

A Theoretical Framework for AI Models Explainability

Matteo Rizzo^{1*}, Alberto Veneri^{1,2}, Andrea Albarelli¹, Claudio Lucchese¹, Cristina Conati²,

¹ Ca' Foscari University ² ISTI-CNR ³ University of British Columbia

{matteo.rizzo, alberto.veneri, andrea.albarelli, claudio.lucchese}@unive.it conati@cs.ubc.ca

Abstract

Explainability is a vibrant research topic in the artificial intelligence community, with growing interest across methods and domains. Much has been written about the topic, yet explainability still lacks shared terminology and a framework capable of providing structural soundness to explanations. In our work, we address these issues by proposing a novel definition of explanation that is a synthesis of what can be found in the literature. We recognize that explanations are not atomic but the product of evidence stemming from the model and its input-output and the human interpretation of this evidence. Furthermore, we fit explanations into the properties of faithfulness (i.e., the explanation being a true description of the model's decision-making) and plausibility (i.e., how much the explanation looks convincing to the user). Using our proposed theoretical framework simplifies how these properties are operationalized and provide new insight into common explanation methods that we analyze as case studies.

1 Introduction

The advent of Deep-Learning (DL) allowed for raising the accuracy bar of Machine Learning models for countless tasks and domains. Riding the wave of enthusiasm around such stunning results, DL models have been deployed even in high-stake decision-making environments, not without criticism [1]. These kinds of environments require not only high predictive accuracy but also an *explanation* of why that prediction was made. The need for explanations initiated the discussion around the explainability of DL models, which are known to be “black boxes”. In other words, their inner decision-making process is hard for humans to be understood. Who should be accountable for a model-based decision and how a model came to a certain prediction are just some of the questions that drive research on explaining Machine Learning (ML) models. With the first attempts of the legislative machinery to make explanations for automatic decisions a user's right [2], the pres-

sure on generating explanations for the ML model's behaviors was raised even more. Although the endeavor of the eXplainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) community to develop both models that are explainable by design [3; 4; 5] and methods to explain existing black-box models [6; 7; 8], the way to DL explainability is paved with results that are mostly preliminary and anecdotal in nature (e.g., [9; 10; 11]). Most notably, it is hard to relate different pieces of research due to a lack of common theoretical grounds capable of supporting and guiding the discussion. In particular, we detect a gap in the literature on foundational issues such as a shared definition of the term “explanation” and the role of the users within the design and deployment of explainability for complex ML models. The lack of a common terminology and of an outline of the main theoretical components of the discussion around interpretability disperses research, while the current literature finds it hard to provide the involved stakeholders with principled analytical tools to operate on black-box models. In this work, we propose a theoretical framework that outlines the core components of the discussion around interpretability disperses research, while the current literature finds it hard to provide the involved stakeholders with principled analytical tools to operate on black-box models. In this work, we propose a theoretical framework that outlines the core components of the explainability machinery and lays out grounds for a more coherent debate on how to explain the decisions of ML models. Such a framework is not meant to be set in stone but rather to be used as a common reference among researchers and iteratively improved to fit more and more sophisticated explainability methods and strategies. Thus, we hope to provide shared jargon and formal definitions to inform and standardize the discussion around crucial topics of XAI. The core of the proposed theoretical framework is a novel definition of explanation, that draws from existing literature in sociology and philosophy but, at the same time, is easy to operationalize when analyzing a specific approach to interpretability. We conceive an explanation as the product of two decoupled components, namely some evidence and its interpretation. Evidence is any sort of information stemming from a ML model, while an interpretation is some semantic meaning that human stakeholders attribute to the evidence to make sense of the model's decision-making process. We relate these definitions to crucial properties of explanations, especially *faithfulness* and *plausibility*. Jacovi & Goldberg define faithfulness as “the accurate representation of the causal chain of decision-making processes in a model” [12]. We argue that faithfulness relates in different ways to the elements of the proposed theoretical framework, namely, it assures the inter-

*Contact Author

pretation of the evidence is true to how the model actually uses it within its inner reasoning. A property orthogonal to faithfulness is plausibility, namely “the degree to which some explanation is aligned with the user’s understanding of the model’s decision process [12]”. A follow-up work by Jacovi & Goldberg addresses plausibility as the “property of an explanation of being convincing towards the model prediction, regardless of whether the model was correct or whether the interpretation is faithful” [13]. We relate plausibility to faithfulness and highlight a need for both of these properties to be embedded in explainability methods and strategies. This has the purpose of generating faithful explanations that are also intuitively convincing for the user. As a case study, we zoom in on the evaluation of faithfulness of some popular DL explanation tools, such as “attention” [8; 14], Gradient-weighted Class Activation Mapping (Grad-CAM) [15], SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) [7], but also of a model considered intrinsically interpretable such as a linear regression model. More specifically, we analyze how our framework can be used in practice and how can be useful to give a common interpretation of the explainability of a ML model.

