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When Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) are used in safety-critical systems, engineers should determine the safety risks associated with DNN errors observed during testing. For DNNs processing images, engineers visually inspect all error-inducing images to determine common characteristics among them. Such characteristics correspond to hazard-triggering events (e.g., low illumination) that are essential inputs for safety analysis. Though informative, such activity is expensive and error-prone.

To support such safety analysis practices, we propose SEDE, a technique that generates readable descriptions for commonalities in error-inducing, real-world images and improves the DNN through effective retraining. SEDE leverages the availability of simulators, which are commonly used for cyber-physical systems. SEDE relies on genetic algorithms to drive simulators towards the generation of images that are similar to error-inducing, real-world images in the test set; it then leverages rule learning algorithms to derive expressions that capture commonalities in terms of simulator parameter values. The derived expressions are then used to generate additional images to retrain and improve the DNN.

With DNNs performing in-car sensing tasks, SEDE successfully characterized hazard-triggering events leading to a DNN accuracy drop. Also, SEDE enabled retraining to achieve significant improvements in DNN accuracy, up to 18 percentage points.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) are increasingly common building blocks in many modern software systems, including safety-critical cyber-physical systems. This is true for automotive systems,
where DNNs are used for a range of activities, from automating driving tasks, such as emergency braking or lane changing [41, 51], to supporting passenger safety through drowsiness detection and gaze detection systems [39].

The DNNs used in computer-vision components of safety-critical autonomous systems are trained and tested using both images generated with simulators and real-world images. Because of the costs associated to labelling and data collection, the availability of real-world images is often limited. For this reason, models are trained mostly using simulator images, while real-world images are used to fine-tune the DNN and then test it [3, 24, 29].

In the presence of erroneous outputs from the DNN, engineers visually inspect the error-inducing images to perform root cause analysis. In a safety-critical context, the objective of such root cause analysis is to identify the events that have triggered DNN errors, which are referred to as the hazard-triggering events. Indeed, such identification is part of safety standards (e.g., ISO/PAS 21448 Chapter 7 [25]) and enables engineers to evaluate the risk associated to potentially hazardous behaviors of the DNN-based system. For example, when DNN inputs are images, by iteratively inspecting multiple images, engineers should be able to group images presenting common characteristics and therefore identify the hazard-triggering events among such commonalities (e.g., the drivers’ head is turned above a certain angle and there is a shadow on their face).

In a safety context, the identification of hazard-triggering events enables engineers to estimate the probability of exposure to a specific hazard (e.g., a system failure caused by an erroneous result from the DNN), which is necessary for risk assessment. For our example above, engineers may determine how likely it is for a shadow to partially cover the driver’s face while his head is turned.

Hazard-triggering events represent the root causes of DNN errors. Unfortunately, their manual identification is expensive and error-prone because it requires the inspection and comparison of many DNN inputs (e.g., images). To simplify the identification of DNN errors, engineers may rely on visualization techniques to generate heatmaps, i.e., images that use colors to capture the relevance of pixels in their contribution to a DNN result [37, 48]. Although a human operator may determine the root cause of a DNN error by noticing that multiple heatmaps highlight the same objects (e.g., long hair [48]), the analysis of a large set or error-inducing images is error-prone (e.g., engineers may not notice some of the error causes). To overcome this problem, our previous work, Heatmap-based Unsupervised Debugging of DNNs (HUDD) [11], automatically groups images showing a same root cause by analyzing heatmaps derived from DNN results and neuron activations — such groups of images are named root cause clusters (RCCs). The rationale behind HUDD is that images sharing the same root causes (e.g., a face turned left) should present similar neuron activations and, consequently, similar heatmaps. However, with HUDD, root cause analysis still remains error-prone because it relies on the capability of the engineer to interpret the generated results (e.g., she may not notice that DNN errors depend not only on a face being turned left but also on a specific illumination angle).

In this paper, we address the problem of automatically generating explicit descriptions for hazard-triggering events. Such descriptions are provided in terms of logical expressions constraining the configuration parameters of the simulator used to train the DNN (e.g., rotation angle of the driver’s head and illumination angle). For example, we may report that the hazard-triggering event that prevents the gaze angle from being correctly estimated is the driver head turned by more than 60 degrees with an illumination angle above 45 degrees (i.e., both eyes are barely visible and covered by a shadow). We name our approach Simulator-based Explanations for DNN Errors (SEDE).

Given a set of error-inducing images (e.g., the error inducing images in the test set), SEDE relies on HUDD to generate RCCs. We assume that all the images belonging to a RCC present the same hazard-triggering events, as suggested by HUDD’s empirical results. For each RCC identified by HUDD, SEDE relies on the simulator used for DNN training to generate more images that belong to
the RCC. Since a RCC characterizes a small portion of the input space, SEDE relies on evolutionary algorithms to efficiently generate RCC images. To better identify the commonalities among RCC images and avoid generating images that present characteristics that are accidentally shared by images, we propose PaiR (Pairwise Replacement), a genetic algorithm that not only generates images belonging to the RCC but also maximizes their diversity.

After PaiR generates images that belong to the RCC, to ensure that these images include hazard-triggering events, SEDE produces additional images that are mispredicted, in addition to belonging to the RCC. This is achieved by relying on a modified version of the multi-objective algorithm NSGA-II (hereafter, \textit{NSGA-II}'). Finally, to precisely characterize hazard-triggering events (i.e., to distinguish between commonalities that cause DNN errors and accidental similarities), SEDE relies on \textit{NSGA-II}' to generate additional images that are similar to error-inducing images but do not cause a DNN error.

The availability of failing and passing images enables SEDE to derive, leveraging the PART decision rule learning algorithm [13], a set of expressions for the simulator parameters that captures commonalities among error-inducing images. These expressions characterize hazard-triggering events and also delimit a portion of the input space that shall be considered unsafe. The expressions generated by SEDE can be used to either estimate the probability of exposure to the hazard-triggering events (based on domain knowledge) or improve the DNN. Improvements in DNN accuracy can be achieved by retraining the model using additional images generated using a simulator, configured with parameters that match the expressions generated by SEDE.

We have performed an empirical evaluation of our approach with three relevant case study subjects provided by our industry partner in the automotive domain, IEE Sensing [22]. Our subjects concern head pose classification and facial landmarks detection, which are important features for in-car sensing solutions such as drowsiness detection. Our empirical results show that (1) PaiR outperforms NSGA-II in identifying a diverse set of images belonging to a RCC, (2) SEDE effectively identifies a set of diverse images with common characteristics, (3) SEDE derives expressions that identify the unsafe portions of the input space where the DNN accuracy drops up to 80%, (4) the expressions generated by SEDE can be used to improve the DNN accuracy (up to 18 percentage points in accuracy).

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we present the required background (heatmaps generation, HUDD, many-objective search algorithms, and rule learning algorithms). In Section 3, we describe SEDE. In Section 4, we present our empirical evaluation, which includes a comparison with HUDD and a random baseline. In Section 5, we discuss related work. Finally, we conclude this paper in Section 6.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 DNN Explanation and Heatmaps

Most of the approaches that aim to explain DNN results [16] concern the generation of heatmaps that capture the importance of pixels in image predictions. They include black-box [7, 43] and white-box approaches [37, 48, 50, 54, 55].

Among the existing heatmap generation approaches, HUDD relies on the Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation (LRP) [37] since it overcomes the limitation of others. First, differently from black-box approaches, it provides the relevance of neurons belonging to internal DNN layers. Second, differently from backpropagation approaches [55] it accounts for information about all the available neurons, not only the ones related to the predicted class. Third, differently from deconvolutional networks [54] and guided backpropagation [50] generates precise, non-sparse heatmaps. Fourth,
differently from Grad-CAM [48], it also works with convolutional DNN layers and regression DNNs.

LRP redistributes the relevance scores of neurons in a higher layer to those of the lower layer. Assuming $j$ and $k$ to be two consecutive layers of the DNN, LRP propagates the relevance scores computed for a given layer $k$ into a neuron of the lower layer $j$. It has been theoretically justified as a form of Taylor decomposition [38]. Fig. 1 illustrates the execution of LRP on a fully connected network used to classify inputs.

A heatmap is a matrix with entries in $\mathbb{R}$, i.e., it is a triple $(N, M, f)$ where $N, M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f$ is a map $[N] \times [M] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Hereafter, we use the syntax $H^L_{i,j}$ to refer to an entry in row $i$ (i.e., $i < N$) and column $j$ (i.e., $j < M$) of a heatmap $H$ computed on layer $L$. The size of the heatmap matrix (i.e., the number of entries) is $N \cdot M$, with $N$ and $M$ depending on the dimensions of the DNN layer $L$. For convolution layers, $N$ captures the number of neurons in the feature map, while $M$ captures the number of feature maps.

2.2 HUDD

HUDD [11] identifies the different situations in which an image-processing DNN is likely to trigger an erroneous result by generating clusters (i.e., root cause clusters, RCCs) containing misclassified input images. The images belonging to the same RCC share a common set of characteristics that are plausible causes for errors. HUDD is based on the intuition that since heatmaps capture the relevance of each neuron on DNN results, the processing of inputs sharing the same root cause (or hazard-triggering event) should lead to similar heatmaps. For this reason, to identify the root causes of DNN errors, HUDD relies on clustering based on heatmaps.

HUDD works as follows. First, for each error-inducing image in the test set, it relies on LRP to generate heatmaps of internal DNN layers. Each heatmap captures the relevance score of each neuron in that layer. Then, HUDD relies on a hierarchical agglomerative clustering algorithm [30] to group images. To measure the distance between two images, which is necessary for clustering, it computes the Euclidean distance between their heatmaps (a heatmap is a matrix). To determine the number of clusters to generate, it relies on the knee-point method to identify the configuration in which the weighted intra-cluster distance (i.e., the distance between pair of images within a cluster weighted by the relative size of the cluster) stops decreasing significantly.

![Fig. 1. Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation.](image-url)
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Require: \( O = o_1, o_2, \ldots \) the number of objectives
Require: \( M \), population size
Require: \( T \), search budget (i.e., number of iterations to perform)
Ensure: a population whose Pareto front indicate the optimal solutions

1: \( t \leftarrow 0 \) //current generation
2: \( P_t \leftarrow \text{RANDOM} - \text{POPULATION}(M) \)
3: while \( t < T \) do
4: \( Q_t \leftarrow \text{GENERATE} - \text{OFFSPRING}(P_t) \)
5: \( R_t \leftarrow P_t \cup Q_t \)
6: \( (F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_l) \leftarrow \text{RANKED} - \text{SORT}(R_t) \)
7: \( r \leftarrow 0 \) //selected Pareto front rank
8: while \( |P_t| + 1 \leq M \) do
9: \( P_{t+1} \leftarrow P_t \cup F_r \)
10: while \( |P_{t+1}| < M \) do
11: \( \text{ind} \leftarrow \text{SELECT} - \text{BASED} - \text{ON} - \text{DISTANCE}(F_r) \)
12: \( P_{t+1} \leftarrow P_{t+1} \cup \text{ind} \)
13: \( t \leftarrow t + 1 \)
14: Return \( P_t \)

Fig. 2. NSGA-II

Since certain inputs space regions might be less dense than others (i.e., include fewer data items), the weighted intra-cluster distance computed by HUDD balances cohesion and cluster size (i.e., it is acceptable to have a larger intra-cluster distance when the cluster has less elements). Also, since LRP can generate heatmaps for each DNN layer, HUDD generates a set of clusters for each DNN layer and selects the one that minimizes the weighted intra-cluster distance (i.e., the one with the most cohesive clusters).

HUDD has proven useful in identifying root causes (or hazard-triggering events) due to a diverse set of problems, including an incomplete training set, an incomplete definition of the predicted classes, and limitations in the simulator controls.

2.3 Multi-objective and Many-objective Optimization

Evolutionary methodologies are state-of-the-art solutions to find a set of nondominated solutions in multi-objective optimization problems. In software engineering, they are widely adopted to identify test inputs that maximize some coverage criterion [42]. Also, they have been successfully used to test autonomous driving systems [2, 20].

