

RACCER: Towards Reachable and Certain Counterfactual Explanations for Reinforcement Learning

JASMINA GAJGIN, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland

IVANA DUSPARIC, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland

While reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms have been successfully applied to numerous tasks, their reliance on neural networks makes their behavior difficult to understand and trust. Counterfactual explanations are human-friendly explanations that offer users actionable advice on how to alter the model inputs to achieve the desired output from a black-box system. However, current approaches to generating counterfactuals in RL ignore the stochastic and sequential nature of RL tasks and can produce counterfactuals which are difficult to obtain or do not deliver the desired outcome. In this work, we propose RACCER, the first RL-specific approach to generating counterfactual explanations for the behaviour of RL agents. We first propose and implement a set of RL-specific counterfactual properties that ensure easily reachable counterfactuals with highly-probable desired outcomes. We use a heuristic tree search of agent's execution trajectories to find the most suitable counterfactuals based on the defined properties. We evaluate RACCER in two tasks as well as conduct a user study to show that RL-specific counterfactuals help users better understand agent's behavior compared to the current state-of-the-art approaches.

CCS Concepts: • **Computing methodologies** → **Reinforcement learning**; • **Human-centered computing** → **User studies**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Reinforcement Learning, Explainability, Counterfactual Explanations

ACM Reference Format:

Jasmina Gajcin and Ivana Dusparic. 2023. RACCER: Towards Reachable and Certain Counterfactual Explanations for Reinforcement Learning. 1, 1 (March 2023), 16 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms have shown remarkable success in many fields in the recent years and are being developed for high-risk areas such as healthcare and autonomous driving [1]. However, RL algorithms often use neural networks to represent their policies, which makes them difficult to understand and hinders their applicability to real-life tasks. Explainable RL (XRL) is a growing research field that addresses the need for improving the understanding of black-box RL models. XRL compiles research in developing methods for explaining RL models both locally, focusing on a decision in a specific state, and globally, explaining the behavior of a model as a whole [21]. For example, saliency maps are a local explanation method that is used to identify parts of the image that most contributed to a decision in a specific state [10, 22]. On a global level, RL models have been distilled into interpretable formats, such as decision trees [4]. However, most methods in XRL generate explanations targeted at developers and expert users. Such explanations often deal in low-level, domain-specific terms which are not easy to comprehend for non-expert users. Non-expert users require more abstract, high-level explanations, that help them better understand and interact with the system.

Authors' addresses: [Jasmina Gajcin](mailto:gajcinj@tcd.ie), gajcinj@tcd.ie, Trinity College Dublin, College Green, Dublin, Ireland; [Ivana Dusparic](mailto:ivana.dusparic@tcd.ie), ivana.dusparic@tcd.ie, Trinity College Dublin, College Green, Dublin, Ireland.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2023 Association for Computing Machinery.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

1

Counterfactual explanations are local user-friendly explanations for interpreting decisions of black-box algorithms. In machine learning, counterfactuals are defined as an answer to the question: “Given that the black-box model M outputs A for input features f_1, \dots, f_k , how can the features change to elicit output B from M ?” [25]. Counterfactual explanations can help users by giving them actionable advice on how to change their input to obtain a desired output. For example, a user rejected for a loan by an AI system, might not only be interested to know why the decision was made, but also how they can improve their application, in order to be approved in the future. Additionally, counterfactuals are inherent to human reasoning, as we rely on them to assign blame and understand events [3].

In the recent years, numerous methods for generating counterfactual explanations for supervised learning tasks have been proposed [5, 14, 15, 18, 20, 23, 26]. The majority of these methods rely on optimizing counterfactual properties such as proximity, sparsity and data manifold closeness, which leads to the a realistic and easily obtainable counterfactual instance. In RL, to the best of our knowledge, there currently exists only one approach for generating counterfactual explanations. Olson et al. [19] use generative deep learning to create counterfactual explanations and rely on the same feature-based properties proximity, sparsity and data manifold closeness used in supervised learning to guide the generating process. However, relying on these traditional counterfactual properties in RL tasks can result in counterfactuals that are similar in features to the original instance but difficult to reach, due to the sequential nature of RL tasks or do not deliver the desired output with certainty, due to stochasticity in the RL environment [8]. Previous work recognizes that counterfactual explanations can suggest user potentially life-changing actions and as such carry great responsibility [8]. Offering users counterfactuals which are not easy to reach or do not deliver on the promised outcome can cost users substantial time, and cause them to lose trust in the AI system.

In this work, we propose RACCER (Reachable And Certain Counterfactual Explanations for Reinforcement Learning), to the best of our knowledge the first approach for generating counterfactual explanations for RL tasks which takes into account the sequential and stochastic nature of the RL framework. Firstly, we propose three novel RL-specific counterfactual properties – *reachability*, *stochastic certainty* and *cost-efficiency*, that should be considered instead of the commonly used proximity, sparsity and data manifold closeness properties when searching for easily obtainable counterfactuals. These counterfactual properties rely on the stochastic and sequential nature of RL tasks and ensure that counterfactuals are easy to reach and deliver the desired outcome with high probability. RACCER searches for the most suitable counterfactual by optimizing a loss function consisting of the three RL-specific properties using heuristic tree search of agent’s execution tree. We evaluate RACCER in two environments of varying complexity – Stochastic GridWorld task and chess, and show that our approach produces counterfactuals that can be reached faster and deliver the desired output more often compared to the baseline methods relying on the traditional counterfactual properties. Additionally, we conduct a user study in which we compare the effect of counterfactual explanations on user understanding of RL agents and show that RACCER generates counterfactuals that help humans better understand and predict the behavior of RL agents.

