

Explaining Image Classification with Visual Debates

Avinash Kori ^{a,*}, Ben Glocker ^a and Francesca Toni ^a

^aDepartment of Computing, Imperial College London

ORCID ID: Avinash Kori <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5878-3584>, Ben Glocker

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4897-9356>, Francesca Toni <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8194-1459>

Abstract. An effective way to obtain different perspectives on any given topic is by conducting a debate, where participants argue for and against the topic. Here, we propose a novel debate framework for understanding and explaining a continuous image classifier’s reasoning for making a particular prediction by modeling it as a multiplayer sequential zero-sum debate game. The contrastive nature of our framework encourages players to learn to put forward diverse arguments during the debates, picking up the reasoning trails missed by their opponents and highlighting any uncertainties in the classifier. Specifically, in our proposed setup, players propose arguments, drawn from the classifier’s discretized latent knowledge, to support or oppose the classifier’s decision. The resulting *Visual Debates* collect supporting and opposing features from the discretized latent space of the classifier, serving as explanations for the internal reasoning of the classifier towards its predictions. We demonstrate and evaluate (a practical realization of) our Visual Debates on the geometric SHAPE and MNIST datasets and on the high-resolution animal faces (AFHQ) dataset, along standard evaluation metrics for explanations (i.e. *faithfulness* and *completeness*) and novel, bespoke metrics for visual debates as explanations (*consensus* and *split ratio*).

1 Introduction

Black-box deep learning models can be explained in various ways, including feature-attribution [43, 35, 47], attention maps [46, 10, 45], counterfactual explanations [22], neuron level inspection [41, 40] or concept based methods [21, 20, 31]. These approaches fall under the category of *post-hoc* explanations, whereby a black-box trained model is diagnosed to extract reasons for making a particular decision. Instead, methods such as [50, 34, 25] aim to develop an intrinsically transparent and aligned model. Each method possesses advantages and disadvantages towards improving the transparency and understanding of the model’s reasoning process [18, 32], uncovering model biases [28], identifying biases in the data-generating process [38], and fulfilling legal obligations for model deployment [7].

In the specific case of image classification, most methods providing visual explanations use either heatmaps or localized image segments that are deemed responsible for making a decision [46, 43, 35, 47]. These explanations capture straightforward input-output relations and do not provide any insights about the model from a debugging or bias mitigation standpoint; thus, they fall under the category of *shallow* explanations. Another major drawback of these methods is that they are a function of the data and the model’s prediction, rather than the model’s internal states. Thus, the *faithfulness* of these explanations




Figure 1: Example use of our debate framework with two steps ($n = 2$). Here, the classifier \mathcal{C} predicts the input image x as a ‘Cat’, while players \mathcal{P}^1 (left, grey) and \mathcal{P}^2 (right, black) claim the image to be ‘Cat’ and ‘Dog’, respectively. Each argument is characterized by a discrete, quantized feature (z_i), a claim (‘Cat’ or ‘Dog’) and a strength (± 1). (See Example 1 and Section 4 for more details.) We also include here a human-readable description of the features in the arguments.

toward the model’s reasoning cannot be ascertained. Very few current explanation methods follow concept-based reasoning as expressed by humans [3, 8], with exceptions [20, 31] focusing on generating disentangled concepts and traces between them to explain the model’s reasoning. Recent approaches [30, 44] keep faithfulness in mind and generate explanations using the model’s latent knowledge rather than the original data.

We propose a novel method for generating faithful explanations for image classification using *disentangled concepts* obtained by *quantization* [52], while leveraging on *debates* to trace the model reasoning. In the case of complex data, the discrete, quantized concepts/features in our explanations may not have a human understandable meaning, but they nonetheless provide useful information about how the model “reasons”. Others advocate debate [25] or dialog [33, 15], but not for explanation. Specifically, [25] advocate debates as an intrinsically transparent and human aligned model demonstrated on a toy setting with the MNIST dataset, while [15] propose a method to learn natural language dialogs in a cooperative way for reasoning about the considered environment. Unlike [25, 15, 16], we develop a post-hoc explanation model scalable beyond MNIST, based on non-cooperative interactions between (fictional) players. Also, while [33] advocate explainability as dialog in principle, we propose a practical framework.

We use debates as they are influential in bringing out various viewpoints for any given question [25]. For illustration, consider the question “Why did the classifier classify this image as a cat?” (see also Figure 1). Debating players may point out quantized features in the image that are for or against the classifier’s decision: a player sup-

* Corresponding Author. Email: a.kori21@imperial.ac.uk.

porting the classifier’s decision may pick concepts like *pointy-ears*, *eyes*, or *whiskers*, while another player may use other concepts like *fur*, *forehead* or *nose* as being characteristic of other animals too, e.g. a dog or a fox. This way, debating points out, in addition to supporting features, also features that oppose the classifier’s decision, thus reflecting the classifier’s uncertainties. While most of the explainable AI methods in the computer vision domain mainly rely on generating single heatmaps or segmenting local image regions responsible for classifiers’ decisions [43, 35, 46, 45, 10, 47], our approach points out both very relevant and possibly ambiguous image regions for the classifiers. In general, explanations with relevant reasons and uncertainties help in developing trust of an AI systems [53].

Example 1. In Figure 1, we demonstrate a simple use of our method with a two step-debate between two (fictional) players shown on the right of the figure (\mathcal{P}^1 - left, grey - and \mathcal{P}^2 - right, black). Here, the classifier predicts the image to be of a ‘Cat’ and the players claim it to be a ‘Cat’ and a ‘Dog’, respectively. The players’ claims are supported by arguments (z_{38}, z_{42} for \mathcal{P}^1 and z_8, z_{11} for \mathcal{P}^2) amounting to quantized features, here visualized as regions in the input image and equipped with a human-understandable description. The debate provides an explanation for the classification, based on the interactions between the players, whereby \mathcal{P}^1 makes the first argument (z_{38}), indicating pointy ears as evidence for ‘Cat’, rebutted by \mathcal{P}^2 ’s first argument (z_8), pointing to the fur as evidence against ‘Cat’ and for ‘Dog’, following which \mathcal{P}^1 makes the second argument (z_{42}), pointing to the eyes as further evidence for ‘Cat’, and thus corroborating \mathcal{P}^1 ’s first argument and rebutting \mathcal{P}^2 ’s argument in turn; finally, \mathcal{P}^2 has a shot at rebutting (with z_{11}), pointing to the forehead/nose as further evidence for ‘Dog’. This simple illustration shows how expressive our visual debates can be, unlike conventional explanations such as those in [46], which simply amount to heatmaps, e.g. covering the entire cat (for examples see [46] and Figure 4(a) later).

Methodologically, our approach distills the knowledge of a trained classifier into a discrete surrogate model (by quantization) and uses the discrete quantized features in debates (see Figure 2). The players involved in the debates learn to pick, from the obtained discrete set of features, the relevant features to the image as arguments. Finally, all the players’ arguments are used to estimate utilities that progressively help the players learn. The arguments in the debate process are visualized by means of a deterministic process adapted from [5], leading to *visual debates* as explanations (as illustrated in Figure 1). Since we use the latent knowledge from the classifier rather than data, the generated explanations can be deemed to be faithful to the classifier in a sense, as we shall see. Overall, our main contributions include:

- **A Debate Framework (Section 4)** that extracts features for supporting and opposing a continuous image classifier’s decision.
- **Player Strategies and Hypothesis Setup (Section 5)** for analysis at “equilibrium”.
- **Visual Debates as Explanations (Section 6) and their Evaluation (Section 7)** along four metrics with image classifiers for three datasets (SHAPE [26], MNIST [17] and AFHQ [12]), with extensive ablations with respect to debate length and classifiers.