2 Designing Explainability

Research in XAI seizes the problem of explaining models for decision-making from multiple perspectives. First of all, we observe that most of the existing literature uses the terms “interpretable” and “explainable” interchangeably, while some have highlighted the semantic nuance that distinguishes the two words [16]. We argue that the term *explainable* (and, by extension *explainability*) is more suited than the term *interpretable* (similarly, by extension, *interpretability*) to describe the property of a model for which effort is made to generate explanations of its decision-making process. The definition of *explanation* is thus crucial and will be discussed extensively in §4. Our claim follows two rationales: (i) the term *interpretation* is used within our proposed framework with a precise meaning that deviates from the current literature (see §4.3); (ii) we argue against grouping models into *inherently interpretable* and *post-hoc explainable*. Recently, Molnar has defined intrinsic interpretability as a property of ML models that are considered fully understandable due to their simple structure (e.g., short decision trees or sparse linear models), while post hoc explainability as the need for some models to apply interpretation methods after training [17]. Although principled, we drop this distinction by claiming that all models embed a certain degree of explainability. Even though to the best of our knowledge, no metrics can quantify explainability yet, we can assert that this depends on multiple factors. In particular, a model is as explainable as the explanations that are proposed to the user to justify a certain prediction are effective. Thus, bringing the human into the explainability design loop is key to deploying models that are actually explainable. Consequently, there are models for which is easier to design explanations (i.e., the so-called white-box models, e.g., linear regression, decision trees, etc.) and models for which the same process is more difficult (i.e., the so-called black-box models, e.g., artificial neural networks). The notion of difficulty here is defined by the inner complexity of the

model. We highlight that the degree of explainability moves along a gradient from black-box to white-box models, without clear-cut thresholds. Nevertheless in §6, we show that explanations for both white-box and black-box models fit our proposed framework. Thus they both can be structured homogeneously and more deeply understood by leveraging theoretical tools. Most importantly, we advocate for explainability design as a crucial part of Artificial Intelligence (AI) software development. We endorse Chazette et al. in claiming that explainability should be considered a non-functional requirement in the software design process [18]. Thus explanations for any ML models (and, especially, for DL models) should be accounted for within the initial design of an AI-powered application. This has three main implications. First of all, the approach to AI design should apply a top-down approach, from delineating explanations to defining the specifics of the model. Secondly, designing explanations means taking humans into the AI development loop, thus fostering human-centered AI. This has the main effect of generating a more intelligible AI by design and, as a side-effect, may increase trust in the end-users [19]. Thirdly, even the most accurate black-box model should not be deployed without an explanation mechanism backing it up, as we cannot be sure whether it learned to discriminate over meaningful or wrong features. A classic example is a dog image classification model learning to detect huskies because of the snowy setting instead of the features of the animal itself, involuntarily deceiving the users [6].

3 Characterising the decision-making process of a Machine Learning Model

In this section, we provide a formal characterization of the decision-making process of any machine learning model for classification. Note that this task is used as a running example for its relevance and relative simplicity. The concepts reported in this section can be extended to other tasks (possibly with minor adjustments). Such concepts will substantiate the explainability components of our proposed framework, whose details are provided in §4. We assume that a ML model M makes predictions according to some decision-making process, namely, it actuates a selection among alternatives of a course of action. The overall decision-making process of M can be represented as a chain of $N > 0$ decision-making processes that are causally related. This causal chain is enforced by model design (i.e., the sequence of layers in the architecture of a neural network, or the depth of a decision tree). It corresponds to the chain of operations needed by the model to compute the classification function through learning (i.e., the approximation of the optimal classification function). More specifically, M learns \hat{f} approximating the desired and unknown decision function f . At every step in the chain of decision-making processes, the model learns how to make the best (i.e., optimized) decision, that is, it learns the function \hat{f}_i with $i \in [1, N]$ such that $\hat{f} = \hat{f}_1 \circ \hat{f}_2 \circ \dots \circ \hat{f}_N$. We refer to each of the functions \hat{f}_i as the *transformation functions* at some step i in the decision-making process. We associate each of these functions to a related sub-decision-making process s_i that we call a *transformation step*.




Figure 1: Example of transformation functions for two steps s_i .

Given some input x , a model M parameterized on Θ makes a prediction \hat{y} as the output of a sequence of N causally dependent transformation steps s_i .

