

# Highlights

## **Explainability for Vision Foundation Models: A Survey**

Rémi Kazmierczak, Eloïse Berthier, Goran Frehse, Gianni Franchi

- Compilation and organization of a comprehensive corpus of articles at the intersection of XAI and foundation models in vision.
- Identification and presentation of trends in XAI evaluation methodologies associated with these approaches.
- In-depth analysis of emerging implications stemming from the integration of foundation models into XAI.
- Highlighting key challenges and future directions for advancing the domain.

# Explainability for Vision Foundation Models: A Survey

Rémi Kazmierczak<sup>a,\*</sup>, Eloïse Berthier<sup>a</sup>, Goran Frehse<sup>a</sup>, Gianni Franchi<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*U2IS, ENSTA, Institut Polytechnique de Paris,*

---

## Abstract

As artificial intelligence systems become increasingly integrated into daily life, the field of explainability has gained significant attention. This trend is particularly driven by the complexity of modern AI models and their decision-making processes. The advent of foundation models, characterized by their extensive generalization capabilities and emergent uses, has further complicated this landscape. Foundation models occupy an ambiguous position in the explainability domain: their complexity makes them inherently challenging to interpret, yet they are increasingly leveraged as tools to construct explainable models. In this survey, we explore the intersection of foundation models and eXplainable AI (XAI) in the vision domain. We begin by compiling a comprehensive corpus of papers that bridge these fields. Next, we categorize these works based on their architectural characteristics. We then discuss the challenges faced by current research in integrating XAI within foundation models. Furthermore, we review common evaluation methodologies for these combined approaches. Finally, we present key observations and insights from our survey, offering directions for future research in this rapidly evolving field.

*Keywords:* Interpretability, Explainability, XAI, Foundation Models, Vision, Survey

---

## 1. Introduction

Deep Neural Networks (DNNs), i.e., networks with a large number of trainable parameters, have had a significant impact on computer vision in recent years [1]. They have achieved state-of-the-art performance in various tasks such as semantic segmentation [2], classification [3], and image generation [4]. However, the depth and complexity of DNNs also lead to a lack of transparency [5] in decision-making and in the interpretability of predictions [6]. There is an increasing demand for transparent DNN models in high-stakes environments where both performance and interpretability are crucial [7]. A wide range of approaches that add transparency and interpretability is broadly referred to as eXplainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) [8] (see Figure 1).

XAI methods provide a bridge between an automated system and human users, whose perceptions and interpretations are inherently subjective. An explanation that satisfies one user may not necessarily satisfy another [9], so to be effective XAI methods should ensure consistency in the interpretations across different users [10]. XAI has garnered increasing interest, particularly in fields where ethical concerns are paramount, such as medical diagnosis [11] and autonomous driving [12], since opaque models may conceal functionalities that contradict moral principles. For instance, gender-biased outcomes have been observed in [13].

Several properties have been identified in the literature as essential for XAI [14, 6], such as trustworthiness, complexity, robustness, generalizability, and objectiveness. We explore this issue further in Section 4.1.

A noticeable trend in deep learning is the use of models that are larger and larger (see Figure 2). The trend began in computer vision with LeNet (60,000 parameters) in 1998, then

---

\*remi.kazmierczak@ensta-paris.fr




Figure 1: **Global goal of XAI.** While a non explainable method only makes inference, an explainable model produces details about the reasons of its decisions, to make its functioning clear or easy to understand

InceptionV3 (6.23M parameters) in 2014, and then Resnet (42.70M parameters) in 2016. Then, the field of natural language processing followed with Transformers (65M parameters) in 2017, then BERT (340M parameters) in 2018, then GPT-2 (1.5T parameters) in 2019, and then QWEN (72B parameters) in 2023. The success of these “large language models” has sparked interest in applying the benefits of high parameter counts and extensive training data to other domains, such as visual question answering [15] and object detection [16]. This has led to the broader classification of such architectures under the global term “foundation models.” Foundation models are in an ambiguous position in the XAI field. On the one hand, the complexity of foundation models makes them particularly difficult to explain. On the other hand, they become increasingly used in the literature as tools to build explainable models.

