

# Let the CAT out of the bag: Contrastive Attributed explanations for Text

Saneem Chemmengath  
IBM Research, Bangalore  
saneem.cg@in.ibm.com

Amar Prakash Azad  
IBM Research, Bangalore  
amarazad@in.ibm.com

Ronny Luss  
IBM Research, NY  
rluss@us.ibm.com

Amit Dhurandhar  
IBM Research, NY  
adhuran@us.ibm.com

## Abstract

Contrastive explanations for understanding the behavior of black box models has gained a lot of attention recently as they provide potential for recourse. In this paper, we propose a method Contrastive Attributed explanations for Text (CAT) which provides contrastive explanations for natural language text data with a novel twist as we build and exploit attribute classifiers leading to more semantically meaningful explanations. To ensure that our contrastive generated text has the fewest possible edits with respect to the original text, while also being fluent and close to a human generated contrastive, we resort to a minimal perturbation approach regularized using a BERT language model and attribute classifiers trained on available attributes. We show through qualitative examples and a user study that our method not only conveys more insight because of these attributes, but also leads to better quality (contrastive) text. Moreover, quantitatively we show that our method is more efficient than other state-of-the-art methods with it also scoring higher on benchmark metrics such as flip rate, (normalized) Levenstein distance, fluency and content preservation.

## 1 Introduction

Explainable AI (XAI) has seen an explosion of interest over the last five years or so, not just in AI research [25, 2], but also in the real world where governments [42, 12] and industry [4] have made sizeable investments. The primary driver for this level of interest has been the inculcation of deep learning technologies [11], which are inherently black box, into decision making systems that affect millions of people. Trust thus has become a central theme in relying on these black box systems, and one way to achieve it is seemingly through obtaining (posthoc) explanations.

Although many feature-based [30, 20, 34] and exemplar-based methods [13, 17, 16] have been proposed to explain local instance level decisions of black box models, contrastive/counterfactual explanations have seen a surge of interest recently [38, 9, 22, 21, 31]. One reason for this is that contrastive explanations are viewed as one of the main tools to achieve recourse [15].

Given this surge of interest and its importance in recourse, in this paper, we propose a novel method Contrastive Attributed explanations for Text (CAT) which provides contrastive explanations for natural language data, a modality that has received comparatively less attention when it comes to these type of explanations. We show that our method produces fluent contrasts and possesses an additional novel twist not seen in prior works. As such, our method also outputs a minimal set of semantically meaningful attributes that it thinks led to the final contrast. These attributes could be subtopics in a dataset, different from the class labels, that characterize a piece of text or the attributes could even be obtained from a different dataset. Our approach is to leverage these attributes by building models (viz. classifiers) for them and then using these classifiers to guide the search for contrasts in the original task. To better understand what CAT offers, consider the examples provided in Table 1. Here we show two example sentences from the AG News dataset [43], which were classified as Sci-Tech by our neural network black box (BB) model (details in Section 4). Each explanation method generates a contrast in the class Business where the other choices were World and Sports. As can be seen, our method CAT produces a closer contrast than a recent method termed Generate Your Counterfactuals (GYC) [22].

Table 1: Contrastive explanations are shown for a state-of-the-art method GYC, our method CAT and an ablation of our method called CAT-na that uses no attributes to explain predictions on two sentences from the AGNews dataset. The red highlighting indicates text that has changed in the contrastive explanation. Both inputs were classified as Sci-Tech while all contrastive sentences were classified as Business. In addition to these changes, CAT outputs the attributes (or subtopics) that it thinks were added/removed from the input to create the contrast. For instance, in the first example it is easy to see that the added word “ticket” could relate to “Travel” and “Sale”, while the removed word “server” from the input relates to “Computers”. Similarly, “tax” in the second example could correspond to “Entertainment” or “Politics”, while “file” corresponds to software files that are often encrypted and hence to “Cryptography”. As can be seen, CAT provides much closer and meaningful contrasts, where the attribute information provides further insight into what subtopics were added/removed to produce the contrast. This can unequivocally help appropriate trust in a model.

Input	GYC	CAT		CAT-na
		Contrast	Attributes	
Global server sales on the rise	Global server sales on <b>Friday, October</b>	Global <b>ticket</b> sales on the rise	+Travel, +Sale, -Computer	Global <b>drug</b> sales on the rise
Movie Studios to sue illegal film file traders	Movie Studios to sue <b>juveniles psychiatrically</b>	Movie Studios to sue illegal film <b>tax</b> traders	+Entertainment, +Politics, -Cryptography	Movie studios to sue illegal <b>insurance</b> file traders

A key novelty is that CAT provides additional information in terms characteristic attributes it thinks the contrast sentence belongs to (indicated by + sign), while also indicating characteristics it thinks are no longer applicable (indicated by - sign). These attributes were obtained from the 20 Newsgroup dataset [43] and the Huffpost News-Category dataset [24], where we trained classifiers for 42 such attributes (20 Newsgroup classes + 22 Huffpost classes), and used them to regularize our search for the contrastive text. Our method picks a few relevant attributes that guide the generation of the contrast, and the attributes in themselves provide additional insight into the functioning of the black box model. This is confirmed through a user study conducted over 37 participants for which the results are reported in section 4.4. Users found it easier to predict the class of the input sentence given our explanation over GYC and an ablation of our method, called CAT with no attributes (CAT-na), and moreover, users qualitatively preferred our method in terms of understandability, sufficiency, satisfiability and completeness on a five point Likert scale.

It is important to note that there are various ways to generate text using different language models (GPT-2, BERT, T5, etc.) and even different techniques on how infilling might be performed (forward or bi-directional). The key idea of guiding the generation of contrasts through attributes can be considered for other recent methods, whether the contrast is learned through differentiable optimization [22] or through combinatorial search [31].

As such, our contributions are as follows:

1. CAT introduces the idea of using attributes to drive the generation of text contrastives. This contribution is both conceptual as it brings new insight to the user as well as methodological as it leads to user-preferred contrasts as seen in the user study.
2. We qualitatively evaluate CAT through many examples on three different datasets from different domain tasks.
3. We quantitatively evaluate CAT over other methods in terms of flip rate, content preservation, fluency, Levenstein distance and efficiency.
4. We demonstrate the utility of CAT through a user study that asks users to determine a model’s prediction on an instance given an explanation. The user study compares CAT with GYC and an ablation of our method CAT-na.