Let the set of transformation functions associated with each step s_i be defined as follows:

$$F_i = \{ \hat{f}_{i,m} : X_{i,m} \rightarrow Y_{i,m} \mid x_{i,j} = \hat{f}_{i,m}(x_{i-1,z}, \Theta) \\ \forall m \in [1, n_i], 0 < j \leq k_i, 0 < z \leq k_{i-1} \}$$

This is exemplified in Figure 1. Each $\hat{f}_{i,m}$ is a function advancing the computation of model M 's prediction from s_{i-1} to s_i via some transformation of the original input or of one of its intermediate representations $x_{i,j}$. These functions are exactly $|F_i| = n_i$ for some $i \in [1, N]$. For a given instance of its parameters Θ , the model M picks one $\hat{f}_{i,m} \in F_i$ at each step s_i to move forward from $x_{i-1,j}$ to $x_{i,z}$. Overall, M approximates the composition $f = f_1 \circ f_2 \dots \circ f_N$ such that $f(x) = y$ is the ground truth prediction. Note that $x = x_{1,1}$, $\hat{y} = x_{N,j}$. For each function related to some s_i , we know the input and output of \hat{f}_i (i.e., x_{i-1}, x_i) but we do not know how the input is transformed into the output through \hat{f}_i , which is opaque. That is, we do not know the learned function behavior depending on the parameters of the model M .

Let the transformation space of s_i be defined as follows:

$$S_i = \{ x_{i,j} \mid x_{i,j} = \hat{f}_{i,m}^*(x_{i-1,z}, \Theta) \\ \forall m \in [1, n_i], 0 < j \leq k_{i,m}, 0 < z \leq k_{i-1} \}$$

That is the union of images of functions $\hat{f}_{i,m} \in F_i$ that can be learned at s_i . If $|S_i| = k_i$ then, at each s_i , M can advance in the transformation space towards at most k_i different input transformations $x_{i,j}$. Note that $k_i \leq n_i$ (i.e., each $x_{i,j}$ is the output of at least one $\hat{f}_{i,m}$). Then the pre-image $PS_m \subset X_m$ of $\hat{f}_{i,m} \in F_i$ satisfies: $PS_m \cap S_{i-1} \neq \emptyset$. That is, the domain of each transformation function contains at least one element from the image of the previous transformation function. This property enforces causality.

At each s_i , the model can choose among k_i decisions $x_{i,j}$ output of the corresponding approximate decision functions. This raises two problems. First, at step s_i the chosen function $\hat{f}_{i,m}$ can map different decisions made at s_{i-1} (i.e., the previous decision step) into the same decision $x_{i,j}$. That is,

the same decision at one step can be made based on different rationales (i.e., again, decisions) from the previous step. For example, words in a text can be encoded in different ways but yield the same text classification score. Thus, we are unsure which $x_{i-1,j}$ led to $x_{i,z}$. Luckily enough, this problem is relatively easy to tackle: depending on the model, we might know the decision taken at each s_{i-1} inspecting the output of the intermediate model component. For instance, in the case of text classification, we can inspect the word embeddings before decoding them into a prediction using a transformer layer.

Second, at s_i the function $\hat{f}_{i,m}$ can map the same decision $x_{i-1,j}$ made by s_{i-1} (i.e., the previous decision step) into $x_{i,z}$ in k_i^1 different ways. In other words, starting from the same input decision at s_{i-1} we can reach the same subsequent decision at s_i in many different ways. For example, pictures of zebras and salmon can be distinguished either based on their anatomy (i.e., zebras have stripes, salmon have gills) or the environment/habitat (i.e., zebras live in savannas, and salmon in rivers). This second problem is harder to tackle: how do we know which of the k_i possible alternative mappings of $x_{i-1,j}$ led to $x_{i,z}$? This remains an open question, with major implications for the discussion around faithfulness, which we enlarge in the next section.

4 Defining explanations

Recent work on ML interpretability produced multiple definitions for the term "explanation". According to Lipton, "explanation refers to numerous ways of exchanging information about a phenomenon, in this case, the functionality of a model or the rationale and criteria for a decision, to different stakeholders" [20]. Similarly, for Guidotti et al. "an explanation is an "interface" between humans and a decision-maker that is at the same time both an accurate proxy of the decision-maker and comprehensible to humans" [21]. Murdoch et al. add to how the explanation is delivered to the user stating that "an explanation is some relevant knowledge extracted from a machine-learning model concerning relationships either contained in data or learned by the model. [...] They can be produced in formats such as visualizations, natural language, or mathematical equations, depending on the context and audience" [22]. On a more general note, Mueller et al. state that "material that is offered as a (candidate) explanation, no matter its medium, format, or reference, is only an explanation if it results in good effect, that is, it has explanatory value for particular individuals. Technically, the property of "being an explanation" is not a property of the text, statements, narratives, diagrams, or other forms of material. It is an interaction of (i) the offered explanation, (ii) the learner's knowledge and beliefs, (iii) the context or situation and its immediate demands, and (iv) the learner's goals or purposes in that context. This explains why it is possible that purely descriptive statements, not primarily intended to serve as explanations, can nevertheless have explanatory value" [23]. Finally, Miller tackles the challenge of defining explanations from a sociological perspective. The author highlights a wide taxonomy of explanations but focuses on those which are "an answer to a "why-question" [24]. A "why-question" is a combina-




