
Self-supervised Interpretable Concept-based Models for Text Classification

Francesco De Santis*
Politecnico di Torino
francesco.desantis@polito.it

Philippe Bich*
Politecnico di Torino
philippe.bich@polito.it

Gabriele Ciravegna*
Politecnico di Torino
gabriele.ciravegna@polito.it

Pietro Barbiero
Università della Svizzera Italiana
University of Cambridge
barbip@usi.ch

Danilo Giordano
Politecnico di Torino
danilo.giordano@polito.it

Tania Cerquitelli
Politecnico di Torino
tania.cerquitelli@polito.it

Abstract

Despite their success, Large-Language Models (LLMs) still face criticism as their lack of interpretability limits their controllability and reliability. Traditional post-hoc interpretation methods, based on attention and gradient-based analysis, offer limited insight into the model’s decision-making processes. In the image field, Concept-based models have emerged as explainable-by-design architectures, employing human-interpretable features as intermediate representations. However, these methods have not been yet adapted to textual data, mainly because they require expensive concept annotations, which are impractical for real-world text data. This paper addresses this challenge by proposing a self-supervised Interpretable Concept Embedding Models (ICEMs). We leverage the generalization abilities of LLMs to predict the concepts labels in a self-supervised way, while we deliver the final predictions with an interpretable function. The results of our experiments show that ICEMs can be trained in a self-supervised way achieving similar performance to fully supervised concept-based models and end-to-end black-box ones. Additionally, we show that our models are (i) interpretable, offering meaningful logical explanations for their predictions; (ii) interactable, allowing humans to modify intermediate predictions through concept interventions; and (iii) controllable, guiding the LLMs’ decoding process to follow a required decision-making path.

1 Introduction

In recent years, transformer-based models have revolutionized the way we approach text interpretation, generation, and classification [1–5]. Their unparalleled performance is attributed to the attention mechanism [6], which allows processing sequential data in a way that capture contextual relationships more effectively than standard deep learning models. Despite their success, the reliability of these models remains limited, primarily due to the lack of interpretability in their decision-making processes and Large-Language Models (LLMs) hallucinations [7, 8]. Indeed, traditional model interpretation methods, often applied post-hoc, heavily rely on the disputed intrinsic interpretability of attention

*Equal contribution.




Figure 1: Left, an ICEM predicting the sentiment of a drug review [21] vs an end-to-end model (E2E). ICEM not only provides accurate predictions but also reveals its decision-making process. This transparency can be leveraged to guide the output of an LLM. Right, the concept accuracy of a self-supervised ICEM in comparison to standard supervised CBM and CEM. On certain datasets, even when using all labeled data, supervised CBM and CEM still do not equal Self-ICEM performance.

mechanisms [9, 10] and gradient-based analysis [11]. These approaches only offer insight about which tokens mostly influenced the model prediction, but whether they explain the model’s decision-making process is disputed [12, 13], and more importantly, do not allow human experts to intervene upon the model to avoid hallucinations.

In the image field, concept-based explainability has emerged as an approach to providing explanations closer to the way human provide and understand explanations [14–16]. Concept-based models [17–20] represent a step forward: by integrating higher-level concepts into the model’s architecture, these methods aim to provide a transparent framework that allows the direct interpretation of the model’s predictions. A gap exists in adapting and applying these innovative approaches to transformer models and to the textual domain. Higher-level concepts such as ‘joy’ or ‘surprise’ exist also in the textual domain, and they are more comprehensible for humans than individual tokens like ‘good’ or ‘bad’, which can be challenging to interpret, particularly in relation to other tokens (e.g., ‘not’). Moreover, concept-based models require expensive annotations for concepts and tasks, which are difficult to obtain in real-world scenarios, particularly for textual data.

This paper addresses these gaps by combining LLMs for predicting high-level interpretable features with interpretable concept-based task predictors, within a framework named Interpretable-Concept Embedding Models (ICEMs). In the experimental results, we show that (i) ICEMs achieve performance close or better than fully supervised CEMs and end-to-end black-box models on text classification, (ii) ICEMs can be trained without concept supervisions in a self-supervised manner by leveraging the generative capabilities of LLMs (Figure 1, right) (iii) ICEMs are *interpretable*, providing meaningful logical explanations for their predictions (e.g., the logic rule in Figure 1, left), (iv) *interactable*, allowing humans to modify intermediate predictions and decision processes through concept interventions, and (v) *controllable*, guiding LLM decoding processes to follow a required decision-making path (e.g., the LLM output in Figure 1, left).

2 Background

In this section, we report the required information regarding LLMs and concept-based models before introducing our method.

LLMs. The transformer architecture, introduced by [6], employs the multi-head attention mechanism to effectively handle long-term relationships. The unmatched performance obtained by this architecture led to the development of LLMs, which essentially consist of multiple stacked transformer blocks trained on vast amounts of data. BERT [22] and RoBERTa [23] are examples of encoder-only LLMs. They are pre-trained to predict the missing tokens in a sequence, leveraging the context from surrounding tokens, a capability enabled by the bidirectional attention mechanism. This particular pre-training is a crucial step that enables the model to understand language in a generalized manner before being fine-tuned for specific tasks. In contrast, decoder-only LLMs [24, 5] are specifically trained to predict the succeeding token within a sequence [25], making them highly effective for

generative purposes. LLMs have demonstrated remarkable abilities in zero and few-shot learning [3], features which have been further enhanced by various prompting strategies [26–28].

Concept-based Models. Concept-based Models [29, 17] are a family of transparent and interactable models. They explicitly represent a set of concepts as an intermediate hidden layer. They are trained by breaking the standard end-to-end training paradigm into the training of two neural modules $f \circ g$. The concept encoder $g : X \rightarrow C$ maps row-level features $x \in X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ into m higher-level abstractions $c \in C \subset [0, 1]^m$ (i.e., the concepts); the task encoder $f : C \rightarrow Y$ predicts n downstream classes based on the learned concepts $\hat{y} = f(g(x))$, $y \in Y \subset [0, 1]^n$. The concept layer may represent a bottleneck in the representation capability of the network—particularly when concepts are represented by scalar values [17] and in those contexts where only few concepts are available. To overcome this issue, CEM [18] proposes to represent concepts as embeddings $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^{m,k}$, informative k -dimensional encodings capable to provide sufficient information to the task predictor $f(\mathbf{c})$ and to overcome the information bottleneck [30]. The concept predictions \hat{c} , instead, are computed over the concept embeddings with a shared scoring function $\hat{c} = s(\mathbf{c})^2$. However, the interpretability of CEM task encoders is limited, as the single dimensions of concept embeddings lack meaningful interpretation. In this paper, we show how to create different interpretable task predictors over concept embeddings, while extending the applicability of concept-based models to the textual domain. Also, supervised concept-based models [17–19] require extensive concept annotations, which are often unavailable, especially in the text domain. Recently, a generative approach [31, 32] has been proposed to mitigate this issue. We extend and improve the generative approach for the text domain, by using the same model for self-supervised concept predictions and sample representations.

3 Method

In this paper, we propose a framework of Interpretable Concept Embedding Models (ICEMs) specifically designed for textual representations. We focus on textual data $x \in X \subset [0, 1]^{|D| \cdot T}$, where each entry represents the presence of a token in a given dictionary D of size $|D|$ across a sequence of up to T tokens. Our aim is to address a text classification task $y \in Y \subset [0, 1]^n$ involving n distinct classes. In Section 3.1, we detail the ICEMs architecture, including the interpretable task predictors, the textual concept encoder, and the training procedure; Section 3.2 explores the methods for training ICEMs in scenarios where concept annotations c are not available, employing a self-supervised approach; finally, in Section 3.3, we propose to guide the generation process of an LLM by means of an I-CEM interpretable function, ensuring its adherence to the provided decision-making path.

3.1 Interpretable Concept Embedding Models (ICEMs)

To create an interpretable predictor, it is essential to utilize both an interpretable data representation and an interpretable model [33]. Concept predictions allow employing an interpretable data representation within the network. However, CEMs provide the task predictions over the concept embeddings, to avoid a generalization loss. Thus, even when using an interpretable task predictor (e.g., a linear layer), concept embeddings do not allow providing an interpretable prediction. To address this issue, the authors in [19] proposed a neural-symbolic module that generates logic rules from concept embeddings. These rules offer interpretable predictions when executed over the predicted concepts.