Our contributions are as follows:

- (1) We design three RL-specific counterfactual properties – reachability, stochastic certainty and cost-efficiency, and provide metrics for their estimation.
- (2) We propose RACCER, the first algorithm for generating RL-specific counterfactual explanations, which relies on the above counterfactual properties.
- (3) We conduct a user study and show that RACCER can produce counterfactuals which help humans better understand agent’s behavior compared to the baseline approaches.

The implementation of RACCER and evaluation details can be found at <https://github.com/anonymous902109/RACCER>.

2 RELATED WORK

In this section, we offer a short overview of counterfactual explanations and counterfactual properties, and summarize some of the most notable methods for generating counterfactuals in supervised and RL.

2.1 Counterfactual Explanations

In the first work on counterfactual explanations for black-box models, Wachter et al. [26] define them as follows: “Score p was returned because variables V had values (v_1, v_2, \dots) associated with them. If V instead had values (v_1', v_2', \dots) , and all other variables had remained constant, score p' would have been returned”. Counterfactual explanations for an instance x are offered in the form of a *counterfactual instance* x' that is similar to x but achieves the desired outcome. They offer users actionable advice on how they can change their features to achieve a desired outcome, and help users better interact with the system. Additionally, they are selective, suggesting users to change only few features. Counterfactual explanations are also inherent to human reasoning, as we use them to assign blame [3]. All of this makes counterfactuals user-friendly explanations [17].

For counterfactual explanations to be useful to users, they need to produce the desired output, and be easy to obtain, in order to minimize user effort. To that end, multiple counterfactual properties have been proposed to evaluate the quality of different counterfactuals [25]. For example, validity is used to measure whether counterfactual achieves the desired output, proximity is a feature-based similarity measure which ensures counterfactual features are similar to those in the original instance, and sparsity measures the number of features changed. By optimizing these counterfactual properties current state-of-the-art approaches search for counterfactuals that can be easily reached from the original instance with minimal user effort, are realistic and produce the desired outcome. Counterfactuals can suggest life-altering actions to the user, and as such carry a great responsibility. Offering users counterfactual explanations that require large amounts of effort or do not deliver the desired outcome can decrease user trust and hinder their interaction with the system.

2.2 Generating Counterfactual Explanations

In supervised learning, counterfactual explanations have been used to propose changes of input features that elicit a desired prediction from a black-box model. In the recent years, numerous works have proposed methods for generating counterfactual explanations in supervised learning [5, 14, 15, 18, 20, 23, 26]. The majority of these methods follow the same approach. Firstly, a loss function is defined by combining different counterfactual properties, such as validity, proximity and sparsity. The loss function is then optimized over a training data set in order to find the most suitable counterfactual. The methods differ in their design of the loss function and the choice of the optimization method. For example, in the first work on counterfactual explanations for supervised learning, Wachter et al. [26] use gradient descent to optimize a loss function based on proximity and validity properties. Similarly, Mothilal et al. [18] propose DICE, which introduces a diversity property to the approach of Wachter et al. [26] to ensure users are offered a set of diverse, high-quality explanations. Dandl et al. [5] pose the problem of counterfactual search as multi-objective optimization and use genetic algorithm to optimize validity, proximity, sparsity and data manifold closeness of counterfactual instances.

In RL, counterfactual explanations aim to explain a decision of a black-box RL model in a specific state by proposing an alternative state in which the model would choose the desired action. Olson et al. [19] propose the only method for generating counterfactuals in RL so far. The approach relies on generative modelling to create counterfactuals which are realistic, similar in features to the original instance and produce a desired output. The approach is not model-agnostic

and requires access to the internal parameters of the black-box model that is being explained. While the approach proposed by Olson et al. [19] generates realistic counterfactuals that can help users better understand agent’s decisions and even detect faulty behavior in Atari agents, they focus on the same feature-based counterfactual properties such as proximity and sparsity as supervised learning methods. However, in RL where two states can be similar in features but distant in terms of execution, feature-based metrics are not sufficient for measuring how obtainable a counterfactual is. Relying only on feature-based similarity measures can produce counterfactuals which are not easily (or at all) obtainable, and decrease human trust in the system. In contrast, our work proposes the first approach for generating RL-specific counterfactuals that take into account the stochastic and sequential nature of RL tasks.

While the goal of counterfactual explanations is to deliver the desired outcome, this is often uncertain due the environment in which the system operates. For example, even if the loan applicant fulfills all conditions stipulated in a counterfactual, the bank might change the conditions for approving a loan. Delaney et al. [6] recognized the need for estimating and presenting the uncertainty associated with counterfactuals to the user in supervised learning tasks. On the other hand, in this work we use estimate uncertainty from an RL perspective, and use it not only as additional information for the user, but as an important factor during search and choice of the counterfactual explanation.

3 RACCER

In this section, we describe RACCER, the approach for generating counterfactual explanations for RL tasks. To generate a counterfactual explanation x' , we require oracle access to the black-box model M being explained, the state x being explained, and the desired outcome a' . Additionally, the approach needs access to the RL environment. RACCER then generates a counterfactual state x' that can be easily reached from x and in which the black-box model M chooses a' with a high probability. We propose a fully model-agnostic method, which does not require information on model parameters and can be used for generating counterfactual explanations of any RL model.

There are two main directions in which the search for counterfactual explanations can be conducted. Namely, we can search either directly for a counterfactual instance x' [5, 18, 20, 26] or for a sequence of actions A that can transform the original instance into a counterfactual [12, 24]. The second approach corresponds to the field of actionable recourse which has often been investigated alongside counterfactual explanations [11]. Once the sequence of actions is found, counterfactual can be obtained by performing the actions on the original state. To estimate how far away in terms of execution two RL states are, we need access to actions used to transform one into the other. For that reason, in this work we utilize the indirect approach to counterfactual generation, where we search for a sequence of actions to transform the original to the counterfactual instance. By following the sequence of actions from the original instance x , a counterfactual x' can be obtained and presented to the user. This way of conducting counterfactual search is more informative for the user, as they can be presented with not just the counterfactual instance, but also the sequence of actions they need to perform to obtain their desired outcome.