Figure 2: Overview of the proposed theoretical framework of explainability.

tion of a “weather question”, preceded by the word ‘why’. A “weather question” is an interrogative question whose correct answer is either ‘yes’ or ‘no’. The presupposition within a “why-question” is the fact referred to in the question under explanation, expressed as if it were true (or false if the question is a negative sentence). For example, the question “why did they do that?” is a why-question, with the inner whether-question being “did they do that?”, and the presupposition being “they did that”. [...] People do not explain the causes for an event per se, but explain the cause of an event relative to some other event that did not occur; that is, an explanation is always of the form “Why P rather than Q?”, in which P is the target event and Q is a counterfactual contrast case that did not occur, even if the Q is implicit in the question. This is called “contrastive explanation”.

The definitions mentioned above offer a well-rounded perspective on what constitutes an explanation. However, they fail to highlight the atomic components of an explanation and to characterize their relationships. We synthesize our proposed definition of explanation based on complementary aspects of the existing definitions. The result is a concise definition that is easy to operationalize for supporting the analysis of multiple approaches to interpretability. Our full proposed framework is reported in the scheme in Figure 2, whose components will be discussed in the following sections.

4.1 Explanation

Given a model M which takes inputs x and returns a prediction \hat{y} , we define an *explanation* ($E(x)$) as the output of an *interpretation function* applied to some *evidence*, providing the answer to a “why question” posed by the user.

4.2 Evidence

Evidence (e) is whatever kind of objective information stemming from the black-box model we wish to provide an explanation for and that can reveal insights into its inner workings and rationale for prediction (e.g., attention weights, model parameters, gradients, etc.).

Evidence Extractor

The evidence is extracted from a model M applying some *evidence extractor* (ξ) function. An evidence extractor is a (not

necessarily white-box) method fetching some kind of relevant information about some input x and prediction \hat{y} for a model M and their relationship, i.e., $e = \xi(x, p, M)$. Evidence extractors (e.g., encoder + attention layers, gradient back-propagation, random tree approximation, etc.) take out known relevant information about M and related transformation steps s_i (i.e., evidence, e.g., attention weights, gradient values, random tree mimicking original model, etc.), producing instances of a certain type of evidence.

Explanatory Potential

We define *explanatory potential* ($\epsilon(e)$) of some evidence as the extent to which the evidence influences the causal chain of transformations steps s_i of a model M . Intuitively, the explanatory potential indicates “how much” of a model the selected type of evidence can explain.

4.3 Interpretation

An *interpretation* ($g(e, p)$) is a function associating semantic meaning to some evidence and mapping its instances into explanations for a given prediction (e.g., “attention weights are descriptive of input components’ importance to model output”). Then an explanation can be defined as $E = g(e, p)$.

Local vs. Global Interpretations

Evidence, and thus the related explanation, can either be local or global. Local evidence (e.g., attention weights, gradient, etc.) relates relevant model information to a particular input x and corresponding prediction p . Then we can define a local explanation as $E_l = g(\xi(x, M, \hat{y}), \hat{y})$. Global evidence (e.g. full set of model parameters) is independent of specific inputs and might explain higher level functioning (providing deeper or wider info) of the model or some of its sub-components. Then $E_g = g(\xi(M))$.

Generating Interpretations

Given some evidence involved in one or more steps s_i of M , we “guess” how evidence is involved in unknown input-to-output transformations by formulating an interpretation g of some extent of the decision-making process of the model. At a low level, this means assuming as true certain conjecture $f_{i,m}^* = f_{i,m}$ for some $i \in [1, N]$, that is a sequence of the k_i possible alternative mappings of $x_{i-1,j}$ to $x_{i,z}$. In other words, we generate a hypothesis g that encapsulates the approximations $f_{i,m}^*$ of the behavior of certain functions $f_{i,m}$ learned by M at some steps s_i , which “operationalizes” the evidence’s instance. On an abstract level, interpretations can be seen as hypotheses about the role of evidence with explanatory power in the explanation-generation process. Just like a good experimental hypothesis, a good interpretation satisfies two core properties: (i) is testable, and (ii) clearly defines dependent and independent variables. Interpretations can be formulated using different forms of reasoning (e.g., deductive, inductive, abductive, etc.). In particular, the survey on explanations and social sciences by Miller reports that people usually make assumptions (i.e., in our context, choose an interpretation) via social attribution of intent (to the evidence) [24]. Social attribution is concerned with how people attribute or explain the behavior of others, and not with