In this paper, we generalize this idea to the generation of any function that, when executed over the concept embeddings, outputs the final classification as an interpretable aggregation of the most important concepts. Formally, we define the ICEM interpretable predictor as:

$$\text{ICEM} \quad \hat{y}_i = \bigoplus_j \mathbf{c}_{ij}, \quad \mathbf{c}_{ij} = \alpha_i(\mathbf{c}_j, \hat{c}_j), \quad (1)$$

where we indicate with \bigoplus a permutation-invariant aggregator function, and with $\alpha(\mathbf{c}_j, \hat{c}_j)$ a (possibly neural) operator assessing whether the j -th concept \mathbf{c}_{ij} should be included in the interpretable aggregation function for the i -th class, according to the provided concept embedding \mathbf{c}_j and concept score \hat{c}_j . In the next paragraphs, we will see how to define \bigoplus , \mathbf{c}_{ij} , and α_i to provide interpretable predictions in terms of a decision rule (R-ICEM) or a linear equation (L-ICEM).

²Here and in the following, we will omit the dependency on the input for simplicity, i.e., we write \hat{c} for $\hat{c}(\mathbf{c})$

Rule-Interpretable Concept Embedding Models (R-ICEM). R-ICEM, as proposed in [19], is an interpretable task predictor producing m logic rules r (one per task) that when executed over the predicted concepts \hat{c} provide the final prediction as following:

$$\text{R-ICEM : } \hat{y}_i = r_i(\hat{c}, \mathbf{c}) = \bigwedge_j \bar{c}_{ij}, \quad \bar{c}_{ij} = \psi_i(\mathbf{c}_j) \Rightarrow (\phi_i(\mathbf{c}_j) \Leftrightarrow \hat{c}_j), \quad (2)$$

where we indicate with \bar{c} the concept literals that have been predicted by means of two neural modules $\phi, \psi : \mathbf{C}_i \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$ working over the concept embedding and assessing for each concept c_j whether it is important (ψ_i) and with which sign (ϕ_i) (positive c_j or negative $\neg c_j$), for the prediction of each class. The prediction of the class \hat{y}_i is positive if and only if all the concepts that are considered important ($\psi_j(\mathbf{c}_i) = 1$) have an associated concept prediction \hat{c}_i having the required sign ($\phi(\mathbf{c}_i)$). To compute the predictions associated to the rules in a differentiable way, we need to define a Triangular Norm (T-Norm) operator and its associated logic: following [19], we utilize the Gödel T-Norm.

Linearly-Interpretable Concept Embedding Model (L-ICEM). Another interpretable function commonly used in explainability is the linear equation [33, 34]. In a linear equation, each term represents a tuple of predicted concept score and weight, corresponding to the importance of each concept in the final prediction y_i , followed by a general bias. In this work, we propose to predict by means of neural network the weights and bias of the linear equation to apply for each sample over the concepts to predict the final class. Formally:

$$\text{L-ICEM : } \hat{y}_i = \sum_j \hat{w}_{ij} \hat{c}_j + \hat{b}_i, \quad \hat{w}_{ij} = \rho_i(\mathbf{c}_j), \hat{b} = \beta_i(\mathbf{c}) \quad (3)$$

where \hat{w}_{ij} is the weight for the j -th concept in predicting the i -th task predicted by a neural module $\rho : \mathbf{C}_i \rightarrow [-1, 1]^n$, where -1 implies a negatively important concept, $+1$ a positively important one and ~ 0 a not important concept³. Note that the bias term \hat{b} is predicted by means of the function $\beta : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$ over all the concept embeddings, and it represents the overall bias of each class. The bias is an optional term, but it allows for positive predictions even when no concept is positively predicted. Indeed, when $\hat{c}_j = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, the prediction would necessarily be $\hat{y}_i = 0$ regardless of the values predicted for the weights \hat{w}_{ij} .

Textual concept encoder. If we further decompose the concept encoder g as a composition of two functions $q \circ h$, we can separately describe the backbone function h providing a single representation for the entire sample as $h : X \rightarrow H \subset \mathbb{R}^b$ and the concept embedding module effectively predicting the concepts as $q : H \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$. For the backbone function $h(x)$, since we consider a text-classification task, an immediate choice is to employ an encoder-only transformer. As shown in [35], however, we can also employ a decoder-only model as a text encoder by requiring it to provide a description of an input sentence by means of a single token. This concept was explored in [35], where the authors prompt a large language model with the phrase, "*this sentence: '[sentence]' means in one word: "*, and then use the subsequently generated embedding to represent the provided sentence. We choose this second approach since it enables the generation of high-quality sentence embeddings without the need for any fine-tuning. In Appendix A.1 we report a comparison between the employed LLM (Mixtral 8x7B [24]) and a fine-tuned BERT encoder [1] as backbone $h(x)$, showing how the first achieves similar performance without fine-tuning.

Training. ICEMs are trained similarly to any supervised concept-based model with a cross-entropy loss over both the predicted concepts and the tasks:

$$\mathcal{L}_{sup} = \mathcal{L}_c + \lambda \mathcal{L}_t = H(c, \hat{c}) + \lambda H(y, \hat{y}), \quad (4)$$

where we indicate the loss over the concept predictions as $\mathcal{L}_c = H(\hat{c}, c)$ and the loss over the task predictions as $\mathcal{L}_t = H(\hat{y}, y)$ and H is the classic cross-entropy loss. In the rest of the paper, we will refer to models trained according to this strategy as SUPERVISED.

3.2 Self-supervised ICEMs

Generative concept annotations. In the image domain, the idea behind concept-based generative approaches [31, 32] is to provide concept annotations by means of a generative model. First, an LLM

³To increase the number of terms having a predicted weight $\hat{w}_j \simeq 0$, rather than using a single network ρ with a tanh activation function, we actually employ two networks ρ^+ and ρ^- both with sigmoids activation function and whose results is subtracted: $\rho = \rho^+ - \rho^-$.

is required to provide several descriptions of each class, and each description is considered a concept for that class (possibly shared with other classes). At training time, the embeddings corresponding to the textual concepts are aligned to the image features extracted by an image encoder in order to predict the presence or absence of the concepts in each sample (e.g., with CLIP [36]). These concept labels c' are then provided to a standard image encoder performing the final classification.

The natural extension of this approach to the text domain is to employ an LLM comparing each input text with a set of proposed concepts and predicting their presence. These concept annotations c' can then be employed to train an ICEM: $\mathcal{L}_{gen} = \mathcal{L}_{c'} + \lambda\mathcal{L}_t = H(c', \hat{c}) + \lambda H(y, \hat{y})$. We will refer to models trained according to this strategy as `GENERATIVE`, as a generative model provides the concept annotations. In Appendix A.2 we report a comparison of the concept annotation performance when using different LLMs.

Self-supervised concept predictions. Employing an LLM to create pseudo concept labels does not obviate the necessity for another model to learn these concepts. In this paper, since we directly employ an LLM as text encoder, we propose to use it to directly make the concept predictions. More precisely, we first prompt the LLM for suitable concepts for the task at hand. Then, employing the same concepts, we ask it to provide a representation for each sample $h(x)$ as well as the concept predictions, i.e., $\hat{c} = c'$. This translates to a straightforward modification of the CEM where the concept prediction is not generated over the embeddings but by the LLM only. We report in Appendix A.3 some examples of prompts. This not only allows zeroing the number of concept annotations required, but it also reduces the number of parameters to train. We will refer to this approach as `SELF-SUP` as the same model directly provides the concept predictions. The self-supervised ICEM models then makes predictions as:

$$\text{SELF-SUP ICEM} \quad \hat{y}_i = \bigoplus_j^m \alpha_i(\mathbf{c}_j, \hat{c}'_j), \quad (5)$$

The corresponding R-ICEM and L-ICEM versions can be obtained by simply substituting the concept predictions \hat{c} with c' from Equations 2, 3. In other words, it is as if a concept intervention is provided at every iteration by an LLM. The concept encoder q and the neural module producing the interpretable prediction α are trained as usual, minimizing only the loss over the tasks: $\mathcal{L}_{selfsup} = \mathcal{L}_t = H(y, \hat{y})$.

3.3 Controlling language modelling

Besides classification, LLMs are widely used for text generation tasks such as image captioning and language translation. Despite improving the generation performance each year, these models still suffer from hallucinations [7, 8] and often produce explanations that contradict either themselves or the input [37]. To enhance the reliability of their outputs and explanations, we propose encoding the interpretable function predicted by an ICEM into their prompt. For example, when given a restaurant review, we prompt an LLM to predict the quality of the restaurant and provide an explanation, instructing it to follow the decision rule created by R-ICEM (e.g., Good Food \wedge Good Service \Rightarrow Good Restaurant). This guides the LLM to produce predictions and explanations consistent with the suggested decision-making process.

