

**Abstract**

The opaque nature and unexplained behavior of transformer-based language models (LMs) have spurred a wide interest in interpreting their predictions. However, current interpretation methods mostly focus on probing models from outside, executing behavioral tests, and analyzing salience input features, while the internal prediction construction process is largely not understood. In this work, we introduce **LM-Debugger**, an interactive debugger tool for transformer-based LMs, which provides a fine-grained interpretation of the model’s internal prediction process, as well as a powerful framework for intervening in LM behavior. For its backbone, **LM-Debugger** relies on a recent method that interprets the inner token representations and their updates by the feed-forward layers in the vocabulary space. We demonstrate the utility of **LM-Debugger** for single-prediction debugging, by inspecting the internal disambiguation process done by GPT2. Moreover, we show how easily **LM-Debugger** allows to shift model behavior in a direction of the user’s choice, by identifying a few vectors in the network and inducing effective interventions to the prediction process. We release **LM-Debugger** as an open-source tool and a demo over GPT2 models.

1 Introduction

Transformer-based language models (LMs) are the backbone of modern NLP models (Bommasani et al., 2021), but their internal prediction construction process is opaque. This is problematic to end-users that do not understand why the model makes specific predictions, as well as for developers who wish to debug or fix model behaviour.

Recent work (Elhage et al., 2021; Geva et al., 2022) suggested that the construction process of LM predictions can be viewed as a sequence of updates to the token representation. Specifically, Geva et al. (2022) showed that updates by the feed-forward network (FFN) layers, one of the building blocks of transformers (Vaswani et al., 2017), can be decomposed into weighted collections of sub-updates, each induced by a FFN parameter vector, that can be interpreted in the vocabulary space.

In this work, we make a step towards LM transparency by employing this interpretation approach to create **LM-Debugger**, a powerful tool for inspection and intervention in transformer LM predictions. **LM-Debugger** provides three main capabilities for single-prediction debugging and model analysis (illustrated in Figure 1). First, for a given input (e.g. “My wife is working as a”), it interprets the model’s prediction at each layer in the network, and the major changes applied to it by FFN layers.

![Figure 1: Illustration of the main capabilities of **LM-Debugger**. Our tool interprets dominant changes in the output distribution induced by the feed-forward layers across the network (self-attention layers are not shown), and enables configuring interventions for shifting the prediction in directions of the user’s choice.](image-url)
This is done by projecting the token representation before and after the FFN update as well as the major FFN sub-updates at any layer to the output vocabulary. Second, it allows intervening in the prediction by changing the weights of specific sub-updates, e.g. increasing (decreasing) a sub-update that promotes music-related (teaching-related) concepts, which results in a modified output. Last, for a given LM, LM-Debugger interprets all the FFN parameter vectors across the network and creates a search index over the tokens they promote. This allows an input-independent analysis of the concepts encoded by the model’s FFN layers, and enables configuring general and effective interventions.

We demonstrate the utility of LM-Debugger for two general use-cases. In the context of prediction debugging, we use the fine-grained tracing of LM-Debugger to inspect the internal disambiguation process performed by the model. Furthermore, we demonstrate how our tool can be used to configure a few powerful interventions that effectively control different aspects in text generation.

We release LM-Debugger as an open-source tool at https://github.com/mega002/lm-debugger and host a demo of GPT2 (Brown et al., 2020) at https://lm-debugger.apps.allenai.org. This to provide better understanding of the inner workings of transformer-based LMs and to facilitate future work in analyzing and controlling NLP models.

2 Underlying Interpretation Method

LM-Debugger establishes a framework for interpreting a token’s representation and updates applied to it at each layer in the network. This framework builds upon recent findings by Geva et al. (2022), who viewed the token representation as a changing distribution over the output vocabulary, and the output from each FFN layer as a collection of weighted sub-updates to that distribution, which are often interpretable to humans. We next elaborate on the findings we rely on at this work.

