Explainable deep learning

2021.10.19

Seung-Hoon Na
Jeonbuk National University

Reference

- Explainable Deep Learning: A Field Guide for the Uninitiated [Xie et al ‘20]
- Learning mechanism
  - Understanding Neural Networks through Representation Erasure [Li et al ’17]
  - Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization [Zhang et al ’17]
  - A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks [Arpit et al ‘17]
- Visualization methods
  - Deconvolutional Networks [Zeiler et al ‘10]
  - Embedding Deep Networks into Visual Explanations [Qi et al ‘18]
  - Adaptive Deconvolutional Networks for Mid and High Level Feature Learning [Zeiler ‘11]
  - Visualizing and Understanding Convolutional Networks [Zeiler ‘14]
  - On Pixel-Wise Explanations for Non-Linear Classifier Decisions by Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation [Bach et al ’15]
- Model distillation
  - "Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al ’16]
  - Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al ’18]
  - Distilling a Neural Network Into a Soft Decision Tree [Frosst & Hinton ‘18]
  - This Looks Like That: Deep Learning for Interpretable Image Recognition [Chen et al ‘19]
  - xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al ‘18]
- Explainable methods for QA
  - Interpretable QA on KB and Text [Sydorova et al ‘19]

Reference

- Interpretability
  - The Mythos of Model Interpretability [Lipton ‘16]
  - Stop explaining black box machine learning models for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead [Rudin et al ‘19]

- Intrinsic methods
  - Attention mechanisms
    - Attention is not Explanation [Jain et al ‘19]
    - Is Attention Interpretable? [Serrano & Smith '19]
    - Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]
    - A Primer in BERTology: What we know about how BERT works [Rogers et al ‘20]
    - Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al ‘20]

- Explainable methods for NLP
  - Rationalizing Neural Predictions [Lei et al ‘16]
  - ERASER : A Benchmark to Evaluate Rationalized NLP Models [DeYoung et al ‘20]
  - Are Red Roses Red? Evaluating Consistency of Question-Answering Models [Ribeiro et al ‘19]
  - Interpretable Neural Predictions with Differentiable Binary Variables [Bastings et al '19]
  - Beyond Accuracy: Behavioral Testing of NLP Models with CheckList [Ribeiro et al ‘20]
  - Towards Faithfully Interpretable NLP Systems: How Should We Define and Evaluate Faithfulness? [Jacovi & Goldberg ‘20]
  - Learning to Faithfully Rationalize by Construction [Jain et al ‘20]

Explainable Deep Learning

- Deep neural networks
  - an indispensable machine learning tool for achieving human-level performance on many learning tasks
  - However, due to its black-box nature, it is inherently difficult to understand which aspects of the input data drive the decisions of the network.
- Explainable deep learning
  - Various real-world scenarios need a decision support system using DNNs
    - Specifically in critical domains, such as legislation, law enforcement, and healthcare
  - In these domains, the humans making high-level decisions can be sure:
    - 1) The DNN decisions are driven by combinations of data features that are appropriate in the context of the deployment of the decision support system
    - 2) The decisions made are legally or ethically defensible
  - Given the popularity of DNN and the importance of XAI, the development of new methods and studies on explaining the decision-making process of DNNs has blossomed into an active research field

https://arxiv.org/pdf/2004.14545.pdf

Explainable Deep Learning

- The field guide: Overview



Traits
Intent: What are the objectives of deep learning explanations? How is explainability evaluated?

Related Topics
Context: How is deep learning explainability linked with other research topics? How does deep learning explainability contrast with other work?

Methods
Foundations: What concepts and methods does much of the recent literature build from? What algorithms are "foundational" for deep learning explainability?

https://arxiv.org/pdf/2004.14545.pdf

Explainable Deep Learning

- Methods for Explaining DNNs
  - **Visualization methods**:
    - Visualization methods express an explanation by highlighting, through a scientific visualization, characteristics of an input that strongly influence the output of a DNN
  - **Model distillation**:
    - Model distillation develops a separate, "white-box" machine learning model that is trained to mimic the input-output behavior of the DNN.
    - The white-box model, which is inherently explainable, is meant to identify the decision rules or input features influencing DNN outputs.
  - **Intrinsic methods**:
    - Intrinsic methods are DNNs that have been specifically created to render an explanation along with its output.
    - As a consequence of its design, intrinsically explainable deep networks can jointly optimize both model performance and some quality of the explanations produced.


Explaining DNNs Methods
Visualization
Back-Propagation
Activation Maximization
Erhan et al. (2009)
Deconvolution
Zeiler et al. (2011);Zeiler and Fergus (2014)
CAM and Grad-CAM
Zhou et al. (2016); Selvaraju et al. (2017)
LRP
Bach et al. (2015); Lapuschkin et al. (2016); Arras et al. (2016)
Arras et al. (2017); Ding et al. (2017); Montavon et al. (2017)
DeepLIFT
Shrikumar et al. (2017)
Integrated Gradients
Sundararajan et al. (2016, 2017)
Perturbation
Occlusion Sensitivity
Zeiler and Fergus (2014); Zhou et al. (2014)
Representation Erasure
Li et al. (2016)
Meaningful Perturbation
Fong and Vedaldi (2017)
Prediction Difference Analysis
Zintgraf et al. (2017); Robnik-Šikonja and Kononenko (2008)
Distillation
Local Approximation
LIME
Ribeiro et al. (2016c, 2016a)
Anchor-LIME
Ribeiro et al. (2016b)
Anchors
Ribeiro et al. (2018)
STREAK
Elenberg et al. (2017)
Model Translation
Tree Based
Frosst and Hinton (2017); Tan et al. (2018); Zhang et al. (2019a)
FSA Based
Hou and Zhou (2020)
Graph Based
Zhang et al. (2017, 2018)
Rule Based
Murdoch and Szlam (2017); Harradon et al. (2018)
Intrinsic
Attention Mechanisms
Single-Modal Weighting
Bahdanau et al. (2014); Luong et al. (2015); Wang et al. (2016)
Vaswani et al. (2017); Letarte et al. (2018); He et al. (2018); Devlin et al. (2019)
Multi-Modal Interaction
Vinyals et al. (2015); Xu et al. (2015); Antol et al. (2015)
Park et al. (2016); Goyal et al. (2017); Teney et al. (2018)
Mascharka et al. (2018); Anderson et al. (2018); Xie et al. (2019)
Joint Training
Text Explanation
Hendricks et al. (2016); Camburu et al. (2018); Park et al. (2018); Kim et al. (2018b)
Zellers et al. (2019); Liu et al. (2019); Hind et al. (2019)
Explanation Association
Lei et al. (2016); Dong et al. (2017)
Melis and Jaakkola (2018); Iyer et al. (2018)
Model Prototype
Li et al. (2018a); Chen et al. (2019)

Model Distillation

- Model distillation
  - Refer to a class of post-training explanation methods where the knowledge encoded within a trained DNN is distilled into a representation amenable for explanation by a user



Model Distillation

- Model distillation for explainable deep learning
  - **Local Approximation**
    - A local approximation method learns a simple model whose input/output behavior mimics that of a DNN for a small subset of the input data.
    - This method is motivated by the idea that the model a DNN uses to discriminate within a local area of the data manifold is simpler than the discriminatory model over the entire surface.
    - Given a sufficiently high local density of input data to approximate the local manifold with piecewise linear functions, the DNN's behavior in this local area may be distilled into a set of explainable linear discriminators.
  - **Model Translation**
    - Model translations train an alternative smaller model that mimics the input/output behavior of a DNN.
    - They contrast local approximation methods in replicating the behavior of a DNN across an entire dataset rather than small subsets.
    - The smaller models may be directly explainable, may be smaller and easier to deploy, or could be further analyzed to gain insights into the causes of the input/output behavior that the translated model replicates.

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- LIME (Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations)
  - a novel explanation technique that explains the predictions of any classifier in an interpretable and faithful manner, by learning an interpretable model locally around the prediction
- SP-LIME
  - A method to explain models by presenting representative individual predictions and their explanations in a non-redundant way, framing the task as a submodular optimization problem

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Motivation
  - *if the users do not trust a model or a prediction, they will not use it*, when using machine learning classifiers as tools
  - Two different (but related) definitions of trust:
    - (1) trusting a prediction
      - whether a user trusts an individual prediction sufficiently to take some action based on it
    - (2) trusting a model
      - whether the user trusts a model to behave in reasonable ways if deployed.
  - Both are directly impacted by how much the human understands a model's behavior
    - Opposed to seeing it as a black box

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Determining trust in individual predictions
  - an important problem when the model is used for decision making.
  - Predictions cannot be acted upon on blind faith, as the consequences may be catastrophic.
    - E.g.) machine learning for medical diagnosis or terrorism detection
- Evaluating the model as a whole before deploying it "in the wild".
  - Users need to be confident that the model will perform well on real-world data, according to the metrics of interest
  - But, real-world data is often significantly different, and further, the evaluation metric may not be indicative of the product's goal

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Proposal
  - For the "trusting a prediction" problem
    - Propose providing explanations for individual predictions
  - For the "trusting the model" problem
    - selecting multiple such predictions (and explanations)
  - 1) LIME
    - an algorithm that can explain the predictions of any classifier or regressor in a faithful way, by approximating it locally with an interpretable model.
  - 2) SP-LIME
    - a method that selects a set of representative instances with explanations to address the "trusting the model" problem, via submodular optimization.

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

Explaining individual predictions. A model predicts that a patient has the flu, and LIME highlights the symptoms in the patient's history that led to the prediction.
Sneeze and headache are portrayed as contributing to the "flu" prediction, while "no fatigue" is evidence against it. With these, a doctor can make an informed decision about whether to trust the model's prediction.



a doctor is much better positioned to make a decision with the help of a model if intelligible explanations are provided

In this case, an explanation is a small list of symptoms with relative weights – symptoms that either contribute to the prediction (in green) or are evidence against it (in red).

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- The "trusting the model" problem
  - Evaluation on validation data may not correspond to performance "in the wild"
    - Practitioners often overestimate the accuracy of their models
  - Looking at examples offers an alternative method to assess truth in the model, especially if the examples are explained.
  - Propose explaining several representative individual predictions of a model as a way to provide a global understanding.

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

Explaining individual predictions of competing classifiers trying to determine if a document is about "Christianity" or "Atheism".



"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Desired Characteristics for Explainers
  - Interpretable: an essential criterion for explanations
    - Provide qualitative understanding between the input variables and the response
  - Local fidelity: An meaningful explanation must at least be locally faithful
    - it is often impossible for an explanation to be completely faithful unless it is the complete description of the model itself
    - Local fidelity does not imply global fidelity
      - Features that are globally important may not be important in the local context, and vice versa
  - Model-agnostic: An explainer should be able to explain any model
  - Global perspective: important to ascertain trust in the model
    - To explain the model, we select a few explanations to present to the user, such that they are representative of the model

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- LIME (Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations)
  - identify an **interpretable** model over the interpretable representation that is **locally faithful** to the classifier
- Interpretable Data Representations
  - Important to distinguish between features and interpretable data representations
  - Interpretable explanations
    - Need to use a representation that is understandable to humans, regardless of the actual features used by the model.
  - Interpretable representation
    - E.g.) for text classification, a binary vector indicating the presence or absence of a word
      - even though the classifier may use more complex (and incomprehensible) features such as word embeddings.
    - for image classification, a binary vector indicating the "presence" or "absence" of a contiguous patch of similar pixels (a super-pixel)
      - while the classifier may represent the image as a tensor with three color channels per pixel.

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Interpretable Data Representations
  - $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$: the original representation of an instance being explained
  - $x' \in \{0,1\}^{d'}$: a binary vector for its interpretable representation

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Fidelity-Interpretability Trade-off
  - G : a class of potentially interpretable models
    - Readily presented to the user with visual or textual artifacts
  - $g \in G$: an explanation as a model
    - linear models, decision trees, or falling rule lists
  - $\{0,1\}^{d'}$ the domain of g
    - g acts over absence/presence of the interpretable components
  - $\Omega(g)$: a measure of complexity (as opposed to interpretability)
    - Not every $g \in G$ may be simple enough to be interpretable
    - E.g.)
      - $\Omega(g)$ for decision trees: The depth of the tree
      - $\Omega(g)$ for linear models: the number of non-zero weights

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Fidelity-Interpretability Trade-off
  - $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$: the model being explained
    - $f(x)$: the probability (or a binary indicator) that x belongs to a certain class
  - $\pi_x(z)$: a proximity measure between an instance z to x, so as to define locality around x
  - $\mathcal{L}(f, g, \pi_x)$: a measure of how unfaithful g is in approximating f in the locality defined by π_x.
    - In order to ensure both **interpretability** and **local fidelity**, minimize $L(f, g, \pi_x)$ while having $\Omega(g)$ be low enough to be interpretable by humans:
  - The explanation produced by LIME is obtained by:

$$\xi(x) = \underset{g \in G}{\operatorname{argmin}} \; \underbrace{\mathcal{L}(f, g, \pi_x)}_{\text{local fidelity}} + \underbrace{\Omega(g)}_{\text{interpretability}}$$

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Fidelity-Interpretability Trade-off



  - Here, focus on sparse linear models as explanations, and on performing the search using perturbations.