NSGA-II [8] is a state-of-the-art solution for optimization problems with up to three objectives. It is shown in Fig. 2. NSGA-II works by first generating a random population (Line 2), which is evolved in a number of iterations (Lines 3 to 13). A new offspring \( (Q_t) \) is generated by applying mutation and crossover operators (Line 4). The algorithm preserves elitism since the new population \( (P_{t+1}) \) is generated by selecting the best individuals in the union of the current population \( (P_t) \) and the offspring (Line 5). The best individuals are selected by first ranking individuals based on their belonging to the \( l \)-th nondominated fronts (Line 6), which is efficiently performed by the fast-nondominated-sorting procedure [8]. Then, the algorithm adds individuals to the population according to their rank (Line 9), till it finds a ranked subset that cannot be fully added (Line 8). Finally, to preserve diversity in the population, NSGA-II selects the items belonging to the last ranked subset according to a crowding distance function that prioritizes individuals being more distant from others along with individuals at the boundaries of the objective space (Line 11). Fig. 3 provides the pseudocode for the function that computes the crowding-distance for a set of individuals. Lines 6 and 7 prioritize the individuals with the best and worst fitness, respectively, by assigning them infinite distance.

The term many-objective is used for algorithms that tackle problems with more than three objectives [32]. A popular many-objective algorithm used in software testing is MOSA [42]. Given
Require: I, vector whose items represent an individual
1: \( l = |I| \)
2: for \( i = 0; i < |I| \) do
3: \( I[i] = 0 \)
4: for each objective \( o \) do
5: \( I \leftarrow \text{sort } I \text{ according to objective } o \)
6: \( I[1]_{\text{distance}} \leftarrow \infty \)
7: \( I[l]_{\text{distance}} \leftarrow \infty \)
8: for \( i = 2 \) to \((l - 1)\) do
9: \( I[i]_{\text{distance}} \leftarrow I[1]_{\text{distance}} + \frac{(I[i+1]_m - I[i-1]_m)}{(\text{max fitness for } o - \text{min fitness for } o)} \)

Fig. 3. Crowding-distance-assignment function for NSGA-II. Red part indicates the instruction commented out in NSGA-II’ to ensure that, for each objective, the best individual is preserved.

test cases (i.e., sequences of inputs for program APIs) as individuals, MOSA models branch coverage as a search objective but does not account for the length of individuals. Shorter test cases are, however, easier to read than longer ones and should be prioritized. Therefore, MOSA extends NSGA-II by relying on an archive that is used to keep track of the the shortest test cases accidentally identified during the search. In addition, since MOSA aims to fulfil all the objectives and not only a subset of them, instead of relying only on the nondominance relation to select elitist individuals (i.e., Line 6 in Fig. 2), it makes use of the preference criterion, a strategy that ensures preserving individuals that minimize the objective score for uncovered objectives (i.e., objectives without an individual already in the archive).

2.4 Diversity optimization

In our work, we aim to rely on evolutionary algorithms to generate a set of diverse images belonging to a RCC. As described in the related literature [18, 20, 46], an image can be modelled as an individual of the population; precisely, an individual is modelled as a vector whose components are referred to as chromosomes, each chromosome captures the values assigned to simulator parameters used to generate the image.

Although, in principle, genetic algorithms can be used to evolve a population of individuals and achieve our objectives (i.e., generate individuals belonging to the RCC and maximize the diversity between them), the use of state-of-the-art algorithms for this purpose (e.g., NSGA-II) is not feasible because it is not possible to define a fitness function for diversity, as explained next.

To maximize diversity, since it is the property of a set of images, it is not possible to define a fitness function that assesses how much an offspring individual contributes to diversity prior to knowing what the final set will be. Also, note that selection based on crowding distance, which is part of NSGA-II, does not help because such distance is defined over the objective space, as opposed to the simulator parameter space. Consequently, the NSGA-II algorithm cannot simply be adopted to address our problem.

An alternative solution consists of relying on an archive where to add, at each iteration of the search algorithm, the individuals in the pareto front that contribute to increasing diversity. Related work suggests to add to the archive the individuals with a distance from the nearest neighbour that is above a set threshold [46]. In our context, such threshold value may directly affect the quality of the results; indeed, if the threshold is too low, most of the selected individuals will be similar to each other, thus making the learning algorithm derive rules that do not characterize the whole RCC. Similarly, if the threshold is too high, we will select only a small number of individuals, which would prevent the generation of accurate rules. Unfortunately, identifying an appropriate threshold requires multiple executions of the algorithm, which, in our context, shall be repeated for every RCC; indeed, since for the simulator it may be easier to generate certain images than others, some
portions of the input space may be denser than others and, therefore, different thresholds might be needed for different RCCs. In practice, this would lead to an expensive process, which is practically infeasible.

Finally, we can represent the whole solution (i.e., a set of $n$ images) as an individual where each image is modelled with a subset of the chromosomes (e.g., the first sequences of $m$ chromosomes are for the first images, the second for the second image, and so on). The solution to the problem would be the best individual in the population after reaching the specified search budget. Unfortunately, such a solution requires many simulator runs to generate a single individual, which leads to an inefficient exploration of the search space and, therefore, entails a large budget to generate the desired solutions. To address our problem, we thus defined an algorithm (i.e., the PaiR algorithm, described in Section 3.1) that takes advantage of every image generated by the simulator in an iteration.

## 2.5 Rule learning algorithms

In our work, we aim to derive properties that characterize unsafe images. Given a dataset capturing properties of safe and unsafe images (e.g., the parameter values used to generate an image with a simulator), our objective can be achieved by relying on machine learning algorithms that derive decision rules [36].

A decision rule is an IF-THEN statement consisting of a condition and a prediction. For example, in our context, a decision rule may indicate that if the horizontal angle used to generate an image is above 50 degrees (i.e., the head of the person is so turned that her left eye is barely visible), then the image is error-inducing. Decision rules are machine learning models that can be easily interpreted by humans [36], which motivates our choice.

The support of a rule indicates the percentage of instances to which the condition of a rule applies, while its accuracy measures the proportion of classes correctly predicted for the instances to which the condition of the rule applies.

To combine multiple rules, rule learning algorithms derive either decision lists or decision sets. A decision list is ordered, we should rely on the prediction of the first rule whose condition evaluates to true. In a decision set, predictions are based on some strategy (e.g., majority voting). Since we aim to rely on the generated rules to derive logical expressions, for our work, we selected algorithms deriving decision lists which can be directly translated into a single expression (see Section 3.2). In particular we rely on the PART algorithm [14], which combines the approach of RIPPER [5], a rule learning algorithm, with decision trees, which have been successfully applied in related work to characterize DNN inputs [18].

PART, similarly to RIPPER, relies on a separate-and-conquer approach. It relies on a partial C4.5 decision tree to derive each rule. It starts by deriving a rule that provides accurate predictions for some of the data points. Such result is achieved by building a pruned C4.5 decision tree from all the data points, and then select the leaf with the largest support to transform it into a rule. The decision tree is then discarded and all the data points that are covered by the rule are excluded from the training set. This rule learning procedure is repeated until the whole data set is processed.

Since, in our context, for each image under analysis we know (1) the DNN outcome (i.e., a DNN error or a correct result) and (2) the set of simulator parameter values used to generate it, we can configure PART to consider the DNN outcome as the class to predict and the simulator parameter values as the features to derive rules from.

Fig. 4 provides an example output generated by PART when processing images from our case study subjects. Each image depicts a person’s head and is represented by a number of simulator parameters configured to generate the image (an example is shown in Fig. 5). The considered
1: $\text{HeadPose}_Y > 50.34$ : class = DNN – error
2: $\text{HeadPose}_Y < 13.34$ : class = DNN – correct
3: $\text{HeadPose}_Z > 60$ & $\text{HeadPose}_Y > 30$ : class = DNN – error
4: $\text{HeadPose}_Z \leq 60$ : class = DNN – correct
5: (default) : class = DNN – error

Fig. 4. Example of PART output

Fig. 5. Example image generated with IEE-Humans, one of the simulators used in our empirical evaluation. It is labeled as looking top-right (i.e., towards the top-right corner of the picture).

parameters include, among others, the orientation of the head (pitch, yaw, roll captured by the parameters $\text{HeadPose}_X$, $\text{HeadPose}_Y$, and $\text{HeadPose}_Z$).

In Fig. 4, Line 1 indicates that we observe a DNN error if the value of the parameter $\text{HeadPose}_Y$ is above 50.34 (i.e., the person is looking to the right of the viewer, with the head turned so much that her left eye is barely visible). Line 2 indicates that, when the rule in Line 1 does not apply and the person is looking center or to her right (i.e., if $\text{HeadPose}_Y$ is below 13.34), then the DNN produces a correct result. Line 3 indicates that, when the two rules above do not hold, we observe a DNN error if the value of parameter $\text{HeadPose}_Z$ is above 60 and the value of parameter $\text{HeadPose}_Y$ is above 30 (i.e., when the head is tilted and the person is looking to her left then the DNN makes a mistake even if her left eye is visible). Line 4 indicates that, when the three rules above do not hold, the DNN result is correct if the value of parameter $\text{HeadPose}_Z$ is below 60 (i.e., the head is not tilted). Finally, Line 5 is the default rule, which indicates that, when all the rules above do not hold, the DNN result is incorrect.

3 SIMULATOR-BASED EXPLANATIONS FOR DNN ERRORS

In this paper, we propose an approach to characterize the root causes (events) leading to DNN errors; we call such events hazard-triggering events. It targets contexts in which DNNs are trained using simulators, which is common practice in safety-critical contexts with complex inputs [3, 24, 29]; for example, DNN implementing vision-based driving tasks or interpreting human postures. This is the case for our industry partner, which relies on a simulator capable of generating images of human bodies, seated in a car environment, to train DNNs that interpret human postures (e.g., determine gaze or drowsiness).

The reference DNN training process is depicted in Fig. 6. It leverages simulators to reduce the cost related to collecting and labelling a large number of images. In general, engineers tend to initially train the DNN using images automatically generated with a high-fidelity simulator (e.g., a human body simulator). Then, to enable the correct processing of real-world images, they fine-tune the trained DNN using real-world images (e.g., images of real people seated in a car). Fine-tuning
consists of relying on the DNN training algorithm to update the weights of the DNN trained with simulator images; retraining may concern the whole set or a subset of the DNN weights (e.g., the fully connected layers in a CNN). Our approach characterizes hazard-triggering events observed in a test set with real world images; such objective is achieved by generating an expression that constrains the parameters of the simulator used to generate the training set.

We name our approach Simulator-based Explanations for DNN Errors (SEDE); it works in four steps depicted in Fig. 7.

In the first step, SEDE relies on a state-of-the-art solution (HUDD), described in Section 2.2, to automatically identify clusters of images (root cause clusters, RCCs) leading to a DNN error because of common hazard-triggering events.

![Fig. 6. DNN training based on simulator images](image)

![Fig. 7. The SEDE workflow](image)
In the second step, SEDE relies on evolutionary search driven by the analysis of heatmaps and simulator parameters to generate images that are associated to RCCs (Section 3.1), enabling accurate learning to distinguish unsafe scenarios. To precisely constrain the simulator parameter values (configurations) of distinct hazard-triggering events and to avoid overfitting, we are interested in generating many diverse images leading to different DNN behaviors. Addressing many hazard-triggering events entails many-objective optimization which we address with multiple search runs. More precisely, for each RCC, our algorithm executes one search to generate a set of diverse images belonging to that RCC, one search to generate a set of unsafe (i.e., error-inducing) images that are close to each of the diverse images and belonging to the RCC, and another search to identify a set of safe images (i.e., not leading to a DNN error) that are close to the unsafe ones. For classifier DNNs, an error is triggered when the output class differs from the ground truth, where the latter is automatically derived from the parameters of the simulator. In the case of regression DNNs, a DNN error is triggered when the difference between the DNN output and the reference value (ground truth) is above a set threshold, which is defined by engineers based on domain knowledge.

In the third step, SEDE relies on the availability of a sufficiently large number of safe and unsafe images to identify those parameter ranges that characterize unsafe images. More precisely, SEDE relies on a machine-learning algorithm (i.e., PART) to extract such ranges, under the form of logical expressions that accurately predict and therefore represent unsafe images.

In the fourth step, SEDE relies on the derived expressions to generate an additional set of images that are intended to be used to retrain and improve the DNN.

