

Causal Fuzzing for Verifying Machine Unlearning

ANNA MAZHAR, Cornell University, USA

SAINYAM GALHOTRA, Cornell University, USA

As machine learning models become increasingly embedded in decision-making systems, the ability to “unlearn” targeted data or features is crucial for enhancing model adaptability, fairness, and privacy in models which involves expensive training. To effectively guide machine unlearning, a thorough testing is essential. Existing methods for verification of machine unlearning provide limited insights, often failing in scenarios where the influence is indirect. In this work, we propose *CAFÉ*, a new causality based framework that unifies datapoint- and feature-level unlearning for verification of black-box ML models. *CAFÉ* evaluates both direct and indirect effects of unlearning targets through causal dependencies, providing actionable insights with fine-grained analysis. Our evaluation across five datasets and three model architectures demonstrates that *CAFÉ* successfully detects residual influence missed by baselines while maintaining computational efficiency.

1 Introduction

Machine learning (ML) models are now a central component of modern software, powering decision-making in domains ranging from healthcare and finance to e-commerce and government services. These models are typically trained on proprietary data, so organizations must ensure that training and deployment comply with legal and policy constraints. A key requirement is machine unlearning: removing the influence of specific data points, features, or subpopulations from a trained model without retraining from scratch. Unlearning is increasingly critical due to (i) privacy regulations such as the GDPR “right to erasure,” (ii) organizational policies that prohibit the use of sensitive attributes or their proxies, and (iii) post-deployment debugging and maintenance that uncover spurious or harmful correlations.

The effectiveness of unlearning hinges on **verification**: without rigorous tests, there is no guarantee that a deployed model has truly forgotten the targeted data or feature. This assurance is not only essential for regulatory compliance and legal defensibility but also for maintaining user trust and ensuring reliable debugging. Heuristic-based methods can provide a false sense of security, allowing residual influence to persist unnoticed and leaving organizations vulnerable to regulatory or legal challenges.

Existing verification approaches can be broadly categorized into (i) data sample unlearning, which aims to eliminate the influence of specific training records or certain specific features of a few data samples, and (ii) feature unlearning, which aims to eliminate the effect of an entire attribute (e.g., race or zip code) so predictions do not depend on it directly or indirectly. These methods also differ in access assumptions, from white-box approaches requiring model internals to black-box techniques. Feature-level verification techniques typically rely on feature-attribution measures such as SHAP values, permutation tests, or gradient saliency [12, 26, 35]. These correlation-based measures can produce misleading insights as they ignore the causal dependencies between the features. As a result, a model may pass naive verification while still encoding residual influence. Data sample unlearning methods [16, 21, 22, 36] likewise cannot guarantee the removal of a specific feature’s indirect effect on those records. Table 1 summarizes a representative set of prior unlearning verification techniques.

In this work, we propose *CAFÉ*, a new causality based framework that unifies datapoint- and feature-level unlearning for verification of black-box ML models. *CAFÉ* tests whether a model has fully unlearned any chosen set of features for any collection of datapoints. Our method (i) evaluates both direct and indirect effects of the unlearning target that captures causal dependencies between features, (ii) provides an aggregate influence score that is easy-to-interpret and actionable, and (iii) enables fine-grained analysis to uncover hidden residual dependencies and subgroup disparities.




Fig. 1. **Hidden Residual Influence in Feature Unlearning.** (A) SHAP attribution suggests successful unlearning of Zip Code (zero importance). (B) Causal analysis reveals that Zip Code’s influence persists through an indirect pathway via NeighborhoodMedianIncome (NMI), resulting in non-zero Indirect Effects.

At the core of our method is a causal fuzzing oracle that (i) intervenes on the target feature or data subset, (ii) propagates changes through a causal graph to downstream variables, and (iii) observes the model’s response. This process yields interpretable influence scores that remain valid even when the model is accessible only as a black box.

The following example illustrates why indirect effects can give a false sense of unlearning and how *CAFÉ* can effectively identify these hidden influences.

Example 1.1. Consider a loan approval model deployed by a bank. The model takes as input applicant features such as income, loan amount, credit score, applicant zip-code, and neighborhood median income (NMI), and outputs an approve/deny decision. Suppose Alice and Bob both earn \$60,000/year, request a \$30,000 loan, and have a credit score of 720. Alice lives in Zip Code 12345 (average neighborhood income \$80k), and her approval probability is 0.62. Bob lives in Zip Code 54321 (average neighborhood income \$45k), and his approval probability is 0.39.

A regulator then prohibits the use of Zip Code because it can act as a proxy for race. The bank unlearns the impact of Zip Code on the prediction variable. Figure 1a shows that attribution methods like SHAP confirm that Zip Code has zero importance, while Credit Score (0.51), Income (0.35), NMI (0.10), and Loan Amount (0.07) are now the “drivers.” However, Bob’s approval probability is still 0.39 because neighborhood median income is highly correlated with Zip Code. When Zip Code is removed, the model simply routes its effect through this correlated feature as shown in Figure 1b.

This example highlights the core problem: while traditional attribution methods like SHAP may suggest that Zip Code has been fully unlearned, reporting zero direct importance, its influence can persist indirectly through correlated features such as neighborhood income. In contrast, *CAFÉ* summarizes that the direct causal impact of Zip Code is zero but the indirect impact is over

Table 1. Categorization of Prior work based on unlearning setting (data sample or feature unlearning) and type of effects captured.

	Unlearning setting	
	Datapoint samples ¹	Feature
Direct	[14, 21, 22, 36] [7, 16, 23, 31]	[4, 9, 44] [1, 3, 10, 39, 40]
Indirect	<i>Our approach</i>	
	Gray: Black-box	White: White-box

¹Most of prior work has focussed on unlearning entire datapoints but we use ‘datapoint samples’ to refer to both, all features of datapoints or a subset of their features

0.32. Additionally, *CAFÉ* allows the user to perform this analysis for any sub-population, such as individuals with age ≤ 25 .

Contributions: In summary, our paper makes the following contributions:

- We introduce a principled framework to test whether a *black-box* ML model has truly unlearned the effect of any specified feature for an arbitrary sub-population. Our method quantifies both *direct* and *indirect* causal influence along the different feature pathways and naturally handles both *feature-level* and *datapoint-level* unlearning scenarios.
- We design an efficient estimator that computes the causal effect of each feature on model predictions. This estimator is provably equivalent to the *average treatment effect* (ATE) under mild identifiability conditions and is orders of magnitude faster than exhaustive causal fuzzing, enabling practical verification at scale.
- We demonstrate the framework on both real-world and carefully constructed semi-synthetic datasets, showing how it reveals hidden residual influence and subgroup disparities that evade conventional feature-attribution based checks. To foster further research on this topic, we have open-sourced the prototype.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. §2 provides background on machine unlearning approaches, and key causal inference concepts. §3 formalizes the problem definition and introduces our unlearning target specification. §4 presents our causal fuzzing framework for machine unlearning verification. §5 evaluates our approach on both semi-synthetic and real-world datasets, demonstrating its effectiveness in detecting hidden residual influence. §6 discusses related work, and §7 concludes with limitations and future directions.

2 Background

In this section, we give an overview of prior work on the verification of machine unlearning and causal inference.