To that end, we set out to find the optimal sequence of actions A that can transform x into a counterfactual state x' . In the remainder of this section we first describe how we can compare and evaluate different action sequences that lead to counterfactual states (Sections 3.1 and 3.2) and describe our approach to searching for the optimal one (Section 3.3).

3.1 Counterfactual Properties for Reinforcement Learning

Counterfactual properties guide the counterfactual search and are used to select the most suitable counterfactual explanation. In supervised learning, they have been designed to ensure minimal user effort is needed to transform the original instance to the counterfactual. These properties have so far been mostly defined as feature-based, assuming

that if two instances are similar in features one can easily be reached from the other. However, due to the sequential nature of RL tasks, two states can be similar in terms of features but far away in terms of execution [27]. For example, consider a state in Atari game of Breakout, and another state obtained by removing the ball from the first state. The two states differ in only a few pixels, however, one can never be transformed into the other using available Breakout actions as the ball cannot be removed from the game. Similarly, stochasticity in the environment can affect the process of transforming the original instance to the counterfactual. Only if the user is presented with a counterfactual that considers these stochastic and sequential constraints can they find the fastest and securest path to the desired outcome.

In this section we propose three RL-specific counterfactual properties that take into account the sequential and stochastic nature of RL tasks. These properties ensure that counterfactuals are easily obtainable from the original instance, and produce desired output with high certainty. Unlike counterfactual properties in supervised learning which are often defined with respect to the counterfactual instance, we define these properties as a functions of action sequence A that transforms x into counterfactual x' .

3.1.1 Reachability property. In RL two states can be similar in terms of state features, but far away in terms of execution. This means that, despite appearing similar, a large number of actions might be required to reach the counterfactual from the original state. Conversely, a state can be very easily reachable by RL actions even if it appears different based on its feature values. Additionally, state features in counterfactual instances can be affected by stochastic processes outside of agent’s control. Relying solely on feature-based similarity measures could dismiss easily reachable counterfactuals where changes in features are beyond agent’s control and do not affect action choice.

To account for sequential and stochastic nature of RL tasks, we propose measuring *reachability*. For a state x and a sequence of actions A , we define reachability as:

$$R(x, A) = \text{len}(A) \tag{1}$$

$R(x, A)$ measures the number of actions within the sequence that navigates to the counterfactual instance. By minimizing this property we ensure that counterfactual can be reached within a small number of steps.

3.1.2 Cost-efficiency property. Current work on counterfactual explanations assumes that each action that changes the original instance carries the same cost. In RL, however, actions often have costs associated with them. If a counterfactual can be obtained through a less costly path, then it should be presented to the user, in order to minimize user effort. For example, if either pawn or a queen sacrifice can bring about piece capture for a chess player, they should be advised to sacrifice the pawn, i.e., the piece of lower value and therefore with a lower cost.

We propose *cost-efficiency* as a counterfactual property which prioritizes instances reachable through least costly actions. For a state x and a sequence of actions A , cost-efficiency is defined as:

$$C(x, A) = \text{rew}(x, A) \tag{2}$$

where $\text{rew}(x, A)$ is the cumulative reward obtained when all actions in A are applied to state x . In this way, user can choose a sequence of least costly actions to transform the original instance into the counterfactual one.

3.1.3 Stochastic certainty property. One of the main qualities of counterfactual explanations is that they deliver the desired outcome. Asking the user to put their time and effort into changing the model inputs, only to obtain another unsatisfactory output can have detrimental effects on user trust in the system. During the time that is needed to convert the original instance into a counterfactual, conditions of the task can change, rendering the counterfactual invalid. For

example, imagine a user unsuccessfully applying for a loan, and receiving a counterfactual explanation, suggesting them to increase their income to be approved. Conditions for approving a loan can change during the time it takes the user to change their income (e.g., change jobs, get promoted), and previously proposed counterfactual can lead to another denied loan request.

Similarly, in RL, the stochastic nature of the environment can make a counterfactual instance invalid during the time it takes the user to obtain it. To ensure that users are presented with counterfactuals that are likely to produce desired output, we propose *stochastic certainty*. For instance x , a sequence of actions A , black-box model M and the desired action a' stochastic certainty is defined as:

$$S(x, A, a') = P[M(x') = a' \mid x' = A(x)] \quad (3)$$

where $A(x)$ is a state obtained by applying actions from A to state x . Intuitively, stochastic certainty measures the probability of the desired outcome still being chosen by M after the time it takes to navigate to the counterfactual state. By maximizing stochastic certainty we promote sequences of actions that more often lead to the desired outcome.

3.2 Loss Function

In order to optimize the counterfactual properties, we design a weighted loss function encompassing RL-specific objectives. For a state x , sequence of actions A , desired output a' , loss function is defined as:

$$L(x, A, a') = \alpha R(x, A) + \beta C(x, A) + \gamma(1 - S(x, A, a')) \quad (4)$$

where α , β and γ are parameters determining the importance of different properties. By minimizing L we can find a sequence of actions which quickly and certainly leads to a counterfactual explanation. However, $L(x, A, a')$ does not verify that a' is predicted in the obtained counterfactual. To that end, we ensure that a validity constraint is satisfied:

$$V(x, x', a') = M(x') == a' \quad (5)$$

where x' is obtained by performing actions from A in x . Validity is used to filter potential counterfactual instances as is described in more detail in the next part of this section.

