

Can LLMs Explain Themselves Counterfactually?

Zahra Dehghanighobadi,^{1,2} Asja Fischer,¹ Muhammad Bilal Zafar^{1,2}

¹Ruhr University Bochum,

²UAR Research Center for Trustworthy Data Science and Security

[zahra.dehghanighobadi, asja.fischer, bilal.zafar]@rub.de

Abstract

Explanations are an important tool for gaining insights into the behavior of ML models, calibrating user trust and ensuring regulatory compliance. Past few years have seen a flurry of post-hoc methods for generating model explanations, many of which involve computing model gradients or solving specially designed optimization problems. However, owing to the remarkable reasoning abilities of Large Language Model (LLMs), *self-explanation*, that is, prompting the model to explain its outputs has recently emerged as a new paradigm. In this work, we study a specific type of self-explanations, *self-generated counterfactual explanations* (SCEs). We design tests for measuring the efficacy of LLMs in generating SCEs. Analysis over various LLM families, model sizes, temperature settings, and datasets reveals that LLMs sometimes struggle to generate SCEs. Even when they do, their prediction often does not agree with their own counterfactual reasoning.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) are rapidly gaining adoption due to their remarkable capabilities across a wide spectrum of real-world tasks (Bommasani et al., 2021; Bubeck et al., 2023; Maynez et al., 2023; Wei et al., 2022a). Recent analyses show that LLMs can lead to significant productivity gains, and can match or even surpass human-level performance (Luo et al., 2024; Peng et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2024). These impressive achievements are often attributed to large datasets, model sizes (Hoffmann et al., 2022; Kaplan et al., 2020) and the effect of alignment with human preferences (Guo et al., 2025; Ouyang et al., 2022). The resulting model complexity, however, means that the LLM outputs can be difficult to explain.

A number of recent studies have looked into explaining predictions of LLMs (Bricken et al., 2023; Templeton et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2024, inter-

alia). Explainability had been a thoroughly studied area of ML even before the advent of modern LLMs (Gilpin et al., 2018; Guidotti et al., 2018). Consequently, a large number of attempts to explain LLM outputs build upon those designed for non-LLM models. For the most part, these techniques operate by computing model gradients or solving specially designed optimization problems to find input features (Cohen-Wang et al., 2025), model neurons (Meng et al., 2022; Templeton et al., 2024), abstract concepts (Kim et al., 2018; Xu et al., 2025) or training data points (Park et al., 2023) that caused the model to depict a certain behavior.

In parallel, inspired by the reasoning abilities of LLMs (Wei et al., 2022b), recent work has started exploring whether LLMs can *explain themselves* without the need for costly operations like computing gradients or solving optimization problems. For instance, Bubeck et al. (2023) show that GPT-4 can provide reasoning for its answers and in the process, can even admit its mistakes. A fast-emerging branch of explainability literature focuses on methods for producing and evaluating *self-generated explanations* (Agarwal et al., 2024; Guo et al., 2025; Lanham et al., 2023; Tanneru et al., 2024; Turpin et al., 2023).

In this work, we focus on a specific type of self-generated explanations called *self-generated counterfactual explanations* (SCEs). Given an input x and the model output \hat{y} , the counterfactual x_{CE} is a modified version of the input that would lead the model to generate another output $y_{\hat{CE}} \neq \hat{y}$ (Wachter et al., 2017). Prior work argues that the contrastive nature of counterfactual explanations means that they are better aligned with human reasoning (Miller, 2019), are better suited to regulation around right-to-explanation (Wachter et al., 2017) and constitute a better test of knowledge (Ichikawa and Steup, 2024) than other input-feature based explanations like LIME (Ribeiro et al., 2016) and SHAP (Lundberg and Lee, 2017).




Figure 1: LLMs are unable to explain themselves counterfactually. Explanation generation behavior of LLaMA-3.1-70B-instruct on an example from GSM8K data. In the left panel, the model **correctly answers** a math problem. In the second panel, the model is asked to produce a self-generated counterfactual explanation (SCE) by revising the original problem so that the answer becomes 25. The resulting SCE is incorrect. The correct answer would be 22 instead of the targeted answer of 25. In the third panel, the SCE is given as a new problem to the model. The model answers with 26 which does not yield the target 25. This figure is best viewed in color.

Our goal in this paper is to study the **efficacy of LLMs in generating SCEs**. We break down our investigation into three research questions (RQs):

RQ1 Are LLMs able to generate SCEs at all?

RQ2 Do LLM predictions on SCEs actually yield the target label?

RQ3 Do LLMs need to make large-scale changes to the input to generate SCEs?

To answer these questions, we design the procedure detailed in Figure 1. We ask the model to make a prediction (Figure 1a); then ask it to generate a SCE (Figure 1b); and finally compute the model’s prediction on the SCE it generated.

We evaluate the efficacy of SCEs, by conducting extensive experiments on seven LLMs (sizes between 7B to 70B parameters) and six datasets that correspond to four unique tasks. All except one LLMs are consistently able to generate SCEs (RQ1). However, in many cases, the model predictions on SCEs do not yield the target label, meaning that models are unable to generate valid counterfactuals (RQ2). On the GSM8K mathematics dataset, the validity of counterfactuals is especially low.

We find that when generating the model prediction on a SCE, the presence of the original prediction (Figure 1a) and the instruction to generate the SCE (Figure 1b) in the context window has a large impact on the eventual prediction on SCE, pointing to flaws in the internal reasoning process of LLMs. Within the same dataset, models show a large spread in the amount of changes they make to the original input when generating the SCE. Overall, our results show that **despite their impressive reasoning abilities, modern LLMs are far from perfect when explaining their own predictions counterfactually**.

2 Related work

Explainability in ML. The literature on ML explainability is vast. There are several ways to categorize explainability methods, *e.g.*, perturbation *v.s.* gradient-based, feature *v.s.* concept *v.s.* prototype-based, importance *v.s.* counterfactual-based and optimization *v.s.* self-generated. See Gilpin et al. (2018), Guidotti et al. (2018), and Zhao et al. (2024) for details and alternative categorizations.

Counterfactual explanations in ML. See Section 1 for a comparison between counterfactual explanations (CEs) and other forms of explainability. Generating valid and plausible CEs is a longstanding challenge (Verma et al., 2024). For instance, Delaney et al. (2023) highlight discrepancies between human-generated and computationally generated CEs. Through two user studies, they find that humans tend to make larger, more meaningful modifications to misclassified images, whereas computational methods prioritize minimal edits. Prior work has also highlighted the need for generating on-manifold CEs to ensure plausibility and robustness (Slack et al., 2021; Tsiourvas et al., 2024). Modeling the data manifold, however, is a challenging problem, even for non-LLM models (Arvanitidis et al., 2016).