the real causes of the behavior. Social attribution is generally expressed through folk psychology, that is the attribution of intentional behavior using ‘everyday’ terms such as beliefs, desires, intentions, emotions, and personality traits. Such concepts may not truly be the cause of the described behavior but are indeed those humans leverage to model and predict each others’ behaviors. This may generate misalignment between a hypothesized interpretation of some evidence and its actual role within the decision-making process of the model. In other words, reasoning on evidence through folk psychology might generate interpretations that are *plausible* but not necessarily *faithful* to the decision-making process of the model (such terms will be further explored in the next sections). Thus social attribution can be a double-edged sword when it enters the interpretation generation process as it can propel plausibility without accounting for faithfulness. This issue was highlighted by Jacovi & Goldberg, who introduced a property of explanations called “aligned faithfulness” [13]. In the words of the authors, an explanation satisfies this property if “it is faithful and aligned to the social attribution of the intent behind the causal chain of decision-making processes”. Our proposed framework allows us to go a step forward in the characterization of this property. More specifically, we observe that the property of aligned faithfulness pertains only to interpretations, not evidence. The latter by itself has no inherent meaning, its semantics is defined by some interpretation that may or may not involve social attribution of intent to the causal chain of decision-making processes.

4.4 Explanation Interface

Explanations are meant to be delivered to some target users. We define XUI (eXplanation User Interface) as the format in which some explanation is presented to the end user. This could be, for example, in the form of text, plots, infographics, etc. We argue that an XUI is characterized by three main properties: (i) human understandability, (ii) informativeness, and (iii) completeness. The *human-understandability* is the degree to which users can understand the answer to their “why” question via the XUI. This property depends on user cognition, bias, expertise, goals, etc., and is influenced by the complexity of the selected interpretation function. The *informativeness (or depth)* of an explanation is a measure of the effectiveness of an XUI in answering the why question posed by the user. That is the depth of information for some s_i of great interest in the XUI. The *completeness (or width)* of an explanation is the accuracy of an XUI in describing the overall model’s workings, and the degree to which it allows for anticipating predictions. That is the width in terms of the number of s_i the XUI spans. Note that both informativeness and completeness are bound by the explanatory potential of the evidence (e.g., attention weights do not explain the full model, just some transformation steps, while the full set of model parameters does).

5 Faithfulness Versus Plausibility

5.1 Faithfulness

Given an interpretation function g describing some transformation steps s_i within a model M ’s decision-making process,




Figure 3: Overview of the outcome on the user of the interaction between faithfulness and plausibility.

we want to be able to prove that g is faithful (at least to some extent) to the actual transformations made by M to an input x to get a prediction \hat{y} . Namely, we define the property of *faithfulness of an interpretation* $(\phi_i(g, e))$, as the extent to which an interpretation g accurately describes the behavior of some function $f_{i,m}(x_{i-1,j}, \Theta)$ that some model M learned to map an output $x_{i-1,j}$ at s_{i-1} into $x_{i,z}$ at s_i making use of some instance evidence e . Given some evidence e and its interpretation function g , we say that a related explanation is faithful to some transformation step s_i if the following two conditions hold: (i) the evidence e has explanatory potential $\epsilon_i > 0$, and (ii) the interpretation g has faithfulness $\phi_i > 0$. Then we can define the *faithfulness of an explanation* as $\Phi = \sum_i \epsilon_i \phi_i \forall i \in I \subseteq [1, N]$ where I is the set of indices of transformation steps s_i that involved evidence e (i.e., all i such that $\epsilon_i > 0$). Note that the faithfulness of an explanation is the sum of the faithfulness scores of its components, that is, the faithfulness of the interpretations of the evidence involved in the generation of the explanation. Besides, the related explanatory power is multiplied by the faithfulness of each interpretation to regulate its impact within the final faithfulness score of the explanation. In fact, evidence with higher explanatory potential should have a larger impact on the overall faithfulness score of the interpretation.

We can have various measures of faithfulness that are associated with different explanation targets, in the same way as we have different evaluation metrics to measure the quality of a ML model to complete a specified task.

When designing a faithful explanatory method we can opt for two approaches. We can achieve faithfulness “structurally” by trying to enforce this property on pre-selected interpretations in model design (e.g., imposing constraints on transformation steps limiting the range of learnable functions). This direction has been recently explored by Jain et al. [25] and Jacovi & Goldberg [13]. An alternative strategy is trial-and-error: formulating interpretations and assessing their faithfulness via formal proofs or requirements-based testing using proxy tasks. While formal proofs are still missing in current literature, a number of tests for faithfulness have been recently proposed [26; 9; 10; 11].




Figure 4: Decision-making process of the simplest model using attention.