2.1 Machine Unlearning

Machine unlearning refers to methods that remove the influence of specific data points or features from a trained machine learning model without retraining from scratch. These methods operate at different levels, targeting individual data points, features, or entire groups of samples [30, 41, 43]. While these approaches aim to remove influence, verification of their effectiveness requires separate techniques—which is the focus of our work. Machine unlearning approaches can be broadly categorized based on their methodological foundations and the guarantees they provide:

Exact unlearning methods provide theoretical guarantees by restructuring the training process. Data-structure based methods, first introduced by Cao and Yang [6], express models in summation form so that forgetting corresponds to updating sufficient statistics. SISA (Sharded, Isolated, Sliced, Aggregated) training [5] restructures learning into independent shards and slices, allowing deletion by retraining only small subsets rather than the entire model.

Certified unlearning methods provide formal guarantees that the resulting model is indistinguishable from one trained without the forgotten data. Ginart et al. [15] and Guo et al. [19] establish statistical bounds and explore extensions to differential privacy and adaptive deletion settings.

Approximate unlearning methods prioritize efficiency and practical utility retention over formal guarantees. These include Amnesiac ML [18], influence-function based updates [17], and distillation-based scrubbing [38], which remove data effects empirically. In distributed settings, federated unlearning methods address client- or record-level contributions while managing challenges of aggregation, efficiency, and auditing [25].

2.2 Causal Inference

Our unlearning verification framework builds on causal inference theory, which provides principled methods for understanding cause-and-effect relationships in data [29]. We review the key concepts that explain our approach.

2.2.1 Causal Models. A causal model formalizes how variables influence each other through a mathematical framework. Formally, a causal model $\langle M, \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{u}) \rangle$ consists of an underlying structural model $M = \langle \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{H} \rangle$ with three components:

- **Observable variables \mathbf{F} :** These represent the features and the target variable (outcome) we measure
- **Background variables \mathbf{U} :** These are the unobserved factors that influence the system
- **Structural functions $\mathbf{H} = (H_X)_{X \in \mathbf{V}}$:** Each function H_X determines how variable X depends on its causes (parents)

The causal relationships are encoded through parent-child dependencies. Variable X can have parents among both the observable variables $\text{Pa}_{\mathbf{F}}(X) \subseteq \mathbf{F} \setminus \{X\}$ and the background variables $\text{Pa}_{\mathbf{U}}(X) \subseteq \mathbf{U}$. The background variables follow a probability distribution $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{u})$ that captures uncertainty in the system. The structure of a causal model is visualized as a *causal graph* $G = \langle \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{E} \rangle$, which is a directed graph where nodes represent variables (both observable and background) and directed edges encode direct causal relationships between variables. A variable Z is called a *descendant* of X if there exists a directed path from X to Z , meaning X causally influences Z either directly or through intermediate variables.

2.2.2 Interventions and Causal Effects. The power of causal models lies in their ability to predict the effects of interventions, i.e., changes we make to the system by forcing certain variables to take specific values. An *intervention* on features $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{F}$ involves overriding their natural causal mechanisms and setting them to constants $\mathbf{x} \in \text{DOM}(\mathbf{X})$. We denote this as $\mathbf{X} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}$. Under intervention, the structural equations for \mathbf{X} are replaced with the constant assignments, while all other relationships remain unchanged.

Potential Outcomes. Given an intervention $\mathbf{X} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}$ and background context \mathbf{u} , the *potential outcome* $Y_{\mathbf{X} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u})$ represents the value that variable Y would take in the modified system. These potential outcomes satisfy the *consistency condition*:

$$\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{x} \implies Y_{\mathbf{X} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u}) = y, \quad (1)$$

This means that if variables \mathbf{X} naturally take values \mathbf{x} in context \mathbf{u} , then forcing them to those same values doesn't change the outcome. The background distribution $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{u})$ induces probability distributions over all potential outcomes. For example, the probability that $Y = y$ under intervention $\mathbf{X} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}$ in contexts characterized by \mathbf{k} is:

$$\mathbb{P}(y_{\mathbf{X} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}} \mid \mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbb{P}(y_{\mathbf{X} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u})) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{k}). \quad (2)$$

The do-operator and Identification. Pearl introduced the do-operator to formalize interventional queries of the form: "What is the probability of observing $Y = y$ if we set \mathbf{X} to \mathbf{x} ?" This is denoted $\mathbb{P}(y \mid \text{do}(\mathbf{x}))$ and represents population-level causal effects under intervention.

A key insight is that interventional distributions can sometimes be computed from observational data (without actually performing interventions) when certain graphical conditions are satisfied. The *backdoor criterion* provides one such condition: if there exists a set of variables \mathbf{C} that blocks

all confounding paths between X and Y in causal diagram G , then [29]:

$$\mathbb{P}(y \mid \text{do}(x)) = \sum_{c \in \text{Dom}(C)} \mathbb{P}(y \mid c, x) \mathbb{P}(c) \quad (3)$$

This formula is crucial for our verification framework as it enables estimation of causal effects from observational data, avoiding the need for explicit interventions.

3 Problem Definition

In this section, we formalize the problem of testing machine unlearning. Our framework extends traditional approaches by allowing fine-grained control over what information is forgotten, moving beyond the removal of entire data points to the selective elimination of specific features within individual examples.

Notation. Let D denote a dataset with n datapoints, each consisting of m attributes (or features) $F = \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$. We refer a datapoint as $t_i \in D$, $\text{DOM}(A_i)$ as the domain of attribute A_i and use $t_i[A_j]$ to denote the value of attribute A_j for tuple t_i .

We begin by defining the unlearning target, which captures the precise scope of information to be removed:

DEFINITION 1 (UNLEARNING TARGET). *An unlearning target specifies the subpopulation that should be "forgotten" by a model. Formally, an unlearning target is a subset*

$$S \subseteq D \times F,$$

where a pair $(t, f) \in S$ indicates that the model should not use feature f for datapoint $t \in D$.

We can vary the subset S to unlearn any set of features for any datapoint. This definition is flexible to perform datapoint, feature or subgroup unlearning. Specifically, if $S = D \times \{f\}$, it means feature f should be forgotten for all datapoints in the dataset (also known as feature unlearning) and if $S = \{t_i\} \times F$, it means that no feature of datapoint t_i should be used by the ML model (also known as datapoint unlearning). Given a sub-group for which we want to perform unlearning, we first define how a feature might influence the outcome variable and then discuss how such influences need to be unlearned.

DEFINITION 2 (CAUSAL INFLUENCE). *A target sub-group $S \subseteq D \times F$ is considered to have a causal influence on a model M if for any pair $(x, f) \in S$ the model output changes on varying the feature f for the datapoint x . More formally,*

$$M(x_{F \leftarrow x_f}) \neq M(x)$$

for all $x_f \in \text{DOM}(f)$ and $x_f \neq x[F]$.

Building on this, we now define the machine unlearning procedure itself.

DEFINITION 3 (MACHINE UNLEARNING). *Let D be a training dataset, \mathcal{A} be a learning algorithm, and $M = \mathcal{A}(D)$ be the trained model.*

A machine unlearning procedure is a function

$$U: (M, S) \mapsto M'$$

that takes a model M , an unlearning target S , and outputs a modified model M' . We say U achieves effective unlearning if every pair $(t_i, f) \in S$ does not have a causal influence on the model M' .

Note: *The procedure U may retain representations of S in the model parameters, provided they do not influence M' 's output distribution.*

This definition captures both settings of feature unlearning and datapoint unlearning. It also gives the flexibility to simulate sub-group unlearning, where a user may want to unlearn the effects of a certain features for a subset of datapoints. For example, if $S = D \times \{f\}$ with D representing all training datapoints and $f = \text{Gender}$, then the model should behave as if the `Gender` feature had never been used in training (and thus any influence of `Gender` on predictions is removed). Such unlearning targets are especially relevant for fairness and privacy, as they cover scenarios like removing the influence of a protected attribute from a model.

