

CELL your Model: Contrastive Explanation Methods for Large Language Models

Ronny Luss Erik Miehling Amit Dhurandhar

IBM Research

rluss@us.ibm.com, erik.miehling@ibm.com, adhuran@us.ibm.com

Abstract

The advent of black-box deep neural network classification models has sparked the need to explain their decisions. However, in the case of generative AI such as large language models (LLMs), there is no class prediction to explain. Rather, one can ask why an LLM output a particular response to a given prompt. In this paper, we answer this question by proposing, to the best of our knowledge, the first contrastive explanation methods requiring simply black-box/query access. Our explanations suggest that an LLM outputs a reply to a given prompt because if the prompt was slightly modified, the LLM would have given a different response that is either less preferable or contradicts the original response. The key insight is that contrastive explanations simply require a distance function that has meaning to the user and not necessarily a real valued representation of a specific response (viz. class label). We offer two algorithms for finding contrastive explanations: i) A myopic algorithm, which although effective in creating contrasts, requires many model calls and ii) A budgeted algorithm, our main algorithmic contribution, which intelligently creates contrasts adhering to a query budget, necessary for longer contexts. We show the efficacy of these methods on diverse natural language tasks such as open-text generation, automated red teaming, and explaining conversational degradation.

1 Introduction

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) has rapidly transformed society and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future, albeit in ways we do not yet know. Thusfar, it has impacted how people conduct their jobs (e.g., code generation for software engineers (Guagenti, 2024), text summarization for lawyers (Christman, 2024) and doctors (Philomin, 2024)) as well as how people conduct their daily activities (e.g., rewriting emails or designing vacation itineraries). As AI advanced over the last two

decades, so did the need for explaining how the AI was making decisions (e.g., why was a customer denied a bank loan or why was an image classified as a pedestrian crossing a street). Such explanations are even the topic of regulations in the USA with the AI Bill of Rights (AIB, 2024) and Europe with the GDPR (Yannella and Kagan, 2018) and the new EU AI Act (eua, 2024).

Much has been done in the area of explainable AI typically regarding classification and regression (see surveys Guidotti et al. (2018) and Yang et al. (2023)) and mostly focuses on black-box models, e.g., deep neural networks. Explanation methods vary and include attribution methods such as LIME (Ribeiro et al., 2016), SHAP (Lundberg and Lee, 2017), and saliency (Simonyan et al., 2013)), and contrastive explanations such as CEM (Dhurandhar et al., 2018) and CAT (Chemmenagath et al., 2022).

The focus of this paper is contrastive explanations for Large Language Models (LLMs). In the typical classification setting, contrastive explanations dictate that a classifier predicted label y on sample x because if x was slightly modified to be x_c , the classifier would have predicted label y_c instead. In the case of LLMs, there is no classifier and the output is a sequence of words. While explainability is a well-studied area for classifiers, explanations for LLMs are still limited. A recent method, MExGen (Paes et al., 2024), derives LIME and SHAP methods for LLMs based on mask infilling while TextGenSHAP (Enouen et al., 2024) speeds up SHAP for LLMs using “speculative decoding”, but these are attribution methods which highlight words in the prompt to maintain the response (not change it) also requiring real valued representations of the response. Such attribution methods are complementary to our proposal of a contrastive method; they are more restrictive as they can explain only individual tokens or need more information when explaining entire responses.

To the author’s knowledge, this paper offers the

Table 1: Contrastive explanations for natural language generation by llama-2-13b-chat. Colors match between what is changed between Input Prompt and Contrastive Prompt. These explanations explain that the Input Prompt generated the Input Response because if the Modifications were made to the Input Prompt, the new Contrastive Prompt would generate the Contrastive Response instead, which contradicts the Input Response (as per NLI model nli-roberta-base). Prompts taken from the Moral Integrity Corpus (Ziems et al., 2022)

Example 1

Input Prompt	What are some tips poor people can give to rich people so they don't go broke?
Input Response	To avoid financial ruin, wealthy individuals should prioritize living below their means, diversify their investments, and cultivate a long-term perspective on wealth.
Contr. Prompt	What are some tips poor people can share with other people so they don't go broke?
Modifications	to rich → other, can give → can share with
Contr. Response	To avoid financial strain, prioritize needs over wants, create a budget, and build an emergency fund to cover unexpected expenses.

Example 2

Input Prompt	If you could kill and save one person from anytime in history who would it be?
Input Response	If I could kill one person from any time in history, it would be Adolf Hitler, the Nazi dictator . . .
Contr. Prompt	If you could go back and save one person from anytime in history who would it be?
Modifications	could kill → could go back
Contr. Response	If I could go back in time and save one person, it would be my great-grandmother who passed . . .

first contrastive explanation methods for LLMs. Consider the examples in Table 1. Given an input prompt that is fed to an LLM, we ask why the LLM output a particular response. Our methods create perturbations of the input prompt, called contrastive prompts, which when fed to the LLM result in a contrastive responses that differ from the input response in some user defined manner, e.g., seek a contrastive response that contradicts the input response. In Example 1, the contrastive explanation dictates: the LLM responded with ways to avoid financial ruin such as diversifying investments because if the prompt had asked about *other* people instead of *rich* people, it would have responded with financial advice for the average person.

The key insight here is that contrastive explanations simply require a distance function that has meaning to the user and not necessarily a real valued representation of a specific response (viz. class label). Moreover, given that input prompts can have contexts which may be large (viz. in Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG)), we also propose an approach that can efficiently find contrasts with a limited number of calls to the black-box model, something that is not considered in previous works. **Contributions.** We propose the first methods to generate contrastive explanations for LLMs: a myopic algorithm that is effective for small prompts and a budgeted algorithm that scales for large contexts. We demonstrate quantitatively that these algorithms are effective and practical. Finally, we offer two new use cases for contrastive explanations: red teaming and conversational AI, showcasing the efficacy of our methods in varied applications.

2 Related Work

Danilevsky et al. (2020) considered explainability for natural language processing, primarily for classification tasks where local explanations were provided, among which our focus is on post-hoc methods that explain a fixed model’s prediction. One large group of explainability methods are feature based where the explanation outputs some form of feature importance (i.e., ranking, relevance, etc.) of the words in text (Wallace et al., 2018; Papernot and Patrick, 2018; Feng et al., 2018; Harbecke et al., 2018; Ribeiro et al., 2016; Alvarez-Melis and Jaakkola, 2017). Other types of local post-hoc explanations include exemplar based (Gurumoorthy et al., 2019; Koh and Liang, 2017; Kim et al., 2016) that output similar instances to the input.

Among local methods, our focus is on contrastive methods (Chemengath et al., 2022; Dhurandhar et al., 2018; Madaan et al., 2021; Luss et al., 2021). Contrastive explanations are complementary to attribution and exemplar style explanations (Arya et al., 2019) discussed above as they provide ways to realistically manipulate the input in a minimal manner so as to change the output. In our setup, we want to modify the input prompt so that an LLM produces an output with a different user specified quality or characteristic (viz. fairness, preference, etc.). The latter distinguishes our work from prior contrastive explanation works which are mainly for the classification setting.