Below, we describe Steps 2 to 4 since Step 1 simply involves the execution of HUDD to generate RCCs.

### 3.1 Step 2 - Automated Generation of Unsafe and Safe Images

In the second step of SEDE, for each RCC, we aim to automatically generate images that (goal 1) present the same hazard-triggering events observed in the RCC and (goal 2) enable a learning algorithm to extract accurate rules predicting unsafe images. These rules shall ideally characterize parameter values that are observed only with unsafe images belonging to a specific RCC.

To achieve goal 1, it shall be sufficient to explore the input space by generating diverse images that are similar to the ones belonging to the RCC.

To achieve goal 2, instead, we need to generate both safe images and unsafe images. To be accurate, the rules derived by SEDE shall provide ranges for parameter values that are observed only or mostly with unsafe images and are as wide as possible. To this end, the unsafe images used to generate the rules must be as diverse as possible and for each unsafe image, we should identify a very similar safe image so that the algorithm learns to precisely distinguish unsafe images from safe ones, i.e., precisely learn the boundary between them.

To achieve the above, we rely on a divide and conquer approach that consists of executing three genetic algorithms for each RCC in a sequence. We make use of genetic algorithms because they have been successfully used by related work to explore the input space of DNNs using simulators [46].

First (Step 2.1), we generate diverse images belonging to the RCC, safe or unsafe. The goal is to cover the cluster with representative images.

Second (Step 2.2), we rely on the generated representative images to generate an additional set of unsafe and diverse images belonging to the cluster; this is achieved by generating, for each representative image, one unsafe image that is close to it and is likely to belong to the RCC.

Third (Step 2.3), for each unsafe image derived by the second evolutionary search, we generate one safe image that is as close as possible to it.

In summary, we aim to generate diverse safe and unsafe images belonging to each RCC to enable effective learning.
3.1.1 Step 2.1 - Generate Representative Images.

We have two objectives: (1) generate a set of images that belong to a cluster and (2) maximise their diversity; however, these are not competing objectives and it is not desirable to rely on a multi-objective search algorithm to address them. Indeed, for our purpose, it is useless to generate a set of diverse images if they do not belong to the RCC. To drive the search process, we thus need a fitness function that enables an evolutionary search algorithm to first generate images that belong to a cluster and then increase their diversity.

In Section 2.4 we clarified why state-of-the-art approaches are inapplicable or ineffective when applied to achieve our objectives; in this section, we propose a dedicated fitness function and algorithm.

In the presence of a function that measures the distance of an individual $i$ from the RCC $C$ (hereafter, $RCC\text{distance}(C,i)$) and a function that measures how an individual contributes to the diversity of cluster members (hereafter, $F_{\text{diversity}}(i)$), to obtain a mathematically adequate behavior, our fitness function $F^C_1(i)$ can be defined as follows:

$$F^C_1(i) = \begin{cases} F_{\text{diversity}}(i) & \text{if } i \text{ belongs to RCC } C \\ RCC\text{distance}(C,i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

(1)

Our goal is to minimize $F_1(i)$ and given that (1) $F_{\text{diversity}}(i) \leq 1$ (see Equation 8) and (2) $RCC\text{distance} \leq 1$ indicates that the image belongs to the RCC and is otherwise above 1, we obtain the targeted property: fitness is always lower in cases where an individual $i$ belongs to the RCC. Below, we describe the functions $F_{\text{diversity}}$ and $RCC\text{distance}(C,i)$.

To determine if an individual belongs to a RCC, we can measure its distance from the RCC centroid and verify if it is shorter than the RCC radius (i.e., the max distance between the centroid and the farthest image). For the distance metric, as in HUDD, we can use the Euclidean distance between two heatmaps (hereafter, $HeatmapDistance$); however, to generate a heatmap we need a concrete image and, therefore, instead of relying on the cluster centroid, we should identify its medoid. The formula for the $HeatmapDistance$ function is:

$$HeatmapDistance(A,B) = \sqrt{\sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{n=1}^{N} (A_{m,n}^L - B_{m,n}^L)^2}$$

(2)

where $A$ and $B$ are two heatmap matrices generated with LRP, and $m, n$ indicate the row and column of a cell in a matrix ($M$ and $N$ indicate the total number of rows and columns, respectively). Since LRP generates one heatmap matrix for every neuron layer of the DNN, we rely on the heatmap generated for layer $L$ as selected by HUDD to generate the RCC.

Similar to related work, within our evolutionary algorithms, we represent an individual using a vector of simulator parameter values (each simulator parameter is captured by one specific vector component); for this reason, to compute the heatmap distance, our search algorithm, for every offspring individual, first generates one image using the simulator, then processes the generated image using the DNN under test, and finally generates its heatmap using the LRP algorithm.

The medoid of a RCC $C$ is the image that minimizes the average pairwise distance from the other images of the RCC; it is computed as follows:

$$Medoid(C) = \min_{y \in C} \left\{ \sum_{x \in C, x \neq y} \frac{HeatmapDistance(x, y)}{|C| \cdot (|C| - 1)} \right\}$$

(3)
The radius of a RCC $C$ is the maximum distance between its medoid and any other image in $C$:

$$\text{Radius}(C) = \max_{y \in C} \left\{ \text{HeatmapDistance}(y, \text{Medoid}(C)) \right\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

Since clusters may have different radii, we compute $\text{RCC}_{distance}(C, i)$ for a RCC $C$ as the heatmap distance between individual $i$ and $C$’s medoid $\text{Medoid}(C)$, normalized by $C$’s radius $\text{Radius}(C)$:

$$\text{RCC}_{distance}(C, i) = \frac{\text{HeatmapDistance}(i, \text{Medoid}(C))}{\text{Radius}(C)}$$ \hspace{1cm} (5)

It enables us to update $F_1$ as follows

$$F^C_1(i) = \begin{cases} F_{\text{diversity}}(i) & \text{if } \text{RCC}_{distance}(C, i) \leq 1 \\ \text{RCC}_{distance}(C, i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (6)

To compute $F_{\text{diversity}}(i)$, we follow related work [46] and measure how much an individual contributes to the diversity of the population by measuring its distance from the closest individual in the population.

We can measure the distance between two individuals $i$ and $j$ based on their chromosome vectors $v_i$ and $v_j$ (containing simulator parameter values), as follows:

$$\text{ChromosomeDistance}(i, j) = \cos(i, j)$$

$$= \frac{v_i \cdot v_j}{\|v_i\| \|v_j\|}$$

$$= \frac{\sum_{p=1}^{\|i\|} (v_i[p] \cdot v_j[p])}{\sqrt{\sum_{p=1}^{\|i\|} v_i[p]^2 \sum_{p=1}^{\|j\|} v_j[p]^2}}$$

where $\cos(i, j)$ is the cosine similarity between $v_i$ and $v_j$, whose range is $[0, 1]$; $v_i[p]$ and $v_j[p]$ indicate the value of the $p$-th component in the vectors $v_i$ and $v_j$, respectively.

$F^C_1$ can therefore be used to drive a search algorithm, as described below.

The SEDE search algorithm: PaiR. Pairwise Replacement (PaiR) is our algorithm to generate representative RCC images; it is presented in Fig. 8 and described below.

PaiR aims to evolve a whole population of individuals to generate a population of individuals that both belong to the RCC under analysis and are diverse. The size of the population is a parameter of the algorithm. PaiR leverages all the images generated by the simulator at every search iteration by replacing one or more images in the parent population with offspring individuals having a better fitness.

PaiR works by looking for individuals that minimize $F^C_1$. At every iteration, PaiR creates a new population $P'$ obtained by replacing an individual $i_p$ with an individual $i_o$ having a better fitness (i.e., $F^C_1(i_o) < F^C_1(i_p)$), as described in the following.

The PaiR algorithm receives as input the RCC under analysis (hereafter, $RCC_C$), the configuration parameters $s$ and $r$, and the search budget $b$ indicating the number of iterations to perform.

To maximize the chances of finding an optimal solution, as in related work [53], the PaiR algorithm starts by generating several random populations (Line 1 to 3) and selecting the population including the individual with the lowest fitness value ($P$, Line 5).
Require: \( \text{RCC}_C \), the RCC under analysis
Require: \( s \), population size
Require: \( r \), number of random populations of images to generate initially
Require: \( b \), search budget (i.e., number of iterations to perform)

Ensure: \( P_C' \), an optimal set of diverse images belonging to cluster \( \text{RCC}_C \)

1: \( \text{repeat} \)
2: \( R \leftarrow R \cup \text{RANDOM} \setminus \text{POPULATION}(s) \)
3: \( \text{until } r \text{ random populations have been generated} \)
4: \( t \leftarrow 0 \)
5: \( P \leftarrow \text{selects the population in } R \text{ with the best fitness} \)
6: \( \text{while } t < b \text{ do} \)
7: \( \text{EVALUATE the FITNESS of } P \text{ based on } \text{RCC}_i \)
8: \( O \leftarrow \text{GENERATE the OFFSPRING population from } P \)
9: \( \text{EVALUATE the FITNESS of } O \text{ based on } P \text{ and } \text{RCC}_C \)
10: \( \text{while } \text{SIZE}(O) > 0 \text{ do} \)
11: \( \text{SORT } O \text{ based on decreasing FITNESS} \)
12: \( i_o \leftarrow \text{extract and remove first individual in } O \)
13: \( \text{if there is at least one individual in } P \text{ that is outside the RCC then} \)
14: \( i_p \leftarrow \text{IDENTIFY the individual in } P \text{ with the highest fitness} \)
15: \( \text{else} \)
16: \( i_p \leftarrow \text{IDENTIFY the individual in } P \text{ that is closer to } i_o \)
17: \( \text{if fitness of } i_o < \text{fitness of } i_p \text{ then} \)
18: \( \text{Within } P, \text{replace } i_p \text{ with } i_o \)
19: \( \text{EVALUATE the FITNESS of } P \text{ based on } \text{RCC}_C \)
20: \( \text{EVALUATE the FITNESS of } O \text{ based on } P \text{ and } \text{RCC}_C \)
21: \( t \leftarrow t + 1 \)
22: \( P'_i \leftarrow \text{all the individuals in } P \text{ that belong to } \text{RCC}_C \)
23: \( \text{return } P'_i \)
24: \( \text{exit} \)

Fig. 8. PaiR, the Genetic Algorithm integrated into SEDE

In its main loop (Lines 6 to 21), PaiR computes the fitness values of individuals in the parent population \( P \) and, from \( P \), generates an offspring population \( O \) by relying on the same strategy commonly adopted with NSGA-II in similar contexts (i.e., tournament selection, simulated binary crossover, crossover probability \( p_c \), and mutation probability \( p_m \)).

The offspring individuals are sorted to process first the ones with better fitness (Line 20). PaiR considers each individual in \( O \) (i.e., \( i_o \)) as a replacement of an individual in \( P \) (i.e., \( i_p \)), if the former has a better fitness. PaiR distinguishes between the cases in which \( P \) only contains individuals belonging to the RCC (Line 15) and when at least one individual does not (Line 13). Indeed, if we do not have enough individuals belonging to the RCC, it is not important to maximize their diversity.

If \( P \) contains at least one individual not belonging to the RCC, PaiR simply looks for the individual in \( P \) with the highest fitness (i.e., the one that is furthest from the cluster medoid). Such individual will be replaced by \( i_o \) if the latter has a lower fitness (Line 17), which is always the case if \( i_o \) belongs to the RCC; otherwise, it depends on the value of \( RCC_{distance} \): \( i_o \) replaces \( i_p \) if \( i_o \) is closer to the RCC medoid.

If all the individuals in \( P \) belong to the RCC, PaiR selects the individual in \( P \) that is closer to \( i_o \) (i.e., \( i_p \), Line 16). The offspring individual \( i_o \) replaces \( i_p \) if \( i_o \) has a lower fitness than \( i_p \) (Line 17). Since \( i_p \) belongs to the RCC, according to Equation 6, \( i_o \) has a lower fitness than \( i_p \) when \( i_o \) belongs to the RCC and has a lower \( F_{diversity} \).