2 Related Work

Our work is in line with [33], advocating the importance of thinking of explainability as a dialog rather than in terms of heatmaps or feature attributions, as in much XAI literature. We give a practical framework in this direction. Another interesting work which tries to encourage

capturing uncertain image regions is [53]. However, unlike [53], we generate both certain and uncertain regions by player interactions in an iterative fashion, while [53] only focuses on statically capturing ambiguities in an image with respect to given classifier.

We borrow some ideas from [25] to develop our post-hoc explainability framework. However, [25] focus on advocating debate as an ideal candidate for an intrinsically transparent model aligning AI objectives with human values, and demonstrate a toy debate game on the MNIST dataset, which proved challenging to scale to other natural imaging datasets. Instead, in the realization of our proposed explanation framework, players are implemented as recurrent attention models [37] to ensure generalisability and scalability.

Our proposed debate framework can be seen as generating explanations as “contests” between fictional agents (arguing for and against a class). There is an emerging interest in developing contestable algorithms, as recent policies for deploying AI systems require the possibility to consider arguments against AI decisions [36, 48]. Specifically, [2, 6, 1] apply this notion of contestability to sociotechnical systems. The idea of contestability encourages AI systems to collaborate with humans rather than receiving a blind delegation of responsibility. This is achieved by providing different avenues of human interactions in the decision-making process [29]. In our framework, instead, contestability is the very essence of explanation as visual debates.

Another line of research in XAI involves the use of computational argumentation [14]. A common aim for computational argumentation is to evaluate a particular claim by considering arguments that support and attack the claim and each other in the context of specific argumentative frameworks (AFs, e.g. of the kinds advocated in [19] or in [9]). At a high-level of detail, debates can be interpreted as simple instances of AFs, as we shall see; however, a fully-fledged analysis of the properties of these AFs is outside the scope of this paper. Instead, we focus on a largely unexplored topic, namely explaining image classifiers via debates as interactive game-playing among learning players. To the best of our knowledge, our proposed debates are the first to use models’ latent knowledge to extract arguments and counterarguments, limiting the action space and leading to *Nash Equilibria*. Other approaches using AFs for explainable image classification either use intrinsically argumentative models, e.g. as in [4], or focus on mirroring the mechanics of the model, e.g. as in [51], rather than explaining with latent features in visual debates.

3 Preliminaries and Notations

Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ be a dataset, such that $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{s} \times \tilde{s} \times c}$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, N\}$, where $\tilde{s} \times \tilde{s} \times c$ corresponds to the dimension of $\tilde{s} \times \tilde{s}$ images with c channels ($c \geq 1$), and $N \geq 2$ is the total number of classes. Let $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a classifier trained on \mathcal{D} : given an *input image* $x \sim \mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{C}(x) \in \mathcal{Y}$ is the predicted class. As conventional in image classification using deep learning, we assume that \mathcal{C} can be decomposed as $\mathcal{C} = g \circ f$, where g is a *feature classifier* and f is a *feature extractor* (see Figure 2).

We aim to explain individual predictions by \mathcal{C} in terms of debates whereby (fictional) players exchange arguments, amounting to features supporting classes. To achieve this, we assume a model q corresponding to a *quantized classifier* which behaves like a proxy to the actual feature classifier g , where $q : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y})$ for \mathcal{Z} a discrete set of *quantized features* [52] and $\mathbb{P}(S)$, for any set S , is a probability distribution over S , representing the probability for elements of S (e.g. determined by a softmax operation). The quantized classifier operates on discrete features rather than continuous features as the original classifier. The discrete features $z \sim \mathcal{Z}$ are obtained from the input image




Figure 2: Overview of the proposed realization of the debate framework for classifier $\mathcal{C} = g \circ f$, in which f is the (pre-trained) feature extractor, g is the (pre-trained) feature classifier, q is the quantized classifier (resulting from the ‘supportized training step’, see Section 6.3) using codebook \mathcal{Z} (resulting from the ‘supportive training step’, see Section 6.3) for distilling the continuous latent knowledge of \mathcal{C} in a discrete form. Γ is a debate game (resulting from both the ‘supportive and contrastive’ training steps, see Section 6.3) with players \mathcal{P}^1 and \mathcal{P}^2 . \mathcal{A}_k^i are the arguments put forward by \mathcal{P}^i at iteration k and \mathcal{C}^i is the claim made by \mathcal{P}^i at the end of the debate, when each player gets a utility, resulting from argument and claim rewards. (We restrict attention to two players only for simplicity.)

x as the result of distilling the continuous latent space of the trained classifier, when applied to x (see Figure 2). For $z \sim \mathcal{Z}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we will use $q(z)_y$ to denote the confidence score for class y as estimated by the quantized classifier q on z , and, with an abuse of notation, we will reserve $q(z)$ to indicate simply the class in \mathcal{Y} with the highest probability/confidence score. Finally, we will use the following notation, for $z \sim \mathcal{Z}$, $z' \subseteq z$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$: $q(z; \text{do}(z'))_y$ stands for the class confidence score for y estimated by q with just the quantized feature z' and all the other features masked, i.e. $\hat{z} = 0, \forall \hat{z} \in z \setminus z'$; and $q(z; \text{do}(z'))$ stands for the class with the highest confidence score after masking.

4 Debate Framework

The debate framework consists of two players $\mathcal{P}^1, \mathcal{P}^2$ who sequentially argue about a common question $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ for a fixed number of n iterations to make final claims $\mathcal{C}^1, \mathcal{C}^2$, respectively.¹ In the context of explanation for image classification, the question Q relates to the classifier’s prediction, and may be something like “Why did the classifier predict the image x as a cat?” and the claims may be $\mathcal{C}^1 = \text{Cat}$ and $\mathcal{C}^2 = \text{Dog}$, as illustrated in Figure 1. Player \mathcal{P}^1 ’s objective is to provide relevant arguments ($\mathcal{A}^1 = \{\mathcal{A}_1^1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n^1\}$) supporting the decision made by the classifier on x , while player \mathcal{P}^2 ’s objective is to provide relevant counterarguments ($\mathcal{A}^2 = \{\mathcal{A}_1^2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n^2\}$) that oppose the classifier’s decision. Here n is the length of/number of steps in the debate: in this paper we assume that this is fixed up-front, depending on the cognitive needs of users using debates as explanations (we experiment with various choices of n in Section 7). Finally, the players are equipped with utilities U^1, U^2 , sanctioning how effective their choices of arguments are towards answering the question with their respective claims. Formally, the debate framework is:

$$\Gamma = \langle \{Q, \mathcal{Z}\}, \{\mathcal{P}^1, \mathcal{P}^2\}, \{\mathcal{A}^1, \mathcal{A}^2\}, \{\mathcal{C}^1, \mathcal{C}^2\}, \{U^1, U^2\} \rangle.$$

In a debate framework, players basically argue about selecting some discrete features for supporting (\mathcal{P}^1) or for opposing (\mathcal{P}^2) the classi-

fier’s reasoning. We will define players in Section 5. Here, we define the other components.

Definition 1 (Arguments). An argument \mathcal{A}_k^i , for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, is a tuple (z_k^i, c_k^i, s_k^i) , where $z_k^i \sim z$ is a particular quantized feature for $x \sim \mathcal{X}$, $c_k^i = \text{argmax}_y q(z; \text{do}(\{z_k^i\}))$ is the argument claim, and $s_k^i \in \{-1, 1\}$ is the argument strength, where, for $\Delta = |q(z)_y - q(z; \text{do}(\{z_k^1, z_k^2\}))_y|$, for $y = \mathcal{C}(x)$ (with $\tau \in (0, 1)$ a given threshold):

$$s_k^1 = \begin{cases} 1, & \Delta \leq \tau \\ -1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad s_k^2 = \begin{cases} 1, & \Delta > \tau \\ -1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Here, Δ measures the effective contribution of a particular pair of argument (by \mathcal{P}^1) and counterargument (by \mathcal{P}^2) towards the quantized classifier’s decision. Note that a low-value of Δ indicates that the majority of the latent information is encoded in the latent features pair (z_k^1, z_k^2) . Also, the notion of argument strength differs between players: player \mathcal{P}^1 , supporting the classifier’s decision, considers a higher value of Δ to be a ‘weak’ (negative) argument, while player \mathcal{P}^2 considers that to be a ‘strong’ argument, in the spirit of zero-sum games. Further, note that the claim of an argument depends only on the chosen quantized feature in that argument. Also, given τ , the strength of an argument depends only on the quantized feature: thus, we will often equate arguments with their quantized features.