Consider a transformer LM with $L$ layers and an embedding matrix $E \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times |V|}$ of hidden dimension $d$, over a vocabulary $V$. Let $w = w_1, \ldots, w_t$ s.t. $\forall i = 1, \ldots, t : w_i \in V$ be an input sequence of tokens, then at each layer $\ell = 1, \ldots, L$, the hidden representation $x_{\ell}^i$ of the $i$-th token is being processed and updated by a FFN layer through a residual connection (He et al., 2016):

$$\tilde{x}_{\ell}^i = x_{\ell}^i + \text{FFN}_\ell(x_{\ell}^i),$$

where $x_{\ell}^i$ is the output from the preceding multi-head self-attention layer, and $\tilde{x}_{\ell}^i$ is the updated token representation (Vaswani et al., 2017). Geva et al. (2022) proposed an interpretation method for these updates in terms of the vocabulary, which we employ as the backbone of LM-Debugger and describe in detail next.

Token Representation as a Distribution Over the Output Vocabulary. The token representation before ($x_{\ell}^i$) and after ($\tilde{x}_{\ell}^i$) the FFN update at any layer $\ell$ is interpreted by projecting it to the vocabulary space and converting it to a distribution:

$$p_{\ell}^i = \text{softmax}(E x_{\ell}^i); \quad \tilde{p}_{\ell}^i = \text{softmax}(E \tilde{x}_{\ell}^i)$$

The final model output is defined by $y = \tilde{p}_L^i$.

The FFN Output as a Weighted Collection of Sub-Updates. Each FFN layer is defined with two parameter matrices $K^\ell, V^\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{d_m \times d}$, where $d_m$ is the intermediate hidden dimension, and a non-linearity function $f$ (bias terms are omitted):

$$\text{FFN}_\ell(x^\ell) = f\left(K^\ell x^\ell\right) V^\ell \quad (1)$$

Geva et al. (2022) interpreted the FFN output by (a) decomposing it into sub-updates, each induced by a single FFN parameter vector, and (b) projecting each sub-update to the vocabulary space. Formally, Eq. 1 can be decomposed as:

$$\text{FFN}_\ell(x^\ell) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_m} f(x^\ell \cdot k^{\ell}_i) v^{\ell}_i = \sum_{i=1}^{d_m} m_i^\ell v_i^\ell.$$

where $k^{\ell}_i$ is the $i$-th row of $K^\ell$, $v_i^\ell$ is the $i$-th column of $V^\ell$, and $m_i^\ell := f(x^\ell \cdot k^{\ell}_i)$ is the activation coefficient of $v_i^\ell$ for the given input. Each term in this sum is interpreted as a sub-update to the output distribution, by inspecting the top-scoring tokens in its projection to the vocabulary, i.e. $Ev_i^\ell$.

In the rest of the paper, we follow Geva et al. (2022) and refer to columns of $V^\ell$ as “value vectors” and to their weighted input-dependent form as “sub-updates”. Importantly, value vectors are static parameter vectors that are independent on the input sequence, while sub-updates are dynamic as they are weighted by input-dependent coefficients.

---

1Layer normalization is omitted (Geva et al., 2022).
For a model with $L$ layers and a hidden dimension $d_m$, there are $L \times d_m$ static value vectors, which induce $L \times d_m$ corresponding sub-updates when running an input through the model.

3 LM-Debugger

LM-Debugger leverages both static and dynamic analysis of transformer FFN layers and the updates they induce to the output distribution for debugging and intervention in LM predictions. These capabilities are provided in two main views, which we describe next.

3.1 Prediction View

This view, shown in Figure 2, is designed for per-example debugging. It allows running inputs through the model to generate text in an autoregressive manner, while tracing the dominant sub-updates in every layer and applying interventions.