\( F_{diversity}(i) \) is computed differently for individuals in the parent and in the offspring population; the reason is that we must decide if an individual \( i_o \) in the offspring population \( O \), would lead to a population \( P' \) with a larger diversity than \( P \). \( P' \) is obtained by replacing an individual \( i_p \) in the parent population \( P \) with \( i_o \); therefore, we obtain a different \( P' \) from a same \( P \), depending on the selected individuals \( i_p \) and \( i_o \). To help identify the most diverse \( P' \) and avoid computing the diversity for all possible \( P' \) obtained from every individual in \( O \), inspired by related work [46], we
compare (a) the distance between $i_p$ and the closest individual in $P$ with (b) the distance between $i_o$ and the closest individual in $P'$. Note that $P'$ includes $i_o$ and $P \setminus i_p$ (i.e., all the elements in $P$ except $i_p$). Therefore, for an individual $i_p$ in the parent population $P$, we compute one minus its distance from $\text{closest}_{i_p}$, the individual in $P$ that is closest to $i_p$

$$F_{\text{diversity}}(i_p) = 1 - \text{ChromosomeDistance}(i_p, \text{closest}_{i_p}) \quad (8)$$

For an individual $i_o$ in the offspring population $O$, we compute one minus its distance from $\text{closest}_{i_o}$, the individual in $P \setminus i_p$ that is closest to $i_o$:

$$F_{\text{diversity}}(i_o) = 1 - \text{ChromosomeDistance}(i_o, \text{closest}_{i_o}) \quad (9)$$

Based on the above, given two individuals $i_o$ and $i_p$ in the offspring and parent population, respectively, the individual $i_o$ has a better fitness than $i_p$ if they both belong to the RCC and $i_o$ has a distance from the closest individual in $P \setminus i_p$ that is larger than the distance of $i_p$ from the closest individual in $P$. Since the distance from the closest individual should increase (lower fitness) when replacing $i_p$ with $i_o$ in the population, we can assume that a population $P'$ will have higher diversity than $P$, which we demonstrate in Section 4.2.

The process is repeated until $O$ is empty (Lines 10 to 20); since $F_1$ depends on the distance between individuals being close to each other, given that both $O$ and $P$ vary over iterations, the fitness of the two populations is recomputed after every replacement (Lines 19 and 20).

After $b$ iterations, the algorithm has generated a population $P_1^C$ of individuals that are diverse and very likely to belong to $\text{RCC}_C$.

3.1.2 Step 2.2 - Generate a set of unsafe images belonging to the cluster.

For each $\text{RCC}_C$, we aim to generate a set of diverse, unsafe images, belonging to the cluster. To preserve the diversity of the images generated by PaiR in Step 2.1 ($P_1^C$), we can identify, for each image in $P_1^C$, an image that is close to it and makes the DNN fail. We can thus model our problem as a many-objective optimization problem with $q$ objectives, where $q$ is the number of images in $P_1^C$.

We define $q$ fitness functions, one for each individual in $P_1^C$. An individual is an image generated with the simulator, modelled as described in Section 3.1.1. All fitness functions share the same parameterized formula $F_2^{C,t}$, where $t \in [1, \ldots, q]$:

$$F_2^{C,t}(i) = \begin{cases} 
\text{ChromosomeDistance}(i, P_1^C[t]) & \text{if } (\text{RCC\text{distance}}(\text{RCC}_C, i) \leq 1) \land (\text{CLOSEST}(i, P_1^C) = P_1^C[t]) \\
1 + \text{Funcertainty}(i) & \text{if } (\text{RCC\text{distance}}(\text{RCC}_C, i) \leq 1) \land (\text{CLOSEST}(i, P_1^C) = P_1^C[t]) \\
2 + \text{ChromosomeDistance}(i, P_1^C[t]) & \text{if } (\text{RCC\text{distance}}(\text{RCC}_C, i) \leq 1) \land (\text{CLOSEST}(i, P_1^C) \neq P_1^C[t]) \\
3 + \text{RCC\text{distance}}(i) & \text{if } \text{RCC\text{distance}}(\text{RCC}_C, i) > 1 
\end{cases} \quad (10)$$

$F_2^{C,t}$ is a piecewise-defined function implemented through four sub-functions that return a value in the range $[0-1]$ incremented by a constant (from 0 for the first sub-function to 3 for the fourth sub-function).

The fourth sub-function of the equation drives the search towards generating an individual belonging to $\text{RCC}_C$; indeed, when this is not the case, $F_2^{C,t}$ measures how far the individual is from the RCC medoid with $\text{RCC\text{distance}}(\text{RCC}_C, i)$. Since not belonging to $\text{RCC}_C$ is the worst case for an individual, $F_2^{C,t}$ must be higher than in other cases. This is achieved by returning $3 + \text{RCC\text{distance}}(\text{RCC}_C, i)$, given that the codomain of the first three sub-functions referred to in $F_2^{C,t}$ lay in the range $[0-3]$. 
The third sub-function of the equation ensures that we generate one image for each individual in $P^C_1$; indeed, if the individual $i$ belongs to $RCC_C$ but the individual in $P^C_1$ that is closest to $i$ is not the $t$-th individual (i.e., $\text{CLOSEST}(i, P^C_1) \neq P^C_1[t]$), $F^{C,t}_2$ returns the cosine distance between $i$ and the $t$-th individual in $P^C_1$, incremented by 2.

The second sub-function helps generating an individual that makes the DNN fail. Indeed, if the individual $i$ belongs to $RCC_C$, is the closest to the $t$-th individual targeted by $F^{C,t}_2$, but does not make the DNN fail, then the fitness function returns a measure of DNN uncertainty increased by one.

To compute the uncertainty component of the fitness, we return one minus the cross-entropy loss function, which is commonly used to measure uncertainty (e.g., in Active Learning approaches \[49\]):

$$F_{\text{uncertainty}}(i) = 1 - \text{entropy}(i) \quad (11)$$

The cross-entropy loss measures how uncertain is the DNN about the provided output where low cross-entropy loss values indicate higher certainty; therefore, by using one minus cross-entropy loss, we direct the search (minimization) towards the identification of images for which the DNN is less certain about results and, therefore, likely to produce an erroneous result.

The first sub-function of $F^{C,t}_2$, instead, for individuals that make the DNN fail, helps select the individual that is closest to the individual targeted by $F^{C,t}_2$; indeed, it returns the chromosome distance between the individual $i$ and the individual $P^C_1[t]$.

**Search Algorithm.** To address our problem, we rely on a modified version of NSGA-II. NSGA-II is known to underperform in the presence of a large number of objectives ($>3$), mainly because of the exponential growth in the number of non-dominated solutions required for approximating the Pareto front \[26\]. However, we do not aim to find, as a solution to our problem, one single individual (i.e., image) that finds the best balance among different objectives but a set of images, each optimizing one independent objective (indeed, each image shall be close to a reference image in $P^C_1$); therefore, we are unlikely to find a set of nondominated solutions larger than $|P^C_1|$ (i.e., we will find one solution for each objective). Also, by definition, $F^{C,t}_2$ is always different than zero, which renders ineffective algorithms that look for an individual that covers an objective (e.g., MOSA\[1\]). Also, we do not require an archive because we do not need to evaluate an individual according to objectives not explicitly modeled (e.g., inputs' length in MOSA). However, we aim to optimize all the objectives and, for this reason, we rely on an extended version of NSGA-II with a modified crowding-distance function that ensures we select the minimal value for each objective, thus resembling the preference criterion of MOSA.

We propose a modified version of NSGA-II (hereafter, NSGA-II') that includes a modified crowding-distance-assignment which ensures preserving, for each objective, the individual with the lowest fitness value. Our modified crowding-distance-assignment is shown in Fig. 3 (page 6); differently from the original crowding-distance-assignment used by NSGA-II, for each objective, we assign infinite crowding distance only to the individual that minimizes the fitness for the objective\[2\]. NSGA-II, instead, assigns infinite distance also to the individual that maximizes the fitness for the objective (Line 7 in Fig. 3). Our choice ensures that, when the Pareto front includes a number of individuals larger than the population size $s$, for each objective, we preserve the individual that minimizes the fitness value. When the Pareto front has a number of individuals lower than the population size $s$, our crowding-distance assignment ensures the selection of individuals that

\[1\] A solution to enable the adoption of MOSA would be to set a threshold to determine when the objective has been covered; however, since RCCs differ with respect to their radius, we choose to not introduce a threshold that may lead to varying performance results across RCCs.

\[2\] As in NSGA-II, if more than one individual has the same minimal fitness, NSGA-II' assigns infinite distance only to one, randomly selected individual.
minimize the fitness\(^3\), which is what we intend to preserve in the final population. However, it is unlikely to obtain a Pareto front with a number of individuals lower than the population size \(s\). Indeed, such situation may occur only when one individual has the same fitness value for several (i.e., \(z\), with \(z \leq q\)) objectives. This may occur when one of the following unlikely scenarios occur:

- one image has the lowest \(RCC_{distance}\) and no other individual falls in the cases covered by the first three sub-functions in \(F_2^{C,t}\), for the same \(z\) objectives;
- one image has the lowest \(ChromosomeDistance(i, P_C^C[t])\) for \(z\) reference images and no other individual falls in the cases covered by the first two sub-functions in \(F_2^{C,t}\), for the same \(z\) objectives;
- one image has the lowest \(F_{uncertainty}(i)\) and no other individual falls in the cases covered by the first sub-function in \(F_2^{C,t}\), for the same \(z\) objectives;
- one image is error-inducing and has the lowest \(ChromosomeDistance(i, P_C^C[t])\), for the same \(z\) objectives.

We apply \(NSGA-II'\) for \(k\) iterations; after the \(k\)-th iteration of \(NSGA-II'\), SEDE generates a population of individuals that likely lead to a DNN error, which we refer to as \(P_2^C\).

### 3.1.3 Step 2.3 - Generate one safe image for each unsafe image.

We aim to generate a set of images that are similar to the unsafe images in \(P_2^C\) but do not lead to a DNN error. As for the previous case, we model our problem as a many-objective optimization problem with \(q\) objectives, where \(q\) is the number of images in \(P_2^C\); for each image in \(P_2^C\), we aim to generate an image that is close to it and makes the DNN pass. We rely on the same \(NSGA-II'\) configuration used for Step 2.2 except for the fitness function, which in this step needs to be adapted to drive the generation of safe images; also, it is not necessary for these generated images to belong to \(RCC_{C}\) (indeed, we may not have any safe image within \(RCC_{C}\)). In Step 2.3, \(NSGA-II'\) evolves a population \(P_3^C\) that initially matches \(P_2^C\).

As for Step 2.2, we define \(q\) fitness functions, one for each image in \(P_2^C\); these functions share the same parameterized formula, for \(t \in [1, \ldots, q]\):

\[
F_3^{C,t}(i) = \begin{cases} 
ChromosomeDistance(i, P_C^C[t]) & \text{if } (CLOSEST(i, P_C^C) = P_C^C[t]) \wedge (DNN_{correct}(i)) \\
1 + \text{entropy}(i) + |1 - RCC_{distance}(RCC_C, i)| & \text{if } (CLOSEST(i, P_C^C) = P_C^C[t]) \wedge (DNN_{error}(i)) \\
2 + ChromosomeDistance(i, P_C^C[t]) & \text{if } CLOSEST(i, P_C^C[t]) \neq P_C^C[t] 
\end{cases}
\]

The third sub-formula in \(F_3^{C,t}\) matches the third formula in \(F_2^{C,t}\) and aims to generate one image close to each unsafe image in \(P_2\).

The definition of the second sub-formula in \(F_3^{C,t}\) has been driven by the fact that, since the initial population is \(P_2^C\), all the images in the population initially cause a DNN error and, therefore, the fitness should drive the search algorithm to find a close image leading to a correct result. To find a close image leading to a correct result we should look for images that either increase the confidence of the DNN result (i.e., leading to a lower entropy) or are close to the border of the RCC. Concerning the latter, since a RCC characterizes unsafe images, we expect that images next to its border are similar to the ones in the RCC but are less likely to be error inducing. In addition, moving further away from the border is expected to lead to images that are increasingly different from the images in the RCC. Such observations are captured by the second sub-formula in \(F_3^{C,t}\), which computes

\(^3\)They are likely unsafe since we give maximal distance only to the best individuals, not the worst.
the absolute difference between one and \(RCC_{\text{distance}}\) (i.e., how close the image is to the RCC border). Such difference is added to \(\text{entropy}(i)\) to help generate safe images.