Self-explanation by LLMs. While a large class of explainability methods require whitebox model access SEs can be deployed in a balckbox manner. SEs can take many forms, e.g., chain-of-thought (CoT) reasoning (Agarwal et al., 2024) and feature attributions (Tanneru et al., 2024). However, research indicates that CoT and feature attributions are not always a faithful representation of the model’s decision-making process (Lanham et al., 2023; Tanneru et al., 2024; Turpin et al., 2024). Our protocol for testing SCEs is distinct from both CoT and feature-attribution based self-explanations.

Chen et al. (2023) argue that effective explanations should empower users to predict how a model will handle different yet related inputs, a concept referred to as simulatability. Their experiments tested whether GPT-3.5’s ability to generate CEs depends on the quality of the examples provided. Interestingly, GPT-3.5 was able to produce comparable (to humans) CEs even when presented with illogical examples, suggesting that its CEs generation capabilities stem more from its pre-training than from the specific examples included in the prompt. Unlike Chen et al. (2023), our focus is not on human simulatability of SCEs.

LLMs for explanations. LLMs are also used to generate explanations for other models (Bhattacharjee et al., 2024; Gat et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023; Nguyen et al., 2024; Slack et al., 2023). Unlike these studies, our focus is on explaining the LLM itself. Additionally, the approach of Nguyen et al. (2024) and Li et al. (2023) involved explicitly providing the model with the original human gold labels in the prompt, without assessing the model’s

independent decision or understanding. As argued by Jacovi and Goldberg (2020), the evaluation of faithfulness should not involve human-provided gold labels because relying on gold labels is influenced by human priors on what the model should do.

3 Generating and evaluating SCEs

We formally describe the process of generating SCEs and then list the metrics used to evaluate their quality.

3.1 Generating counterfactuals

We consider datasets of the form $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$. \mathbf{x} are input texts, e.g., social media posts or math problems. $y_i \in \mathcal{Y}$ are either discrete labels, e.g., sentiment of a social media post, or integers from a predefined finite set, e.g., solution to a math problem. The model prediction and explanation process consists of the following steps. Precise prompts for each step are shown in Appendix C.

Step 1: Input and output. Given the input \mathbf{x} , we denote the model output by $\hat{y} = f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{Y}$. For instruction-tuned LLMs, this step involves encapsulating the input \mathbf{x} into a natural language prompt before passing it through the model, see for example the work by Dubey et al. (2024). We detail these steps in Appendix C. The outputs of LLMs are often natural language and one needs to employ some post-processing to convert them to the desired output domain \mathcal{Y} . For the sake of notational simplicity, we do not explicitly state these post-processing steps here but describe them in Appendix D.

Step 2: Generating SCEs. A counterfactual explanation \mathbf{x}_{CE} is a modified version of the original input \mathbf{x} that would lead the model to change its decision, that is $f(\mathbf{x}) \neq f(\mathbf{x}_{\text{CE}})$. A common strategy for generating counterfactuals is to first identify a counterfactual output $y_{\text{CE}} \neq y$ and then solve an optimization problem to generate \mathbf{x}_{CE} such that $f(\mathbf{x}_{\text{CE}}) = y_{\text{CE}}$ (Mothilal et al., 2020; Verma et al., 2024; Wachter et al., 2017). y_{CE} is either chosen at random or in a targeted manner. Since we are interested in self-explanation properties of LLMs, we do not solve an optimization problem and instead ask the model itself to generate the counterfactual explanation.

A key desiderata for counterfactual explanations is to keep the differences between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}_{CE} to

a minimum (Verma et al., 2024). Our preliminary experiments showed that an **unconstrained prompting** where the model is simply asked to generate a counterfactual already led to relatively small changes from \mathbf{x} to \mathbf{x}_{CE} for many models. However, to systematically keep changes to a minimum, we use a **rationale-based prompting** method as well. This method is inspired by rationale-based explanations (DeYoung et al., 2019). We first ask the model to identify the rationales in the original input that caused the model to predict \hat{y} . Next, we ask the model to alter only these rationales such that the output changes to y_{CE} .

Step 3: Generating model output on \mathbf{x}_{CE} . Finally, we ask the model to make the prediction on the counterfactual it generated, namely, $y_{\text{CE}} = f(\mathbf{x}_{\text{CE}})$. While one would expect y_{CE} to be the same as y_{CE} , we find that in practice this is not always true.

One could ask the model to make this final prediction while the model still retains Steps 1 and 2 in its context window or without them. We denote the former as prediction **with context** and latter as predictions **without context**.

3.2 Evaluating CEs

We use the following metrics for evaluating SCEs.

Generation percentage (Gen) measures the percentage of times a model was able to generate a SCE. In a vast majority of cases, the models generate a SCE as instructed. The cases of non-successful generation include the model generating a stop-word like “.” or “!” or generating a \mathbf{x}_{CE} that is much shorter in length than \mathbf{x} . We describe the detailed filtering process in [Appendix D](#).

Counterfactual validity (Val) measures the percentage of times the SCE actually produces the intended target label, *i.e.*, $f(\mathbf{x}_{\text{CE}}) = y_{\text{CE}}$. As described in Step 3 in Section 3.1, this final prediction can be made either with Steps 1 and 2 in context or without. We denote the validity without context as Val and with context as Val_C.

Edit distance (ED) measures the edit distance between the original input \mathbf{x} and the counterfactual \mathbf{x}_{CE} . Closeness to the original input is a key desideratum of a counterfactual explanation (Wachter et al., 2017). Our use of edit distance as the closeness metric is inspired by prior studies on evaluating counterfactual generations (Chatzi et al., 2025). We only report the ED for valid SCEs. Since the validity of SCEs is impacted by the presence of Steps

1 and 2 in the generation context (Section 3.1), we report the edit distance for the in-context case separately and denote it by ED_C. For simplifying comparisons across datasets of various input lengths, we normalize the edit distance to a percentage by first dividing it by the length of the longer string (\mathbf{x} or \mathbf{x}_{CE}) and then multiplying it by 100.

4 Experimental setup

In this section, we describe the datasets, models and parameters used in our experiments.

4.1 Datasets

To gain comprehensive insights into the counterfactual generation ability of LLMs, we consider datasets from four different domains: decision making, sentiment classification, mathematics and natural language inference. We describe each dataset in detail.

1. DiscrimEval (decision making) by Tamkin et al. (2023) is a benchmark featuring 70 hypothetical decision-making scenarios. Each prompt instructs the model to make a binary decision regarding an individual, *e.g.*, whether the individual should be granted a loan, whether the individual should receive medical treatment. The prompts are designed such that a *yes* decision is always desirable. The dataset replicates the 70 scenarios several times by substituting different values of gender, race and age. We fix these features to arbitrarily selected values of female, white, and 20 years old.

2. FolkTexts (decision making) by Cruz et al. (2024) is a Q&A dataset suite derived from the 2018 US Census PUMS data. Each instance consists of a textual description of an individual’s features like their educational status, age, and occupation. The modeling task is to predict whether the yearly income of the individual exceeds \$50,000.