Prediction Trace (Figure 2, main panel). The user enters an input for the model, for which a detailed trace of the prediction across the network is provided. For each layer, it shows the top-tokens in the output distribution, before and after the FFN update, and the 10 most dominant FFN sub-updates. For every sub-update $m_i v^i_\ell$ we show an identifier $L[\ell][D[i]$ of its corresponding value vector and the coefficient for the given input (e.g. $L17D4005$ and $9.79$). The top distribution tokens and sub-updates are sorted by the token probability/sub-update coefficient from left (highest) to right (lowest). A small arrow next to each sub-update allows setting an intervention on its corresponding value vector.

Interventions (Figure 2, lower panel). Beyond tracing the output distribution, LM-Debugger also allows intervening in the prediction process by setting the coefficients of any vector values in the network, thus, inducing sub-updates of the user’s choice. To set an intervention for a specific value vector, the user should enter its identifier to the panel and choose whether to “turn it on or off”, that is, setting its coefficient to the value of the coefficient of the most dominant sub-update in that layer, or to zero, respectively. When running an input example, all interventions in the panel will be effective, for the entire generation process.

Value Vector Information (Figure 2, right panel). A natural question that arises is how to choose meaningful interventions. LM-Debugger provides two complementary approaches for this. A bottom-up approach is to observe the dominant sub-updates for specific examples, and apply interventions on them. A sub-update can be interpreted by inspecting the top-tokens in the projection of its corresponding value vector to the vocabulary (Geva et al., 2022). For convenience, we let the

2The layer and dimension in the identifier use zero-index.
user assigns names to value vectors. Another way to find meaningful interventions is by a top-down approach of searching for value vectors that express concepts of the user’s interest. We provide this capability in the exploration view of LM-Debugger, which is described next.

3.2 Exploration View

This view allows static exploration of value vectors, primarily for analyzing which concepts are encoded in the FFN layers, how concepts are spread over different layers, and identifying groups of related value vectors.

**Keyword Search** (Figure 3). Value vectors are interpreted by the top tokens they promote. By considering these sets of tokens as textual documents, LM-Debugger allows searching for concepts encoded in value vectors across the layers. This is enabled by a search index that LM-Debugger holds in the background, which stores the projections of all value vectors to the vocabulary, and allows executing simple queries against them using the BM25 (Robertson et al., 1995) algorithm.

**Cluster Visualization** (Figure 4). Assuming the user is interested in locating a specific concept in the network and that she has found a relevant value vector, either from debugging an example in the prediction view or by the keyword search. A natural next step is to find similar value vectors that promote related tokens. To this end, LM-Debugger provides a clustering of all value vectors in the network, which allows mapping any value vector to a cluster of similar vectors in the hidden space (Geva et al., 2022). The interface displays a random sample of vectors from the cluster, as well as an aggregation of their top tokens as a word cloud, showing the concepts promoted by the cluster.

4 Debugging LM Predictions by Tracing FFN Updates

In this section, we demonstrate the utility of LM-Debugger for interpreting model behavior upon a given example. As an instructive example, we will consider the case of sense disambiguation. When generating text, LMs often need to perform sense disambiguation and decide on one plausible continuation. For example, the word “for” in the input “The book is for” has two plausible senses of purpose (e.g. “reading”) and person (e.g. “him”) (Karidi et al., 2021). We will now inspect the prediction by GPT2 (Brown et al., 2020) and track the internal sense disambiguation process for this example. To this end, we enter the input in the prediction view and click Trace, which provides a full trace of the prediction across layers.

Table 1 displays a part of this trace from selected layers, showing a gradual transition from purpose to person sense. Until layer 11 (out of 24), the top-tokens in the output distribution are mostly related to sale/example purposes. Starting from layer 12, the prediction slowly shifts to revolve about the audience of the book, e.g. anyone and ages, until layer 18 where sale is eliminated from the top position. In the last layers, tokens become more specific, e.g. beginners and adults.

To examine the major updates through which the prediction has formed, we can click on specific sub-updates in the trace to inspect the top-scoring tokens in their projections. We observe that in early layers, tokens are often related to purpose sense (e.g. instance in L2D1855 and buyers in L12D659), in intermediate layers tokens are a mix of both senses (readers in L16D3026 and preschool in L17D2454, and sale/free in L16D1662), and mostly person sense in the last layers (users in L18D685, people in L20D3643, and those in L21D2007).