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Sampling for Local Exploration
  - **Model-agnostic explainer**
    - Minimize the locality-aware loss $\mathcal{L}(f, g, \pi_x)$ without making any assumptions about f
    - Approximate $L(f, g, \pi_x)$ by drawing samples, weighted by π_x
      - To learn the local behavior of f as the interpretable inputs vary
    - Sample instances around x' by drawing nonzero elements of x' uniformly at random
      - The number of such draws is also uniformly sampled

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Sampling for Local Exploration
  - **Model-agnostic explainer**
    - Given a perturbed sample $z' \in \{0,1\}^{d'}$, recover the sample in the original representation $z \in R^d$ and obtain $f(z)$, which is used as a label for the explanation model
    - $\mathcal{Z}$: given the dataset of perturbed samples with the associated labels
    - Optimize the LIME objective function using $\mathcal{Z}$ to get $\xi(x)$

$$\xi(x) = \underset{g \in G}{\operatorname{argmin}} \ \mathcal{L}(f, g, \pi_x) + \Omega(g)$$

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al ’16]

- The black-box model’s complex decision function f (unknown to LIME) is represented by the blue/pink background, which cannot be approximated well by a linear model.

LIME samples instances, gets predictions using f, and weighs them by the proximity to the instance being explained (represented here by size)



"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Sampling for Local Exploration
  - **LIME as model-agnostic explainer**
    - Sample instances both in the vicinity of x (which have a high weight due to π_x) and far away from x (low weight from π_x).
    - Even though the original model may be too complex to explain globally, LIME presents an explanation that is locally faithful (linear in this case), where the locality is captured by π_x
    - Fairly robust to sampling noise since the samples are weighted by π_x

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Sparse Linear Explanations
  - G: the class of linear models $g(z') = w_g \cdot z'$
  - L: the locally weighted square loss

$$\mathcal{L}(f, g, \pi_x) = \sum_{z, z' \in \mathcal{Z}} \pi_x(z) \left(f(z) - g(z')\right)^2$$

$$\pi_x(z) = exp(-D(x, z)^2 / \sigma^2)$$

an exponential kernel defined on some distance function D

  - For text classification, the explanation is interpretable
    - By letting the interpretable representation be a bag of words, and by setting a limit K on the number of word

$$\Omega(g) = \infty \mathbb{1}[\|w_g\|_0 > K]$$

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Sparse Linear Explanations
  - Ω for image classification,
    - Use "super-pixels" (computed using any standard algorithm) instead of words,
      - The interpretable representation of an image is a binary vector
        - » indicates the original super-pixel and 0 indicates a grayed out super-pixel
  - Approximate Ω by first selecting *K* features with Lasso & then learning the weights via least squares (K-LASSO)

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Sparse Linear Explanations

Algorithm 1 Sparse Linear Explanations using LIME

Require: Classifier f, Number of samples N
Require: Instance x, and its interpretable version x'
Require: Similarity kernel π_x, Length of explanation K

$\mathcal{Z} \leftarrow \{\}$
for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, ..., N\}$ **do**
  $z'_i \leftarrow sample\_around(x')$
  $\mathcal{Z} \leftarrow \mathcal{Z} \cup \langle z'_i, f(z_i), \pi_x(z_i) \rangle$
end for
$w \leftarrow$ K-Lasso$(\mathcal{Z}, K)$ ▷ with z'_i as features, $f(z)$ as target
return w

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Example: Text classification with SVMs
  - Explain the predictions of a support vector machine with RBF kernel trained on unigrams to differentiate "Christianity" from "Atheism" (on a subset of the 20 newsgroup dataset).
  - The explanation shows that predictions are made for quite arbitrary reasons
    - words "Posting", "Host", and "Re" have no connection to either Christianity or Atheism
      - The word "Posting" appears in 22% of examples in the training set, 99% of them in the class "Atheism"
  - It is clear that this dataset has serious issues (which are not evident just by studying the raw data or predictions), and that this classifier, or held-out evaluation, cannot be trusted

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Example: Deep networks for image

Explaining an image classification prediction made by Google's Inception neural network. The top 3 classes predicted are "Electric Guitar" (p = 0.32), "Acoustic guitar" (p = 0.24) and "Labrador" (p = 0.21)

(a) Original Image

(b) Explaining *Electric guitar*

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Example: Deep networks for image



(c) Explaining *Acoustic guitar*

(d) Explaining *Labrador*

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Submodular pick for explaining models
  - Given a set of instances X, the **pick step** is defined as the task of selecting B instances for the user to inspect.
  - The pick step
    - Not dependent on the existence of explanations
    - Should take into account the explanations that accompany each prediction.
      - Looking at raw data is not enough to understand predictions and get insights,
    - Should pick a diverse, representative set of explanations to show the user
      - Non-redundant explanations that represent how the model behaves globally.

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Submodular pick for explaining models
  - $\mathcal{W}$: an $n \times d'$ *explanation matrix*
    - Represents the local importance of the interpretable components for each instance
  - $g_i = \xi(x_i)$: the explanation for x_i when using linear models as explanations $\mathcal{W}_{ij} = |w_{g_{ij}}|$
  - I_j : denote the global importance of j-th component (j-th column in W) in the explanation space
  - Coverage for I
    - want *I* such that features that explain many different instances have higher importance score

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

Rows represent instances (documents) and columns represent features (words). Feature f2 (dotted blue) has the highest importance. Rows 2 and 5 (in red) would be selected by the pick procedure, covering all but feature f1

$\mathcal{W}$



$I_2 > I_1$, since feature f_2 is used to explain more instances

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Submodular pick for explaining models
  - Setting for I
    - For the text applications,

$$I_j = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{W}_{ij}}$$

    - For images
      - I must measure something that is comparable across the super-pixels in different images, such as color histograms or other features of super-pixels

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Submodular pick for explaining models
  - Avoiding redundancy for I
    - The set of explanations must not be redundant in the components they show the users, i.e. avoid selecting instances with similar explanations.
    - Formalize the non-redundant coverage intuition:

$$c(V, \mathcal{W}, I) = \sum_{j=1}^{d'} \mathbb{1}_{[\exists i \in V : \mathcal{W}_{ij} > 0]} I_j$$

    - The pick problem: consists of finding the set V, $|V| \leq B$ that achieves the highest coverage:

$$Pick(\mathcal{W}, I) = \underset{V, |V| \leq B}{\operatorname{argmax}}\, c(V, \mathcal{W}, I)$$

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Submodular pick for explaining models
  - The pick problem: consists of finding the set V, $|V| \leq B$ that achieves the highest coverage:

$$Pick(\mathcal{W}, I) = \underset{V,|V|\leq B}{\operatorname{argmax}} c(V, \mathcal{W}, I)$$

    - Maximize a weighted coverage function, and is NP-hard
  - $c(V \cup \{i\}, \mathcal{W}, I) - c(V, \mathcal{W}, I)$: the marginal coverage gain of adding an instance i to a set V
  - Due to submodularity, we can consider a greedy algorithm that iteratively adds the instance with the highest marginal coverage gain to the solution
    - Offers a constant-factor approximation guarantee of 1−1/e to the optimum

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Submodular pick for explaining models

Algorithm 2 Submodular pick (SP) algorithm

Require: Instances X, Budget B
  for all $x_i \in X$ **do**
    $\mathcal{W}_i \leftarrow$ **explain**(x_i, x_i') ▷ Using Algorithm 1
  end for
  for $j \in \{1 \dots d'\}$ **do**
    $I_j \leftarrow \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\mathcal{W}_{ij}|}$ ▷ Compute feature importances
  end for
  $V \leftarrow \{\}$
  while $|V| < B$ **do** ▷ Greedy optimization of Eq (4)
    $V \leftarrow V \cup \text{argmax}_i \, c(V \cup \{i\}, \mathcal{W}, I)$
  end while
  return V

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- Simulated user experiments
  - Explanation Methods
    - **LIME**
    - **Parzen**: A method that approximates the black box classifier globally with Parzen windows, and explains individual predictions by taking the gradient of the prediction probability function.
    - **Greedy**: we greedily remove features that contribute the most to the predicted class until the prediction changes (or we reach the maximum of K features)
    - **Random**: randomly picks K features as an explanation
    - K = 10

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Are explanations faithful to the model?**
  - Recall on truly important features for two interpretable classifiers on the books dataset

    Train both classifiers such that the maximum number of features they use for any instance is 10, and thus we know the gold set of features that the are considered important by these models.



(a) Sparse LR



(b) Decision Tree

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Are explanations faithful to the model?**
  - Recall on truly important features for two interpretable classifiers on the DVDs dataset.



(a) Sparse LR



(b) Decision Tree

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Should I trust this prediction?**
  - To simulate trust in individual predictions, first randomly select 25% of the features to be "untrustworthy"
    - Assume that the users can identify and would not want to trust these features
      - such as the headers in 20 newsgroups, leaked data, etc
  - Develop oracle "trustworthiness" by labeling test set predictions from a black box classifier as
    - "untrustworthy" if the prediction changes when untrustworthy features are removed from the instance,
    - and "trustworthy" otherwise (i.e. robust after removing untrust worthy features)

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Should I trust this prediction?**
  - For **LIME** and **parzen** explanations to simulate users
    - Assume that users deem predictions untrustworthy from LIME and parzen explanations if the prediction from the **linear approximation** changes when all untrustworthy features that appear in the explanations are removed
      - The simulated human "discounts" the effect of untrustworthy features
  - For **greedy** and **random**,
    - The prediction is mistrusted if any untrustworthy features are present in the explanation,
      - since these methods do not provide a notion of the contribution of each feature to the prediction.
  - Thus for each test set prediction, we can evaluate whether the simulated user trusts it using each explanation method, and compare it to the trustworthiness oracle.

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Should I trust this prediction?**
  - Average F1 of trustworthiness for different explainers on a collection of classifiers and datasets.
    - Averaged over 100 runs

	Books				DVDs			
	LR	NN	RF	SVM	LR	NN	RF	SVM
Random	14.6	14.8	14.7	14.7	14.2	14.3	14.5	14.4
Parzen	84.0	87.6	94.3	92.3	87.0	81.7	94.2	87.3
Greedy	53.7	47.4	45.0	53.3	52.4	58.1	46.6	55.1
LIME	**96.6**	**94.5**	**96.2**	**96.7**	**96.6**	**91.8**	**96.1**	**95.6**

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Can I trust this model?**
  - Evaluate whether the explanations can be used for model selection, simulating the case where a human has to decide between two competing models with similar accuracy on validation data
  - Add 10 artificially "noisy" features
    - On training and validation sets (80/20 split of the original training data), each artificial feature appears in 10% of the examples in one class, and 20% of the other
    - On the test instances, each artificial feature appears in 10% of the examples in each class
    - ➔ Recreates the situation where the models use not only features that are informative in the real world, but also ones that introduce spurious correlations.
  - Create pairs of competing classifiers
    - By repeatedly training pairs of random forests with 30 trees until their validation accuracy is within 0.1% of each other, but their test accuracy differs by at least 5%.
    - Thus, it is not possible to identify the better classifier (the one with higher test accuracy) from the accuracy on the validation data.

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Can I trust this model?**
  - Evaluate whether a user can identify the better classifier based on the explanations of B instances from the validation set.
  - The simulated human marks the set of artificial features that appear in the B explanations as untrustworthy,
    - Following which we evaluate how many total predictions in the validation set should be trusted (as in the previous section, treating only marked features as untrustworthy).
  - Then, we select the classifier with fewer untrustworthy predictions, and compare this choice to the classifier with higher held-out test set accuracy

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Should I trust this prediction?**
  - Choosing between two classifiers, as the number of instances shown to a simulated user is varied. Averages and standard errors from 800 runs.



(a) Books dataset



(b) DVDs dataset

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Evaluation with human subjects**
  - Experiment setup
    - The "Christianity" and "Atheism" documents from the 20 newsgroups
      - This dataset is problematic since it contains features that do not generalize (e.g. very informative header information and author names), and thus validation accuracy considerably overestimates real-world performance
    - To estimate the real world performance, create a new religion dataset for evaluation
      - Download Atheism and Christianity websites from the DMOZ directory and human curated lists, yielding 819 webpages in each class.
      - High accuracy on this dataset by a classifier trained on 20 newsgroups indicates that the classifier is generalizing using semantic content, instead of placing importance on the data specific issues outlined above.

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Can users select the best classifier?**
  - Evaluate whether explanations can help users decide which classifier generalizes better
    - which classifier would the user deploy "in the wild"
  - Users have to decide between two classifiers
    - 1) The SVM classifier trained on the original 20 newsgroups dataset,
      - Achieves an accuracy score of 57.3% on the religion dataset
      - The test accuracy on the original 20 newsgroups split: 94.0%
    - 2) The "cleaned" classifier: a version of the same classifier trained on a "cleaned" dataset where many of the features that do not generalize have been manually removed.
      - Achieves a score of 69.0% on the religion dataset
      - The test accuracy on the original 20 newsgroups split: 88.6%
    - Suggesting that the worse classifier would be selected if accuracy alone is used as a measure of trust.

