

Interpreting Embedding Spaces by Conceptualization

Adi Simhi and Shaul Markovitch
Department of Computer Science, Technion, Israel
{adi.simhi,shaulm}@cs.technion.ac.il

Abstract

One of the main methods for semantic interpretation of a text is mapping it into a vector in some embedding space. Such vectors can then be used for a variety of textual processing tasks. Recently, most embedding spaces are a product of training large language models. One major drawback of this type of representation is their incomprehensibility to humans. Understanding the embedding space is crucial for several important needs, including the need to debug the embedding method and compare it to alternatives, and the need to detect biases hidden in the model. In this paper, we present a novel method of understanding embeddings by transforming embedding space into a comprehensible conceptual space. We present an algorithm for deriving a conceptual space with dynamic on-demand granularity. We also show a method for transferring any vector in the original incomprehensible space to an understandable vector in the conceptual space. We combine human tests with cross-model tests to show that the conceptualized vectors indeed represent the semantics of the original vectors. We also show the use of our method for various tasks, including comparing the semantics of alternative models.

1 Introduction

Recently, we have seen major progress in NLP thanks to the development of Large Language Models (LLMs) that are based on deep neural networks and are trained on a vast amount of text [9, 23, 15]. These models can then be used for generating embeddings for natural language sentences [25, 21].

While these powerful embedding methods show excellent performance on a variety of tasks, they suffer from a major drawback. The dimensions

of the vector space used for the embedding are internal structures in a neural network and are not comprehensible to humans. This does not present a problem when the embedding algorithm is used as a black box. Understanding the embedding space is, however, crucial for several important needs, including the need to explain the decision of a system that uses the embedding, the need to debug the embedding method and compare it to alternatives, and the need to detect biases hidden in the model [5, 18, 27].

The importance of interpretability was recognized by many researchers. Several works present methods for explaining a *decision* of a system that uses the embedding (mainly classifiers) (e.g. [26, 16]). These methods are mainly tailored to understanding the decisions rather than the model itself. Some works [31, 13] try to solve the problem of model understanding by training or retraining for generating a new model that is interpretable, thus detouring the problem of understanding the original model. Another line of work tries to find orthogonal transformations. It, however, provides only a limited level of interpretability and usually requires an embedding matrix [10, 22]. Many methods try to assign meaning to each dimension of the embedding space. For example, some *probing* methods use classification to find meaning associated with the individual space dimensions [6, 8].

In this work, we present a novel methodology for conceptualization of embedding spaces. Our algorithm maps any vector in the original latent space into a vector in a human-understandable conceptual space, allowing a deep understanding of the original space. We also present an algorithm that, given an ontology, generates a conceptual space with desired granularity. The original black-box algorithm (usually LLM-based) is still used for the decision, thus we maintain its high performance.

Our method has the following features:

1. Unlike most existing methods, it does not assume that each dimension in the latent space corresponds to an explicit and human-understandable concept.
2. It is model agnostic - it can work with any model without additional training. Our only requirement is a black box that receives a text fragment and outputs a vector.
3. Our conceptual embedding space can be generated, given an ontology, for any given desired size and can be selectively deepened to specialize in specific subjects.

The general methods presented here can be used in various ways:

1. Given an input text and its latent vector, our algorithm allows us to understand the semantics of it *according to the model*.
2. It can help us to gain an understanding of the model, including its strengths and weaknesses, by probing it with texts in subjects that are of interest to us. This understanding can be used for debugging a given model or for comparing alternative models.
3. Given a decision system based on the LLM, our algorithm helps to understand the decision and to explain it using the conceptual representation. This can also be useful in detecting biased decisions.

We evaluate our new method via a sequence of qualitative and quantitative methods. In particular, we present a novel method for evaluating the correspondence between the latent representation and its understandable counterpart using both human raters and LLMs.

2 The Conceptualization Algorithm

Let T be a space of textual objects (sentences, for example). Let $L = L_1 \times \dots \times L_k$ be a latent embedding space. Let $f : T \rightarrow L$ be a function that maps a text object to a vector in the latent space. Typically, f will be a LLM or LLM-based.

Our method requires two components: A set of concepts $C = c_1, \dots, c_n$ defining a conceptual space $\mathcal{C} = c_1 \times \dots \times c_n$, and a mapping function $\tau : C \rightarrow T$ that returns a textual representation for each concept in C .

In the pre-processing stage, we map each concept $c \in C$ to a vector in L by applying f on $\tau(c)$, the textual representation of c . We thus define n vectors in L , $\hat{c}_1, \dots, \hat{c}_n$ such that $\hat{c}_i \equiv f(\tau(c_i))$.

Given a vector $l \in L$ (that typically represents some input text), we measure its similarity to each vector \hat{c}_i using any given similarity measure sim . The algorithm then outputs a vector in the conceptual space, using the similarities as the dimensions.

We have thus defined a meta-algorithm CES (Conceptualizing Embedding Spaces) that, for any given embedding method f , a set of concepts C and a mapping function τ from concepts to text, takes a vector in the latent space L and returns a vector in the conceptual space \mathcal{C} :

$$CES^{f,C,\tau}(l) = \langle sim(l, \hat{c}_1), \dots, sim(l, \hat{c}_n) \rangle^T$$

A graphical representation of the process is depicted in Figure 1.




Figure 1: An outline of our methodology.

If we use cosine similarity as sim , and use a normalised f function, we can implement CES as matrix multiplication, which can accelerate our computation. First, observe that, under these restrictions, cosine similarity is equivalent to the dot product between vectors. Let $U = u_1, \dots, u_k$ be the standard basis in k dimensions as a base of L . We can look at the projection of U in the \mathcal{C} space, by using function ϕ such that $\phi(u_i) = \langle \phi(u_i^1), \dots, \phi(u_i^n) \rangle^T$ where $\phi(u_i^j) = cosine(u_i, c_j) = u_i \cdot \hat{c}_j$. We can now create a $n \times k$ matrix $M = \langle \phi(u_1), \dots, \phi(u_k) \rangle$. Using this matrix, we get $CES^{f,C,\tau}(l) = M \cdot l$.

2.1 Generating Conceptual Spaces

To allow a conceptual representation in various levels of abstraction, we have devised a method that, given a hierarchical ontology, generates a conceptual space of desired granularity.