This survey provides a panorama of explainability techniques within the field of foundation models in computer vision, and more particularly *pretrained foundation models* (PFMs). It is structured as follows. Section 2 provides background on foundation models and XAI methods, takes stock of existing surveys, and proposes a taxonomy for XAI methods. Section 3 defines the identified classes of XAI methods and describes their background, their use of PFMs, their applications, and their evaluation. In Section 4, we discuss different methods used to evaluate the quality of produced explanations. Some observations from our survey are presented in Section 5. The different challenges faced by XAI methods are described in Section 6, including a description of problems that remain open. Finally, Section 7 presents our conclusions and potential avenues for further research.

## 2. Background

In this section, we delineate the scope of our investigation through the definition of the main terminologies. Subsection 2.1 presents the range of vision foundation models, offering a comprehensive understanding of their fundamental aspects. Subsection 2.2 refers to the contextual background associated with XAI and its interrelation with interpretability. Subsection 2.3 points out similar surveys and how the present one differs from them. Lastly, Subsection 2.4 presents a spectrum of distinct strategies aimed at amalgamating foundation models with XAI methodologies.




Figure 2: **Chronology of the order of magnitude of the number of parameters of learning methods.** While early methods were interpretable and lightweight, subsequent developments have led to an increase in complexity that has culminated in foundation models, which are mainly characterized by their size.

### 2.1. Foundation models

According to [17], a foundation model is defined as “any model trained on broad data that can be adapted to a wide range of downstream tasks.” The significance of foundation models lies in their demonstrated ability to generalize across diverse tasks, leading to their emergent utilization in various applications. While there is widespread consensus to label deep learning models like GPT [18] or CLIP [19] as foundation models, a significant debate persists regarding the delineation between foundation models and other DNNs models [20]. The definition pivots on the notion of extensive datasets and a high volume of data, a criterion that remains subjective and open to interpretation.

While the concept of foundation model is relatively recent, the use of large pretrained models to enhance performance predates their emergence. Ancestral to foundation models, the widely employed feature representation backbones, such as VGG [21], ResNet [22], and ViT [23] pretrained on ImageNet [24], paved the way of modern computer vision with DNNs. These pretrained feature representation backbones were used as an initialization for other vision tasks [25]. Indeed, it has been observed that incorporating such techniques facilitates faster convergence, particularly in scenarios with limited training data [26]. Another emphasis of foundation models is the prevalent use of self-supervised techniques to benefit from the widest corpus of data.

The initial models recognized as foundation models emerged from the domain of large language models based on transformers [27], such as GPT-2 [28] and BERT [29]. Their designation as such stemmed from the fact that these large language models exhibit remarkable generalization performances, coupled with their exploitation of extensive text datasets. This success has subsequently led to various emerging applications [30, 31].

The success observed in large language models encouraged a shift towards scaling models in other domains, notably in computer vision [15, 32], where substantial volumes of data are readily accessible. Moreover, the widespread adoption of transformers in vision tasks aligns with the structural foundation laid by language models. Consequently, this evolution has led

to a new wave of models. Notably, language/vision models, capable of processing textual and visual inputs and projecting them into a shared embedding space. A prominent example of this category is CLIP [19], known for its ability to represent text and language modalities within a unified framework. Also, text-conditioned diffusion models, capable of generating high-quality images across a diverse spectrum of tasks like stable diffusion [33]. These models demonstrate proficiency in creating images through conditioning on extensive textual information, marking a significant advancement within the domain.