3.3 Counterfactual Search

Our goal is to obtain a sequence of actions A that minimizes the loss function L and satisfies the validity constraint. Unlike traditional counterfactual search which directly searches for a counterfactual in a data set, we are looking for an optimal sequence of actions that can transform the original state into a counterfactual one. This means that we cannot directly optimize L over a data set of states to find a counterfactual as this would give us no information about how difficult this counterfactual is to reach in terms of RL actions. To this end, we propose a counterfactual search algorithm that utilizes heuristic tree search to find a sequence of actions that transform the original into counterfactual state that minimizes the loss function L . The details of the algorithm are given in Algorithm 1 and shown in Figure 1.

The proposed algorithm builds a tree to represent agent's execution – each node corresponds to a state, and each edge to one action. Each node n is also associated with a value $val(n)$ and each edge is assigned a value $Q(n, a)$. These values are based on the loss function L and are used to determine which node should be expanded in the next iteration. Children of a node are obtained by taking a specific action in that node. To account for the stochasticity in the environment, we apply determinization to the expanding process by adding hidden determinization nodes each time an action is




Fig. 1. Heuristic tree search: in each iteration a node is selected by navigating the tree from the root to a leaf by choosing actions according to the UCT formula. The node is expanded by performing all possible actions and appending all obtained states as children of the node. Finally, newly generated nodes are evaluated and their values are propagated back to the root to update the values of parent nodes. The white nodes represent states, while black nodes are determination nodes, that serve to instantiate all possible children states of a node in a stochastic environment.

performed. The children of determinization nodes are sampled from the possible states that result from performing a specific action. To calculate $val(n)$ we compute the value of $L(x, A, a')$, where A is the sequence of actions that navigates from root x to node n in the tree. $Q(n, a)$ is calculated for each node n and action a as the average of values val of the children nodes obtained when performing a in n . To estimate $L(x, A, a')$ we need to calculate the values of individual counterfactual properties of reachability, cost-efficiency and stochastic uncertainty for nodes in the tree. We calculate reachability of node n as the length of the path between the root and n . To calculate cost-efficiency of n we record and sumate the environment's rewards along the path from the root to n . Finally, to calculate stochastic certainty, we perform N simulations by unrolling the sequence of actions A from x in the environment, and record the number of times a desired outcome is obtained in the resulting state. We then calculate stochastic certainty as:

$$S(x, A, a') = \frac{N(M(x') == a')}{N} \quad (6)$$

where x' is a state obtained after following A in x . We normalize the values for reachability and cost-efficiency so that they fall within $[0, 1]$ range, while stochastic uncertainty values naturally belong to that range. We can then evaluate a node in tree by combining and weighting the three counterfactual properties to obtain $L(x, A, a')$ as shown in Equation 4.

At the start of the search, a tree is constructed with only the root node corresponding to the state x that is being explained. At each step of the algorithm, a node in the tree is chosen and tree is expanded with the node's children. All actions are expanded simultaneously in the node. The resulting children nodes are then evaluated against L , and the results are propagated back to the tree root to update the value of nodes and edges. To decide which node is expanded in each iteration we navigate the tree from the root, at each node n taking the action decided by the Upper Confidence Bound applied for Trees (UCT) formula [13]:

$$a^* = \arg \max_{a \in A} \left\{ Q(a, n) + C \sqrt{\frac{\ln(N(n))}{N(s, a)}} \right\} \quad (7)$$

Algorithm 1 Counterfactual heuristic tree search

```

1: Input: state  $x$ , desired outcome  $a'$ , black-box model  $M$ , environment  $E$ 
2: Parameters: number of iterations  $T$ 
3: Output: counterfactual state  $x'$ 
4:  $t = \{x\}$  {Initializing search tree}
5:  $i = 0$ 
6: while  $i < T$  do
7:    $n = \text{select}(t)$  {Select state  $n$  to be expanded}
8:    $S = \text{expand}(n)$  {Expand  $n$  by performing available actions and obtain a set of new states  $S$ }
9:   for all  $s \in S$  do
10:     $val(s) = L(x, A, a')$  {Evaluate new states in  $S$  according to  $L$ }
11:     $t+ = s$ 
12:   end for
13:    $\text{backpropagate}()$  {Propagate newly evaluated values back to the root}
14:    $i+ = 1$ 
15: end while
16:  $p = []$ 
17: for all  $s \in t$  do
18:   if  $valid(s)$  then
19:     $p+ = s$  {Filter valid counterfactuals}
20:   end if
21: end for
22:  $cf = \arg \min_{s \in p} L(x, s(A), a')$  {Select best counterfactual as the valid counterfactual which minimizes  $L$ }

```

where C is the exploration constant, $N(n)$ number of times n was visited and $N(n, a)$ number of times a was chosen in n . UCT balances between following the paths of high value and exploring underrepresented paths through the exploration constant C . The process is repeated until a predetermined maximum number of iterations T is reached.

Once the tree is fully grown, all nodes are first filtered according to the validity constraint to remain only with the states that deliver the desired output. The remaining nodes are potential counterfactual explanations. Then all nodes are evaluated against L . The state corresponding to the node in the tree with minimum value for L is presented to the user as the best counterfactual.

4 EXPERIMENTS

In this section we outline the experiment setup for evaluating RACCER. We describe the baseline approaches we evaluate RACCER against (Section 4.1) and the evaluation tasks (Section 4.2).