Given the theoretical framework established above, we now formally state the central problem addressed in this work:

PROBLEM 1 (MACHINE UNLEARNING VERIFICATION PROBLEM). *Let M' be a model produced by applying unlearning procedure U to original model M with unlearning target $S \subseteq D \times F$. Given:*

- *Black-box access to model M'*
- *Knowledge of the causal graph G over features F and outcome Y*

Design a method to determine whether M' exhibits residual causal influence from the target set S on model predictions.

This leads us to define our verification approach in the following section, where we formalize *Causal Fuzzing* as a practical method for assessing unlearning effectiveness.

4 Causal Fuzzing For Machine Unlearning

We outline several key goals that any ideal approach to machine unlearning verification should aim to achieve. These goals provide guiding principles for ensuring that verification methods are both rigorous and practical when applied in complex, real-world settings.

4.1 Key Design Goals

We state the following four design goals for unlearning verification, each targeting a core challenge:

- **G1 – Thoroughness:** The test must be comprehensive in detecting residual dependence of the unlearning target on predictions *regardless of whether the dependence is direct or mediated* by other variables. This ensures that indirect influences are not overlooked, which could otherwise lead to false conclusions about successful unlearning.
- **G2 – Black-Box Access:** The procedure must operate with prediction-only access to the model (no gradients, weights, or training logs). This reflects common deployed model constraints.
- **G3 – Interpretability:** The method should provide clear, actionable insights that help users understand and better guide unlearning efforts. Practitioners need to know not just whether unlearning failed, but where and how residual influence persists.
- **G4 – Efficiency:** It should have minimal computational overhead and execution time, making the technique scale to modern models and be applied in practice.

4.2 Causal Fuzzing Oracle

To evaluate the effectiveness of machine unlearning, we implement a novel causal fuzzing technique that systematically fuzzes the unlearned model’s behavior through targeted interventions on the unlearning target. The key idea is simple: if a model has truly forgotten a feature f for a tuple t in D , then changing this feature *and their causal consequences* should no longer influence predictions. If prediction changes persist, they indicate residual dependence and incomplete unlearning. Since each post-intervention state defines a probability distribution, we approximate expected changes in prediction using Monte Carlo samples drawn from realistic intervention values.

Algorithm 1 Causal Fuzzing for Machine Unlearning

Input: Causal graph $G = (V, E)$, unlearned model M' , unlearning target $S \subseteq D \times F$, Structural equations H

Output: Causal Influence score $\Delta Y(\theta)$

```

1:  $\Delta Y \leftarrow 0$ 
2: for each  $(x, f) \in S$  do
3:   Sample a new intervention value  $\theta_f \in \text{DOM}(f)$  for feature  $f$ 
4:    $x' \leftarrow x$  // Copy original instance
5:    $x'[f] \leftarrow \theta_f$  // Apply intervention
6:   // Propagate intervention
7:   for each node  $v \in \text{DESCENDANTS}(x, G)$  do
8:     if  $v = f$  then
9:       continue
10:     $\text{parents}(v) \leftarrow \{u : (u, v) \in E\}$ 
11:    if  $\text{parents}(v)$  have changed values then
12:       $x'[v] \leftarrow H_v(x'[\text{parents}(v)])$  // Predict using causal model
13:     $\Delta Y \leftarrow \Delta Y + (M'(x') - M'(x))$  // Accumulate influence
14: return  $\Delta Y$ 

```

The oracle assumes that only the causal structure of the data, represented as a directed acyclic graph $G = (V, E)$, is available but the functional dependencies are not known. This assumption is reasonable in many domains where either expert knowledge provides the structure or causal discovery methods can be applied (e.g., PC algorithm [37], LiNGAM [33]).

Causal Fuzzing Algorithm. (Algorithm 1) outlines our causal fuzzing process, which operates in three key phases. First, the algorithm initializes by setting the total influence score to zero and iterates over each target feature in the unlearning set F (lines 1). For each test instance, it samples an intervention value θ_f (line 3) and creates a copy of the original instance to apply the intervention (line 4–5). Rather than treating feature changes in isolation, the algorithm traverses nodes in topological order of the causal graph G (line 7). For each node v that is not the intervened feature, it identifies the node’s parents and checks whether any parent values have been modified by previous interventions (lines 10–12). When parent values change, the algorithm updates the node’s value using the corresponding causal model H_v (line 12). These models are lightweight regression models which are trained on observational data. This propagated fuzzing ensures that the perturbed instance maintains causal consistency with the intervention.

Finally, the algorithm measures the influence by computing the prediction difference between the intervened instance x' and the original instance x using the unlearned model M' (line 13). This difference is accumulated across all features and test instances to produce the total causal influence score. The algorithm achieves **G2 (Black-box access)** by requiring only prediction access to M' , while **G1 (Thoroughness)** is satisfied through the systematic propagation that captures both direct effects (immediate feature changes) and indirect effects (mediated through downstream variables).

Direct, Indirect, and Path-Specific Influence. The oracle is flexible enough to decompose influence into direct and indirect components. To evaluate the total influence, the algorithm runs in full, propagating interventions through all descendants. To isolate direct influence, we modify the procedure by skipping the propagation step (lines 6–12). The difference between total and direct effects yields the indirect influence. This decomposition allows practitioners to determine whether residual dependence arises from the target feature itself or from mediated pathways. More generally,

the framework can be extended to compute path-specific influence, by selectively propagating interventions along certain subsets of paths in G while holding others fixed.

By decomposing the influence score into direct and indirect components, our methodology achieves **G3 (Interpretability)** and provides actionable insights into *where* residual dependence persists in the model. This breakdown enables users to pinpoint whether incomplete unlearning is due to direct retention of the target feature or mediated through other variables.

While the causal fuzzing approach achieves goals G1-G3, it falls short of **G4 (Efficiency)** due to significant computational overhead. The method requires training multiple lightweight regression models $\mathbf{H} = \{H_v : v \in V\}$ to capture causal relationships and repeating the intervention propagation process for every test instance and target feature. This computational cost scales with the dataset size and graph complexity, making the approach potentially prohibitive for large-scale applications.

Algorithm 2 *CAFÉ*: Causal-Aware Fast Estimator

Input: Causal graph G , outcome Y , unlearning target $S \subseteq D \times F$ with target features F_S

Output: Per-feature total, natural direct, and natural indirect effects: $\{\tau_{\text{total}}^j, \tau_{\text{direct}}^j, \tau_{\text{indirect}}^j\}_{j=1}^{|F_S|}$

```

1: for each target feature  $f_j \in F_S$  do
2:   // Identify sets from  $G$ 
3:    $Z_j \leftarrow$  a valid back-door set for  $f_j \rightarrow Y$  in  $G$ 
4:    $M_j \leftarrow$  mediators on directed paths  $f_j \rightsquigarrow Y$  in  $G$ 
5:    $\theta \leftarrow$  Identify interventions for feature  $f_j$ 
6:   // Total, Direct and Indirect effect, respectively
7:    $\tau_{\text{total}}^j \leftarrow$  Compute total impact using Def 4
8:    $\tau_{\text{direct}}^j \leftarrow$  Compute direct impact using Def 4
9:    $\tau_{\text{indirect}}^j \leftarrow \tau_{\text{total}}^j - \tau_{\text{direct}}^j$ 
10: return  $\{\tau_{\text{total}}^j, \tau_{\text{direct}}^j, \tau_{\text{indirect}}^j\}_{j=1}^{|F_S|}$ 

```

4.3 *CAFÉ*: Causal-Aware Fast Estimator

To address the computational limitations of causal fuzzing while preserving its theoretical rigor, we develop *CAFÉ*, a Causal-Aware Fast Estimator that achieves **G4 (Efficiency)** without sacrificing the causal foundations established in our oracle. The key insight is to replace the expensive intervention propagation process with an aggregate causal effect estimation (referred to as *CAFÉ* score) using the backdoor criterion, a principle in causal inference that allows us to identify causal effects from observational data when confounding paths are properly blocked (see §2).