For the experiments described in this paper, we chose Wikipedia category directed graph as our ontology as it provides a constantly- updated, wide and deep coverage of our knowledge, but any other knowledge graph can be used too. Since the edges in the Wikipedia graph are not labeled, we performed an additional step of assigning a score to each edge, based on its similarity to its siblings, which we named *siblings* score (see Appendix A).

A major strength of the hierarchical representation of concepts is its multiple levels of abstraction. For our purpose, that means that we can request a concept space with a given level of granularity. Given a concept graph G , we can define $d(c)$, the depth of each concept (node) as the length of the shortest path from the root. We designate by $C^i = \{c \in C | d(c) = i\}$ as the set of all concepts with a depth of exactly i . For example, MATHEMATICS

and HEALTH are concepts from C^1 , and MATHEMATICAL TOOLS and PUBLIC HEALTH are their direct children and are concepts from C^2 .

2.2 On-demand Conceptual Spaces

One problem with fix-depth conceptual spaces is the large growth in the number of nodes with the increase in depth. For example, in our implementation, $|C^1| = 37$, $|C^2| = 706$ and $|C^3| = 3467$. Another problem arises in domain-specific tasks, where high-granularity concepts are needed in specific subjects but not in others. Lastly, it is often difficult to know ahead of time what is the required granularity for the given task.

We have therefore developed an algorithm that, given a contextual text $T' \subseteq T$ of input texts and the desired concept-space size, generates a concept space of that size with granularity tailored to T' . The main idea is to deepen categories that are strongly associated with T' , thus enlarging the distances between the textual objects, allowing for more refined reasoning. We use the symbol C^* to indicate a concept space that is created this way.

The algorithm (1) starts with C^1 as its initial concept space. It then iterates until the desired size is achieved. At each iteration, the set of text examples T' is embedded into the *current* space using CES. The concept with the largest weight is then selected for expansion. The algorithm selects its best $p\%$ children for some p , judged by their *siblings* score, and adds them to the current conceptual space. In addition, the algorithm uses a flag *removeP* to determine whether to remove the concept that was expanded. In the results shown in this paper, *removeP* was set to false. Using the parameter in this way allows flexibility in the conceptual representation. While this may seemingly reduce the orthogonality of the representation, we observed that it often improves the quality of the model interpretation.

If the embedding is used for classification tasks, we can use the labels of the training examples in addition to their text. In such a case, we evaluate concepts using a linear combination of the weight according to the embedding of the training texts and the entropy according to the labels of the examples. As before, the node with the maximal value is chosen for expansion. The entropy of a concept is determined by the set of labeled examples whose text is embedded into a vector with the given concept assigned the highest weight. The intuition is that concepts representing texts in different classes need refinement to allow better separation.

Algorithm 1 Selective deepening

Input: $T', size, removeP$ **Output:** C^*

```
 $C \leftarrow C^1$ 
while  $|C| < size$  do
   $emb \leftarrow AVG_{t \in T} (CES^{f,C,\tau}(f(t)))$ 
   $\hat{c} \leftarrow$  concept in  $C$  with max weight in  $emb$ 
   $best \leftarrow$  p% of  $children(\hat{c})$  with highest  $siblings$  score
   $C \leftarrow C \cup best$ 
  if  $removeP$  is True then
     $C \leftarrow C \setminus \hat{c}$ 
  end if
end while
return  $C$ 
```

2.3 Mapping Concepts to Text

The mapping function τ maps concepts to text. When the concepts in the ontology have meaningful names, such as in the case of Wikipedia categories, we can use a straightforward approach and use τ that maps into these names. We have also devised a more complex function, called $\hat{\tau}$, that maps a concept to a concatenation of the concept name with the names of its children¹. Given a concept c with name t_c and children names t_{c_1} and t_{c_2} , $\hat{\tau}(c) = "t_c \text{ such as } t_{c_1} \text{ and } t_{c_2}"$. This approach has two advantages: It exploits the elaborated knowledge embedded in the ontology for potentially more accurate mapping, and it produces full sentences, which may be a better fit for f that was trained on sentences. However, we did not observe a significant improvement using $\hat{\tau}$.

3 Empirical Evaluation

It is not easy to evaluate an algorithm whose task is to create an understandable representation that matches the original incomprehensible embedding. We performed a series of experiments, including a human study, that show that our method indeed achieved its desired goal. For all the experiments, we have used RoBERTa sentence embedding model² [25, 15] as our f , un-

¹We take the two best children (with the highest *siblings* score)

²Model all-distilroberta-v1 from Hugging Face. For simplicity we refer to it as SRoBERTa

less otherwise specified. All models used in this work were applied with their default parameters. Whenever the concept space C^* was used, we set $size = 768$ to match the size used by SRoBERTa, but we observed that using much smaller values yielded almost as good results. For τ , the function that maps concepts to text, we have just used the text of the concept name (with a length of 4.25 words on average in G).³

3.1 Qualitative Evaluation

We first show several examples of conceptual representations created by CES to get some insight into the way that our method works. We have applied SRoBERTa to 3 sentences from 3 different recent CNN articles to get 3 latent embedding vectors. We have used the first 10 sentences of each article as the contextual text T' for generating C^* .

Table 1 shows the conceptual embeddings generated by CES. We show only the 3 top concepts with their associated depth. Observe that the conceptual vectors are understandable and intuitively capture the semantics of the input texts. Note that the representations shown are not based on some new embedding method, but reflect SRoBERTa’s understanding of the input text. In Appendix E, we study, using the same examples, the effect of the concept-space granularity on the conceptual representation, using a fixed-depth concept space instead of C^* . Lastly, in Appendix F, we study, using the same examples, the difference in the representation of two additional models (SBERT and ST5).

3.2 Evaluation on Classification Tasks

To show that our representation matches the original one generated by the LLM, we first show that learning using the original embedding dimensions as features and learning using the conceptual features yield *similar* classifiers. Most works try to show such similarity by comparing accuracy results. This method, however, is prone to errors. Two classifiers might give us an accuracy of 80%, while agreeing only on 60% of the cases. Instead, we use a method that is used for *rater agreement*, reporting two numbers: the raw agreement and Cohen’s kappa coefficient [7].

