



# Grounding Counterfactual Explanation of Image Classifiers to Textual Concept Space

Siwon Kim

Jinoh Oh

Sungjin Lee

Seunghak Yu

Jaeyoung Do

Tara Taghavi



## **One-page Summary**

#### **Motivation**



**Concept direction CLIP** latent space

**Method** 



#### **Results**



**Target class** 









#### Counterfactual





source:

## Are existing explanations human-understandable?

Attribution-based explanation



• Visual counterfactual explanation



- $\rightarrow$  Conventional visual XAI methods
- Can: Provide important regions



source: Das, Arun, and Paul Rad. "Opportunities and challenges in explainable artificial intelligence (xai): A survey." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.11371* (2020). Goyal, Yash, et al. "Counterfactual visual explanations." International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, 2019.

## Towards human understandable explanation: Concept-based explanation

#### Concept?

- The units of human-understandable high-level semantics
- Typically defined by words such as "stripe", "white", ...
- Concept Activation Vector (CAV)
  - Positive dataset: samples that exhibit c
  - Negative dataset: samples that exclude *c*
  - CAV = A vector normal to the linear hyperplane



Example: "Stripe" concept

I. Diverging CAVs & 2. Unintended entanglement

source: Kim, Been, et al. "Interpretability beyond feature attribution: Quantitative testing with concept activation vectors (tcav)." *International conference on machine learning.* 4 PMLR, 2018

# I. Diverging CAVs



### 2. Unintended entanglement



Positive images for "Green"



#### Positive images for "Grass"

## Vision (V) and Language (L) were Separated



Language model embedding space



## CLIP enables V&L Joint Embedding Space



### **CLIP** enables textual guidance on images

CLIP embedding space



## **CLIP** enables textual guidance on images





"a photo of cat" "a photo of red cat"

## But, the target classifier is not CLIP

• How can we leverage the well-performing CLIP latent space?







 $1.f = [f_{\text{bottom}}, f_{\text{top}}]$ 







## **Research Questions**

- I. How can we obtain concept direction bank V?
- 2. How can we obtain weight *w*?
- 3. How can we implement projection and inverse projection?



## **Research Questions**

- I. How can we obtain concept direction bank V?
- 2. How can we obtain weight *w*?
- 3. How can we implement projection and inverse projection?



## I. Prepare concept direction bank

- Build concept direction vector bank V
  - Given a predefined concept library *C*,
  - Generate prompt pair for concept *c* 
    - $[t_{src}^c, t_{trg}^c] = [$ "a photo of object", "a photo of *c* object"]
  - $v_c = MinMaxNormalize(CLIP_{text}(t_{src}^c) CLIP_{text}(t_{trg}^c))$
  - $V = \{v_c | c \in C\}$ , where *C* is a predefined concept set

Category	Prompt template				
Color	"A photo of {} object"				
Texture	"A photo of {} object"				
Scene	"A photo of object on {}"				
Material	"A photo of object made of {}"				
Part	"A photo of object containing {}"				
Object	"A photo of object along with {}"				



## **Research Questions**

I. How can we obtain concept direction bank *V*?

- 2. How can we obtain weight w?
- 3. How can we implement projection and inverse projection?



## **2.** Optimize w until the prediction changes to $y_t$

2. Optimize *w* with the objective function below

$$\min_{w} \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{CE} + \alpha \cdot \mathcal{L}_{reg} + \beta \cdot \mathcal{L}_{id}$$

•  $\mathcal{L}_{CE} = CrossEntropy(f_{top}(g_{inv}(e_p)), y_t)$ 

- Change the prediction to the target class by minimizing the cross-entropy loss
- $\mathcal{L}_{reg}$ 
  - Elastic net regularization: regularize concept importance to be 1) sparse and 2) unique minimum

•  $\mathcal{L}_{id} = \left| \left| e_p - e \right| \right|^2$ 

- Counterfactual approach requires the minimal modification
- Identity loss to constrain the minimal perturbation

## **Research Questions**

- I. How can we obtain concept direction bank *V*?
- 2. How can we obtain weight w?
- 3. How can we implement projection and inverse projection?



## 3. Prepare projector and inverse projector



## 3. Prepare projector and inverse projector

- Additionally finetune with cycle consistency loss
  - $\mathcal{L}_{\text{finetune}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{proj}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{inv}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{cycle}}$

• 
$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{cycle}} = \left| \left| f_{\text{bottom}}(x) - g_{\text{inv}} \left( g_{\text{proj}}(f_{\text{bottom}}(x)) \right) \right| \right|^2$$





## **Experimental setup**

- Target model
  - CLIP+linear models
    - Trained on ImageNet/Animal with Attributes2 (AWA2)/Caltech-UCSD Birds-200-2011 (CUB)
    - Shares the embedding space with CLIP  $\rightarrow$  Projection is not needed
  - ResNet18 models
    - Trained on ImageNet/AWA2/CUB
    - Does not share the embedding space with CLIP  $\rightarrow$  Projection is needed
- Concept library C
  - Reduce BRODEN for ImageNet-trained models
  - AWA2, CUB for AWA2-trained and CUB-trained models, respectively

## **Qualitative evaluation**



## Qualitative Comparison between Ours and CCE

• Spurious correlation in dataset collection of CCE led to inaccurate interpretation





Positive images for "Green"



Positive images for "Grass"

## **Debugging misclassification cases**

**→** 

(a) Misclassified as

"Rhinoceros"

**Original image** 

- Correct answer
- "Hippopotamus"



(b) Backgroundedited image



**Prediction** "Hippopotamus"

(C) Examples of "Rhinoceros"



#### Examples of "Hippopotamus"



## **Quantitative Evaluation**

- Lack of ground truth explanation
  - Especially for conceptual explanation
  - Some previous works often skip quantitative evaluation

- Repurpose existing datasets with class-wise attributes
  - . AWA2 dataset
    - 85 binary attributes are provided for 50 animal classes
  - 2. CUB dataset
    - 312 continuous attributes are provided for 200 bird classes

### **Examples of Ground Truth Attributes**

#### AWA2 attribute labels

#### CUB attribute labels



Polar bear





## **Quantitative Evaluation Protocol**

- Since our method adopts counterfactual approach,
  - $A_{y_0}$ : Attributes of the original class,  $A_{y_t}$ : Attributes of the target class
  - Only the difference between two attributes is our interest
  - Consider only if the two elements of the attributes are different
  - $A_{\text{GT}} = [A_{y_t}[i] A_{y_o}[i] \text{ for } i \text{ in range}\left(\text{len}(A_{y_o})\right) \text{ if } A_{y_o}[i] \neq A_{y_t}[i]]$



#### • **Report** AUROC( $A_{GT}$ , I)

### **Quantitative Comparison w/ Baseline-CCE**

• 26% improved AUROC compared to Baseline-CCE

Target model	Dataset	Library	CCE	Ours
CLIP+Linear	AwA2 CUB	$C_{ m AwA2} \ C_{ m CUB}$	0.6436 0.7066	0.8132 0.7891
ResNet18	AwA2 CUB	$C_{ m AwA2} \ C_{ m CUB}$	0.6113 0.6979	0.7314 0.7750
ResNet50	AwA2 CUB	$C_{ m AwA2} \ C_{ m CUB}$	0.5811 0.6811	0.7316 0.7336

# Thank You!