

Forward Composition Propagation for Explainable Neural Reasoning

Isel Grau^{a,1,*}, Gonzalo Nápoles^{b,1}, Marilyn Bello^{c,d}, Yamisleydi Salgueiro^e

^a*Information Systems Group, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands.*

^b*Department of Cognitive Science & Artificial Intelligence, Tilburg University, The Netherlands.*

^c*Department of Computer Science, Central University of Las Villas, Cuba.*

^d*Faculty of Business Economics, Hasselt University, Belgium.*

^e*Department of Computer Science, Universidad de Talca, Campus Curico, Chile.*

Abstract

This paper proposes an algorithm called Forward Composition Propagation (FCP) to explain the predictions of feed-forward neural networks operating on structured pattern recognition problems. In the proposed FCP algorithm, each neuron is described by a composition vector indicating the role of each problem feature in that neuron. Composition vectors are initialized using a given input instance and subsequently propagated through the whole network until we reach the output layer. It is worth mentioning that the algorithm is executed once the network's training network is done. The sign of each composition value indicates whether the corresponding feature excites or inhibits the neuron, while the absolute value quantifies such an impact. Aiming to validate the FCP algorithm's correctness, we develop a case study concerning bias detection in a state-of-the-art problem in which the ground truth

*Corresponding author

Email address: `i.d.c.grau.garcia@tue.nl` (Gonzalo Nápoles)

¹Equal contribution

is known. The simulation results show that the composition values closely align with the expected behavior of protected features.

Keywords: explainable artificial intelligence, compositional explanations, deep neural networks, fairness, bias

1. Introduction

In recent years, the performance of machine learning algorithms in solving complex tasks from a high volume of structured and unstructured data has caught the attention of industry, governments and society. These techniques are increasingly deployed in specific decision-making tasks that affect humans directly, such as medical diagnosis or treatment, recidivism prediction, personalized recommendations, recruiting, etc. Therefore, there is a clear need to ensure the meaningful and responsible use of machine learning models [5]. Regrettably, the best-performing machine learning techniques tend to build less transparent models, obstructing trust and raising questions about the accountability and fairness of the decisions.

Explainable artificial intelligence (XAI) studies measures and methods for obtaining interpretable models or generating explanations. When working with models that are not intrinsically interpretable, post-hoc methods are the alternative way for obtaining explanations that are understandable to humans. By and large, post-hoc explanation methods can either rely on the inner structures of the explained model or be completely model-agnostic. Prominent approaches in the latter category include the use of local or global surrogate models [31, 6, 19, 18] approximating the predictions with a more interpretable technique such as rules, a linear regression or feature attribu-

tion methods [10, 16, 24]. At the same time, post-hoc explanation methods specifically designed for neural networks cover multilayer [40, 35], convolutional [33, 39, 7, 13] as well as recurrent [2, 11] architectures.

In particular, feature attribution methods aim to determine the role of the problem features in the predictions produced by network systems. The majority of these approaches are backpropagation methods [36, 38, 37, 3, 35], which means that they rely on the backward pass to propagate an importance signal through the layers. However, these methods compute the feature attribution for a specific prediction in the output layer only, and the majority of them neglect the negative influence of the features [35]. Other studies [7, 28] focus on finding the composition of the neurons with regard to predefined concepts, including neurons in the hidden layers. The main limitation of these approaches is the need for a labeled dataset of semantic concepts when working with non-structured data.

This paper proposes a method termed Forward Composition Propagation (FCP) for computing composition describing the neurons in a multilayered neural network. Compositions are expressed in terms of the features of a structured decision problem. Our algorithm produces a local explanation for a given instance after the neural network is trained, which is independent of the produced prediction. The negative or positive influence of the feature in the neural unit is represented with the sign of the composition. We illustrate the meaning of the composition values through a case study on bias detection, where we show that the compositions capture the propagation of bias from the protected features to the output neurons through the entire network. We analyze whether different activation functions affect the propagation and,

ultimately, the detection of the bias in the network.

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 2 revises the state-of-the-art on explainability for neural networks. Section 3 presents the proposed FCP explanation method. Section 4 illustrates the usability of FCP with a case study on fairness where the ground truth is known. Section 5 concludes the paper and provides future research directions.