5.2 Plausibility

The combined value of the three above-mentioned properties of XUIs (*i.e.*, human understandability, informativeness, and completeness) drives the plausibility of an explanation. More specifically, we define *plausibility* as the degree to which an explanation is aligned with the user’s understanding of the partial or overall inner workings of the model. Plausibility is a user-dependent property and as such, it is subject to the user’s knowledge, bias, etc. Differently from faithfulness, the plausibility of explanations can be assessed via user studies. Note that a plausible explanation is not necessarily faithful, just like a faithful explanation is not necessarily plausible. It is desirable for both properties to be satisfied in the design of some explanation. Interestingly, an unfaithful but plausible explanation may deceive a user into believing that a model behaves according to a rationale when it is actually not the case. This raises ethical concerns around the possibility that poorly designed explanations could spread inaccurate or false knowledge among the end-users. Fig. 3 provides a simplified overview of the problem.

6 Case Studies

6.1 Attention

The introduction of attention mechanisms has been one of the most notable breakthroughs in DL research in recent years. Originally proposed for empowering neural machine translation tasks [8], the transformer architecture has popularised the concept of attention citeVaswani2017-kq, which is the current state-of-the-art approach for numerous automated cognitive tasks. The chain of transformations in the simplest neural model making use of attention is a three-step causal process: (i) encoding, (ii) weight encodings by attention scores, and (iii) decoding into prediction. This is exemplified in Figure 4.

Then we can define the function learned by the model as the composition $f = f_1 \circ f_2 \circ f_3$, where each f_i for $i \in [1, 3]$ corresponds to the respective decision-making process in the causal chain.

Evidence. Let f_1 be an encoder function such that $f_1(x) = \hat{x}$, with \hat{X} being the set of encoded input timesteps for some input x split in some consequent tokens t . Moreover, let $W = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \hat{x}_i$ for all $\hat{x}_i \in \hat{X}$. That is, W is the set of encoded timesteps weighted by their corresponding attention scores.

Thus $f_2(\hat{X}) = W$. Then evidence is related to attention as follows:

$$\xi_{att}(x, M) = \{\alpha_i \mid W = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \hat{x}_i\} \quad (1)$$

That is, the evidence e_{att} for some input x is the set of output α_i scores produced by the attention layer and then applied to the encoded timesteps \hat{x}_i . The explanatory potential $\epsilon(e_{att})$ can be computed as the ratio between the number of parameters analyzed N with respect to the total number of parameters of the model $|\Theta|$, *i.e.*, $N/Theta$.

Interpretation. The interpretation of the evidence is a function $g(e_{att}(x, M), \hat{y})$ that describes the unknown function f_{3,m_3} s.t. $f_{3,m_3}(W, \Theta) = \hat{y}$. A faithful interpretation describes the behavior of the function f_{3,m_3} the model learned to decode attention-weighted encodings into predictions.

Faithfulness. Note that we do not know the faithful interpretation function so we hypothesize its behavior by formulating a candidate interpretation. The generation of such an interpretation is usually guided by the intuition of the researcher. In the case of attention, the interpretation of the attention is generally the following: ”the value of each attention weight describes the importance of the corresponding token in the original input to the model output”. Unfortunately, albeit plausible, research in this field disproved this interpretation [9; 10; 11], leaving the role of attention for explainability (if any) still unclear.

6.2 Grad-CAM

A popular explanation called Grad-CAM [15] presents a method to explain a prediction made by an image classifier using the information encompassed in the back-propagated gradient of a prediction. In short, Grad-CAM uses the information about the gradient computed at the last convolutional layer of a Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) given a certain input x to assign a feature importance score for each input feature.

Evidence. The Grad-CAM evidence-extraction ξ_{grad} method consisted of using the feature activation map A^k of a convolutional layer from a given input x to compute the neurons’ importance weights α_i . The explanatory potential $\epsilon(e_{grad})$ is related, as for the attention mechanism, to the number of parameters analyzed w.r.t the total number of parameters of the method.

Interpretation. Grad-CAM claim that the computed neuron’s weights α_i corresponds to the part of the input features that influence the final prediction the most.

Faithfulness. The authors measure the faithfulness of the model using image occlusion. That is, they patched some part of the input to the model, and they measured the correlation with the difference in the final output. With this faithfulness metric, a high correlation means a high faithfulness in the explanation.

6.3 SHAP

Lundberg & Lee in 2017 proposed SHAP [7] a method to assign an importance value to each feature used by a black-box model M to explain a single prediction \hat{y} . SHAP has

been presented as a generalization of other well-known explanation methods, such as Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations (LIME) [27], DeepLIFT [28], Layer-wise relevance propagation [29], and classic Shapley value estimation [7].

SHAP, and the corresponding SHAP values, have been proposed as the unique solution to find an additive feature attribution method of the type:

$$h(z') = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^M \beta_i z'_i \quad (2)$$

where $z'_i \in \{0, 1\}^M$ is a simplified version of the input x , M is the number of features used in the explanation, and $\beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a coefficient that represents the effect that the i -th feature has on the output.