5 Configuring Effective Interventions for Controlled Text Generation

Beyond interpretability, LM-Debugger enables to intervene in LM predictions. We show this by finding value vectors that promote specific concepts and applying simple and effective interventions.

**Controlling Occupation Prediction.** Consider the input “My wife is working as a”. When run-...
Figure 3: Keyword search in the exploration view of LM-Debugger, which matches user queries against the tokens promoted by value vectors of the model.

Figure 4: Cluster visualization in the exploration view of LM-Debugger, which maps a given value vector to its cluster of similar value vectors in the network.

nning it through GPT2, the final prediction from the last layer has the top tokens nurse, teacher, waitress. We would like to intervene in the prediction in order to change its focus to occupations related to software engineering, which in general are less associated with women (De-Arteaga et al., 2019). To this end, we will use the exploration view of LM-Debugger to search for value vectors promoting software-related concepts.

Searching the keywords “software”, “developer”, and “engineer” brings up two value vectors with coherent concepts: L10D3141 and L17D115 (Figure 3). Now, we will add these value vectors to the intervention panel in the prediction view, and run the example again. Our intervention, that only involved two (0.002%) vectors in the network, dramatically changed the prediction to software, programmer, consultant, developer, effectively shifting it in the direction we wanted. This demonstrates the power of LM-Debugger to change model behaviour and fix undesirable predictions.

Controlling the Sentiment of Generated Text.
The previous example focused on next-token prediction. We now take this one step further and configure powerful and general interventions that influence various texts generated by the model. For our experimental setting, we will attempt to control the sentiment in generated reviews by GPT2, for inputs taken from the Yelp dataset (Asghar, 2016).

We choose our interventions independently of the inputs, with two easy steps. First, we use the keyword search (Figure 3) to identify “seed” value vectors that promote positive and negative adjectives/adverbs, using the queries “terrible, mediocre, boring” and “spacious, superb, delicious”. Then, we take one value vector for each polarity and, us-
“Service in this place is”—
\[\uparrow\text{Positive}\]
a bit of a mess. I’m not sure
\[\uparrow\text{Negative}\]
a good place to make the right efforts to make
a waste of a bunch of crap that is too

“I have been to this
restaurant twice and was”—
\[\uparrow\text{Positive}\]
both times I was disappointed. The first time I
\[\uparrow\text{Negative}\]
have been served excellent food and good service. The
have been disappointed. The food is over processed and

“We went on a weeknight. Place was”—
\[\uparrow\text{Positive}\]
packed. We had to wait for the bus
\[\uparrow\text{Negative}\]
good, good food, good staff, good people
too far for us to get lost. We were

“Went for breakfast on
6/16/14. We”—
\[\uparrow\text{Positive}\]
had a great time. We had a great time
\[\uparrow\text{Negative}\]
have a good team of people who are able to
were too heavy for the wrong type of food that

Table 2: Continuations (limited to 10 tokens) generated by GPT2 for different inputs from the Yelp dataset, with and without interventions for “turning on” sub-updates for positive and negative sentiment.

6 Implementation Details

The prediction view is implemented as a React web application with a backend Flask server that runs an API for executing models from the Transformers library by HuggingFace (Wolf et al., 2020). The exploration view is a Streamlit web application, which (a) sends user search queries to an Elasticsearch index with the top tokens of all vector value projections, and (b) visualize clusters of value vectors created with the scikit-learn package (Pedregosa et al., 2011). Our current implementation supports any GPT2 model from HuggingFace, and other auto-regressive models can be plugged-in with only a few local modifications (e.g. translating the relevant layer names). More details and instructions for how to deploy and run LM-Debugger are provided at https://github.com/mega002/lm-debugger.