2. Explainable methods for neural networks

Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) have gained relevance in recent years due to their excellent performance in complex tasks such as computer vision [23], natural language processing [22], and recommender systems [29]. However, the features that allow these models to succeed in such application domains (multiple hidden layers, non-linear transformations, etc.) make it impossible for humans to follow/understand how the mapping from input data to predictions occur. This means that DNNs are black-boxes limiting their deployment in real applications where safe-critical models are required [4].

The literature reports plenty of works that aim at providing explanations of neural networks methods. They can be broadly grouped into explanation by simplification, feature attribution explanation, and visual explanation [5]. Methods of the first and second categories are the most widely adopted to explain neural networks, being the third category less common. The latter is due to the complexities of creating visualizations just from the inputs and outputs of a black-box model. In any case, as humans privilege the comprehension of visual data, visual explanation strategies are mainly applied in combination with feature attribution techniques.

Explanation by simplification focuses on, given a complex model, constructing a simpler surrogate model that behaves like the original one but is easier to interpret. Decision trees and rules are the preferred surrogate models for simplifying neural networks [20]. Early works in this category focused on networks with one hidden layer, e.g., DIFACONN-miner [30], KDRuleEx [34], and CRED [32]. They all extract decision trees, tables, or rules that describe the neural network based on the units of its hidden layer. More contemporary works such as DeepRed [40] extend these approaches to DNN by adding more decision trees and rules. In the literature reviewed, we observed that, as the complexity of the neural network increases, researchers prioritize the use of feature attribution methods. This is because simplifying a neural network with more hidden layers is a complex task.

Feature attribution methods aim to determine the role of the features in the predictions produced by the network. The majority of approaches are backpropagation methods, which means that they rely on the backward pass to propagate an importance signal through the layers. For example, in the context of image classification, the Gradient approach [36], DeconvNet [38] and Guided Backpropagation [37] compute the gradient of the output neurons with respect to the input image, producing saliency maps. These approaches mainly differ in their way of handling the backpropagation of the gradient through non-linear units that transform negative activations into positive outputs, e.g., ReLU units. When backpropagating, discarding the negative gradients provokes that these approaches do not count for the negative influence of features [35]. In contrast, Layerwise Relevance Propagation (LRP) [3, 26] backpropagates a relevance score starting from the activation of

the predicted class neuron, taking the input and their sign into consideration. While DeepLIFT [35] compares the activation of each neuron to a reference activation and backpropagates this difference, allowing the information to propagate when the gradient is zero. Finally, deep Taylor decomposition [27] consider each neuron as an object that can be decomposed and expanded, then aggregate and back-propagates these explanations from the output to the input layer. All these methods compute the feature attribution for a specific prediction in the output layer only.

Introduced by D. Bau et al. in [7], Network Dissection (ND) is an interpretability technique that quantifies the latent representations of convolutional neural networks using a data set of images with labels of concepts. The method considers each unit as a concept detector. Thus, measuring the alignment between high-activated units and concepts can determine whether the unit responds to the human-interpretable concept. The main drawback of this approach is that it requires a data set with a dense inventory of pre-defined concepts. In addition, if a concept is not in the inventory, the method will not explain a neuron using that concept.

Authors in [28] present a generalization of the ND method termed Compositional Explanations (CE). Instead of just using the basics concepts as in ND, the idea behind CE is to combinatorically expand the set of possible explanations under consideration with compositional operators on concepts. Then, using beam search, the authors generated complex compositional explanations matching the unit’s activations. This model/task agnostic strategy was tested on computer vision and natural language inference, obtaining higher quality explanations than ND. In both study cases, authors demon-

strate that units are not just feature detectors but operationalized complex decision rules composed of multiple concepts [28].

Compositional explanations methods have two limitations in general. 1) They heavily rely on a dense inventory of pre-defined concepts. So, if a concept of interest is missing from the annotated data set, it will not appear in an explanation. 2) Although these approaches give a neuron-level understanding of the model, they are unable to: (i) identify the full range of concepts encoded in the representations, (ii) draw definitive causal links between inputs and decisions [28].