After the success achieved by leveraging diverse modalities and driven by the aspiration to craft increasingly versatile agents, a new wave of foundation models has emerged. These models endeavor to incorporate an expanding array of modalities, exemplified by innovations like IMAGEBIND [34] and GATO [35]. These advanced foundation models not only process text and images but also integrate additional elements such as sound or action data, enriching their capacity to comprehend varied inputs across multiple modalities. Furthermore, the scaling-up trend has extended beyond conventional data sources, embracing more challenging and intricate datasets. For instance, there has been a notable trend towards scaling up models to handle more diverse tasks. A widely explored task in this context is visual question answering, which leverages the capabilities of large language models by incorporating visual tokens. For instance, LLaVa [15] extends the LLaMa architecture [36] to handle visual data, BLIP [32] adapts BERT [29] for image-based tasks. Another rapidly growing area is zero-shot object detection and segmentation, exemplified by recent models such as SAM [37], SAM2 [38], and Grounding DINO [16]. Finally, the trend to scale up models has progressed, as shown by the examples of GPT-4 [39] or Pixtral [40]

These models are commonly used in a pretrained modality, where their weights remain fixed, hence the term Pretrained Foundation Models (PFMs). Subsequently, there are two primary approaches to their utilization. First, these models can be fine-tuned by training a lightweight probe on top of them (or on top of their intermediate feature embeddings). Another technique is to use a low rank adaptator to fine tune the PFM [41]. Alternatively, they can be employed end-to-end to execute specific tasks, facilitated by conditioning techniques such as prompt engineering. For a more visual representation, a comprehensive non exhaustive summary of these models is depicted in Table 1.

We delineate the scope of our investigation from the range of existing PFMs as follows:

- we include methods using vision PFMs: these models are characterized by their handling of the vision modality, including images or videos, either as input or output modalities;
- we exclude backbones pretrained exclusively on ImageNet due to the ambiguity surrounding their classification as PFMs.

## 2.2. Explainable AI (XAI)

According to [6], we can define an explainable model as a computational model that is designed to provide specific details or reasons regarding its functioning, to ensure clarity and ease of understanding. In broader terms, an explanation denotes the information or output that an explainable model delivers to elucidate its operational processes.

In the literature, as notably highlighted in [56, 57], there exists a nebulous distinction between the terminologies “interpretability” and “explainability”. In some instances, these terms are used interchangeably, further complicating their differentiation. To ensure coherence and eliminate ambiguity, we choose to use the terms explainable and interpretable synonymously.

From a historical perspective, the primary explainability methods for early AI algorithms involved employing transparent models. Such models are characterized by their simplicity, which allows their decision process to serve as an explanation in itself. These models are easily

Table 1: **Overview of Different PFMs.** **Input** refers to the modalities of the input, **Output** refers to the modality of the output, and **Type** refers to the categorization of PFMs according to the formalism of [42].

Method	Input	Output	Type
Bert [29]	Text	Text	Generative
BLIP-2 [32]	Text, Image	Text	Hybrid
CLIP [19]	Text, Image	Similarity score	Contrastive
CoCa [43]	Text, Image	Text	Hybrid
Dalle-2 [44]	Text	Image	Generative
Dalle-3 [45]	Text	Image	Generative
Flamingo [46]	Text, Image	Text	Conversational
GiT [47]	Image	Text	Adaptation
Glide [48]	Text, Image	Image	Generative
GPT4 [39]	Text, Image	Text	Conversational
GroundingDINO [16]	Image	Bounding Boxes	Contrastive
LLaVA [15]	Text, Image	Text	Conversational
LXMERT [49]	Text, Image	Text	Conversational
MiniGPT4 [50]	Text, Image	Text	Conversational
Mplug [51]	Text, Image	Text	Generative
OFA [52]	Text, Image	Text	Conversational
Segment Anything [53]	Image	Instance segmentation	Foundational
Stable Diffusion [33]	Text	Image	Generative
STAIR [54]	Text, Image	Text	Hybrid
VisualBERT [55]	Text, Image	Text	Conversational

interpretable due to their straightforward nature and clear features. Examples of such models include linear regression [58], logistic regression [59], and decision trees [60]. For instance, an explanation generated by a decision tree consists of a series of logical assertions that lead to the selection of a specific leaf node, narrowing the gap with neural symbolic AI [61]. However, as noted by previous research, the explainability potential of these methods is contingent upon the complexity of their construction: if the number of parameters becomes too large, transparency is compromised.