3. Twitter financial news (sentiment classification) by ZeroShot (2022) provides an annotated corpus of finance-related tweets, specifically curated for sentiment analysis in the financial domain. Each tweet is labeled with one of three sentiment classes: *Bearish*, *Bullish*, or *Neutral*.

4. SST2 (sentiment classification) or Stanford Sentiment Treebank by Socher et al. (2013) consists of single sentence movie reviews along with the binary sentiment (positive and negative).

5. GSM8K (math) or Grade School Math 8K by Cobbe et al. (2021) consists of mathematical prob-

lems. The answer to the problems is always a positive integer. The original dataset also consist of reasoning steps that one could follow to solve the problem. For simplicity, we ask the model to only generate the answer.

6. Multi-Genre Natural Language Inference (MGNLI) by Williams et al. (2018) consists of pairs of sentences, the premise, and the hypothesis. The model is asked to classify the relationship between two sentences. The relationship values can be: entailment, neutral or contradiction.

4.2 Models, infrastructure, and parameters

We aim to gain insights into the counterfactual generation ability of models across various architectural aspects. The models we study are:

Small models namely Gemma-2-9B-it henceforth referred to as GEM_s , Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct (LAM_s), Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3 (MST_s).

Medium models consist of Gemma-2-27B-it (GEM_m), Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct (LAM_m), and Mistral-Small-24B-Instruct-2501 (MST_m).

Reasoning model. We only consider DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-32B ($R1_m$).

All experiments were run on a single node with 8x NVIDIA H200 GPUs. The machine was shared between multiple research teams. We ran all the models in their original 16-bit precision and did not employ any size reduction strategies like quantization. For each model, we consider two temperature values, $T = 0$ and $T = 0.5$.

For generating the counterfactuals, one needs to provide the model with the target label y_{CE} . For classification datasets, we select y_{CE} from the set $\mathcal{Y} - \{\hat{y}\}$ at random. For the GSM8K data, we generate $y_{CE} = \hat{y} + \epsilon$ with ϵ was sampled from a uniform distribution $\text{Unif}(1, 2, \dots, 10)$.

Given the high cost of LLM inference, we subsample datasets as follows: For classification datasets, we select 250 samples at random from each class. For the non-classification, GSM8K data, we also randomly select 250 samples. While we did not track the precise time, the experiments took several days on multiple GPUs to complete.

We occasionally used ChatGPT for help with coding errors.

5 Results

Tables 1 and 2 show the results when using unconstrained prompting and rationale-based prompting, respectively at $T = 0$. Tables 4 and 5 showing

results with a higher temperature $T = 0.5$ are included in Appendix B and discussed under each RQ.

RQ1: Ability of LLMs to generate SCEs

Most models are able to generate SCEs in a vast majority of cases with the exception of GEM_s model for the DiscrimEval, FolkTexts, and GSM8K datasets. At a higher temperature of 0.5 the ability of GEM_s to generate SCEs goes up slightly (Table 4), whereas for LAM_s , it decreases slightly on average.

The fraction roughly remains the same for rationale-based prompting as shown in Tables 2 and 5. The affect of temperature on the ability of GEM_s and LAM_s to generate SCEs remains the same.

RQ2: Do SCEs yield the target label?

Model generated SCEs yield the target label in most cases, however, there are large variations. The most prominent variation is along the task level. For the more challenging mathematical reasoning tasks in GSM8K, the percentage of times the models generate valid SCEs in only in single digits for most models. For the FolkTexts tasks which requires the model to reason through the Censugathered data of individuals, the validity in many cases is low.

We also see a somewhat expected variation at *model-size* level. The smaller models, GEM_s (9B parameters), LAM_s (8B), and MST_s (7B) tend to generate valid SCEs at a higher rate than the larger versions GEM_m (27B), LAM_m (70B), and MST_m (24B). There are only few exceptions like MGNLI where GEM_m performs better. The reasoning model $R1_m$ (32B) does not always perform better than the similarly sized models GEM_m and MST_m . For instance, for FolkTexts, the percentage of valid SCEs generated by $R1_m$ is much lower than for GEM_m or MST_m .

*Presence of the original prediction and counterfactual generation in the context window has a large impact on validity as shown by the comparison of Val and Val_C in Tables 1 and 2. Most prominently, on the GSM8K dataset, the validity increases significantly meaning that the **mathematical reasoning ability of the model is impacted by information that should be irrelevant**. On the FolkTexts data too the model deems more SCEs as valid when the prediction and SCE generation are provided in the context. However, for some task and model combinations, the validity rate decreases with the presence of additional information*

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	89	33	9	61	51
LAM _m	100	90	77	30	29
MST _s	100	86	73	32	31
MST _m	100	84	90	14	14
GEM _s	16	37	50	27	21
GEM _m	100	84	67	23	25
R1 _m	100	84	66	30	28

(a) DiscrimEval

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	99	6	19	69	77
LAM _m	100	67	99	9	8
MST _s	100	68	99	32	32
MST _m	100	53	99	5	4
GEM _s	0.2	0	0	0	0
GEM _m	100	100	100	14	14
R1 _m	100	34	50	12	6

(b) FolkTexts

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	81	65	35	57	41
LAM _m	99	88	71	48	54
MST _s	99	82	94	45	44
MST _m	100	82	100	34	35
GEM _s	99	86	97	42	41
GEM _m	100	75	92	51	52
R1 _m	99	77	96	35	36

(c) Twitter Financial News

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	72	42	32	80	76
LAM _m	98	94	86	42	43
MST _s	85	84	82	76	75
MST _m	100	98	99	48	48
GEM _s	93	98	100	59	59
GEM _m	100	99	99	72	72
R1 _m	99	92	54	49	46

(d) SST2

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	67	4	17	7	17
LAM _m	96	13	61	5	7
MST _s	91	6	52	5	10
MST _m	92	0	86	0	6
GEM _s	19	2	21	79	27
GEM _m	97	6	85	5	6
R1 _m	93	3	54	29	8

(e) GSM8K

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	80	61	45	41	41
LAM _m	100	87	69	38	37
MST _s	100	58	86	29	31
MST _m	100	84	98	34	33
GEM _s	99	91	91	45	45
GEM _m	100	23	29	40	40
R1 _m	100	72	95	34	35

(f) MG NLI

Table 1: [Unconstrained prompting at $T = 0$] Performance of LLMs in Generating SCEs in terms of percentage of times the models are able to generate a SCE (Gen), percentage of times the model predictions on SCEs yield the target label (Val), and the normalized edit distance (ED) between the original inputs and SCEs. ED is only reported for valid SCEs. Val_C and ED_C denotes the metric values when the instructions for prediction on the original input and the SCE generation are provided in the context while computing the validity of the SCE (Section 3.2). \uparrow means higher values are better.

in the context. Examples include LAM_s and LAM_m on DiscrimEval and LAM_s on SST2.

Temperature generally does not impact the SCE validity by a large amount as shown by comparing Tables 2 and 4. However, there are exceptions like LAM_s and LAM_m on DiscrimEval and FolkTexts datasets.