³The total runtime for the experiments described here was 24 hours on 8 cores of Intel Xeon Gold 5220R CPU 2.20GHz. The graph creation from the full Wikipedia dump of 2020 took several days with a maximal memory allocation of 100GB.

sentence	c_1	c_2	c_3
This is now a very contagious virus	VIRUSES (3)	DISEASE OUTBREAKS (3)	VIRUS TAXONOMY (4)
The search for life on Mars and ocean worlds in our solar system	LIFE IN SPACE (2)	HYPOTHETICAL LIFE FORMS (2)	DISCOVERIES BY ASTRONOMER (3)
The bias in these AI systems presents a serious issue	ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (3)	MACHINE LEARNING (3)	COMPUTING AND SOCIETY (3)

Table 1: Example of the model outputs on the sentences. The number in parenthesis is the depth of the concept.

We use the following data sets: AG News ⁴, Ohsumed and R8 ⁵, Yahoo [38], BBC News [14], DBpedia 14 [38] and 20Newsgroup ⁶. We use only topical classification data sets, as the concept space we use does not include the necessary concepts needed for tasks like sentiment analysis. If a data set has more than 10,000 examples, we randomly sample 10,000. The results are averaged over 10 folds. We use a random forest learning algorithm with 100 trees and a maximum depth of 5. The conceptual space used by CES is C^* , using the training set as the contextual text T' .

Table 2 shows the agreement between a classifier trained on the LLM embedding and a classifier trained on the conceptual embedding generated by CES. We report raw agreement and kappa coefficient with standard deviation. The second column reports raw agreement with a random classifier for reference. Kappa can range from -1 to +1 with 0 indicating random chance. We can see that all the values are relatively high, indicating high agreement between the LLM embedding and CES’s embedding. We repeated the experiment by changing two parameters, $removeP = True$, and $\hat{\tau}$ as a mapping function, and found little effect on the results (see Appendices B and C).

We also ran a similarity test on the triplets data set [12] and found high agreement between the LLM model and its CES interpretation (Appendix D).

⁴ Available online: http://groups.di.unipi.it/~gulli/AG_corpus_of_news_articles.html

⁵ Available online: <https://www.kaggle.com/weipengfei/ohr8r52> used for Ohsumed and R8 data sets

⁶ taken from sklearn data sets python library

data set	Rand Raw Agreement	raw agreement	kappa coef
20 Newsgroup	0.051	0.609 \pm 0.017	0.584 \pm 0.018
AG News	0.248	0.869 \pm 0.013	0.826 \pm 0.017
DBpedia 14	0.068	0.852 \pm 0.012	0.840 \pm 0.013
Ohsumed	0.103	0.689 \pm 0.008	0.577 \pm 0.010
Yahoo	0.097	0.633 \pm 0.015	0.586 \pm 0.017
R8	0.232	0.874 \pm 0.009	0.759 \pm 0.018
BBC News	0.194	0.958 \pm 0.014	0.947 \pm 0.018

Table 2: LLM- and CES-based classifiers’ agreement.

3.3 Evaluating Understandability

While the results reported here look promising, they are not sufficient to indicate that our goal is achieved. Consider the following hypothetical algorithm. Let D be the size of the LLM embedding space. The algorithm selects D random English words and assigns each to an arbitrary dimension. This hypothetical algorithm satisfies two requirements: Using it will always be in 100% agreement with the original (as the mapping is 1-1), and its generated representation will be understandable by humans. However, it is clear that it does not convey to humans any knowledge regarding the LLM representation. In the next subsections, we describe experiments with humans and with other models that support our claim that CES generates understandable representations that indeed *reflect* the semantics of the LLM embedding.

3.3.1 Evaluation By Humans

We have designed a human experiment with the goal of testing the human understandability of the latent representation by observing only its conceptual mapping. The experiment tests the agreement, given a set of test examples, between two raters:

1. A classifier that was trained on a training set using the LLM embeddings.
2. A human rater that does not have access to the training set and does not have access to the test text. The only data presented to the human is the top 3 concepts of the CES representation of the LLM embedding. 3 graduate students were used for rating.

data set	raw agreement with RF	raw agreement with NC
AG News	0.85	0.80
BBC News	0.80	0.75
Ohsumed	0.65	0.82
Yahoo	0.65	0.75

Table 3: Human-RF and human-NC agreement

We claim that if there is a high agreement between the two, then the conceptual representation indeed reflects the meaning of the LLM embedding.

To allow classification by the human raters, out of the 7 data sets described in the previous subsection, we chose the 4 that have meaningful names for the classes. To make the classification task less complex for the raters, we randomly sampled two classes from each data set, thus creating a binary classification problem. For each binary data set, we set aside 20% of the examples for training a classifier based on the LLM embedding, using the same method and parameters as in the previous subsection. The resulting classifier was then applied to the remaining 80% of the data set.

Out of this test set, we sample 10 examples on which the LLM-based classifier was right and 10 on which it was wrong⁷. This is the test set that is presented to the human raters. Each test case is represented by the 3 top concepts of the CES embedding, after applying feature selection on the full embedding to choose the top 20% concepts. As before, the conceptual space is C^* with $size = 768$ and with the training set used as contextual text T' . The instruction to the human raters was: *"A document belongs to one of two classes. The document is described by the following 3 key phrases (topics): 1, 2, and 3. To which of the two classes do you think the document belongs to?"*. The final human classification of a test example was computed by the majority voting of 3 raters. For the LLM-based classification, we used two learning algorithms. The first is Random Forest (RF) with the same parameters as in Section 3.2. The second is Nearest-Centroid Classifier (NC) which computes the centroid of each class and returns the one closest to the test case.

Table 3 shows the raw agreement between the LLM-based and the human classification, for the two learning algorithms. Kappa coefficient was not computed as the test set is too small. The results are encouraging as they show quite a high agreement. Note that the learning algorithm had access to the full training set, while the human could see the conceptual representation of only the test case. Indeed, we can see that the agreement with the less

⁷except for the Ohsumed data set where only 7 wrong answers were found

sophisticated NC classifier is higher on average than the agreement with the RF classifier.