7 Related Work

Interpreting single-predictions and the general behavior of LMs is a growing research area that attracted immense attention in recent years (Belinkov et al., 2020; Choudhary et al., 2022). LM-Debugger is the first tool to interpret and intervene in the prediction construction process of transformer-based LMs based on FFN updates.

Existing interpretation and analysis frameworks mostly rely on methods for behavioral analysis (Ribeiro et al., 2020) by probing models with adversarial (Wallace et al., 2019) or counterfactual examples (Tenney et al., 2020), input saliency methods that assign importance scores to input features (Wallace et al., 2019; Tenney et al., 2020), and analysis of the attention layers (Hoover et al., 2020; Vig and Belinkov, 2019).

More related to LM-Debugger, other tools analyze patterns in neuron activations (Rethmeier et al., 2020; Dalvi et al., 2019; Alammar, 2021). Unlike these methods, we focus on interpreting the model parameters and on intervening in their contribution to the model’s prediction.

The functionality of LM-Debugger is mostly related to tools that trace hidden representations across layers. Similarly to LM-Debugger, Alammar (2021); Nostalgebraist (2020) interpret the token representation in terms of the output vocabulary. We take this one step further and interpret the FFN updates to the representation, allowing to observe not only the evolution of the representation but also the factors that induce changes in it.

Our intervention in FFN sub-updates relates to recent methods for locating and editing knowledge in the FFN layers of LMs (Meng et al., 2022; Dai et al., 2021). Different from these methods, LM-Debugger aims to provide a comprehensive and fine-grained interpretation of the prediction construction process across the layers.
8 Conclusion

We introduce LM-Debugger, a debugger tool for transformer-based LMs, and the first tool to analyze the FFN updates to the token representations across layers. LM-Debugger provides a fine-grained interpretation of single-predictions, as well as a powerful framework for intervention in LM predictions.
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A Appendix

A.1 Details on Interventions to Control Generated Text Sentiment

Table 3 lists all the value vectors selected for our interventions described in §5, and examples for top-scoring tokens in their projections. These vectors were found with the exploration view of LM-Debugger (§3.2), using both keyword search and clustering visualisation. All the interventions were configured to “turn on” these vectors, namely, setting their coefficients to be maximal for the corresponding layer. This is following the observation by Geva et al. (2022) that FFN updates operate in a token promotion mechanism (rather than elimination).
### Sentiment Value Vector Example Top-scoring Tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentiment</th>
<th>Value Vector</th>
<th>Example Top-scoring Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td>L13D1763</td>
<td>properly, appropriately, adequate, truthful, humane, fulfill, inclusive, timely, patiently, sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L13D2011</td>
<td>clean, Proper, secure, flawless, safest, graceful, smooth, calmly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L14D944</td>
<td>peacefully, graceful, respectful, careful, generous, patiently, calm, tolerant, fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L15D74</td>
<td>Excellence, superb, trustworthy, marvelous, terrific, awesome, Amazing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L20D988</td>
<td>successful, optimal, perfect, satisfactory, welcome, helpful, fulfilling, healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>L11D4</td>
<td>outdated, inadequate, stale, lousy, dull, mediocre, boring, wasteful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L14D2653</td>
<td>trivial, dismiss, rigid, unsupported, only, prejud, obfusco, pretend, dispar, slander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L16D974</td>
<td>inappropriately, poorly, disrespect, unreliable, unhealthy, insecure, improperly, arrogance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L17D3790</td>
<td>inappropriate, improper, wrong, bad, harmful, unreasonable, defective, disturbance, errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L18D91</td>
<td>confused, bizarre, unfairly, horrible, reckless, neglect, misplaced, strange, nasty, mistakenly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L18D3981</td>
<td>wrong, incorrect, insufficient, misleading, premature, improperly, unrealistic, outdated, unfair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Value vectors used for controlling sentiment in generated text, that promote positive and negative adjectives/adverbs. For each vector, we show example top-scoring tokens from its projection to the vocabulary, as presented in the exploration view of LM-Debugger.