Definition 2 (Claims). The claim \mathcal{C}^i of player \mathcal{P}^i is defined as $\text{agg}^i(\{z_1^i, \dots, z_n^i\}, \{z_1^{-i}, \dots, z_n^{-i}\})$, for some aggregation function $\text{agg}^i : (\cup^n \mathcal{Z}) \times (\cup^n \mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$.

The notion of player’s claim is thus distinguished from that of argument claim: the former is cumulative and results from the full set of features in arguments (for \mathcal{P}^1) and counterarguments (for \mathcal{P}^2) at the end of the debate, while the latter only depends on the feature put forward at a particular step. In practice, in our realization of the debate framework in Section 6, to obtain agg^i we will use hidden state vectors of recurrent neural networks as aggregated arguments, which is followed by a linear layer to map arguments to classes. Note that different players may perceive the effectiveness of the arguments and counterarguments differently, so different agg^i may result for

¹ The framework is actually applicable to any number of players, but we focus for simplicity on two players only.

both players, leading to different players' claims at the end of the debate (after step n).

Definition 3 (Utilities). Let $Q = q(z, \text{do}(\mathcal{A}^1, \mathcal{A}^2))$, and let

$$r_{\Gamma}^i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } Q = C^i, Q \neq C^{-i}; \\ -1 & \text{if } Q \neq C^i, Q = C^{-i}; \\ 0 & \text{if } Q \neq C^i, Q \neq C^{-i} \text{ or } Q = C^i, Q = C^{-i}. \end{cases}$$

Then, the utility \mathcal{U}^i of player \mathcal{P}^i is $\mathcal{U}^i = r_{\Gamma}^i + \sum_{k=1}^{k=n} s_k^i$.

Here, we treat the argument strength s_k^i , at step k , as an *argument reward*. The utility is a function of the argument rewards and of an overall *claim reward* r_{Γ}^i from the debate, obtained by masking all the quantized features not present in the arguments and comparing the prediction by the quantized classifier after masking (Q) with the claims by the players. Note that, when Q matches neither or both claims by the players, the claim reward is 0, as basically there is no debate between the players in those cases. Note also that the utilities, by design, have a zero-sum nature (i.e. $\mathcal{U}^1 = -\mathcal{U}^2$), reflecting that players should focus on different concepts (quantized features).

Example 1. (continued) In Figure 1, in both steps, the argument rewards are +1 for \mathcal{P}^1 and -1 for \mathcal{P}^2 , resulting in utilities of ± 3 , respectively. The arguments' strength reflects that the classifier is pretty confident that the prediction is correct (as all arguments by \mathcal{P}^1 are 'strong' and those by \mathcal{P}^2 are 'weak'), but in general the argument strength for any player may be any in $\{1, -1\}$.

For debate frameworks to provide *faithful* explanations, we need to guarantee that the classifier's reasoning is encoded in the selected arguments: in Section 7, this faithfulness will be measured by computing the accuracy of the debate framework with respect to the classifier's prediction [11]. Given the complexity of the latent space when classifying images, the discretization by the quantized classifier helps both in limiting the argument space for the players and, alongside the choice of n , in generating *cognitively tractable* explanations [13].

Finally, note that our debates could be interpreted from the perspective of computational argumentation. For example, each player's argument may be seen as a *rebuttal attack* against each argument by the other player and thus the debate framework may be deemed to form an abstract argumentation framework in the spirit of [19], albeit of a restricted form. Moreover, the aggregation function in Definition 2 could be viewed as a form of *gradual semantics*, in the spirit of [9]. A re-interpretation of our debates in formal computational argumentation terms and a generalization of the debates to accommodate more complex forms of argumentation are both outside the scope of our paper and are left as interesting directions for future work.

5 Players' Strategies and Hypotheses

In this section, we take the individual players' viewpoints and formulate hypotheses driving our experimental analysis.

So far we have looked at debate frameworks as static objects. Here, we demonstrate how players adopt strategies to maximize their utilities for the purpose of generating arguments in debates as faithful explanations for classifiers. Players \mathcal{P}^1 and \mathcal{P}^2 are characterized by parameters θ^1 and θ^2 , respectively, learnable during training (see Section 6). Strategies amount to (parameterized) probability distributions over choices of quantized features, conditioned on the quantized features in all previous arguments (by either players).

Definition 4 (Argument Profiles). Players \mathcal{P}^i 's argument profile at step $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ are defined as

$$\alpha_k^1 : \bigcup_{t < k} \mathcal{A}_t^1 \cup \bigcup_{t < k} \mathcal{A}_t^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\theta^1}(\mathcal{Z}) \text{ and} \\ \alpha_k^2 : \bigcup_{t \leq k} \mathcal{A}_t^1 \cup \bigcup_{t < k} \mathcal{A}_t^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\theta^2}(\mathcal{Z}).$$

Due to the debates' sequential and fully observable nature, an argument made by player \mathcal{P}^i at step k can be used by both players in all the subsequent steps, and player 2's k^{th} argument is dependent on player 1's k^{th} argument, but not vice versa. Note that players never observe the entire environment at once, but have access to it only via the generate arguments, and the classifier's feedback (reasoning) on the arguments. In practice, in Section 6, we will enforce (by including them in the objective function during training) properties of *argument entropy minimization* and *argument diversity maximization* to shape the players' argument profiles, as follows.

Definition 5 (Argument Entropy (\mathcal{AH})). For $z \sim \mathcal{Z}$, $\mathcal{AH}(z) = -\mathbb{E} \log p$, where p is the probability of considering a particular feature as an argument.

This notion ensures that the probability distribution over features in an argument profile is focused on a selected few features, leading to more manageable, *cognitively tractable* explanations.

Definition 6 (Argument Diversity (\mathcal{AD})). $\mathcal{AD}(\mathcal{A}^1, \mathcal{A}^2) = (\mathbb{E}((\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^1 - \mathcal{A}^2)^2) + \mathbb{E}((\mathcal{A}^1 - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^2)^2)) - \lambda \sum_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \mathbb{E}((\mathcal{A}^i - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^i)^2)$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{k=n} \mathcal{A}_k^i$ and λ is a hyperparameter.

Intuitively, to preserve the diversity in arguments and encourage coherence between arguments, we maximize the variance between inter-player arguments while minimizing the variance between intra-player arguments: the first term in the definition of \mathcal{AD} measures diversity in arguments and counterarguments made by the players, while the last term captures the diversity within a player's arguments.