3.3.2 Evaluation by Other Models

We repeated the experiments of the last subsection, with the same test sets, but instead of using human raters, we used a LLM rater. The LLM rater receives the top 3 concepts, just like the human raters, and makes a decision by computing cosine similarity between its embedding of each class name to its embedding of the textual representation of the 3 concepts. The 3 LLMs used for rating are SBERT [25]⁸, ST5 [21]⁹ and SRoBERTa. Note that the two uses of SRoBERTa are quite different. The one used for the original classification is based on a training set and a learning algorithm, while the model used for rating just computes similarity between the class name and the 3 concepts.

One major difference between our method and alternatives is that they try to assign meaning to each dimension of the latent space while we map each latent vector to a conceptual space. We denote the alternative approach by Dimension Meaning Assignment (DMA). We have designed two competitors that represent the DMA approach.

The first one, termed DMA^{words}, is based on a vocabulary of 10,000 frequent words¹⁰. We represent each word by our LLM, yielding 10,000 vectors of size 768. We now map each dimension to the word with the highest weight for it. We make sure that the mapping is unique. The second one, which we call DMA^{concepts}, is built in the same way, using, instead of words, the concepts in C^3 .

Table 4 shows the results expressed in raw agreement. We can see that CES method performs better than the alternatives (except for a single test case).

4 CES Application

In this section, we show some applications of CES.

⁸Model bert-base-nli-mean-tokens from Hugging Face

⁹Model sentence-t5-large from Hugging Face

¹⁰<https://www.mit.edu/ecprice/wordlist.10000>

Evaluation Model	Method	Yahoo	BBC	AG News	Ohsumed
SBERT	DMA ^{words}	0.60 / 0.60	0.55 / 0.80	0.55 / 0.50	0.65 / 0.47
	DMA ^{concepts}	0.65 / 0.55	0.55 / 0.70	0.50 / 0.35	0.65 / 0.47
	CES	0.80 / 0.90	0.70 / 0.85	0.75 / 0.60	0.71 / 0.53
ST5	DMA ^{words}	0.65 / 0.65	0.35 / 0.60	0.45 / 0.50	0.65 / 0.47
	DMA ^{concepts}	0.70 / 0.70	0.45 / 0.30	0.55 / 0.60	0.53 / 0.35
	CES	0.80 / 0.90	0.80 / 0.75	0.60 / 0.55	0.76 / 0.82
SRoBERTa	DMA ^{words}	0.50 / 0.70	0.35 / 0.40	0.55 / 0.60	0.59 / 0.41
	DMA ^{concepts}	0.60 / 0.40	0.35 / 0.50	0.60 / 0.45	0.71 / 0.53
	CES	0.85 / 0.85	0.75 / 0.80	0.70 / 0.65	0.82 / 0.76

Table 4: Evaluation by another model using DMA^{words}, DMA^{concepts} and CES. The rater is SRoBERTa-RF / SRoBERTa-NC.

4.1 Using CES for Comparing Models

One major feature of our methodology is that it allows us to gain an understanding of the semantics of trained models. This allows us when considering alternative models, to compare their semantics, to understand the differences between their views of the world, and compare their potential knowledge gaps. We demonstrate this by comparing the views of three LLMs, SBERT, ST5, and SRoBERTa on two example texts, by observing their conceptual representations in C^3 generated by CES.

Table 5 shows the top 3 concepts of the vector generated by CES for the 3 LLMs given the text "FC Barcelona". We can see that while SRoBERTa and ST5 give high weight to the sport aspect of the input text, SBERT does not.

To validate this observation, we compare, for each of the 3 models, the cosine similarity in the latent space between "FC Barcelona" and the sport-related phrase "Miami Dolphin", to its similarity to the city-related phrase "Politics in Spain".

The results support our observation. SBERT embedding is more similar to the city aspect embedding while the two others are more similar to the sports text embedding.

In Table 6, for the input "Manhattan Project", we can see that ST5 gives high weight to the military project while SBERT gives high weight to concepts related to New York and to theater. SRoBERTa recognizes both aspects.

model	c_1	c_2	c_3	d(t,"Miami Dolphins")	d(t,"politics in Spain")
SBERT	GOVERNMENT OF SPAIN	SPANISH PEOPLE	CATALAN CULTURE	0.42	0.57
SROBERTa	TEAMS	SPORT BY CITY	SAINTS	0.40	0.30
ST5	TEAM SPORTS	SPORTS TEAMS	PEOPLE IN SPORTS BY ORGANIZATION	0.79	0.75

Table 5: t="FC Barcelona", FC Barcelona top 3 concepts using CES and validation by the LLM.

model	c_1	c_2	c_3	d(t,"Nuclear bomb")	d(t,"New York")
SBERT	CITY-STATES	NEW YORK CITY NIGHTLIFE	THEATRE BY CITY	0.49	0.74
SROBERTa	MILITARY PROJECTS	NEW YORK CITY NIGHTLIFE	SPACE PROGRAMS	0.36	0.34
ST5	NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY	NUCLEAR POWER	NUCLEAR ENERGY	0.84	0.79

Table 6: t="Manhattan Project", Manhattan Project top 3 concepts using CES and validation by the LLM.

4.2 Using CES for Understanding Full LLM

Another application of our method is analyzing the layers of the LLM. We show here an example of analyzing changes of the embedding through the layers of BERT ¹¹.

Given an input text, we assign a single vector for each layer by averaging the embedding of its tokens. We then use CES to map these latent vectors to the conceptual space. We can now follow the relative weight of each concept throughout the layers.

As a case study, we use the previous example: "Manhattan Project". Figure 2 shows the ranking graphs (lower rank - higher weight) for two of the concepts (using C^3). We present one concept that is dominant at the

¹¹Model bert-base-uncased from Hugging Face, including the input initial embedding.




Figure 2: BERT layers for 'Manhattan Project' text.

first layers, MILITARY PROJECTS, and one that is dominant at the last layers, NEW YORK CITY NIGHTLIFE. We can see the process of the two concepts changing their relative weight - one upwards and one downwards.

5 Related Work

The problem of interpretability has received significant attention in the last few years. A large body of research [26, 17, 37, 24, 28, 11, 29, 36] is devoted to generate an explanation for the *decision* of the model (mostly classification). Most of these methods use neighboring examples or counterfactuals to give the user an insight into the reasoning behind the decision.

Several works set a goal, like ours, of understanding the model itself, rather than its decisions. Most of these works attempt to assign some meaning to the dimensions, either of the original latent space or of a different space that the original one is transformed to.