## 2 Related Literature

Regarding the explanations of machine learning predictions on text data, a recent survey [6] considered 50 recent explainability works specifically for natural language processing, and moreover only methods that “justify predictions” rather than understanding “a model’s behavior in general”. Our intention is also to explain individual predictions. Little work has been done for global explainability with respect to text classification; [30] suggests using various

“representative” local predictions to get a global understanding of model behavior. The vast majority of explainability techniques found by [6] fall under local explainability.

Local methods can be divided among post-hoc methods that explain a fixed model’s prediction and self-explainable methods where the model is itself understandable; our focus is on the former. One large group of explainability methods are feature based where the explanation outputs some form of feature importance (i.e., ranking, positive/negative relevance, contributions, etc.) of the words in text [39, 27, 10, 14, 30, 1]. Other types of local post-hoc explanations include exemplar based [13, 17, 16] that output similar instances to the input.

Amongst local methods our focus is on contrastive/counterfactual methods [9, 22, 21] that modify the input such that the class changes and explains the prediction as “If the sample were modified by  $X$ , the prediction would have been  $Y$  instead,” where  $X$  is a change to the input and  $Y$  is a new class. Note that such explanations are complementary to the other methods discussed above. They offer different types of intuition and thus should be used in conjunction with rather than instead of counterfactuals. [21] learn contrasts using latent attributes, but specifically for color images. Their approach does not readily translate to text as humans do not perceive minor unrealistic parts of a generated image contrast, whereas any nuance in text is easily noticed. Thus, generating (fluent) contrasts for text models is inherently much more challenging.

The most relevant comparison to our work is [22]. GYC [22] builds on the text generation of [7] by learning perturbations to the history matrix used for language modeling that are also trained to reconstruct input from the generated counterfactuals (rather than only generate counterfactuals from the input). A diversity regularization term ensures that this does not result in counterfactuals that are identical to the input. A more recent work MICE [31] masks and replaces important words selected by [34] in order to flip the prediction. Both works are targeted, i.e., the user must decide what class the counterfactual should be in. Moreover, the latter requires fine-tuning their model to each target, which makes it a different setup than ours. POLYJUICE [41] allows for various modifications to text including negation, word replacement, insertion, deletion, etc., and uses control codes to guide which modifications are made during generation of untargeted counterfactuals. Similar to MICE, POLYJUICE uses masks to infill and selects generated counterfactuals that are most fluent as measured by the change in likelihood from that of the original text. Our method goes beyond these where it also outputs (hidden) subtopics that are added/removed from the original text to create the contrast, giving important intuition that is missing from these other methods. This is confirmed through a user study we conduct and qualitative examples we provide. The attribute classifiers built to predict these subtopics also aid in creating better contrasts.




Figure 1: Above we see how CAT creates contrastive explanations. It first finds important words in the text which it then (minimally) alters by either replacing/deleting a subset of them or by inserting new ones in the spaces around them so as to i) change the black box model’s prediction, ii) maintain fluency and iii) change a minimal number of attribute classifier predictions (by a significant amount). The output is the contrastive text along with a list of the attributes added/removed relative to the input text.

Table 2: Five examples of CAT applied to AgNews dataset. Modifications to/in original/contrasts are shown by strikeout/red highlighting. Attribute changes offer insight into how the black box model views certain words with multiple possible meanings.

Input/CAT	Attribute Changes	Input Pred	Contrast Pred
Kazaa Owner Cheers <del>File</del> <b>Salary</b> -Swapping Decision (AP)	+forsale, +baseball, +hockey, -arts, -windows, -cryptography	sci-tech	sports
New Human Species <del>Discovered</del> <b>influenza</b>	+medicine, -cryptography	sci-tech	world
US shows flexibility on <del>Israeli</del> <b>virtual</b> settlements	+arts, +cryptography, -mideast	world	sci-tech
Pace of U.S. <del>Factory</del> <b>population</b> Growth Climbs in Dec	+politics, -money, -travel	business	sci-tech
It may take 146 years for Nigeria to wipe out <del>corruption</del> <b>funds</b> from its <del>bank</del> system going by the latest report ...	+ money, - politics	world	business

Table 3: Five examples of CAT applied to Hate Speech dataset. Modifications to/in original/contrasts are shown by strikeout/red highlighting. \$\$\$\$ represents a vulgar word. No strikeout implies there was an insertion.

Input/CAT	Attribute Changes	Input Pred	Contrast Pred
Ever try to make a <del>girl</del> <b>patient</b> play video games? they are terrible. these are the skills they will need for the future. we're \$\$\$\$.@	+medicine, -parenting, -arts	hate	not hate
It sounds so ugly to hear a <del>female</del> <b>parent</b> talk about another female claiming she's a "\$\$\$\$ or \$\$\$\$" like \$\$\$\$ it ain't yo \$\$\$\$ why u worried for	+parenting, +atheism, -entertainment, -politics	hate	not hate
Illegal <del>immigration</del> <b>software</b> drives up real estate prices, widens wealth-gaps, reduces high-tech investment, increases state and local tax burdens, hurts kids' schools and college education, pushes Americans away from high-tech jobs	+money, +science	hate	not hate
When <del>you</del> <b>women</b> 're out drinking all night vs when the bill comes	+politics, -environment, -guns	not hate	hate
Readers respond: Kudos on <del>illegal</del> immigrant <del>features</del> <b>women</b>	+latino voices, +politics -travel, -mideast	not hate	hate

### 3 Proposed Approach

We now describe our Contrastive Attributed explanations for Text (CAT) method. Contrastive explanations, convey why the model classified a certain input instance to a class  $p$ , and not another class  $q$ . This is achieved by creating contrastive examples (also called contrasts) from input instance which get predicted as  $q$ . Contrastive examples are created by minimally perturbing the input such that the model prediction changes. In the case of text data, perturbations can be of three types: (1) inserting a new word, (2) replacing a word with another, and (3) deleting a word. In addition to keeping the number of such perturbations small, contrastive explainers also try to maintain grammatical correctness and fluency of the contrasts [22, 31].