3. Forward composition propagation

In this section, we will present the main contribution of our paper, which concerns a method —termed Forward Composition Propagation (FCP)— to explain the reasoning of feed-forward neuronal networks. In short, our method describes each neuron with a composition vector expressed in terms of features describing the structured pattern classification or regression problem under analysis. Such composition vectors provide semantics to the hidden components of the networks and are propagated through the whole network from the input layer to the last one.

Before presenting the explanation method, it seems convenient to formalize the reasoning mechanism of feed-forward neural networks. Let us assume that we have a network involving N inputs, H hidden layers with arbitrary width and M output neurons. Moreover, let $A^{(l)}$ be the activation vector associated to the l -th layer such that $a_i^{(l)} \in A^{(l)}$ denotes the activation value of the i -th neuron in that layer. In this formalization, $l = 0$ represents the

input layer containing the feature values for a given instance, while $l = H + 1$ represents the last layer with the network's output. Equation (1) displays the reasoning mechanism used to compute the activation value of the i -th neural processing entity in the $(l + 1)$ layer,

$$a_i^{(l+1)} = f \left(\sum_{a_j^{(l)} \in A^{(l)}} w_{ji} a_j^{(l)} + b_i^{(l+1)} \right) \quad (1)$$

where w_{ji} denotes the weight connecting the j -th neuron in the previous layer with the i -th neuron in the current layer, $b_i^{(l)}$ represents the bias weight attached to the i -th neuron in the $(l + 1)$ -th layer, while $f(\cdot)$ is an activation function the provides non-linearity to the network.

The FCP algorithm associates each neuron with an N -dimensional vector that expresses its composition in terms of the features describing the problem. These composition vectors are calculated for a given problem instance after the network has been trained. Let $\Theta_i^{(l)} = [\vartheta_{i1}^{(l)}, \dots, \vartheta_{iN}^{(l)}]$ be the composition vector for the i -th neuron belonging to the l -th layer and $\Theta^{(l)}$ be the set of all composition vectors in that layer. In our algorithm, the composition vectors in the input layer will be vectors full of zeros; only the position $\vartheta_{ii}^{(l)}$ will take one to indicate that the i -th neuron is entirely described by the i -th problem feature. Equation (2) and (3) show how to obtain the k -th composition value for the i -th neuron in the following layer,

$$\bar{\vartheta}_{ik}^{(l+1)} = \sum_{\Theta_j^{(l)} \in \Theta^{(l)}} w_{ji} \vartheta_{jk}^{(l)} |a_j^{(l)}| \quad (2)$$

$$\vartheta_{ik}^{(l+1)} = \frac{\bar{\vartheta}_{ik}^{(l+1)}}{\sum_v |\bar{\vartheta}_{iv}^{(l+1)}|}. \quad (3)$$

This algorithm computes the composition vectors in the current layer by considering the composition vectors carried over from the previous layer, the weights connecting these two layers, and the absolute activation values of neurons in the current layer. It should be observed that we use the absolute activation values to prevent situations in which we mistakenly change the sign of compositions. For example, when multiplying a negative composition value by a negative neuron’s activation value, this situation comes to light. In reality, the neurons’ activation values should be understood as weights indicating how relevant neurons are in the network regardless of whether their activation values are negative or positive. At the same time, we normalize each composition value by dividing it by the sum of absolute composition values attached to that neural processing entity.

Figure 1 depicts the composition vectors calculated by the FCP algorithm in a feed-forward neural network composed of three layers. In this example, we use a sigmoid transfer function in all neurons while intentionally neglecting the bias weights for the sake of simplicity. In the first layer, the matrix that results from stacking all composition vectors is the identity matrix. Such a matrix indicates which feature fully describes a given neuron in the input layer. In the upper layers, composition values take value in the $[-1, 1]$ interval and indicate the intensity and direction to which a certain feature affects the neuron. For example, the hidden neuron $h_1^{(1)}$ is described by the composition vector $[-0.01, 0.032]$ such that the second problem feature plays a larger role on that neuron when compared with the first one.




Figure 1: Composition vectors computed by the proposed FCP algorithm for a neural system having two inputs, a single hidden layer with three neurons without bias weights and two output neurons. The numbers inside the neurons represent their activation values computed with a sigmoid transfer function while the vectors on the top denote their associated composition vectors.