One relatively early approach tries to find orthogonal or close to or-

thogonal transformations of the original embedding matrix [10, 22, 30] such that a set of words with high weight in a given dimension are related and thus hopefully represent some significant concept. The advantage of these orthogonal methods is that they do not lose information due to the orthogonality. Several of these works [2, 20, 33] transform the original embedding to a sparse one to improve the interpretability of each dimension. One limitation of the above methods is their reliance on an embedding matrix. This makes them applicable only to static models.

Some works try to assign a specific concept to each dimension. For example, [32] try to find whether a specific dimension correlates to a category from the 110 categories of the SEMCAT data set. Note that this method is different from ours. We do not assume that each latent dimension corresponds to a human-understandable concept. In addition, their method, unlike ours, requires an embedding matrix.

Probing methods try to interpret the model by studying its internal components. [35] make changes to the input to find out what parts of the model (specific attention heads) a bias comes from. [34] use probing on BERT model to find the role of each layer in the text interpretation process. [3] and [8] show how linguistic properties are distributed in the model and in specific neurons. [6] create an attention-based probing classifier to find out what information is captured by each attention head of BERT.

Some works [19, 1, 4, 13, 31] try to detour the problem of model interpretation by generating a new understandable model, based on the original model, sometimes with training or retraining some of these methods. The main difference between these methods and ours is the final model used for the given tasks. We insist on using the original models, thus preserving their power. Our method is only to understand the used model. The other methods, on the other hand, use the understandable models instead of the original, thus potentially harming performance. They do not aim at solving the problem of understanding the original model.

6 Conclusion

Previous approaches that attempted to understand latent embedding spaces, in particular those generated by LLMs, assumed that the dimensions of these spaces correlate to some semantic concepts recognizable by humans. This assumption is not necessarily true as it is quite possible that each latent dimension represents some complex combination of human recognizable concepts.

In this work, we introduce an alternative approach that maps the latent embedding space into a space of concepts that are well-understood by humans and provide good coverage of the human knowledge. We also present a method for generating such a conceptual space with an on-demand level of granularity.

We evaluate our method by an extensive set of experiments including a novel method for evaluating the correspondence of the conceptual embedding to the *meaning* of the original embedding both by humans and by other models. Finally, we showed an application of our method for comparing models and analyzing the layers of the model.

7 Limitations

One limitation of our work is that the evaluation was done only on the SRoBERTa model and using a few data sets in the classification task and human/model evaluation. A second limitation is that the concepts that create the conceptual embedding space are not independent. Lastly, we only show a few examples of CES application although there are more.

References

- [1] Ning An, Meng Chen, Li Lian, Peng Li, Kai Zhang, Xiaohui Yu, and Yilong Yin. Enabling the interpretability of pretrained venue representations using semantic categories. *Knowl. Based Syst.*, 235:107623, 2022.
- [2] Sanjeev Arora, Yuanzhi Li, Yingyu Liang, Tengyu Ma, and Andrej Risteski. Linear algebraic structure of word senses, with applications to polysemy. *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics*, 6:483–495, 2018.
- [3] Anthony Bau, Yonatan Belinkov, Hassan Sajjad, Nadir Durrani, Fahim Dalvi, and James R. Glass. Identifying and controlling important neurons in neural machine translation. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net, 2019.
- [4] Zied Bouraoui, Víctor Gutiérrez-Basulto, and Steven Schockaert. Integrating ontologies and vector space embeddings using conceptual spaces (invited paper). In Camille Bourgaux, Ana Ozaki, and Rafael

- Peñaloza, editors, *International Research School in Artificial Intelligence in Bergen, AIB 2022, June 7-11, 2022, University of Bergen, Norway*, volume 99 of *OASICs*, pages 3:1–3:30. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [5] Nadia Burkart and Marco F. Huber. A survey on the explainability of supervised machine learning. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 70:245–317, 2021.
- [6] Kevin Clark, Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, and Christopher D. Manning. What does BERT look at? an analysis of bert’s attention. In Tal Linzen, Grzegorz Chrupala, Yonatan Belinkov, and Dieuwke Hupkes, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 ACL Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP, BlackboxNLP@ACL 2019, Florence, Italy, August 1, 2019*, pages 276–286. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019.
- [7] Jacob Cohen. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 20(1):37–46, 1960.
- [8] Fahim Dalvi, Nadir Durrani, Hassan Sajjad, Yonatan Belinkov, Anthony Bau, and James R. Glass. What is one grain of sand in the desert? analyzing individual neurons in deep NLP models. In *The Thirty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2019, The Thirty-First Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference, IAAI 2019, The Ninth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2019, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA, January 27 - February 1, 2019*, pages 6309–6317. AAAI Press, 2019.
- [9] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2019, Minneapolis, MN, USA, June 2-7, 2019, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019.
- [10] Philipp Dufter and Hinrich Schütze. Analytical methods for interpretable ultradense word embeddings. In Kentaro Inui, Jing Jiang, Vincent Ng, and Xiaojun Wan, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*,

EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019, Hong Kong, China, November 3-7, 2019, pages 1185–1191. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019.

- [11] Javid Ebrahimi, Anyi Rao, Daniel Lowd, and Dejing Dou. Hotflip: White-box adversarial examples for text classification. In Iryna Gurevych and Yusuke Miyao, editors, *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2018, Melbourne, Australia, July 15-20, 2018, Volume 2: Short Papers*, pages 31–36. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2018.
- [12] Liat Ein-Dor, Yosi Mass, Alon Halfon, Elad Venezian, Ilya Shnayderman, Ranit Aharonov, and Noam Slonim. Learning thematic similarity metric from article sections using triplet networks. In Iryna Gurevych and Yusuke Miyao, editors, *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2018, Melbourne, Australia, July 15-20, 2018, Volume 2: Short Papers*, pages 49–54. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2018.
- [13] Manaal Faruqui, Jesse Dodge, Sujay Kumar Jauhar, Chris Dyer, Eduard H. Hovy, and Noah A. Smith. Retrofitting word vectors to semantic lexicons. In Rada Mihalcea, Joyce Yue Chai, and Anoop Sarkar, editors, *NAACL HLT 2015, The 2015 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Denver, Colorado, USA, May 31 - June 5, 2015*, pages 1606–1615. The Association for Computational Linguistics, 2015.
- [14] Derek Greene and Padraig Cunningham. Practical solutions to the problem of diagonal dominance in kernel document clustering. In William W. Cohen and Andrew W. Moore, editors, *Machine Learning, Proceedings of the Twenty-Third International Conference (ICML 2006), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA, June 25-29, 2006*, volume 148 of *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*, pages 377–384. ACM, 2006.
- [15] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized BERT pretraining approach. *CoRR*, abs/1907.11692, 2019.
- [16] Scott M. Lundberg and Su-In Lee. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. In Isabelle Guyon, Ulrike von Luxburg, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Rob Fergus, S. V. N. Vishwanathan, and

- Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 4765–4774, 2017.
- [17] Scott M. Lundberg and Su-In Lee. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. In Isabelle Guyon, Ulrike von Luxburg, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Rob Fergus, S. V. N. Vishwanathan, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 4765–4774, 2017.
- [18] Andreas Madsen, Siva Reddy, and Sarath Chandar. Post-hoc interpretability for neural NLP: A survey. *CoRR*, abs/2108.04840, 2021.
- [19] Binny Mathew, Sandipan Sikdar, Florian Lemmerich, and Markus Strohmaier. The POLAR framework: Polar opposites enable interpretability of pre-trained word embeddings. In Yennun Huang, Irwin King, Tie-Yan Liu, and Maarten van Steen, editors, *WWW '20: The Web Conference 2020, Taipei, Taiwan, April 20-24, 2020*, pages 1548–1558. ACM / IW3C2, 2020.
- [20] Brian Murphy, Partha Pratim Talukdar, and Tom M. Mitchell. Learning effective and interpretable semantic models using non-negative sparse embedding. In Martin Kay and Christian Boitet, editors, *COLING 2012, 24th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Proceedings of the Conference: Technical Papers, 8-15 December 2012, Mumbai, India*, pages 1933–1950. Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, 2012.
- [21] Jianmo Ni, Gustavo Hernandez Ábrego, Noah Constant, Ji Ma, Keith B. Hall, Daniel Cer, and Yinfei Yang. Sentence-t5: Scalable sentence encoders from pre-trained text-to-text models. In Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022, Dublin, Ireland, May 22-27, 2022*, pages 1864–1874. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022.
- [22] Sungjoon Park, JinYeong Bak, and Alice Oh. Rotated word vector representations and their interpretability. In Martha Palmer, Rebecca Hwa, and Sebastian Riedel, editors, *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference*

on *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2017, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 9-11, 2017*, pages 401–411. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2017.

- [23] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21:140:1–140:67, 2020.
- [24] Nazneen Fatema Rajani, Ben Krause, Wengpeng Yin, Tong Niu, Richard Socher, and Caiming Xiong. Explaining and improving model behavior with k nearest neighbor representations. *CoRR*, abs/2010.09030, 2020.
- [25] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. In Kentaro Inui, Jing Jiang, Vincent Ng, and Xiaojun Wan, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019, Hong Kong, China, November 3-7, 2019*, pages 3980–3990. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019.
- [26] Marco Túlio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. Model-agnostic interpretability of machine learning. *CoRR*, abs/1606.05386, 2016.
- [27] Marco Túlio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. ”why should I trust you?”: Explaining the predictions of any classifier. In Balaji Krishnapuram, Mohak Shah, Alexander J. Smola, Charu C. Aggarwal, Dou Shen, and Rajeev Rastogi, editors, *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, San Francisco, CA, USA, August 13-17, 2016*, pages 1135–1144. ACM, 2016.
- [28] Marco Túlio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. Anchors: High-precision model-agnostic explanations. In Sheila A. McIlraith and Kilian Q. Weinberger, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, (AAAI-18), the 30th Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence (IAAI-18), and the 8th AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence (EAAI-18), New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, February 2-7, 2018*, pages 1527–1535. AAAI Press, 2018.

- [29] Alexis Ross, Ana Marasovic, and Matthew E. Peters. Explaining NLP models via minimal contrastive editing (mice). In Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL/IJCNLP 2021, Online Event, August 1-6, 2021*, volume ACL/IJCNLP 2021 of *Findings of ACL*, pages 3840–3852. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021.
- [30] Sascha Rothe and Hinrich Schütze. Word embedding calculus in meaningful ultradense subspaces. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2016, August 7-12, 2016, Berlin, Germany, Volume 2: Short Papers*. The Association for Computer Linguistics, 2016.
- [31] Lütü Kerem Senel, Furkan Sahinuç, Veysel Yücesoy, Hinrich Schütze, Tolga Çukur, and Aykut Koç. Learning interpretable word embeddings via bidirectional alignment of dimensions with semantic concepts. *Inf. Process. Manag.*, 59(3):102925, 2022.
- [32] Lutfi Kerem Senel, Ihsan Utlu, Veysel Yücesoy, Aykut Koç, and Tolga Çukur. Semantic structure and interpretability of word embeddings. *IEEE ACM Trans. Audio Speech Lang. Process.*, 26(10):1769–1779, 2018.
- [33] Anant Subramanian, Danish Pruthi, Harsh Jhamtani, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Eduard H. Hovy. SPINE: sparse interpretable neural embeddings. In Sheila A. McIlraith and Kilian Q. Weinberger, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, (AAAI-18), the 30th innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence (IAAI-18), and the 8th AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence (EAAI-18), New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, February 2-7, 2018*, pages 4921–4928. AAAI Press, 2018.
- [34] Ian Tenney, Dipanjan Das, and Ellie Pavlick. BERT rediscovers the classical NLP pipeline. In Anna Korhonen, David R. Traum, and Lluís Màrquez, editors, *Proceedings of the 57th Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2019, Florence, Italy, July 28- August 2, 2019, Volume 1: Long Papers*, pages 4593–4601. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019.
- [35] Jesse Vig, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yonatan Belinkov, Sharon Qian, Daniel Nevo, Yaron Singer, and Stuart M. Shieber. Investigating gender bias in language models using causal mediation analysis. In Hugo

- Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020.
- [36] Tongshuang Wu, Marco Túlio Ribeiro, Jeffrey Heer, and Daniel S. Weld. Polyjuice: Automated, general-purpose counterfactual generation. *CoRR*, abs/2101.00288, 2021.
- [37] Chih-Kuan Yeh, Been Kim, Sercan Ömer Arik, Chun-Liang Li, Tomas Pfister, and Pradeep Ravikumar. On completeness-aware concept-based explanations in deep neural networks. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020.
- [38] Xiang Zhang, Junbo Jake Zhao, and Yann LeCun. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. In Corinna Cortes, Neil D. Lawrence, Daniel D. Lee, Masashi Sugiyama, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2015, December 7-12, 2015, Montreal, Quebec, Canada*, pages 649–657, 2015.