As an example, take the case of a black box model trained on the AG News dataset that predicts which category a certain news headline falls under. Given a headline, "*Many technologies may be a waste of time and money, researcher says*" which is predicted as Sci-Tech, a contrastive explainer will try to explain why this headline wasn't predicted as, say, *Business* by generating a contrastive example, "*Many technologies **jobs** may be a waste of time and money, researcher says*" which is predicted as Business. Observe that a single word replacement achieves a prediction change. Such contrastive explanations can help users test the robustness of black box classification models.

We observed that even with constraints for minimal perturbation and fluency on a given black box model and an instance, there are multiple contrastive examples to choose from and, very often, many are less informative than others. For example, another possible contrast is, "*Many technologies may be a waste of ~~time~~ **investment** and money, researcher says*" which also gets predicted as Business. However, this particular explanation is not as intuitive as the previous one as "money" is a form of "investment" and the nature of the sentence has not changed in an obvious sense with the word "technologies" still present in the sentence.

To alleviate this problem, we propose to construct and use a set of *attribute classifiers*, where the attributes could be tags/subtopics relevant to the classification task obtained from the same or a related dataset used to build the original

Table 4: Five examples of CAT applied to NLI dataset. Modifications to/in original/contrasts are shown by strikeout/red highlighting. The  $\langle /s \rangle$  delimiter separates text from hypothesis. Attribute changes offer insight into how the black box model views certain words that could have multiple meanings.

Input/CAT	Attribute Changes	Input Pred	Contrast Pred
Two outdoor workers conversing while on <del>break</del> <b>lawn</b> . $\langle /s \rangle$ people on sidewalk	-electronics	entail -ment	contra -diction
The double sink is freshly polished chrome. $\langle /s \rangle$ The sink is <del>chrome</del> <b>rust</b> colored	+space, -graphics -electronics	entail -ment	contra -diction
A group of children, wearing white karate shirts, look at the American flag. $\langle /s \rangle$ The children <del>are</del> <b>looked</b> at a karate tournament.	-entertainment	neutral	contra -diction
A man is about to <del>play</del> <b>steal</b> his guitar. $\langle /s \rangle$ a man is performing for school children	-entertainment	neutral	contra -diction
Two women are giving each other a hug while a man holding a glass is looking at the camera. $\langle /s \rangle$ The people are all taking <del>naps</del> <b>photos</b> during the hottest part of the day.	+graphics, -electronics	contra -diction	neutral

classifier. Attribute classifiers indicate the presence/absence of a certain subtopic in the text and confidence scores from these classifiers could be used as a regularization to create a contrast. We thus prefer contrasts which change attribute scores measurably as opposed to those contrasts which do not. However, at the same time, we want a minimal number of attribute scores to change so as to have crisp explanations. Hence, our regularization not only creates more intuitive contrasts, but also provides additional information to the user in terms of changed subtopics which, as confirmed through our user study in Section 4.4, provide better understanding of the model behavior. The important steps in our method are depicted in Figure 1.

Formally, given an input text  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , and a text classification model  $f(\cdot)$  which predicts  $y = f(x) \in \mathcal{Y}$ , we aim to create a perturbed instance  $x'$  such that the predictions  $f(x) \neq f(x')$  and  $x'$  is “minimally” different from  $x$ . We use a set of  $m$  attribute classifiers  $\zeta_i : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , which produce scores indicative of presence (higher scores) or absence (lower scores) of corresponding attributes in the text. We say that attribute  $i$  is added to the perturbed sentence if  $\zeta_i(x') - \zeta_i(x) > \tau$  and removed when  $\zeta_i(x') - \zeta_i(x) < -\tau$ , for a fixed  $\tau > 0$ . Word-level Levenshtein distance between original and perturbed instance  $d_{Lev}(x', x)$ , which is the minimum number of deletions, substitutions, or insertions required to transform  $x$  to  $x'$  is used to keep the perturbed instance close to the original. The naturalness (fluency) of a generated sentence  $x'$  is quantified by the likelihood of sentence  $x'$  as measured by the language model used for generation; we denote this likelihood by  $p_{LM}(x')$ . For a predicate  $\phi$ , we denote  $\mathbb{1}_\phi$  the indicator of  $\phi$ , which takes the value 1 if  $\phi$  is true and 0 otherwise. Given this setup, we propose to find contrastive examples by solving the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \max_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \quad & \|\zeta(x') - \zeta(x)\|_\infty - \beta \sum_i \mathbb{1}_{|\zeta_i(x') - \zeta_i(x)| > \tau} \\
 & + \lambda \cdot \max_{j \in \mathcal{Y} \setminus y} \{ [f(x')]_j - [f(x)]_y \} \\
 & + \eta \cdot p_{LM}(x') - \nu \cdot d_{Lev}(x', x),
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where  $\zeta(x)$  is a vector such that  $[\zeta(x)]_i = \zeta_i(x)$ ,  $\beta, \lambda, \eta, \nu > 0$  are hyperparameters that trade-off different aspects, and  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  is the  $l_\infty$  norm. The first term in the objective function encourages to pick an  $x'$  where at least one attribute is either added/removed from  $x$ . The second term minimizes the number of such attributes for ease of interpretation. The third term is the contrastive score, which encourages the perturbed instance to be predicted different than the original instance. Fourth and fifth terms ensure that the contrast is fluent and close to the original instance, respectively.

The above objective function defines a controlled natural language generation problem. Earlier methods for controlled generation that shift the latent representation of a language model (such as GPT-2) [22, 7] have resulted in generated sentences being very different from the original sentence. We thus adopt a different strategy where we first take the original sentence and identify locations where substitutions/insertions need to be made using available feature attribution methods such as Integrated Gradients [36]. These words are ordered by their attribution and greedily replaced with a [MASK] token. An MLM pre-trained BERT model [37, 8] is then used to fill these masks. We take the top  $k$  such replacements ranked by BERT likelihood. For insertions, a mask token is inserted to the right and left of

important words in order to generate a set of perturbations similar to the input example. The attribute classifiers are applied to each generated candidate contrast, and the best  $x'$  is selected as evaluated by Eq. 1.