DEFINITION 4 (TOTAL *CAFÉ* SCORE). *Let G be a known causal graph over features F and outcome Y , and let M' be a model after applying unlearning procedure U with target $S \subseteq D \times F$. We define the *CAFÉ* score as the expected difference in model output when each feature f is varied for the subset of datapoints in S . More formally, the total influence score is computed as:*

$$\Delta Y = \sum_{f \in F_S} \sum_{z_f \in \text{Dom}(Z_f)} [\mathbb{E}_S[M'(X) \mid Z_f = z_f, X_f = \theta_f] - \mathbb{E}_S[M'(X) \mid Z_f = z_f, X_f = x_f]]$$

where B_f is the set of variables that block the path between f and Y , and θ_f is an intervened value of feature f . E_S denotes the expected value of the model output for the datapoints in S , F_S is the set of features in S and x_f is the original value of feature f .

A model M' is considered to have effectively unlearned the target S if the total causal influence ΔY remains below a specified threshold $\tau > 0$ across a range of perturbations on the features in S .

This definition provides the theoretical basis for our practical verification algorithm that follows. We define the direct impact as the same score evaluated after blocking all other paths.

CAFÉ Algorithm. (Algorithm 2) implements this principle by systematically identifying and estimating causal effects for each target feature. For each target feature f_j , the algorithm performs three critical identification steps. First, it identifies a valid backdoor set Z_j for the causal relationship $f_j \rightarrow Y$ (line 3). This set must satisfy the backdoor criterion: it blocks all spurious (non-causal) paths between f_j and Y while leaving all directed paths open. Second, it identifies the set of mediators M_j that lie on directed causal paths from f_j to Y (line 4). These mediators are crucial for decomposing total effects into direct and indirect components.

The core estimation phase (lines 7–9) uses these identified sets to compute causal effects. *CAFÉ* estimates interventional effects by comparing model predictions across different treatment values for each target feature f_j (line 5). These intervention values represent the perturbed feature value which would reveal the residual influence if the feature were not properly unlearned.

The **total effect** (line 7) captures the complete causal influence of f_j on Y . Similarly, the **direct effect** (line 8) is evaluated by conditioning on both Z_j and the mediators M_j . This allows isolating the portion of the effect that flows directly from f_j to Y without passing through the identified mediators. Finally, the **indirect effect** is computed as the difference between total and direct effects (line 9), capturing the influence that flows through the mediating variables.

CAFÉ achieves significant computational savings compared to causal fuzzing by replacing Monte Carlo simulation with closed-form expected value estimates. We evaluate the computational efficiency of *CAFÉ* in addition to its effectiveness in section 5.

5 Evaluation

In this section, we evaluate *CAFÉ* and other baselines over several real-world and semi-synthetic datasets to answer the following research questions:

RQ1 (*CAFÉ* for Testing Unlearning): How does *CAFÉ* compare against baselines? In this experiment, we consider features with varying causal influence and compare how *CAFÉ* and other verification techniques quantify the impact.

RQ2 (Direct vs. Indirect Effect Across Unlearning Targets): When do direct and indirect effects provide different insights for various types of unlearning targets (single vs. multiple features, global vs. subgroup unlearning)?

RQ3 (Robustness and Generalizability): How robust is *CAFÉ* across different model architectures and under causal graph uncertainty?

RQ4 (Fidelity and Efficiency of *CAFÉ*): Does *CAFÉ* provide significant speedup while ensuring close fidelity as compared to causal fuzzing?

5.1 Experimental Setup

Baselines. We compare our proposed methods with several attribution based methods. For feature influence estimation, we include SHAP [26], a widely used method based on cooperative game theory; permutation importance [12], which measures the change in model performance when a feature’s values are permuted. We also incorporated feature influence measurement techniques from fairness testing frameworks. In particular, we include FairTest [39], a tree-based subpopulation discovery framework that employs multiple statistical metrics to identify unwarranted associations in model outputs across sensitive features, and AIF360 [3], which provides a comprehensive suite of metrics to assess and mitigate bias in machine learning models. We apply standard metrics




Fig. 2. Causal DAGs heart-disease and performance datasets.

Table 2. Summary of datasets used in evaluation.

Dataset	Type	# Samples	# Features	Outcome
Heart-Disease	Semi-synthetic	10,000	5	Risk (continuous)
Performance	Semi-synthetic	10,000	5	Score (continuous)
German Credit	Real-world	1,000	20	Credit Risk (binary)
Adult Income	Real-world	48,842	14	Income (binary)
Drug Consumption	Real-world	1,885	12	Drug Use (binary)

including statistical parity difference (SPD), disparate impact (DI), equal opportunity difference (EOD), and average odds difference (AOD).

Datasets. We evaluate our approach on both semi-synthetic and real-world datasets as summarized in Table 2. For semi-synthetic datasets, the causal graphs were already known. For the German and Adult datasets, we obtained the causal graph from [8], while for the Drug dataset, we used LiNGAM [33] to generate the causal structure.

- **German Credit Dataset:** [20] A dataset used for credit risk evaluation, with features such as age, credit history, and employment status.
- **Adult Income Dataset:** [2] A dataset used for income classification based on features such as education, occupation, and marital status.
- **Drug Consumption Dataset:** [11] A dataset used for predicting drug consumption based on personality traits and demographics.
- **Heart-Disease Dataset:** A dataset for heart disease risk evaluation, with features such as blood pressure, smoking, exercise, and BMI (Figure 2a).
- **Performance Dataset:** A dataset for performance evaluation, with socio-economic features such as education years, experience years, gender, and income (Figure 2b).

5.2 CAFÉ for Testing Unlearning (RQ1)

In this section, we assess the effectiveness of CAFÉ to validate unlearning and compare it with other baselines. We test unlearning methods by simulating scenarios where each feature contributes different direct and indirect effects to the outcome.

5.2.1 Experimental Setup and Validation Strategy. We evaluate CAFÉ using two complementary validation approaches that address different aspects of ground truth availability:

Semi-synthetic datasets with known ground truth: For the Heart-Disease and Performance datasets, we generated several experimental scenarios with varying degrees of feature influence

²Smoking (S) raises blood pressure (B) and body mass index (M), both of which causally influence the binary outcome Risk (R). Exercise (E) lowers BMI, yielding an indirect protective effect on risk.

³Education years (E) and Income (I) directly influence performance score S while experience years (X) and gender (G) influence S indirectly through E and I.




Fig. 3. Feature influence ranked using different metrics. *CAFÉ* yields the correct ranking according to the ground-truth in both datasets while SHAP, perm and Fairtest fails to capture mediated influences.

on the outcome, including cases where features have the highest influence, lowest influence, and no relationship with the outcome (i.e., excluded from model training). The ground truth influence rankings were determined using the underlying structural equations from the data generation process, providing a reliable benchmark for direct comparison against *CAFÉ* and baseline methods.