4.1 Baseline Approaches

In this work, we proposed a model-agnostic approach for generating counterfactual explanations for RL. In the current state-of-the-art there is only one other method for generating counterfactuals for RL [19], but it requires substantial information about the RL model parameters. For that reason we cannot compare our work to Olson et al. [19]. Instead, we implement two baseline models based on current state-of-the-art approaches in supervised learning and RL. Both baseline approaches optimize feature-based metrics that are used in the majority of current counterfactual approaches. Specifically, all baselines optimize the following 6 counterfactual properties:

- (1) *Validity*: we use simple binary metrics for determining whether the desired outcome a' is obtained in the counterfactual state x' :

$$d_v(x, x') = M(x') == a' \quad (8)$$

- (2) *Proximity*: as we evaluate our approach in environments with discrete features, we decide on measuring the feature-based proximity using the Euclidian distance between the original and the counterfactual state in the encoding space:

$$d_p(x, x') = |enc(x) - enc(x')|_2^2 \quad (9)$$

The encoder-decoder pair is trained on a dataset of rollout trajectories of black-box policy M that is being explained.

- (3) *Sparsity*: to calculate sparsity we count the number of different features between the original and counterfactual instance:

$$d_s(x, x') = |x - x'|_1 \quad (10)$$

- (4) *Data manifold closeness*: to estimate how realistic the counterfactual instance is we use the encoding loss, similar to methods in [7, 15]:

$$d_{dmc}(x, x') = |dec(enc(x')) - x'|_2^2 \quad (11)$$

- (5) *Actionability*: actionability refers to maintaining the values of immutable features. As different tasks have different immutable features, we define actionability depending on the task. More detail is given in Section 4.2.
- (6) *Game fidelity*: generating counterfactuals can often involve changing or deleting features and comes with the risk that the obtained state no longer complies with the game rules. We ensure that the generated counterfactual abides by the rules of the game by implementing game fidelity constraint. Game fidelity depends on the task, and is described in more detail for specific environments in Section 4.2.

To search for the best counterfactual, we define a baseline loss function L_{BO} which relies on the proximity, sparsity and data manifold closeness properties:

$$L_{BO}(x, x', a') = \theta_0 d_p(x, x', a') + \theta_1 d_s(x, x', a') + \theta_2 d_{dmc}(x, x', a') \quad (12)$$

Parameters θ_0 , θ_1 and θ_2 determine the importance of different objectives. For simplicity, we use $\theta_0 = \theta_1 = \theta_2 = -1$ for our experiments, resulting in a loss function which favors all properties equally (Table 1). The remaining properties validity, actionability and game fidelity are used as constraints to filter the obtained instances for those that satisfy the game rules, do not change immutable features and deliver the desired outcome.

To optimize baseline loss L_{BO} , we implement two baseline approaches:

- (1) BO+GEN: this approach uses a genetic algorithm to find the best counterfactuals based on the baseline loss function L_{BO} . Genetic algorithm is a model-agnostic optimization approach that has previously been used to search for counterfactuals in supervised learning [5]. We use a basic $(\mu + \lambda)$ genetic algorithm with L_{BO} as the fitness function [2]. The parameters of the algorithm are provided in Table 1.
- (2) BO+TS: we optimize the loss function L_{BO} using heuristic tree search. The optimization algorithm is the same heuristic tree search as used in RACCER and described in Section 3.3, except BO+TS uses L_{BO} to evaluate nodes and expand the tree, and ultimately choose the best counterfactual. Parameters used in the approach for different environments can be found at Table 1.

Table 1. Parameters used for generating counterfactual explanations for *BO + GEN*, *BO + TS* and *RACCER* approaches in Stochastic GridWorld and chess environments.

Parameter \ Task	Task		Loss Parameter		Value
	Stochastic GridWorld	Chess			
Number of iterations (T)	300	1	α		-1
Number of simulations (N)	100	20	β		-1
Maximum number of actions (k)	5	1	γ		-1
Evaluation dataset size ($ D $)	500	63	Θ_0		-1
Generation sample size	1000	100	Θ_1		-1
Genetic iterations	30	10	Θ_2		-1

4.2 Evaluation Tasks

We evaluate our approach in two environments – Stochastic GridWorld and Chess.

4.2.1 Stochastic GridWorld. Stochastic GridWorld is a simple 5×5 gridworld, where agent is tasked with shooting the dragon. To successfully shoot the dragon, agent has to be in the same file or row as the dragon, and the space between them has to be empty. In that situation agent can successfully perform the SHOOT action and win the game. Environment also contains different types of trees, located in the middle file of the grid, that can block agent’s shooting path to the dragon. Agent can chop down the tree by performing a required number of CHOP actions when located directly next to the tree. Different tree types require different number of consecutive CHOP actions to disappear. At each step, agent can move one step in any of the directions and perform SHOOT and CHOP actions. Additionally, the middle file of the board is extremely fertile, and trees can regrow along this file with different probabilities. Agent’s actions are penalized with -1 reward, while successfully shooting the dragon brings $+10$ reward. The episode ends when the dragon is shot or when the maximum number of time steps is reached. The only immutable feature in the environment is the dragon’s location, as it cannot move within one episode. We consider all states that contain an agent, a dragon, a have trees only along the middle file of the grid to correspond to the rules of the games.

In this environment two states can appear very similar but be far away in terms of execution. For example, even if the only difference between two states is one tree, depending on its type chopping it down might be a lengthy process. Chopping down a tree in order to be able to shoot the dragon might be less preferable than simply going around it, and suggesting this to the user could save them time and effort. Similarly, due to the stochastic nature of the task, during the time needed to obtain a counterfactual, new trees can regrow and potentially block agent’s path to the dragon.

4.2.2 Chess. We evaluate our approach in Chess environment, with the aim of assisting users with understanding simple tactics. Specifically, we focus on positions in which user might prematurely attack, before the attack is fully formed. In this situation, user might be interested to know why the attack is not the best option, and a counterfactual explanation could give them actionable advice on how to prepare and execute the attack. In the chess environment we do not consider any features as immutable, due to the complexity of the game and high number of possible situations that can arise from one state. To check if counterfactual states correspond to valid game states we use functionalities provided within the Stockfish package [28].