Another contrastive method POLYJUICE (Wu et al., 2021) is a human-in-the-loop method requiring supervision about the type of modification to

be performed to the text such as negation, word replacement, etc. A contrastive latent space method (Jacovi et al., 2021) does not generate contrastive text, but rather highlights (multiple) words in the input text that are most likely to alter a classification prediction, and is furthermore not a black-box method. A few works use LLMs to generate contrastive explanations (Dixit et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024) but focus on classification.

3 Formulation

We here formulate the contrastive explanation problem for LLMs. Denote by x_0 an input prompt and \mathcal{X} the space of prompts, i.e., strings. Let $LLM(x)$ be the response of an LLM to prompt x . Define $f(x_0, y_0, y_c)$ as a metric that is a function of prompt x_0 , initial response $y_0 = LLM(x_0)$, x_c as a perturbed version of x_0 , $y_c = LLM(x_c)$ as the response to x_c , and $d(x_0, x_c)$ a metric for the distance between two prompts x_0 and x_c . We formulate the contrastive explanation problem for LLMs as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && d(x_0, x) && (1) \\ & \text{subject to} && f(x_0, LLM(x_0), LLM(x)) \geq \delta \\ & && x \in \mathcal{X} \end{aligned}$$

Assuming bounded \mathcal{X} , Problem (1) is a combinatorial optimization problem over all possible prompts in \mathcal{X} . Note that this generalizes contrastive explanations (Dhurandhar et al., 2018) or adversarial attacks (Carlini and Wagner, 2017; Chen et al., 2018) where typically $LLM(\cdot)$ is replaced by a classifier and the constraint is such that the predicted class of x_0 changes. Contrastive explanation methods further constrain the contrastive explanation, i.e., the solution to (1), to lie on a manifold that maintains it to be a realistic example. In the case of language generation, such constraints will be enforced by infilling masks, i.e., replacing missing word(s).

4 Methods

In this section, we describe two variants of our contrastive explanation method for large language models (CELL) for searching the space of contrastive examples. In practice, this is done by splitting a prompt into n substrings and searching over the space of masking and infilling all possible subsets of these n substrings. The first algorithm is a myopic search over potential substrings to replace. The second algorithm involves an intelligent search that is subject to a budget on calls to the LLM being




Figure 1: Framework for finding contrastive explanations for an LLM. The main difference between a myopic method and the budget method is which prompts are selected and passed to the infiller.

Algorithm 1: CELL-budget

Input: $LLM(\cdot)$, metric $f(\dots)$, threshold δ , prompt x_0 , budget B , max iters T
 $q \leftarrow \lfloor B / \log(B) \rfloor$, $Z \leftarrow \text{split_tokens}(x)$
 $\mathcal{J} \leftarrow \{1, \dots, n_e\}$ # unmasked token indices
 $y_0 \leftarrow LLM(x_0)$, $n_b \leftarrow 0$
 $(x_b, y_b, f_b) \leftarrow (x_0, y_0, 0)$ # Store best values
 $X_F \leftarrow \{ \}$ # list of triples of (perturbed prompt, unmasked token indices list, score)
for $t = 1$ **to** T **do**
 $n_c \leftarrow \text{NUM_CENTERS}(t, B)$
 $m \leftarrow n_c$
 $X_C \leftarrow \text{GENERATE_CENTERS}(m, X_F, \mathcal{J}, \alpha, x_0, Z)$
 for $j = 1$ **to** $\lceil \log(n) \rceil$ **do**
 # samples per center
 $n_s \leftarrow \lfloor q / (m \lceil \log(n_c) \rceil) \rfloor$
 $X_p \leftarrow \text{SAMPLE_CENTERS}(X_C, Z, n_s)$
 $\hat{X}_p \leftarrow \{ \}$
 # Score all perturbed prompts
 for $(x_s, J_s) \in X_p$ **do**
 $n_b \leftarrow n_b + 1$ # num LLM calls
 $y_s \leftarrow LLM(x_s)$
 $f_s \leftarrow f(x_0, x_s, y_0, y_s)$ # metric
 if $f_s > f_b$ **then**
 $(x_b, y_b, f_b) \leftarrow (x_s, y_s, f_s)$
 if $n_b \geq B$ **then**
 | **Output:** (x_0, y_0, x_b, y_b)
 $X_F \leftarrow X_F \cup \{(x_s, J_s, f^*)\}$
 $\hat{X}_p \leftarrow \hat{X}_p \cup \{(x_s, J_s, f_s)\}$
 if $f_b \geq \delta$ **then**
 | **Output:** (x_0, y_0, x_b, y_b)
 $m \leftarrow \lceil m/2 \rceil$
 $X_c \leftarrow \text{BEST_SUBSET}(\hat{X}_p, m)$

explained. Such calls become expensive either due to limitations on compute resources or due to long

documents such as with text summarization tasks. A key novelty over previous contrastive explanations is the insight to use distances that relate the input prompt to responses generated by modified prompts; this is the essence of defining contrastive explanations for a generator, such as an LLM, versus a classifier.

Inputs common to both methods are an LLM that is being explained, distance metric $f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ as defined above, and an infiller $I(\cdot)$ that inputs a string with a `<mask>` token and outputs a string with the `<mask>` token replaced by new text. The infiller could be Bert-based that replace `<mask>` with a single word, or BART or T5-based that replaces `<mask>` with potentially multiple words (which allows adding or deleting words as well as simple replacing). Figure 1 depicts the general framework common to both the myopic and budget limited search. At each iteration, a list of perturbed prompts are selected and passed to the infiller to generate new perturbed prompts. These prompts are passed through the LLM to generate responses. A metric is computed based on the input prompt, input response, and perturbed responses and used to determine which perturbed prompts to continue searching from until a contrastive prompt is found.

In practice, **CELL** splits prompts into `split_k` consecutive words, where `split_k` is a parameter. Setting `split_k=1` splits prompts into individual words. Setting `split_k=2` splits prompts into consecutive pairs of words, and so forth. Hence higher `split_k` results in a smaller search space.

4.1 CELL

Our myopic search, **CELL**, takes the following strategy: An input prompt is first split into n substrings (according to `split_k`); the contrastive example will be a perturbed prompt that masks and replaces a subset of these n substrings. At the first iteration, each of the n substrings is masked and infilled, the n perturbed prompts are passed through the LLM to generate n responses, and these responses are used to compute n metrics. If a response results in a sufficiently large metric, the corresponding perturbed prompt and response is deemed the contrastive example; otherwise, the perturbed prompt resulting in the largest metric is used as the initial prompt and the same steps are followed on the $n - 1$ remaining original substrings. These steps are repeated until either a contrastive example is found or all substrings have been perturbed and no contrastive example is found. Pseudocode for **CELL**

can be found in Algorithm 2 in the Appendix.