4 Experiments

In this section, we want to answer the following research question:

- **Generalization.** Is ICEMs performance comparable to black-box models for text classification? Does the self-supervised strategy provide better performance than the generative one? (Section 4.2)
- **Concept Efficiency.** How many concept supervisions are required to match self-sup ICEM accuracy? (Section 4.3)
- **Interpretability.** Do ICEMs provide meaningful explanations on textual data? Can we effectively interact with ICEMs? (Section 4.4)
- **Control.** Can we control an LLM generation process with ICEMs? (Section 4.5)

4.1 Setup

We test ICEMs performance over different datasets (both with and without concept-supervisions), comparing against several models and for different metrics. For all experiments, we report the average and standard deviation across five repetitions. The models were trained on a dedicated server equipped with an AMD EPYC 7543 32-Core processor and one NVIDIA A100 GPU. Our code is publicly available at www.example.com⁴

Dataset. We evaluated ICEM performance on three text-classification datasets for which concept annotations is available: CEBaB [38], MultiEmotions-IT [39], and Drug review [21]. Additionally, we tested generative and self-supervised ICEMs on the Depression dataset [40], where concept annotations are unavailable. An LLM [24] identified six depression-related concepts: self-deprecation, loss of interest, hopelessness, sleep disturbances, appetite changes, and fatigue. Further information regarding the datasets is reported in Appendix A.4.

Baselines. We compare ICEMs against several baselines, including concept-based and black-box models. CBM+LL and CBM+MLP are two CBM models proposed in [17] and employing a fuzzy concept bottleneck layer followed, respectively, by a linear layer and a multi-layer perceptron providing the final prediction. CBM+DT and CBM+XG are two CBM variants proposed in [19] using decision tree and XGBoost [41] on top of the concept bottleneck layer. As described in Section 2, CEM [18] employs a distributed concept representation to increase CBM generalization performance, at the cost, however, of losing task interpretability. Finally, we compare with an end-to-end (E2E) model, using an encoder $h(x)$ and few fully connected layers, and trained to classify the task without intermediate concepts. For the training details regarding each model, please refer to Appendix A.4.

Metrics. We evaluate ICEMs against various baselines using different metrics, each analyzing distinct model characteristics. Firstly, to assess ICEM **generalization** performance, we compute task and concept accuracy. For generative and self-sup ICEMs, we also compute concept accuracy, simulating scenarios where concept annotations are available, but training occurs without employing them directly, as detailed in Section 3.2. To test model **efficiency**, we examine the concept f1 score as the number of concept annotations increases. To assess **interpretability**, we provide ICEM explanations for both R-ICEM and L-ICEM, we evaluate the effectiveness of concept interventions [42] to enhance classification accuracy, and we evaluate the Causal-Concept Effect (CaCE) [43], measuring the causal relevance of concepts for task predictions.

4.2 ICEMs Generalization (Table 1)

ICEMs match black-box task performance. The initial finding from analyzing Table 1 is that all ICEMs consistently deliver task performance comparable to an E2E black-box model. Notably, the E2E model is never the top-performing model (marked with the symbol *), which is always either a CEM or an ICEM. When it comes to interpretable models, ICEMs invariably emerge as the best interpretable predictor among the compared ones, with an improvement of at least 7-18% over the closest competitor, which is usually CBM+DT.

Self-supervised ICEMs overcome generative ICEMs task performance. Another important result that can be inferred from Table 1 is that self-supervised ICEMs task accuracy is equal or higher (Multiemo-It and Drug) than generative ICEMs. This result is interesting because self-supervised ICEMs have fewer parameters to train than the corresponding generative ones. This behaviour is likely due to the lower concept accuracy (see Figure 2) which also affects the resulting predictions. Notably, self-supervised ICEMs task accuracy matches the one of supervised models. Thus, the self-supervised concept annotation procedure does not to affect the performance of the model while it reduces the human annotation effort.

4.3 Self-supervised ICEMs strongly reduce human annotation effort (Figure 2)

In Figure 2 we report the concept accuracy of a selection of compared methods when increasing the annotation effort. Self-supervised and generative ICEMs are reported with a straight line since they do

⁴We will release the code upon paper acceptance.

Table 1: Task accuracy (%) of the compared models. We report in **bold** the best result among the same type of models (e.g., supervised, interpretable ones) and with a * models having the overall best accuracy on a dataset. We use \checkmark to indicate models requiring concept supervision (C. Sup.) or having an interpretable task predictor (T. Inter.). We do not report supervised model results for the Depression dataset (–) since it is not equipped with concept annotations.

Type	Method	C. Sup.	T. Inter.	CEBaB	Multiemo-It	Drug	Depression
E2E	–	\checkmark	\checkmark	88.80 ± 0.75	75.67 ± 0.47	63.66 ± 1.20	97.18 ± 0.03
SUP.	CBM+MLP	\checkmark	\times	78.41 ± 9.30	45.43 ± 8.20	45.42 ± 4.90	–
	CBM+XG	\checkmark	\times	83.01 ± 0.10	69.01 ± 0.02	55.00 ± 0.13	–
	CEM	\checkmark	\times	89.60 ± 0.49	77.02 ± 0.81	$66.81^* \pm 0.40$	–
	CBM+LL	\checkmark	\checkmark	71.43 ± 9.71	42.67 ± 7.01	34.60 ± 10.10	–
	CBM+DT	\checkmark	\checkmark	77.20 ± 0.40	65.00 ± 0.02	47.20 ± 0.40	–
	R-ICEM	\checkmark	\checkmark	87.20 ± 1.33	76.33 ± 0.47	65.40 ± 0.80	–
	L-ICEM	\checkmark	\checkmark	89.34 ± 0.37	73.32 ± 3.42	63.32 ± 0.09	–
GEN.	CBM+MLP	\times	\times	76.19 ± 3.40	70.28 ± 0.65	42.43 ± 1.10	84.72 ± 1.72
	CBM+XG	\times	\times	74.43 ± 0.40	69.80 ± 0.09	53.85 ± 0.30	86.87 ± 0.03
	CEM	\times	\times	88.07 ± 0.70	82.41 ± 0.80	63.80 ± 0.38	97.06 ± 0.11
	CBM+LL	\times	\checkmark	62.07 ± 0.22	68.66 ± 4.20	33.14 ± 2.10	50.25 ± 0.39
	CBM+DT	\times	\checkmark	78.03 ± 0.23	65.32 ± 0.39	40.06 ± 1.30	83.10 ± 0.13
	R-ICEM	\times	\checkmark	87.80 ± 0.01	80.82 ± 1.25	63.12 ± 0.48	96.48 ± 0.24
	L-ICEM	\times	\checkmark	$89.97^* \pm 0.35$	74.33 ± 2.51	61.77 ± 0.31	96.50 ± 0.18
SELF SUP.	R-ICEM	\times	\checkmark	88.90 ± 0.39	83.38 ± 0.40	64.55 ± 0.38	$97.19^* \pm 0.10$
	L-ICEM	\times	\checkmark	88.84 ± 0.62	$83.46^* \pm 1.09$	66.50 ± 0.10	96.99 ± 0.22




Figure 2: Concept F1 score vs number of concept labels of a selection of methods. Self-supervised and generative ICEMs achieves high concept accuracy without employing any human annotation.

not require any concept supervision⁵ Self-supervised and generative models achieve concept accuracy close to that of supervised models when using all annotations, and significantly higher otherwise. Even with full concept annotations, supervised models do not always surpass self-supervised ICEMs, which achieve the highest concept accuracy in two out of three cases. This can be attributed to two factors: (i) it may be possible that the number of concept annotations required to match the accuracy of self-supervised ICEMs exceeds what is available on some datasets, (ii) the embeddings provided by an LLM may contain less information than what the same LLM can generate through self-supervision. On the other hand, the concept accuracy of generative ICEMs is generally lower. Indeed, the concepts predicted by generative ICEMs are an approximation of the self-provided concepts c' used by self-supervised ICEMs. In Appendix A.5, Table 6, we report the concept accuracy of all models over all dataset when provided with full concept annotations.

⁵Generative ICEMs results are reported with variance (and differently among the ICEMs) because the concept are still learnt. For self-supervised ICEM, instead, the result does not vary because we set a temperature equal to zero for the LLM predicting the concepts, which results in a deterministic annotation.

Table 2: A few explanations provided by the ICEMs for CEBaB. More example for all dataset are reported in Appendix A.8.