A Siblings score

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a knowledge graph, where V is a set of concepts and $E \subseteq V \times V$ is a set of links between concepts. Let $Obj(c)$ be the set of objects belonging to concept c . We say that c_1 *is-a* c_2 if $Obj(c_1) \subseteq Obj(c_2)$. We define $parents(c) = \{c' \in V | (c', c) \in E\}$ and $children(c) = \{c' \in V | (c, c') \in E\}$. Given a node c and a parent node p , we define $siblings(c, p) = children(p) - \{c\}$.

The main idea behind our method of detecting *is-a* links is that a set of siblings connected to a specific parent through *is-a* links should be similar. We estimate similarity between a node and its sibling by the similarity between their set of parents. Instead of using a binary decision, we chose to assign a continuous value in $[0, 1]$ that will be used by our algorithms for generating conceptual spaces.

We can now define the *siblings* score of an edge (p, c) as:

$$AVERAGE_{s \in siblings(c,p)} \frac{|parents(c) \cap parents(s)|}{|parents(c)|}$$

data set	raw agree- ment	kappa coef	raw agree- ment <i>removeP</i> True	kappa coef <i>removeP</i> True
20 News- group	0.609 ± 0.017	0.584 ± 0.018	0.618 ± 0.016	0.594 ± 0.018
AG News	0.869 ± 0.013	0.826 ± 0.017	0.871 ± 0.012	0.828 ± 0.015
DBpedia 14	0.852 ± 0.012	0.840 ± 0.013	0.871 ± 0.012	0.861 ± 0.013
Ohsumed	0.689 ± 0.008	0.577 ± 0.010	0.706 ± 0.016	0.592 ± 0.022
Yahoo	0.633 ± 0.015	0.586 ± 0.017	0.642 ± 0.011	0.597 ± 0.012
R8	0.874 ± 0.009	0.759 ± 0.018	0.875 ± 0.010	0.759 ± 0.020
BBC News	0.958 ± 0.014	0.947 ± 0.018	0.957 ± 0.019	0.946 ± 0.023

Table 7: LLM- and CES-based classifiers’ agreement. **Using *removeP* as True.**

We remove from each node $\lambda\%$ (35% in our experiments) of its parent links with lowest *siblings* score.

B Testing the effect of the *removeP* parameter

Our algorithm for generating on-demand conceptual spaces 2.2 retains a parent after expanding it and adding its children. This has several advantages, but we commonly prefer embedding spaces that are orthogonal. In this section, we test the performance of our method if we delete the parent after expansion (controlled by the *removeP* parameter). We ran the classification task as described in Section 3.2 with the only difference that the *removeP* parameter is set to True. The results are shown in Table 7. We can see that the differences are insignificant.

C Testing the effect of the τ function

One of the major components of our method is the τ function that maps a concept into a text object that is then converted to a latent vector. For the experiments described in this work, we have used τ that just outputs the

data set	raw agree- ment	kappa coef	raw agree- ment $\hat{\tau}$	kappa coef $\hat{\tau}$
20 News- group	0.609 \pm	0.584 \pm	0.615 \pm	0.591 \pm
	0.017	0.018	0.014	0.015
AG News	0.869 \pm	0.826 \pm	0.869 \pm	0.825 \pm
	0.013	0.017	0.010	0.014
DBpedia 14	0.852 \pm	0.840 \pm	0.841 \pm	0.829 \pm
	0.012	0.013	0.014	0.015
Ohsumed	0.689 \pm	0.577 \pm	0.693 \pm	0.581 \pm
	0.008	0.010	0.011	0.016
Yahoo	0.633 \pm	0.586 \pm	0.638 \pm	0.591 \pm
	0.015	0.017	0.013	0.015
R8	0.874 \pm	0.759 \pm	0.878 \pm	0.766 \pm
	0.009	0.018	0.009	0.017
BBC News	0.958 \pm	0.947 \pm	0.963 \pm	0.953 \pm
	0.014	0.018	0.012	0.016

Table 8: LLM- and CES-based classifiers’ agreement. **Using $\hat{\tau}$ function.**

concept names. In this section, we repeat the classification tests with $\hat{\tau}$ (see Section 2.3). Table 8 shows the results. We can see that the differences are insignificant.

D Evaluation on a Similarity Task

In this section, we use the conceptual representation in the context of an algorithm that estimates semantic similarity between sentences by measuring cosine similarity between their embeddings. Specifically, we evaluate the agreement between using the latent embedding generated by SRoBERTa and using the conceptual embedding generated by CES with C^3 (We cannot use C^* since we do not have any contextual text to be used as T').

The data set used is the triplet test that was generated from Wikipedia articles [12]. Each test consists of three sentences, all from the same Wikipedia article. Two sentences are from the same section and the third is from a different section. A sentence is labeled as more similar to the one from the same section than to the one from the other section. We used a subset of 1000 triplets randomly sampled from the full data set.

The results are shown in Table 9. We can see that CES embedding and SRoBERTa embedding have a high raw agreement and Kappa coefficient, larger than their agreement with the true label.

models	raw agreement	kappa coef
True labels and LMM labels	0.726	0.452
True labels and C^3 labels	0.692	0.384
LMM labels and C^3 labels	0.820	0.640

Table 9: Raw agreement and kappa coefficient between SRoBERTa LLM labels, True labels and CES using C^3 labels on Wikipedia triplet data set.

E A Qualitative Evaluation using Fixed-Depth Concept Spaces

We ran the same qualitative evaluation, as shown in Section 3.1, on the sentences taken from CNN. Instead of using the concept space C^* , we used fixed-depth spaces, C^1 , C^2 , and C^3 . Our goal is to study the effect of the granularity of the concept space on the way the latent vectors are represented.