Rationale-based prompting has diverse impact on SCE validity as shown by comparing Tables 1 and 2. In some cases like MST_m on GSM8K, the fraction of SCEs deemed valid by the model increases significantly from 0% to 72%. In other cases like

LAM_m on DiscrimEval, the amount goes down from 90% to 47%.

RQ3: Changes required to generate SCEs

For a given task and dataset, different LLMs require different amount of changes to generate SCEs, even for a similar level of validity. Consider for MST_m, LAM_s and LAM_m models for DiscrimEval data. The validity of SCEs ranges between 89% to 100% while the normalized edit distance ranges between 14 and 61.

The required changes also depend on the task

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	94	30	3	13	71
LAM _m	100	47	86	11	15
MST _s	100	84	23	39	34
MST _m	100	60	60	14	16
GEM _s	25	17	6	2	4
GEM _m	100	46	67	21	19
R1 _m	100	70	44	18	17

(a) DiscrimEval

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	84	26	57	24	24
LAM _m	99	69	18	43	40
MST _s	93	58	93	28	25
MST _m	100	37	89	2	2
GEM _s	0.2	0	0.2	0	1
GEM _m	99	46	55	7	7
R1 _m	98	29	25	12	17

(b) FolkTexts

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	81	52	4	77	23
LAM _m	100	93	74	79	79
MST _s	100	86	82	66	63
MST _m	100	72	98	17	16
GEM _s	98	80	97	23	23
GEM _m	100	85	99	18	19
R1 _m	100	64	77	40	40

(c) Twitter Financial News

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	72	24	27	59	44
LAM _m	98	83	69	66	64
MST _s	70	95	97	71	71
MST _m	100	83	98	32	30
GEM _s	92	73	95	30	29
GEM _m	100	86	98	30	29
R1 _m	99	76	72	47	45

(d) SST2

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	67	0.6	24	80	81
LAM _m	99	10	27	64	52
MST _s	91	2	51	69	68
MST _m	92	74	1	47	31
GEM _s	19	0	10	0	48
GEM _m	96	5	60	28	39
R1 _m	94	4	48	80	77

(e) GSM8K

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	81	33	67	75	68
LAM _m	99	91	52	77	73
MST _s	99	86	35	78	72
MST _m	99	72	83	29	27
GEM _s	86	67	86	23	24
GEM _m	100	72	90	14	13
R1 _m	100	56	83	42	44

(f) MGSLI

Table 2: [Rationale-based prompting at $T = 0.0$] Performance of LLMs in Generating SCEs. For details of metric names, see the caption of Table 1.




Figure 2: [LAM_m on GSM8K with $T = 0$] Histogram of SCE length for a model without (top) and with (bottom) original prediction and counterfactual generation instruction in the context. In both cases, the distribution of lengths varies between valid and invalid SCEs.

and dataset. For example, in SST2, where models achieve some of the highest validity scores, we observe the highest ED. Conversely, the lowest ED is observed in the GSM8K dataset, where models perform the worst. This relationship between validity and edit distance, however, is not completely linear and also depends on the input length. In DiscrimEval and MGSLI where the input length can be several tens to hundreds of tokens, the model are able to achieve high Val score with relatively lower values of ED.

Temperature also influences ED. For instance, in unconstrained prompting with a $T = 0.5$ (Table 4), ED values across all datasets, except for Twitter Financial News data, are consistently higher compared to $T = 0$.

	DEV	TWT	SST	FLK	NLI	MTH
LAM _s	52	19	48	74	6	1
LAM _m	16	13	61	100	0	10
MST _s	5	0	81	15	8	100
MST _m	18	0	9	1	7	100
GEM _s	22	0	7	–	0	42
GEM _m	7	0	0	1	8	30
R1 _m	2	10	26	1	13	51

(a) Without context

	DEV	TWT	SST	FLK	NLI	MTH
LAM _s	43	62	91	46	13	81
LAM _m	12	9	66	2	25	11
MST _s	2	24	63	100	27	5
MST _m	17	100	36	3	8	3
GEM _s	100	0	100	–	17	3
GEM _m	12	13	18	100	0	100
R1 _m	37	92	84	1	13	48

(b) With context

Table 3: [Unconstrained prompting with $T = 0$] Normalized difference in lengths of valid and invalid counterfactuals for DiscrimEval (DEV), Twitter Financial News (TWT), SST2 (SST), FolkTexts (FLK), MGNLI (NLI) and GSM8K (MTH) datasets. Left pane shows the differences *without* prediction and counterfactual generations provided as context (Section 3.2) whereas right table shows the differences *with* this information.

Rationale-based prompting does not consistently lead to closer SCEs as seen when comparing Tables 1 and 2. For instance, for DiscrimEval, the ED values are generally lower with rationale-based prompting but are higher for MGNLI.

Are invalid SCEs statistically different?

In this section, we aim to characterize the differences between valid and invalid SCEs. Specifically, we investigate if the lengths of SCEs can provide a clue on their validity. Our question is inspired by previous work on detecting LLM hallucinations (Azaria and Mitchell, 2023; Snyder et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024) which shows that incorrect model outputs show statistically different patterns from correct answers. Figure 2 shows that the length distribution of valid and invalid SCEs is indeed different.

Next, we systematically analyze these difference in SCE lengths. Specifically, for each model, dataset and SCE generation configuration, we compute the *normalized difference in lengths* as $\frac{|L_{\text{val}} - L_{\text{inval}}|}{\max(L_{\text{val}}, L_{\text{inval}})} \times 100$ where L_{val} is the average length of valid SCEs. The normalization ensures that the metric lies in the range $[0, 100]$. The results in Table 3 show that in many dataset and model combinations, the SCEs lengths can indeed provide a signal on their validity.

6 Conclusion and future work

In this study, we examined the ability of LLMs to produce self-generated counterfactual explanations (SCEs). We design a prompt-based setup for evaluating the efficacy of SCEs. Our results show that LLMs consistently struggle with generating valid SCEs. In many cases model prediction on a SCE does not yield the same target prediction

for which the model crafted the SCE. Surprisingly, we find that LLMs put significant emphasis on the context—the prediction on SCE is significantly impacted by the presence of original prediction and instructions for generating the SCE. Based on this empirical evidence, we argue that LLMs are still far from being able to explain their own predictions counterfactually. Our findings add to similar insights from recent studies on other forms of self-explanations (Lanham et al., 2023; Tanneru et al., 2024).

Our work opens several avenues for future work. Inspired by counterfactual data augmentation (Sachdeva et al., 2023), one could include the counterfactual explanation capabilities a part of the LLM training process. This inclusion may enhance the counterfactual reasoning capabilities of the LLM. Follow ups should also explore the effect of prompt tuning, specifically, model-tailored prompts for generating SCEs. These approaches might lead to better quality SCEs.