## 4 Experimental Study

### 4.1 Setup Details

We use an MLM pre-trained BERT<sup>1</sup> from Huggingface [40] to generate text perturbations. For attributes, classes from the Huffpost News-Category [24] and 20 Newsgroups [26] datasets were used. The Huffpost dataset has 200K news headlines split into 41 classes. We merged similar classes and removed those which weren't a standard topic; 22 classes remained. The 20 Newsgroups dataset has 18000 newsgroup posts with 20 topic classes. Together, we obtained 42 attributes. For 22 classes from Huffpost, we trained 22 1-vs-all binary classifiers with a distilbert [32] base, so that the same sentence can have multiple classes. For 20 Newsgroups, we trained multiclass classifiers with a distilbert base on the other 20 classes. More details on setup details are provided in appendix.

We evaluate our explanation method on models trained on AgNews [43], DBPedia [18], Yelp [33], NLI [5], and Hate Speech [3]. For an apples-to-apples comparison of our methods with GYC on AgNews, DBPedia and Yelp, we trained models with the same architecture as the ones in their work: that is an Embedding Bag layer followed by a linear layer. For NLI<sup>2</sup> and Hate speech<sup>3</sup> we used a Roberta [19] based model available in huggingface.

### 4.2 Qualitative Evaluations

We now provide qualitative examples from three diverse datasets AgNews, NLI and Hate Speech. In appendix we provide additional examples from these and other datasets as well.

**AgNews.** The dataset is from a real-world news domain which contains short news headlines and bodies from four new categories - world, business, sports, and sci-tech. It contains 30K training and 1.9K test examples per class, comprising of 128K samples. Our experiments focus on explanations for predicting the class from the headlines.

Table 2 shows results of applying CAT to five headlines in the AgNews dataset. The first row explains that the headline is predicted as sci-tech because if the headline was more related to topics such as things for sale, baseball, hockey, and less about computer-related topics, it would have been predicted sports, which is achieved in the contrast by replace "File" with "Salary". It is important to consider the interaction of words; here, the black box model considers Kazaa a sports team because of the change. The second and third rows offer intuitive examples as to how the attribute changes relate to the contrasts. The insight is that we learn what topics the black box model finds most relevant to the prediction, as opposed to only knowing the single word and needing to figure out why that caused the change. In the fourth row, adding politics and removing money leads to changing the input from business to sci-tech as "factory growth" has more relationship to money while "population growth" is related to politics. In the fifth row, we have the opposite as adding money and removing politics changes the input from world to business. This last example illustrates that, for longer text, single perturbations are often insufficient to flip the label and multiple changes are needed. These last two examples offer the insight that the classifier associates business with politics, which is not obvious a priori.

**Hate Speech.** The dataset is composed of hate speech tweets labelled as hate or non-hate. It contains about 8100 tweets for training and 900 tweets for testing out of which about 3700 hate tweets. The text in such tweets is much less structured and of much poorer grammar than the other datasets we experiment with. Nevertheless, CAT offers interesting insight as seen in Table 3. Note that we have hidden vulgar words (only for presentation purposes).

The first two rows show contrasts that illustrate the black box model's potential bias of relating hate speech with female gender tweets; when the tweets are modified from pertaining to females, the tweets are predicted as not hate. Different topics are used to modify the tweets such as medicine where the contrast discusses a patient of unknown gender. The third row illustrates insight into the black box model that requires an interaction of words. The word "immigration" by itself is not necessarily aligned with hate speech but "illegal immigration" is more likely aligned with such speech as shown by the prediction. Adding attributes about money and science are used to explain how the tweet can be changed to not hate. The last two rows make the same point as the first two rows but in the reverse direction; modifying tweets that are not hateful by adding female connotations can easily change the prediction to

<sup>1</sup><https://huggingface.co/bert-base-uncased>

<sup>2</sup><https://huggingface.co/roberta-large-mnli>

<sup>3</sup><https://huggingface.co/cardiffnlp/twitter-roberta-base-hate>

hate. This is a potential bias of the black box model that should be investigated and is how one can benefit from using contrastive explanations. The insight from the attributes is that there are different topics through which the bias can be introduced. Moreover, the last example shows again that a single perturbation is not enough; in this case, an insertion and replacement are required to find a contrast showing that while the addition of “women” biases the classifier to predict hate, the interaction of words is important as an additional insertion is required.

**NLI.** The Natural Language Inference [5] dataset contains samples of two short ordered texts, and the labels are either contradiction if the second text contradicts the first, neutral if the two texts do not contradict or imply one another, or entailment if the second text is a logical consequence of the first text.

Table 4 illustrates CAT applied to five example texts from the NLI dataset. The first row shows an entailment that was modified to a contradiction by replacing the word “break” with “lawn”. While this would be the explanation offered by a typical counterfactual method, CAT additionally shows that the topic of electronics (often associated with the word “break”) was removed. Such insight can offer more clarity as to why the contrast was predicted a contradiction rather than neutral, which seems more likely until we learn that the electronics topic that has nothing to do with the hypothesis was removed from the text. In row two, the change of “chrome” to “rust” is attributed to adding the space topic (as rust is an important issue in space exploration) and removed the graphics and electronics topics associated with chrome (books or web browsers). In row three, the difference of children being a part of a tournament versus simply watching the tournament is attributed to a reduction of the entertainment topic (and similarly in row four for playing a guitar versus stealing a guitar). In row five, the change of “naps” to “photos” is attributed to adding the graphics topic, which makes sense and helps build trust in the model.

Table 5: We evaluate CAT on four properties: 1) **Flip** rate, ii) **Dist**(distance), iii) **Fluency**, iv) **Cont** (content preservation). We report mean values for each metric.  $\uparrow$  ( $\downarrow$ ) indicates the higher (lower) desired score whereas  $\approx 1$  indicates desired value be close to 1. Best results are bolded and NR implies no result. We report pairwise t-test and standard deviation in appendix.