Overall, composition vectors computed by the FCP algorithm allow explaining how the predictions were obtained using the network’s inner knowledge structures and understanding the role of each feature in these predictions. This happens because hidden neurons are no longer black-box entities bearing no meaning when it comes to the problem domain. It is worth noting that the bias weights are not considered when computing then composition vectors since they do not map to any explicit feature. Therefore, using a bias

regularizer in the training phase to keep these weights as small as possible is advised to generate more reliable explanations.

4. Numerical simulations

In this section, we assess the correctness of our algorithm by using a case study concerning fairness in machine learning.

4.1. Methodology

We test our algorithm using the German Credit dataset [15], which is used for classifying loan applicants at a bank as good or bad credit risks. Applicants are described by the following 20 features: *Age*, *Credit amount*, *Credit history*, *Months*, *Foreign worker*, *Housing*, *Installment rate*, *Job*, *Existing credits*, *People liable*, *Other debtors*, *Other installment*, *Gender*, *Employment since*, *Residence since*, *Property*, *Purpose*, *Savings account*, *Checking account*, *Checking account*, and *Telephone*. The dataset contains the information of 1000 loan applicants, with 700 belonging to the good class and 300 to the bad class. Based on the literature, *age* and *gender* are considered protected features [8, 17, 14]. It should also be mentioned that gender/female and age/young (younger than 25 years old) are the protected groups. The preprocessing steps included: (i) normalization of numeric features using the max-min scaler, (ii) encoding target classes as integers, and (iii) re-coding the nominal protected feature *sex&marital status* to include only *gender*-related information as conducted in the literature.

Regarding the neural system, we used a fully-connected neural network with four layers: an input layer, two hidden layers, and an output layer. The hidden layers have $2N$ and N hidden neurons, respectively, with N being

the number of problem features. These neural units will operate with either Exponential Linear Unit (ELU), Leaky Rectified Linear Unit (Leaky ReLU), Sigmoid, or Hyperbolic Tangent transfer functions. The categorical cross-entropy is adopted as the loss function, while output neurons are equipped with Softmax transfer functions. The weights associated with the multi-layer networks are computed using the well-known Adam optimization algorithm [21] such that the learning rate is set to 0.001, the number of epochs is set to 100, and the batch size is set to 32. Finally, we use 80% of the dataset to build the model and 20% for testing purposes.

To validate the FCP algorithm’s correctness, we will assess the extent to which the composition vectors align with the ground truth in the German Credit dataset. When it comes to the protected features, it has been reported in the literature that there is bias against young people while men are often favored [25, 9, 1]. In a nutshell, the bias patterns in the dataset indicate that males and older people are more likely to receive good credit when compared to women and young applicants. In the case of the numerical feature *age*, it would suffice to verify that there is a positive (negative) correlation between age and the corresponding composition values for the case of good (bad) credit. In the case of the nominal feature *gender*, we will contrast the predictions computed by the neural network with the predictions computed directly from the composition vectors associated with the decision neurons. In other words, the decision class will be given by the neuron with the largest composition value for the gender feature. We expect to observe a close resemblance between the predictions produced by the neural network and the ones obtained from the composition values.

4.2. Results and discussion

We will start our analysis by inspecting the composition values attached to the protected feature *age* for the cases of good credit (see Figure 2) and bad credit (see Figure 3) using different transfer functions. These density plots contrast the composition values computed with our algorithm and the normalized values of the protected feature. There seem to be strong correlation patterns between the feature values and the composition values even when the FCP algorithm operates with the neurons’ activation values, which come out from a non-linear transfer function.

Table 1 shows the Pearson’s correlation between the feature under analysis and the corresponding composition values for both good and bad credits. Overall, we can observe a positive correlation between the composition values and the feature values in the case of good credit. This means that the model favors older applicants with good credits, and the composition values capture such a pattern. Similarly, we can note a negative correlation between the composition values and the feature values in the case of bad credit. This behavior matches with the ground truth suggesting a tendency against granting bad credits to older people.

Table 1: Pearson’s correlation between the protected feature age and the corresponding composition values for both good and bad credits.