Evidence. In this case, the only evidence $e_{shape} = \xi_{shap}(M, x)$ used by SHAP are the predictions made by the classifier in a neighborhood of x . To compute the explanatory potential $\epsilon(e_{shap})$ of this method we can adopt two ways of reasoning. On the one hand, we can say that $\epsilon(e_{shap})$ is approximately zero because we cannot say anything about the reasoning behind the predictions made by a classifier only looking at the value of its predictions and without considering how the model is described. On the other hand, we can also say that $\epsilon(e_{shap})$ is directly proportional to the number of predictions that we use in our analysis since having access to the prediction of the whole feature space would give an exact reproduction of the model without knowing its description. We claim that the more reasonable definition of the $\epsilon(e_{shap})$ is the latter. Thus, the greater the number of predictions we have, the higher the exploratory potential of the method.

Interpretation. The interpretation g_{shap} of the evidence proposed by SHAP is that, given e_{shap} , we can locally reproduce the behavior of a complex unknown model with a simple additive model $h(\cdot)$, and analyzing $h(\cdot)$ we can get a local explanation E_{shap} of the behavior of the initial model. That is, the proposed interpretation of the evidence is the result of the optimization problem in Equation 2.

Faithfulness. Even though the authors do not present a measure of the faithfulness of the explanation directly, they provide three desirable properties that are *i)* local accuracy, *ii)* missingness, *iii)* consistency. The authors showed that their method is the only one that satisfies all these properties, assessing a requirements-based form of faithfulness as described in section 5.

6.4 Linear regression model

Linear regression models are not an explanation method but are normally considered *intrinsically interpretable*. Following our proposed framework, we claim that defining them, among other models, as *intrinsically interpretable* is not accurate and often misleading. In fact, the definition of what is simple to be interpreted by humans is not well-defined, and we can enumerate various examples of models that are easy to be interpreted by a practitioner but they are almost black-boxed for non-expert users. That is the case for a linear regression model, which is normally referred to as an *intrinsically interpretable* model because for people with a basic

mathematical background is relatively easy to understand the prediction made by the model.

A linear regression model $\hat{f}_{lin}(\cdot)$ is typically formulated as:

$$\hat{f}_{lin}(x) = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_i x'_i \quad (3)$$

where β_i are the weights of the learned features, and N is the feature space dimension.

Evidence. The implicit assumption, claiming that a linear model is intrinsically interpretable, is that the weights $\beta_i, 1 \leq i \leq M$ are a good explanation for the model. Thus $e_{lin} = \{\beta_i, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$. With a linear model, we have the maximum explanatory potential ξ_{lin} because with e_{lin} we can fully describe the model.

Interpretation. Assuming a normalization of the features, we can say that the higher the value of β_i , the higher the contribution of the feature x_i to the model prediction.

Faithfulness. There are no doubts about the faithfulness of the interpretation of the predictions given the normalization assumption, and in fact, a linear model is normally considered an intrinsically interpretable method. However, its plausibility to a non-expert user is not guaranteed.

7 Future Work

The novel framework proposed in this work makes it clear that the XAI community must still face many challenges before claiming the explainability of a model. First, we observe an abundance of evidence for explaining black-box models. Yet, generating faithful interpretations is hard, as much as it is simple to be deceived by plausible yet untrue interpretations. Secondly, even if an interpretation might be correct (*i.e.*, faithful), it still has to be wrapped in such a way that it is easy for the stakeholders to digest. These implications wink at working on explainability from a novel perspective. That is, explainability should be part of the software design and engage the stakeholders at the earliest stages of the development of an AI-based tool. Future research will need to address the problem of generating faithful interpretations, possibly envisioned through a top-down model design that accounts for explainability as much as it accounts for accuracy. Moreover, user studies should be integrated into the explainability design to understand how to deliver explanations that are faithful, possibly plausible, and certainly human-understandable. Going a step further, multiple explanation designs should be tested for their effectiveness in enabling the users to perform their tasks in an informed manner, which is the ultimate goal of explainability.

8 Conclusions

In this work, we propose a novel theoretical framework that brings order and opportunities for a better design of explanations to the XAI community by introducing formal terminology. The framework allows dissecting explanations into evidence (factual data coming from the model) and interpretation (a hypothesized function that describes how the model uses the evidence). The explanation is the product of the application of the interpretation to the evidence and is presented

to the target user via some form of explanation interface. These components allow for designing more principled explanations by defining the atomic components and the properties that enable them. There are three core properties: (i) the explanatory potential for the evidence (i.e., how much of the model the evidence can tell about); (ii) the faithfulness of the interpretation (i.e., whether the interpretation is actually true to the decision-making of the model); (iii) the plausibility of the explanation interface (i.e., how much the explanation makes sense to the user and is intelligible). We show that the theoretical framework can be applied to explanations coming from a variety of methods, which fit the atomic components we propose. The lesson learned from analyzing explanations over the lent of our proposed framework is that the human (both stakeholder and researcher) should be involved in the design of explainability as soon as possible in the AI-powered software design process. This allows for a proper filling of each component in the theoretical framework of explainability and informs model design. The top-down approach that is established this way propels the human understanding of how AI (and ML in particular) works, possibly fostering user trust in the system.