We limited our investigation to open source models of upto 70B parameters. Extending our analysis to larger and more recent models, *e.g.*, DeepSeek R1 671B, and closed source models like OpenAI o3 would be an interesting avenue for future work.

Finally, our experiments were limited to relatively simple tasks: classification and mathematics problems where the solution is an integer. This limitation was mainly due to the fact that it is difficult to automatically judge validity of answers for more open-ended language generation tasks like search and information retrieval. Scaling our analysis to such tasks would require significant human-annotation resources, and is an important direction for future investigations.

7 Limitations

Our work has several limitations. First, explainability and privacy can sometimes be at odds with each other. Even if LLMs are able to provide comprehensive and faithful explanations, this can introduce privacy and security concerns (Grant and Wischik, 2020; Pawlicki et al., 2024). Detailed explanations may inadvertently expose sensitive information or be exploited for adversarial attacks on the model itself. However, our work focuses on publicly available models and datasets, ensuring that these risks are mitigated.

Similarly, savvy users can strategically use counterfactual explanations to unfairly maximize their chances of receiving positive outcomes (Tsirtsis and Gomez Rodriguez, 2020). Detecting and limiting this behavior would be an important desideratum before deployment of LLM counterfactuals.

Our analyses in this paper solely focused on automated metrics to evaluate quality of SCEs. Future studies can conduct human surveys to assess how plausible the explanations appear from a human perspective. This feedback can then be used to enhance the model’s performance through methods such as direct preference optimization (Rafailov et al., 2024).

References

- Chirag Agarwal, Sree Harsha Tanneru, and Himabindu Lakkaraju. 2024. Faithfulness vs. plausibility: On the (un) reliability of explanations from large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04614*.
- Georgios Arvanitidis, Lars K Hansen, and Søren Hauberg. 2016. A locally adaptive normal distribution. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 29.
- Amos Azaria and Tom Mitchell. 2023. **The internal state of an LLM knows when it’s lying**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 967–976, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Amrita Bhattacharjee, Raha Moraffah, Joshua Garland, and Huan Liu. 2024. Towards llm-guided causal explainability for black-box text classifiers. In *AAAI 2024 Workshop on Responsible Language Models, Vancouver, BC, Canada*.
- Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. 2021. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*.
- Trenton Bricken, Adly Templeton, Joshua Batson, Brian Chen, Adam Jermy, Tom Conerly, Nick Turner, Cem Anil, Carson Denison, Amanda Askell, Robert Lasenby, Yifan Wu, Shauna Kravec, Nicholas Schiefer, Tim Maxwell, Nicholas Joseph, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Alex Tamkin, Karina Nguyen, Brayden McLean, Josiah E Burke, Tristan Hume, Shan Carter, Tom Henighan, and Christopher Olah. 2023. Towards monosemanticity: Decomposing language models with dictionary learning. *Transformer Circuits Thread*. <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2023/monosemantic-features/index.html>.
- Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, et al. 2023. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712*.
- Ivi Chatzi, Nina L Corvelo Benz, Eleni Straitouri, Stratis Tsirtsis, and Manuel Gomez Rodriguez. 2025. Counterfactual token generation in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 4th Conference on Causal Learning and Reasoning*.
- Yanda Chen, Ruiqi Zhong, Narutatsu Ri, Chen Zhao, He He, Jacob Steinhardt, Zhou Yu, and Kathleen McKeown. 2023. Do models explain themselves? counterfactual simulatability of natural language explanations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08678*.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Benjamin Cohen-Wang, Harshay Shah, Kristian Georgiev, and Aleksander Madry. 2025. Contextcite: Attributing model generation to context. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:95764–95807.
- André F Cruz, Moritz Hardt, and Celestine Mendler-Dünner. 2024. Evaluating language models as risk scores. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.14614*.
- Eoin Delaney, Arjun Pakrashi, Derek Greene, and Mark T Keane. 2023. Counterfactual explanations for misclassified images: How human and machine explanations differ. *Artificial Intelligence*, 324:103995.
- Jay DeYoung, Sarthak Jain, Nazneen Fatema Rajani, Eric Lehman, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Byron C Wallace. 2019. Eraser: A benchmark to evaluate rationalized nlp models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.03429*.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.

- Yair Gat, Nitay Calderon, Amir Feder, Alexander Chapanin, Amit Sharma, and Roi Reichart. 2023. Faithful explanations of black-box nlp models using llm-generated counterfactuals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00603*.
- Leilani H Gilpin, David Bau, Ben Z Yuan, Ayesha Bajwa, Michael Specter, and Lalana Kagal. 2018. Explaining explanations: An overview of interpretability of machine learning. In *2018 IEEE 5th International Conference on data science and advanced analytics (DSAA)*, pages 80–89. IEEE.
- Thomas D Grant and Damon J Wischik. 2020. Show us the data: Privacy, explainability, and why the law can’t have both. *Geo. Wash. L. Rev.*, 88:1350.
- Riccardo Guidotti, Anna Monreale, Salvatore Ruggieri, Franco Turini, Fosca Giannotti, and Dino Pedreschi. 2018. A survey of methods for explaining black box models. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 51(5).
- Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. 2025. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, et al. 2022. An empirical analysis of compute-optimal large language model training. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:30016–30030.
- Jonathan Jenkins Ichikawa and Matthias Steup. 2024. The Analysis of Knowledge. In Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman, editors, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Fall 2024 edition. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.
- Alon Jacovi and Yoav Goldberg. 2020. Towards faithfully interpretable nlp systems: How should we define and evaluate faithfulness? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.03685*.
- 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. 2023. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*.
- Been Kim, Martin Wattenberg, Justin Gilmer, Carrie Cai, James Wexler, Fernanda Viegas, et al. 2018. Interpretability beyond feature attribution: Quantitative testing with concept activation vectors (tcav). In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2668–2677. PMLR.
- Tamera Lanham, Anna Chen, Ansh Radhakrishnan, Benoit Steiner, Carson Denison, Danny Hernandez, Dustin Li, Esin Durmus, Evan Hubinger, Jackson Kernion, et al. 2023. Measuring faithfulness in chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13702*.
- Yongqi Li, Mayi Xu, Xin Miao, Shen Zhou, and Tiejun Qian. 2023. Prompting large language models for counterfactual generation: An empirical study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14791*.
- Scott Lundberg and Su-In Lee. 2017. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30:4765–4774.
- Xiaoliang Luo, Akilles Rechart, Guangzhi Sun, Kevin K Nejad, Felipe Yáñez, Bati Yilmaz, Kangjoo Lee, Alexandra O Cohen, Valentina Borghesani, Anton Pashkov, et al. 2024. Large language models surpass human experts in predicting neuroscience results. *Nature human behaviour*, pages 1–11.
- Joshua Maynez, Priyanka Agrawal, and Sebastian Gehrmann. 2023. Benchmarking large language model capabilities for conditional generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.16793*.
- Kevin Meng, David Bau, Alex Andonian, and Yonatan Belinkov. 2022. Locating and editing factual associations in gpt. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:17359–17372.
- Tim Miller. 2019. Explanation in artificial intelligence: Insights from the social sciences. *Artificial intelligence*, 267:1–38.
- Ramaravind K Mothilal, Amit Sharma, and Chenhao Tan. 2020. Explaining machine learning classifiers through diverse counterfactual explanations. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 607–617.
- Van Bach Nguyen, Paul Youssef, Jörg Schlötterer, and Christin Seifert. 2024. LLMs for generating and evaluating counterfactuals: A comprehensive study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00722*.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Sung Min Park, Kristian Georgiev, Andrew Ilyas, Guillaume Leclerc, and Aleksander Madry. 2023. Trak: Attributing model behavior at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14186*.
- Marek Pawlicki, Aleksandra Pawlicka, Rafał Kozik, and Michał Choraś. 2024. Explainability versus security: The unintended consequences of xai in cybersecurity. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM Workshop on Secure and Trustworthy Deep Learning Systems*, pages 1–7.