Method	AgNews				Yelp				Dbpedia			
	$\uparrow$ Flip	$\downarrow$ Dist	$\uparrow$ Cont	$\approx 1$ Fluency	$\uparrow$ Flip	$\downarrow$ Dist	$\uparrow$ Cont	$\approx 1$ Fluency	$\uparrow$ Flip	$\downarrow$ Dist	$\uparrow$ Cont	$\approx 1$ Fluency
GYC	0.42	0.40	0.77	1.13	0.70	0.49	0.61	1.32	0.72	0.52	0.55	1.33
CAT	<b>1</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>1.05</b>

Method	NLI				Hate Speech			
	$\uparrow$ Flip	$\downarrow$ Dist	$\uparrow$ Cont	$\approx 1$ Fluency	$\uparrow$ Flip	$\downarrow$ Dist	$\uparrow$ Cont	$\approx 1$ Fluency
GYC	NR				NR			
CAT	<b>1</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.98</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>1.02</b>

### 4.3 Quantitative Evaluations

We evaluate CAT and GYC on 500 randomly selected test instances from AgNews, Yelp and Dbpedia. We do not report results on NLI and Hate Speech for GYC as it did not produce valid contrasts possibly because of the longer length of the texts and compatibility with the Roberta classifier. For each dataset, we measure the following properties: i) *Flip rate* (Flip), ii) *Edit distance* (Dist), iii) *Fluency*, and iv) *Content Preservation* (Cont). Flip rate is a measure of the model’s efficacy to generate contrastive sentences and is defined as the fraction of inputs for which an edit successfully flips the prediction. Edit Distance is the number of edits as measured by the word-level Levenstein distance between input and contrastive sentences, i.e., the minimum number of deletions, insertions, or substitutions required to transform one into the other. We report a normalized version given by the Levenshtein distance divided by the number of words in the input; this metric has ranges from 0 to 1. Fluency measures the alignment of the contrastive and input sentence distributions. We evaluate fluency by calculating masked language modeling loss on both the original and edited sentences using a pre-trained GPT-2 model and compute fluency as the ratio of the loss of the contrast to the loss of the input sentence. A value of 1.0 indicates the contrast is as fluent as the original sentence. Content preservation measures how much input content is preserved while generating a contrastive sentence in a latent embedding space. For

this, we compute the cosine similarity between input and contrastive sentence embeddings obtained from a pre-trained sentence BERT [29] model. We report means of each metric across all the instances obtained from generated contrastive sentences in Table 5.




Figure 2: The left figure shows the percentage (human) accuracy in predicting the label of the input sentence based on the contrastive explanations. Users perform significantly better using our CAT explanations especially when provided with attributes. The right figure shows a 5-point Likert scale (higher better) for four qualitative metrics used in previous studies [23] compared across the methods. Here too, the difference is noticeable for all four metrics. Error bars are one standard error.

**Observations:** In Table 5 we show the performance of our proposed approach, CAT, and also GYC [22], which is the most relevant state-of-the-art method. It is evident that CAT produces contrasts with highest flip rate, retains highest content relative to the original sentence with fewest changes and maintains best language fluency across all datasets as compared to GYC. This can be accredited to the core of the CAT approach which is based on minimal but relevant perturbations through a controlled local greedy search procedure guided by attribute classifiers.

We also estimated the efficiency of CAT by computing the time it takes to obtain a contrastive explanation normalized by the input length. CAT and GYC were evaluated on a NVIDIA V100 GPU for 10 contrastive explanations. The mean time taken by CAT and GYC were 2.37 and 10.69 seconds, respectively. The efficiency of CAT can again be credited to the controlled local greedy search approach.

#### 4.4 Human Evaluation

We now describe a user study we conducted to ascertain the value of our attributed explanations. User studies having become ubiquitous in explainable AI literature [30, 35, 28, 21] because they illustrate the benefit of these tools to the end user. We follow in the direction of most user studies by ascertaining benefit by requiring participants to perform a task given our explanations, as opposed to solely asking users the utility of our method.

**Methods:** We consider three different explanation methods: 1) CAT, 2) CAT-na (i.e. CAT without attributes) and 3) GYC. Comparison of CAT with CAT-na provides an ablation, while its comparison with GYC showcases its value relative to other state-of-the-art contrastive text explanations.

**Setup:** The AgNews dataset was used for the study. We built a four class neural network black box model (described earlier) to predict articles as either belonging to Business, Sci-Tech, World or Sports categories. The task given to users was to determine the classification of the article based on a contrastive explanation from one of the respective methods. Five options were provided to the user which included the four classes along with a “Can’t Tell” option. For each method, seven randomly chosen sentence-explanation pairs were provided to the user where the users were blinded to the exact method producing the explanation. For each (anonymized) explanation method, we additionally asked the users for their qualitative assessment along four dimensions; completeness, sufficiency, satisfaction and understandability based on a 5 point Likert scale. Thus, there were a total of 24 questions that users answered. Users were also allowed to leave optional comments which we provide in the Supplement, along with screen shots from the user study.



We hosted our survey on Google Forms. 37 participants from quantitative backgrounds including data science, engineering and business analytics took part in the study. We did this as recent work shows that most consumers of such explanations have these backgrounds [4].

**Observations:** Figure 2 depicts the results from our user study. The top figure demonstrates that both our methods CAT and its ablation CAT-na (which does not use attributes) significantly outperform GYC in terms of usability towards the task. Moreover, the benefit of the attributes is also evident as CAT not only does better than CAT-na in terms of “Correct” responses, but it also has fewer “Wrong” answers with some of this gap being attributed to “Cannot Tell”. This indicates that the insight CAT provides through attributes helps users err on the side of caution, rather than convincing them of something that is incorrect.

Our method performs much better than GYC and the ablation from a qualitative perspective, as well, as seen in Figure 2 (bottom). These qualitative preferences of CAT are further confirmed through the (optional) comments written by some participants, e.g., “... explainer B was very good, and explainer C was reasonably good”, where “explainer B” refers to CAT and “explainer C” to CAT-na.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a contrastive explanation method, CAT, with a novel twist where we construct attribute classifiers from relevant subtopics available in the same or different dataset used to create the black box model, and leverage them to produce high quality contrasts. The attributes themselves provide additional semantically meaningful information that can help gain further insight into the behavior of the black box model. We have provided evidence for this through diverse qualitative examples on multiple datasets, a carefully conducted user study and through showcasing superior performance on four benchmark quantitative metrics. In the future, it would be interesting to test this method on other applications with the appropriate attribute classifiers.