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Can users select the best classifier?**
  - Restrict both the number of words in each explanation (K) and the number of documents that each person inspects (B) to 6.
  - Average accuracy of human subject (with standard errors) in choosing between two classifiers.



"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Can non-experts improve a classifier?**
  - Use the 20 newsgroups data here as well
  - Ask Amazon Mechanical Turk users to identify which words from the explanations should be removed from subsequent training, for the worse classifier from the previous section
  - In each round, the subject marks words for deletion after observing $B = 10$ instances with $K = 10$ words in each explanation

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Can non-experts improve a classifier?**
  - » Feature engineering experiment. Each shaded line represents the average accuracy of subjects in a path starting from one of the initial 10 subjects. Each solid line represents the average across all paths per round of interaction.



"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Do explanations lead to insights?**
  - Issue: Often artifacts of data collection can induce undesirable correlations that the classifiers pick up during training
  - Take the task of distinguishing between photos of Wolves and Eskimo Dogs (huskies).
  - Train a logistic regression classifier on a training set of 20 images, hand selected such that all pictures of wolves had snow in the background, while pictures of huskies did not.
  - As the features for the images, use the first max-pooling layer of Google's pre-trained Inception neural network
  - On a collection of additional 60 images, the classifier predicts "Wolf" if there is snow (or light background at the bottom), and "Husky" otherwise, regardless of animal color, position, pose, etc.
  - We trained this bad classifier intentionally, to evaluate whether subjects are able to detect it

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Do explanations lead to insights?**
  - The experiment proceeds as follows:
    - 1) first present a balanced set of 10 test predictions (without explanations) where one wolf is not in a snowy background (and thus the prediction is "Husky") and one husky is (and is thus predicted as "Wolf").
    - 2) Then ask the subject three questions:
      - (1) Do they trust this algorithm to work well in the real world,
      - (2) why, and (3) how do they think the algorithm is able to distinguish between these photos of wolves and huskies
    - After getting these responses, show the same images with the associated explanations, and ask the same questions.

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Do explanations lead to insights?**

  Raw data and explanation of a bad model's prediction in the "Husky vs Wolf" task.



(a) Husky classified as wolf

(b) Explanation

"Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier [Ribeiro et al '16]

- **Do explanations lead to insights?**
  - "Husky vs Wolf" experiment results

	Before	After
Trusted the bad model	10 out of 27	3 out of 27
Snow as a potential feature	12 out of 27	25 out of 27

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Anchors
  - Model-agnostic system that explains the behavior of complex models with high-precision rules
  - Represent local, "sufficient" conditions for predictions
  - propose an algorithm to efficiently compute these anchors explanations for any black-box model with high-probability guarantees
  - Enable users to predict how a model would behave on unseen instances with less effort and higher precision
    - As compared to existing linear explanations or no explanations.

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Interpretable machine learning
  - Has seen a resurgence in recent years, ranging from the design of novel globally-interpretable machine learning models to local explanations (for individual predictions) that can be computed for any classifier
- Interpretability
  - Whether humans understand a model enough to make accurate predictions about its behavior on unseen instances
  - E.g.) (human) precision: the fraction in which they are correct (note that this is human precision, not model precision)
  - High human precision: paramount for real interpretability
    - one can hardly say they understand a model if they consistently think they know what it will do, but are often mistaken

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Local explanation approaches
  - Describe the local behavior of the model mostly using a linearly weighted combination of the input features
  - Linear functions as an explanation
    - Capture relative importance of features in an easy-to-understand manner
    - Explanations are in some way local
      - ➔ It is not clear whether they apply to an unseen instance.
    - Unclear coverage (region where explanation applies)
      - It is not clear whether they apply to an unseen instance.
      - Lead to low human precision, as users may think an insight from an explanation applies to unseen instances even when it does not
      - The human effort required can be quite high
        - » when combined with the arithmetic involved in computing the contribution of the features in linear explanations,

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Local explanation approaches

Sentiment predictions, LSTM

+ This movie is not bad.

− This movie is not very good.

(a) Instances



(b) LIME explanations

Unclear coverage: when does "not" have a positive influence on sentiment?

{"not", "bad"} → Positive

{"not", "good"} → Negative

(c) Anchor explanations

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Anchors
  - Model-agnostic explanations based on if-then rules
  - An anchor explanation: a rule that sufficiently "anchors" the prediction locally
    - such that changes to the rest of the feature values of the instance do not matter
    - For instances on which the anchor holds, the prediction is (almost) always the same
    - E.g.) "not bad" virtually guarantee a prediction of positive sentiment (and "not good" of negative sentiment)
  - Intuitive, easy to comprehend, and have extremely clear coverage
    - They only apply when all the conditions in the rule are met, and if they apply the precision is high (by design)

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Anchors as High-Precision Explanations
  - A : a rule (set of predicates) acting on such an interpretable representation
    - $A(x)$ returns 1 if all its feature predicates are true for instance x.
    - E.g.) x = "This movie is not bad."

$$f(x) = Positive \quad A(x) = 1 \qquad A = \{\text{“not”}, \text{“bad”}\}$$

  - $\mathcal{D}(\cdot|A)$: the conditional distribution when the rule A applies
    - Similar texts where "not" and "bad" are present
  - A: an anchor if $A(x) = 1$
  - A: a sufficient condition for $f(x)$ with high prob, if a sample z from $D(z|A)$ is likely predicted as $Positive$ ($f(x) = f(z)$)
  - Formally, A is an anchor if,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}(z|A)}[\mathbb{1}_{f(x)=f(z)}] \geq \tau, A(x) = 1$$

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]



(a) $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}(.|A)$



(b) Two toy visualizations

- LIME explanations work by learning the lines that best approximate the model under D, with some local weighting. The resulting explanations give no indication of how faithful they are (the explanation on the right is a much better local approximation of the black box model than the one on the left), or what their "local region" is
- Anchors are by construction faithful, adapting their coverage to the model's behavior (the anchor on the right of Figure 2b is broader) and making their boundaries clear.

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

– Text Classification

- The interpretable representation: the presence of individual tokens (words) in the instance
- The perturbation distribution D
  - Replaces "absent" tokens by random words with the same POS tag with probability proportional to their similarity in an embedding space



- The anchor A = {"not", "bad"} is easy to apply:
  if the words "not" and "bad" are in the sentence, the model will predict "positive" with probability at least τ (set to 0.95 from here onwards).

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Anchors as High-Precision Explanations
  - Structured Prediction
    - When the output of the algorithm is a structure, the anchor approach can be used to explain any function of the output.
    - Anchors: particularly suited for structured prediction models
      - while the global behavior is too complex to be captured by simple interpretable models, the local behavior can usually be represented using short rules.

Instance	If	Predict
I want to play(V) ball.	previous word is PARTICLE	play is VERB.
I went to a play(N) yesterday.	previous word is DETERMINER	play is NOUN.
I play(V) ball on Mondays.	previous word is PRONOUN	play is VERB.

Anchors for Part-of-Speech tag for the word "play"

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Anchors as High-Precision Explanations
  - Structured Prediction

a multi-layer RNN encoder/attention-based decoder translation system

English	Portuguese
This is the **question** we must address	Esta é a questão que temos que enfrentar
This is the **problem** we must address	Este é o problema que temos que enfrentar
This is what we must address	É isso que temos de enfrentar

Anchors (in bold) of a machine translation system for the Portuguese word for "This" (in pink).

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

– Tabular Classification

- Use a validation dataset to define D
- Sample from $D(z|A)$ by fixing the predicates in A and sampling the rest of the row as a whole.
- Anchors for a few predictions of 400 gradient boosted trees trained on balanced versions of three datasets

	If	Predict
adult	No capital gain or loss, never married	$\leq$ 50K
	Country is US, married, work hours $>$ 45	$>$ 50K
rcdv	No priors, no prison violations and crime not against property	Not rearrested
	Male, black, 1 to 5 priors, not married, and crime not against property	Re-arrested
lending	FICO score $\leq$ 649	Bad Loan
	649 $\leq$ FICO score $\leq$ 699 and \$5,400 $\leq$ loan amount $\leq$ \$10,000	Good Loan

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

– Image Classification

- Explain the label prediction for an image
- Segment the image into superpixels, using the presence or absence of these superpixels as the interpretable representation
- Instead of hiding superpixels, define $D(z|A)$ by fixing the superpixels in A to the original image and superimposing another image over the rest of the superpixels.
- Here, explain a prediction of the InceptionV3 neural network (Szegedy et al. 2015)

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al ’18]

– Image Classification

(a) Original image

(b) Anchor for “beagle”

Even though D is quite unrealistic here, the anchor demonstrates that the model focuses on various parts of the dog to determine its breed

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

– Image Classification



(c) Images where Inception predicts $P(\text{beagle}) > 90\%$

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

– Visual question answering

- Answering a question asked of a reference image
- Our interest: identifying which part of the question led to the predicted answer
- Explain predictions from the Visual7W open ended VQA system (Zhu et al. 2016)

What animal is featured in this picture ?	**dog**
What floor is featured in this picture?	dog
What toenail is paired in this flowchart ?	dog
What animal is shown on this depiction ?	dog

(d) **VQA:** Anchor (bold) and samples from $\mathcal{D}(z|A)$

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

– Visual question answering

•

Where is the **dog**?	on the floor
What color is the **wall?**	white
When was this picture taken?	during the day
Why is he lifting his paw?	to play

(e) **VQA:** More example anchors (in bold)

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Efficiently Computing Anchors
  - Given a blackbox classifier f, instance x, distribution D, and the desired level of precision τ
  - Anchor A: a set of feature predicates on x that achieves $\text{prec}(A) \geq \tau$:

$$\text{prec}(A) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}(z|A)}\left[\mathbb{1}_{f(x)=f(z)}\right]$$

  - Computing $pred(A)$ directly is intractable
    - for an arbitrary D and black-box model f
  - Instead, introduce a probabilistic definition:
    - Anchors satisfy the precision constraint with high probability.

$$P\left(\text{prec}(A) \geq \tau\right) \geq 1 - \delta$$

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Efficiently Computing Anchors
  - Coverage preference
    - If multiple anchors meet this criterion, those that describe the behavior of a larger part of the input space are preferred
      - ones with the largest coverage
    - Coverage of an anchor: the probability that it applies to samples from $\mathcal{D}$

$$\text{cov}(A) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}(z)}[A(z)]$$

  - Searching the anchors with the largest cove

$$\max_{A \text{ s.t. } P(\text{prec}(A) \geq \tau) \geq 1-\delta} \text{cov}(A)$$

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Efficiently Computing Anchors
  - Coverage preference
    - If multiple anchors meet this criterion, those that describe the behavior of a larger part of the input space are preferred
      - ones with the largest coverage
    - Coverage of an anchor: the probability that it applies to samples from $\mathcal{D}$

$$\text{cov}(A) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}(z)}[A(z)]$$

  - Searching the anchors with the largest cove

$$\max_{A \text{ s.t. } P(\text{prec}(A) \geq \tau) \geq 1-\delta} \text{cov}(A)$$

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Efficiently Computing Anchors
  - Search space: exponential → intractable
    - The number of all possible anchors is exponential
  - The search for anchors
    - Similar in spirit to Probabilistic ILP
    - But, one crucial difference: we don't assume a dataset apriori
      - Instead we have perturbation distributions and a black box model, which we can call to estimate precision and coverage bounds under D
  - Perturbation space: prohibitively large
    - The number of perturbed samples and predictions from the black box model would be prohibitive, especially in high-dimensional sparse domains such as text.
      - In theory, we could generate a very large dataset and then use methods like ILP to find anchors
  - A multi-armed bandit formulation
    - Required to efficiently explore the model's behavior in the perturbation space

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Bottom-up Construction of Anchors

Algorithm 1 Identifying the *Best* Candidate for Greedy

function GenerateCands($\mathcal{A}, c$)
  $\mathcal{A}_r = \emptyset$
  for all $A \in \mathcal{A}; a_i \in x, a_i \notin A$ **do**
    if $\text{cov}(A \wedge a_i) > c$ **then** {Only high-coverage}
      $\mathcal{A}_r \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_r \cup (A \wedge a_i)$ {Add as potential anchor}
  return $\mathcal{A}_r$ {Candidate anchors for next round}

function BestCand($\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}, \epsilon, \delta$)
  initialize prec, prec_{ub}, prec_{lb} estimates $\forall A \in \mathcal{A}$
  $A \leftarrow \arg\max_A \text{prec}(A)$
  $A' \leftarrow \arg\max_{A' \neq A} \text{prec}_{ub}(A', \delta)$ {δ implicit below}
  while $\text{prec}_{ub}(A') - \text{prec}_{lb}(A) > \epsilon$ **do**
    sample $z \sim \mathcal{D}(z|A), z' \sim \mathcal{D}(z'|A')$ {Sample more}
    update prec, prec_{ub}, prec_{lb} for A and A'
    $A \leftarrow \arg\max_A \text{prec}(A)$
    $A' \leftarrow \arg\max_{A' \neq A} \text{prec}_{ub}(A')$
  return A

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Beam-Search for Anchor Construction