	ELU	Leaky ReLU	Sigmoid	Hyperbolic
Good credit	0.712	0.659	0.951	0.753
Bad credit	-0.911	-0.832	-0.951	-0.879

The results in Figures 2 and 3 also indicate that the sigmoid function




Figure 2: Composition values contrasted with the protected feature *age* in the case of good credit. There seems a positive correlation between the values of that feature and the composition values computed by the FCP algorithm.

reports the largest correlation between the feature values and the composition values associated with the protected feature *age*.

We will continue our analysis by inspecting the composition values attached to the protected feature *gender* in the case of good and credits for different transfer functions. Figure 4 shows the distribution of good and bad credits for both female and male applicants as computed by the neural net-




Figure 3: Composition values contrasted with the protected feature *age* in the case of bad credit. There seems a negative correlation between the values of that feature and the composition values computed by the FCP algorithm.

work. These values will be used for reference as they approximations of the ground-truth obtained with different transfer functions. Figure 5 displays the distribution of good and bad credits for both gender categories as computed from the composition values in the last layer.




Figure 4: Distribution of good and bad credits for both female and male applicants as computed by the neural network on the test data. It shall be noticed that male applicants are more likely to receive a good credit if we take into account only the feature gender. These patterns will be compared with the decisions derived from composition values associated with the feature gender in the output layer.




Figure 5: Distribution of good and bad credits for both female and male applicants computed from the composition vectors attached to the test instances. Similarly to the patterns obtained with the neural network, male applicants are more likely to receive a good credit if we take into account only the feature gender.

In this experiment, we adopt Cohen’s kappa coefficient [12] to measure the agreement in the predictions computed from the neural network and the ones computed from the composition values. Like other correlation statistics, kappa values range from -1 to +1 such that positive values give a measure of agreement. The kappa values when using ELU, Leaky ReLU, sigmoid and hyperbolic tangent as the activation functions are 0.49, 0.40, 0.09 and 0.38, respectively. These values suggest that composition values can be used to capture the bias patterns encoded in the data. It shall be mentioned that a perfect agreement was not expected since the neural network makes the decisions using all features, not only the protected one.

The results concerning the sigmoid function require further discussion since its corresponding kappa value is close to zero. When using this function, the predictions computed from the composition values align perfectly with the gender categories (i.e., males will receive a good credit while females will receive a bad one). As mentioned, the low agreement between the predictions computed by the network and those computed from compositions suggests that other features are considered by the network. Although these features provide some balance in the decisions, the predictions continue to be biased toward granting good credits to male applicants.

5. Concluding remarks

In this paper, we presented an algorithm to describe hidden neurons in feed-forward networks using composition vectors. Such vectors indicate the role of features in each neural processing entity as characterized by the direction and magnitude of composition values. The direction indicates whether

the feature excites or inhibits the neuron, while the magnitude quantifies the strength of such impact. An advantage of the FCP algorithm is that it operates using a given instance and the knowledge structures of a previously trained neural network. This means that the explanations it produces help understand the inner working of the black box itself instead of only explaining its predictions. At the same time, being model-dependent and relying on structured features can be considered a limitation.

During the experiments, we illustrated the correctness of our algorithm using a case study related to fairness in machine learning in which the ground truth was known. The results using several transfer functions showed that age correlated with the composition values for that feature in the last layer. The results concerning the categorical feature gender indicated alignment between the prediction computed by the network and those obtained from composition values in the last layer. Overall, the composition values allowed us to arrive at the following conclusions: (i) older applicants will likely receive a good credit while younger applicants will likely receive a bad one, and (ii) men applicants are more likely to receive a good credit. Such conclusions align with the ground truth, thus confirming the suitability of the FCP algorithm to generate composition-based explanations.

While the proposed algorithm was intended to provide meaning to hidden neurons in feed-forward neural networks to explain their inner workings, it opens an exciting research avenue to tackle the bias issue in neural systems. For example, we can modify the backpropagation algorithm to minimize the compositions values corresponding to protected features without altering the dataset or significantly harming accuracy. In that way, the class distribution

will not change, but the network will be encouraged to make future decisions by focusing on unprotected features. Such an improved learning algorithm will be the center of our next research endeavors.