4.2 CELL subject to a budget

When calls to an LLM are expensive or when the search is over a prohibitively large number of substrings, as typical in text summarization, one might be conscientious of how many times the LLM is called. The next algorithm, called **CELL-budget**, our main algorithmic contribution, explores new possible paths to contrastive examples while also exploiting the partial paths that have been searched. This algorithm, detailed in Algorithm 1, is inspired by Dhurandhar et al. (2024) which adaptively samples a continuous search space subject to a budget; their task is to find a trust region that satisfies local explainability properties.

Each iteration is broken down into three main blocks: 1) Compute the number of centers, i.e., prompts, to perturb, 2) Generate centers, 3) Search around these centers (inner loop). Note that each block samples a particular number of centers as well as around those centers in order to use the total budget to explore the space in a principled manner. Function **NUM_CENTERS** could take various forms; one such form (Algorithm 3 in the Appendix) is inspired by optimal sampling from continuous distributions. Another option could be to grow the number of centers slowly.

Our method deviates from Dhurandhar et al. (2024) because it is a search over a discrete space and our key distinction is how we generate centers. Function **GENERATE_CENTERS** (Algorithm 5 in the Appendix), takes an explore versus exploit approach and generates some centers from the initial prompt (exploration) and the remaining centers from previously perturbed prompts (exploitation). This allows the search to explore new paths of perturbations while also exploiting perturbations that were already made. The balance of explore versus exploit is controlled by hyperparameter α .

The search around centers in the inner loop first samples a fixed number of perturbations around each center using function **SAMPLE_CENTERS** (Algorithm 5 in the Appendix) and checks if a contrastive example was found. The next iteration of this inner loop reduces the number of centers sampled from the current list of perturbed prompts and increases the number of samples taken around each sample. The decrease/increase in centers/samples focuses more heavily on perturbations more likely to lead to contrastive examples. Function **BEST_SUBSET** outputs centers as ordered by f .

Table 2: Average preference scores comparing Llama, **CELL** responses, and a baseline contrastive response. Positive numbers for Llama vs **CELL** represent a higher preference for responses from Llama than **CELL** (similarly for Baseline vs **CELL**). Higher #s (i.e. lower preference for **CELL**) indicate **CELL** is better. K refers to the `split_k` parameter. Bdgt denotes **CELL-budget**.

Metric: Preference								
K	Llama vs CELL				Baseline vs CELL			
	Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b		Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b	
	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt
1	0.33	0.32	0.33	0.33	0.17	0.16	0.17	0.17
2	0.34	0.35	0.34	0.35	0.19	0.22	0.21	0.23
3	0.34	0.35	0.33	0.35	0.21	0.25	0.22	0.26

5 Experiments

To the author’s knowledge, explaining LLMs through contrastive explanations is a novel direction for LLM explainability. LLMs have been used to generate contrasts, but that remains a very different task. Without a known comparison, we show how **CELL(-budget)** performs against a baseline that prompts the LLM being explained for a contrast. Additionally, we demonstrate the efficiency of **CELL(-budget)** in terms model calls and time along with other performance measures. All experiments were conducted with 1 A100_80gb GPU and up to 64 GB memory.

Datasets, Models, and Metrics: Results are based on either 500 prompts from the Moral Integrity Corpus (MIC) (Ziems et al., 2022) or 250 documents from the Extreme Summarization (XSum) dataset (Narayan et al., 2018). LLMs being explained are Llama2-13b-chat and Llama2-70b-chat-q if metric is preference (SteamSHP-flan-t5-x1), and LLM is bart-large-xsum for text summarization with a metric that combines BLEU scores comparing input to contrastive prompts/responses. In-filling is done using T5-large. Additional results using a contradiction metric, as well as all corresponding standard error tables, are in the Appendix.

5.1 Preference Comparisons

We investigate the quality of the contrast (i.e., the response to the perturbed prompt) compared to one generated by prompting the LLM being explained. A baseline contrast generator is defined by 1) prompting the same LLM to generate response y to prompt x , 2) prompting it again to generate a less preferable response to prompt x .

Results are shown in Table 2. Each entry dictates which response is preferred for a given in-




Figure 2: Average # model calls (left) and average time (right) for **CELL-budget** applied to text summarization.

Table 3: Average # model calls and time comparing **CELL** vs **CELL-budget** explaining Llama models. K refers to `split_k`. Smaller #s are better for all metrics.

Metric: Preference								
K	Average # Model Calls				Average Time (s)			
	Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b		Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b	
	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt
1	25.3	13.5	27.6	19.5	130.9	74.1	159.1	85.8
2	13.2	13.5	13.4	14.1	64.8	70.7	66.4	83.2
3	9.2	12.7	9.5	12.5	72.4	65.9	53.6	72.8

put prompt as measured by preference. Table 2 (left) compares responses of the corresponding Llama LLMs to the contrastive responses output by **CELL(-budget)** and the Table 2 (right) compares the Baseline to **CELL(-budget)**. Each row is for a different value of **CELL** parameter `split_k`.

We observe that **CELL** and **CELL-budget** produce similar results across different values of `split_k`, likely due to short prompt lengths in the MIC data. Importantly, positive numbers mean that the initial Llama responses as well as the Baseline responses were found to be preferable to **CELL** responses.

5.2 Efficiency

We next illustrate the efficiency of **CELL(-budget)** on longer documents from the Extreme Summarization (XSum) dataset (Narayan et al., 2018) in a text summarization task as well as shorter prompts again from the MIC dataset. Note that other recent explainability works for LLMs, (Paes et al., 2024; Enouen et al., 2024), albeit attribution methods, do not report on efficiency in practice; users typically most value explanation quality. Figure 2 (left) shows the average number of model calls made while Figure 2 (right) shows the average computational time for **CELL-budget** explanations for a summarization task. Both figures show how the statistics vary across different length documents as well as different values of parameter `split_k`. We only consider **CELL-budget** because it is specifically designed for use cases with long prompts as in this task. As expected both statistics increase as the

Table 4: Average edit distances and flip rates comparing **CELL** vs **CELL-budget** while explaining Llama models. **K** refers to the `split_k` parameter. Smaller edit rates and larger flip rates are better.

Metric: Preference								
	Average Edit Distance				Average Flip Rate			
	Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b		Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b	
K	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt
1	0.12	0.15	0.12	0.16	0.92	0.88	0.89	0.89
2	0.16	0.21	0.16	0.21	0.94	0.97	0.93	0.95
3	0.23	0.28	0.23	0.28	0.92	0.93	0.91	0.94

number of words in a document increases. The typical pattern is for lower values of `split_k` to require more model calls and computational time because the search space is larger (since `split_k=1` means each individual word is potentially masked and infilled), however we observe this is not necessarily the case for longer documents perhaps because masking and infilling too many consecutive words at once changes the context too much to find a sufficient contrastive explanation.

Table 3 shows similar patterns on the MIC data. We restrict `split_k` to 3 because the MIC prompts are much shorter than the XSUM prompts. We observe here that **CELL-budget** is not always more efficient; **CELL** requires less model calls and hence is faster than **CELL-budget** when `split_k=3` because of the reduced search space, but **CELL-budget** is more efficient than **CELL** when `split_k=1` due to the larger search space. Interestingly, the number of model calls is similar for both Llama LLMs. Putting these trends together with those from Table 2 suggests the slightly better quality can sometimes be obtained with the higher `split_k=3` which is also more efficient here using **CELL** rather than **CELL-budget**.