The top five concepts of each input sentence for each concept space are presented in Tables 10, 11 and 12. For comparison, we also include the top concepts of the C^* concept space. We can see the refinement of the top concepts as the depth grows. Using C^1 , the conceptual representation gives a very general and non-specific account of the text’s meaning. Using the more refined C^2 and C^3 concept spaces, we can gain a deeper understanding of the input text. We can also notice that C^* has an advantage over the fixed-depth alternatives as it can use deeper concepts when needed without compromising the size.

F A Qualitative Evaluation using Different Models

We ran the same qualitative evaluation, as shown in Section 3.1, on the sentences taken from CNN on all three models: SBERT, ST5, and SRoBERTa. Our goal is to study the difference between the models in a qualitative test.

The top five concepts of each input sentence for each model are presented in Tables 13, 14 and 15. It seems that all of the models ”understood” the texts similarly. In Table 15 we can see a difference between SBERT and the other models. It seems that SBERT gave more weight to the word *bias* while the other models gave more weight to the word *AI* from the input sentence.

c	C^1	C^2	C^3	C^*
c_1	MASS MEDIA	ORGANIZATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC	VIRUSES	VIRUSES (3)
c_2	PEOPLE	GLOBAL HEALTH	INFECTIOUS DISEASES	DISEASE OUTBREAKS (3)
c_3	HEALTH	HEALTH DISASTERS	DISEASE OUTBREAKS	VIRUS TAXONOMY (4)
c_4	CULTURE	REPRODUCTION	VACCINATION	COVID-19 PANDEMIC IN EUROPE (5)
c_5	WORLD	EVOLUTION	VIRAL MARKETING	COVID-19 PANDEMIC IN ASIA (5)

Table 10: An example of the top concepts of the model’s output for the input **”This is now a very contagious virus”**, taken from CNN.

c	C^1	C^2	C^3	C^*
c_1	LIFE	LIFE IN SPACE	EXTRATERRESTRIAL LIFE	LIFE IN SPACE (2)
c_2	WORLD	HYPOTHETICAL LIFE FORMS	MESOZOIC LIFE	HYPOTHETICAL LIFE FORMS (2)
c_3	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	ORIGIN OF LIFE	PALEOZOIC LIFE	DISCOVERIES BY ASTRONOMER (3)
c_4	GEOGRAPHY	COSMOLOGY	EXPLORERS	ARTIFICIAL LIFE (2)
c_5	HUMANITIES	FICTIONAL LIFE FORMS	POLAR EXPLORATION	ASTRONOMICAL CATALOGUES (2)

Table 11: An example of the top concepts of the model’s output for the input **”The search for life on Mars and ocean worlds in our solar system”**, taken from CNN.

c	C^1	C^2	C^3	C^*
c_1	CONCEPTS	INTELLECTUAL COMPETITIONS	ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE	ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (3)
c_2	POLICY	LEARNING	COLLECTIVE INTELLIGENCE	MACHINE LEARNING (3)
c_3	ETHICS	ISSUES IN ETHICS	COMPUTER ETHICS	COMPUTING AND SOCIETY (3)
c_4	POLITICS	SOCIAL SYSTEMS	MACHINE LEARNING	INTELLECTUAL COMPETITIONS (2)
c_5	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	CONCEPTUAL SYSTEMS	CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS	INFORMATION SYSTEMS (3)

Table 12: An example of the top concepts of the model’s output for the input **”The bias in these AI systems presents a serious issue”**, taken from CNN.

c	SBERT	ST5	SROBERTa
c_1	DISEASE OUTBREAKS (3)	VIRUSES (3)	VIRUSES (3)
c_2	DISASTERS (2)	COVID-19 PANDEMIC IN EUROPE (5)	DISEASE OUTBREAKS (3)
c_3	DOOMSDAY SCENARIOS (3)	COVID-19 PANDEMIC IN ASIA (5)	VIRUS TAXONOMY (4)
c_4	HAZARDS (3)	DISEASE OUTBREAKS (3)	COVID-19 PANDEMIC IN EUROPE (5)
c_5	CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (4)	PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY OF INTERNATIONAL CONCERN (3)	COVID-19 PANDEMIC IN ASIA (5)

Table 13: An example of the top concepts of the model’s output for the input **”This is now a very contagious virus”**, taken from CNN. The number in parenthesis is the depth of the concept in the concept graph.

c	SBERT	ST5	SRoBERTa
c_1	ATMOSPHERE OF EARTH (3)	LIFE IN SPACE (2)	LIFE IN SPACE (2)
c_2	OUTER SPACE (3)	DISCOVERIES BY ASTRONOMER (3)	HYPOTHETICAL LIFE FORMS (2)
c_3	SOLAR SYSTEM IN FICTION (4)	HUMAN SPACEFLIGHT (3)	DISCOVERIES BY ASTRONOMER (3)
c_4	DISCOVERIES BY ASTRONOMER (3)	ASTROBIOLOGY (3)	ARTIFICIAL LIFE (2)
c_5	ASTRONOMICAL LOCATIONS IN FICTION (4)	ASTRONOMICAL OBJECTS (3)	ASTRONOMICAL CATALOGUES (4)

Table 14: An example of the top concepts of the model’s output for the input **”The search for life on Mars and ocean worlds in our solar system”**, taken from CNN. The number in parenthesis is the depth of the concept in the concept graph.

c	SBERT	ST5	SRoBERTa
c_1	CONFLICTS (2)	ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORKS (4)	ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (3)
c_2	SEXUALITY AND GENDER- RELATED PREJUDICES (3)	MACHINE LEARNING (3)	MACHINE LEARNING (3)
c_3	GLOBAL CONFLICTS (3)	ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (3)	COMPUTING AND SOCIETY (3)
c_4	POLITICAL CORRUPTION (2)	SOCIAL SYSTEMS (2)	INTELLECTUAL COMPETITIONS (2)
c_5	ANTI-ISLAM SENTIMENT (4)	ARTIFICIAL LIFE (2)	INFORMATION SYSTEMS (3)

Table 15: An example of the top concepts of the model’s output for the input **”The bias in these AI systems presents a serious issue”**, taken from CNN. The number in parenthesis is the depth of the concept in the concept graph.