In particular, the pursuit of performance, as evidenced by the competition to achieve the highest ImageNet top-1 accuracy, has led to the development of models with increasingly large numbers of parameters. Consequently, state-of-the-art methods have gained a reputation for being opaque, as their inner workings are often incomprehensible to humans. In response to this challenge, additional techniques known as post-hoc methods have emerged [62, 63, 64]. These methods are applied to the model after the training process to provide explanations. Commonly used post-hoc methods include different approaches such as visualization techniques [63], which highlight influential parts in an image that contribute most to the model’s decision-making. Sensitivity analysis [65] represents another approach, based on the analysis of the variations of the model’s predictions when the input data change. Local explanation techniques, such as LIME [62], aim to explain the model’s predictions by creating a local, simplified model around a point of interest, which is transparent. Finally, feature relevance techniques, such as SHAP [66], estimate the impact of each feature on the model’s decision.

In opposition to post-hoc ones, ante-hoc methods produce explanations by design [42]. With the growing availability of models capable of performing auxiliary tasks and architectures structured as a sequence of subtasks, there has been a shift towards what [67] describes as “inherently explainable models.” These models, while not inherently transparent, incorporate interpretable components that facilitate human understanding. It is noteworthy that inherently explainable models are not transparent in nature. Instead, they achieve interpretability through the incorporation of interpretable components, in a way that makes their functioning understandable by humans. A typical example of such models is those based on Chains of Thought reasoning (see Section 3.1.3). These models, while being complex and opaque, are considered interpretable because they provide textual hints in addition to their output, helping to understand their functioning. Another example is Concept Bottleneck Models (Section 3.1.1), which, while not inherently transparent, are designed to describe inputs using semantically interpretable concepts. Similarly, Prototypical Networks (Section 3.1.4) learn semantically




Figure 3: **Chain representing the acceptance of AI in society.** Each box presents the involved audience (middle) and the description of the step (bottom).

meaningful prototypes during training, providing an additional layer of interpretability. These families of models allow for the integration of various interpretability tools. For instance, logical reasoning can be incorporated into Concept Bottleneck Models to process and analyze concepts or used to establish relationships between components in chain-of-thought-based models.

We delineate the scope of our study from the spectrum of available XAI methods as follows:

- Our focus is solely on XAI methods used in conjunction with vision PFMs. This encompasses the corpus of available PFMs, as constrained by the scope defined in Section 2.1.
- We examine papers focusing on either “interpretable” or “explainable” artificial intelligence, without differentiation.

It is important to note that transparent methods are absent from our study by design, as the presence of PFMs inherently leads to opaque models. Then, our study is categorized into (1) PFMs to facilitate XAI methods, whether as post-hoc methods or inherently explainable models (see Section 3), and (2) papers tackling issues and challenges about explaining PFMs (see Section 6). For further insights about transparent models, we redirect the reader to the survey of [6].

### 2.3. Existing surveys

The burgeoning need for feedback on AI models has resulted in a substantial surge in publications in the domain of XAI. This escalation is highlighted by the emergence of meta-surveys and comprehensive analyses, reflecting the growing landscape of research in this area [68, 69]. Numerous prior studies have delved into subjects closely aligned with our investigations. For instance, [70] focuses specifically on elucidating explainability within multimodal contexts, while [56] centers on the explainability of large language models. Additionally, [42] addresses related taxonomies, underscoring the breadth and depth of prior research relevant to our study. Compared to existing works, our survey emphasizes on the recent use of vision PFMs in XAI.




Figure 4: Summary of the XAI methods presented in our study.

#### 2.4. Corpus

*Methodology.* To gain a comprehensive understanding of how PFMs are utilized in XAI methods, we began by assembling a corpus of relevant papers. This corpus comprises 122 studies, including 76 on inherently explainable models (Section 3.1), 20 on post-hoc methods (Section 3.2), and 26 papers addressing enhancing the explainability of PFMs (Section 6). All the selected papers were published until January 2025.