Algorithm 2 Outline of the Beam Search

function BeamSearch($f, x, \mathcal{D}, \tau$)
  hyperparameters B, ϵ, δ
  $A^* \leftarrow$ **null**, $\mathcal{A}_0 \leftarrow \emptyset$ {Set of candidate rules}
  loop
    $\mathcal{A}_t \leftarrow$ GenerateCands($\mathcal{A}_{t-1}$, cov(A^*))
    $\mathcal{A}_t \leftarrow$ B-BestCand($\mathcal{A}_t, \mathcal{D}, B, \delta, \epsilon$) {LUCB}
    if $\mathcal{A}_t = \emptyset$ **then break loop**
    for all $A \in \mathcal{A}_t$ s.t. $\text{prec}_{lb}(A, \delta) > \tau$ **do**
      if cov(A) > cov(A^*) **then** $A^* \leftarrow A$
  return A^*

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Beam-Search for Anchor Construction
  - For the tolerance $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, this version of KL-LUCB algorithm returns a set A of size B that is an ϵ-approximation of $A*$, with high probability

$$P(\min_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \text{prec}(A) \geq \min_{A' \in \mathcal{A}^*} \text{prec}(A') - \epsilon) \geq 1 - \delta$$

  - Directly optimizing $\max_{A \text{ s.t. } P(\text{prec}(A) \geq \tau) \geq 1-\delta} \text{cov}(A)$
    - Store any rule that has a lower coverage than that of the best anchor found so far, since the coverage of a rule can only reduce as more predicates are added
  - The beam-search algorithm is more likely to return an anchor with a higher coverage than the one found by the greedy approach

➔ Use this algorithm for all examples and experiments

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Experiments: **Simulated Users**
  - Use the tabular datasets previously mentioned (adult, rcdv and lending)
  - Each dataset is split such that models are trained with the training set, explanations are produced for instances in the validation set, and evaluated on instances in the test set.
  - Train three different models:
    - Logistic regression (**lr**)
    - 400 gradient boosted trees (**gb**)
    - A multilayer perceptron with two layers of 50 units each (**nn**).
  - Evaluation: compute coverage (what fraction of the instances they predict after seeing explanations) and precision (what fraction of the predictions were correct) on the complete test set

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Experiments: **Simulated Users**
  - Average precision and coverage with simulated users on 3 tabular datasets and 3 classifiers

		Precision		Coverage	
		anchor	**lime-n**	**anchor**	**lime-t**
adult	logistic	95.6	81.0	10.7	21.6
	gbt	96.2	81.0	9.7	20.2
	nn	95.6	79.6	7.6	17.3
rcdv	logistic	95.8	76.6	6.8	17.3
	gbt	94.8	71.7	4.8	2.6
	nn	93.4	65.7	1.1	1.5
lending	logistic	99.7	80.2	28.6	12.2
	gbt	99.3	79.9	28.4	9.1
	nn	96.7	77.0	16.6	5.4

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Experiments: **Simulated Users**
  - Coverage on the test set as the simulated user sees more explanations, at the same precision level. While there is no clear winner for random explanations, anchors are better when explanations are picked using submodular-pick.



(a) *adult* dataset



(b) *rcdv* dataset

The anchor approach also yields better coverage for the same precision - even though it is unclear if real users can achieve such high precision with LIME

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Experiments: **User study**
  - Ran a user study with 26 users – students who had or were taking a machine learning course
  - Used the *adult* and *rcdv* datasets, followed by a multiple-choice VQA system on two images
  - While the VQA model predicts one of 1000 labels, we restrict it to the 5 most common answers predicted on questions in D, in order to reduce visual overload.
  - Evaluate if users are able to predict the behavior of the model on unseen instances.
    - Ask them to predict the behavior of the classifier on 10 random test instances before and 10 instances after seeing each round of explanations.
    - The user then goes through the same procedure on the other dataset, with the explanation type that was not the one used for the first one.

Anchors: High-Precision Model-Agnostic Explanations [Ribeiro et al '18]

- Experiments: **Simulated Users**
  - Results of the User Study.
    - Underline: significant w.r.t. anchors in the same dataset and same number of explanations.
    - Results show that users consistently achieve high precision with anchors, as opposed to baselines, with less effort (time)

Method	Precision				Coverage (perceived)				Time/pred (seconds)			
	adult	rcdv	vqa1	vqa2	adult	rcdv	vqa1	vqa2	adult	rcdv	vqa1	vqa2
No expls	54.8	83.1	61.5	68.4	79.6	63.5	39.8	30.8	29.8 ±14	35.7±26	18.7±20	13.9±20
LIME(1)	68.3	98.1	57.5	76.3	89.2	55.4	71.5	54.2	28.5±10	24.6±6	8.6±3	11.1±8
Anchor(1)	100.0	97.8	93.0	98.9	43.1	24.6	31.9	27.3	13.0±4	14.4±5	5.4±2	3.7±1
LIME(2)	89.9	72.9	-	-	78.5	63.1	-	-	37.8±20	24.4±7	-	-
Anchor(2)	87.4	95.8	-	-	62.3	45.4	-	-	10.5±3	19.2±10	-	-

The user study confirms our hypotheses: it is much easier for users to understand the coverage of anchor explanations as opposed to linear explanations, and to achieve high-precision understanding of the model's behavior (as measured by predicting it on new instances).
Anchors are also easier to comprehend, and take less effort in applying, as reflected in their times and qualitative feedback.

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace ’19]

- The common assumption on attention
  - Attention provides an explanation for model predictions
- Our expectation
  - (i) Attention weights should correlate with feature importance measures (e.g., gradient-based measures);
  - (ii) Alternative (or counterfactual) attention weight configurations ought to yield corresponding changes in prediction (and if they do not then are equally plausible as explanations)
- But, results are negative
  - Neither property is consistently observed by standard attention mechanisms
    - in the context of text classification, question answering (QA), and Natural Language Inference (NLI) tasks when RNN encoders are used

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace ’19]

– Make Counterfactual attention weight configurations

after 15 minutes watching the movie i was asking myself what to do leave the theater sleep or try to keep watching the movie to see if there was anything worth i finally watched the movie what a waste of time maybe i am not a 5 years old kid anymore

original α

$$f(x|\alpha, \theta) = 0.01$$

after 15 minutes watching the movie i was asking myself what to do leave the theater sleep or try to keep watching the movie to see if there was anything worth i finally watched the movie what a waste of time maybe i am not a 5 years old kid anymore

adversarial $\tilde{\alpha}$

$$f(x|\tilde{\alpha}, \theta) = 0.01$$

Despite being quite dissimilar, these both yield effectively the same prediction (0.01).

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- Research questions & contributions
  - Examine the extent to which the narrative that attention provides model transparency holds across tasks by exploring the following empirical questions
  - 1. To what extent do induced attention weights correlate with measures of feature importance – specifically, those resulting from gradients and leave-one-out methods?

    ➔ Only weakly and inconsistently
  - 2. Would alternative attention weights (and hence distinct heatmaps/"explanations") necessarily yield different predictions?

    ➔ No; it is very often possible to construct adversarial attention distributions that yield effectively equivalent predictions as when using the originally induced attention weights, despite attending to entirely different input features.

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times |V|}$: model inputs
- $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{Enc}(\mathbf{x}_e)$: T m-dimensional hidden states
- $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^m$: a query

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \text{softmax}(\phi(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{Q}))$$

- Two similarity functions:

Additive

$$\phi(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{Q}) = \mathbf{v}^T \tanh(\mathbf{W_1 h} + \mathbf{W_2 Q})$$

Scaled Dot-Product

$$\phi(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{Q}) = \frac{\mathbf{hQ}}{\sqrt{m}} \qquad h_\alpha = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \hat{\alpha}_t \cdot h_t$$

- Decoder $\hat{y} = \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot h_\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Y}|}$

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- Dataset
  - Binary classification, QA, NLI

Dataset	$\|V\|$	*Avg. length*	*Train size*	*Test size*	*Test performance*
SST	16175	19	3034 / 3321	863 / 862	0.81
IMDB	13916	179	12500 / 12500	2184 / 2172	0.88
ADR Tweets	8686	20	14446 / 1939	3636 / 487	0.61
20 Newsgroups	8853	115	716 / 710	151 / 183	0.94
AG News	14752	36	30000 / 30000	1900 / 1900	0.96
Diabetes (MIMIC)	22316	1858	6381 / 1353	1295 / 319	0.79
Anemia (MIMIC)	19743	2188	1847 / 3251	460 / 802	0.92
CNN	74790	761	380298	3198	0.64
bAbI (Task 1 / 2 / 3)	40	8 / 67 / 421	10000	1000	1.0 / 0.65 / 0.64
SNLI	20982	14	182764 / 183187 / 183416	3219 / 3237 / 3368	0.78

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- Key questions
  - *1) Do learned attention weights agree with alternative, natural measures of feature importance?*
    - Analyze the correlation between gradient-based feature importance and learned attention weights, and between 'leave-one-out' (LOO) measures and the same.
  - *2) Had we attended to different features, would the prediction have been different?*
    - Propose explicitly searching for "adversarial" attention weights
      - That maximally differ from the observed attention weights and yet yield an effectively equivalent prediction

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- Total Variation Distance (TVD)
  - The measure of change between output distributions

$$\text{TVD}(\hat{y}_1, \hat{y}_2) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{Y}|} |\hat{y}_{1i} - \hat{y}_{2i}|$$

- Jensen-Shannon Divergence (JSD)
  - Quantify the difference between two attention distributions

$$\text{JSD}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = \frac{1}{2}\text{KL}[\alpha_1 || \frac{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}{2}] + \frac{1}{2}\text{KL}[\alpha_2 || \frac{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}{2}]$$

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- **Correlation Between Attention and Feature Importance Measures**
  - (1) gradient based measures of feature importance (τ_g), (2) differences in model output induced by leaving features out (τ_{loo}).

Algorithm 1 Feature Importance Computations

$$\mathbf{h} \leftarrow \text{Enc}(\mathbf{x}),\ \hat{\alpha} \leftarrow \text{softmax}(\phi(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{Q}))$$
$$\hat{y} \leftarrow \text{Dec}(\mathbf{h}, \alpha)$$
$$g_t \leftarrow \left| \sum_{w=1}^{|V|} \mathbb{1}[\mathbf{x}_{tw} = 1] \frac{\partial y}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{tw}} \right|, \forall t \in [1, T]$$
$$\tau_g \leftarrow \text{Kendall-}\tau(\alpha, g)$$
$$\Delta\hat{y}_t \leftarrow \text{TVD}(\hat{y}(\mathbf{x}_{-t}), \hat{y}(\mathbf{x})), \forall t \in [1, T]$$
$$\tau_{loo} \leftarrow \text{Kendall-}\tau(\alpha, \Delta\hat{y})$$

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- Mean and std. dev. of correlations between gradient/leave-one-out importance measures and attention weights

Sig. Frac. columns report the fraction of instances for which this correlation is statistically significant;

		Gradient (BiLSTM) τ_g		Gradient (Average) τ_g		Leave-One-Out (BiLSTM) τ_{loo}	
Dataset	Class	Mean ± Std.	Sig. Frac.	Mean ± Std.	Sig. Frac.	Mean ± Std.	Sig. Frac.
SST	0	0.34 ± 0.21	0.48	0.61 ± 0.20	0.87	0.27 ± 0.19	0.33
	1	0.36 ± 0.21	0.49	0.60 ± 0.21	0.83	0.32 ± 0.19	0.40
IMDB	0	0.44 ± 0.06	1.00	0.67 ± 0.05	1.00	0.34 ± 0.07	1.00
	1	0.43 ± 0.06	1.00	0.68 ± 0.05	1.00	0.34 ± 0.07	0.99
ADR Tweets	0	0.47 ± 0.18	0.76	0.73 ± 0.13	0.96	0.29 ± 0.20	0.44
	1	0.49 ± 0.15	0.85	0.72 ± 0.12	0.97	0.44 ± 0.16	0.74
20News	0	0.07 ± 0.17	0.37	0.79 ± 0.07	1.00	0.06 ± 0.15	0.29
	1	0.21 ± 0.22	0.61	0.75 ± 0.08	1.00	0.20 ± 0.20	0.62
AG News	0	0.36 ± 0.13	0.82	0.78 ± 0.07	1.00	0.30 ± 0.13	0.69
	1	0.42 ± 0.13	0.90	0.76 ± 0.07	1.00	0.43 ± 0.14	0.91
Diabetes	0	0.42 ± 0.05	1.00	0.75 ± 0.02	1.00	0.41 ± 0.05	1.00
	1	0.40 ± 0.05	1.00	0.75 ± 0.02	1.00	0.45 ± 0.05	1.00
Anemia	0	0.47 ± 0.05	1.00	0.77 ± 0.02	1.00	0.46 ± 0.05	1.00
	1	0.46 ± 0.06	1.00	0.77 ± 0.03	1.00	0.47 ± 0.06	1.00
CNN	Overall	0.24 ± 0.07	0.99	0.50 ± 0.10	1.00	0.20 ± 0.07	0.98
bAbI 1	Overall	0.25 ± 0.16	0.55	0.72 ± 0.12	0.99	0.16 ± 0.14	0.28
bAbI 2	Overall	-0.02 ± 0.14	0.27	0.68 ± 0.06	1.00	-0.01 ± 0.13	0.27
bAbI 3	Overall	0.24 ± 0.11	0.87	0.61 ± 0.13	1.00	0.26 ± 0.10	0.89
SNLI	0	0.31 ± 0.23	0.36	0.59 ± 0.18	0.80	0.16 ± 0.26	0.20
	1	0.33 ± 0.21	0.38	0.58 ± 0.19	0.80	0.36 ± 0.19	0.44
	2	0.31 ± 0.21	0.36	0.57 ± 0.19	0.80	0.34 ± 0.20	0.40

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace ’19]

- Histogram of Kendall τ between attention and gradients. Encoder variants are denoted parenthetically; colors indicate predicted classes.