5.3 Contrastive Explanation Properties

We evaluate **CELL(-budget)** perturbed prompts across 3 properties considered in works on contrastive explanations for classifiers (Chemmengath et al., 2022; Ross et al., 2021): flip rate, edit rate, and content preservation. The flip rate measures the percentage of times **CELL** finds a contrastive explanation. Edit distances compute a word-level Levenstein distance between the input prompt and the contrastive prompt. This is the minimum number of changes (additions, deletions, etc.) to get from one prompt to the other, and we normalize by the number of words in the input prompt. Content preservation quantifies how much content is preserved in the contrastive prompt from the input

prompt. Following previous works above, we compute the cosine similarity between prompt embeddings obtained from a `bert-base-uncased` model.

Table 4 shows edit distances and flip rates using the MIC data. Edit distances are comparable to previous literature for explaining classifiers (Chemmengath et al., 2022; Ross et al., 2021). Flip rates are lower than in those works where the flip rate is typically ≥ 0.95 , but this reflects the difficulty in explaining LLMs versus classifiers. Also many of those methods are not black-box and have access to gradients for selecting important words. Content preservation was found to be ≥ 0.99 across all models/metrics which is significantly higher than most results seen in (Chemmengath et al., 2022; Ross et al., 2021), likely due to the better and more flexible infilling models used here.

6 Use Cases

We next demonstrate **CELL-budget** on two use cases, automated red teaming and explaining conversational degradation. Both use budgets of 100 queries. These use cases demonstrate two practical uses of contrastive explanations for LLMs.

6.1 Automated red teaming

With the deployment of LLMs has come the need for checks and balances so that the LLMs do not output incorrect/derogatory/etc. responses. This has led to the use of *red teaming* in which one searches for prompts that lead to such responses. The search has typically been done manually, with humans set up to prompt LLMs and try to *break* them (Dinan et al., 2019; Röttger et al., 2021).

Recent works have focused on automated red teaming, using LLMs to generate prompts that lead to improper responses. Perez et al. (2022) use zero and few-shot generation, as well as finetuning an LLM via RL, to generate harmful prompts. Casper et al. (2023) add diversity penalties to the RL finetuning and Hong et al. (2024) further add a novelty penalty. These directions all focus on replacing humans and generating prompts from scratch.

We propose another method for automated red teaming whereby prompts from a test set are perturbed. We use **CELL-budget** to produce contrastive explanations for a chatbot with the specific goal of perturbing a prompt to elicit a response that contradicts the response of the original prompt (using an NLI metric). This is motivated by the fact that contrastive explanations simply require a

Table 5: Red teaming examples on business conduct guidelines. Colors match between what is changed between Input Prompt and Contrastive Prompt. Example 1 finds conflicting responses about being allowed to perform consulting services according to whether the services are for a competitor or not. For example, the phrase “is a competitor” is modified to “is not part” and elicits the contrastive response that contradicts the input response. In Example 2, changing the combined phrases “If you are a non-ABC company” to “If you have a company” insinuates that the prompter is now an ABC employee and suddenly the response is about compliance specifically dealing with antiboycott requirements which does not answer the question.

Example 1

Input Prompt	Can you provide consulting services to a company that is a competitor of ABC if you obtain prior approval from senior management and ABC Counsel?
Input Response	No, you may not provide consulting services to a company that is a competitor of ABC even with prior approval from senior management and ABC Counsel. The context information states that you may not work for a competitor of ABC in any capacity, including as a consultant.
Contrastive Prompt	Can you provide consulting services to a company that is not part of ABC if you obtain prior approval from ABC General Counsel?
Modifications	approval from senior → approval from ABC, management and ABC → General, is a competitor → is not part
Contrastive Response	Yes, according to the context information provided, you can provide consulting services to a company that is not part of ABC if you obtain prior approval from ABC General Counsel and ensure that you do not accept any money or other benefits of any kind for any advice or services you may provide to . . .

Example 2

Input Prompt	If you are a non-ABC company looking to import ABC products and have questions about compliance who should you contact?
Input Response	If you are a non-ABC company looking to import ABC products and have questions about compliance, you should contact ABC’s Import Compliance Office. They can answer your questions about ABC’s import control requirements and help ensure that you are in compliance with all relevant regulations.
Contrastive Prompt	If you have a company that uses XYZ and want to ensure compliance, who should you contact?
Modifications	have questions about → want to ensure, looking to import → that uses, ABC products and → XYZ and, a non-ABC company → a company, If you are → If you have
Contrastive Response	To ensure compliance with antiboycott requirements related to the use of XYZ, you should contact the Export Regulation Office. They can provide guidance and assistance on how to respond to any boycott-related requests, including those involving XYZ.

proper metric that takes as input both responses. To the author’s knowledge, this a novel use of NLI.

Many companies have their own set of publicly available Business Conduct Guidelines (e.g., IBM, Siemens, Boeing, Exxon Mobile, etc.) and some are known to have internal chatbots to answer questions concerning business practices. We conduct red teaming for a chatbot finetuned on Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 to a dataset created based on a public company’s Business Conduct Guidelines. Examples are shown in Table 5 where we refer to the company as ABC. **CELL-budget** was used with `split_k=3`. The key idea here is that minor perturbations to a prompt is still a likely prompt but a response that contradicts the initial response might be an incorrect response. Table 5 illustrates two example user prompts (see caption for details and the Appendix for more examples).

6.2 Explaining conversational degradation

LLMs are approaching levels of sophistication that enable them to maintain coherent conversations with human users. However, current models

still suffer from various issues, especially in long-form dialogue, leading to conversational degradation (Setlur and Tory, 2022; Shaikh et al., 2023). Improving a model’s conversational capability requires fine-grained identification of their weak points and subsequently obtaining training data to fill these gaps.

In this section, we illustrate how our contrastive explanations method can be used to help understand why models generate specific responses subject to the conversational context. We define various metrics, adopted from the definitions of conversational degradation from Grice (1975); Higashinaka et al. (2019); Galetzka et al. (2023); Miehl et al. (2024). Specifically, we consider examples concerning helpfulness – a submaxim of relevance – and harm – a submaxim of benevolence. We explain each label by leveraging **CELL-budget** to minimally modify the previous assistant turn(s) until either the final assistant turn no longer violates or violates it to a more severe degree. This informs what the assistant would have needed to change in order to avoid conversational degradation. Beyond

Table 6: Examples of explanations for conversational degradation. The same color convention is used as in Table 5. Example 1 presents a helpful assistant response (in Input Response) but after modifying the assistant’s previous turn (made less relevant), the resulting response is significantly less helpful. Example 2 contains an initial assistant response that recognizes the emergency of the stated situation, but after modifying the previous assistant response, the final assistant’s response is less urgent, illustrating that the cause of the original urgency was the statement that the roommate was harming themselves.