References

- [1] Cynthia Rudin. Stop explaining black box machine learning models for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead. *Nat Mach Intell*, 1(5):206–215, May 2019.
- [2] Bryce Goodman and Seth Flaxman. European union regulations on algorithmic Decision-Making and a “right to explanation”. *AIMag*, 38(3):50–57, October 2017.
- [3] Chaofan Chen, Oscar Li, Chaofan Tao, Alina Jade Barnett, Jonathan Su, and Cynthia Rudin. This looks like that: Deep learning for interpretable image recognition. June 2018.
- [4] Quanshi Zhang, Ying Nian Wu, and Song-Chun Zhu. Interpretable convolutional neural networks. pages 8827–8836, October 2017.
- [5] Bo-Jian Hou and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Learning with interpretable structure from gated RNN. *IEEE Trans Neural Netw Learn Syst*, 31(7):2267–2279, July 2020.
- [6] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. “why should I trust you?”: Explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD ’16, pages 1135–1144, New York, NY, USA, August 2016. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [7] Scott Lundberg and Su-In Lee. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. May 2017.
- [8] Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. September 2014.
- [9] Sarthak Jain and Byron C Wallace. Attention is not explanation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North*, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [10] Sarah Wiegrefe and Yuval Pinter. Attention is not not explanation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 11–20, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [11] Sofia Serrano and Noah A Smith. Is attention interpretable? In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2931–2951, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [12] Alon Jacovi and Yoav Goldberg. Towards faithfully interpretable NLP systems: How should we define and evaluate faithfulness? April 2020.
- [13] Alon Jacovi and Yoav Goldberg. Aligning faithful interpretations with their social attribution. *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguist.*, 9:294–310, March 2021.
- [14] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. June 2017.
- [15] 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. (2):336–359, October 2016.
- [16] Brent Mittelstadt, Chris Russell, and Sandra Wachter. Explaining explanations in AI. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAT* ’19, pages 279–288, New York, NY, USA, January 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [17] Christoph Molnar. *Interpretable Machine Learning: A Guide for Making Black Box Models Explainable*. 2 edition, 2022.
- [18] Larissa Chazette and Kurt Schneider. Explainability as a non-functional requirement: challenges and recommendations. *Requirements Engineering*, 25(4):493–514, December 2020.
- [19] Bo Li, Peng Qi, Bo Liu, Shuai Di, Jingen Liu, Jiquan Pei, Jinfeng Yi, and Bowen Zhou. Trustworthy AI: From principles to practices. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, August 2022.
- [20] Zachary C Lipton. The mythos of model interpretability. June 2016.
- [21] Riccardo Guidotti, Anna Monreale, Salvatore Ruggieri, Franco Turini, Dino Pedreschi, and Fosca Giannotti. A survey of methods for explaining black box models. February 2018.
- [22] W James Murdoch, Chandan Singh, Karl Kumbier, Reza Abbasi-Asl, and Bin Yu. Definitions, methods, and applications in interpretable machine learning.

Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 116(44):22071–22080, October 2019.

- [23] Shane T Mueller, Robert R Hoffman, William Clancey, Abigail Emrey, and Gary Klein. Explanation in Human-AI systems: A literature Meta-Review, synopsis of key ideas and publications, and bibliography for explainable AI. February 2019.
- [24] Tim Miller. Explanation in artificial intelligence: Insights from the social sciences. June 2017.
- [25] Sarthak Jain, Sarah Wiegrefe, Yuval Pinter, and Byron C Wallace. Learning to faithfully rationalize by construction. April 2020.
- [26] Julius Adebayo, Justin Gilmer, Michael Muelly, Ian Goodfellow, Moritz Hardt, and Been Kim. Sanity checks for saliency maps. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS’18, pages 9525–9536, Red Hook, NY, USA, December 2018. Curran Associates Inc.
- [27] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. “why should I trust you?”: Explaining the predictions of any classifier. February 2016.
- [28] Avanti Shrikumar, Peyton Greenside, and Anshul Kundaje. Learning important features through propagating activation differences. In Doina Precup and Yee Whye Teh, editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3145–3153, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 2017. PMLR.
- [29] Sebastian Bach, Alexander Binder, Grégoire Montavon, Frederick Klauschen, Klaus-Robert Müller, and Wojciech Samek. On Pixel-Wise explanations for Non-Linear classifier decisions by Layer-Wise relevance propagation. *PLoS One*, 10(7):e0130140, July 2015.