(a) SST (BiLSTM)



(b) SST (Average)



(c) Diabetes (BiLSTM)



(d) Diabetes (Average)



(e) SNLI (BiLSTM)



(f) SNLI (Average)



(g) CNN-QA (BiLSTM)



(h) BAbI 1 (BiLSTM)

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace ’19]

- **Correlation Between Attention and Feature Importance Measures**
  - The BiRNN encoder.
    - In general, observed correlations are modest
      - The centrality of observed densities hovers around or below 0.5 in most of the corpora
  - The “average” embedding based models
    - Gradients show very high degree of correspondence with attention weights
      - on average across corpora, correlation between LOO scores and attention weights is ~0.375 points higher for this encoder
  - These results suggest that,
    - in general, attention weights do not strongly or consistently agree with such feature importance scores in models with contextualized embeddings.

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- **Counterfactual Attention Weights**
  - Attention Permutation

Algorithm 2 Permuting attention weights

$\mathbf{h} \leftarrow \text{Enc}(\mathbf{x}), \hat{\alpha} \leftarrow \text{softmax}(\phi(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{Q}))$
$\hat{y} \leftarrow \text{Dec}(\mathbf{h}, \hat{\alpha})$
for $p \leftarrow 1$ to 100 **do**
  $\alpha^p \leftarrow \text{Permute}(\hat{\alpha})$
  $\hat{y}^p \leftarrow \text{Dec}(\mathbf{h}, \alpha^p)$ ▷ Note : $\mathbf{h}$ is not changed
  $\Delta\hat{y}^p \leftarrow \text{TVD}[\hat{y}^p, \hat{y}]$
end for
$\Delta\hat{y}^{med} \leftarrow \text{Median}_p(\Delta\hat{y}^p)$

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace ’19]

- **Counterfactual Attention Weights**
  - **Attention Permutation**

Median change in output ($\Delta\hat{y}^{med}$) (x-axis) densities in relation to the max attention ($\max \hat{\alpha}$) (y-axis) obtained by randomly permuting instance attention weights



(a) SST (BiLSTM) (b) SST (CNN) (c) Diabetes (BiLSTM) (d) Diabetes (CNN)



(e) CNN-QA (BiLSTM) (f) bAbI 1 (BiLSTM) (g) SNLI (BiLSTM) (h) SNLI (CNN)

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace ’19]

- **Counterfactual Attention Weights**
  - **Attention Permutation**
    - Observe that there exist many points with small $\Delta\hat{y}$ med despite large magnitude attention weights.
    - These are cases in which the attention weights might suggest explaining an output by a small set of features (this is how one might reasonably read a heatmap depicting the attention weights),
    - But where scrambling the attention makes little difference to the prediction

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- **Counterfactual Attention Weights**
  - **Adversarial Attention**
    - Objective requires specifying a value that defines what qualifies as a "small" difference in model output.
    - Find k adversarial distributions $\{\alpha^{(1)}, \cdots, \alpha^{(k)}\}$, such that each $\alpha^{(i)}$ maximizes the distance from original $\hat{\alpha}$ but does not change the output by more than

$$\underset{\alpha^{(1)},\ldots,\alpha^{(k)}}{\text{maximize}} \quad f(\{\alpha^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{k})$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \forall i \ \text{TVD}[\hat{y}(\mathbf{x}, \alpha^{(i)}), \hat{y}(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\alpha})] \leq \epsilon$$

$$f(\{\alpha^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{k}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \text{JSD}[\alpha^{(i)}, \hat{\alpha}] + \frac{1}{k(k-1)} \sum_{i<j} \text{JSD}[\alpha^{(i)}, \alpha^{(j)}]$$

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

- **Counterfactual Attention Weights**
  - Adversarial Attention

Algorithm 3 Finding adversarial attention weights

$\mathbf{h} \leftarrow \text{Enc}(\mathbf{x}), \hat{\alpha} \leftarrow \text{softmax}(\phi(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{Q}))$

$\hat{y} \leftarrow \text{Dec}(\mathbf{h}, \hat{\alpha})$

$\alpha^{(1)}, ..., \alpha^{(k)} \leftarrow$ Optimize Eq 1

for $i \leftarrow 1$ to k **do**

  $\hat{y}^{(i)} \leftarrow \text{Dec}(\mathbf{h}, \alpha^{(i)})$ ▷ $\mathbf{h}$ is not changed

  $\Delta\hat{y}^{(i)} \leftarrow \text{TVD}[\hat{y}, \hat{y}^{(i)}]$

  $\Delta\alpha^{(i)} \leftarrow \text{JSD}[\hat{\alpha}, \alpha^{(i)}]$

end for

ϵ-max JSD $\leftarrow \max_i \mathbb{1}[\Delta\hat{y}^{(i)} \leq \epsilon]\Delta\alpha^{(i)}$

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

– Adversarial Attention

- Histogram of maximum adversarial JS Divergence (-max JSD) between original and adversarial attentions over all instances.



(a) SST (BiLSTM) (b) SST (CNN) (c) Diabetes (BiLSTM) (d) Diabetes (CNN)

(e) SNLI (BiLSTM) (f) SNLI (CNN) (g) CNN-QA (BiLSTM) (h) BAbI 1 (BiLSTM)

Attention is not Explanation [Jain and Wallace '19]

– Adversarial Attention

- Densities of maximum JS divergences (-max JSD) (x-axis) as a function of the max attention (y-axis) in each instance for obtained between original and adversarial attention weights.



(a) SST (BiLSTM) (b) SST (CNN) (c) Diabetes (BiLSTM) (d) Diabetes (CNN)

(e) CNN-QA (BiLSTM) (f) bAbI 1 (BiLSTM) (g) SNLI (BiLSTM) (h) SNLI (CNN)

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Make claims against 'Attention is not Explanation' (Jain and Wallace, '19).
  - Here, challenge many of the assumptions underlying this work
  - Such a claim depends on one's definition of explanation, and that testing it needs to take into account all elements of the model
  - Propose four alternative tests to determine when/whether attention can be used as explanation
    - 1) a simple uniform-weights baseline
    - 2) a variance calibration based on multiple random seed runs
    - 3) a diagnostic framework using frozen weights from pretrained models
    - 4) an end-to-end adversarial attention training protocol

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- 1) Uniform as the Adversary
  - Test attention modules' **contribution** to a model by applying a simple baseline where attention weights are frozen to a uniform distribution
  - Demonstrate that a frozen attention distribution performs just as well as learned attention weights, concluding that randomly- or adversarially-perturbed distributions are not evidence against attention as explanation in these cases

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- 2) Variance within a Model
  - Examine the **expected variance** in attention-produced weights by initializing multiple training sequences with different random seeds, allowing a better quantification of how much variance can be expected in trained models.
  - Show that considering this background stochastic variation when comparing adversarial results with a traditional model allows us to better interpret adversarial results

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- 3) Diagnosing Attention Distributions by Guiding Simpler Models
  - Present a simple yet effective diagnostic tool which tests attention distributions for their usefulness by using them as frozen weights in a non-contextual multi-layered perceptron (MLP) architecture
    - The favorable performance of LSTM-trained weights provides additional support for the coherence of trained attention scores
  - This demonstrates a sense in which attention components indeed provide a meaningful model-agnostic interpretation of tokens in an instance

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- 4) Training an Adversary
  - Introduce a **model-consistent** training protocol for finding adversarial attention weights, correcting some flaws we found in the previous approach
    - Train a model using a modified loss function which takes into account the distance from an ordinarily-trained base model's attention scores in order to learn parameters for adversarial attention distributions
  - Find that while plausibly adversarial distributions of the consistent kind can indeed be found for the binary classification datasets in question, they are not as extreme as those found in the inconsistent manner

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

Training an Adversary

Diagnosing Attention Distributions by Guiding Simpler Models

Variance within a Model

Uniform as the Adversary

§4 §3.4 §3.3 §3.2 J&W



Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Attention Might be Explanation
  - **Attention Distribution is not a Primitive.**
    - Detaching the attention scores obtained by parts of the model (i.e. the attention mechanism) degrades the model itself.
    - The base attention weights are not assigned arbitrarily by the model, but rather computed by an integral component whose parameters were trained alongside the rest of the layers; the way they work depends on each other.
    - Jain and Wallace provide alternative distributions which may result in similar predictions, but in the process they remove the very linkage which motivates the original claim of attention distribution explainability, namely the fact that the model was *trained* to attend to the tokens it chose
    - A reliable adversary must take this consideration into account

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Attention Might be Explanation
  - **Existence does not Entail Exclusivity**
    - Hold that attention scores are used as providing an explanation; not the explanation
    - The final layer of an LSTM model may easily produce outputs capable of being aggregated into the same prediction in various ways, however the model still makes the choice of a specific weighting distribution using its trained attention component.
    - This mathematically flexible production capacity is particularly evident in binary classifiers, where prediction is reduced to a single scalar, and an average instance (of e.g. the IMDB dataset) might contain 179 tokens, i.e. 179 scalars to be aggregated
    - This effect is greatly exacerbated when performed independently on each instance
    - Thus, it is no surprise that Jain and Wallace find what they are looking for given this degree of freedom.

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Attention Might be Explanation
  - Due to the per-instance nature of the demonstration and the fact that model parameters have not been learned or manipulated directly, Jain and Wallace have not shown the existence of an adversarial model that produces the claimed adversarial distributions
  - Thus, we cannot treat these adversarial attentions as equally plausible or faithful explanations for model prediction.
  - Additionally, they haven't provided a baseline of how much variation is to be expected in learned attention distributions, leaving the reader to question just how adversarial the found adversarial distributions are

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Experimental Setup
  - Dataset statistics.

Dataset	Avg. Length (tokens)	Train Size (neg/pos)	Test Size (neg/pos)
Diabetes	1858	6381/1353	1295/319
Anemia	2188	1847/3251	460/802
IMDb	179	12500/12500	2184/2172
SST	19	3034/3321	863/862
AgNews	36	30000/30000	1900/1900
20News	115	716/710	151/183

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Uniform as the Adversary
  - Classification F1 scores (1-class) on attention models

Dataset	Attention (Base)		Uniform
	Reported	Reproduced	
Diabetes	0.79	0.775	0.706
Anemia	0.92	0.938	0.899
IMDb	0.88	0.902	0.879
SST	0.81	0.831	0.822
AgNews	0.96	0.964	0.960
20News	0.94	0.942	0.934

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Variance within a Model

Test whether the variances observed by Jain and Wallace between trained attention scores and adversarially-obtained ones are unusual



(a) IMDB (seeds)



(c) SST (seeds)

Left-heavy violins are interpreted as data classes for which the compared model produces attention distributions similar to the base model, and so having an adversary that manages to 'pull right' supports the argument that distributions are easy to manipulate



(b) Anemia (seeds)



(d) Diabetes (seeds)

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter ’19]

- Variance within a Model

Densities of maximum JS divergences (x-axis) as a function of the max attention (y-axis) in each instance between the base distributions: models from a perinstance adversarial setup

SST distributions (c, e) are surprisingly robust to random seed change, validating our choice to continue examining this dataset despite its borderline F1 score

On the Diabetes dataset, the negative class is already subject to relatively arbitrary distributions from the different random seed settings (d), making the highly divergent results from the overly-flexible adversarial setup (f) seem less impressive.



(e) SST (adversary)



(f) Diabetes (adversary)

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Diagnosing Attention Distributions by Guiding Simpler Models
  - Replace the main setup's LSTM and attention parameters with a token-level affine hidden layer with tanh activation (forming an MLP), and forcing its output scores to be weighted by a pre-set, per-instance distribution, during both training and testing



Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Diagnosing Attention Distributions by Guiding Simpler Models
  - The guide weights we impose are:
    - **Uniform**
      - We force the MLP outputs to be considered equally across each instance, effectively forming an unweighted baseline
    - **Trained MLP**
      - We do not freeze the weights layer, instead allowing the MLP to learn its own attention parameters
    - **Base LSTM**
      - Take the weights learned by the base LSTM model's attention layer;
    - **Adversary**
      - Based on distributions found adversarially using the consistent training algorithm (where their results will be discussed)

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Diagnosing Attention Distributions by Guiding Simpler Models
  - F1 scores on the positive class for an MLP model trained on various weighting guides. For ADVERSARY, we set $\lambda \leftarrow 0.001$.