*Taxonomy.* In prior studies, the need for adaptable organizational frameworks in the large field of XAI has led to the introduction of various taxonomies. As presented in [42], which extensively examines diverse taxonomies across surveys, prevalent approaches encompass stages, types of results, functioning approaches, output formats of explanations, and scope.

Drawing upon the definitions provided in [42], we separate each of the methods of our corpus. The resulting taxonomy is presented in Figure 4 and 13, as well as Tables 2 and 3. A detailed characterization and discussion of each of the identified categories is provided in the next section.

### 3. XAI Methods for Pretrained Foundation Models

In this section, we present and discuss different categories of PFMs for XAI. They are divided into two main groups. First, we examine inherently explainable models, which are designed to produce explanations by incorporating interpretable components directly into their architecture. Second, we explore post hoc methods, which encompass any external tool to the model, used after the training phase to provide explanations.



Table 2: **Overview of inherently explainable models.** **Scope** refers to whether the method offers insights at the sample level (local) or across the entire dataset (global). **Format** refers to the modality of the explanation. **Functioning** refers to the separation described in the taxonomy of [42]. **Result** refers to the type of explanation.

Method	Scope	Format	Functioning	Result
Adaptative CBM [71]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
ARTxAI [72]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Beyond Accuracy [73]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
BBA [74]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
CBM with filtering [75]	Local	Numerical, Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
CC:DAE [76]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
CEIR [77]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Chat GPT XAI [78]	Local	Textual, Visual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
ChatGPT CBM [79]	Local	Numerical, Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
ChartThinker [80]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Classification with descriptors [81]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
CLIP-QDA [82]	Local, Global	Num., Textual, Visual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
CoBRa [83]	Local	Rules	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Concept Gridlock	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
ComFe [84]	Local	Visual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
CoT Prompt [85]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
CoT diffusion [86]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
CoTBLIP [87]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
CPSeg [88]	Local	Textual, Visual, Rules	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
DCLUB [89]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
DDCoT [90]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Decap [91]	Local	Rules	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
DME-Driver [92]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
DoT [93]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Dolphins [94]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
DriveGPT4 [95]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
DVP [96]	Local	Textual, Visual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
ECEnet [97]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Explainable meme classification [98]	Local	Visual	Examples	Examples
Explicit CoT [99]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
ExTraCT [100]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
GenSAM [101]	Local	Visual, Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
GPT4 street crossing [102]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Hierarchical CBM [103]	Local	Numerical, Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
II-MMR [104]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Interpretable Cancer screening [105]	Local	Numerical	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Interpretable VQA [106]	Local	Rules	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Judge MLLM [107]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
KAM-CoT [108]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Label free CBM [109]	Local, Global	Numerical, Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
LaBo [110]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
LACA [111]	Local	Textual	Architecture Modif.	Feature importance
Latent SD [112]	Local	Visual	Architecture Modif.	Feature importance
Learning Concise [113]	Local, Global	Numerical, Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
LEXIS [114]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
LLM Grounded diffusion [115]	Local	Textual	Architecture Modif.	Feature importance
LLM-Mutate [116]	Local	Visual, Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
MCLE [117]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Med-MICN [118]	Rules, Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
MMCBM [119]	Local, Global	Textual, Visual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Multimodal VQA [120]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Q-SENN [121]	Local, Global	Visual+Textual	Examples	Feature importance
R-VLM [122]	Local	Visual, Rules	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Reason2Drive [123]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Robust CBM [124]	Local	Num., Textual, Visual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Skin lesion CBM [125]	Local	Numerical, Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
SLOG [126]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
SNIFFER [127]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Socratic Reasoning [128]	Local	Textual, Rules	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Sparse CBM [129]	Local	Numerical, Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
SPANet [130]	Local	Textual, Visual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
SpatialVLM [131]	Local	Textual, Visual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
SpLiCE [132]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
STAIR [54]	Local	Numerical, Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Stochastic CBM [133]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
sViT [134]	Local	Visual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Text-To-Concept [135]	Local	Visual+Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
ToA [136]	Local	Rules	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
VALE [137]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
VAMOS [138]	Local	Textual	Local Perturbations	Examples
WISE [139]	Local	Textual, Visual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
Visual CoT [140]	Local	Textual, Visual, Rules	Local Perturbations	Examples
Visual CoT [141]	Local	Visual, Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
VLG-CBM [142]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
VoroNav [143]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance
XCoOp [144]	Local	Textual	Leveraging structure	Feature importance