Given an argument profile, a player's *strategy* is any $S_{\theta^i}^i = \{z_1^i, \dots, z_n^i\}$ such that $z_k \sim \alpha_k^i(\cdot)$. We will use $\mathbb{P}_{\theta^1}(\mathcal{Z}_k), \mathbb{P}_{\theta^2}(\mathcal{Z}_k)$ to denote the policy distribution, from which strategies are drawn, for players \mathcal{P}^1 and \mathcal{P}^2 at step k , respectively. We use $\mathcal{U}^i(\mathcal{S}_{\theta^1}^1, \mathcal{S}_{\theta^2}^2) = r_{\Gamma}^i + \sum_{t=1}^{t=k} s_t^i$ to indicate the utility for a player \mathcal{P}^i when both the players use strategies $\mathcal{S}_{\theta^1}^1, \mathcal{S}_{\theta^2}^2$, respectively, within debate framework Γ (cf Definition 3 – as before, $\mathcal{U}^1(\mathcal{S}_{\theta^1}^1, \mathcal{S}_{\theta^2}^2) = -\mathcal{U}^2(\mathcal{S}_{\theta^1}^1, \mathcal{S}_{\theta^2}^2)$). Then, players in a debate framework can be seen as participating in a game with joint objective defined in terms of the players' utilities and the log-likelihood of the policy distributions:

$$V(\mathcal{P}^1, \mathcal{P}^2) = \min_{\theta^1} \max_{\theta^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left(\log \mathbb{P}_{\theta^1}(\mathcal{Z}_k) - \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta^2}(\mathcal{Z}_k) \right) \mathcal{U}^2(\mathcal{S}_{\theta^1}^1, \mathcal{S}_{\theta^2}^2) \right] \quad (1)$$

This game falls under the category of finite player, finite strategy, fully observable, zero-sum sequential games, which guarantees the existence of at least one mixed strategy *Nash equilibrium (NE)* [39] ($\mathcal{S}_{\theta^1}^1, \mathcal{S}_{\theta^2}^2$), where, for player \mathcal{P}^1 , argument \mathcal{A}_k^1 made by \mathcal{P}^1 at step $k > 1$ is a *best response* to \mathcal{P}^2 's argument \mathcal{A}_{k-1}^2 at the previous step iff $\mathcal{U}^1(\mathcal{S}_{\theta^1}^1, \mathcal{S}_{\theta^2}^2) \geq \mathcal{U}^1(\mathcal{S}_{\theta^1}^1, \mathcal{S}_{\theta^2}^2)$ for all choices θ of parameters (similarly for player \mathcal{P}^2).

When training players for realizing our debate framework (see Section 6), we aim to make sure that, in any NE, both players try to find arguments that align closely with the classifier's reasoning about the input image, with each player trying to uncover the information that the other player failed to capture. Thus, our realization of the debate framework is driven by the following hypotheses (assessed empirically in Section 7).

Hypothesis 1. Both players converge at NE, making true and honest arguments about the input image.

This hypothesis is inspired by [25], who advocate it for debates for AI safety. In our setting, the hypothesis is crucial to guarantee that explanations are *faithful* to the classifier’s reasoning.

Hypothesis 2. At any NE, the sampled features $z \sim \mathcal{Z}$ for any input image can be partitioned into z_1 and z_2 , such that $z_1 \cup z_2 = z$ and $z_1 \cap z_2 = \emptyset$, where z_1 is a set of features uniquely observed for a given class while z_2 is a set of features that can be observed for multiple classes. At convergence, the arguments made by \mathcal{P}^1 and \mathcal{P}^2 are sampled from a probability distribution over features z_1 and z_2 respectively (i.e., $\mathbb{P}_{\theta^1}(\mathcal{Z}) \approx \mathbb{P}(z_1)$, $\mathbb{P}_{\theta^2}(\mathcal{Z}) \approx \mathbb{P}(z_2)$).

This hypothesis is plausible due to the design of the argument rewards (as s_k^1 can be forced to be 1 if $\mathcal{A}_k^1 \in z_1$ and s_k^2 can be forced to be 1 if the $\mathcal{A}_k^2 \in z_2$). Features in z_1 and z_2 correspond, respectively, to semi-factual and counterfactual features as described in [27], in that, in our debate game, the player \mathcal{P}^1 , supporting the classifier’s class, performs semi-factual perturbations, affecting the internal state of the player while preserving the class, while the other player \mathcal{P}^2 performs counter-factual perturbations, affecting the input so as to obtain a different class. The split of the latent feature space into the two components z_1 and z_2 is a consequence of these behaviors by the players, which, in turn, paves the way towards explanations that focus on both absolute and uncertain image regions responsible for the classifier’s decision making.

6 Methods

In this section, we describe the methods deployed to realize the debate framework and the players behaviour from Sections 4-5. The proposed realization is overviewed in Figure 2.

6.1 Discretization

The output of f is continuous, posing multiple challenges for extracting meaningful explanations about the classifier’s latent reasoning. To address this, we first distill the classifier’s latent knowledge into a codebook \mathcal{Z} with \tilde{n} discrete features each of dimension d , using the process of vector quantization, similarly to [52]. However, instead of sampling across pixels, we sample along channels, and these channels are disentangled using Hessian penalty of [42] for obtaining varied features in the codebook. We initialize the codebook with a uniform discrete prior, with all \tilde{n} features being uniformly distributed in the range $(-1/\tilde{n}, 1/\tilde{n})$. This is done for two main reasons: (i) to bound the vectors with respect to a total number of discrete features, and (ii) to spread all the features within the given range. The quantization is achieved by deterministically mapping $\tilde{z} = f(x)$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$ to the nearest codebook vector $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, formally $z = \operatorname{argmin}_j \tilde{d}(\tilde{z}, z_j)$, for all $z_j \in \mathcal{Z}$ and some convex distance function \tilde{d} (this is captured by \mathcal{L}_{quant} in Figure 2). In this work we consider two different distance measures: (i) Euclidean sampling: where $\tilde{d}(a, b) = \|a - b\|_2^2$ and (ii) Cosine sampling: where $\tilde{d}(a, b) = -\langle a, b \rangle$. To distill the knowledge from the continuous to the discrete space, we introduce a quantized classifier q , which maps the average pooled sampled vector z to the classifier’s decision $\mathcal{C}(x)$ for any given input $x \in \mathcal{X}$. The parameters in the quantized classifier are trained using knowledge distillation loss \mathcal{L}_{dist} , which is the cross-entropy loss between the classifier’s decision $\mathcal{C}(x) = y$ and the quantized classifier’s prediction $q(z) = \tilde{y}$ (see Figure 2).

6.2 Players

To capture the sequential nature of debates, we implement players with unrolled gated recurrent units (GRU) as the *backbone network* ζ^i . In addition, each player also includes a *policy network* Π^i selecting discrete features $z \sim \mathcal{Z}$ as arguments, a *modulator network* \mathcal{M}^i converting arguments to the hidden state dimension in ζ^i (referred to as modulated arguments), and a *claim network* estimating the player’s final claim \mathcal{C}^i (with an abuse of notation, we call this network also \mathcal{C}^i). We also use a *baseline network* \mathcal{B}^i for estimating the value of a particular argument in the spirit of [37]. Figure 3 overviews the players’ architecture and its evolution within a debate with n steps.




Figure 3: Architecture for Player \mathcal{P}^i . \mathcal{M}^i is a modulator network and e_k^i is a modulated argument, ζ^i is a GRU (the backbone network), h_k^i is a hidden state vector, \mathcal{B}^i , Π^i and \mathcal{C}^i are the baseline, policy and claim networks, respectively. \hat{z}_k is a masked state vector.

At every step $k < n$ (with step 0 some random initialization), \mathcal{P}^i receives an argument \mathcal{A}_{k-1}^i and makes an argument \mathcal{A}_k^i . \mathcal{A}_{k-1}^i is mapped onto representation e_{k-1}^i which is used to update the memory of the backbone network ζ^i to h_{k-1}^i . Then, the policy network Π^i considers h_{k-1}^i conditioned on \hat{z}_{k-1} and the quantized classifier’s decision \hat{y} as an input to estimate argument \mathcal{A}_k^i , where \hat{z} is generated by masking the environment with respect to \mathcal{A}_k^1 and \mathcal{A}_k^2 . At the next step, \mathcal{M}^i transforms \mathcal{A}_k^i to the required dimension, which is later used in ζ^i to accumulate the sequential knowledge of arguments made by the players. Player \mathcal{P}^1 estimates the first argument \mathcal{A}_1^1 using a sampled feature and randomly initialized hidden state vector. Once estimated, arguments are considered common knowledge, and both players can use this information to estimate their subsequent arguments.