The codomains of the second and the third sub-formula overlap as the former may return a fitness value above 3; this choice reflects the fact that an image being far away from the RCC border (i.e., when \(|1 - RCC_{\text{distance}}(C, i)| > 1\)) is unlikely to provide useful information (i.e., it is not helpful to derive rules that characterize safe images that are not similar to the ones in the RCC). Therefore, such image would be as useless as an image that is not close to the target image (i.e., \(P^C_2[i]\)). Also, if the DNN is highly uncertain about an image \(i\) (i.e., \(\text{entropy}(i)\) is close to 1), it is unlikely for that image to help driving the algorithm towards a correct result. For the reasons above, the result of the second sub-formula falls into the codomain of the third sub-formula when the sum \(\text{entropy}(i) + |1 - RCC_{\text{distance}}(RCC_C, i)|\) is above two.

The first sub-formula in \(P^C_3[t]\), in the presence of images leading to correct DNN results, aims to minimize the distance from the \(t\)-th image; therefore, it returns the chromosome distance between the individual \(i\) and the target image \(P^C_2[t]\).

The algorithm NSGA-II* terminates after \(k\) iterations with a population \(P^C_2\) including images that are likely safe and close to the images in \(P^C_2\).

### 3.2 Step 3. Characterize unsafe images

In Step 3, we aim to generate an expression that characterizes unsafe images by using PART, to learn decision rules. For example, we could learn that images likely lead to a DNN error when the parameters \(\text{HeadPose}_x\) and \(\text{HeadPose}_y\) are together above 10 and 50, respectively.

PART generates as output a list of mutually exclusive rules (see Section 2.5) that predict the class of a data point; in our context, these rules predict the DNN output generated for an image (i.e., error or correct output) based on the values of the simulator parameters used to generate the image.

Since in Step 2, for each RCC, SEDE generated a set of likely unsafe \((P^C_2)\) and safe \((P^C_3)\) images, associated with simulator parameters, to learn decision rules with PART, SEDE selects from \(P^C_2\) all the images that belong to the RCC and are failing, and all the images from \(P^C_3\) that are not failing.

To generate an expression from the PART output (hereafter, referred to as \(\text{PART expression}\)), we implemented a procedure that, for all the rules leading to a DNN error, generates a subexpression that joins the negation of all the preceding rules with the current rule. The generated subexpressions are mutually exclusive. For the example in Fig. 4, it leads to the following expression:

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{HeadPose}_y > 50.34) \parallel \\
(\neg(\text{HeadPose}_y > 50.34) & \land \neg(\text{HeadPose}_y < 13.34)) \parallel \\
& (\text{HeadPose}_z > 60 \land \text{HeadPose}_y > 30) \parallel \\
(\neg(\text{HeadPose}_y > 50.34) & \land \neg(\text{HeadPose}_y < 13.34)) \parallel \\
& \neg(\text{HeadPose}_z > 60 \land \text{HeadPose}_y > 30) \parallel \\
& \neg(\text{HeadPose}_z <= 60)
\end{align*}
\]

\((13)\)

Indeed, for Line 1 in Fig. 4, SEDE simply reports the expression generated by PART (there are no preceeding expressions), which leads to “\(\text{HeadPose}_y > 50.34\)”. For Line 2, SEDE does not generate any subexpression because it concerns cases in which the DNN generates a correct output; the same happens for Line 4. For Line 3, SEDE negates the preceding expressions (i.e., “\(\text{HeadPose}_y > 50.34\)” and “\(\text{HeadPose}_y < 13.34\)” and joins them with the PART expression of Line 3 (i.e., “\(\text{HeadPose}_z > 60 \land \text{HeadPose}_y > 30\)”). For Line 5, SEDE simply generates a subexpression joining the negation of all the preceding expressions.

Unfortunately, PART does not generate expressions for parameters whose range is shared by the two classes under consideration (i.e., DNN error and DNN correct). For example, the PART
output in Fig. 4 does not include an expression with “HeadPose$_X > 10$”, which indicates that the head is looking top because this characteristic is observed in both safe and unsafe images. Such commonalities, however, might be important to characterize unsafe inputs; indeed, in our example, if the RCC includes images looking top, safe images close to the generated unsafe images will be likely to be looking top. To address this issue, SEDE joins the PART expression with an expression that constrains the parameters not appearing in the PART expression. For the example above, it joins the expression “HeadPose$_X > 10$” with the PART expression in Equation 13, thus leading to:

\[
\text{HeadPose}_X > 10 \& \\
((\text{HeadPose}_Y > 50.34) \ || \\
(\neg (\text{HeadPose}_Y > 50.34) \& \neg (\text{HeadPose}_Y < 13.34) \\
\& (\text{HeadPose}_Z > 60 \& \text{HeadPose}_Y > 30)) \ || \\
(\neg (\text{HeadPose}_Y > 50.34) \& \neg (\text{HeadPose}_Y < 13.34) \\
\& \neg (\text{HeadPose}_Z > 60 \& \text{HeadPose}_Y > 30) \\
\& \neg (\text{HeadPose}_Z \leq 60)))
\]

(14)

### 3.3 Step 4. Generate unsafe images for retraining

In Step 4, for each RCC, SEDE automatically generates a set $U$ of unsafe images by relying on the simulator. Thanks to the simulator, these images can indeed be automatically labeled and, consequently, can be used to retrain the DNN. We refer to this set of images as the **unsafe improvement set**. More precisely, we aim to train a new DNN model by relying on an extended training set that consists of a portion of the training set used to train the DNN under analysis and the unsafe improvement set. The retraining process is configured as a fine-tuning process where the weights of the DNN to be trained are initially set to be equal to the weights of the DNN under analysis. Our rationale is that by retraining the DNN with an additional set of images belonging to the unsafe portion of the input space, we enable the DNN to better learn how to provide correct results for such inputs.

To avoid losing information derived from the original training process, the extended training set consists of $S\%$ of the simulator images and $R\%$ of the real-world images belonging to the original training set. We suggest to configure $S$ and $R$ such that the number of simulator images is not overwhelmingly larger than the number of real-world images (e.g., twice the number of real-world images, at most). More precisely, we suggest to limit the number of simulator images because they may overly influence the DNN with characteristics that are not present in real-world images (e.g., faces with regular shapes); nevertheless, we suggest to keep a representative set of simulator-based images (e.g., 5%) because they may include a number of scenarios (in our case studies, head positions) not covered by real-world images. For real-world images, since they are generally low in number, we suggest to keep most or all of them to prevent the risk of losing any image that captures an under-represented scenario. For our experiments, we set $S=5\%$ and $R=100\%$ (see Section 4.6) We leave to future work the identification of a solution for the automated selection of the best configuration for $S$ and $R$ (e.g., by selecting the DNN with the best accuracy among the ones generated by repeating the retraining process with different values for $S$ and $R$).

The accuracy of the DNN training process may depend on a wide range of factors, including the specific simulator images selected from the original training set, the images belonging to the unsafe improvement set, and other random factors (e.g., the order of images in the training batches). For this reason, SEDE repeats the retraining process (i.e., generate unsafe images in $U$ for each RCC and retrain the DNN) multiple times and keeps the DNN that provides the best result. Though
repeating the training process increases the training cost (e.g., buying additional GPU time in Cloud systems), such costs are largely justified by the benefits (i.e., obtain a more accurate DNN).

4 EMPIRICAL EVALUATION

Our empirical evaluation aims to address the following research questions:

RQ1 Does PaiR generate a more diverse set of images compared to NSGA-II? Diversity is essential to enable the characterization of RCCs and, to that end, SEDE integrates a dedicated genetic algorithm (PaiR) whose performance is evaluated by this RQ and compared to NSGA-II in terms of image diversity within clusters.

RQ2 Does SEDE generate simulator images that are close to the center of each RCC? The generation of images belonging to a RCC is a necessary step to generate expressions that characterize the RCC. Since there is no guarantee of generating, using simulators, images that are similar to real-world images, this research question evaluates if the images generated by SEDE are closer to the center (medoid) of a cluster than random simulated, unsafe images.

RQ3 Does SEDE generate, for each RCC, a set of images sharing similar characteristics? To successfully characterize RCCs with PART, it is necessary, for each RCC, to rely on a set of images presenting similar characteristics while preserving diversity regarding other aspects. In other words, the generated images shall present similar values for a subset of the simulator parameters while being diverse regarding the other parameters.

RQ4 Do the RCC expressions identified by SEDE delimit an unsafe space? This research question aims to determine if the analyzed DNN under-performs when processing images matching RCC expressions. In other words, is the DNN accuracy significantly lower for such images, as expected, than for random images from the whole input space?

RQ5 How does SEDE compare to traditional DNN accuracy improvement practices? This research question evaluates the effectiveness of SEDE (Step 4), in terms of accuracy improvements, compared to HUDD and a baseline consisting of randomly generated images for each RCC (namely, random baseline)

4.1 Subject Systems

We consider DNNs that implement head pose detection and face landmarks detection. They are building blocks for in-car monitoring systems (e.g., driver’s drowsiness detection) under study at IEE Sensing, our industry partner.

The head pose detection DNN (HPD) receives as input the cropped image of the head of a person and determines its pose according to nine classes (straight, turned bottom-left, turned left, turned top-left, turned bottom-right, turned right, turned top-right, reclined, looking up).

The facial landmarks detection DNN (FLD) determines the location of the pixels corresponding to 27 face landmarks delimiting seven face elements: nose ridge, left eye, right eye, left brow, right brow, nose, mouth. Several face landmarks match each face element (e.g., there are four landmarks to outline a mouth). The accuracy of this regression DNN is computed as the percentage of images with landmarks being accurately predicted. For each landmark, we compute the prediction error as the euclidean distance between the predicted and correct landmark pixel on the input image; an image is considered accurately predicted if the average error is below 4 pixels, as suggested by IEE engineers.

Our DNNs have been trained with simulator images, fine-tuned with real-world images, and tested with real-world images, following the process in Fig. 6. For our experiments we relied on two different simulators developed by IEE and based on the 3D simulation of MakeHuman [6] and MBLab [34] using rendering engine Blender [4]. The first simulator is called IEE-Faces, it relies...
Table 1. IEE-Faces simulator parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camera Direction</td>
<td>Direction of scenario camera (X, Y, Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera Location</td>
<td>Location of scenario camera (X, Y, Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamp Location</td>
<td>Location of scenario lamp source (X, Y, Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HeadPoseX</td>
<td>Vertical position of the head (degrees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HeadPoseY</td>
<td>Horizontal position of the head (degrees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HeadPoseZ</td>
<td>Tilting position of the head (degrees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makehuman Model</td>
<td>Preset makehuman face model (9 face models)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. IEE-Humans simulator parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamp Location</td>
<td>Location of scenario lamp source (X, Y, Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamp Direction</td>
<td>Direction of scenario lamp source (X, Y, Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamp Color</td>
<td>Color of scenario lamp source (R, G, B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera Height</td>
<td>Height of scenario camera (pixels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HeadPoseX</td>
<td>Vertical position of the head (degrees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HeadPoseY</td>
<td>Horizontal position of the head (degrees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HeadPoseZ</td>
<td>Tilting position of the head (degrees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age of the generated humanoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Gender of the generated humanoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris Size</td>
<td>Size of the humanoid iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Size</td>
<td>Size of the humanoid pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Saturation</td>
<td>Level of the humanoid eye saturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Color</td>
<td>Color of the humanoid eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Value</td>
<td>Controls the lightness level of iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin Freckles</td>
<td>Amount of procedural freckles added to the skin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin Oil</td>
<td>Brightness of subtle oil effect on the skin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin Veins</td>
<td>Amount of procedural veins added to the skin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

on seven preset MakeHuman models of human faces developed by IEE; it provides 13 parameters that enable controlling different characteristics of the image such as illumination angle and head orientation. Table 1 provides a description of all the parameters of IEE-Faces. IEE-Faces generates one image in 20 seconds, on the hardware used for our experiments. The second simulator is called IEE-Humans and it generates images that are more realistic (i.e., have more details) than the ones generated by IEE-Faces. IEE-Humans provides 23 different configuration parameters, they are described in Table 2. It takes 100 seconds to generate an image.