Real-world datasets with literature-based validation: For the German Credit, Adult Income, and Drug Consumption datasets, ground truth causal impact is unavailable due to the complexity of real-world dependencies between variables. Instead, we validate *CAFÉ*'s feature influence rankings by comparing them against established findings from prior literature and domain knowledge, examining whether our causal approach aligns with previously documented empirical studies and well-established predictors in each domain.

5.2.2 Evaluating *CAFÉ* Across Datasets. We evaluate the correctness of *CAFÉ* using the established approaches across the following datasets.

Heart-Disease: Figure 3a shows that *CAFÉ* demonstrates strong alignment with the ground truth feature rankings, while baseline methods show significant deviations from the correct rankings, underestimating the influence of key features. For instance, the ground truth identifies smoking as the most influential feature, which *CAFÉ* correctly captures, while all baselines ranked it second last. This discrepancy arises because smoking influences risk mainly through its effect on bmi and blood_pressure, which is not captured by methods that ignore mediation.

In one scenario, the model was trained without the smoking feature to simulate perfect unlearning of the direct effect, expecting it to have non-zero influence only through the mediators. However, all baseline methods assigned it negligible influence and ranked it the lowest. However, *CAFÉ* correctly ranked smoking as the most influential feature, consistent with the ground truth derived from the structural equations. This highlights an important residual influence that remains undetected by conventional approaches when verifying machine unlearning.

Performance: Figure 3b shows that *CAFÉ* mirrors the ground truth rankings for features in *Performance* dataset with complex causal interactions, while baseline methods fail to account for mediated effects. For instance, baselines can be observed to overestimate feature importance by focusing solely on direct effects while missing the broader causal context. The ground truth ranks experience as 3rd out of 4 features, which *CAFÉ* correctly captures, while all baselines incorrectly rank it highest. This occurs because experience has a strong direct effect on performance, but




Fig. 4. Comparison of feature influence and *CAFÉ* results across two datasets. Each panel shows a different metric or comparison for heart-disease risk and performance.

other features exert substantial influence through pathways that flow *through* experience. Specifically, education directly influences experience, and gender influences education, creating a causal chain where upstream features gain substantial indirect influence that ultimately surpasses experience’s total effect. *CAFÉ* accurately accounts for this complete causal topology, recognizing that while experience serves as an important mediator, the features that influence it deserve higher overall rankings due to their combined direct and mediated contributions.

German: Figure 4a summarizes the feature influence rankings for the German Credit dataset, highlighting the differences between *CAFÉ* and baseline methods. *CAFÉ* confirms widely acknowledged top predictors in the German dataset as checking, duration, and savings with housing consistently least influential [13]. Importantly, *CAFÉ* diverges from SHAP and permutation methods by ranking credit amount higher, a result consistent with literature emphasizing its causal influence but often down weighted in purely associational rankings. This distinction highlights how causal methods better reflect underlying mechanisms rather than predictive correlations.

Adult: Figure 4b shows that *CAFÉ* corroborates established findings for the Adult dataset by ranking education, sex, and age as the top predictors. In contrast, FairTest overemphasizes hours worked while downplaying sex. This divergence arises because FairTest relies on surface-level correlations, hours shows a strong direct association with income (i.e., more hours lead to higher wages), overlooking the way sex influences hours. Consequently, FairTest underestimates the impact of sex while overestimating that of hours.

Drug: Figure 4c displays the ranking of features for the Drug Consumption dataset. It highlights broad agreement with baseline methods, as verified in [13]. Demographic factors (e.g., country, age) dominate, while sensation-seeking is among the top predictors. Where baselines diverge (e.g., Gender), they tend to emphasize global correlations and overlook causal relationships.

5.2.3 Limitations of Standard Fairness Metrics for Unlearning Verification. In this experiment, we evaluate how standard fairness metrics quantify the effects of the sensitive attribute and compare it with *CAFÉ*. Consider the performance dataset where gender serves as a protected feature targeted for unlearning. *CAFÉ*’s causal analysis reveals that while gender shows negligible *direct* influence on predictions (consistent with successful direct unlearning), it maintains substantial *indirect* influence through causal pathways via education_years and experience_years (Figure 6b).




Fig. 5. Relative feature influence comparison for performance dataset.




Fig. 6. Direct, Indirect, and Total influence breakdown using CAFÉ.

Figure 5 reports four common fairness metrics— Statistical Parity Difference (SPD), Disparate Impact (DI), Equal Opportunity Difference (EOD), and Average Odds Difference (AOD)— for each feature treated as “protected” for performance dataset. We see that `education_years` and `income` exhibit the largest SPD and AOD values, indicating substantial group-level disparities when these features vary. `gender` shows a moderate SPD (0.3) and EOD (0.25), while `experience_years` registers near zero on all metrics. As a baseline, these results confirm which features co-vary most strongly with outcome disparities under standard statistical tests.

The fundamental limitation is that fairness metrics, like other baselines we discussed, only capture associational group differences at the outcome level. They cannot distinguish whether observed disparities stem from direct dependencies or indirect causal pathways risking false confidence.

Finding 1. *Mediator influence is accurately captured by CAFÉ. Conventional metrics that ignore mediation (SHAP, permutation importance, FairTest) over-state purely direct features (e.g. `experience`) and under-state features whose influence is largely indirect (e.g. `smoking`, `exercise`) (Fig. 3a).*

While CAFÉ effectively captures the causal relationships, it is important to benchmark its performance against causal fuzzing, which exhaustively explores the full causal graph. In the following section, we compare the results of CAFÉ with those from causal fuzzing, evaluating CAFÉ’s fidelity and computational efficiency.

5.3 Direct vs. Indirect Effect Across Unlearning Targets (RQ2)

Here, we examine the significance of both direct and indirect influences of various machine unlearning targets S . Besides the obvious **Feature Unlearning** and **Datapoint Unlearning**, the unlearning target can be more granular.

Based on the definition of unlearning targets provided in §3, these targets can be categorized into four special cases. All unlearning targets follow the general form $S = T \times A$, where $T \subseteq D$ specifies which datapoints are affected and $A \subseteq F$ specifies which features to remove.

- **Feature Unlearning** $S = D \times \{f\}$: Global single feature unlearning.

- **Datapoint(s) Unlearning** $S = T \times A$: Complete datapoint unlearning $S = \{t_i\} \times F$ or subgroup multi-feature unlearning.
- **Subgroup Feature Unlearning** $S = T \times \{f\}$: Single feature datapoint or subgroup unlearning.
- **Multi-Feature Unlearning** $S = D \times A$: Global multi-feature unlearning.

We have thus far focused **Feature Unlearning** in section §5.2. However, extending the analysis to the remaining three types of unlearning targets reveals distinct and meaningful insights.

5.3.1 Datapoint(s) Unlearning. The unlearning target $S = T \times A$ encompasses two distinct scenarios depending on the scope of T and A :

Scenario 1: Complete Datapoint Unlearning. When T represents a specific datapoint t_i and A includes all features F , this corresponds to complete datapoint unlearning $S = \{t_i\} \times F$, i.e. removing all influence of a particular data instance from the model. This scenario focuses on eliminating the holistic contribution of individual samples.

Scenario 2: Subgroup Multi-Feature Unlearning. When A represents a subset of features and T is a subgroup of datapoints (e.g., filtered by conditions like $\text{age} > 50$), this corresponds to unlearning specific features within targeted subgroups.