6.3 Training

The parameters for a player \mathcal{P}^i can be represented as $\theta^i = \{\theta_{\zeta}^i, \theta_{\Pi}^i, \theta_{\mathcal{M}}^i\}$, where θ_{ζ}^i , θ_{Π}^i , and $\theta_{\mathcal{M}}^i$ correspond to the parameters in the backbone network ζ^i , policy network Π^i , and modulator network \mathcal{M}^i , respectively. We use the REINFORCE learning rule with the baseline value to reduce variance in estimates as proposed in [37], averaged over M Monte Carlo samples to update the parameters θ^i :

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_m \sum_k \nabla_{\theta^i} \log \Pi_{\theta^i}^i(h_k^i | \hat{z}_k, \hat{y})(U^i - b_k^i) \quad (2)$$

where U^i is the player’s utility (see Definition 3) and b_k^i corresponds to the baseline value learned by reducing the squared error between U^i and b_k^i . The gradient in the above learning rule $\nabla_{\theta^i} \log \Pi_{\theta^i}^i(\cdot)$ can be mapped to gradients of the GRU backbone network ζ^i obtained at step k , which can be computed by standard backpropagation [54]. The

REINFORCE learning rule described above allows the player to generate an optimal argument sequence based on feedback obtained via delayed cumulative reward (U^i) at the end of every learning episode (i.e. debate of n steps).

The loss term corresponding to the REINFORCE learning rule is described as $\mathcal{L}_{REINFORCE} = -\sum_k \log \Pi_{\theta^i}^i(h_k^i | \hat{z}_k, \hat{y})(U^i - b_k^i)$. To train the policy network Π^i , this is combined with argument entropy and argument diversity regularisation terms as per Definitions 5 and 6, represented respectively by $\mathcal{L}_{AH} = \mathcal{AH}(\mathcal{A}_k^i)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{AD} = -\mathcal{AD}(\mathcal{A}^1, \mathcal{A}^2)$. These regularisation terms ensure that players make a meaningful argument in any given step. The negative sign in \mathcal{L}_{AD} and \mathcal{L}_{AH} is to accommodate minimization in the final objective.

Our training setup consists of two steps: (i) *supportive* training, where both players are trained to support the classifier’s decisions, followed by (ii) *contrastive* training, where the players are trained for debating, generating arguments and counterarguments. In the case of supportive training, we use the objective function with utility U^1 for both players along with minimisation of a negative log-likelihood term \mathcal{L}_{NLL} between \mathcal{C} ’s decision and \mathcal{P}^1 ’s final claim. Supportive training may be considered a pre-debate step to provide an initial knowledge base for the players to generate arguments and counterarguments in the debate. The \mathcal{L}_{NLL} term helps to learn better representations in the backbone networks ζ^i , by distilling the classifier’s knowledge. The combined loss during supportive training is $\mathcal{L}_{sup.} = \mathcal{L}_{REINFORCE} + \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{NLL} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{AH} - \lambda_3 \mathcal{L}_{AD}$. The actual debate takes place in the contrastive training step, where players are trained with their respective utilities. The combined loss during contrastive training is $\mathcal{L}_{con.} = \mathcal{L}_{REINFORCE} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{AH} + \lambda_3 \mathcal{L}_{AD}$. We do not enforce \mathcal{L}_{NLL} during contrastive training to preserve the min-max nature of the debate joint objective in Eq. 1.

6.4 Visualization

To visualize arguments in debates, so that they can be comprehensible to human users, we follow a deterministic approach based on [5]. We consider, from any specific argument \mathcal{A}_k^i , a low-resolution attention map $\mathcal{F} \sim z$ drawn from the quantized feature z in \mathcal{A}_k^i . We then compare \mathcal{F} with the original input image by resizing it to input-dimension using bilinear interpolation, anchoring the interpolation with respect to the feature’s receptive field. Specifically, we first normalize the resized attention map between 0 and 1 using minmax normalization and overlay it on the original image. Following this visualization, our debate framework can serve as explanations as *visual debates*, e.g. as illustrated in Figure 1.

6.5 Evaluation Metrics

For evaluating the performance of our method, we measure and compare properties of *completeness*, *faithfulness*, *consensus*, and *split ratio* across debates of varying debate length, sampling criterion, and feature extractor. Formally: (i) *completeness* measures the accuracy of the debate framework with respect to the ground truth labels, by measuring the data-specific knowledge encoded within the arguments (higher values of completeness indicate that meaningful arguments are learned/used in the debates); (ii) *faithfulness* measures the accuracy of the debate framework with respect to the classifier’s prediction, by quantifying the distillation of the classifier’s latent knowledge in the debate framework whereby, as previously discussed, visual debates are faithful explanations given sufficient arguments (the higher the value of faithfulness the higher the extent of distillation of the classifier’s latent knowledge, indicating lower possibilities of debate); (iii)

consensus measures how often players agree on the classifier’s prediction (given sufficient debate length, the higher the value of consensus the lower the ambiguity in the classifier’s representations, and the lower the consensus the more ambiguous/uncertain the classifier); and (iv) *split ratio* (Z_R) quantitatively measures the existence of splits as per Hypothesis 2; for z_1 and z_2 the sets of arguments sampled by \mathcal{P}^1 and \mathcal{P}^2 respectively for a given input image, $Z_R = \frac{|z_1|}{|z_1|+|z_2|}$, where $|S|$ stands for the cardinality of set S . Thus, the split ratio is the ratio between the total number of uniquely sampled features by \mathcal{P}^1 with respect to \mathcal{P}^2 , and the total number of unique features over the entire training set. Note that, whereas (i)-(ii) are adaptations to our setting of standard properties in XAI [49], (iii)-(iv) are specific to our debates.

7 Experiments

We evaluate our debate framework with three different CNN classifiers, namely a vanilla network with 5 convolutional layers, ResNet18 [23], and DenseNet121 [24], each of them trained on the SHAPE [26], MNIST [17] and AFHQ [12] datasets. We use images of dimension 32×32 with 1 channel for SHAPE and MNIST, and 128×128 with 3 channels for AHFQ. Details about the trained classifiers and training strategies are detailed in the Supplementary Material (SM). Since, to the best of our knowledge, we are the first to study debates for explaining image classifiers, we are not aware of any baseline methods. Thus, to establish players behaviour, measure satisfaction of properties (from Section 6.5) and verify hypothesis 2, we conduct extensive ablations on debate length n with different codebook samplings (see Section 6.1).

All findings are in Table 4. The last three columns correspond to the split ratio, demonstrating that the different players’ opinions differ about 40-60% of the time, aligning with hypothesis 2. Note that difference in arguments does not mean difference in final claims, as the final claims result from the combined effect of all the arguments. As described in Section 6.5, consensus measures agreement between the players’ final claim with respect to the classifier’s prediction and is linked to the classifier’s uncertainty: based on the results in Table 4, when increasing debate length, the consensus also tends to increase when the model is accurate (a counter-example can be seen for the AFHQ-DenseNet experiment). Based on the experiments it can also be observed that given sufficient debate length the faithfulness of the generated explanation also increases, validating our claim that visual debates lead to faithful explanations. Another observation from Table 4 is that, for well-performing classifiers, the completeness score is similar to the faithfulness score (differing by $\sim 5\%$), again pointing towards faithful explanations.