Due to the rules of the game, even two states that differ only in one piece can be unreachable from one another, as pieces are difficult or impossible to appear back on the board. Similarly, the game is highly stochastic due to opponent’s moves, and planning an attack has to include an analysis of its probable success depending on the opponent’s choices.

Table 2. Average values of counterfactual properties for counterfactual explanations generated using $BO + GEN$, $BO + TS$ and $RACCER$ approaches in Stochastic GridWorld and Chess tasks.

Task	Stochastic Gridworld			Chess		
Approach	BO + GEN	BO + TS	RACCER	BO + GEN	BO + TS	RACCER
Metric						
Generated counterfactuals (%)	74.60%	56.80%	73.40%	98.41 %	95.24%	100%
Proximity	-0.23	-0.31	-0.45	-0.06	-0.25	-0.24
Sparsity	-2.02	-2.09	-3.24	-5.54	-3.71	-3.75
Data manifold closeness	-0.37	-0.36	-0.57	-14.58	-13.05	-14.80
L_{BO}	-2.62	-2.76	-4.26	-20.19	-17.02	-18.80
Reachability	-0.58	-0.59	-0.41	-1	-1	-1
Cost-efficiency	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1	-0.48	-0.45
Stochastic uncertainty	-0.45	-0.33	-0.21	-1	-0.68	-0.44
L	-2.03	-1.93	-1.62	-3	-2.14	-1.86

Suggesting to the user a counterfactual which is unobtainable in the game terms or one that is only successful for a small number of opponent’s responses will not assist the user to perform the attack.

5 EVALUATION

In this section we describe the evaluation process of RACCER in the Stochastic GridWorld and Chess environments. Firstly, we evaluate the counterfactuals against counterfactual properties of reachability, cost-efficiency and stochasticity, as well as feature-based properties proximity, sparsity and data manifold closeness. Additionally, we conduct a user study, to investigate how different types of counterfactual explanations affect user understanding of agent’s behavior.

For both tasks, we first obtain a black-box model M which is being explained. For Stochastic GridWorld we train a DQN [16], while for the chess tasks we use Stockfish engine. Additionally, we assume access to the environment in both tasks. For each task we generate a data set of factual states for which we generate counterfactual explanations. In chess environment we manually created a dataset of 63 game states in which a player can perform a simple, multi-step tactical attack. The final action in the attack is used as the desired outcome. In this way, the counterfactual explanation can demonstrate to the user what preparatory steps need to be take for the attack to be successful. In the Stochastic GridWorld we sample a dataset with 100 factual states by unrolling expert policy M in the environment. For each state, we explain each alternative action that agent did not choose in that state, resulting in 500 generated counterfactuals.

5.1 Evaluating Counterfactual Properties

We evaluate counterfactual explanations produced by baselines $BO + GEN$ and $BO + TS$ and compare them with RACCER based on their reachability, cost-efficiency and stochastic certainty, and feature-based properties proximity, sparsity and data manifold closeness. For each factual state, we run the all three approaches to select the best counterfactual, and evaluate counterfactual properties for them. We limit the search for counterfactuals to k actions. Parameters used in $BO + GEN$, $BO + TS$, and $RACCER$ approaches are given in Table 1.

Evaluating RL-specific counterfactual properties for $BO + TS$ and RACCER is straightforward as both use tree search to navigate to the counterfactual and properties can be calculated by analysing the sequence of actions leading from the root to the counterfactual. Genetic search, however, generates a counterfactual by combining different states and uses no notion of actions. To measure reachability, cost-efficiency and stochastic certainty for a counterfactual x' generated




Fig. 2. Sample question from the conducted user study

by $BO + GEN$, we build a tree of agent’s execution of length k rooted in x and find x' in it. In that way we can estimate properties which rely on actions even for explanations generated through direct search for counterfactual states. If x' cannot be found in the tree, it is assigned the lowest possible value for each property which is -1 .

We present the average results for each counterfactual property and the loss function L value for all three approaches in the Stochastic GridWorld and Chess environment in Table 2. We also record the values of baseline counterfactual properties of proximity, sparsity and data manifold closeness, as well the L_{BO} value for each generated counterfactual (Table 2). We record values of properties already multiplied with their weighing factors ($\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2$) from Table 1. For each approach we also record the percentage of states for which a counterfactual was successfully found.

In the Stochastic GridWorld environment, $RACCER$ and $BO + GEN$ approaches generate counterfactuals for over 70% of factual states. $BO + TS$ algorithm, however, provides counterfactuals for only 56.80% of states. We assume that this is a consequence of the algorithm’s reliance on feature-based counterfactual properties when deciding which node to expand in the execution tree. As $BO + TS$ uses proximity, sparsity and data manifold closeness metrics to decide which node to expand in each iteration, it prefers nodes whose features are similar to the root. For this reason, $BO + TS$ navigates the tree by often choosing to follow the action $SHOOT$ that does not change features. This behavior leads to a lack of diversity within the explored nodes, and ultimately to fewer generated counterfactuals. While baseline algorithms $BO + GEN$ and $BO + TS$ perform better than $RACCER$ in feature-based metrics (proximity, sparsity, data manifold closeness and baseline loss function L_{BO}), $RACCER$ produces counterfactuals that perform better in reachability and stochastic uncertainty and report lower values for L . As the normalized cost is -1 for any sequence of actions in the Stochastic GridWorld, there is no difference in cost-efficiency property values between the approaches.