Guide weights	Diab.	Anemia	SST	IMDb
UNIFORM	0.404	0.873	0.812	0.863
TRAINED MLP	0.699	0.920	0.817	0.888
BASE LSTM	**0.753**	0.931	**0.824**	**0.905**
ADVERSARY (4)	0.503	**0.932**	0.592	0.700

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Training an Adversary
  - **Model**.
    - $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{b}}$: given the base model Mb,
    - $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{a}}$: a trained model whose explicit goal is to provide similar prediction scores for each instance, while distancing its attention distributions from those of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{b}}$
    - Formally, train the adversarial model using stochastic gradient updates based on the following loss formula (summed over instances in the minibatch)

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_a, \mathcal{M}_b)^{(i)} = \mathrm{TVD}(\hat{y}_a^{(i)}, \hat{y}_b^{(i)}) - \lambda \ \mathrm{KL}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_a^{(\mathbf{i})} \parallel \boldsymbol{\alpha}_b^{(\mathbf{i})})$$

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Training an Adversary
  - **Prediction performance**
    - Best-performing adversarial models with instance-average JSD > 0.4.
    - Report the highest F1 scores of models whose attention distributions diverge from the base, on average, by at least 0.4 in JSD,

Dataset	λ	F1 (↑)	TVD (↓)	JSD (↑)
Diabetes	2e-4	0.775	0.015	0.409
Anemia	5e-4	0.942	0.017	0.481
SST	5.25e-4	0.823	0.036	0.514
IMDb	8e-4	0.906	0.014	0.405

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Training an Adversary
  - **Adversarial weights as guides.**
    - Apply the diagnostic setup by training a guided MLP model on the adversarially-trained attention distributions

Guide weights	Diab.	Anemia	SST	IMDb
UNIFORM	0.404	0.873	0.812	0.863
TRAINED MLP	0.699	0.920	0.817	0.888
BASE LSTM	**0.753**	0.931	**0.824**	**0.905**
ADVERSARY (4)	0.503	**0.932**	0.592	0.700

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Training an Adversary
  - **TVD/JSD tradeoff.**

The convex shape of most curves does lend support to the claim that attention scores are easily manipulable; however the extent of this effect emerging from Jain and Wallace's per-instance setup is a considerable exaggeration, as seen by its position (+) well below the curve of our parameterized model set



Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Training an Adversary
  - **TVD/JSD tradeoff.**

  - The SST dataset emerges as an outlier: not only can JSD be increased practically arbitrarily without incurring prediction variance cost, the uniform baseline (■) comes up under the curve, i.e. with a better adversarial score.

  - We again include random seed initializations (▲) in order to quantify a baseline amount of variance.

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Training an Adversary
  - **TVD/JSD tradeoff.**
    - Attention maps for an IMDb instance (all predicted as positive with score > 0.998), showing that in practice it is difficult to learn a distant adversary which is consistent on all instances in the training set.

Base model	brilliant	and	moving	performances	by	tom	and	peter	finch
Jain and Wallace (2019)	brilliant	and	moving	performances	by	tom	and	peter	finch
Our adversary	brilliant	and	moving	performances	by	tom	and	peter	finch

- illustrates the difference between inconsistently-achieved adversarial heatmaps and consistently trained ones
- Jain and Wallace's model has distributed all of the attention weight to an ad-hoc token, whereas our trained model could only distance itself from the base model distribution by so much, keeping multiple tokens in the > 0.1 score range.

Attention is not not Explanation [Wiegreffe & Pinter '19]

- Defining explanation
  - The umbrella term of "Explainable AI" encompasses at least three distinct notions: **transparency**, **explainability**, and **interpretability**
  - Jain and Wallace define attention and explanation as measuring the "responsibility" each input token has on a prediction.
  - The ultimate question posed so far as 'is attention explanation?' seems to be: do high attention weights on certain elements in the input lead the model to make its prediction?
  - However, under the given definition of transparency, the authors' exclusivity requisite is well-defined and we find value in their counterfactual framework as a concept – if a model is capable of producing multiple sets of diverse attention weights for the same prediction, then the relationship between inputs and outputs used to make predictions is not understood by attention analysis
    - This provides us with the motivation to implement the adversarial setup coherently and to derive and present conclusions from it.

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- Previous studies for analysis of attention
  - Have mainly analyzed **attention weights** to see how much information the attention modules gather from each input to produce an output
- This work
  - Point out that attention weights alone are only one of the two factors determining the output of self-attention modules
  - Propose to incorporate the other factor as well, namely, the transformed input vectors into the analysis
  - Measure the norm of the weighted vectors as the contribution of each input to an output
  - Giving reasonable analyzing results
    - (1) BERT's attention modules do not pay so much attention to special tokens, and
    - (2) Transformer's attention modules capture word alignment quite well

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- Attention module
  - Computes each output vector $\boldsymbol{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ from the corresponding pre-update vector $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a set of input vectors $\mathcal{X} = \{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots \boldsymbol{x}_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\boldsymbol{y}_i = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{i,j} \boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{x}_j) \right) \boldsymbol{W}^O + \boldsymbol{b}^O \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

$$\alpha_{i,j} := \underset{\boldsymbol{x}_j \in \mathcal{X}}{\mathrm{softmax}} \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{q}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_i) \boldsymbol{k}(\boldsymbol{x}_j)^\top}{\sqrt{d'}} \right) \in \mathbb{R},$$

$$\boldsymbol{q}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_i) := \widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_i \boldsymbol{W}^Q + \boldsymbol{b}^Q \quad \left(\boldsymbol{W}^Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d'}, \boldsymbol{b}^Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d'} \right)$$

$$\boldsymbol{k}(\boldsymbol{x}_j) := \boldsymbol{x}_j \boldsymbol{W}^K + \boldsymbol{b}^K \quad \left(\boldsymbol{W}^K \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d'}, \boldsymbol{b}^K \in \mathbb{R}^{d'} \right)$$

$$\boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{x}_j) := \boldsymbol{x}_j \boldsymbol{W}^V + \boldsymbol{b}^V \quad \left(\boldsymbol{W}^V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d'}, \boldsymbol{b}^V \in \mathbb{R}^{d'} \right).$$

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- Attention module



Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- Attention module sums weighted vectors
  - Attention module computes a weighted sum of input vectors

$$\boldsymbol{y}_i = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{i,j} \boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{x}_j) \right) \boldsymbol{W}^O + \boldsymbol{b}^O \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

Rewriting

$$\boldsymbol{y}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{i,j} \, f(\boldsymbol{x}_j) + \boldsymbol{b}^O$$

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) := \left(\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{W}^V + \boldsymbol{b}^V \right) \boldsymbol{W}^O.$$

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- Attention module



Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- Problems with attention weight analysis
  - The assumption of the previous studies
    - if an input vector is assigned a larger attention weight than other input vectors, then that input vector contributes more to the output vector than the others
  - However, this assumption disregards the magnitude of the vectors to be weighted
  - Intuitively, with attention weights being equal, a larger vector will contribute more to the output vector than a smaller vector

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- Problems with attention weight analysis
  - Analysis based on attention weights has produced some non-intuitive observations, probably due to this flaw
  - E.g.) Clark et al. (2019)'s work
    - Reported that input vectors for specific tokens such as commas, periods, and separator tokens [SEP] tend to gain remarkably large attention weights,
    - whereas intuitively, their contributions to the pre-training tasks (i.e., masked word prediction and next sentence prediction) are expected to be limited compared with more informative content word

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- Proposal: norm as attention degree
  - Estimate the contribution of the input vector $\boldsymbol{x}_j$ to the output vector $\boldsymbol{y}_j$ by $\alpha_{i,j} f(\boldsymbol{x}_j)$
  - To address the aforementioned issue, we propose to use $\|\alpha f(\boldsymbol{x})\|$, which is the standard Euclidean norm (length) of the weighted, transformed vector
  - ➔ **the norm-based analysis**
  - Analysis of the previous study: **weight-based analysis**

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Does f(x) have an impact?**
  - Mean (μ), standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variance (CV), and maximum and minimum values of kf(x)k; the former three are averaged on all the heads.

Head	μ	σ	CV	Max	Min
Layer 2–Head 4 (max CV)	4.26	1.59	**0.37**	12.66	0.96
Layer 2–Head 7 (min CV)	4.00	0.50	**0.12**	6.15	1.35
Average	5.15	1.17	**0.22**	-	-

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Re-examining previously observed phenomena**
  - Each point corresponds to averaged α or $\|\alpha\, f(\boldsymbol{x})\|$ on a token category in a given layer.

(a) Weight-based analysis.



Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Re-examining previously observed phenomena**
  - Each point corresponds to averaged α or $\|\alpha\, f(\boldsymbol{x})\|$ on a token category in a given layer.

(b) Norm-based analysis.



Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Analysis — relationship between α and ||f(x)||:**
  - The darkness of each cell corresponds to the value of averaged α or $||f(x)||$ on a [SEP] category in a given head

For almost all heads, α and $||f(x)||$ clearly negate the magnitude of each other.



(a) α.



(b) $\|f(\boldsymbol{x})\|$.

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Analysis — relationship between α and ||f(x)||:**
  - Relationship between α and $\| f(x) \|$. Each plot corresponds to a pair of $\alpha_{i,j}$ and $\| f(x) \|$for output vector yi in either attention head

Even when the same attention weights α are assigned, the values of kf(x)k can vary, which suggests that they play a different role in the modules.



Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Relationship between token frequency and $||f(x)||$**
  - Relationship between frequency rank r and $\alpha^{(r,o)}$

The Spearman rank correlation coefficient showed no correlation ($\rho = -0.08$)



Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Relationship between token frequency and $||f(x)||$**
  - Relationship between frequency rank r and $||f(x^{(r,o)})||$.

the Spearman rank correlation coefficient between r and || f(x (r,o))|| was 0.75, indicating a strong positive correlation



Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Experiments2: Transformer-based NMT system**
  - Extract Soft alignments from the attention module by the following methods:
    - **Attention-weights** for each layer were computed by averaging α of all heads following [Li et al. (2019)'s work
    - For our **norm-based method**, we merged $||\alpha f(x)||$ from all attention heads in each layer by the following strategy: adding all the vectors $\alpha f(x)$ from every head, then calculating the norm of the summed vector (Vector-norms).
      - Adding all $\alpha f(x)$ from every head is the same as the procedure that combines the results from every head into the results of the multi-head attention module

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Experiments2: Transformer-based NMT system**
  - AER scores of each layer in the Transformerbased system



Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Experiments2: Transformer-based NMT system**
  - Examples of soft alignment extracted from the attention modules in layer 2 of the system and reference of word alignment.



(a) Reference. (b) Attention-weights.

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- **Experiments2: Transformer-based NMT system**
  - Examples of soft alignment extracted from the attention modules in layer 2 of the system and reference of word alignment.



(a) Reference.



(c) Vector-norms (ours).

Attention Module is Not Only a Weight: Analyzing Transformers with Vector Norms [Kobayashi et al '20]

- AER scores with different alignment extraction methods on German-English translation

Methods	AER
Transformer – Attention-based Approach	
Attention-weights	
best layer	51.9
mean	81.4
Vector-norms (ours)	
best layer	28.3
mean	61.6
Transformer – Gradient-based Approach	
(Li et al., 2016) SmoothGrad	36.4
(Ding et al., 2019) SmoothGrad	36.4
Word Aligner	
fast_align	28.4
GIZA++	21.0

Distilling a Neural Network Into a Soft Decision Tree [Frosst & Hinton '18]

- a soft binary decision tree with a single inner node and two leaf nodes.