To illustrate qualitative difference between the types of explanations obtained from our debate framework and standard feature attribution-based explanations with LIME [43], DeepSHAP [35], deepLIFT [47], and gradCAM [46], we generated the illustrations in Figure 4. Figure 4(a) focuses on existing explanations with AFHQ for comparison, while Figures 4(b), 4(c), 4(d), 4(e), and 4(f) focus on our visual debate explanations on all three datasets. In the case of the visual debates, the first image is the input, while the first and second rows correspond respectively to \mathcal{P}^1 ’s and \mathcal{P}^2 ’s visual arguments (their names are their respective codebook embeddings). By observing, for instance, Figures 4(a) and 4(e), it can be seen that the collective debate arguments result in similar explanations as existing methods, but the debate provides additional information by splitting the region of interest into multiple sub-regions as contrasting arguments. Thus, the existing methods provide simple input-output explanations (Figure 4(a)) and disregard the inner reasoning of the classifier, which limits

Table 1: Ablation results with respect to debate length (4, 6 or 10) with mean and variance over three random runs.

PPTY → DATASET ↓	FEATURE EXT. ↓	CODEBOOK SAMPLING ↓	COMPLETENESS			FAITHFULNESS			CONSENSUS			SPLIT RATIO (Z_R)		
			4	6	10	4	6	10	4	6	10	4	6	10
SHAPE	VANILLA (0.94±0.01)	EUCLIDIAN	0.55±0.12	0.80±0.10	0.85±0.02	0.55±0.14	0.79±0.07	0.89±0.03	0.33±0.15	0.64±0.06	0.78±0.01	0.58	0.60	0.60
		COSINE	0.58±0.23	0.84±0.06	0.82±0.01	0.58±0.19	0.81±0.03	0.88±0.02	0.34±0.16	0.76±0.07	0.82±0.01	0.48	0.56	0.56
	RESNET (0.98±0.01)	EUCLIDIAN	0.74±0.23	0.83±0.14	0.96±0.03	0.76±0.12	0.81±0.06	0.98±0.02	0.41±0.12	0.58±0.05	0.89±0.02	0.38	0.54	0.58
		COSINE	0.73±0.20	0.81±0.08	0.97±0.02	0.76±0.21	0.83±0.04	0.97±0.02	0.44±0.09	0.62±0.05	0.91±0.01	0.44	0.58	0.58
MNIST	VANILLA (0.98±0.00)	EUCLIDIAN	0.36±0.22	0.45±0.03	0.73±0.01	0.38±0.18	0.49±0.01	0.83±0.00	0.24±0.17	0.62±0.06	0.74±0.04	0.44	0.45	0.56
		COSINE	0.46±0.11	0.58±0.06	0.79±0.02	0.53±0.08	0.61±0.05	0.78±0.00	0.22±0.11	0.58±0.02	0.82±0.01	0.42	0.45	0.55
	RESNET (0.99±0.00)	EUCLIDIAN	0.42±0.19	0.46±0.08	0.81±0.02	0.45±0.13	0.51±0.02	0.85±0.01	0.18±0.21	0.57±0.09	0.76±0.03	0.54	0.58	0.61
		COSINE	0.38±0.22	0.42±0.03	0.78±0.00	0.42±0.12	0.49±0.05	0.81±0.00	0.21±0.09	0.58±0.02	0.78±0.00	0.43	0.60	0.60
AFHQ	VANILLA (0.96±0.02)	EUCLIDIAN	0.81±0.09	0.86±0.06	0.89±0.05	0.89±0.02	0.91±0.04	0.94±0.03	0.35±0.11	0.43±0.08	0.92±0.04	0.39	0.44	0.50
		COSINE	0.31±0.10	0.68±0.02	0.77±0.02	0.33±0.09	0.71±0.04	0.82±0.01	0.38±0.11	0.63±0.05	0.76±0.02	0.44	0.48	0.49
	RESNET (0.98±0.01)	EUCLIDIAN	0.76±0.06	0.84±0.01	0.91±0.01	0.81±0.07	0.90±0.02	0.97±0.00	0.30±0.08	0.69±0.03	0.93±0.02	0.38	0.41	0.43
		COSINE	0.58±0.08	0.72±0.03	0.88±0.00	0.64±0.06	0.75±0.02	0.92±0.01	0.40±0.18	0.63±0.08	0.72±0.07	0.40	0.42	0.41
DENSENET (0.65±0.08)	EUCLIDIAN	0.49±0.12	0.54±0.11	0.58±0.08	0.54±0.12	0.60±0.06	0.62±0.02	0.31±0.11	0.40±0.09	0.56±0.04	0.60	0.63	0.68	
	COSINE	0.41±0.23	0.40±0.08	0.65±0.02	0.43±0.13	0.43±0.04	0.65±0.03	0.33±0.16	0.48±0.02	0.60±0.00	0.72	0.72	0.77	




Figure 4: Explanations obtained by RestNet18 model trained on respective datasets, (a) illustrates explanations obtained from GradCAM, DeepLIFT, DeepSHAP, and LIME from left to right respectively, (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) illustrates debate explanations.

their use to debug or reason about the underpinning model. Instead, even though the interpretability of the arguments in the visual debates is somewhat subjective, they help in better pointing out the shortcuts captured by the model. The illustrations show that, even when the embeddings selected by the players are unique, visual arguments may overlap, indicating the need for better object centric representations in the classifiers, which we plan to explore and address in future work.

8 Conclusion

We defined a novel, practical debate framework for generating post-hoc explanations for image classification as visual debates between

(fictional) players. We experimentally showed players’ convergence at Nash Equilibrium and the existence of different sets of features from which players can sample their arguments during debates, confirming our hypotheses. We also showed that our visual debates satisfy desirable properties of completeness, faithfulness, and consensus.

Besides the avenues for future work mentioned in the paper, we believe that our method could be used to support ontology alignment among humans and models’ latent knowledge. Our debates can also be further explored to develop stand-alone transparent and aligned large scale models. Finally, we plan to extend our method with domain experts to assign semantic meaning to arguments and extract a high-level reasoning chain possibly used by classifiers in making decisions.

Acknowledgements

A. Kori was supported by UKRI (grant agreement no. EP/S023356/1), in the UKRI Centre for Doctoral Training in Safe and Trusted AI. F. Toni was partially funded by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 101020934) and by J.P. Morgan and the Royal Academy of Engineering under the Research Chairs and Senior Research Fellowships scheme.