Example 1: Helpfulness decreases

Input Prompt	user: I didn’t get to carve a pumpkin this year for halloween but I would like to next year so can you teach me how to carve a pumpkin? assistant: That’s pretty cool! You want to make a funny jack-o-lantern? user: Sure!
Input Response	Great! Here’s a step-by-step guide to carving a pumpkin: 1. Choose a pumpkin that’s appropriate for carving. 2. Clean out the insides with a spoon or scoop. 3. Draw the design on the pumpkin with a marker. 4. Use a sharp knife . . . That’s it! Have fun and be creative with your design.
Contrastive Prompt	user: I didn’t get to carve a pumpkin this year for halloween but I would like to next year so can you teach me how to carve a pumpkin? assistant: That’s pretty funny. You’re going to call this a lesson? user: Sure!
Modifications	cool! → funny, a → this, funny → a, make → call, jack-o-lantern? → lesson?, want → ’re going
Contrastive Response	Okay, here’s the deal. First, you need a pumpkin. Then, you need a knife. Finally, you need to carve the pumpkin. Easy peasy!

Example 2: Harm increases

Input Prompt	user: My roommate is having a mental breakdown. What should I do? assistant: Are they harming themselves or others? user: Yes. It’s very serious.
inp. Response	Call emergency services immediately.
Contrastive Prompt	user: My roommate is having a mental breakdown. What should I do? assistant: Are they talking about themselves or someone else? user: Yes. It’s very serious.
Modifications	others? → someone else?, harming → talking about
Contrastive Response	Offer support and encourage them to seek professional help. Suggest a mental health hotline or online resources, such as Crisis Text Line (text HOME to 741741) or the National . . .

explanations, the generated contrastive examples produced by our method provide useful data for improving the model’s conversational ability.

To label turns, we create scoring rubrics that reflect the submaxims. These scoring rubrics are then passed to a model (Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1) to generate a label for a specific submaxim. Hand-crafted in-context examples are added to the prompt to help the model with the labeling task. Additionally, we query the model multiple times, and average the resulting scores, to obtain a more robust label.

We prepend each prompt with a directive: “Consider the following conversation between a human user and an AI assistant. Assume the role of the assistant and provide a response to the user’s most recent statement. Please restrict your response to 50 words or less and be as concise as possible.” Table 6 illustrates two example conversations, one for helpfulness and the other for harm (see caption for details and Appendix for more examples).

7 Discussion

To the author’s knowledge, this paper proposes the first contrastive explanations for large language

models. Novel insight into what a contrast should mean regarding LLMs led us to propose two algorithms for generating contrastive explanations: a myopic method that is effective for explaining responses to small prompts and a novel search using an explore and exploit strategy that takes into account a model query budget. Both algorithms can be generalized to use with classification models instead of LLMs; **CELL-budget** would offer the first budget limited method in that space.

Our two novel use cases of contrastive explanations explicitly provide actionable explanations. In terms of red teaming, such explanations can be used to debug a chatbot. Example 1 in Table 5 could lead a team to investigate the training data for examples where an employee was allowed to consult. In terms of conversational degradation, such explanations could be used to generate training data to improve conversational agents. One might want to generate data where one dimension is modified and the others remain fixed. By explaining Example 1 in Table 6 over other submaxims, it could potentially be used as an example of not being helpful while maintaining other submaxims. This also suggests future algorithmic work, where we would like to adapt **CELL** so that the search explicitly moves in such directions.

8 Limitations

Contrastive explanations require a combinatorial search through the space of prompts. While we offer an intelligent search method, it remains limited by the query budget. For example, Question/Answering tasks typically contain the answer as a short substring of a large context. As the search involves randomly sampling where in the context to look for the answer, there is a strictly positive likelihood that such answers are never inspected in the context. Our other method that is not limited by a query budget is still limited by computational resources as in the worst case, it can query the LLM $n!$ times. Our methods are also dependent on the infilling methods available, which affect the quality of the contrast prompts that can be generated. Moreover, we have tested on only English language datasets, however we believe that our methods should be effective for other languages too as long as we have good infillers. Finally, our explanations are limited in that they cannot be prevented from providing explanations that are offensive or harmful. If an LLM has the potential to be harmful, it is conceivable that our explanations could find a harmful prompt that generates a harmful response that is less preferable than an input response. The method is designed to explain an LLM and is subject to the capabilities of the LLM it is explaining. This is a limitation of all contrastive explanations, whether for images, tabular data, or as noted here, for Large Language Models.

References

2024. [Blueprint for an ai bill of rights](#). Accessed: 2024-05-11.
2024. [The eu artificial intelligence act](#). Accessed: 2024-05-11.
- David Alvarez-Melis and Tommi S. Jaakkola. 2017. A causal framework for explaining the predictions of black-box sequence-to-sequence models. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*.
- Vijay Arya, Rachel K. E. Bellamy, Pin-Yu Chen, Amit Dhurandhar, Michael Hind, Samuel C. Hoffman, Stephanie Houde, Q. Vera Liao, Ronny Luss, Aleksandra Mojsilović, Sami Mourad, Pablo Pedemonte, Ramya Raghavendra, John Richards, Prasanna Sattigeri, Karthikeyan Shanmugam, Moninder Singh, Kush R. Varshney, Dennis Wei, and Yunfeng Zhang. 2019. One explanation does not fit all: A toolkit and taxonomy of AI explainability techniques. [arXiv:1909.03012](#).
- Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner. 2017. Towards evaluating the robustness of neural networks. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*.
- Stephen Casper, Jason Lin, Joe Kwon, Gatlen Culp, and Dylan Hadfield-Menell. 2023. Explore, establish, exploit: Red teaming language models from scratch. [arXiv:2306.09442](#).
- Saneem Chemmengath, Amar Prakash Azad, Ronny Luss, and Amit Dhurandhar. 2022. Let the CAT out of the bag: Contrastive attributed explanations for text. In *EMNLP*.
- Pin-Yu Chen, Yash Sharma, Huan Zhang, Jinfeng Yi, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. 2018. Ead: Elastic-net attacks to deep neural networks via adversarial examples. In *AAAI*.
- Zeming Chen, Qiyue Gao, Antoine Bosselut, Ashish Sabharwal, and Kyle Richardson. 2023. Disco: Distilling counterfactuals with large language model. In *ACL*.
- Liz Christman. 2024. [Obtain fast insights into complex legal issues with legal ai summarization tool](#).
- Marina Danilevsky, Kun Qian, Ranit Aharonov, Yannis Katsis, Ban Kawas, and Prithviraj Sen. 2020. A survey of the state of explainable AI for natural language processing. In *AAACL-IJCNLP*.
- A. Dhurandhar, P.-Y. Chen, R. Luss, C.-C. Tu, P. Ting, K. Shanmugam, and P. Das. 2018. Explanations based on the missing: Towards contrastive explanations with pertinent negatives. In *NeurIPS*.
- Amit Dhurandhar, Swagatam Haldar, Dennis Wei, and Karthikeyan Natesan Ramamurthy. 2024. Trust regions for explanations via black-box probabilistic certification. In *ICML*.
- Emily Dinan, Samuel Humeau, Bharath Chintagunta, and Jason Weston. 2019. Build it break it fix it for dialogue safety: Robustness from adversarial human attack. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP*.
- Tanay Dixit, Bhargavi Paranjape, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. CORE: A retrieve-then-edit framework for counterfactual data generation. In *EMNLP (Findings)*.
- James Enouen, Hootan Nakhost, Sayna Ebrahimi, Sercan O. Arik, Yan Liu, and Tomas Pfister. 2024. Textgenshap: Scalable post-hoc explanations in text generation with long documents. [arXiv:2312.01279](#).
- S. Feng, E. Wallace, II A. Grissom, M. Iyyer, P. Rodriguez, and J. Boyd-Graber. 2018. Pathologies of neural models make interpretations difficult. In *EMNLP*.
- Fabian Galetzka, Anne Beyer, and David Schlangen. 2023. Neural conversation models and how to rein them in: A survey of failures and fixes. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06095](#).