Review	Predictions/Explanations	
<i>The food was great as usual, but it came so quickly. It felt like we were rushed.</i>	Label	Positive
	Pred. Label	Positive
	R-ICEM:	Good Food \wedge \neg Good Service
	L-ICEM:	+1 Good Food
<i>The food was great as usual, but it came so quickly. It felt like we were rushed. Too noisy for my taste.</i>	Label	Positive
	Pred. Label	Neg. (R-ICEM), Pos. (L-ICEM)
	R-ICEM	Good Food \wedge \neg Good Service
	L-ICEM	\wedge \neg Good Noise
	L-ICEM	+1 Good Food

4.4 ICEMs interpretability

ICEMs explanations help to understand the model decision process (Table 2). ICEMs further enhance CBMs interpretability by elucidating the decision process from concepts to tasks. Table 2 illustrates this with explanations on the CEBaB dataset: in one case, a positive prediction is made due to a single negative concept by both ICEMs, while in the second case, multiple negative concepts lead to a negative prediction in R-ICEM, while still correctly positive in L-ICEM. Despite an error, R-ICEM’s interpretation remains reasonable. See Appendix A.8, Table 9 for explanations across all datasets. For example, in the Drug review (also in Table 3), both ICEMs correctly identifies an efficient drug with no side effects, distinguishing it from Adderall, which exhibits several side effects. The associated explanations, "Effectiveness \wedge \neg Side Effects," and "1 Effectiveness + 0 SideEffects", highlighting ICEMs ability to provide meaningful insights into model predictions.

ICEMs are responsive to concept interventions (App. A.6, Figure 4). As noted in [18], CEMs may not be very responsive to concept interventions, especially without conducting them during training. Following this recommendation, we train all ICEMs with a 0.5 concept intervention probability during testing. In Appendix A.6, Figure 4, we depict the task accuracy gain with increasing intervention probability, showing ICEMs’ responsiveness to interventions and a performance improvement by several percentage points. A similar behaviour can also be observed for CBMs. However, the latter were starting from a lower task accuracy and a higher increase could have also been expected. This result indicates that it is possible to interact with ICEMs, checking alternatives outputs when different concept predictions are suggested to the model.

ICEMs predictions are strongly caused by predicted concepts (App. A.7, Table 7, 8). To assess concept-based models’ responsiveness to do-interventions over concepts [44], we evaluate the causal concept effect (CaCE) [43]. CaCE measures the impact of modifying input samples on model predictions, particularly for concept-based models where interventions can be made at the concept level. Since in the evaluated dataset all concepts are globally relevant for the classification of the task (positively or negatively), the models should exhibit high absolute CaCE values for all concepts. This would indicate strong conditioning on modifications over these concepts rather than other spurious information (e.g., concept leakage [45]). Tables 7, 8 reported in Appendix A.7, show that both supervised, generative and self-supervised ICEMs have higher CaCE values compared to CBMs, and inline with CEMs (L-ICEMs is actually even higher), suggesting stronger reliance on predicted concepts. Conversely, low CaCE values for CBMs may indicate potential concept leakage issues, possibly due to the concept-bottleneck representation constraint.

4.5 ICEMs can be used to control LLMs generation (Table 3)

To evaluate the ability to control the LLM generation process, we integrate the decision process provided by ICEMs into the prompt of an LLM and assess whether the outputs can be conditioned based on the given decision path. In Table 3, we present two examples that seem to confirm this capability. Specifically, we first insert a review (first column) and then ask the model to provide a prediction and an explanation following R-ICEM’s rule (second column), and another prediction and explanation after intervening by changing the conclusion – the class— and/or the premise – the concepts (third column). For both examples (from CEBaB and Drug), the LLM generates predictions

Table 3: Examples of controlled LLM generation. In the first column we report the texts provided to the LLM to analyze. In the second column, the LLM output following the original R-ICEM, while in the third one, the LLM output following an intervened rule.

Text	LLM conditioned by R-ICEM	LLM conditioned by intervened rule
<p>CEBaB: <i>The food was great as usual, but it came so quickly. It felt like we were rushed. Too noisy for my taste</i></p>	<p>Rule: $\text{Good Food} \wedge \neg\text{Good Service} \wedge \neg\text{Good Noise} \Rightarrow \neg\text{Good Restaurant}$ LLM: Sentiment: Negative. Explanation: <i>The review highlights that the food was great but the service felt rushed and the noise was too high, creating an unpleasant dining experience.</i></p>	<p>Rule: $\text{Good Food} \Rightarrow \text{Good Restaurant}$ LLM: Sentiment: Positive. Explanation: <i>The reviewer highlighted that the food was great, which suggests a positive experience despite feeling rushed and finding the place too noisy.</i></p>
<p>Drug: <i>It helps me to concentrate and focus for a more prolonged period of time than Adderall XR 20mg. When taking Adderall I had a lot of side effects ranging from dry mouth to aggressive behavior.</i></p>	<p>Rule: $\text{Effective} \wedge \neg\text{Side Effects} \Rightarrow \text{Positive}$ LLM: Sentiment: Positive. Explanation: <i>The drug review highlights improved concentration and focus compared to Adderall, along with a lack of adverse effects previously experienced, indicating a positive experience.</i></p>	<p>Rule: $\text{Side Effects} \Rightarrow \text{Negative}$ LLM: Sentiment: Negative. Explanation: <i>Despite its positive impact on concentration and focus compared to Adderall XR 20mg, the mention of side effects like dry mouth and aggressive behavior leads to a negative overall sentiment.</i></p>

that adhere to the specified rules. Additionally, the explanations are influenced by the input sample, but the LLM adapts the explanations according to the provided rule, emphasizing the factors that support each decision process. For CEBaB, in the first case, it highlights negative service and noise to support the negative sentiment; in the second case, it emphasizes food quality. For the Drug review, in the first case, it notes the absence of side effects to predict a positive review; in the second case, it states the presence of side effects to justify a negative review prediction.

5 Related Work

The need to elucidate LLM decision-making process is paramount, since it is posing a barrier to their adoption in fields where transparent decision-making is essential [46, 47]. The attention mechanisms on which transformer models are built, while offering partial interpretability, has been criticized for its lack of clarity and consistency [9, 10]. To enhance LLM explainability, various standard XAI techniques like LIME [48] and Shapley values [49], alongside newer methods [50, 51, 11, 52], have been applied. Standard XAI techniques, however, have demonstrated several limitations [53, 54, 13], primarily because they provide explanations in terms of input features, which often lack meaningful interpretations for non-expert users [55]. Post-hoc Concept-based Explainable AI (C-XAI) methods [14, 56, 57, 16] address this issue by providing explanations of existing models through concepts. CBMs [17, 58, 20, 19] make a step forward, directly integrating these concepts as explicit intermediate network representations. Their application to the NLP tasks, however has been so far limited [59]. Also, supervised concept-based models require costly annotations. To overcome this, hybrid [60, 45], unsupervised [29, 61], and generative approaches [31, 32] have been developed. In this paper we make a step forward in this direction. Finally, LLMs can produce themselves explanations that are easily understood by humans [62, 28, 63]. However, if not properly guided, their explanations may be unreliable, since they do not reflect the prompted input or the same LLM output [37]

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a family of interpretable concept-based models for text classification. The experimental results have shown these models match black-box models performance, can be trained without concept supervision, are interpretable, and can be employed to control LLM output.

Impact. This paper could positively impact the society by enhancing LLM transparency and interpretability through ICEMs. However, the ability to guide LLMs with decision rules could be misused to produce factually incorrect statements.

Limitations. We focused on binary or ternary sentiment analysis for the ease of identifying concepts in this field. Extending to other NLP tasks should be feasible with an appropriate set of concepts. Our models were tested on texts composed of few sentences, and while they should work for longer texts, this is not guaranteed. Although we claim interpretability through decision rules or linear functions [12], we did not perform a user study yet to confirm ICEMs ease of use.

Future work. Besides decision rules and linear equation functions, other descriptions could be generated and used to provide an interpretable prediction. As an example, we could also generate a text describing how each concept has been predicted and its role in the final prediction, together with the indication of the task prediction. We leave this approach for future exploration.

References

- [1] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [2] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018.
- [3] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [4] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [5] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, and Lukas Blecher et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, 2023.
- [6] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [7] Yejin Bang, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Nayeon Lee, Wenliang Dai, Dan Su, Bryan Wilie, Holy Love-nia, Ziwei Ji, Tiezheng Yu, Willy Chung, et al. A multitask, multilingual, multimodal evaluation of chatgpt on reasoning, hallucination, and interactivity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04023*, 2023.
- [8] Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, et al. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05232*, 2023.
- [9] Sarthak Jain and Byron C Wallace. Attention is not explanation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.10186*, 2019.
- [10] Sarah Wiegrefe and Yuval Pinter. Attention is not not explanation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.04626*, 2019.
- [11] Hila Chefer, Shir Gur, and Lior Wolf. Transformer interpretability beyond attention visualization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 782–791, 2021.
- [12] Cynthia Rudin. Stop explaining black box machine learning models for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead. *Nature machine intelligence*, 1(5):206–215, 2019.