References

- [1] ‘Designing contestability: Interaction design, machine learning, and mental health’, in *Conf. on Designing Interactive Systems*, (2017).
- [2] Marco Almada, ‘Human intervention in automated decision-making: Toward the construction of contestable systems’, in *17th International Conference on AI and Law*, (2019).
- [3] Sharon Lee Armstrong, Lila R Gleitman, and Henry Gleitman, ‘What some concepts might not be’, *Cognition*, **13**(3), 263–308, (1983).
- [4] Hamed Ayoobi, S. Hamidreza Kasaei, Ming Cao, Rineke Verbrugge, and Bart Verheij, ‘Explain what you see: Open-ended segmentation and recognition of occluded 3D objects’, *CoRR*, abs/2301.07037, (2023).
- [5] David Bau, Bolei Zhou, Aditya Khosla, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba, ‘Network dissection: Quantifying interpretability of deep visual representations’, in *CVPR*, (2017).
- [6] Emre Bayamlioglu, ‘Contesting automated decisions’, *Eur. Data Prot. L. Rev.*, **4**, 433, (2018).
- [7] Adrien Bibal, Michael Lognoul, Alexandre De Stree, and Benoît Frénay, ‘Legal requirements on explainability in machine learning’, *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, **29**(2), 149–169, (2021).
- [8] Daniel C Burnston and Philipp Haueis, ‘Evolving concepts of “hierarchy” in systems neuroscience’, in *Neural Mechanisms*, (2021).
- [9] Claudette Cayrol and Marie-Christine Lagasque-Schiev, ‘Graduality in argumentation’, *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, **23**, 245–297, (2005).
- [10] Aditya Chattopadhyay, Anirban Sarkar, Prantik Howlader, and Vineeth N Balasubramanian, ‘Grad-cam++: Generalized gradient-based visual explanations for deep convolutional networks’, in *WACV*, (2018).
- [11] Zixi Chen, Varshini Subhash, Marton Havasi, Weiwei Pan, and Finale Doshi-Velez, ‘What makes a good explanation?: A harmonized view of properties of explanations’, in *Workshop on Trustworthy and Socially Responsible Machine Learning, NeurIPS 2022*, (2022).
- [12] Yunjey Choi, Youngjung Uh, Jaejun Yoo, and Jung-Woo Ha, ‘Stargan v2: Diverse image synthesis for multiple domains’, in *CVPR*, (2020).
- [13] Kristijonas Čyras, Dimitrios Letsios, Ruth Misener, and Francesca Toni, ‘Argumentation for explainable scheduling’, in *AAAI*, (2019).
- [14] Kristijonas Čyras, Antonio Rago, Emanuele Albini, Pietro Baroni, and Francesca Toni, ‘Argumentative XAI: a survey’, in *IJCAI*, (2021).
- [15] Abhishek Das, Satwik Kottur, José MF Moura, Stefan Lee, and Dhruv Batra, ‘Learning cooperative visual dialog agents with deep reinforcement learning’, in *ICCV*, (2017).
- [16] Chaorui Deng, Qi Wu, Qingyao Wu, Fuyuan Hu, Fan Lyu, and Mingkui Tan, ‘Visual grounding via accumulated attention’, in *CVPR*, (2018).
- [17] Li Deng, ‘The MNIST database of handwritten digit images for machine learning research [best of the web]’, *IEEE signal processing magazine*, **29**(6), 141–142, (2012).
- [18] Finale Doshi-Velez, Ryan Budish, and Mason Kortz, ‘The role of explanation in algorithmic trust’, Technical report, Artificial Intelligence and Interpretability Working Group, (2017).
- [19] Phan Minh Dung, ‘On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games’, *Artificial intelligence*, **77**(2), 321–357, (1995).
- [20] Asma Ghandeharioun, Been Kim, Chun-Liang Li, Brendan Jou, Brian Eoff, and Rosalind W Picard, ‘Dissect: Disentangled simultaneous explanations via concept traversals’, *arXiv:2105.15164*, (2021).
- [21] Amirata Ghorbani, James Wexler, James Zou, and Been Kim, ‘Towards automatic concept-based explanations’, *arXiv:1902.03129*, (2019).
- [22] Yash Goyal, Ziyang Wu, Jan Ernst, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Stefan Lee, ‘Counterfactual visual explanations’, in *ICML. PMLR*, (2019).
- [23] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun, ‘Deep residual learning for image recognition’, in *CVPR*, pp. 770–778, (2016).
- [24] Gao Huang, Zhuang Liu, Laurens Van Der Maaten, and Kilian Q Weinberger, ‘Densely connected convolutional networks’, in *CVPR*, pp. 4700–4708, (2017).
- [25] Geoffrey Irving, Paul Christiano, and Dario Amodei, ‘AI safety via debate’, *arXiv:1805.00899*, (2018).
- [26] Kaggle. Shapes dataset. <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/smeschke/four-shapes?resource=download>, 2016.
- [27] Eoin M Kenny and Mark T Keane, ‘On generating plausible counterfactual and semi-factual explanations for deep learning’, in *AAAI*, (2021).
- [28] Been Kim, Martin Wattenberg, Justin Gilmer, Carrie Cai, James Wexler, Fernanda Viegas, et al., ‘Interpretability beyond feature attribution: Quantitative testing with concept activation vectors’, in *ICML*, (2018).
- [29] Daniel N Kluttz, Nitin Kohli, and Deirdre K Mulligan, ‘Shaping our tools: Contestability as a means to promote responsible algorithmic decision making in the professions’, in *Ethics of Data and Analytics*, Auerbach Publications, (2022).
- [30] Avinash Kori, Ben Glocker, and Francesca Toni, ‘GLANCE: Global to local architecture-neutral concept-based explanations’, *arXiv:2207.01917*, (2022).
- [31] Avinash Kori, Parth Natekar, Balaji Srinivasan, and Ganapathy Krishnamurthi, ‘Interpreting deep neural networks for medical imaging using concept graphs’, in *International Workshop on Health Intell.*, (2021).
- [32] Joshua Alexander Kroll, *Accountable algorithms*, Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 2015.
- [33] Himabindu Lakkaraju, Dylan Slack, Yuxin Chen, Chenhao Tan, and Sameer Singh, ‘Rethinking explainability as a dialogue: A practitioner’s perspective’, *arXiv:2202.01875*, (2022).
- [34] Andrew K Lampinen, Nicholas Roy, Ishita Dasgupta, Stephanie CY Chan, Allison Tam, James McClelland, Chen Yan, Adam Santoro, Neil C Rabinowitz, Jane Wang, et al., ‘Tell me why! explanations support learning relational and causal structure’, in *ICML. PMLR*, (2022).
- [35] Scott M Lundberg and Su-In Lee, ‘A unified approach to interpreting model predictions’, in *NeurIPS*, (2017).
- [36] Henrietta Lyons, Eduardo Velloso, and Tim Miller, ‘Conceptualising contestability: Perspectives on contesting algorithmic decisions’, *ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, (2021).
- [37] Volodymyr Mnih, Nicolas Heess, Alex Graves, et al., ‘Recurrent models of visual attention’, *NeurIPS*, **27**, (2014).
- [38] Arunachalam Narayanaswamy, Subhashini Venugopalan, Dale R Webster, et al., ‘Scientific discovery by generating counterfactuals using image translation’, in *Int. Conf. on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, (2020).
- [39] John Nash, ‘Non-cooperative games’, *Annals of mathematics*, 286–295, (1951).
- [40] Chris Olah, Nick Cammarata, Ludwig Schubert, Gabriel Goh, Michael Petrov, and Shan Carter, ‘Zoom in: An introduction to circuits’, *Distill*, (2020). <https://distill.pub/2020/circuits/zoom-in>.
- [41] Chris Olah, Alexander Mordvintsev, and Ludwig Schubert, ‘Feature visualization’, *Distill*, (2017). <https://distill.pub/2017/feature-visualization>.
- [42] William Peebles, John Peebles, Jun-Yan Zhu, Alexei Efros, and Antonio Torralba, ‘The hessian penalty: A weak prior for unsupervised disentanglement’, in *ECCV*, (2020).
- [43] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin, ‘Why should I trust you? Explaining the predictions of any classifier’, in *22nd ACM SIGKDD Int. Conf. on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, (2016).
- [44] Ainkaran Santhirasekaram, Avinash Kori, Andrea Rockall, et al., ‘Hierarchical symbolic reasoning in hyperbolic space for deep discriminative models’, *arXiv:2207.01916*, (2022).
- [45] Sam Sattarzadeh, Mahesh Sudhakar, Konstantinos N Plataniotis, et al., ‘Integrated grad-cam: Sensitivity-aware visual explanation of deep convolutional networks via integrated gradient-based scoring’, in *IEEE Int. Conf. on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, (2021).
- [46] Ramprasaath R Selvaraju, Michael Cogswell, Abhishek Das, Ramakrishna Vedantam, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra, ‘Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization’, in *ICCV*, (2017).
- [47] Avanti Shrikumar, Peyton Greenside, and Anshul Kundaje, ‘Learning important features through propagating activation differences’, in *ICML*, (2017).
- [48] Royal Society. Explainable AI: the basics, 2022.
- [49] Kacper Sokol and Peter Flach, ‘Explainability fact sheets: a framework for systematic assessment of explainable approaches’, in *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 56–67, (2020).
- [50] Wolfgang Stammer, Patrick Schramowski, and Kristian Kersting, ‘Right for the right concept: Revising neuro-symbolic concepts by interacting with their explanations’, in *CVPR*, (2021).