## A Appendix

### A.1 Quantitative Evaluation Statistics

Table 5 shows the performance evaluation of our proposed approach, CAT, on five different datasets. It was noted that CAT outperformed GYC over AgNews, Yelp and Dbpedia by statistically significant margins. We verify this statement in Table 6 where we report pairwise t-tests comparing the means for CAT and GYC and standard deviation of CAT for each metric and dataset. The improvement of CAT over GYC is observed to be statistically significant across all metrics. We do not report additional statistics for the flip rate metric as CAT always produces a contrastive sentence with a flipped class label unlike GYC which sometimes fails to flip.

### A.2 Additional Setup Details

All experiments were run on NVIDIA V100 GPUs. Since no ground truth exists for our contrastive explanations, hyperparameters for CAT objective (given in Eq.1) were tuned qualitatively by observation. It is important to consider that, in practice a user will only need to tune the hyperparameters once at the beginning and will then be able to generate explanations for an arbitrary number of instances from the dataset. Our tuning led to the following values which we used across datasets: We kept highest weights for  $\lambda = 5.0$  to make sure that perturbed sentences have a label different from that of original sentence. We used mean of BERT logits of words inserted/replaced as a surrogate for  $p_{LM}(x')$  with regularization parameter  $\eta$  set to be 1.0 and regularization parameter  $\nu$  for Levenshtein distance set to 2.0.  $\beta$  was set to 3.0. We used two values of  $\tau$ . For binary attribute classifiers from the Huffpost News dataset, we set  $\tau = 0.3$ , and for multiclass attribute classifiers trained on the 20 Newsgroup dataset, we set  $\tau = 0.05$ . Attribute classifiers were trained with DistliBERT base for 10 epochs using the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of  $5 \times 10^{-5}$ , weight decay of 0.01, and a batch size of 16.

Of the five black box models experimented in the paper, models trained on NLI and the Hate Speech dataset were directly taken from the huggingface website. The black box models for AgNews, DBPedia and Yelp is composed of an EmbeddingBag layer followed by a linear layer, a ReLU and another linear layer to obtain the logit. The logit is provided to a classifier we trained with cross entropy loss for 4, 14 and 2 classes for AgNews, DBPedia and Yelp,

Table 6: We evaluate CAT on three metrics: i) **Dist**(distance), ii) **Fluency**, iii) **Cont** (content preservation). We report p-values from a pairwise t-test of the difference of means between GYC and CAT for all metrics. As can be seen by the negligible p-values, CAT is (statistically) significantly better than GYC. We also report standard deviation (std. dev.) for all metrics for CAT and GYC, which together with the means reported in the main paper, are used to run the t-tests.

Stat	AgNews			Yelp		
	Dist	Cont	Fluency	Dist	Cont	Fluency
p-value	$< 1e^{-8}$	$< 1e^{-8}$	$< 1e^{-8}$	$< 1e^{-8}$	$< 1e^{-8}$	$< 1e^{-8}$
std. dev. (GYC)	0.164	0.110	0.286	0.140	0.105	0.467
std. dev. (CAT)	<b>0.098</b>	<b>0.084</b>	<b>0.105</b>	<b>0.100</b>	<b>0.076</b>	<b>0.134</b>

Stat	Dbpedia		
	Dist	Cont	Fluency
p-value	$< 1e^{-8}$	$< 1e^{-8}$	$< 1e^{-8}$
std. dev.(GYC)	0.132	0.115	0.344
std. dev.(CAT)	<b>0.059</b>	<b>0.069</b>	<b>0.064</b>

respectively. The model is trained using the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of  $1 \times 10^{-3}$ , weight decay of 0.01, and a batch size of 32.

### A.3 Additional Information for User Study

Figure 3 shows screenshots of the user study, including the instructions and example questions for different methods discussed in the study. For the users the methods were named as Explainer A, B and C, where they correspond to GYC, CAT, and CAT-na respectively. Some users also left optional comments at the end of the user study which we list here:

- “I found the questions confusing... What is complete, sufficient and understandable explanation in a word change? Also, in each example, what was I supposed to guess, the category of the article or the possible prediction of the method? Are those things different?”
- “Explainer A was pretty bad, explainer B was very good, and explainer C was reasonably good.”
- “Explainer b was the best. The q&a at the end of each page allows multiple choices per row, which is bad. Each question should remove the modified classification as an option (if the modified sentence is World, I shouldn’t be allowed to choose World). Early on the survey should state clearly that there are only 4 categories (business/sci-tech/sports/world) which I didn’t know right away, I expected each question have 4 different options, and knowing this might have helped me understand what we’re doing here better. The opening text was very confusing.”
- “I found B to be the best one.”
- “nice survey”

### A.4 Additional Qualitative Examples

Table 7 offers at least five more examples of contrastive explanations from each dataset. Additional insight can be gained from the attributes; in the first row, adding travel-related text can flip the class from business to world, i.e., the article was predicted business because if it was more about travel it would have been predicted as world. This type of explanation adds extra intuition as opposed to only being given the replacement of words, “oil” to “winds” in this case. As can also be seen, insight is also a function of using attributes that have a relationship to the dataset and task. For example, attributes derived from news sources are often not helpful for explaining sentiment classifiers (e.g., Yelp) for which sentiment is often flipped by the negation of the text. This is to be expected; good explanations require good attributes.

Table 7: Extra contrastive explanation examples from five datasets: AgNews, Hate Speech, NLI, DBPedia, and Yelp.