- [13] Julius Adebayo, Justin Gilmer, Michael Muehly, Ian Goodfellow, Moritz Hardt, and Been Kim. Sanity checks for saliency maps. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [14] Been Kim, Martin Wattenberg, Justin Gilmer, Carrie Cai, James Wexler, Fernanda Viegas, et al. Interpretability beyond feature attribution: Quantitative testing with concept activation vectors (tcav). In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2668–2677. PMLR, 2018.
- [15] Amirata Ghorbani, James Wexler, James Y Zou, and Been Kim. Towards automatic concept-based explanations. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [16] Eleonora Poeta, Gabriele Ciravegna, Eliana Pastor, Tania Cerquitelli, and Elena Baralis. Concept-based explainable artificial intelligence: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12936*, 2023.
- [17] Pang Wei Koh, Thao Nguyen, Yew Siang Tang, Stephen Mussmann, Emma Pierson, Been Kim, and Percy Liang. Concept bottleneck models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5338–5348. PMLR, 2020.
- [18] Mateo Espinosa Zarlenga, Pietro Barbiero, Gabriele Ciravegna, Giuseppe Marra, Francesco Giannini, Michelangelo Diligenti, Zohreh Shams, Frederic Precioso, Stefano Melacci, Adrian Weller, Pietro Lió, and Mateja Jamnik. Concept embedding models: Beyond the accuracy-explainability trade-off. In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 21400–21413. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/867c06823281e506e8059f5c13a57f75-Paper-Conference.pdf.
- [19] Pietro Barbiero, Gabriele Ciravegna, Francesco Giannini, Mateo Espinosa Zarlenga, Lucie Charlotte Magister, Alberto Tonda, Pietro Lio, Frederic Precioso, Mateja Jamnik, and Giuseppe Marra. Interpretable neural-symbolic concept reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1801–1825. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023.
- [20] Eunji Kim, Dahuin Jung, Sangha Park, Siwon Kim, and Sungroh Yoon. Probabilistic concept bottleneck models. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML’23. JMLR.org, 2023.
- [21] Felix Gräßer, Surya Kallumadi, Hagen Malberg, and Sebastian Zaunseder. Aspect-based sentiment analysis of drug reviews applying cross-domain and cross-data learning. In *Proceedings of the 2018 international conference on digital health*, pages 121–125, 2018.
- [22] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *CoRR*.
- [23] 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*.
- [24] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.
- [25] Alec Radford and Karthik Narasimhan. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:49313245>.
- [26] Tony Z. Zhao, Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Dan Klein, and Sameer Singh. Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models. *CoRR*, abs/2102.09690, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.09690>.
- [27] Seonghyeon Ye, Hyeonbin Hwang, Sohee Yang, Hyeonung Yun, Yireun Kim, and Minjoon Seo. Investigating the effectiveness of task-agnostic prefix prompt for instruction following, 2023.
- [28] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed H. Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2201.11903, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11903>.

- [29] David Alvarez Melis and Tommi Jaakkola. Towards robust interpretability with self-explaining neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [30] Ravid Shwartz-Ziv and Naftali Tishby. Opening the black box of deep neural networks via information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.00810*, 2017.
- [31] Yue Yang, Artemis Panagopoulou, Shenghao Zhou, Daniel Jin, Chris Callison-Burch, and Mark Yatskar. Language in a bottle: Language model guided concept bottlenecks for interpretable image classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19187–19197, 2023.
- [32] Tuomas Oikarinen, Subhro Das, Lam M. Nguyen, and Tsui-Wei Weng. Label-free concept bottleneck models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=FLCg47MNvBA>.
- [33] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. " why should i trust you?" explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 1135–1144, 2016.
- [34] Trevor J Hastie. Generalized additive models. In *Statistical models in S*, pages 249–307. Routledge, 2017.
- [35] Ting Jiang, Shaohan Huang, Zhongzhi Luan, Deqing Wang, and Fuzhen Zhuang. Scaling sentence embeddings with large language models, 2023.
- [36] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021.
- [37] Xi Ye and Greg Durrett. The unreliability of explanations in few-shot prompting for textual reasoning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:30378–30392, 2022.
- [38] Eldar D Abraham, Karel D’Oosterlinck, Amir Feder, Yair Gat, Atticus Geiger, Christopher Potts, Roi Reichart, and Zhengxuan Wu. Cebab: Estimating the causal effects of real-world concepts on nlp model behavior. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 17582–17596, 2022.
- [39] Rachele Sprugnoli et al. Multiemotions-it: a new dataset for opinion polarity and emotion analysis for italian. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Italian Conference on Computational Linguistics (CLiC-it 2020)*, pages 402–408. Accademia University Press, 2020.
- [40] Andrew Yates, Arman Cohan, and Nazli Goharian. Depression and self-harm risk assessment in online forums. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2968–2978, 2017.
- [41] Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 785–794, 2016.
- [42] Mateo Espinosa Zarlenga, Katie Collins, Krishnamurthy Dvijotham, Adrian Weller, Zohreh Shams, and Mateja Jamnik. Learning to receive help: Intervention-aware concept embedding models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [43] Yash Goyal, Amir Feder, Uri Shalit, and Been Kim. Explaining classifiers with causal concept effect (cace). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.07165*, 2019.
- [44] Judea Pearl, Madelyn Glymour, and Nicholas P Jewell. *Causal inference in statistics: A primer*. John Wiley & Sons, 2016.
- [45] Emanuele Marconato, Andrea Passerini, and Stefano Teso. Glancenets: Interpretable, leak-proof concept-based models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:21212–21227, 2022.

- [46] Enkelejda Kasneci, Kathrin Seßler, Stefan Küchemann, Maria Bannert, Daryna Dementieva, Frank Fischer, Urs Gasser, Georg Groh, Stephan Günemann, Eyke Hüllermeier, Stephan Krusche, Gitta Kutyniok, Tilman Michaeli, Claudia Nerdel, Juergen Pfeffer, Oleksandra Poquet, Michael Sailer, Albrecht Schmidt, Tina Seidel, and Gjergji Kasneci. Chatgpt for good? on opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. 103:102274, 01 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274.
- [47] Caleb Ziems, William Held, Omar Shaikh, Jiaao Chen, Zhehao Zhang, and Diyi Yang. Can large language models transform computational social science?, 2024.
- [48] Marco Túlio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. "why should I trust you?": Explaining the predictions of any classifier. *CoRR*, abs/1602.04938, 2016. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1602.04938>.
- [49] Scott M Lundberg and Su-In Lee. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [50] Enja Kokalj, Blaž Škrlič, Nada Lavrač, Senja Pollak, and Marko Robnik-Šikonja. BERT meets shapley: Extending SHAP explanations to transformer-based classifiers. In Hannu Toivonen and Michele Boggia, editors, *Proceedings of the EACL Hackashop on News Media Content Analysis and Automated Report Generation*, pages 16–21, Online, April 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.hackashop-1.3>.
- [51] Henning Heyen, Amy Widdicombe, Noah Yamamoto Siegel, Philip Colin Treleaven, and Maria Perez-Ortiz. The effect of model size on llm post-hoc explainability via lime. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Secure and Trustworthy Large Language Models*, 2024.
- [52] Hila Chefer, Shir Gur, and Lior Wolf. Generic attention-model explainability for interpreting bi-modal and encoder-decoder transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 397–406, 2021.
- [53] Pieter-Jan Kindermans, Sara Hooker, Julius Adebayo, Maximilian Alber, Kristof T Schütt, Sven Dähne, Dumitru Erhan, and Been Kim. The (un) reliability of saliency methods. *Explainable AI: Interpreting, explaining and visualizing deep learning*, pages 267–280, 2019.
- [54] Amirata Ghorbani, Abubakar Abid, and James Zou. Interpretation of neural networks is fragile. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 33, pages 3681–3688, 2019.
- [55] Forough Poursabzi-Sangdeh, Daniel G Goldstein, Jake M Hofman, Jennifer Wortman Wortman Vaughan, and Hanna Wallach. Manipulating and measuring model interpretability. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pages 1–52, 2021.
- [56] Zhengxuan Wu, Karel D’Oosterlinck, Atticus Geiger, Amir Zur, and Christopher Potts. Causal proxy models for concept-based model explanations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 37313–37334. PMLR, 2023.
- [57] Chih-Kuan Yeh, Been Kim, Sercan Arik, Chun-Liang Li, Tomas Pfister, and Pradeep Ravikumar. On completeness-aware concept-based explanations in deep neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:20554–20565, 2020.
- [58] Mateo Espinosa Zarlenga, Pietro Barbiero, Zohreh Shams, Dmitry Kazhdan, Umang Bhatt, Adrian Weller, and Mateja Jamnik. Towards robust metrics for concept representation evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.10367*, 2023.
- [59] Dheeraj Rajagopal, Vidhisha Balachandran, Eduard H Hovy, and Yulia Tsvetkov. Selfexplain: A self-explaining architecture for neural text classifiers. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 836–850, 2021.
- [60] Yoshihide Sawada and Keigo Nakamura. Concept bottleneck model with additional unsupervised concepts. *IEEE Access*, 10:41758–41765, 2022.