We trained three DNNs in total, two HPD DNNs and one FLD DNN. One HPD DNN (hereafter, HPD-F) has been trained using IEE-Faces and another one (hereafter, HPD-H) using IEE-Humans. The FLD DNN has been trained using IEE-Faces.

To fine-tune and test the HPD DNNs we relied on the BIWI real-world dataset [12], which contains over 15,000 pictures of 20 people faces (6 females and 14 males) annotated with head pose angle. People were recorded sitting in front of a Kinect [35], which is a motion sensor add-on for the Xbox 360 gaming console, and were asked to turn their head around trying to span all possible yaw/pitch angles they could perform. For each image, the head pose angle is computed using FaceShift [17]. For our experiments, we automatically labeled each image with a head pose class derived from the provided angles; we considered 1,000 close-up pictures— similar to what can be obtained with in-car, DNN-based sensors— belonging to two persons where one is used for training and the other one for testing, to mimic a realistic situation. To fine-tune and test the FLD DNN, since we require landmarks accurately annotated, we relied on a dataset provided by IEE.
Table 3. Case Study Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DNN</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Simulator</th>
<th>Real-world</th>
<th>Simulator-based Training Set Size (Accuracy)</th>
<th>Test Set Size (Accuracy)</th>
<th>Epochs</th>
<th>Fine-tuning Training Set Size (Accuracy)</th>
<th>Simulator-based Test Set Size (Accuracy)</th>
<th>Real-world Test Set Size (Accuracy)</th>
<th>Epochs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLD</td>
<td>IEE-Faces</td>
<td>IEE</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,000 (99.92%)</td>
<td>2,750 (44.41%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9,000 (95.44%)</td>
<td>2,825 (43.22%)</td>
<td>1,000 (80.06%)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPD-F</td>
<td>IEE-Faces</td>
<td>BIWI</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,500 (91.20%)</td>
<td>2,750 (85.43%)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21,976 (95.35%)</td>
<td>2,200 (87.10%)</td>
<td>500 (51.65%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPD-H</td>
<td>IEE-Humans</td>
<td>BIWI</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,400 (85.38%)</td>
<td>3,000 (80.21%)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18,476 (90.23%)</td>
<td>1,000 (85.23%)</td>
<td>500 (51.03%)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. SEDE Configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Number of iterations</th>
<th>Avg. Execution Time (hrs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 provides the number of images used to fine-tune the DNNs along with the obtained accuracy (i.e., the percentage of images for which the DNN provides correct results). Column *Data Source* provides the names of both the simulator and the real-world dataset used to train and fine-tune the DNNs. The columns under *Simulator-based Training* and *Fine-tuning* provide details about the size (i.e., number of images) of the training and test sets used in those phases along with the accuracy of the DNN. The data set used for training the fine-tuned DNNs (FLD, HPD-F, HPD-H) consists of simulator images (3,000 for FLD, 21,500 for HPD-F, 18,000 for HPD-H) and real-world images (6,000 for FLD, 476 for HPD-F, 476 for HPD-H).

Column *Epochs* reports the number of epochs considered to train the DNNs; all the DNNs have been trained for a number of epochs sufficient to achieve an accuracy above 90% with a training set of simulator and real-world images.

All the DNNs were implemented with PyTorch [44]. HPD follows the AlexNet architecture [31] which is commonly used for image classification tasks, while FLD follows the Hourglass architecture [40], which is optimized for landmarks detection (regression tasks).

In SEDE Step 1, for each case study DNN, we process all the error-inducing images of the case study with HUDD to generate RCCs. HUDD’s execution led to 10 RCCs for HPD-F DNN, 11 RCCs for HPD-H DNN, and 10 RCCs for FLD DNN.

Table 4 provides further information about the configuration of SEDE.

4.2 RQ1. Does PaiR generate a more diverse set of images compared to NSGA-II?

4.2.1 Experiment Design. We aim to demonstrate that PaiR, our dedicated algorithm to derive a diverse image population belonging to a RCC, performs better than NSGA-II. We choose NSGA-II as a baseline for comparison since its crowding distance function is designed to preserve and optimize the diversity between individuals by prioritizing individuals being more distant from others, along with individuals at the boundaries of the objective space. To this end, we measure the diversity in the populations generated by the two algorithms over time, and determine the best algorithm leading to a more diverse population quicker.
We configured NSGA-II with an objective function (see Equation 15) that drives the generation of individuals belonging to the RCC through their normalized distance from the cluster’s medoid, as for PaiR (see Equation 5).

\[ F^C(i) = RCC_{distance}(C, i) \]  

Equation 15

For both NSGA-II and PaiR, to measure the diversity of the population, since every individual is represented by a vector with the simulator parameter values used to generated the image (chromosome), we compute the average of the chromosome distance across pairs of individuals in the population. Individuals that do not belong to a cluster are ignored from the computation of diversity; indeed, an individual not belonging to any cluster may increase diversity but it would not be useful for SEDE.

We configured PaiR and NSGA-II with the same time budget; precisely, we let NSGA-II execute for the duration required by our algorithm to perform 100 iterations. It amounts to 40 hours for HPD-F and FLD, 200 hours for HPD-H; differences are due to the time taken by the simulators to generate a single image. We executed PaiR and NSGA-II for all the 31 RCCs identified for our case study DNNs. To account for randomness, we ran the experiment four different times for each root-cause cluster. With a total of 31 RCCs, the four experiment runs enabled us to collect 124 data points, which are sufficient to draw statistical conclusions within a practical execution time.

To compare the increase in diversity achieved over time by the two algorithms, for each RCC, we recorded the diversity achieved by the two algorithms every hour. Also, we tracked the percentage of individuals belonging to any RCC—a larger number of such individuals should lead to better results in later stages of SEDE—and the percentage of covered clusters (i.e., RCCs with at least one individual belonging to them).

PaiR performs better than NSGA-II if, over time, the following conditions hold: (1) the diversity achieved by PaiR is significantly higher than the diversity achieved by NSGA-II, which would indicate that PaiR fits better our purpose (i.e., generating a diverse population of individuals); (2) PaiR generates a larger proportion of individuals belonging to any RCC, which is useful to characterize RCCs since PART rules can be expected to be more accurate if a larger set of data points is considered; (3) PaiR covers a larger number of RCCs (i.e., PaiR generates at least one image belonging to each cluster), thus enabling the characterization of a larger number of RCCs in later SEDE steps.

4.2.2 Results. Fig. 9 shows the evolution of diversity obtained with PaiR and NSGA-II for our case study DNNs. To simplify visual comparisons, we plot the average, minimum, and maximum diversity observed at each timestamp (i.e., every hour); data points are diversity values observed across the four executed runs for all RCCs.

In Fig. 9, we can observe that, in the first 10 hours of execution, both PaiR and NSGA-II present a sharp peak for both average and maximum diversity. This is mainly due to the fact that in the first hours of execution the two algorithms generate a limited number of images belonging to each RCC (see Fig. 10) which are likely to be diverse regardless of the generation strategy. After 10 hours of execution and the initial peak, for PaiR, we can observe an up-trend in average diversity reaching 0.0218, 0.152, and 0.237 for HPD-F, HPD-H, and FLD, respectively. In contrast, NSGA-II presents an average diversity that keeps decreasing till 15 hours (HPD-F), 50 hours (HPD-H), and 20 hours (FLD), and then stabilizes around 0.0035, 0.00389, and 0.004, at much lower levels than PaiR.

Tables 5, 6, and 7 report statistics about the diversity obtained for all RCCs, for both PaiR and NSGA-II. To compare the two techniques, we also provide the Vargha and Delaney’s $\hat{A}_{12}$ effect size and p-values resulting from a non-parametric Mann-Whitney U-test, where each individual observation is the diversity for one RCC in one of the four runs. PaiR achieves a significantly higher
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Fig. 9. Evolution of diversity achieved by PaiR (left) compared to NSGA-II (right) for HPD-F (top), HPD-H (middle), and FLD (bottom) DNNs

diversity (i.e., $p$-value < 0.05) compared to NSGA-II in all subjects and for all but two timestamps. For HPD-F, between 10 and 15 hours of execution, PaiR performs similarly to NSGA-II. However, with a time budget of 20 hours PaiR outperforms NSGA-II with a large effect size (i.e., $>0.64$); given the safety-critical contexts in which the DNN under analysis should be adopted, we believe that a budget of 20 hours to be acceptable for DNN analysis.

Fig. 10 shows the average, minimum, and maximum percentage of individuals belonging to each RCC under analysis observed at each timestamp over the four executed runs. For both PaiR and NSGA-II, the number of individuals belonging to any RCC increases over time, though this trend is much steeper for PaiR. Indeed, on average, a larger proportion of the individuals generated by PaiR...
Table 5. RQ1: Statistical significance test for HPD-F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (hrs.)</th>
<th>Avg. diversity across RCCs</th>
<th>p-value (U-test)</th>
<th>Effect Size ((\hat{A}_{12}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PaiR</td>
<td>NSGA-II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>0.0450</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>0.0147</td>
<td>0.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0116</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0156</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.0176</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.0182</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.0218</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. RQ1: Statistical significance test for HPD-H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (hrs.)</th>
<th>Avg. diversity across RCCs</th>
<th>p-value (U-test)</th>
<th>Effect Size ((\hat{A}_{12}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PaiR</td>
<td>NSGA-II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0343</td>
<td>0.0282</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0283</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0197</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
<td>0.0059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0267</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0269</td>
<td>0.0097</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.0542</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
<td>5e-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.0685</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td>15e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0891</td>
<td>0.0040</td>
<td>5.34e-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
<td>4.07e-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.1181</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
<td>5.34e-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.1372</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
<td>4.07e-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.1529</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
<td>4.07e-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. RQ1: Statistical significance test for FLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (hrs.)</th>
<th>Avg. diversity across RCCs</th>
<th>p-value (U-test)</th>
<th>Effect Size ((\hat{A}_{12}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PaiR</td>
<td>NSGA-II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.1138</td>
<td>4e-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.0342</td>
<td>2e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
<td>2e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>2e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
<td>2e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>2e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.0063</td>
<td>2e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>2e-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

belongs to a RCC for a given execution time. This should result in better supporting the generation of PART rules at later stages of SEDE.

Tables 8, 9, and 10 report statistics about the percentage of individuals belonging to any RCC, for PaiR and NSGA-II. We report the \(\hat{A}_{12}\) statistics and p-values resulting from a non-parametric Mann-Whitney U-test, where each observation is the percentage of individuals belonging to one cluster in one of the four runs. PaiR achieves a significantly higher number of individuals belonging
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Fig. 10. Percentage of individuals belonging to a cluster generated by PaiR (left) compared to NSGA-II (right) for HPD-F (top), HPD-H (middle) and FLD (bottom) DNNs

Fig. 11 shows the percentage of clusters covered by PaiR and NSGA-II, for all subjects. PaiR is capable of covering (i.e., generating representative images of) a larger number of RCCs: 7 out of 10 RCCs (70.0%) for HPD-F, 11 out of 11 RCCs (100.0%) for HPD-H, 9 out of 10 RCCs (90.0%) for FLD. NSGA-II, instead, generates images belonging to only 4 out of 10 RCCs (40.0%) for HPD-F, 10 out of 11 RCCs (90.9%) for HPD-H, and 9 out of 10 RCCs (90.0%) for FLD. Since the cases in which PaiR does not cover all the clusters are the ones involving a simulator with a lower number of RCCs (i.e., *p*-value < 0.05) compared to NSGA-II, for all subjects and timestamps except one. For HPD-F, around 10 hours of execution, PaiR performs similarly to NSGA-II. However, with a time budget of 25 hours PaiR significantly outperforms NSGA-II, with a large effect size (i.e., > 0.64).
configuration parameters (i.e., HPD-F and FLD), we believe that our imperfect results are due to our limited control of the simulator in use. However, PaiR still performs better than NSGA-II, thus showing that it can better leverage the capabilities of the simulator. We conclude that PaiR is a better choice than NSGA-II since it helps explain a larger number of RCCs.