Input/CAT	Attribute Changes	Input Pred	Contrast Pred	Dataset
Oil <b>Winds</b> Up from 7-Week Lows on U.S. Weather	+travel	business	world	AgNews
New Hummer Is Smaller, Cheaper and Less Gas <b>cpu</b> Hungry	+cryptography, -travel, -space	business	sci-tech	AgNews
Perfect start for France in <del>Federation</del> <b>Microsoft Cup</b>	+cryptography, -motorcycles, -hockey, -space, -politics	sports	sci-tech	AgNews
Will sinking Lowe resurface in <b>playoffs 2020?</b>	+space, -hockey	sports	sci-tech	AgNews
<b>Kuwait Source:</b> Fundamentalists Recruiting Teens (AP)	+guns, religion, -mideast	world	sci-tech	AgNews
Harry in <del>nightclub</del> <b>inflight</b> scuffle	+sports, +space, -religion, -cryptography, -electronics	world	sci-tech	AgNews
I thought you <b>ladies</b> were leaving the country you washed up \$\$\$\$ \$\$\$\$?	+politics, -cryptography	hate	not hate	Hate
Such crimes must attract severest punishment,say Min Jail term of 25Y. If they r <del>illegal migrants</del> <b>convicted</b> , force them to leave the Country immediately	+atheism, -politics	hate	not hate	Hate
@briansteller <b>she</b> is a complete <del>joke</del> <b>\$\$\$\$</b> ! if you see...	+women, +cryptography, -sports, -politics	not hate	hate	Hate
Do you <b>chicks</b> ever <del>rap</del> <b>talk</b> in your whitest voice possible or is that just me?	+parenting, +atheism, +politics -world, -sports, -arts	not hate	hate	Hate
There's <b>Women get</b> no greater satisfaction than knowing you did it yourself' -me when someone asks me ...	+women, +entertainment, +religion, -sports	not hate	hate	Hate
Five soldiers hold and aim their <del>weapons</del> <b>blades</b> . </s> The soldiers are <del>eating</del> <b>armed</b> .	-guns	contra-diction	entail-ment	NLI
Skateboarder jumps of off dumpster. </s> a <del>bike</del> <b>young</b> rider in a race	+world	contra-diction	neutral	NLI
Two people walking down a dirt trail with backpacks on looking at <del>items</del> <b>map</b> they are carrying. </s> One is holding a map.	+space, -motorcycles, -electronics	neutral	entail-ment	NLI
A brown and black dog is jumping to catch a red ball. </s> Two dogs are <del>not</del> playing catch with their owner.	-arts	neutral	contra-diction	NLI
A girl is standing in a field pushing up her hat with one finger and her hand is covering most of her face. </s> A <del>girl</del> <b>boy</b> covers her face.	+parenting, -medicine	entail-ment	contra-diction	NLI
Channel Chaos is a 1985 Australian <del>film</del> <b>production</b> set at a TV station	+electronics, -travel, -space	film	company	DBPedia
Dinik is a <del>village</del> <b>lake</b> in Croatia	+medicine, +space, -mideast	village	natural place	DBPedia
Air Cargo Mongolia is a Mongolian <del>airline</del> <b>newspaper</b>	+politics, -space	plant	written work	DBPedia
ACTION is a bus service <del>operator</del> <b>based</b> in Canberra Australia	+autos, -electronics	company	transport-ation	DBPedia
Jagjaguwar is an indie rock record <del>label</del> <b>musician</b> based in Bloomington Indiana	+space, +politics, -world -forsale, -electronics	company	artist	DBPedia
he really <b>hardly</b> made our anniversary dinner entertaining memorable	+world, +sports, +cryptography -home&living, -electronics	positive	negative	Yelp
they also have deep fried desserts if you're <del>brave</del> <b>poor</b> enough	+medicine, -travel -religion, -politics	positive	negative	Yelp
i <del>definitely</del> <b>never</b> will go back	-entertainment	positive	negative	Yelp
jesse is completely <del>rude</del> <b>perfect</b>	+cryptography, -entertainment, -medicine, -space	negative	positive	Yelp
the pizza <del>sauce</del> <b>heaven</b> is also way too sweet	+world, +travel, +arts, +atheism +religion, -medicine, -politics	negative	positive	Yelp

## AI Explanations Survey

PLEASE READ!

This survey will ask you to read a sentence from a news article and ask what an AI model predicted as its topic (i.e. Business, Sci-Tech, Sports or World) given a contrastive explanation. A contrastive explanation is an alternate sentence very similar to the original sentence, but for which the AI model predicts differently.

In the survey such explanations are provided by 3 different methods (Explainer A, B and C) where one of the methods (Explainer B) in addition to the contrastive sentence also provides information about what subtopics/attributes it thinks were removed/added from/to the original sentence that led to the contrast.

There are a total of 24 questions where for 21 of these we ask you to guess the AI models prediction for the original sentence, while for 3 of them we ask you to rate each of the explanation methods on a scale of 1-5 (least-most) in terms of qualitative aspects such as completeness, understandability, satisfaction and sufficiency.

The survey should take 10-15 minutes. No personal information will be retained other than what you choose to provide. Thank you for agreeing to do the survey.

(a)

For Explainer B was the explanation \*

	Not at all	Little bit	Somewhat	Pretty much	Absolutely
complete?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
sufficient?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
satisfactory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
understandable?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(b)

Question 1 \*

The original article is

"HP Moves Deeper Into Consumer Electronics."

If the article rather was

"HP Moves Deeper Into Energy Consumption."

it would have been predicted **Sci-Tech**. Was the original article predicted as:

- Business
- Sci-Tech
- Sports
- World
- Can't Tell

(c)

Question 7 \*

The original article is

"Grassroots movement to register younger voters leaves publishing tools accessible to outsiders."

If the article rather was

"Grassroots movement to register younger **players** leaves publishing tools accessible to outsiders."

it would have been predicted **Sports** because it removed the attribute **[politics]** and added **[hockey]**. Was the original article predicted:

- Business
- Sci-Tech
- Sports
- World
- Can't Tell

(d)

Figure 3: In (a) we show the instructions for the survey. In (b) we see the qualitative questions. In (c) and (d) we see the task oriented questions for GYC and CAT respectively.