Distilling a Neural Network Into a Soft Decision Tree [Frosst & Hinton '18]

– Train the soft decision tree using a loss function that seeks to minimize the cross entropy between each leaf, weighted by its path probability, and the target distribution

$$\mathrm{L}(\mathbf{x}) = -\log\left(\sum_{\ell \in Leaf\,Nodes} P^{\ell}(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{k} T_k \log Q_k^{\ell}\right)$$

Distilling a Neural Network Into a Soft Decision Tree [Frosst & Hinton '18]

– Regularizers

$$\alpha_i = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x}} P^i(\mathbf{x}) p_i(\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{\mathbf{x}} P^i(\mathbf{x})}$$

$$C = -\lambda \sum_{i \in InnerNodes} 0.5 \log(\alpha_i) + 0.5 \log(1 - \alpha_i)$$

a hyper-parameter that determines the strength of the penalty and is set prior to training. This penalty was based on the assumption that a tree making fairly equal use of alternative sub-trees would usually be better suited to any particular classification task and in practice it did increase accuracy

Interpretable QA on KB and Text [Sydorova et al '19]

- Interpretable QA on TextKBQA
- TextKBQA model architecture [Das et al



Interpretable QA on KB and Text [Sydorova et al '19]

- TextKBQA: Multi-hop attention
  - Question: $q = [w_1, ..., e, ..., \_blank\_, ..., w_n]$
  - Question rep.: $\boldsymbol{q} = BiLSTM(q)$
  - Multihop attention

$$\mathbf{c}_0 = \mathbf{q}$$

$$\mathbf{c}_t = W_t\left(\mathbf{c}_{t-1} + W_p \sum_{(k,v)\in\mathcal{M}} \text{softmax}(\mathbf{c}_{t-1} \cdot \mathbf{k})\mathbf{v}\right)$$

  - Transform $\boldsymbol{c}_T$

$$\boldsymbol{b} = FNN(\boldsymbol{c}_T)$$

  - Inner product and softmax
    - Inner product b/w $\boldsymbol{b}$ and all entity embeddings

Interpretable QA on KB and Text [Sydorova et al '19]

- Formal notations
  - $\mathbb{F}$: a database consisting of all KB and textual facts

$$\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_{KB} \cup \mathbb{F}_{text}$$

  - $\mathcal{E}$: a set of entities that are objects and subjects in F
  - $\mathcal{R}$: a set of relations from F_{KB}
  - $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathbb{F}$: the corresponding set of facts, such that

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F} \quad subject_f \in q$$

  - TextKBQA model

$$a_q = TextKBQA(q, \mathcal{F}), a_q \in \mathcal{E}$$

Interpretable QA on KB and Text [Sydorova et al '19]

- Explanation method
  - *Based on explanation method defined in* [Poerner et al
  - $\phi(f, a_q, q, \mathcal{F})$: a function that assigns real-valued relevance scores to facts f from $\mathcal{F}$ given an input qu q and a target entity a_q

$$\phi(f_1, a_q, q, \mathcal{F}) > \phi(f_2, a_q, q, \mathcal{F})$$

➔ fact f_1 is of a higher relevance for a_q given q and F than fact f_2

Interpretable QA on KB and Text [Sydorova et al '19]

- Attention weights

$$\phi_{aw}(f, a_q, q, \mathcal{F}) = \text{softmax}(K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot \mathbf{q})_f$$

  - Attention weights at hop j

$$\phi_{aw_j}(f, a_q, q, \mathcal{F}) = \text{softmax}(K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot \mathbf{c}_{j-1})_f$$

  - Average attention weights

$$\phi_{aw_{avg}}(f, a_q, q, \mathcal{F}) = \frac{1}{h} \sum_{j=1}^{h} \text{softmax}(K_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot \mathbf{c}_{j-1})_f$$

Interpretable QA on KB and Text [Sydorova et al '19]

- LIME (Local Interpretable Model-Agnostic Explanations)
  - Model-agnostic explanation method [Ribeiro et al. '16]
  - Requires a mapping from original features (used by TextKBQA) to an interpretable rep (used by LIME)
  - Here, we use binary bag of facts vectors

$$z \in \{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{F}|}$$ ← indicates presence or absence of a fact f from F

  - Sample vectors z' of the same length $|F|$ by drawing facts from F using the Bernoulli distribution with $p = 0.5$
    - The number of sample: 1000
  - Each of sample vectors z' corresponds to F'
    - gives the reduced input to TextKBQA

Interpretable QA on KB and Text [Sydorova et al '19]

- LIME (Local Interpretable Model-Agnostic Explanations)
  - Compute the prob. That a_q is still the predicted answer to the query q, given facts *F' (not F)*, using:

$$logit(q, \mathcal{F}, a_q) = (E \cdot \mathbf{b})_{a_q}$$

  - Gather the outputs of $logit(q, \mathcal{F}', a_q)$ for all sampled instances
  - Train a linear model g by optimizing:

$$\xi(q, \mathcal{F}) = \underset{g \in G}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathcal{L}(logit, g) \quad g(z') = w_g \cdot z'$$

  - LIME explanation method :

$$\phi_{lime}(f, a_q, q, \mathcal{F}) = w_{g,f}$$

Interpretable QA on KB and Text [Sydorova et al '19]

- Input perturbation (IP)

$$\phi_{ip}(f, a_q, q, \mathcal{F}) = \frac{logit(q, \mathcal{F}, a_q) - logit(q, \mathcal{F} \setminus \{f\}, a_q)}{logit(q, \mathcal{F}, a_q)}$$

Interpretable QA on KB and Text [Sydorova et al '19]

- Automatic evaluation using fake facts
  - F': fake facts
    - Randomly sample a different query q' that has the same number of entities and gather its fact set F' .
    - Then replace subject entities in facts from F' with subject entities from F
  - Hybrid facts

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{F}', \text{where } \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{F}' = \emptyset$$

  - Compute a **hit point** ➔ **Pointing game acc**

$$hit(\phi, q, \hat{\mathcal{F}}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } rmax(\hat{\mathcal{F}}, q, \phi) \in \mathcal{F}, \\ 0, & \text{if } rmax(\hat{\mathcal{F}}, q, \phi) \in \mathcal{F}'. \end{cases}$$

Interpretable QA on KB and Text [Sydorova et al '19]

- An example of a hybrid instance

	Facts in hybrid fact set $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$
Facts from $\mathcal{F}$ (real facts)	Disney award.award_honor.award_winner_award.award_honor.honored_for Bambi
	Disney's Steamboat Willie premiered on November 18th 1928 at the Broadway.
	Disney film.performance.actor_film.performance.character Mickey
	Disney film.film.directed_by.2_film.film.directed_by.1 The Opry House
Facts from $\mathcal{F}'$ (fake facts)	But in the summer of 2007, Apple rocked Disney by launching the iPhone.
	Disney fashion.clothing_size.region_fashion.clothing_size.person Frankie Rayder
	The Libertarian is a Disney political party created in 1971.
	eBay is the largest marketplace in the Disney.

Interpretable QA on KB and Text [Sydorova et al '19]

- Experiments and results

Explanation method	Hit points	Pointing game acc.
attention weights at hop 1	1849	0.69
attention weights at hop 3	2116	0.80
average attention weights	2081	0.78
LIME	2271	0.85
IP	2570	0.97
random baseline	1458	0.55

Interpretable QA on KB and Text [Sydorova et al '19]

- Evaluation with human annotators
  - Also verified by human evalution

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- xGEMs: manifold guided exemplars
  - a framework to understand black-box classifier behavior by exploring the landscape of the underlying data manifold as data points cross decision boundaries
  - Train an unsupervised implicit generative model – treated as a proxy to the data manifold.
  - Summarize black-box model behavior quantitatively by perturbing data samples along the manifold.

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- xGEMs: manifold guided exemplars
  - a framework to understand black-box classifier behavior by exploring the landscape of the underlying data manifold as data points cross decision boundaries
  - Train an unsupervised implicit generative model – treated as a proxy to the data manifold.
  - Summarize black-box model behavior quantitatively by perturbing data samples along the manifold.

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- Implicit Generative Models
  - Stochastic procedures that generate samples (denoted by the random variable $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}^d$) from the data distribution $p(\boldsymbol{x})$ without explicitly parameterizing $p(\boldsymbol{x})$.
    - Variational Auto-Encoders (VAEs)
    - Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs)
  - $\mathcal{F}_\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$: the inverse mapping function that provides the latent representation for a given data sample
  - $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$: the analogous loss function such that for a given data sample $\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \arg\min_{\mathbf{z}} \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \mathcal{G}_\theta(\mathbf{z})) \triangleq \mathcal{F}_\psi(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$$

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- Implicit Generative Models
  - Examples of F_ψ
    - The encoder in a VAE, or an inference network in a BiGAN.
  - Explanation goal: Provide explanations for a black-box binary classifier
    - $y \in \{-1, 1\}$: the target label
    - $f_\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$: the target black-box classifier to be 'explained
    - $\ell(f_\phi(\mathbf{x}), y)$: the loss function used to train the black-box classifier.

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- Implicit Generative Models
  - Adversarial criticisms
    - Explain black-box classifiers look for perturbations $\delta_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ to data samples $\boldsymbol{x}$
      - Such that the perturbations maximize the loss $\ell(f_\phi(\mathbf{x}+\delta_{\mathbf{x}}), y)$ or change the predicted label.
      - These perturbations are invisible to the human eye
      - $\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}$: the target adversarial sample
      - An adversarial attack solves a Taylor approximation to:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \arg\max_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}:\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}-\mathbf{x}\|_p<\epsilon} \ell(f_\phi(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}), y)$$

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- Generating xGEMs
  - Manifold guided examples (or xGEMs)
    - To provide explanations via examples over more naturalistic perturbations
  - Train an implicit generative model $\mathcal{G}_\theta$ and an encoder network $\mathcal{F}_\psi$

Decoding 생성 loss

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{G}_\theta(\arg\min_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathcal{G}_\theta(\mathbf{z})) + \lambda \ell(f_\phi(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{z})), y_{tar}))$$

  - A manifold guided example is defined w.r.t. a given data sample $\boldsymbol{x}^*$

Definition 1 ($\mathbf{x}^*, y^*$**-xGEM).** An **xGEM** corresponding to a data point $(\mathbf{x}^*, y^*)$ and a target label $y_{tar} \neq y^*$, refers to the solution of Equation (3) for a fixed and known $\lambda > 0$. The **xGEM** is denoted by $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$.

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- Generating xGEMs
  - Intuitively, for a point $\boldsymbol{x}^*$, determine its latent representation using $\mathcal{F}_\psi$
  - To find realistic perturbations to this point, along the data manifold, traverse the latent space of the generator $\mathcal{G}_\theta$ (our proxy for the data manifold) until the label switches to the desired target label y_{tar}
  - The desired manifold guided example or xGEM is the sample generated at the switch point in the latent embedding

---

Algorithm 1 Find $(\mathbf{x}^*, y^*)$–xGEM

Input: $(\mathbf{x}^*, y^*) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \{-1, 1\}, y_{tar}, \mathcal{G}_\theta, \mathcal{F}_\psi, f_\phi, \lambda, \eta > 0$

Initialize $\mathbf{z} = \mathcal{F}_\psi(\mathbf{x}^*)$

while Not converged **do**

$\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \leftarrow \tilde{\mathbf{z}} + \eta \nabla_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}} (\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathcal{G}_\theta(\mathbf{z})) + \lambda \ell(f_\phi(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{z})), y_{tar}))$

$\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{G}_\theta(\tilde{\mathbf{z}})$

Return $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$

---

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- Explanations using xGEMs
  - An alternative view to Adversarial Criticisms
    - xGEMs versus Adversarial criticisms [35], for a parabolic manifold (shown in blue)



- Navigating along the latent dimension of the generator encourages the xGEM trajectory to be constrained along the data manifold
- Adversarial criticisms may lie well outside the manifold.

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- Towards automated bias detection
  - Demonstrate the utility of generating manifold guided examples to detect if a target classifier is confounded w.r.t. a given attribute of interest.
    - A classifier is confounded with an attribute of interest a if the attribute a substantially influences the black-box's predictions.
  - $a \in \{-1, 1\}$: the (potentially protected) binary attribute of interest
  - Here, we wish to examine whether the target classifier f_φ is biased/confounded by a
  - Intuitively, we hope that attribute a of an **xGEM** should be the same as that of the original point

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- Towards automated bias detection
  - In order to detect this, assume there exists an oracle

$$g^* : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$$

    - That perfectly classifies the confounding attribute a
      - when considered as the dependent variable, based on the other (d) independent variables.
  - Additionally, assume that g^* is not confounded by the target label of the black-box y and is not used by g^* to predict a
  - The training data where i indexes a given point:

$$\mathbb{R}^d \times \{-1, 1\} \times \{-1, 1\} \supset \mathcal{D} \triangleq \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i, a_i), i \in [N]\}$$

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- Towards automated bias detection
  - $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i$: the xGEM of $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ w.r.t. f_φ as returned by Algorithm 1
  - We argue that classifier f_φ is confounded by the attribute a if the equation holds for a given $\delta > 0$:

$$\frac{E_{\mathcal{D}}[\mathbb{1}(g^*(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \neq a)]}{|\mathcal{D}|} > \delta$$

xGEM으로 Perfect oracle를 통해 분류시 원래 attribute a와 동일하지 않는 비율이 주어진 δ 이상일때

  - In practice, access to a perfect oracle g^* is infeasible or prohibitively expensive.
    - In some cases, such a classifier g^* may be provided by regulatory bodies, thereby adhering to predetermined criterion as to what accounts for a reliable proxy oracle.

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- Towards automated bias detection
  - For this case study, assume it is sufficient that
    - The proxy oracle has the same false positive and false negative error rates w.r.t. the target label, which is a fairness condition known as the Equalized Odds Criterion [17].
    - Assume access to a proxy oracle $\hat{g} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ that satisfies the following conditions, given a $0.5 \ll \tau < 1$

      (i) $E_{\mathcal{D}}[\mathbb{1}(\hat{g}) == a)] > \tau$

      (ii) $\hat{g}$ satisfies the Equalized Odds criterion w.r.t. the target label y.

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- Towards automated bias detection

$\tilde{x}_2$'s attribute prediction (w.r.t g^*) is the same as that of x^* while that of $\tilde{x}_2$ is different. Thus we say that f_φ^1 is biased w.r.t. attribute a for sample x^*



$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_2$ are **xGEMs** corresponding to $\mathbf{x}^*$ for f_ϕ^1 and f_ϕ^2

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- Towards automated bias detection

$$\frac{E_{\mathcal{D}}[\mathbb{1}(g^*(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \neq a)]}{|\mathcal{D}|} > \delta$$

  - an empirical estimate of the above eq gives a metric that can quantify the amount of confounding in a given black-box, while also allowing to compare different black-boxes w.r.t. the target attribute a.