- [61] Anirban Sarkar, Deepak Vijaykeerthy, Anindya Sarkar, and Vineeth N Balasubramanian. A framework for learning ante-hoc explainable models via concepts. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10286–10295, 2022.
- [62] Chandan Singh, Jeevana Priya Inala, Michel Galley, Rich Caruana, and Jianfeng Gao. Rethinking interpretability in the era of large language models, 2024.
- [63] Amrita Bhattacharjee, Raha Moraffah, Joshua Garland, and Huan Liu. Towards llm-guided causal explainability for black-box text classifiers, 2024.
- [64] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- [65] Anita Mahinpei, Justin Clark, Isaac Lage, Finale Doshi-Velez, and Weiwei Pan. Promises and pitfalls of black-box concept learning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.13314*, 2021.
- [66] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Fixing weight decay regularization in adam. *CoRR*, abs/1711.05101, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.05101>.

A Appendix / supplemental material

A.1 Encoder comparison

This section compares the employment of a different model as backbone $h(x)$. Indeed, in the rest of the paper we always reported the result when using *Mixtral 8x7B*[24] as backbone model. Here, instead, we report the performance of all models in terms of task (Table 4) and concept accuracy (Table 5 when employing BERT as backbone function [1], an encoder-only model. Both tables show that there is not a great difference with respect to Tables 1, 6, with BERT providing slightly lower performance on Multiemo-It and Drug datasets. This result shows that the proposed approach scale also to other architecture. We chose to employ Mixtral since it can be also effectively used to provide concept annotation, therefore having a single model for both encoding the sample and predicting concept scores.

Table 4: This table presents the outcomes of models utilizing BERT as backbone. Task accuracy (%) of the compared models. We report in bold the best result among the same type of models (e.g., supervised, interpretable ones) and with a * models having the overall best accuracy on a dataset. We use ✓ to indicate models requiring concept supervision (C. Sup.) or having an interpretable task predictor (T. Inter.). We do not report supervised model results for depression (–) since it does not provide concept annotations.

Type	Method	C. Sup.	T. Inter.	CEBaB	Multiemo-It	Drug	Depression
E2E	–	✓	✓	90.67 ± 0.47	75.67 ± 0.47	59.33 ± 0.56	97.80 ± 0.23
SUP.	CBM+MLP	✓	✗	78.01 ± 6.51	54.10 ± 4.51	36.67 ± 6.24	–
	CBM+XG	✓	✗	80.00 ± 0.34	69.02 ± 0.64	51.00 ± 0.28	–
	CEM	✓	✗	90.67 ± 0.47	77.00 ± 0.82	58.33 ± 1.70	–
	CBM+LL	✓	✓	61.00 ± 12.02	49.67 ± 5.46	34.33 ± 7.38	–
	CBM+DT	✓	✓	75.67 ± 0.47	65.02 ± 0.34	46.23 ± 0.78	–
	R-ICEM	✓	✓	90.33 ± 1.24	76.33 ± 0.57	55.33 ± 0.45	–
	L-ICEM	✓	✓	91.33* ± 0.49	77.00 ± 0.12	58.33 ± 0.68	–
GEN.	CBM+MLP	✗	✗	73.19 ± 4.6	44.89 ± 2.79	35.16 ± 4.3	83.20 ± 2.18
	CBM+XG	✗	✗	81.67 ± 0.51	67.43 ± 0.33	44.94 ± 0.91	87.00 ± 1.01
	CEM	✗	✗	85.84 ± 1.76	78.77 ± 0.10	55.43 ± 2.10	96.12 ± 0.50
	CBM+LL	✗	✓	58.13 ± 2.62	52.50 ± 2.3	36.85 ± 9.4	51.48 ± 2.16
	CBM+DT	✗	✓	81.61 ± 0.50	61.10 ± 0.13	40.16 ± 0.11	80.55 ± 0.03
	R-ICEM	✗	✓	86.49 ± 0.42	79.47 ± 0.58	58.66 ± 1.39	95.98 ± 1.27
L-ICEM	✗	✓	85.03 ± 0.51	77.62 ± 0.91	60.83 ± 0.87	96.87 ± 0.20	
SELF	R-ICEM	✗	✓	86.7 ± 0.25	80.47 ± 0.63	61.67* ± 1.33	97.03* ± 0.11
SUP.	L-ICEM	✗	✓	87.03 ± 0.16	82.71* ± 0.42	60.29 ± 0.40	95.44 ± 0.65

A.2 LLM concept annotation comparison

This section presents a comparison between the employment of two different LLMs (*Mistral 7B*[64] and *Mixtral 8x7B*[24]) as concept annotator. In Figure 3 we report the results on the three datasets for which human concept annotation is available in terms of both concept F1 score and concept accuracy. We also report, as a baseline, a global (class-level) annotation strategy, providing to all samples belonging to a given class the same concept annotation. More in details, we label the positive class with positive concepts or negated negative concepts (e.g. Good restaurant class – Good Food, Good Service, Good Ambience, Good Noise, Good Drug – Efficient, not Side effects). We can observe that between the two LLMs there is not a significant, with Mixtral providing slightly higher performance. Comparing against the baseline, instead, we can observe that there is a great improvement in CEBaB and Drug dataset, while in Multiemo-It the improvement is only visible when considering the F1 score, while in the case of accuracy it actually seems higher.

Table 5: This table presents the outcomes of the models that utilize BERT as backbone. Concept accuracy (%) of the compared models for datasets equipped with concept annotations. We reported in bold the best model for each dataset. Self-supervised R-ICEM and L-ICEM are reported with the same concept accuracy with zero standard deviation, since the concept predictions are provided by an LLM with temperature set to zero.

Type	Method	CEBaB	Multiemo-It	Drug
E2E	–	84.17 ± 2.50	73.50 ± 2.11	72.01 ± 3.08
SUP.	CBM+LL	83.17 ± 3.45	73.67 ± 1.63	73.01 ± 1.10
	CBM+MLP	83.83 ± 2.51	75.67 ± 1.69	71.67 ± 1.44
	CEM	84.83 ± 2.06	74.75 ± 1.15	72.51 ± 0.49
	R-ICEM	85.17 ± 1.63	74.67 ± 1.10	73.17 ± 1.09
	L-ICEM	83.92 ± 2.52	75.01 ± 1.09	72.56 ± 2.48
GEN.	CBM+LL	83.9 ± 0.11	68.21 ± 0.37	57.80 ± 3.63
	CBM+MLP	80.2 ± 0.66	61.9 ± 1.30	83.25 ± 0.15
	CEM	84.89 ± 0.30	67.97 ± 0.11	87.49 ± 0.27
	R-ICEM	82.58 ± 0.04	67.13 ± 1.36	86.79 ± 0.07
	L-ICEM	83.07 ± 0.21	66.53 ± 0.10	87.23 ± 0.48
SELF SUP.	R-ICEM	88.15 ± 0.00	70.74 ± 0.00	89.34 ± 0.00
	L-ICEM	88.15 ± 0.00	70.74 ± 0.00	89.34 ± 0.00




Figure 3: Comparison among concept annotation methods. Left, F1 score macro. Right, Concept accuracy. Mistral provides the highest accuracy on average.

A.3 Prompts

This section shows the prompts used to instruct *Mistral 7B* and *Mistral 8x7B* to perform the annotations on the 4 different datasets. We adopted the in-context instruction learning [27] prompting strategy.