References

- [1] Aggarwal, A., Lohia, P., Nagar, S., Dey, K., Saha, D., 2019. Black box fairness testing of machine learning models, in: Proceedings of the 2019 27th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA. p. 625–635.
- [2] Arras, L., Montavon, G., Müller, K.R., Samek, W., 2017. Explaining recurrent neural network predictions in sentiment analysis, in: Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment and Social Media Analysis, pp. 159–168.
- [3] Bach, S., Binder, A., Montavon, G., Klauschen, F., Müller, K.R., Samek, W., 2015. On pixel-wise explanations for non-linear classifier decisions by layer-wise relevance propagation. PLOS ONE 10, 1–46.
- [4] Bai, X., Wang, X., Liu, X., Liu, Q., Song, J., Sebe, N., Kim, B., 2021. Explainable deep learning for efficient and robust pattern recognition: A survey of recent developments. Pattern Recognition 120, 108102.
- [5] Barredo Arrieta, A., Díaz-Rodríguez, N., Del Ser, J., Bennetot, A., Tabik, S., Barbado, A., Garcia, S., Gil-Lopez, S., Molina, D., Benjamins, R., Chatila, R., Herrera, F., 2020. Explainable artificial in-

- telligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible ai. *Information Fusion* 58, 82–115.
- [6] Bastani, O., Kim, C., Bastani, H., 2018. Interpretability via model extraction. [arXiv:1706.09773](#).
- [7] Bau, D., Zhou, B., Khosla, A., Oliva, A., Torralba, A., 2017. Network dissection: Quantifying interpretability of deep visual representations, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 6541–6549.
- [8] Bellamy, R.K.E., Dey, K., Hind, M., Hoffman, S.C., Houde, S., Kannan, K., Lohia, P., Martino, J., Mehta, S., Mojsilovic, A., Nagar, S., Ramamurthy, K.N., Richards, J., Saha, D., Sattigeri, P., Singh, M., Varshney, K.R., Zhang, Y., 2018. Ai fairness 360: An extensible toolkit for detecting, understanding, and mitigating unwanted algorithmic bias. [arXiv:1810.01943](#).
- [9] Biswas, S., Rajan, H., 2020. Do the machine learning models on a crowd sourced platform exhibit bias? an empirical study on model fairness, in: *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, Association for Computing Machinery. p. 642–653.
- [10] Breiman, L., 2001. Random forests. *Machine Learning* 45, 5–32.
- [11] Choi, E., Bahadori, M.T., Kulas, J.A., Schuetz, A., Stewart, W.F., Sun, J., 2016. Retain: an interpretable predictive model for healthcare using reverse time attention mechanism, in: *Proceedings of the 30th In-*

- ternational Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, pp. 3512–3520.
- [12] Cohen, J., 1960. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 20, 37–46.
- [13] Dabkowski, P., Gal, Y., 2017. Real time image saliency for black box classifiers, in: *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA. p. 6970–6979.
- [14] Delobelle, P., Temple, P., Perrouin, G., Frénay, B., Heymans, P., Berendt, B., 2021. Ethical adversaries: Towards mitigating unfairness with adversarial machine learning. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter* 23, 32–41.
- [15] Dua, D., Graff, C., et al., 2017. UCI machine learning repository .
- [16] Fisher, A., Rudin, C., Dominici, F., 2019. All models are wrong, but many are useful: Learning a variable’s importance by studying an entire class of prediction models simultaneously. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 20, 1–81.
- [17] Friedler, S.A., Scheidegger, C., Venkatasubramanian, S., Choudhary, S., Hamilton, E.P., Roth, D., 2019. A comparative study of fairness-enhancing interventions in machine learning, in: *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 329–338.
- [18] Frosst, N., Hinton, G., 2017. Distilling a neural network into a soft decision tree, in: *Proceedings of the AI*IA 2017 First International*