- Sida Peng, Eirini Kalliamvakou, Peter Cihon, and Mert Demirer. 2023. The impact of ai on developer productivity: Evidence from github copilot. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06590*.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. " why should i trust you?" explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 1135–1144.
- Rachneet Sachdeva, Martin Tutek, and Iryna Gurevych. 2023. Catfood: Counterfactual augmented training for improving out-of-domain performance and calibration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07822*.
- Dylan Slack, Anna Hilgard, Himabindu Lakkaraju, and Sameer Singh. 2021. Counterfactual explanations can be manipulated. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:62–75.
- Dylan Slack, Satyapriya Krishna, Himabindu Lakkaraju, and Sameer Singh. 2023. Explaining machine learning models with interactive natural language conversations using talktomodel. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(8):873–883.
- Ben Snyder, Marius Moisesescu, and Muhammad Bilal Zafar. 2024. [On early detection of hallucinations in factual question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '24, page 2721–2732, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Richard Socher, Alex Perelygin, Jean Wu, Jason Chuang, Christopher D. Manning, Andrew Ng, and Christopher Potts. 2013. [Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank](#). In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1631–1642, Seattle, Washington, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Tamkin, Amanda Askill, Liane Lovitt, Esin Durmus, Nicholas Joseph, Shauna Kravec, Karina Nguyen, Jared Kaplan, and Deep Ganguli. 2023. Evaluating and mitigating discrimination in language model decisions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03689*.
- Sree Harsha Tanneru, Chirag Agarwal, and Himabindu Lakkaraju. 2024. Quantifying uncertainty in natural language explanations of large language models. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1072–1080. PMLR.
- Adly Templeton, Tom Conerly, Jonathan Marcus, Jack Lindsey, Trenton Bricken, Brian Chen, Adam Pearce, Craig Citro, Emmanuel Ameisen, Andy Jones, et al. 2024. Scaling monosemanticity: Extracting interpretable features from claude 3 sonnet. transformer circuits thread.
- Asterios Tsourvas, Wei Sun, and Georgia Perakis. 2024. Manifold-aligned counterfactual explanations for neural networks. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3763–3771. PMLR.
- Stratis Tsirtsis and Manuel Gomez Rodriguez. 2020. Decisions, counterfactual explanations and strategic behavior. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:16749–16760.
- Miles Turpin, Julian Michael, Ethan Perez, and Samuel Bowman. 2023. Language models don't always say what they think: Unfaithful explanations in chain-of-thought prompting. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:74952–74965.
- Miles Turpin, Julian Michael, Ethan Perez, and Samuel Bowman. 2024. Language models don't always say what they think: unfaithful explanations in chain-of-thought prompting. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Sahil Verma, Varich Boonsanong, Minh Hoang, Keegan Hines, John Dickerson, and Chirag Shah. 2024. Counterfactual explanations and algorithmic recourses for machine learning: A review. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(12):1–42.
- Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt, and Chris Russell. 2017. Counterfactual explanations without opening the black box: Automated decisions and the gdpr. *Harv. JL & Tech.*, 31:841.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. 2022a. Emergent abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022b. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel Bowman. 2018. [A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 1112–1122. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhihao Xu, Ruixuan Huang, Changyu Chen, and Xiting Wang. 2025. Uncovering safety risks of large language models through concept activation vector. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:116743–116782.

Jingfeng Yang, Hongye Jin, Ruixiang Tang, Xiaotian Han, Qizhang Feng, Haoming Jiang, Shaochen Zhong, Bing Yin, and Xia Hu. 2024. Harnessing the power of llms in practice: A survey on chatgpt and beyond. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data*, 18(6):1–32.

ZeroShot. 2022. Twitter financial news dataset. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/zeroshot/twitter-financial-news-sentiment>. Accessed: Feb 2025.

Muru Zhang, Ofir Press, William Merrill, Alisa Liu, and Noah A. Smith. 2024. How language model hallucinations can snowball. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML'24*. JMLR.org.

Haiyan Zhao, Hanjie Chen, Fan Yang, Ninghao Liu, Huiqi Deng, Hengyi Cai, Shuaiqiang Wang, Dawei Yin, and Mengnan Du. 2024. Explainability for large language models: A survey. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 15(2):1–38.

A Reproducibility and licenses

Dataset Licenses and Usage.

1. **DiscrimEval:** We utilize the dataset version made available by the authors at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/Anthropic/discrim-eval>. It is distributed under the CC-BY-4.0 license.
2. **Folktexts:** The dataset version we reference is the one provided by the authors, accessible at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/acruz/folktexts>. FolkTexts code is made available under the MIT license. The dataset is licensed under the U.S. Census Bureau’s terms (<https://www.census.gov/data/developers/about/terms-of-service.html>).
3. **Twitter Financial News:** We employ version 1.0.0 of the dataset, as released by the authors, available at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/zeroshot/twitter-financial-news-sentiment>. The dataset is distributed under the MIT License.
4. **SST2:** The dataset version used in our work is the one published by the StanfordNLP team at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/stanfordnlp/sst2>. The dataset itself does not provide licensing information. However, the whole StanfordNLP toolkit is available under Apache2.0 license, see <https://github.com/stanfordnlp/stanza>.
5. **GSM8K:** We make use of the dataset version released by the authors, accessible at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/openai/gsm8k?row=3>. It is licensed under the MIT License.
6. **Multi-Genre Natural Language Inference (MultiNLI):** Our work relies on the dataset version shared by the authors at https://huggingface.co/datasets/nyu-mln/multi_nli. It is available under the CC-BY-SA-3.0 license.

Model Licenses. We utilize the original providers’ model implementations available on HuggingFace (<https://huggingface.co>).

1. Mistral models (Jiang et al., 2023) are released under the APACHE-2.0 license.
2. Gemma models are released under the custom Gemma-2 license.
3. LLaMA models (Dubey et al., 2024) are released under the custom LLaMA-3.1 license.
4. DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-32B (Guo et al., 2025), derived from the Qwen-2.5 series, retains its original APACHE-2.0 license.