In the chess task, all three approaches can successfully generate counterfactuals for almost all provided factual states. While showing the best results for proximity property, $BO + GEN$ reports the worst performance on other baseline properties sparsity and data manifold closeness, as well as the baseline objective L_{BO} . Additionally, $BO + GEN$ produces counterfactuals that cannot be reached from the original instance in the allotted number of steps, as it often removes, adds or replaces pieces contrary to the game rules. This results in BO_{GEN} reporting the worst performance




Fig. 3. Users’ rating of different explanations properties on a 1 - 5 Likert scale for different explanation types.

according to the RL-specific metrics and L . Baseline approaches $BO + TS$ produces counterfactuals with lowest values for baseline properties proximity, sparsity and data manifold closeness, as well as L . However, RACCER performs better in RL-specific metrics reachability, cost-efficiency and stochastic uncertainty, as well as RL-specific loss function L .

While baseline methods perform better on feature-based metrics, RACCER produces counterfactuals which are easier to reach through less costly paths and deliver the desired outcome more frequently.

5.2 User Study

In Section 5.1 we have shown that RACCER generates counterfactuals that are easier to reach and more probable to deliver the desired outcome compared to the baseline approaches. However, counterfactual explanations are ultimately intended to assist humans in real-life tasks, and evaluating them in this context is necessary to ensure their usefulness. To that end, we conduct a user study in which we evaluate the effect of different types of counterfactual explanations on user understanding of agent’s behavior. Specifically, we compare the counterfactual explanations produced by the baseline $BO + GEN$ and those produced by RACCER. We conduct the study in the Stochastic GridWorld environment, as it has simple rules, and requires no prior knowledge from users (which also ensures that results are not skewed by different levels of prior knowledge, like for example, the case might be with chess).

We sourced 50 participants through the Prolific platform from English-speaking countries (UK, Ireland, Canada, USA, Australia and New Zealand) and split them into two groups. The first group received counterfactuals generated by $BO+GEN$ and the second counterfactuals produced by RACCER. After filtering participants for those who have passed attention checks, we have remained with 46 participants, 23 in each group.

The study consisted of 10 questions, and in each question participants were shown a game state from the Stochastic GridWorld task (Figure 2). Participants were offered multiple possible action sequences and asked to choose the one they believe agent will take in the shown game state. The participants were then shown a counterfactual explanation for that state, that explains in which situation agent would have chosen action *SHOOT*. Finally, participants were again presented with the original state, and asked to predict a sequence of agent’s actions. They could remain with their original answer, or change it based on the presented explanations. We focus on counterfactual explanation for the action *SHOOT*, as performing this action is agent’s goal, and as such it carries the most information about agent’s behavior. To generate questions for the user study, we assume a black-box agent M in the Stochastic GridWorld as described in

Section 5. For M , we generate counterfactual explanations using algorithms $BO + GEN$ and RACCER approaches as described in Sections 4.1 and 3 respectively. At the end of the study users also ranked the explanations based on the *explanation goodness metrics* [9] on a 1 – 5 Likert scale (1 - strong disagreement, 5 - strong agreement). Specifically, users reported whether they found explanations to be useful, satisfying, complete, detailed, actionable, trustworthy and reliable. Additionally, we included a question about how confident users are about their predictions, in order to estimate the effect of counterfactuals on user confidence. A sample user study is available at: <https://forms.gle/4DLPhcMABwkJTahx5>.

To evaluate the effect of counterfactuals on user understanding we measure users’ accuracy in predicting the correct sequence of actions after seeing the explanation. The correct sequence of actions is the one the agent M would take. There are two reasons for choosing prediction accuracy as the evaluation metrics for this study. Firstly, successful prediction of agent’s behavior indicates that user understands and can anticipate system’s behavior. From a perspective of actionable advice, on the other hand, prediction accuracy tell us how good the user is at choosing the best path to performing the SHOOT action and winning the game after seeing a counterfactual explanations. In other words, accurate prediction of agent’s behavior indicates that the counterfactual has helped the user identify the best path to achieving the goal, which is the ultimate purpose of these explanations.

Users presented with counterfactual explanations generated by $BO + GEN$ have chosen a correct sequence of actions in 23.04% of cases. In contrast, users that saw RL-specific counterfactuals generated by RACCER chose the correct sequence in 56.52% of situations. We performed a Wilcoxon Signed-rank test with significance level 0.05 and found significant difference in accuracy prediction between participants who received counterfactuals generated by $BO + GEN$ compared to RACCER algorithm ($W = 4.0, p = 0.0015$).

We record the results of user’s ranking of explanation goodness metrics in Figure 3 for counterfactuals generated by $BO + GEN$ and RACCER algorithms. We perform a Wilcoxon Signed-rank test with significance level 0.05 to evaluate the differences in user rankings of explanations goodness metrics. However, we found no significant difference in ratings for any of the explored metrics. This indicates users find explanations generated using $BO + GEN$ and RACCER approaches equally satisfying. Even though users perceive baseline explanations as satisfactory, they do not help them understand agent behavior, indicating that traditional feature-based methods can generate misleading counterfactuals.

6 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this work, we presented RACCER, the first RL-specific approach to generating counterfactual explanations. We designed and implemented three novel counterfactual properties that reflect the sequential and stochastic nature of RL tasks, and provided a heuristic tree search approach to finding a counterfactual that optimizes these properties. We evaluated our approach in a Stochastic GridWorld and a more complex chess tasks, and showed that RACCER generates counterfactuals that are easier to reach and provide the desired outcomes more often compared to baseline approaches. We have also conducted a user study, and shown that users presented with counterfactuals generated by RACCER could correctly predict behavior of RL agents twice more frequently compared to users presented with baseline explanations. This indicates that RL-specific counterfactuals help users better understand and anticipate agent’s behavior.