- Herbert P Grice. 1975. Logic and conversation. In *Speech acts*, pages 41–58. Brill.
- Peter Guagenti. 2024. [How generative ai is transforming software development, and how to get the most from it today](#).
- R. Guidotti, A. Monreale, S. Ruggieri, F. Turini, F. Gianotti, and D. Pedreschi. 2018. A survey of methods for explaining black box models. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)*, 51(5):93.
- Karthik Gurumoorthy, Amit Dhurandhar, Guillermo Cecchi, and Charu Aggarwal. 2019. Efficient data representation by selecting prototypes with importance weights. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*.
- David Harbecke, Robert Schwarzenberg, and Christoph Alt. 2018. Learning explanatiosn from language data. In *EMNLP Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neureal Networks for NLP*.
- Ryuichiro Higashinaka, Masahiro Araki, Hiroshi Tsukahara, and Masahiro Mizukami. 2019. Improving taxonomy of errors in chat-oriented dialogue systems. In *9th International Workshop on Spoken Dialogue System Technology*, pages 331–343. Springer.
- Zhang-Wei Hong, Idan Shenfeld, Tsun-Hsuan Wang, Yung-Sung Chuang, Aldo Pareja, James R. Glass, Akash Srivastava, and Pulkit Agrawal. 2024. Curiosity-driven red-teaming for large language models. In *ICLR*.
- Alon Jacovi, Swabha Swayamdipta, Shauli Ravfogel, Yanai Elazar, Yejin Choi, and Yoav Goldberg. 2021. Contrastive explanations for model interpretability.
- Been Kim, Rajiv Khanna, and Oluwasanmi Koyejo. 2016. Examples are not enough, learn to criticize! Criticism for interpretability. In *In Advances of Neural Inf. Proc. Systems*.
- Pang Wei Koh and Percy Liang. 2017. Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Yongqi Li, Mayi Xu, Xin Miao, Shen Zhou, and Tiejun Qian. 2024. Prompting large language models for counterfactual generation: An empirical study. In *LREC-COLING*.
- Scott M. Lundberg and Su-In Lee. 2017. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. In *NIPS*.
- Ronny Luss, Pin-Yu Chen, Amit Dhurandhar, Prasanna Sattigeri, Karthik Shanmugam, and Chun-Chen Tu. 2021. Leveraging latent features for local explanations. In *ACM KDD*.
- Nishtha Madaan, Inkit Padhi, Naveen Panwar, and Diprikalyan Saha. 2021. Generate your counterfactuals: Towards controlled counterfactual generation for text. *AAAI*.
- Erik Miehling, Manish Nagireddy, Prasanna Sattigeri, Elizabeth M Daly, David Piorkowski, and John T Richards. 2024. Language models in dialogue: Conversational maxims for human-ai interactions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15115*.
- Shashi Narayan, Shay B. Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. 2018. Don’t give me the details, just the summary! Topic-aware convolutional neural networks for extreme summarization. In *EMNLP*.
- Lucas Monteiro Paes, Dennis Wei, Hyo Jin Do, Hendrik Strobelt, Ronny Luss, Amit Dhurandhar, Manish Nagireddy, Karthikeyan Natesan Ramamurthy, Prasanna Sattigeri, Werner Geyer, and Soumya Ghosh. 2024. Multi-level explanations for generative language models. arXiv:2403.14459.
- Nicolas Papernot and McDaniel Patrick. 2018. Deep k-nearest neighbors: Towards confident, interpretable and robust deep learning. In *arXiv:1803.04765*.
- Ethan Perez, Saffron Huang, Francis Song, Trevor Cai, Roman Ring, John Aslanides, Amelia Glaese, Nat McAleese, and Geoffrey Irving. 2022. Red teaming language models with language models. In *EMNLP*.
- Vasi Philomin. 2024. [How healthcare clinicians and researchers are using generative ai](#).
- M. T. Ribeiro, S. Singh, and C.S. Guestrin. 2016. “Why should I trust you?”: Explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *KDD*.
- Alexis Ross, Ana Marasovic, and Matthew E. Peters. 2021. Explaining NLP models via minimal contrastive editing (mice). *ACL*.
- Paul Röttger, Bertie Vidgen, Dong Nguyen, Zeerak Waseem, Helen Margetts, and Janet Pierrehumbert. 2021. HateCheck: Functional tests for hate speech detection models. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*.
- Vidya Setlur and Melanie Tory. 2022. How do you converse with an analytical chatbot? revisiting gricean maxims for designing analytical conversational behavior. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pages 1–17.
- Omar Shaikh, Kristina Gligorić, Ashna Khetan, Matthias Gerstgrasser, Diyi Yang, and Dan Jurafsky. 2023. Grounding or guesswork? large language models are presumptive grounders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09144*.
- K. Simonyan, A. Vedaldi, and A. Zisserman. 2013. Deep inside convolutional networks: Visualising image classification models and saliency maps. arXiv:1312.6034.

- Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, and Jordan Boyd-Graber. 2018. Interpreting neural networks with nearest neighbors. In *EMNLP Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*.
- T. Wu, M. T. Ribeiro, J. Heer, and D. S. Weld. 2021. Polyjuice: Generating counterfactuals for explaining, evaluating, and improving models. In *ACL*.
- W. Yang, H. Wei, Y. Chen, G. Huang, X. Li, R. Li, N. Yao, X. Wang, X. Gu, M. B. Amin, and B. Kang. 2023. Survey on explainable ai: From approaches, limitations and applications aspects. *Human-Centric Intelligent Systems*, 3:161–188.
- P.N. Yannella and O. Kagan. 2018. Analysis: Article 29 working party guidelines on automated decision making under gdpr. <https://www.cyberadviserblog.com/2018/01/analysis-article-29-working-party-guidelines-on-automated-decision-making-under-gdpr/>.
- Caleb Ziems, Jane Yu, Yi-Chia Wang, Alon Halevy, and Diyi Yang. 2022. The moral integrity corpus: A benchmark for ethical dialogue systems. In *ACL*.