- [51] Purin Sukpanichnant, Antonio Rago, Piyawat Lertvittayakumjorn, and Francesca Toni, ‘Neural QBAFs: Explaining neural networks under LRP-based argumentation frameworks’, in *AIxIA 2021 - Advances in AI - 20th International Conference of the Italian Association for AI*, (2021).
- [52] Aaron Van Den Oord, Oriol Vinyals, et al., ‘Neural discrete representation learning’, *Adv. in NeurIPS*, **30**, (2017).
- [53] Pei Wang and Nuno Vasconcelos, ‘Deliberative explanations: visualizing network insecurities’, *NeurIPS*, **32**, (2019).
- [54] Daan Wierstra, Alexander Foerster, Jan Peters, and Juergen Schmidhuber, ‘Solving deep memory POMDPs with recurrent policy gradients’, in *Int. Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*, (2007).

Appendix

In this appendix, we provide additional details on the players’ behavior in our debate framework (Section A), pre-trained classifier details (Section B), additional ablation experiments and conclusions in section C and finally we illustrate the behavior of committed and non-committed behavior in section D. We also demonstrate additional debate examples in the end of the SM.

A Debate Objective

As previously described in section 5, the joint objective with respect to the defined policy network Π_{θ_i} in a min-max format can be described as:

$$V(\mathcal{P}_{\theta^1}^1, \mathcal{P}_{\theta^2}^2) = \min_{\theta^1} \max_{\theta^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_t \log \Pi_{\theta^1}(h_t^1 | \hat{z}_t, \hat{y}) \mathcal{U}_t^2(\mathcal{S}^1, \mathcal{S}^2) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_t \log \Pi_{\theta^2}(h_t^2 | \hat{z}_t, \hat{y}) \mathcal{U}_t^1(\mathcal{S}^1, \mathcal{S}^2) \right] \quad (3)$$

Based on our argument strength and utility definition, we can claim that the utility $\mathcal{U}^1 > 0$ iff the majority of the arguments have positive argument strength. This ensures that the sampled arguments belong to the semifactual feature set (features, when masked affect class probability but not class outcome). While for player \mathcal{P}^2 we can claim that utility $\mathcal{U}^2 > 0$ the majority of features that are sampled as arguments belong to the counterfactual feature set (features when masked affect the class probability and class outcome).

With this knowledge, if we binarize the utility values, we can restructure the debate objective defined in Equation 3 as follows:

$$\tilde{V}(\mathcal{P}_{\theta^1}^1, \mathcal{P}_{\theta^2}^2) = \min_{\theta^1} \max_{\theta^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_t \log \Pi_{\theta^1}(\cdot) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_t \log \Pi_{\theta^2}(\cdot) \right] \quad (4)$$

such that: $\mathcal{A}_t^1 \in z_1, \mathcal{A}_t^2 \in z_2$

Where z_1 and z_2 correspond to the semi-factual and counter-factual feature sets. This brings us to our second Hypothesis, which argues about the existence of z_1 and z_2 , such that $z_1, z_2 \subseteq z$ such that $z_1 \cup z_2 = z$ and $z_1 \cap z_2 = \emptyset$ and at convergence forces arguments to follow $\Pi_{\theta^1}^1(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(z_1), \Pi_{\theta^2}^2(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(z_2)$.

B Pre-trained models

Vanilla model: We use the custom architecture consisting of 7 convolutional layers with 3×3 kernel with batch-norm and ReLU activation layer. Finally, we project the global average pooled vector onto a class probability space using a linear layer followed by softmax activation.

To reduce the dimensionality of features, we apply the max pooling layer after the first, third, and fifth layers. We train this classifier for 50 epochs with a batch size of 64. We use Adam optimizer with an initial learning rate of 0.001 and weight decay of 0.001.

Deeper models: For high-resolution images, we consider the standard DenseNet-121 and Resnet18 architecture and train the model. We use Adam optimizer with an initial learning rate of 0.001 and weight decay of 0.005 and trained model for 64 epochs.

All our models were trained on a system with GPU: Nvidia Telsa T4 16GB, CPU: Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6230, and RAM of 384GB.

C Codebook Ablation and Argument Properties

To understand the effect of codebook size on debate accuracy and argument properties, we also tabulate the resulting debate outcome accuracy and split ratio as a result of codebook size and debate length variation.

Table 2 demonstrates the debate accuracy by varying codebook size and debate length on all three datasets, while Table 3 demonstrates the variation in split ratio with respect to debate length and codebook size.

Based on this ablation, we claim that:

- The debate length helps in achieving better debate accuracy irrespective of codebook size. However, the improvement in performance plateaus after certain length, depending upon dataset.
- Increase in codebook size has an effect on debate performance; we believe this might be because after a certain threshold over codebook size, it makes it easier for players to differentiate between z_1 and z_2 .

D Committed Vs Non-committed debates

The debates can be categorized into committed and non-committed debates [25]. In the case of committed debates, players are expected to make a claim about the environment at the beginning or at the end of the debate. In contrast, in the case of non-committed debates, players argue about the environment without making any claims. [25] compare the debate with pre-committed and non-committed behavior and observe that debates with pre-committed claims perform much better in comparison with non-committed debates. Pre-committed debates have similar properties as non-committed debates, assuming the judge is honest in all the cases. In [25], players reason out all the possibilities without revealing them and make a claim first and provide reasons based on opponents’ arguments. However, in our setup, as the players are modeled as POMDP, they reason about an environment only via exchanging arguments and finally use those arguments to make a claim. We conduct ablations demonstrating the performance of both committed and non-committed behavior in debate. In the case of non-committed debates, the claim made by a player is only used in regularisation and not in policy updates, and player \mathcal{P}^1 gets a positive reward if the debate outcome is the same as the classifier’s decision.

In the case of any NE, given an optimal horizon length n and POMDP structure of players, if arguments and counterarguments made by both players in each and every step are optimal, the debate results in a similar outcome with or without post committing to any claim. We demonstrate this by comparing argument properties and debate convergence via multiple ablations as demonstrated in table 4 in SM and table 1 in the main text.

Table 2: Debate faithfulness by varying codebook size (total number of discrete features) on SHAPE, MNIST, and AFHQ datasets.

Datasets (\rightarrow)	SHAPE				MNIST				AFHQ				
	Codebook Size in \mathcal{E} (\downarrow)	4	6	10	20	4	6	10	20	4	6	10	20
1024	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.61	0.74	0.83	0.79
512	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.63	0.79	0.83	0.83
256	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.61	0.78	0.78	0.82
128	0.59	0.82	0.93	0.94	0.52	0.64	0.73	0.74	0.61	0.81	0.79	0.81	
64	0.58	0.80	0.93	0.94	0.52	0.64	0.88	0.94	-	-	-	-	

Table 3: Split ratio by varying codebook size (total number of discrete features) on SHAPE, MNIST, and AFHQ datasets.

Datasets (\rightarrow)	SHAPE				MNIST				AFHQ				
	Codebook Size in \mathcal{E} (\downarrow)	4	6	10	20	4	6	10	20	4	6	10	20
1024	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.53	0.52	0.60	0.60
512	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.53	0.58	0.56	0.56
256	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.50	0.58	0.58	0.58
128	0.59	0.60	0.58	0.59	0.40	0.47	0.58	0.57	0.53	0.59	0.59	0.59	
64	0.58	0.58	0.60	0.58	0.38	0.46	0.56	0.56	-	-	-	-	

Table 4: Ablation results results w.r.t debate length on non-committed games.

$n / Z_R \rightarrow \setminus$ Dataset \downarrow	<i>faithfulness</i>			Split Ratio (Z_R)		
	4	6	10	4	6	10
SHAPE	0.55	0.79	0.89	0.58	0.60	0.60
MNIST	0.58	0.61	0.75	0.44	0.45	0.56
AFHQ	0.60	0.77	0.80	0.43	0.58	0.54