To summarize, our results demonstrate that the adoption of PaiR is an appropriate choice in our context; indeed, (1) it can generate images for a larger number of RCCs than NSGA-II, (2) most of the images it generates belong to a RCC, and, (3) these images have a much higher diversity than those generated by NSGA-II.

In the rest of our evaluation, we ignore the clusters for which PaiR was not able to identify representative images (Step 2.1), as described above. Also, we ignore one cluster for which SEDE did not identify unsafe images (Step 2.2), possibly because the hazard-triggering event is the presence of jewelry, which is not generated by our simulator. In total, we ignore three clusters in the case of HPD-F, and one cluster for HPD-H and FLD.
Fig. 11. Percentage of covered clusters (with at least one individual generated) for PaiR and NSGA-II for HPD-F, HPD-H and FLD DNNs

4.3 RQ2. Does SEDE generate simulator images that are close to the center of each RCC?

4.3.1 Experiment Design. This research question evaluates whether the images generated by SEDE for each RCC are closer to the medoid of the RCC than random failing images. Otherwise, we cannot claim that SEDE contributes to generating images that help characterize the RCC.

To measure the distance of an image from the RCC medoid we once again rely on the heatmap distance between the RCC medoid and the image (see Equation 2).

For each RCC, we compute the distance between the RCC medoid and every image generated by SEDE to characterize the RCC in Step 2.1. Also, we compute the distance of the unsafe images in the simulator-based test set (i.e., random failing images) from the RCC medoid. To positively answer our research question, for each RCC, the average distance from the medoid to the images generated by SEDE should be significantly smaller than the average distance obtained with random unsafe simulated images, based on a non-parametric Mann-Whitney U-test.

4.3.2 Results. Fig. 12 shows boxplots reporting, for all RCCs across DNNs, the heatmap distances from RCC medoids, for images in the unsafe test set and those generated by SEDE for every RCC in Step 2.1. Fig. 12 shows that the images generated by SEDE (i.e., boxplots with IDs 1 to 26) are much closer to the RCC medoid than random unsafe images (i.e., boxplots with IDs UI-1 to UI-26). Indeed, with SEDE, the median lays in the ranges [0.056, 0.125] for HPD-F, [0.048, 0.113] for HPD-H, and [18.6, 64.3] for FLD. For random unsafe images, the median tends to be much higher and lays in the ranges [0.38, 0.48] for HPD-F, [0.08, 0.24] for HPD-H, and [42.0, 73.6] for FLD.
Fig. 12. Heatmap distances of SEDE images from the medoid of HPD-F (top), HPD-H (middle) and FLD (bottom) RCCs compared to unsafe test set images (UI)
Table 11. RQ2: Statistical significance test for HPD-F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCC</th>
<th>Avg. distance from medoid</th>
<th>p-value (U-test)</th>
<th>Effect Size ($\hat{A}_{12}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEDE Images</td>
<td>Unsafe Images</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>5.1e-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>4.5e-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>7.1e-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>2.1e-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>6.4e-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>1.4e-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>5.4e-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. RQ2: Statistical significance test for HPD-H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCC</th>
<th>Avg. distance from medoid</th>
<th>p-value (U-test)</th>
<th>Effect Size ($\hat{A}_{12}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEDE Images</td>
<td>Unsafe Images</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>1.5e-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>3.4e-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>1.4e-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>5.6e-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>4.8e-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>3.3e-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>1.1e-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>2.2e-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>7e-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.00543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. RQ2: Statistical significance test for FLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCC</th>
<th>Avg. distance from medoid</th>
<th>p-value (U-test)</th>
<th>Effect Size ($\hat{A}_{12}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEDE Images</td>
<td>Unsafe Images</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>46.28</td>
<td>1.7e-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>41.90</td>
<td>2.6e-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.17</td>
<td>56.84</td>
<td>4e-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.95</td>
<td>49.99</td>
<td>1.2e-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>49.99</td>
<td>57.64</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.63</td>
<td>48.03</td>
<td>3e-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>51.10</td>
<td>58.63</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.45</td>
<td>72.75</td>
<td>5e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>4e-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 11 to 13 provide, for each RCC across DNNs, the average distance of SEDE images and random unsafe images, along with p-values and effect size.

On average, SEDE images are closer to the medoid of the clusters by 80.7% for HPD-F, 54.6% for HPD-H and 24.9% for FLD. These differences with unsafe test set images are always statistically significant ($p$-value $< 0.05$) with a large effect size above 0.64.
4.4 RQ3. Does SEDE generate, for each RCC, a set of images sharing similar characteristics?

4.4.1 Experiment Design. This research question assesses if the images generated by SEDE for each RCC, present similar characteristics (i.e., similar values for a subset of the simulator parameters). If this is true, for each RCC, we should observe a subset of parameters with a variance that is significantly lower than the variance observed in randomly generated images. For each RCC, instead of comparing the variance of each parameter \( p \), which depends on the parameter range, we can compare the variance reduction rate (VRR), which can be computed as the ratio of the variance for a parameter \( p \) for a given RCC \( C_i \) over that of a set of randomly generated images:

\[
\text{VRR}_{C_i}(p) = 1 - \frac{\text{variance of } p \text{ for the images in } C_i}{\text{variance of } p \text{ for a set of random images}}
\]

For a parameter, a positive VRR indicates that its values are likely to be constrained to a smaller range than the one of the input domain. A 50% VRR means that the observed range is reduced by 50%, which is considered to be a high reduction rate [11].

For each RCC, we compute VRR for each parameter. We positively answer our research question if, for a large number of RCCs, a subset of parameters present a large VRR (> 0.5).

4.4.2 Results. Fig. 13 provides boxplots capturing the distribution of the variance reduction for each of the 26 RCCs. Each data point in a boxplot captures the variance reduction of one parameter.

![Boxplots showing variance reduction rate for each RCC](image)

Fig. 13. Variance reduction for all simulator parameters associated with generated images in the root-cause clusters of HPD-F (boxplots 1 to 7), HPD-H (boxplots 8 to 17), and FLD (boxplots 18 to 26) DNNs

Fig. 13 shows that for all the RCCs except boxplot 17, the top whisker is above 0.8; since the top whisker reports the max value (excluding outliers4) observed for a parameter, such result indicates that for all RCCs except one, we can observe at least one parameter with a high variance reduction, thus enabling us to positively answer our research question. Also, for 20 out of 26 clusters, the third quartile is above 0.5. Since it indicates the lowest value for the 25% data points having the highest variance reduction, it means that in 20 RCCs, 25% of the parameters present a variance reduction rate above 0.5. Therefore, for a large proportion of RCCs (77%), more than one parameter present a

---

4In our boxplots, 
upperwhisker = min(max(x), Q3 + 1.5 * IQR), 
lowerwhisker = max(min(x), Q1 - 1.5 * IQR), 
with IQR being the Inter Quartile Range and Qx the x-th quantile.
large variance reduction, which indicates that the hazard-triggering event is captured by several parameters (i.e., a specific combination of parameter values is needed to make the DNN fail).

4.5 RQ4. Do the RCC expressions identified by SEDE delimit an unsafe space?

4.5.1 Experiment Design. For each RCC, SEDE provides a set of expressions representing conjunctions of parameter ranges that characterize the unsafe images in the RCC. This research question evaluates if these expressions actually characterize an unsafe space, which implies that images whose parameters match such an expression are more likely to trigger a DNN error than those that don’t.

To address this research question, for each RCC, we generated 500 images matching the RCC expression and computed the DNN accuracy obtained with these images. To generate each image, for each simulator parameter, we select a random value in the range provided in the expression. Also, we consider a random input set consisting of 500 images selected from the randomly generated simulator image used to test the fine-tuned DNN (see column Simulator-based Test Set in Table 3).

We can positively answer our research question if, for a large subset of RCCs, the images generated from RCC expressions lead to a significantly lower DNN accuracy than randomly generated images, for each RCC. Since, for each RCC, we compare two image groups (i.e., 500 random images and 500 images generated by SEDE) labeled with a categorical variable (i.e., indicating if the DNN produces a correct output), we rely on the Fisher’s exact test to assess differences in proportions of images leading to DNN errors.

4.5.2 Results. Fig. 14 provides boxplots capturing the accuracy obtained with the random test set images and those generated according to RCC expressions. Each data point in the SEDE images boxplots corresponds to the DNN accuracy of one of the 26 RCC expressions. The accuracy observed with the random test sets for HPD-F, HPD-H and FLD DNNs is 87.0%, 85.2% and 43.2%, respectively. In contrast, the images generated according to RCC expressions lead to much lower accuracy in the ranges [6.2%, 79.8%], [34.0%, 66.6%] and [2.0%, 39.2%], for HPD-F, HPD-H and FLD, respectively. Moreover, for 25 out of 26 clusters, SEDE generates images leading to an accuracy that, based on a Fisher’s exact tests (see Tables 14, 15, and 16), significantly differs from the accuracy obtained with random images. Since in 25 out of 26 RCCs (96.15%) the RCC expressions generated by SEDE clearly delimit an unsafe space, we can positively answer RQ4.

4.6 RQ5. How does SEDE compare to traditional DNN accuracy improvement practices?

4.6.1 Experiment Design. This research question aims to determine if SEDE performs better than state-of-the-art solutions. We compare SEDE with HUDD since it is the only approach that works
Fig. 14. Percentage of correctly classified images observed on SEDE images compared to the random test set images for HPD-F, HPD-H and FLD DNNs

Table 15. RQ4: Statistical significance test for HPD-H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCC</th>
<th>DNN Accuracy</th>
<th>p-value (Fisher’s Exact)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEDE Unsafe Set</td>
<td>Random Input Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>1e-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>4e-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>7e-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>5e-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>1e-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>2e-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with real-world images and addresses both root cause explanations and retraining (see Section 5). Furthermore, we consider a baseline approach which consists of retraining the DNN with an additional set of randomly generated images.
Simulator-based explanation and debugging of hazard-triggering events in DNN-based safety-critical systems

Table 16. RQ4: Statistical significance test for FLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCC</th>
<th>DNN Accuracy</th>
<th>p-value (Fisher’s Exact)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEDE Unsafe Set</td>
<td>Random Input Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>4e-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>9e-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>4e-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>4e-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>4e-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>2e-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2e-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding SEDE, we followed the procedure described in Section 3.3. The third column of Table 17 provides the size of the training set considered to retrain each DNN; precisely, we report the total number of simulator images generated according to SEDE expressions (Unsafe Set), the number of simulator images retained from the simulator training set (Training Set Sim.) and the number of real-world images retained from the set used for fine-tuning (Training Set Real). For each RCC, we have generated, with SEDE, 50 images to be used for retraining. As anticipated in Section 3.3, we retained 5% of the images in the original simulator-based training set, and all the real-world images used to fine-tune the DNN.

In the case of HUDD, we applied its selection algorithm to sample, from an improvement set, 50 images for each RCC (HUDD selects the images that are closer to the RCC centroid). We generated an improvement set with random face images (i.e., generated by randomly selecting simulator parameter values). To avoid bias, we selected for each case study DNN the same number of images as that generated by SEDE (i.e., 50 images for each RCC), which led to a total of 450 images for FLD, 350 for HPD-F, and 500 for HPD-H.

Concerning the random baseline, for each case study DNN, we generated a retraining set consisting of a number of randomly generated simulator images and real-world images. To avoid unfair comparisons, the randomly generated images match in number the images selected by SEDE.

Further, for all the three approaches described above (i.e., SEDE, HUDD, and random baseline), we followed the SEDE retraining process, which consists of retraining the DNN for multiple times and selecting the DNN yielding the best test set accuracy. In our experiments, since each retraining task takes approximately three hours, we performed three retraining tasks since they can be performed overnight, which is acceptable in practice. For all the approaches, we constructed the retraining data set in the same way as SEDE. It consists of the images selected by the approach under analysis, a random selection of images from the original simulator-based training set (5% of the whole set), and all the real-world images used to fine-tune the DNN. To account for randomness, for each approach, we repeated the experiment ten times (i.e., for ten times, we selected the best DNN generated out of three runs). For each approach, we generate ten DNNs.

To positively answer our research questions, SEDE should lead to retrained DNNs with an accuracy that is significantly higher than the one observed when retraining the DNN using either HUDD or the random baseline.