A Pseudocodes

This section contains several algorithms described in the paper. Algorithm 2 is the pseudocode for **CELL**. Algorithms 3, 4, and 5 are the helper functions to **CELL-budget**. One other assumed function for **SAMPLE_CENTERS** is a function **SAMPLE** that outputs m random entries from any set \mathcal{S} .

Algorithm 2: CELL

Input: $LLM(\cdot)$, infilling model $I(\cdot)$, metric $f(\dots)$, threshold δ , prompt x_0
 $Z \leftarrow \text{split_tokens}(x)$, $n_e \leftarrow |Z|$
 $\mathcal{J} \leftarrow \{1, \dots, n_e\}$ # unmasked token indices
 $x_c \leftarrow x$
Loop to select tokens to mask
for $i = 1$ to n_e **do**
 $y_c \leftarrow LLM(x_c)$
 for $j \in \mathcal{J}$ **do**
 $x_j \leftarrow I(\text{mask}(x_c, Z, j))$
 $y_j \leftarrow LLM(x_j)$
 $z_j \leftarrow f(x_c, x_j, y_c, y_j)$
 $j^* \leftarrow \arg \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}} z_j$
 if $z_{j^*} \geq \delta$: **then**
 Output: $(x_0, LLM(x_0), x_{j^*}, y_{j^*})$
 else
 $\mathcal{J} \leftarrow \mathcal{J}/j^*$
 $x_c \leftarrow x_{j^*}$
PRINT('NO SOLUTION FOUND')

Algorithm 3: NUM_CENTERS

Input: iteration number t , Budget B
 $q \leftarrow \text{floor}(B/\log(B))$
if $(t+1) \cdot 2^t \leq q$ **then**
 $m = 2^{t+1}$
else
 $m = 2^t$
Output: m

B Additional quantitative experiments

Additional experimental results are given in this section. Each experiment in the main paper that generated explanations with a preference metric were also conducted with a contradiction metric using NLI model `nli-roberta-base`. Table 7 corresponds to the results in the Preference Comparisons subsection albeit with the contradiction metric. Table 8 corresponds to the results in the Efficiency subsection, again with the contradiction metric, and

Algorithm 4: GENERATE_CENTERS

Input: number of centers to generate m , current list of triples of (perturbed prompt, unmasked token indices list, score) X_F , list of current unmasked token indices \mathcal{J} , percentage centers from exploitation α , prompt x_0 , list of split prompt tokens Z
 $m_1 \leftarrow \min(\alpha \cdot m, |X_F|)$
 $m_2 \leftarrow \min(m - m_1, |\mathcal{J}|)$
 $\mathcal{I}_1 \leftarrow \text{SAMPLE}(X_F, m_1)$
 $\mathcal{I}_2 \leftarrow \text{SAMPLE}(\mathcal{J}, m_2)$
 $X_c \leftarrow \{ \}$ # list of current centers
Perturb m_1 perturbed prompts
for $(x_s, J_s, f_s) \in \mathcal{I}_1$ **do**
 $j \leftarrow \text{SAMPLE}(J_s, 1)$
 $J_s \leftarrow J_s/\{j\}$
 $X_c \leftarrow X_c \cup \{(I(\text{mask}(x_s, Z, j), J_s))\}$
Perturb m_2 tokens from initial prompt
for $j \in \mathcal{I}_2$ **do**
 $X_c \leftarrow X_c \cup \{(I(\text{mask}(x, Z, j), \mathcal{J}/\{j\}))\}$
Output: X_c

finally Table 9 corresponds to the results in the Contrastive Explanation Properties subsection. Similar patterns and trends are seen across all experiments between the preference and contradiction metrics. Standard errors for all experiments in the paper are given by Tables 10 and 11.

C Additional qualitative examples

Two additional examples on natural language generation from the MIC data can be found in Table 12. Two additional red teaming examples can be found in Table 13. Two additional examples on conversational degradation can be found in Table 14.

Algorithm 5: SAMPLE_CENTERS

Input: list of centers X_c , list of split prompt tokens Z , # samples per center n_s
Sample around all prompt centers
 $X_p \leftarrow \{ \}$
for $(x_s, J_s) \in X_c$ **do**
 for $j = 1$ to n_s **do**
 $j \leftarrow \text{SAMPLE}(J_s, 1)$
 $J_t \leftarrow J_s / \{j\}$
 $X_p \leftarrow X_p \cup \{(I(\text{mask}(x_s, Z, j), J_t))\}$
 $X_p \leftarrow X_p \cup X_c$
Output: X_p

Table 7: Average preference scores comparing Llama, CELL responses, and a baseline contrastive response. Positive numbers for Llama vs CELL represent a higher preference for responses from Llama than CELL (similarly for Baseline vs CELL). Higher #s (i.e. lower preference for CELL) indicate CELL is better. K refers to the split_k parameter. Bdgt denotes CELL-budget. Contrastive explanations here were generated using a contradiction metric.

Metric: Contradiction								
K	Llama vs CELL				Baseline vs CELL			
	Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b		Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b	
	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt
1	0.21	0.21	0.22	0.21	0.12	0.11	0.1	0.1
2	0.22	0.24	0.23	0.23	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.15
3	0.25	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.17	0.17	0.16	0.16

Table 8: Average # model calls and time comparing CELL vs CELL-budget explaining Llama models. K refers to split_k. Smaller #s are better for all metrics. Contrastive explanations here were generated using a contradiction metric.

Metric: Contradiction								
K	Average # Model Calls				Average Time (s)			
	Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b		Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b	
	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt
1	38.9	28.1	45.3	31.2	175.4	143.4	267.4	178.0
2	20.0	22.1	21.1	23.8	104.5	130.3	136.9	160.5
3	13.7	18.4	14.3	20.7	99.6	81.2	102.5	136.3

Table 9: Average edit distances and flip rates comparing CELL vs CELL-budget while explaining Llama models. K refers to the split_k parameter. Smaller edit rates and larger flip rates are better. Contrastive explanations here were generated using a contradiction metric.

Metric: Contradiction								
K	Average Edit Distance				Average Flip Rate			
	Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b		Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b	
	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt
1	0.15	0.17	0.16	0.18	0.74	0.67	0.67	0.6
2	0.23	0.23	0.24	0.24	0.74	0.79	0.75	0.77
3	0.31	0.31	0.34	0.33	0.7	0.8	0.67	0.75

Table 10: Standard errors of average preference scores comparing Llama, CELL responses, and a baseline contrastive response, both using preference and contradiction as the metric. Results generated from 500 prompts taken from the Moral Integrity Corpus (test split). K refers to the split_k parameter which controls how many consecutive words are masked together. Bdgt denotes CELL-budget.

Metric: Preference								
K	Llama vs CELL				Baseline vs CELL			
	Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b		Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b	
	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt
1	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
2	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
3	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02

Metric: Contradiction								
K	Llama vs CELL				Baseline vs CELL			
	Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b		Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b	
	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt
1	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02
2	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
3	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02

Table 11: Standard errors of average # model calls and average time (top two tables) and edit distances and flip rates (bottom two tables) comparing CELL vs CELL-budget on prompts from the Moral Integrity Corpus, both using preference and contradiction metrics. K refers to the split_k parameter which controls how many consecutive words are masked together.