Conventional analyses that focus primarily on direct effects may therefore overlook substantial residual influence. This is particularly problematic when indirect effects arising through mediated pathways differ markedly between subgroups, even if direct effects appear identical. For example, in the Heart Disease dataset, we examined the subgroup with $\text{age} > 50$ for the feature set $\{\text{BMI}, \text{blood_pressure}\}$. The direct effect revealed by $CAF\acute{E}$ for this subgroup was nearly identical to that for $\text{age} \leq 50$, which would suggest no meaningful difference in influence. However, the indirect effect was much larger for the $\text{age} > 50$ subgroup, resulting in a substantial gap in the total effect between the two groups (Figure 7). When attempting to unlearn this discrepancy across these subgroups, baselines incorrectly conclude that there is no discrepancy and that the influence is identical, failing to account for the differing indirect effects. In contrast, $CAF\acute{E}$ successfully captures this nuance.




Fig. 7. Comparison of direct, indirect, and total causal influence for unlearning targets in the Heart Disease dataset, stratified by age group ($\text{age} > 50$ vs. $\text{age} \leq 50$). Each bar shows the breakdown of influence for BMI, highlighting subgroup-specific differences in mediated effects.

5.3.2 Subgroup Feature Unlearning. When unlearning a single feature for a specific subset of data points, the challenge lies in accurately isolating its influence within that group. Even if the feature’s global influence is small, it may have a substantial impact on a particular subgroup defined by shared characteristics (e.g., age range, diagnosis category, or geographic region).

For instance, in the Adult dataset, we examined feature rankings at both global and subgroup levels, revealing a stark contrast in Age’s influence. While Age ranks 5th globally (Figure 4b), it becomes the most influential feature when analyzing only individuals under 40. This finding aligns with established literature indicating that Age is a strong predictor of income, with age 40 representing a critical threshold where middle-aged and older individuals typically earn more than younger individuals. SHAP, on the other hand, still ranks Age 4th in the subgroup. This dramatic shift demonstrates how subgroup-specific causal mechanisms can be masked by global analyses, highlighting the critical importance of targeted unlearning verification for demographic subgroups.

5.3.3 Multi-Feature Unlearning. When unlearning multiple features across the entire dataset, their combined influence is shaped by both direct interactions between the features and indirect effects mediated through other variables. While each feature may have only a moderate individual influence, their joint direct and indirect effects can amplify or suppress the total influence in ways that are not visible when examining direct effects alone.

In the Drug dataset, we observe that `education` exerts a negative influence on drug consumption while `ethnicity` shows a positive influence. When combined, these opposing forces nearly cancel each other, yielding a negligible net effect. It emphasizes how strong but opposing contributions can mask one another in aggregate analyses. This pattern also illustrates the additivity property of multi-feature influence, where the total effect emerges as the sum of individual contributions, even if they operate in opposite directions. Such results highlight the necessity of examining feature-level and subgroup-specific effects, since important drivers of behavior may be obscured when only total influence is considered.

Path-by-Path Analysis. Beyond measuring total causal effects, *CAFÉ* enables fine-grained analysis of causal influence across individual pathways. This capability is crucial for understanding how unlearning targets exert their influence through different causal mechanisms. By decomposing the total effect into path-specific contributions, we can identify which causal pathways carry the strongest influence and assess whether residual dependencies persist through specific mediators after unlearning.

CAFÉ implements path-specific analysis by systematically blocking all but one causal path at a time when estimating influence. For instance, consider unlearning smoking in the heart disease dataset. The total causal effect might mask that smoking influences risk through two distinct pathways: `smoking` \rightarrow `blood_pressure` \rightarrow `risk` and `smoking` \rightarrow `bmi` \rightarrow `risk`. If these pathways have opposing effects (one positive, one negative), the aggregate influence might appear negligible, leading to false confidence in unlearning completeness.

Through path-specific decomposition, *CAFÉ* reveals that these opposing effects originate from distinct causal mechanisms. This granular analysis is valuable for several reasons: (1) it identifies which specific mediators carry residual influence, (2) it reveals potential instabilities where future changes to mediating features (for example, due to shifts in data distribution or model updates) could reactivate the influence of supposedly unlearned features, and (3) it guides targeted mitigation strategies by pinpointing the exact pathways that require intervention.

By isolating path-specific contributions, *CAFÉ* provides actionable insights into the robustness of unlearning outcomes and enables verification that accounts for the complete causal topology.

Finding 2. *Examining direct and indirect effects separately is crucial for robust unlearning verification. Conventional approaches that rely solely on direct effects can be misleading by three key phenomena: subgroup-specific mediation patterns that vary dramatically across populations despite similar direct effects, feature importance rankings that shift completely when moving from global to subgroup analysis, and cancellation effects where opposing effects mask underlying vulnerabilities.*

5.4 Robustness and Generalizability (RQ3)

In this section, we evaluate the robustness of *CAFÉ* under two key challenges: (1) application to black-box models, and (2) uncertainty in the causal graph specification. While *CAFÉ* is designed to be model-agnostic, it is important to explore how effectively it evaluates models with varying complexity and the accuracy of the assumed causal structure.

5.4.1 Varying ML Models. To assess the generalizability of our approach, we performed the same evaluations of *CAFÉ* on random forests and neural networks. Each architecture captures feature




Fig. 8. Feature influence comparison for Adult dataset using Random Forest and Neural Network models.

relationships differently, providing a comprehensive test of our black-box method’s robustness. While linear models are directly interpretable through coefficients, random forests and neural networks present more complex, black-box scenarios.

Figure 8 illustrates the differences in feature influence rankings between the causal analysis and *CAFÉ*’s results for both model types. *CAFÉ* consistently ranks education-num, sex, and age among the top influences, which aligns with well-established findings in the Adult dataset literature. This dataset is known to be highly biased with respect to sex due to several causal pathways through variables like marital status and education. In contrast, shap and permutation importance consider marital status as more important because of its direct impact on the outcome.

5.4.2 Causal Graph Mis-specification. To assess the stability of causal feature rankings under structural variations of the underlying causal graph, we systematically modified the graph by adding edges, removing edges, and enforcing full connectivity. The results in Figure 9 report the percentage of rank changes across datasets.

We observe that changes, such as adding extra 50% new edges or removing 25% of existing edges, lead to only small changes in rankings ($\leq 5\%$). This suggests that the ranking procedure is robust to mild structural uncertainty, which is important in practice where the true causal graph is rarely known with certainty. However, removing existing edges severely yielded larger changes. For example, removing 50% of edges shifts rankings by up to 17%. Similarly, enforcing a fully connected graph (assumed in the absence of any causal knowledge) produces a 19% shift in the German dataset. These larger deviations highlight that while moderate structural misspecification may be tolerable, extreme distortions of the causal structure substantially alter the conclusions drawn from ranking.




Fig. 9. Rank changes under different causal graph mis-specifications.

Finding 3. *CAFÉ* demonstrates robust performance across diverse model architectures (linear, random forest, neural networks) and maintains rank-order under moderate causal DAG mis-specification.

5.5 Efficiency of CAFÉ (RQ4)

We compare CAFÉ’s execution time with several baseline methods across different model types. Table 3 shows the average execution times for each method for all features in the *Adult* dataset. For logistic regression, SHAP’s Linear Explainer is fastest with negligible time (0.0006s), followed by CAFÉ (0.03s). CAFÉ is $\approx 3\times$ faster than permutation importance and $51\times$ faster than causal fuzzing.

For random forest, CAFÉ has the shortest execution time (0.03s). SHAP takes considerably longer for tree-based models (415.6s). This difference stems from SHAP’s need to compute explanations across multiple trees. For neural networks, SHAP runs even slower taking 565.4s since it uses computationally expensive KernelSHAP algorithm. This experiment shows that the optimizations of CAFÉ help to efficiently evaluate the causal influence of each feature.