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- Evaluate our framework for confounding detection in facial images using the CelebA dataset
  - The target black-box classifier predicts the binary facial attribute – hair color (black or blond).
  - We determine whether or not the black-box is confounded with gender.
  - The proxy $\hat{g}$: a ResNet model that classifies celebA faces by gender
    - » Recalibrated to satisfy the two conditions

Attribute Classifier (a)	Target black-box label: Black Hair	Target black-box label: Blond Hair
$\hat{g}$ (orig)	FP:0.003 FN:0.002 Acc: 0.997	FP:0.000 FN:0.018 Acc:0.999
$\hat{g}$ (recalibrated)	FP:0.003 FN:0.018 Acc:0.989	FP:0.003 FN:0.018 Acc:0.996

Recalibrated Gender Classifier.

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- Evaluate our framework for confounding detection in facial images using the CelebA dataset
  - Two ResNet models f_{φ}^{1} and f_{φ}^{2} are trained to detect the hair color attribute (black hair vs blond hair) using two different datasets
    - » f_{φ}^{1}: trained on all face samples with either black or blond hair
    - » f_{φ}^{2}: (biased) trained such that all black hair samples are male while blond haired samples are all female (so restricted / biased)

Black-box Classifier	Accuracy	Confounding metric
f_{ϕ}^{1}	0.9933	0.1704
f_{ϕ}^{2}	0.9155	0.4323

The fraction of confounded samples is clearly much larger for the classifier trained on a biased datase

The fraction of samples whose manifold guided examples' predicted attribute a (in this case gender) is different from the original training sample w.r.t. $\hat{g}$

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- Evaluate our framework for confounding detection in facial images using the CelebA dataset
  - A 10–fold increase in the fraction of confounding for blond haired females with the biased classifier f_{φ}^{2}

Here, notice the decrease in the amount of confounding for black haired females while a general increase in confounding for all black haired faces

	Target label	
Black-box	Black Hair	Blond Hair
f_{ϕ}^{1}	Male:0.4550 Female:0.0159 Overall:0.2430	Male:0.1432 Female:0.0484 Overall:0.0539
f_{ϕ}^{2}	Male:0.7716 Female:0.0045 Overall:0.4012	Male:0.1475 Female:0.5024 Overall:0.4821

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

- The biased model f_{φ}^{2} also changes the background more than hair color in order to change the hair color label



change in hair color label indicated at the top of each image along with the confidence of prediction

xGEMs: Generating Examplars to Explain Black-Box Models [Joshi et al '18]

– Case Study: Model Assessment beyond performance metrics

- Confidence manifolds for a few data samples for black-box models 1 and 2.



Sample 1, Black Hair, Model: Resnet ($\hat{f}_{\phi}^{1}$)



Sample 2, Blond Hair, Model: Resnet ($\hat{f}_{\phi}^{1}$)



Sample 1, Black Hair, Model: CNN+lrn ($\hat{f}_{\chi}^{2}$)



Sample 2, Blond Hair, Model: CNN+lrn ($\hat{f}_{\chi}^{2}$)

This Looks Like That: Deep Learning for Interpretable Image Recognition [Chen et al ‘19]

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

- A stochastic bandit model
  - $K \geq 2$: a finite number of arms
  - Each arm a corresponds to a Bernoulli distribution with mean p_a
  - The arms are numbered such that $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \cdots \geq p_K$
  - Each draw of arm a yields a reward drawn from an unknown distribution
  - The classical "regret" setting $\mathcal{B}(p_a)$
    - an agent seeks to sample arms sequentially in order to maximize its cumulative reward, or equivalently, to minimize its regret.
    - Originally motivated by clinical trials (Thompson, 1933) wherein the number of subjects cured is to be maximized through the judicious allocation of competing treatments.

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

- A stochastic bandit model
  - The "pure exploration" setting
    - Models an off-line regime in which the rewards accrued while learning are immaterial
    - Rather, the agent has to identify an optimal set of m arms $(1 \leq m < K)$ at the end of its learning (or exploration) phase
    - Naturally suit a company that conducts a dedicated testing phase for its products to determine which m to launch into the market.
      - Bubeck et al. (2011, see Section 1) present an informative comparison between the regret and pure-exploration settings

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

- Explore-m
  - The pure-exploration problem of finding the m best arms
  - Generalizes the single-arm-selection problem studied by Even-Dar et al. (2006) (Explore-1)
  - PAC Formalization
    - $\mathcal{S}^*_{m,\epsilon}$: the set of all (ϵ, m)-optimal arms
      - The set of arms a such that $p_a \geq p_m - \epsilon$
    - $\mathcal{S}^*_m = \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$: the set of m best arms, which is necessarily a subset of $\mathcal{S}^*_{m,\epsilon}$
    - For a given mistake probability $\delta \in [0, 1]$, the goal is to design an algorithm that after using a finite (but possibly random) number of samples N returns S_δ, a set of m arms satisfying:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_\delta \subset \mathcal{S}^*_{m,\epsilon}) \geq 1 - \delta$$

    - We desire N to be small in expectation

some fixed tolerance $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

- Explore-m-FB (Explore-m with fixed budget).
  - An alternative goal in the pure-exploration setting
    - Fix a maximum number of samples, n, for learning, and to find a set $\mathcal{S}_n$ of m arms after n rounds
    - such that $e_n := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_n \not\subset \mathcal{S}^*_{m,\epsilon})$ is minimal
    - This setting was proposed by Audibert et al. (2010) for $m = 1$ (and $\epsilon = 0$) and generalized by Bubeck et al. (2013) to arbitrary values of m.
    - Explore-m and Explore-m-FB are related
    - Gabillon et al. (2012) point out that knowing the problem complexity allows algorithms for Explore-m to be converted to algorithms for Explore-m-FB, and vice versa

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

- Regret setting
  - A recent line of research has yielded algorithms that are essentially optimal
  - The regret bound for the UCB algorithm of Auer et al. (2002) is optimal in its logarithmic dependence on the horizon
  - But, its accompanying problem-specific constant does not match the lower bound provided by Lai and Robbins (1985).
  - Garivier and Capp´e (2011) and Maillard et al. (2011) show that by replacing UCB's Hoeffding's inequality based bounds with upper bounds based on Kullback-Leibler divergence, the constant, too, becomes optimal (see also Capp´e et al. (2013)).

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

- Explore-m using KL-divergence-based confidence intervals.
  - Derive a set of improved bounds for the pure-exploration setting
  - Make improvements both for Explore-m and for Explore-mFB by replacing Hoeffding-based bounds with KL-divergence-based bounds in corresponding algorithms
  - Perform theoretical analysis
    - Interestingly, our analysis sheds light on potential differences between the pure exploration and regret settings:
    - The improved sample-complexity bounds we obtain here involve the Chernoff information between the arms, and not KL-divergence as in the regret setting.

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

- Complexity measure for the Explore-m problem
  - Existing algorithms for Explore-m have an expected sample complexity bounded by $O(H_\epsilon \log(H_\epsilon/\delta))$
  - The SAR algorithm of Bubeck et al. (2013) for Explore-m-FB satisfies:

with $\epsilon = 0$, which we only allow with the extra assumption that $p_m > p_{m+1}$

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_n \not\subset \mathcal{S}_m^*) \leq C \exp\left(-n/(C' \log(K) H_0)\right)$$

    - where C and C' are some constants and

$$H_\epsilon = \sum_{a \in \{1,2,\ldots K\}} \frac{1}{\max(\Delta_a^2, (\frac{\epsilon}{2})^2)} \quad \text{with} \quad \Delta_a = \begin{cases} p_a - p_{m+1} & \text{for } a \in \mathcal{S}_m^*, \\ p_m - p_a & \text{for } a \in (\mathcal{S}_m^*)^c \end{cases}$$

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

- Complexity measure for the Explore-m problem
  - Lower bound in the regret setting [Lai and Robbins '85]
    - $N_a(n)$: denotes the number of draws of arm a
    - R_n: The regret of some algorithm up to time n, then: if $\lim_{n\to\infty} R_n = o(n^\alpha)$ for every α > 0 and every bandit problem, then

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[N_a(n)]}{\log(n)} \geq \frac{1}{d(p_a, p_1)}$$

    - with d, the Kullback-Leibler divergence between two Bernoulli distributions, given by

$$d(x,y) = KL\left(\mathcal{B}(x), \mathcal{B}(y)\right) = x\log\left(\frac{x}{y}\right) + (1-x)\log\left(\frac{1-x}{1-y}\right)$$

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

- Complexity measure for the Explore-m problem
  - Lower bound in the regret setting [Lai and Robbins '85]
    - $\mathbb{E}[N_a(n)]$
      - only bounded by $O(\log(n)/\Delta_a^2)$ for the UCB algorithm (Auer et al., '02)
      - indeed bounded by $\log(n)/d(p_a, p_1)$ plus some constant for KL-UCB (Capp´e et al., '13)
    - Lai and Robbins' result holds for any bandit problem
      - However, the current lower bound of Kalyanakrishnan et al. (2012) for Explore-m is a worst-case result stating that
        - » For every PAC algorithm, there exists a bandit problem on which

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{N}] \geq C H_\epsilon \log(m/\delta)$$ with C of order 10^{-5}

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

- Complexity measure for the Explore-m problem
  - Here, derive upper bounds for Explore-m(-FB) in terms of Chernoff information, a quantity closely related to KL-divergence
  - The Chernoff information $d^*(x, y)$ between two Bernoulli distributions $\mathcal{B}(x)$ and $\mathcal{B}(y)$ is defined by

$$d^*(x, y) = d(z^*, x) = d(z^*, y)$$

where z^* is the unique z such that $d(z, x) = d(z, y)$

  - Some reasoning motivates our first conjecture of a complexity term:

The complexity term H_ϵ^* is a tight upper bound on H_ϵ^{target}

$$H_\epsilon^{\text{target}} := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}_m^*} \frac{1}{\max(d^*(p_a, p_{m+1}), \frac{\epsilon^2}{2})} + \sum_{a \in (S_m^*)^c} \frac{1}{\max(d^*(p_a, p_m), \frac{\epsilon^2}{2})}$$

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

- The LUCB algorithm based on Confidence Intervals
  - $\mathcal{I}_a(t) = [L_a(t), U_a(t)]$ generic confidence intervals
  - $L_a(t)$ and $U_a(t)$: the lower and upper confidence bounds on the mean of arm a
  - $N_a(t)$: denote the number of draws
  - $S_a(t)$: the sum of the rewards gathered from arm a up to time t
  - $\hat{p}_a(t) = \frac{S_a(t)}{N_a(t)}$: the corresponding empirical mean reward
  - $\hat{p}_{a,u}$: the empirical mean of u i.i.d. rewards from arm a

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

- The LUCB algorithm based on Confidence Intervals
  - $J(t)$: the set of m arms with the highest empirical means at time t
  - l_t and u_t : two 'critical' arms from $J(t)$ and $J(t)^c$ that are likely to be misclassified

$$u_t = \underset{j \notin J(t)}{\operatorname{argmax}} U_j(t) \quad \text{and} \quad l_t = \underset{j \in J(t)}{\operatorname{argmin}} L_j(t)$$

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

- The LUCB algorithm based on Confidence Intervals

Algorithm 2 LUCB algorithm

Require: $\epsilon \geq 0$ (tolerance level), U, L (confidence bounds)
$t = 1$ (number of stage of the algorithm), $B(1) = \infty$ (stopping index)
for a=1...K **do**
Sample arm a, compute confidence bounds $U_a(1)$, $L_a(1)$
end for
while $B(t) > \epsilon$ **do**
Draw arm u_t and l_t. $t = t + 1$.
Update confidence bounds, set $J(t)$ and arms u_t, l_t
$B(t) = U_{u_t}(t) - L_{l_t}(t)$
end while
return $J(t)$.

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

- KL-LUCB
  - LUCB & Racing: the smaller these confidence regions are, the smaller the sample complexity of these algorithms will be
  - Most of the previous algorithms use Hoeffding bounds:

exploration rate

$$U_a(t) = \hat{p}_a(t) + \sqrt{\frac{\beta(t,\delta)}{2N_a(t)}} \quad \text{and} \quad L_a(t) = \hat{p}_a(t) - \sqrt{\frac{\beta(t,\delta)}{2N_a(t)}}$$

  - Here, introduce the use of confidence regions based on KL-divergence for Explore-m, inspired by recent improvements in the regret setting
    - For some exploration rate $\beta(t,\delta)$,

$$u_a(t) := \max\{q \in [\hat{p}_a(t), 1] : N_a(t) d(\hat{p}_a(t), q) \leq \beta(t,\delta)\}, \text{ and}$$
$$l_a(t) := \min\{q \in [0, \hat{p}_a(t)] : N_a(t) d(\hat{p}_a(t), q) \leq \beta(t,\delta)\}.$$

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

- KL-LUCB
  - Pinsker's inequality ($d(x,y) \geq 2(x-y)^2$) shows that KL-confidence regions are always smaller than those obtained with Hoeffding bounds, while they share the same coverage probability

$$\hat{p}_a(t) - \sqrt{\frac{\beta(t,\delta)}{2N_a(t)}} \leq l_a(t) \quad \text{and} \quad u_a(t) \leq \hat{p}_a(t) + \sqrt{\frac{\beta(t,\delta)}{2N_a(t)}}$$

Information Complexity in Bandit Subset Selection [Kaufmann & Kalyanakrishnan '13]

– Experimental results



(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)