B Additional results

Table 4 shows the SCE evaluation metrics for direct prompting when using a temperature of 0.5. Table 5 shows the metrics when using rationale-based prompting with temperatures of 0.5.

C Prompts for generating and evaluating SCEs

Recall from Section 3.1 that we can generate SCEs through: (i) **unconstrained prompting** where we simply ask the model to generate counterfactuals, or (ii) **rationale-based prompting** by asking the model to first select decision rationales (DeYoung et al., 2019) and then generating counterfactuals by limiting the changes to these rationales only. For each dataset, we show prompts separately for each prompt type.

C.1 DiscrimEval

C.1.1 Unconstrained prompting

1. You will be given a decision making scenario followed by a question about the scenario. Answer the question with ‘Yes’ or ‘No’. Do not include any additional words in your answer. Your answer should start with ‘ANSWER:’.
The scenario is: {SCENARIO}
The question is: {QUESTION}
2. Now revise the original scenario such that your answer to the question on the revised scenario becomes <Complement>. Share the revised scenario. The revised scenario should start with ‘REVISED SCENARIO:’.

C.1.2 Rationale-based prompting

1. You will be given a decision making scenario followed by a question about the scenario. Answer the question with ‘Yes’ or ‘No’. Do not include any additional words in your answer. Your answer should start with ‘ANSWER:’.

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _c	ED \downarrow	ED _c
LAM _s	79	45	18	60	45
LAM _m	100	96	96	33	32
MST _s	100	87	61	33	32
MST _m	100	79	86	19	20
GEM _s	24	35	29	23	15
GEM _m	99	80	65	26	25
R1 _m	100	82	74	29	27

(a) DiscrimEval

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _c	ED \downarrow	ED _c
LAM _s	99	18	28	72	75
LAM _m	100	70	99	10	9
MST _s	100	86	99	32	32
MST _m	100	62	99	7	5
GEM _s	8	11	5	15	19
GEM _m	100	100	99	14	14
R1 _m	99	48	67	12	9

(b) FolkTexts

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _c	ED \downarrow	ED _c
LAM _s	81	58	33	63	54
LAM _m	99	90	74	53	50
MST _s	99	80	88	49	48
MST _m	100	83	99	36	37
GEM _s	99	88	98	44	43
GEM _m	100	78	94	50	52
R1 _m	99	72	94	37	38

(c) Twitter Financial News

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _c	ED \downarrow	ED _c
LAM _s	84	32	29	84	81
LAM _m	99	95	90	47	47
MST _s	77	88	86	73	72
MST _m	99	95	99	45	44
GEM _s	93	96	99	54	54
GEM _m	100	99	99	72	72
R1 _m	99	91	65	53	50

(d) SST2

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _c	ED \downarrow	ED _c
LAM _s	62	1	12	26	35
LAM _m	96	15	66	8	10
MST _s	98	6	49	11	12
MST _m	93	0.4	87	0.6	5
GEM _s	30	0	27	0	51
GEM _m	96	7	88	4	6
R1 _m	89	4	52	32	11

(e) GSM8K

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _c	ED \downarrow	ED _c
LAM _s	67	61	45	39	38
LAM _m	100	89	76	37	38
MST _s	100	60	82	31	33
MST _m	100	81	97	35	37
GEM _s	97	75	88	47	47
GEM _m	100	73	93	46	45
R1 _m	100	68	90	36	35

(f) MGnLI

Table 4: [Unconstrained prompting at $T = 0.5$] Performance of LLMs in Generating SCEs in terms of percentage of times the models are able to generate a SCE (Gen), percentage of times the model predictions on SCEs yield the target label (Val), and the normalized edit distance (ED) between the original inputs and SCEs. Val_c and ED_c denotes the metric values when the instructions for prediction on the original input and the SCE generation are provided in the context while computing the validity of the SCE (Section 3.2). \uparrow means higher values are better.

The scenario is: {SCENARIO}
The question is: {QUESTION}

- Now, identify the ‘rationales’ behind your answer. The rationales are words, phrases or sentences in the original scenario that led you to answer with <Original Answer>. Share a list of rationales with one rationale per line.
- Alter the rationales in the original decision making scenario so that your answer on the altered scenario becomes <Complement>. Keep the changes to a minimum. The altered scenario should start with ‘ALTERED SCE-

NARIO:’.

C.2 FolkTexts prompts

We adapt the prompts from Cruz et al. (2024).

C.2.1 Unconstrained prompting

- You will be provided data corresponding to a survey respondent. The survey was conducted among US residents in 2018. Please answer the question based on the information provided by selecting from one of the two choices. The data provided is enough to reach an approximate answer. Do not include any

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	81	32	11	72	37
LAM _m	99	49	78	21	16
MST _s	99	84	32	39	40
MST _m	100	51	56	13	15
GEM _s	33	26	26	19	13
GEM _m	99	60	68	19	19
R1 _m	100	54	53	25	20

(a) DiscrimEval

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	57	44	40	23	27
LAM _m	96	50	24	31	20
MST _s	98	61	87	29	27
MST _m	99	37	85	5	5
GEM _s	9	19	30	43	6
GEM _m	98	45	53	10	9
R1 _m	85	37	32	15	14

(b) FolkTexts

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	83	65	9	73	24
LAM _m	99	90	75	65	63
MST _s	99	89	83	65	62
MST _m	100	74	98	22	20
GEM _s	98	78	96	24	24
GEM _m	99	85	99	23	22
R1 _m	99	66	72	45	39

(c) Twitter Financial News

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	68	37	37	63	48
LAM _m	99	86	72	65	63
MST _s	73	92	90	70	69
MST _m	99	83	98	38	36
GEM _s	87	75	96	30	29
GEM _m	100	57	66	32	31
R1 _m	99	78	74	50	50

(d) SST2

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	54	3	17	80	82
LAM _m	95	9	40	58	53
MST _s	87	45	3	68	67
MST _m	91	1	67	46	48
GEM _s	29	0	23	0	43
GEM _m	94	5	68	35	30
R1 _m	87	8	43	70	75

(e) GSM8K

	Gen \uparrow	Val \uparrow	Val _C	ED \downarrow	ED _C
LAM _s	68	39	28	80	71
LAM _m	99	88	99	75	74
MST _s	100	88	41	77	71
MST _m	100	69	83	33	33
GEM _s	84	65	81	27	27
GEM _m	100	70	88	18	18
R1 _m	100	61	81	46	46

(f) MGnLI

Table 5: [Rationale-based prompting at $T = 0.5$] Performance of LLMs in Generating SCEs in terms of percentage of times the models are able to generate a SCE (Gen), percentage of times the model predictions on SCEs yield the target label (Val), and the normalized edit distance (ED) between the original inputs and SCEs. Val_C and ED_C denotes the metric values when the instructions for prediction on the original input and the SCE generation are provided in the context while computing the validity of the SCE (Section 3.2). \uparrow means higher values are better.

additional words. Your answer must start with ‘ANSWER:’.