Table 3. Average execution time comparison across different methods and model types.

Method	LR	RF	NN
SHAP	0.00s	415.61s	565.41s
FairTest	8.46s	8.53s	8.50s
Perm.	0.11s	6.63s	0.31s
Causal Fuzz.	1.54s	1.49s	1.42s
CAFÉ	0.030s	0.026s	0.027s

Finding 4. CAFÉ maintains consistent execution times across model types (0.026-0.030s), while baseline methods show significant variation, with SHAP taking over 400s for complex models.

6 Related Work

Datapoint Unlearning Verification. The verification of datapoint removal from machine learning models has emerged as a critical area of research, with various approaches developed to address different aspects of the problem.

Explainability-Based Verification Methods: Shapley values from cooperative game theory measure each feature’s (or datapoint’s) marginal contribution to a prediction, with SHAP [26] providing practical approximations. If a removed feature retains a high Shapley value after unlearning, its influence was not fully mitigated. Influence functions approximate the effect of removing or perturbing a training example on the model’s loss by computing parameter gradients and (optionally) Hessian-vector products [23]. Gradient-trajectory analysis instead tracks parameter updates throughout training to assess each example’s cumulative contribution to learned parameters [14]. However, these explainability-based methods face significant limitations: Shapley values are computationally expensive, especially for high-dimensional data or large models, and depend heavily on the sample of data and its distribution. Similarly, gradient- and influence-based techniques require white-box access to model parameters and can be computationally prohibitive for large or deep models.

Approximate Deletion and Memorization Analysis: Izzo et al. [21] introduced efficient, approximate data deletion methods for linear and logistic models, emphasizing practical deletion at lower computational cost without requiring full retraining. However, after unlearning, it is still possible that the model may carry detectable traces of those samples. Jagielski et al. [22] proposed empirical methods to quantify memorization and forgetting.

Attack-Based Verification Approaches: Research on privacy implications of unlearning has shown risks associated with dataset updates and attacks. Salem et al. [31] demonstrated that updates in online learning can leak training data through inference and reconstruction attacks. Chen et al. [7] revealed that standard machine unlearning procedures can inadvertently enable new inference attacks, posing privacy risks. Membership inference attacks can also be repurposed for datapoint unlearning [32, 34]. More recently, formal verification approaches have been explored; for example, Sommer et al. [36] developed Athena, a probabilistic system offering formal guarantees for data removal using data poisoning in training. Goel et al. [16] proposed adversarial evaluation protocols for assessing unlearning efficacy in realistic, imperfect settings.

While these attack-based methods provide valuable insights into unlearning verification, they primarily focus on adversarial scenarios and may not capture subtle forms of information leakage or indirect influence pathways that persist after unlearning.

Feature Unlearning Verification (Fairness Testing) Feature unlearning verification centers on assessing and mitigating the influence of sensitive input features to support fairness or compliance.

Statistical and Correlation-Based Testing: Themis. [13] automates the detection of discriminatory decision patterns for fairness testing. Tramèr et al. [39] created FairTest to empirically identify unwarranted associations in data-driven software. Aggarwal et al. [1] extended this approach and used individual discrimination detection via symbolic execution and local explainability. FlipTest [4] applied optimal transport theory, and Zhang et al. [44] proposed gradient-based white-box tests.

Advanced Input Generation Methods: A growing thread incorporates interpretability and sophisticated input generation, as seen in Fan et al.’s [10] explanation-guided genetic algorithms and Xiao et al.’s [42] latent imitator for black-box generation of discriminatory instances. Monjezi et al. [27] advanced the theory of fairness testing using extreme value theory for rare events, while IBM [3] released AIF360, an open bias audit toolkit for practical fairness evaluation. Vidal et al. [40] specifically addressed verification of machine unlearning using explainable AI methods.

These fairness testing approaches typically rely on correlation analysis and may overlook indirect influence via complex causal pathways.

Causal Approaches. Causal inference has emerged as a powerful framework for fairness testing and understanding feature influence in machine learning systems. Nabi and Shpitser [28] proposed methods for fair inference using causal models, which allow for modeling of direct and indirect effects among features and outcomes. Kusner et al. [24] developed counterfactual fairness, defining fairness through counterfactual reasoning about what would have happened in an alternative world where sensitive attributes differed. Chiappa [8] made significant contributions to path-specific fairness, developing methods to decompose the total effect of sensitive attributes into direct and indirect effects along specific causal pathways.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

Our results demonstrate that indirect paths can be a hidden vector for residual influence in machine unlearning, a risk missed by existing verifiers. Our causal-effect estimator *CAFÉ* offers a practical means to detect such influence, making it suitable for integration in continuous integration (CI) pipelines for model audits. We take the first step towards more reliable unlearning verification by explicitly accounting for indirect relationships in the data. Several limitations must be acknowledged to provide a complete picture of the method’s applicability and guide future research directions.

Causal Graph Dependency. Our approach fundamentally depends on a causal graph specification of the training dataset. Our robustness experiments (RQ4) show that our method can tolerate mis-specifications in the causal graph as learned by the model, still providing useful verification results even when the structure is not perfectly accurate. This suggests that the approach remains practical in settings where causal knowledge is approximately captured by the model.

Data Modality. Our approach is currently designed and evaluated on tabular data. It would be interesting to extend unlearning verification to other data modalities. For images and natural language, this may involve reasoning over higher-level concepts or representations. While causal analysis in these domains has been explored, its use for unlearning verification remains open.

Generalizability to Large Language Models (LLMs). Extending unlearning verification to LLMs raises distinctive challenges due to their high-dimensional latent spaces, and contextualized embeddings. Developing verification protocols that can meaningfully assess whether specific concepts, patterns, or pathways have been unlearned in such models remains an open direction.