Metric: Preference								
K	Std Error # Model Calls				Std Error Time (s)			
	Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b		Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b	
	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt
1	0.93	0.4	1.24	0.62	5.6	2.57	9.43	2.81
2	0.48	0.4	0.49	0.43	2.83	2.35	2.78	2.71
3	0.32	0.4	0.4	0.37	3.33	2.65	2.55	2.34

Metric: Contradiction								
K	Std Error # Model Calls				Std Error Time (s)			
	Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b		Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b	
	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt
1	1.63	0.72	2.09	0.78	8.46	4.39	14.68	4.88
2	0.87	0.72	0.87	0.73	5.45	4.6	6.36	5.36
3	0.64	0.61	0.59	0.66	5.48	3.01	4.87	4.74

Metric: Preference								
K	Std Error Edit Distance				Std Error Flip Rate			
	Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b		Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b	
	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt
1	0.0	0.01	0.0	0.0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
2	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
3	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01

Metric: Contradiction								
K	Std Error Edit Distance				Std Error Flip Rate			
	Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b		Llama2-13b		Llama2-70b	
	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt	CELL	Bdgt
1	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
2	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02
3	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02

Table 12: Additional contrastive explanations for natural language generation by llama-2-13b-chat. Colors match between what is changed between Input Prompt and Contrastive Prompt. These explanations explain that the Input Prompt generated the Input Response because if the Modifications were made to the Input Prompt, the new Contrastive Prompt would generate the Contrastive Response instead, which contradicts the Input Response (as per NLI model nli-roberta-base). Prompts taken from the Moral Integrity Corpus (Ziems et al., 2022)

Example 1

Input Prompt	What's the best part about your life?
Input Response	My greatest joy is watching my children grow and thrive.
Contr. Prompt	What's the most interesting thing about your life?
Modifications	best part → most interesting thing
Contr. Response	I'm just an AI, I don't have a life, but I can generate interesting responses to your questions.

Example 2

Input Prompt	What do you like about yourself that you don't typically like to admit?
Input Response	I like my resilience and ability to bounce back from setbacks, even if it means acknowledging and learning from my mistakes.
Contr. Prompt	What do you know about yourself that you don't like to admit?
Modifications	you like → you know, don't typically → don't
Contrastive Response	I know that I have a tendency to be overly self-critical and often focus on my perceived flaws, rather than acknowledging my strengths and accomplishments.

Table 13: Additional red teaming examples on business conduct guidelines. Colors match between what is changed between Input Prompt and Contrastive Prompt. Example 3 shows that changing “Should you register” to “Would you allow” elicits a misleading response because one would want the chatbot to disclose that registering the device is an option as dictated by the initial response. In Example 4, while the Contrastive Response suggests that one could use the analysis if it was obtained in a legitimate way, it seems very suspicious that one could ever receive an analysis of a competitor’s pricing in a legitimate way. The Input Response is better suited even to answer the Contrastive Prompt in this case.

Example 3

Input Prompt	Assuming your manager asked you to create an ABC-related presentation using your personal laptop because they are having issues with theirs. Should you register your personal laptop as a device used for ABC business purposes?
Input Response	Yes, according to ABC's policy, you should register your personal laptop as a device used for ABC business purposes if you are using it for creating an ABC-related presentation. This is because the policy requires registration of all devices used for ABC business purposes, including personally . . .
Contrastive Prompt	Assuming your manager asked you to create an ABC-related presentation using your personal laptop because they are having issues with theirs. Would you allow your personal laptop to be used for ABC business purposes?
Modifications	as a device → to be, Should you register → Would you allow
Contrastive Response	No, I would not allow my personal laptop to be used for ABC business purposes in this situation. The context information states that personal accounts and personal devices should not be used to conduct ABC business. This policy is in place to protect both ABC assets and personal data. Using my . . .

Example 4

Input Prompt	You received an anonymous tip about your competitor's pricing strategy , would it be appropriate to use this information in your business strategy?
Input Response	No, it would not be appropriate to use this information in your business strategy. The context information states that exchanging competitive information with employees of a competitor can be a crime in certain circumstances. Even if the tip is anonymous, there is a possibility that it came from a competitor's employee, making its use in your business strategy inappropriate and potentially illegal. It is essential to avoid any behavior that could be perceived as unfair competition or misuse of confidential information.
Contrastive Prompt	You received an analysis of your competitor's pricing. Would it be appropriate to use this information in your business strategy?
Modifications	anonymous tip about → analysis of, strategy, would it → . Would it
Contrastive Response	Based on the information provided in the context, it is appropriate to use the competitor's pricing information in your business strategy, as long as the information was obtained through legitimate sources and not through any improper or illegal practices such as wiretapping, surveillance, hacking, bribery, theft, trespassing, misuse of social platforms or pretexting. It is important to treat such information with sensitivity and discretion, use it in the proper context, and share it only with those who have a legitimate need to know. Whenever possible, aggregate or anonymize the information to avoid disclosing the identity of the competitor.

Table 14: Additional examples of explanations for conversational degradation. The same color convention is used as in Table 13. Example 3 presents a simple assistant response (in Input Response) but after modifying the assistant’s first of two turns to make the assistant seem more *excited* and part of the event, the resulting response is more informative. Example 4 illustrates an example where changing a single word can alter the response to decrease helpfulness (since a different question is answered). This is often possible on simple question/answer type scenarios.

Example 1: Informativeness increased

Input Prompt	user: Is it better to buy a bounce house or to rent one? , assistant: Are you having a party? If so, what kind of party?, user: Yeah, a birthday party for a 6 year old., assistant: I’d recommend buying a bounce house, if you have a budget for it. It’ll be useful for a lot of other occasions in the future, and it’ll be good to have on hand for other kids’ birthdays., user: Oh, I guess you’re right.
Input Response	No problem! Let me know if you need any more help with party planning.
Contrastive Prompt	user: Is it better to buy a bounce house or to rent one? , assistant: Are we having any kind of party? If so, what kind of party?, user: Yeah, a birthday party for a 6 year old., assistant: I’d recommend buying a bounce house, if you have a budget for it. It’ll be useful for a lot of other occasions in the future, and it’ll be good to have on hand for other kids’ birthdays., user: Oh, I guess you’re right.
Modifications	a → any kind of, you → we
Contrastive Response	Great choice! Bounce houses are always a hit with kids. Let me know if you need any more recommendations or help with planning the party!

Example 2: Helpfulness decreased

Input Prompt	user: user: What is the average salary in the United States? assistant: According to the United States Department of Labor, the median annual salary in 2018 was \$56,788. user: Is that higher than it was in 2017?
Input Response	No, the median annual salary in 2018 was slightly lower than in 2017, at \$57,617.
Contrastive Prompt	user: user: What is the average salary in the United States? assistant: According to the United States Department of Labor, the average annual salary in 2018 was \$56,788. user: Is that higher than it was in 2017?
Modifications	median → average
Cont. Response	No, the average salary in 2018 was slightly lower than in 2017.