CEBaB dataset

In a dataset of restaurant reviews there are 4 possible concepts: good food, good ambiance, good service and good noise. Given a certain review, you have to detect if those concepts are present or not in the review. Answer format: good food:score, good ambiance:score, good service:score, good noise:score. Do not add any text other than that specified by the answer format. The score should be equal to 1 if the

concept is present or zero otherwise, no other values are accepted. The following are examples: review: 'The food was delicious but the service fantastic'. answer: good food:1, good ambiance:0, good service:1, good noise:0
review: 'The staff was very rough but the restaurant decorations were great. Other than that there was very relaxing background music'. answer: good food:0, good ambiance:1, good service:0, good noise:1
Now it's your turn: review: {review}
answer:

Drug dataset

In a dataset of drug reviews there are 2 possible concepts: - effectiveness: 1 if the drug was highly effective and 0 if it was marginally or not effective, - side effects: 1 if the drug gave side effects and 0 otherwise. Given a certain review, you have to detect if those concepts are present or not in the review. Answer format: effectiveness: score, side effects: score. Do not add any text other than that specified by the answer format. The score should be equal to 1 if the concept is present or zero otherwise, no other values are accepted. The following are examples: review: 'The medicine worked wonders for me. However, I did experience some side effects. Despite this, I still found it easy to use and incredibly effective'. answer: effectiveness: 1, side effects: 1
review: 'Not only did it fail to alleviate my symptoms, but it also led to unpleasant side effects'. answer: effectiveness: 0, side effects: 1
Now it's your turn: review: review answer:

Multiemo-it dataset

In a dataset containing comments in Italian, you need to identify the following concepts:
joy: the user who wrote the comment expresses joy, trust: the user who wrote the comment expresses trust, sadness: the user who wrote the comment expresses sadness, surprise: the user who wrote the comment is surprised. Response format: joy: score, trust: score, sadness: score, surprise: score. The score must be equal to 1 if the concept is present and 0 otherwise; other values are not accepted. The following are examples:
comment: 'Mi piace la rivisitazione di questa canzone, più dolce, raffinata, elegante, bellissima!' response: joy: 1, trust: 1, sadness: 0, surprise: 1
Now it's your turn: comment: review Answer:

Depression dataset

You have to identify the presence or absence of 6 concepts in a given text. The concepts to be identified are: - Self-Deprecation: the text exhibits self-critical or self-deprecating language, expressing feelings of guilt, shame, or inadequacy. - Loss of Interest: diminished pleasure or motivation in the writer's descriptions of hobbies or pursuits. - Hopelessness: the writer express feelings of futility or a lack of optimism about their prospects. - Sleep Disturbances: the writer mentions insomnia, oversleeping, or disrupted sleep as part of their experience. - Appetite Changes: there are references to changes in eating habits. - Fatigue: there are references to exhaustion or lethargy. Answer format: Self-Deprecation: score, Loss of Interest: score, Hopelessness: score, Sleep Disturbances: score, Appetite Changes: score, Fatigue: score. The score has to be 1 if the concept is detected and 0 otherwise. Do not add any other text besides the one specified in the answer format.
text: text Answer:

A.4 Experimental Details

Dataset To check the ICEM performance in standard conditions for concept-based models, we first selected three text-classification datasets for which concept annotations are provided or in which

attribute annotations can be employed to this scope. The first dataset is CEBaB [38], a dataset designed to study the causal effects of real-world concepts on NLP models. It includes short restaurant reviews annotated with sentiment ratings at both overall-review level and for four dining experience aspects (food quality, noise level, ambiance, and service). The second dataset is MultiEmotions-IT [39], a dataset designed for opinion polarity and emotion analysis and containing comments related to videos and advertisements posted on social media platforms. These comments have been manually annotated according to different aspects, among which we choose two dimensions: opinion polarity, describing the overall sentiment expressed by users (that we employed as task labels), and basic emotions from which we selected joy, trust, sadness, and surprise (concept labels). The third dataset is Drug review [21], a dataset that provides patient reviews on specific drugs. The reviews are annotated with the overall satisfaction of the users (which we discretize to a binary representation) and drug experience annotations as effectiveness and side effects. Furthermore, to test the generalization capability of self-supervised ICEMs in a scenario where concept annotations are not actually provided, we chose the Depression dataset[40]⁶ which consists of Reddit posts for users who claimed to have been diagnosed with depression and control users. An LLM [24], when prompted to provide the concepts related to depression posts, provided the following six concepts: self-deprecation, loss of interest, hopelessness, sleep disturbances, appetite changes, and fatigue.

Evaluation We evaluate ICEMs against the baselines according to different metrics, each one analysing a different characteristic of the models. First, to check ICEM **generalization** performance, we compute the task and the concept accuracy. For GENERATIVE and SELF-SUP ICEMs, we still compute the concept accuracy for those datasets in which concept annotations are available, thereby simulating a scenario where the concepts suggested by the LLM resemble the actual concepts. Still, we train the model without employing the actual concept annotations but by prompting the same LLM as described in Section 3.2. To test the **efficiency** of the models, we report the concept accuracy of the models when increasing the number of concept annotations (provided by humans). Finally, to test the **interpretability** of the model, we first report examples of ICEM explanations for both R-ICEM and L-ICEM. Secondly, we check whether it is possible to intervene on the predicted concepts [42] and improve the classification accuracy even when using an interpretable predictor, possibly self-supervised. Thirdly, we check the Causal-Concept Effect (CaCE) [43], a measure introduced to assess the causality of a model with respect to a given concept. Concept-based models, indeed, are generally required to make task predictions according to the predicted concepts. However, the employment of vectorial concept representations [65] may lead to model ignoring the predicted concepts. We will see that this is not the case of ICEMs.

Experimental settings For the CBMs, E2E and ICEMs models, the training process involved utilizing an AdamW optimizer [66] with a λ coefficient (4) set at 0.5 to emphasize concept learning over task loss. Moreover, a scheduler was implemented with a gamma of 0.1 and a step size of 10 epochs throughout the 50-epoch training period. For all the hidden layers we set a ReLU activation function. Here are further insights into the methodologies’ architecture, with the number of output neurons indicated within brackets.

- E2E: layer 1 (100), layer 2 (number of classes);
- CEM: concept embedding size of 768, layer 1 (10), layer 2 (number of classes);
- CBMs, concept prediction: layer 1 (10), layer 2 (number of concepts);
 - LL, task prediction: layer (number of classes);
 - MLP, task prediction: layer 1 ($3 \cdot$ number of concepts), layer 2 (number of classes).
- R-ICEMs: the temperature parameter is set to 1.

The text’s embedding size varies depending on the chosen backbone. When employing BERT, it remains at 768, whereas adopting the LLMs approach [35] increases it to 4096. For Dtree and XGBoost, we employed the default hyperparameter settings. The DTree model was implemented using the sklearn library, while the XGBoost model was implemented using the xgboost library⁷. We conducted five experiments for each methodology. The training time for the different experiments averages around 10 minutes using the setup specified in section 4.1.

⁶For the Depression dataset, we actually employed the cleaned version available on Kaggle.

⁷The xgboost library can be found at <https://github.com/dmlc/xgboost>.

The CEBaB dataset [38] does not necessitate any splitting procedure as it inherently offers training, validation, and test sets. In the training set, modifications include counterfactual examples, while both the validation and test sets exclusively contain original reviews. For the remaining datasets, we partitioned the data into training, validation, and test sets using stratified sampling based on the task labels. The proportions allocated are 0.7 for training, 0.1 for validation, and 0.2 for testing. Each experiment was conducted with a different seed.

A.5 Concept Accuracy

We here report the concept accuracy of all models when provided with all the available concept annotations. The results shown in Figure 2 are here confirmed. We again see that Self-supervised strategy is a very good approach since without human effort it provides better concept accuracy in CEBaB and Drug. Only on Multiemo-It the performance are significantly lower. This result may be due to the fact that the latter dataset is in Italian while the other datasets are in English, a language for which the LLMs have certainly seen more training samples.

Table 6: Concept accuracy (%) of the compared models for datasets equipped with concept annotations. We reported in bold the best model for each dataset. Self-supervised R-ICEM and L-ICEM are reported with the same concept accuracy with zero standard deviation, since the concept predictions are provided by an LLM with temperature set to zero.