4.6.2 Results. Columns five to seven (i.e., RBL, HUDD, and SEDE) in Table 17 show the average accuracy of the three approaches across ten runs along with the delta with respect to the original DNN model. Also, for SEDE, we report the delta with respect to the best competing approach (i.e.,
Table 17: RQ5: Unsafe set size and the accuracy improvement of SEDE compared to HUDD and random baseline (RBL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DNN</th>
<th>Original Model Accuracy</th>
<th>Retraining Set Size</th>
<th>RBL Training Set (Sim. + Real)</th>
<th>RBL Unsafe Set Size</th>
<th>HUDD Accuracy (Gain)</th>
<th>SEDE Accuracy (Gain)</th>
<th>Gain over best baseline</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Stat. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLD</td>
<td>80.06%</td>
<td>150 + 6,000</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>77.41% (-2.65%)</td>
<td>79.94% (-0.11%)</td>
<td>86.14% (+6.07%)</td>
<td>+6.19%</td>
<td>1e-4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPD-F</td>
<td>51.65%</td>
<td>1,075 + 476</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>44.33% (-7.32%)</td>
<td>45.80% (-5.85%)</td>
<td>56.15% (+4.50%)</td>
<td>+10.35%</td>
<td>4e-4</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPD-H</td>
<td>51.03%</td>
<td>900 + 476</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>55.57% (+4.54%)</td>
<td>60.65% (+9.62%)</td>
<td>69.68% (+18.65%)</td>
<td>+9.03%</td>
<td>1e-4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HUDD or random baseline). Finally, we report p-values using a non-parametric Mann–Whitney U-test, for statistical significance, and the $\hat{A}_{12}$ statistics, for effect size.

SEDE, on average, improves the DNN for FLD, HPD-F and HPD-H by +6.07%, +4.50% and +18.65%; the other two approaches, instead, do not improve the HPD-F and FLD DNNs but decrease their performance. For HPD-H, HUDD and the random baseline led to an improvement that is lower than SEDE’s, +9.62% and +4.54%, respectively. We believe that in the case of HPD-F and FLD, the retraining based on HUDD and random decrease the DNN performance because the simulator being used generates images that are less realistic; such characteristic leads to the generation of images that are unlikely to include hazard-triggering events and, in turn, the retraining set selected by HUDD and random is not likely to include unsafe images. Since the retraining is performed using (1) the images selected by the approach under analysis, (2) a subset of the original training set, and (3) the real world training set, safe cases will be over-represented in the training set. In general, unsafe images that are present in the original training set may not be retained for retraining.

Similar to the above, we believe that, since it is complicated for IEE-Faces to generate unsafe images, in the case of HPD-F and FLD, SEDE led to a more limited improvement in accuracy than in the case of HPD-H (i.e., +4.50% vs +18.65%).

Finally, SEDE, on average, improves the DNN results by 9 percentage points over the best competing approach (i.e., +6.19% for FLD, +10.35% for HPD-F, and +9.03% for HPD-H). The difference is always statistically significant (i.e., $p$-value < 0.05) with a large effect size.

Figure 15 shows boxplots with the accuracy of the DNNs retrained using SEDE, HUDD, and the random baseline. Each data point captures the accuracy obtained in one of the ten retraining runs. The boxplots of SEDE overlap with the boxplot of a competing approach only in one case (i.e., the max value for the random baseline), thus suggesting that SEDE performs significantly better with a strong effect size; indeed, competing approaches never lead to a better DNN than SEDE.

### 4.7 Threats to validity

#### 4.7.1 Internal validity

In our work, we rely on clusters to capture different root causes of a DNN error where the quality of clusters largely affect the characterization of an unsafe space. This threat is mitigated by empirical results demonstrating that HUDD clusters include images with similar characteristics [11].

#### 4.7.2 External validity

The selection of the case study DNNs and simulators may affect the generalizability of results. We alleviate this issue by selecting subject DNNs that implement classification and regressions tasks motivated by IEE business needs and addressing problems that are quite common in the automotive industry.
Moreover, we rely on two simulators that differ for their fidelity and number of configuration parameters. As we have seen, these characteristics affect the effectiveness of retraining and SEDE’s capacity to identify hazard-triggering events. We focus on DNNs processing human faces because they are the focus of our project partners at IEE; we did not consider DNNs performing other tasks (e.g., processing road images) because an industrial case study on that topic was not available for our project.

4.7.3 Conclusion validity. To avoid violating parametric assumptions in our statistical analysis, we rely on a non-parametric test and effect size measure (i.e., Mann Whitney U-test and the Vargha and Delaney’s $\hat{A}_{12}$ statistics, respectively) to evaluate the statistical and practical significance of differences in results. When comparing classification results (i.e., RQ4) we applied the Fisher’s exact test, which is commonly used in similar contexts.

Further, for RQ1, we executed the competing approaches for four runs, for each of the 31 RCCs under analysis, to account for randomness and eliminate bias. For RQ2 to RQ4, we compared the results obtained with a large number of images. For RQ2, we considered 25 SEDE images for each RCC and 5,470 unsafe test set images. For RQ3, we considered 650 SEDE images and 1,500 randomly generated images. For RQ4, we considered 500 SEDE images for each RCC and 1,500 random test set images. For RQ5, because of the stochastic nature of SEDE (e.g., DNN retraining), the experiments were executed over thirty runs.
4.7.4 **Construct validity.** In RQ1 we aim to evaluate if our approach achieves a higher diversity than a state-of-the-art approach. We rely on the chromosome distance computed for each pair of images generated for a RCC, which is based on the parameter values used to generate images with a simulator. By relying on simulator parameter values we can objectively measure diversity.

In RQ2 we evaluate if the images generated by SEDE are close to the medoid of the RCC under analysis. We rely on the heatmap distance since it is the distance metric adopted to generate RCCs.

For RQ3, since simulator parameters drive the selection of specific image characteristics (e.g., head direction), we rely on the variance reduction rate for parameter values to objectively assess the similarity across images belonging to a RCC; variance reduction has also been used to evaluate HUDD [11].

RQ4 evaluates if SEDE expressions are useful for delimiting an unsafe space. RQ5 evaluates the ability of SEDE to improve a DNN. For both, we relied on the accuracy metric (i.e., the percentage of correctly classified images), which is suggested also by safety standards as a mean to evaluate if DNNs can be used for safety-related tasks [25].

5 **RELATED WORK**

A number of tools supporting DNN explanation are available nowadays [21, 47]. However, for explanations concerning DNNs that process images, such frameworks boil down to generating one heatmap for every error-inducing input image; each heatmap shall be visually inspected by engineers, which makes the accurate investigation of several (e.g., 50) DNN errors highly expensive. Example frameworks are INNvestigate [23] and TorchRay [52]. The cost of the manual inspection of heatmaps is one of the problems addressed by HUDD [11], which groups together similar images thus simplifying the identification of the root causes of DNN errors; however, HUDD still requires domain experts capable of visually spotting the commonalities across images, which is no longer needed with SEDE.

Similarly to HUDD, MODE automatically identifies the images to be used to retrain a DNN [33]. However, it cannot identify the root causes of DNN errors; further, it cannot automatically generate the images to be used for retraining, which is instead achieved by SEDE. Like HUDD, MODE’s effectiveness remains limited by the availability of an improvement set including unsafe images. Finally, a reusable tool implementing MODE is not available.

Deepjanus characterizes the frontier of DNN misbehaviours by identifying pairs of inputs that are close to each other, with one input leading to a correct DNN result and the other to a DNN error. It relies on the popular NSGA-II algorithm extended with an archive (to keep the best individuals found in the search) and with repopulation (to escape from stagnation by replacing the most dominated individuals with random ones). Like SEDE, Deepjanus relies on a fitness function that includes a measure of sparseness of the solutions; sparseness is measured as the distance from the closest input the archive, which is populated with inputs having a distance above a given threshold. Differently from Deepjanus, SEDE does not require the configuration of a threshold value, which might be particularly expensive in our context (see Section 2.4). Also, SEDE provides explicit explanations for DNN errors represented using expressions constraining parameter values; Deepjanus, instead, presents example images to end-users thus requiring the visual inspection of images like HUDD. Finally, Deepjanus cannot relate errors observed with images generated with a simulator to errors observed with real world data, which is a key contribution of SEDE.

**Anchors** are if-then rules that constraint a subset of the input features so that changes to the unconstrained features do not influence the result of the model to be explained [45]. The Anchors algorithm constructs an explanation rule iteratively, by interacting with the model to be explained. At each iteration it alters the values associated to one input feature, till it identifies a range within which the accuracy is above a given threshold. The Anchors algorithm works with the test dataset,
not simulators; also, when applied to DNN processing images, it does not generate expressions but identifies the image chunks influencing the DNN result, similarly to heatmap-based approaches.

Kim et al. [27] process images generated with simulators and rely on rule extraction algorithms to characterize correctly and incorrectly classified images in terms of simulator parameters. Unlike SEDE, the approach of Kim et al. cannot be applied to real-world images, which are instead necessary to ensure the applicability of the DNN in the field.

Other works [9, 10, 15, 28] concern DNN retraining approaches that aim to improve the DNN robustness by relying on either image transformations (e.g., rotations) or adversarial inputs. SEDE focuses on DNN accuracy not robustness; also, instead of relying on image transformations, it is the first approach relying on simulators to improve the DNN accuracy observed when the DNN is applied to real-world images.

Some DNN testing approaches can provide explanations for portions of the input space in which DNN errors are observed [1, 19, 56]. For instance, Abdessalem et al. [1] rely on evolutionary algorithms to search for test inputs using simulators and, to maximize test effectiveness, decision trees are used during the search process to learn the regions of the input space that are likely unsafe and, hence, should be targeted by testing. Finally, engineers are presented with decision tree leaves that characterize such portions. Further, recent work studies the effectiveness of decision trees in characterizing the input space of the simulator-based testing process [19]. Finally, DeepHyperion [56] configures a generative model using a metaheuristic search algorithm directed towards generating test inputs in a specific dimension of the inputs space and provides a set of feature maps which visualize the degree of accuracy obtained for different values of dimensions pairs. Different from SEDE, these DNN testing approaches can only be used to characterize simulated scenarios not real-world ones.

To summarize, SEDE is the first approach to automatically derive expressions that characterize the unsafe portion of the input space, based on the results obtained with real-world images leading to DNN errors. Also, it is the first approach that leverages the generated explanations in order to retrain and improve the DNN.

6 CONCLUSION

The identification of hazard-triggering events is a safety engineering practice that enables engineers to evaluate the risk associated to potentially hazardous behaviors of a system. In this paper, we address the problem of characterizing hazard-triggering events affecting the correct execution of DNN-based systems. We introduced SEDE, a novel approach based on evolutionary algorithms, which generates expressions that characterize hazard-triggering events observed in real-world images processed by DNNs. Such expressions constrain the configuration parameters of a simulator capable of generating images similar to the real-world images under analysis. In turn, they characterize the unsafe portions of the input space.

To identify the unsafe portions of the input space from real-world images, SEDE relies on a state-of-the-art approach, HUDD, that generate clusters (i.e., root cause clusters, RCCs) containing images sharing a common set of characteristics. Such commonalities capture the hazard-triggering events to be investigated by engineers. For each RCC, SEDE performs three distinct executions of evolutionary algorithms; as a results, it generates two set of images belonging to the RCC, one leading to DNN errors while the other leading to correct results. The two sets are then processed by PART, a rule extraction algorithm, to automatically derive SEDE expressions. The evolutionary algorithms employed by SEDE are a modified version of NSGA-II and PaiR, an algorithm introduced in this paper to efficiently generate, using a simulator, images that belong to a RCC and are diverse.

Additionally, SEDE improves the DNN under analysis by retraining it with images that match the generated expressions.
Empirical results conducted with representative case studies in the automotive domain show that (a) the evolutionary searches employed by SEDE lead to images belonging to the RCCs and having similar characteristics, (b) the expressions generated by SEDE successfully characterize the unsafe input space (i.e., they lead to images showing a DNN accuracy decreased by at least 30% points, on average), (c) the retraining process employed by SEDE increases the DNN accuracy up to 18 percentage points with a gain over the best baseline of at least 6 percentage points.
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