In this work we have limited our search to only the best counterfactual. In the future work, we hope to expand our search to include a set of diverse counterfactual explanations optimizing different counterfactual properties. In this way, users would have a wider choice of potential actionable advice. Similarly, we have also assumed in our work that all counterfactual properties are of the same importance to the user. However, some users might be more interested in a shorter but riskier path, while others might prefer safety over speed. In the future work we hope to utilize a human-in-the-loop approach to generate personalized counterfactual explanations that fit users preferences.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This publication has emanated from research conducted with the financial support of a grant from Science Foundation Ireland under Grant number 18/CRT/6223. For the purpose of Open Access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kai Arulkumaran, Marc Peter Deisenroth, Miles Brundage, and Anil Anthony Bharath. 2017. Deep reinforcement learning: A brief survey. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* 34, 6 (2017), 26–38.
- [2] J. Blank and K. Deb. 2020. pymoo: Multi-Objective Optimization in Python. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 89497–89509.
- [3] Ruth MJ Byrne. 2019. Counterfactuals in Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Evidence from Human Reasoning. In *IJCAI* 6276–6282.
- [4] Youri Coppens, Kyriakos Efthymiadis, Tom Lenaerts, Ann Nowé, Tim Miller, Rosina Weber, and Daniele Magazzeni. 2019. Distilling deep reinforcement learning policies in soft decision trees. In *Proceedings of the IJCAI 2019 workshop on explainable artificial intelligence*. 1–6.
- [5] Susanne Dandl, Christoph Molnar, Martin Binder, and Bernd Bischl. 2020. Multi-objective counterfactual explanations. In *International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature*. Springer, 448–469.
- [6] Eoin Delaney, Derek Greene, and Mark T Keane. 2021. Uncertainty estimation and out-of-distribution detection for counterfactual explanations: Pitfalls and solutions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.09734* (2021).
- [7] Amit Dhurandhar, Pin-Yu Chen, Ronny Luss, Chun-Chen Tu, Paishun Ting, Karthikeyan Shanmugam, and Payel Das. 2018. Explanations based on the missing: Towards contrastive explanations with pertinent negatives. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.07623* (2018).
- [8] Jasmina Gajcin and Ivana Dusparic. 2022. Counterfactual Explanations for Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11846* (2022).
- [9] Robert R Hoffman, Shane T Mueller, Gary Klein, and Jordan Litman. 2018. Metrics for explainable AI: Challenges and prospects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.04608* (2018).
- [10] Tobias Huber, Katharina Weitz, Elisabeth André, and Ofra Amir. 2021. Local and global explanations of agent behavior: Integrating strategy summaries with saliency maps. *Artificial Intelligence* 301 (2021), 103571.
- [11] Amir-Hossein Karimi, Gilles Barthe, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Isabel Valera. 2020. A survey of algorithmic recourse: definitions, formulations, solutions, and prospects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.04050* (2020).
- [12] Amir-Hossein Karimi, Julius Von Kügelgen, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Isabel Valera. 2020. Algorithmic recourse under imperfect causal knowledge: a probabilistic approach. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 265–277.
- [13] Levente Kocsis and Csaba Szepesvári. 2006. Bandit based monte-carlo planning. In *European conference on machine learning*. Springer, 282–293.
- [14] Thibault Laugel, Marie-Jeanne Lesot, Christophe Marsala, Xavier Renard, and Marcin Detyniecki. 2017. Inverse classification for comparison-based interpretability in machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.08443* (2017).
- [15] Arnaud Van Looveren and Janis Klaise. 2021. Interpretable counterfactual explanations guided by prototypes. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*. Springer, 650–665.
- [16] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Alex Graves, Ioannis Antonoglou, Daan Wierstra, and Martin Riedmiller. 2013. Playing atari with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.5602* (2013).
- [17] Christoph Molnar. 2019. *Interpretable Machine Learning*.
- [18] Amaravind 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*. 607–617.
- [19] Matthew L Olson, Lawrence Neal, Fuxin Li, and Weng-Keen Wong. 2019. Counterfactual states for atari agents via generative deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.12969* (2019).
- [20] Rafael Poyiadzi, Kacper Sokol, Raul Santos-Rodriguez, Tijl De Bie, and Peter Flach. 2020. FACE: feasible and actionable counterfactual explanations. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*. 344–350.
- [21] Erika Puiutta and Eric Veith. 2020. Explainable reinforcement learning: A survey. In *International cross-domain conference for machine learning and knowledge extraction*. Springer, 77–95.
- [22] Matthias Rosynski, Frank Kirchner, and Matias Valdenegro-Toro. 2020. Are Gradient-based Saliency Maps Useful in Deep Reinforcement Learning? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.01281* (2020).
- [23] Robert-Florian Samoilescu, Arnaud Van Looveren, and Janis Klaise. 2021. Model-agnostic and Scalable Counterfactual Explanations via Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.02597* (2021).
- [24] Berk Ustun, Alexander Spangher, and Yang Liu. 2019. Actionable recourse in linear classification. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 10–19.
- [25] Sahil Verma, John Dickerson, and Keegan Hines. 2021. Counterfactual Explanations for Machine Learning: Challenges Revisited. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.07756* (2021).
- [26] Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt, and Chris Russell. 2017. Counterfactual explanations without opening the black box: Automated decisions and the GDPR. *Harv. JL & Tech.* 31 (2017), 841.

- [27] Ziyu Wang, Tom Schaul, Matteo Hessel, Hado Hasselt, Marc Lanctot, and Nando Freitas. 2016. Dueling network architectures for deep reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1995–2003.
- [28] Ilya Zhelyabuzhsky. 2022. Stockfish. <https://github.com/zhelyabuzhsky/stockfish>