Type	Method	CEBaB	Multiemo-It	Drug
E2E	–	79.30 ± 1.55	80.92 ± 0.55	83.90 ± 1.02
SUP.	CBM+LL	75.55 ± 3.00	78.42 ± 2.70	83.40 ± 1.20
	CBM+MLP	75.56 ± 3.10	78.75 ± 2.37	83.20 ± 1.14
	CEM	84.85 ± 0.57	85.42 ± 0.91	88.10 ± 1.37
	R-ICEM	84.65 ± 0.98	85.08 ± 0.71	88.20 ± 0.71
	L-ICEM	83.05 ± 1.15	83.59 ± 1.54	88.51 ± 0.43
GEN.	CBM+LL	70.50 ± 0.40	62.04 ± 4.20	51.76 ± 3.50
	CBM+MLP	71.20 ± 2.90	65.76 ± 3.80	81.90 ± 0.24
	CEM	82.03 ± 0.42	70.40 ± 0.22	86.03 ± 0.90
	R-ICEM	82.03 ± 0.40	69.84 ± 0.40	86.50 ± 0.03
	L-ICEM	81.28 ± 0.76	70.23 ± 0.62	87.00 ± 0.21
SELF	R-ICEM	88.15 ± 0.00	70.74 ± 0.00	89.34 ± 0.00
SUP.	L-ICEM	88.15 ± 0.00	70.74 ± 0.00	89.34 ± 0.00

A.6 Concept interventions

As introduced in Section 4.4, ICEMs are sensible to concept interventions. This characteristic is very important since it implies that a human can interact with the model, providing counterfactual predictions when prompted with different concept predictions. In Figure 4, 6, 5 we simulate this situation by correcting mispredicted concepts with the correct concept predictions and check whether the task prediction has been also modified. More in details, we report the improvement in task accuracy when increasing the probability to correct the concepts. Both supervised, generative and self-supervised approaches improve the performance when increasing the probability of intervention. Interestingly, however, there is not a clear trend among the datasets and the approaches. CBM+LL results the most sensible methods with generated concept labels, but it performs below average when trained in a supervised way. Conversely, L-ICEM, R-ICEM and CEM perform very well on the supervised case (improving the accuracy up to 10-15 % in the Multiemo-it dataset), they perform below average on generated labels. We will further analyze this behaviour in future work.

A.7 Causal Concept Effect

As anticipated in Section 4.4, Concept-based models predictions must be causally influenced by the predicted concepts. We assess concept-based models’ responsiveness to *do-interventions* using the Causal Concept Effect (CaCE) [43], which measures the impact of input modifications on model




Figure 4: Concept interventions on the CEBaB datasets for (left) supervised approaches and (right) generative and self-supervised ones.




Figure 5: Concept interventions on the Drug datasets for (left) supervised approaches and (right) generative and self-supervised ones.




Figure 6: Concept interventions on the Multiemo-it datasets for (left) supervised approaches and (right) generative and self-supervised ones.

predictions. Higher absolute CaCE values indicate stronger conditioning on relevant concepts. Tables 7, 8 show that both supervised, generative, and self-supervised ICEMs have higher CaCE values compared to CBMs, suggesting stronger reliance on predicted concepts, particularly for L-ICEMs, while low CaCE values for CBMs. This result is positive since all concepts considered in this work are relevant for the task at hand. We leave for future work the exploration of tasks where there are confounding concepts and checking whether ICEMs are capable to not consider them.

A.8 Explanation examples

We here provide some further examples of explanations provided by L-ICEMs and R-ICEMs for all datasets. Except for the different predictions and explanations in the second review of CEBaB, we can appreciate how the explanations tend to be very similar among the proposed methods. On average, they always highlight the same important terms (Good Food, Supriprise and Effectiveness

Table 7: Causal Concept Effect (CaCE) for Supervised methods. A high (absolute) value implies a strong responsiveness of a model to modifications to a certain concept.

Concept		CBM+LL	CEM	R-ICEM	L-ICEM
CeBAB	Food	-0.02 ± 0.01	0.29 ± 0.03	0.33 ± 0.04	0.75 ± 0.00
	Ambiance	0.01 ± 0.05	0.08 ± 0.01	0.02 ± 0.01	0.51 ± 0.03
	Service	0.01 ± 0.04	0.13 ± 0.01	0.20 ± 0.08	0.74 ± 0.00
	Noise	-0.01 ± 0.10	-0.05 ± 0.01	-0.02 ± 0.01	0.57 ± 0.06
Multiemo.	Joy	0.04 ± 0.06	0.18 ± 0.01	0.16 ± 0.07	0.51 ± 0.14
	Trust	0.02 ± 0.10	0.60 ± 0.04	0.47 ± 0.15	0.84 ± 0.37
	Sadness	-0.04 ± 0.05	-0.06 ± 0.01	-0.04 ± 0.02	0.32 ± 0.02
	Surprise	-0.01 ± 0.06	0.03 ± 0.01	0.06 ± 0.05	0.36 ± 0.03
Drug	Effectiveness	0.02 ± 0.10	0.43 ± 0.02	0.28 ± 0.02	0.14 ± 0.04
	Side Effects	-0.07 ± 0.14	-0.52 ± 0.01	-0.25 ± 0.02	-0.15 ± 0.18

Table 8: CACE for Self-Supervised and Generative methods with a Mixtral backbone.

	CBM+LL	CEM	R-ICEM	L-ICEM	Self-Sup. R-ICEM	Self-Sup. L-ICEM
Effectiveness	0.05 ± 0.08	0.21 ± 0.09	0.00 ± 0.03	0.71 ± 0.30	0.17 ± 0.06	0.09 ± 0.27
Side Effects	-0.12 ± 0.03	-0.15 ± 0.07	-0.18 ± 0.13	-0.53 ± 0.41	-0.13 ± 0.07	-0.78 ± 0.02
Food	-0.04 ± 0.07	0.13 ± 0.02	0.18 ± 0.01	0.11 ± 0.00	0.11 ± 0.02	0.72 ± 0.03
Ambiance	0.02 ± 0.13	0.05 ± 0.00	0.02 ± 0.01	0.50 ± 0.08	0.03 ± 0.01	0.46 ± 0.04
Service	0.08 ± 0.07	0.07 ± 0.01	0.04 ± 0.01	0.66 ± 0.18	0.07 ± 0.01	0.57 ± 0.06
Noise	-0.12 ± 0.07	0.00 ± 0.02	0.00 ± 0.01	-0.02 ± 0.13	-0.01 ± 0.01	0.26 ± 0.01
Joy	0.10 ± 0.08	0.12 ± 0.07	0.23 ± 0.15	0.92 ± 0.79	0.33 ± 0.11	0.80 ± 0.08
Trust	0.14 ± 0.13	0.10 ± 0.02	0.18 ± 0.15	0.45 ± 0.78	0.17 ± 0.01	0.70 ± 0.02
Sadness	-0.11 ± 0.14	-0.11 ± 0.05	-0.17 ± 0.13	-0.06 ± 0.07	0.02 ± 0.02	-0.08 ± 0.04
Surprise	0.01 ± 0.09	-0.17 ± 0.02	-0.09 ± 0.06	-0.49 ± 0.22	-0.03 ± 0.05	-0.49 ± 0.24

and Hopelessness). L-ICEMs, however, normally employ less terms resulting in a possible more readable explanation. We leave for future work a proper comparison among the two methods, possibly by means of a user study.

Table 9: A few explanations provided by ICEMs for each dataset

Review			
CEBaB	<i>The food was great as usual, but it came so quickly. It felt like we were rushed.</i>	Label Pred. Label R-ICEM: L-ICEM:	Positive Positive Good Food $\wedge \neg$ Good Service +1 Good Food
CEBaB	<i>The food was great as usual, but it came so quickly. It felt like we were rushed. Too noisy for my taste.</i>	Label Pred. Label R-ICEM L-ICEM	Positive Neg. (R-ICEM), Pos. (L-ICEM) Good Food $\wedge \neg$ Good Service $\wedge \neg$ Good Noise +1 Good Food
Multiemo-It	<i>Good morning, since last night I don't have internet at home. Why is that? Are there issues with the lines?</i>	Label Pred. Label R-ICEM L-ICEM	Neutral Neutral Surprise $\wedge \neg$ Joy $\wedge \neg$ Trust $\wedge \neg$ Sadness +1 Surprise
Drug	<i>It helps me to concentrate and focus for a more prolonged period of time than Adderall XR 20mg. When taking Adderall I had a lot of side effects ranging from dry mouth to aggressive behavior [...]</i>	Label Pred. Label R-ICEM L-ICEM:	Positive Positive Effectiveness $\wedge \neg$ Side Effects +1 Effectiveness +0 Side Effects
Depression	<i>i ve tried to do everything right i ve tried so hard it never get better no matter what it s always a circular road and i always end up in the same place i m just so tired</i>	Label Pred. Label R-ICEM L-ICEM	Depressed Depressed Hopelessness \wedge Deprecation +1 Hopelessness