Table 3: **Overview of Post-hoc XAI Methods.** **Scope** refers to whether the method provides sample-wise insights (local) or dataset-wise insights (Global). **Output format** refers to the modality of the explanation. **Functioning** refers to the separation described in the taxonomy of 2.4. **Result** refers to the type of explanation.

Method	Scope	Output Format	Functioning	Result
Assessing bias vis [145]	Global	Numerical	Meta Explanation	Feature importance
Beyond CLIP [146]	Global	Textual, Visual	Meta Explanation	Feature importance
CLIP-Dissect [147]	Global	Textual, Visual	Meta Explanation	Feature importance
Concept Sliders [148]	Local	Visual	Leveraging structure	Examples
Counterfactual latent diffusion [149]	Local	Visual	Examples	Examples
Decoupling Pixel Flipping [150]	Local	Visual	Perturbation	Feature importance
Diffusion visual counterfactual [151]	Local	Visual	Examples	Examples
Distilling model failures [152]	Global	Textual, Visual	Meta Explanation	Examples
Explain Any Concept [153]	Local	Visual, Numerical	Architecture Modification	Surrogate models
FALCON [154]	Global	Textual, Visual	Meta Explanation	Examples
Grounding counterfactuals [155]	Local	Numerical, Textual	Examples	Feature importance
Hard Prompts Easy [156]	Local	Textual, Visual	Examples	Examples
RePrompt [157]	Local	Textual, Visual	Local Perturbations	Feature importance
SSD-LLM [158]	Global	Textual, Visual	Meta Explanation	Examples
TeDeSC [159]	Global	Textual, Visual	Meta Explanation	Examples
TIFA [160]	Local	Rules	Meta Explanation	Feature importance
VIEScore [161]	Local	Textual	Meta Explanation	Feature importance
Zero-shot Model Diagnosis [162]	Local	Visual, Textual	Examples	Feature importance

### 3.1. Inherently explainable models

The complete list of inherently interpretable methods is presented in Table 2. Each method is associated with the taxonomy of [42], which includes scope, output format, functioning, and type of result.

#### 3.1.1. Concept bottleneck models

*Definition.* A family of ante-hoc explainability techniques designed to make the predictions of DNNs interpretable by modifying their structure. Specifically, a DNN is partitioned into two components: (1) a concept predictor that maps input data to a set of semantic concepts, and (2) a classifier that predicts the final output class based on these concepts, as shown in Table 5. The concepts typically represent high-level, human-understandable features that are relevant to the prediction task. Explanations are derived from the latent space of concepts, as the model’s predictions can be attributed to a specific set of concepts it focuses on during inference.




Figure 5: **Scheme of the principle of an inherently interpretable model through a concept bottleneck.** Given an input, the CBM first generates a conceptual representation based on a predefined set of concepts. Subsequently, the model produces an output using this conceptual representation.

*Background.* Concept Bottleneck Models (CBMs) represent an interpretable approach in machine learning, where models make predictions based on high-level, human-interpretable concepts extracted from the data—often designated by descriptive terms (e.g., words), rather than on direct data-to-prediction mappings. While the term “Concept Bottleneck Models” is relatively new, this paradigm has roots in pre-deep learning literature [169, 170]. The concept of CBMs was formally introduced by [171], with similar ideas presented as “Semantic Bottleneck Networks” by [172]. Recent advancements have leveraged large language models to construct concepts from CLIP text embeddings [110, 109], giving rise to a family of CLIP-based CBMs. This direction has spurred extensive research [54, 72, 78, 75, 129].