The respondent data is: {description}

The question is: {question}

The choices are: {choices}

- Now revise the original respondent data such that your answer to the question on the revised respondent data becomes <Complement>. Share the revised data. The revised data should start with ‘REVISED DATA:’

C.2.2 Rationale-based prompting

- You will be provided data corresponding to a survey respondent. The survey was conducted among US residents in 2018. Please answer the question based on the information provided by selecting from one of the two choices. The data provided is enough to reach an approximate answer. Do not include any additional words. Your answer must start with ‘ANSWER:’.

The respondent data is: {description}

The question is: {question}

The choices are: {choices}

2. Now, identify the ‘rationales’ behind your answer. The rationales are words, phrases or sentences in the original respondent data that led you to answer with `<Original Answer>`. Share a list of rationales with one rationale per line. The list should start with ‘RATIONALS:’
3. Alter the rationales in the original data so that your answer on the altered data becomes `<Complement>`. Keep the changes to a minimum. The altered data should start with ‘ALTERED DATA:’

C.3 SST2

C.3.1 Unconstrained prompting

- You will be given a movie review. Assess its sentiment and classify it as ‘Positive’ or ‘Negative.’ Do not include any additional words in your answer. Your answer should start with ‘ANSWER:’
- Now revise the original review so that the sentiment of the revised review becomes `<Complement>`. Share the revised review. The revised review should start with ‘REVISED REVIEW:’

C.3.2 Rationale-based prompting

- You will be given a movie review. Assess its sentiment and classify it as ‘Positive’ or ‘Negative.’ Do not include any additional words in your answer. Your answer should start with ‘ANSWER:’
- Now, identify the ‘rationales’ behind your answer. The rationales are words, phrases or sentences in the original review that led you to answer with `<Original Answer>`. Share a list of rationales with one rationale per line. The list should start with ‘RATIONALS:’
- Alter the rationales in the original review so that your answer on the altered review becomes `<Complement>`. Keep the changes to a minimum. The altered review should start with ‘ALTERED REVIEW:’

C.4 Twitter Financial News

C.4.1 Unconstrained prompting

1. You will be given a finance-related news post from X (formerly Twitter) followed by a question about its sentiment. Respond with ‘Bearish,’ ‘Bullish,’ or ‘Neutral.’ Do not include

any additional words in your answer. Your answer should start with ‘ANSWER:’.

The twitter post is: {twitter}

The question is: {question}

2. Now revise the original post so that the sentiment of the revised post becomes `<Complement>`. Share the revised post. The revised post should start with ‘REVISED POST:’.

C.4.2 Rationale-based prompting

1. You will be given a finance-related news post from X (formerly Twitter). Assess its sentiment and classify it as ‘Bearish,’ ‘Bullish,’ or ‘Neutral.’ Do not include any additional words in your answer. Your answer should start with ‘ANSWER:’
2. Now, identify the ‘rationales’ behind your answer. The rationales are words, phrases or sentences in the original Twitter post that led you to answer with `<Original Answer>`. Share a list of rationales with one rationale per line. The list should start with ‘RATIONALS:’
3. Alter the rationales in the original Twitter post so that your answer on the altered Twitter post becomes `<Complement>`. Keep the changes to a minimum. The altered Twitter post should start with ‘ALTERED TWITTER POST:’

C.5 GSM8K

C.5.1 Unconstrained prompting

1. You will be given a math problem. The solution to the problem is an integer. Your task is to provide the solution. Only provide the final answer as an integer. Do not include any additional word or phrase. Your final answer should start with ‘FINAL ANSWER:’
2. Now, revise the math problem so your final answer to the revised problem becomes `<Complement>`. Share the revised Problem. The revised problem should start with ‘REVISED PROBLEM:’

C.5.2 Rationale-based prompting

1. You will be given a math problem. The solution to the problem is an integer. Your task is to provide the solution. Only provide the final answer as an integer. Do not include any additional word or phrase. Your final answer should start with ‘FINAL ANSWER:’

2. Now, identify the ‘rationales’ behind your answer. The rationales are words, phrases or sentences in the original problem that led you to answer with `<Original Answer>`. Share a list of rationales with one rationale per line. The list should start with ‘RATIONALS:’
3. Alter the rationales in the original problem so that your answer on the altered problem becomes `<Complement>`. Keep the changes to a minimum. The altered problem should start with ‘ALTERED PROBLEM:’.

C.6 Multi-Genre Natural Language Inference (MGNLI)

C.6.1 Unconstrained prompting

1. You will be given two sentences denoting a premise and a hypothesis respectively. Determine the relationship between the premise and the hypothesis. The possible relationships you can choose from are ‘Entail’, ‘Contradict’ and ‘Neutral’. Only pick one of the options. Do not include any additional words in your answer. Your answer should start with ‘ANSWER:’
The premise is: {premise}
The hypothesis is: {hypothesis}
2. Now revise the original hypothesis so that your answer to the question about its relationship becomes `<Complement>`. Share the revised hypothesis. The revised hypothesis should start with ‘REVISED HYPOTHESIS:’

C.6.2 Rationale-based prompting

1. You will be given two sentences denoting a premise and a hypothesis respectively. Determine the relationship between the premise and the hypothesis. The possible relationships you can choose from are ‘Entail’, ‘Contradict’ and ‘Neutral’. Only pick one of the options. Do not include any additional words in your answer. Your answer should start with ‘ANSWER:’
The premise is: {premise}
The hypothesis is: {hypothesis}
2. Now, identify the ‘rationales’ behind your answer. The rationales are words, phrases or sentences in the original hypothesis that led you to answer with `<Original Answer>`. Share

a list of rationales with one rationale per line. The list should start with ‘RATIONALS:’

3. Alter the rationales in the original hypothesis so that your answer on the altered hypothesis becomes `<Complement>`. Keep the changes to a minimum. The altered hypothesis should start with ‘ALTERED HYPOTHESIS:’.

D Postprocessing model outputs

1. Post-processing for all datasets starts by normalizing the model’s short answer, such as Yes or No in DiscrimEval. We also remove common extra characters that models tend to add to their answers, such as (*, \, ', .., !, ?).
2. Filtering and removing model generations where the model’s first answer is not valid. This means the model did not pick one of the valid options as an answer.
3. Filtering and removing generations that are shorter than expected. This happens when the model does not provide the complete CEs or gives a non-response. Generally, we remove cases where the model is unable to follow the given instructions.
4. Filtering and removing cases where the model is unable to generate rationales. If the model fails to detect the important part of the text for answering, we do not consider its CEs generation.
5. For the mathematics dataset, since we do not provide predefined options for the model’s answer, it can generate any number as the final answer to the math problem. Therefore, we consider CEs valid if the model’s answer is mathematical with the expected answer: `<Complement>`.