References

- [1] Aniya Aggarwal, Pranay Lohia, Seema Nagar, Kuntal Dey, and Diptikalyan Saha. 2019. Black box fairness testing of machine learning models. In *Proceedings of the 2019 27th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE 2019)*. 625–635.
- [2] Barry Becker and Ronny Kohavi. 1996. Adult. UCI Machine Learning Repository.
- [3] Rachel K. E. Bellamy, Kuntal Dey, Michael Hind, Samuel C. Hoffman, Stephanie Houde, Kalapriya Kannan, Pranay Lohia, Jacquelyn Martino, Sameep Mehta, Aleksandra Mojsilovic, Seema Nagar, Karthikeyan Natesan Ramamurthy, John Richards, Diptikalyan Saha, Prasanna Sattigeri, Moninder Singh, Kush R. Varshney, and Yunfeng Zhang. 2018. AI Fairness 360: An Extensible Toolkit for Detecting, Understanding, and Mitigating Unwanted Algorithmic Bias. arXiv:1810.01943
- [4] Emily Black, Samuel Yeom, and Matt Fredrikson. 2020. FlipTest: fairness testing via optimal transport. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT* '20)*. 111–121.
- [5] Lucas Bourtole, Varun Chandrasekaran, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Hengrui Jia, Adelin Travers, Baiwu Zhang, David Lie, and Nicolas Papernot. 2020. Machine Unlearning. arXiv:1912.03817
- [6] Yinzhi Cao and Junfeng Yang. 2015. Towards Making Systems Forget with Machine Unlearning. In *2015 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*.
- [7] Min Chen, Zhikun Zhang, Tianhao Wang, Michael Backes, Mathias Humbert, and Yang Zhang. 2021. When Machine Unlearning Jeopardizes Privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS '21)*. 896–911.
- [8] Silvia Chiappa. 2019. Path-specific counterfactual fairness. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirty-First Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference and Ninth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence (AAAI'19/IAAI'19/EAAI'19)*.
- [9] Chongyu Fan, Jiancheng Liu, Yihua Zhang, Eric Wong, Dennis Wei, and Sijia Liu. 2024. SalUn: Empowering Machine Unlearning via Gradient-based Weight Saliency in Both Image Classification and Generation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [10] Ming Fan, Wenyang Wei, Wuxia Jin, Zijiang Yang, and Ting Liu. 2022. Explanation-guided fairness testing through genetic algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '22)*. 871–882.
- [11] Egan-Vincent Fehrman, Elaine and Evgeny Mirkes. 2015. Drug Consumption (Quantified). UCI Machine Learning Repository.
- [12] Aaron Fisher, Cynthia Rudin, and Francesca Dominici. 2019. All Models are Wrong, but Many are Useful: Learning a Variable's Importance by Studying an Entire Class of Prediction Models Simultaneously. arXiv:1801.01489
- [13] Sainyam Galhotra, Yuriy Brun, and Alexandra Meliou. 2017. Fairness testing: testing software for discrimination. In *Proceedings of the 2017 11th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE 2017)*. 498–510.
- [14] Garima, Frederick Liu, Satyen Kale, and Mukund Sundararajan. 2020. Estimating training data influence by tracing gradient descent. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS '20)*.
- [15] Antonio A. Gintart, Melody Y. Guan, Gregory Valiant, and James Zou. 2019. *Making AI forget you: data deletion in machine learning*.
- [16] Shashwat Goel, Ameya Prabhu, Amartya Sanyal, Ser-Nam Lim, Philip Torr, and Ponnurangam Kumaraguru. 2023. Towards Adversarial Evaluations for Inexact Machine Unlearning. arXiv:2201.06640
- [17] Aditya Golatkar, Alessandro Achille, and Stefano Soatto. 2020. Eternal Sunshine of the Spotless Net: Selective Forgetting in Deep Networks. In *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 9301–9309.
- [18] Laura Graves, Vineel Nagisetty, and Vijay Ganesh. 2021. Amnesiac Machine Learning. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (2021)*.
- [19] Chuan Guo, Tom Goldstein, Awni Hannun, and Laurens Van Der Maaten. 2020. Certified data removal from machine learning models. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML '20)*.
- [20] Hans Hofmann. 1994. Statlog (German Credit Data). UCI Machine Learning Repository.
- [21] Zachary Izzo, Mary Anne Smart, Kamalika Chaudhuri, and James Zou. 2021. Approximate Data Deletion from Machine Learning Models. arXiv:2002.10077
- [22] Matthew Jagielski, Om Thakkar, Florian Tramèr, Daphne Ippolito, Katherine Lee, Nicholas Carlini, Eric Wallace, Shuang Song, Abhradeep Thakurta, Nicolas Papernot, and Chiyuan Zhang. 2023. Measuring Forgetting of Memorized Training Examples. arXiv:2207.00099
- [23] Pang Wei Koh and Percy Liang. 2017. Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70 (ICML '17)*.
- [24] Matt Kusner, Joshua Loftus, Chris Russell, and Ricardo Silva. 2017. Counterfactual fairness. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS'17)*.

- [25] Ziyao Liu, Yu Jiang, Jiyuan Shen, Minyi Peng, Kwok-Yan Lam, Xingliang Yuan, and Xiaoning Liu. 2024. A Survey on Federated Unlearning: Challenges, Methods, and Future Directions. *ACM Comput. Surv.* (2024).
- [26] Scott M. Lundberg and Su-In Lee. 2017. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS'17)*. 4768–4777.
- [27] Verva Monjezi, Ashutosh Trivedi, Vladik Kreinovich, and Saeid Tizpaz-Niari. 2025. Fairness Testing Through Extreme Value Theory. In *2025 IEEE/ACM 47th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*.
- [28] Razieh Nabi and Ilya Shpitser. 2018. Fair inference on outcomes. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirtieth Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference and Eighth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence*.
- [29] Judea Pearl. 2009. *Causality: Models, Reasoning and Inference* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press, USA.
- [30] Youyang Qu, Xin Yuan, Ming Ding, Wei Ni, Thierry Rakotoarivelo, and David Smith. 2024. Learn to Unlearn: Insights Into Machine Unlearning. *Computer* (2024).
- [31] Ahmed Salem, Apratim Bhattacharya, Michael Backes, Mario Fritz, and Yang Zhang. 2020. Updates-leak: data set inference and reconstruction attacks in online learning. In *Proceedings of the 29th USENIX Conference on Security Symposium (SEC'20)*.
- [32] Ahmed Salem, Yang Zhang, Mathias Humbert, Pascal Berrang, Mario Fritz, and Michael Backes. 2018. ML-Leaks: Model and Data Independent Membership Inference Attacks and Defenses on Machine Learning Models. [arXiv:1806.01246](https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.01246)
- [33] Shohei Shimizu, Patrik O. Hoyer, Aapo Hyvärinen, and Antti Kerminen. 2006. A Linear Non-Gaussian Acyclic Model for Causal Discovery. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* (2006).
- [34] Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2017. Membership Inference Attacks Against Machine Learning Models. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 3–18.
- [35] Karen Simonyan, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. 2014. Deep Inside Convolutional Networks: Visualising Image Classification Models and Saliency Maps. [arXiv:1312.6034](https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6034)
- [36] David M. Sommer, Liwei SONG, Sameer Wagh, and Prateek Mittal. 2022. Athena: Probabilistic Verification of Machine Unlearning. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*.
- [37] Peter Spirtes, Clark Glymour, and Richard Scheines. 2001. *Causation, Prediction, and Search*. The MIT Press.
- [38] Ayush K. Tarun, Vikram S. Chundawat, Murari Mandal, and Mohan Kankanhalli. 2024. Fast Yet Effective Machine Unlearning. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* (2024).
- [39] Florian Tramèr, Vaggelis Atlidakis, Roxana Geambasu, Daniel Hsu, Jean-Pierre Hubaux, Mathias Humbert, Ari Juels, and Huang Lin. 2017. FairTest: Discovering Unwarranted Associations in Data-Driven Applications. In *2017 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*. 401–416.
- [40] Alex Pujol Vidal, Anders S. Johansen, Mohammad N. S. Jahromi, Sergio Escalera, Kamal Nasrollahi, and Thomas B. Moeslund. 2025. Verifying Machine Unlearning with Explainable AI. In *Pattern Recognition. ICPR 2024 International Workshops and Challenges: Kolkata, India, December 1, 2024, Proceedings, Part VI*.
- [41] Weiqi Wang, Zhiyi Tian, Chenhan Zhang, and Shui Yu. 2024. Machine Unlearning: A Comprehensive Survey. [arXiv:2405.07406](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.07406)
- [42] Yisong Xiao, Aishan Liu, Tianlin Li, and Xianglong Liu. 2023. Latent Imitator: Generating Natural Individual Discriminatory Instances for Black-Box Fairness Testing. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (ISSTA 2023)*.
- [43] Heng Xu, Tianqing Zhu, Lefeng Zhang, Wanlei Zhou, and Philip S. Yu. 2023. Machine Unlearning: A Survey. *ACM Comput. Surv.* (2023).
- [44] Lingfeng Zhang, Yueling Zhang, and Min Zhang. 2021. Efficient white-box fairness testing through gradient search. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (ISSTA 2021)*. 103–114.