- Workshop on Comprehensibility and Explanation in AI and ML, pp. 1–8.
- [19] Grau, I., Sengupta, D., Lorenzo, M.M.G., Nowe, A., 2018. Interpretable self-labeling semi-supervised classifier, in: Proceedings of the IJCAI/ECAI 2018 2nd Workshop on Explainable Artificial Intelligence, pp. 52–57.
- [20] Hailesilassie, T., 2016. Rule extraction algorithm for deep neural networks: A review. *International Journal of Computer Science and Information Security* 14, 376–381.
- [21] Kingma, D.P., Ba, J., 2017. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. [arXiv:1412.6980](https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980).
- [22] Lauriola, I., Lavelli, A., Aioli, F., 2021. An introduction to Deep Learning in Natural Language Processing: Models, techniques, and tools. *Neurocomputing* .
- [23] Liu, L., Ouyang, W., Wang, X., Fieguth, P., Chen, J., Liu, X., Pietikäinen, M., 2020. Deep Learning for Generic Object Detection: A Survey. *International Journal of Computer Vision* 128, 261–318.
- [24] Lundberg, S.M., Lee, S.I., 2017. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions, in: Guyon, I., Luxburg, U.V., Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S., Garnett, R. (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30. Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 4765–4774.

- [25] Mehrabi, N., Morstatter, F., Saxena, N., Lerman, K., Galstyan, A., 2021. A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 54.
- [26] Montavon, G., Binder, A., Lapuschkin, S., Samek, W., Müller, K.R., 2019. Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation: An Overview. Springer International Publishing, Cham. pp. 193–209.
- [27] Montavon, G., Lapuschkin, S., Binder, A., Samek, W., Müller, K.R., 2017. Explaining nonlinear classification decisions with deep taylor decomposition. *Pattern Recognition* 65, 211–222.
- [28] Mu, J., Andreas, J., 2021. Compositional explanations of neurons. [arXiv:2006.14032](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.14032).
- [29] Nápoles, G., Grau, I., Salgueiro, Y., 2020. Recommender system using Long-term Cognitive Networks. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 206, 106372.
- [30] Özbakır, L., Baykasoğlu, A., Kulluk, S., 2010. A soft computing-based approach for integrated training and rule extraction from artificial neural networks: Difaconn-miner. *Applied Soft Computing* 10, 304–317.
- [31] Ribeiro, M.T., Singh, S., Guestrin, C., 2016. “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*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA. p. 1135–1144.
- [32] Sato, M., Tsukimoto, H., 2001. Rule extraction from neural networks

- via decision tree induction, in: Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Neural Networks, pp. 1870–1875.
- [33] Selvaraju, R.R., Cogswell, M., Das, A., Vedantam, R., Parikh, D., Batra, D., 2017. Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization, in: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision, pp. 618–626.
- [34] Sethi, K.K., Mishra, D.K., Mishra, B., 2012. Kdruleex: A novel approach for enhancing user comprehensibility using rule extraction, in: 2012 Third International Conference on Intelligent Systems Modelling and Simulation, IEEE. pp. 55–60.
- [35] Shrikumar, A., Greenside, P., Kundaje, A., 2017. Learning important features through propagating activation differences, in: Precup, D., Teh, Y.W. (Eds.), Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR. pp. 3145–3153.
- [36] Simonyan, K., Vedaldi, A., Zisserman, A., 2014. Deep inside convolutional networks: Visualising image classification models and saliency maps, in: In Workshop at International Conference on Learning Representations.
- [37] Springenberg, J., Dosovitskiy, A., Brox, T., Riedmiller, M., 2015. Striving for simplicity: The all convolutional net, in: ICLR Workshop Track.
- [38] Zeiler, M.D., Fergus, R., 2014. Visualizing and understanding convolutional networks, in: Fleet, D., Pajdla, T., Schiele, B., Tuytelaars, T.

- (Eds.), *Computer Vision – ECCV 2014*, Springer International Publishing, Cham. pp. 818–833.
- [39] Zeiler, M.D., Taylor, G.W., Fergus, R., 2011. Adaptive deconvolutional networks for mid and high level feature learning, in: *2011 International Conference on Computer Vision*, IEEE. pp. 2018–2025.
- [40] Zilke, J.R., Mencía, E.L., Janssen, F., 2016. Deepred–rule extraction from deep neural networks, in: *International Conference on Discovery Science*, Springer. pp. 457–473.