## References

- [1] David Alvarez-Melis and Tommi S. Jaakkola. A causal framework for explaining the predictions of black-box sequence-to-sequence models. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*, 2017.
- [2] Vijay Arya, Rachel K. E. Bellamy, Pin-Yu Chen, Amit Dhurandhar, Michael Hind, Samuel C. Hoffman, Stephanie Houde, Q. Vera Liao, Ronny Luss, Aleksandra Mojsilović, Sami Mourad, Pablo Pedemonte, Ramya Raghavendra, John Richards, Prasanna Sattigeri, Karthikeyan Shanmugam, Moninder Singh, Kush R. Varshney, Dennis Wei, and Yunfeng Zhang. One explanation does not fit all: A toolkit and taxonomy of AI explainability techniques. arXiv:1909.03012, 2019.
- [3] Francesco Barbieri, Jose Camacho-Collados, Luis Espinosa Anke, and Leonardo Neves. Tweeteval: Unified benchmark and comparative evaluation for tweet classification. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Findings*, pages 1644–1650, 2020.
- [4] Umang Bhatt, Alice Xiang, Shubham Sharma, Adrian Weller, Yunhan Jia Ankur Taly, Joydeep Ghosh, Ruchir Puri, José M. F. Moura, and Peter Eckersley. Explainable machine learning in deployment. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 2020.
- [5] Samuel R. Bowman, Gabor Angeli, Christopher Potts, and Christopher D. Manning. A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*, 2015.
- [6] Marina Danilevsky, Kun Qian, Ranit Aharonov, Yannis Katsis, Ban Kawas, and Prithviraj Sen. A survey of the state of explainable AI for natural language processing. In *ACL-IJCNLP*, 2020.
- [7] S. Dathathri, A. Madotto, J. Lan, J. Hung, E. Frank, P. Molino, J. Yosinski, and R. Liu. Plug and play language models: A simple approach to controlled text generation. In *ICLR*, 2020.
- [8] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [9] Amit Dhurandhar, Pin-Yu Chen, Ronny Luss, Chun-Chen Tu, Paishun Ting, Karthikeyan Shanmugam, and Payel Das. Explanations based on the missing: Towards contrastive explanations with pertinent negatives. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 592–603, 2018.
- [10] Shi Feng, Eric Wallace, Alvin Grissom II, Mohit Iyyer, Pedro Rodriguez, and Jordan Boyd-Graber. Pathologies of neural models make interpretations difficult. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3719–3728, Brussels, Belgium, October–November 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [11] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville. *Deep Learning*. MIT Press, 2016.
- [12] David Gunning. Explainable artificial intelligence (xai). In *Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency*, 2017.
- [13] Karthik Gurumoorthy, Amit Dhurandhar, Guillermo Cecchi, and Charu Aggarwal. Efficient data representation by selecting prototypes with importance weights. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, 2019.
- [14] David Harbecke, Robert Schwarzenberg, and Christoph Alt. Learning explanations from language data. In *EMNLP Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neureal Networks for NLP*, 2018.
- [15] Amir-Hossein Karimi, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Isabel Valera. Algorithmic recourse: from counterfactual explanations to interventions. In *ACM conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency (FAccT)*, 2021.
- [16] Been Kim, Rajiv Khanna, and Oluwasanmi Koyejo. Examples are not enough, learn to criticize! Criticism for interpretability. In *In Advances of Neural Inf. Proc. Systems*, 2016.
- [17] Pang Wei Koh and Percy Liang. Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2017.

- [18] Jens Lehmann, Robert Isele, Max Jakob, Anja Jentzsch, D. Kontokostas, Pablo N. Mendes, Sebastian Hellmann, M. Morsey, Patrick van Kleef, S. Auer, and C. Bizer. Dbpedia - a large-scale, multilingual knowledge base extracted from wikipedia. *Semantic Web*, 6:167–195, 2015.
- [19] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- [20] Scott M. Lundberg and Su-In Lee. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4765–4774, 2017.
- [21] Ronny Luss, Pin-Yu Chen, Amit Dhurandhar, Prasanna Sattigeri, Karthik Shanmugam, and Chun-Chen Tu. Leveraging latent features for local explanations. In *ACM KDD*, 2021.
- [22] Nishtha Madaan, Inkit Padhi, Naveen Panwar, and Diptikalyan Saha. Generate your counterfactuals: Towards controlled counterfactual generation for text. *AAAI*, 2021.
- [23] Prashan Madumal, Tim Miller, Liz Sonenberg, and Frank Vetere. Explainable reinforcement learning through a causal lens. In *AAAI*, 2020.
- [24] Rishabh Misra. News category dataset, 06 2018.
- [25] Christoph Molnar. Interpretable machine learning, 2019.
- [26] 20 Newsgroup. Kaggle, 2008.
- [27] Nicolas Papernot and McDaniel Patrick. Deep k-nearest neighbors: Towards confident, interpretable and robust deep learning. In *arXiv:1803.04765*, 2018.
- [28] Karthikeyan Natesan Ramamurthy, Bhanukiran Vinzamuri, Yunfeng Zhang, and Amit Dhurandhar. Model agnostic multilevel explanations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- [29] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. 2019.
- [30] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. “Why should I trust you?”: Explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1135–1144, 2016.
- [31] Alexis Ross, Ana Marasovic, and Matthew E. Peters. Explaining NLP models via minimal contrastive editing (mice). *ACL*, 2021.
- [32] Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*, 2019.
- [33] Tianxiao Shen, Tao Lei, Regina Barzilay, and Tommi Jaakkola. Style transfer from non-parallel text by cross-alignment. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’17*, page 6833–6844, 2017.
- [34] Karen Simonyan, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. Deep inside convolutional networks: Visualising image classification models and saliency maps. *arXiv:1312.6034*, 2013.
- [35] Chandan Singh, W. James Murdoch, and Bin Yu. Hierarchical interpretations for neural network predictions. In *Intl. Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2019)*, 2019.
- [36] Mukund Sundararajan, Ankur Taly, and Qiqi Yan. Axiomatic attribution for deep networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3319–3328. PMLR, 2017.
- [37] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 5998–6008, 2017.

- [38] Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt, and Luciano Floridi. Why a right to explanation of automated decision-making does not exist in the General Data Protection Regulation. *Int. Data Privacy Law*, 7(2):76–99, May 2017.
- [39] Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, and Jordan Boyd-Graber. Interpreting neural networks with nearest neighbors. In *EMNLP Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, 2018.
- [40] Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, et al. Huggingface’s transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03771*, 2019.
- [41] T. Wu, M. T. Ribeiro, J. Heer, and D. S. Weld. Polyjuice: Generating counterfactuals for explaining, evaluating, and improving models. In *ACL*, 2021.
- [42] Philip N. Yannella and Odia Kagan. Analysis: Article 29 working party guidelines on automated decision making under gdpr. 2018. <https://www.cyberadviserblog.com/2018/01/analysis-article-29-working-party-guidelines-on-automated-decision-making-under-gdpr/>.
- [43] Xiang Zhang, Junbo Zhao, and Yann LeCun. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 1*, NIPS’15, page 649–657, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2015. MIT Press.