*Use of Pretrained Foundation Models.* In their inner functioning, CBMs require models to incorporate semantically meaningful concepts, which is challenging without specially tailored datasets. The introduction of PFMs has made it possible to overcome this limitation through their multimodal generalizability. By leveraging PFMs in the encoder, CBMs can effectively embed meaningful concepts. One of the pioneering works in this direction is [81], which employs text descriptions of classes to augment zero-shot classification by CLIP through score thresholds on these descriptors. Additionally, [78] uses CLIP to encode both image and text tokens associated with these concepts, resulting in a latent space that captures the combined encoding of text and image representations. An additional advantage of this approach is its training efficiency: since concept representations are inherently semantically meaningful and low-dimensional, training can focus primarily on the inference model, keeping it lightweight. Beside CLIP, a noticeable work is [142] that uses Grounding DINO [16] to spot the position of the detected concepts as bounding boxes.

*Application and benchmark.* CBMs are primarily applied to image classification tasks, as the structure of the latent space—often aligned with words due to its design—naturally supports classification processes. Notably, CBMs have also been adapted for applications beyond image classification, including video understanding [138] and image representation learning [77]. Given the broad range of applications, a variety of datasets are utilized, spanning domains like medical imaging [75, 124], art [72], and autonomous driving [168].

*Evaluation.* Primarily due to the challenges of conducting evaluations, many studies rely on qualitative explanations using datasets adapted to their respective models. However, some works have adopted tailored XAI evaluation metrics to provide quantitative insights. For example, deletion metrics [64] are utilized in [82, 103], while sparsity metrics [173] are employed in [129].

### 3.1.2. Textual rationale generation

*Definition.* A family of ante-hoc explainability techniques designed to make the predictions of DNNs interpretable by modifying their structure. These methods incorporate a specialized component trained to generate textual justifications for the model’s predictions. This component produces explanations by decoding the latent space of the network (as illustrated in Table 6) and often derived from an LLM. The generated explanations typically take the form of concise textual statements that directly address the question: “Why did the model make this specific inference?”

*Background.* Rationales provide context and reasoning that closely align with human language and cognitive processes, offering explanations that are more naturally interpretable by humans. This concept has been explored since the early days of AI, often through template-based approaches that consists in triggering predefined sentences based on specific conditions within the system framework being met [174, 175]. However, generating multimodal, text-based rationales from deep vision models has been particularly challenging due to the complexity of combining




Figure 6: **Scheme of the principle of an inherently interpretable model through the generation of textual rationale.** Given an input, the model generates a textual rationale alongside its output, providing insights into the reasoning behind the prediction. Compared to other methods that imply some interpretable decomposition of the model, the model here can be opaque.

visual and linguistic information. The first successful approach to tackle this was introduced by [176], which involved training a model on a custom dataset specifically designed for multimodal rationale generation. Recent advancements in large language models [18] and large multimodal models [32] have since opened new avenues for rationale generation, reducing dependence on dataset-specific constraints and enabling more flexible and generalizable methods across the field.

*Use of Pretrained Foundation Models.* Analogous to Concept Bottleneck Models, the emergence of multimodal PFMs has significantly accelerated the development of approaches utilizing textual rationales. Due to their more flexible framework, a wider variety of PFMs have been employed in this domain, including CLIP [91, 117], as well as BLIP [120] and LLaVA [76]. This diversity is particularly noteworthy since the latter two models are specifically designed for image captioning tasks, highlighting their adaptability and relevance in generating coherent and contextually appropriate textual explanations. In addition, we also noticed some works using extra modules to guide the image captioning module on areas the model focuses on [137, 177].

*Application and benchmark.* The established nature of rationale-generating methods with standardized architectures has paved the way for adaptations tailored to specific domains, such as autonomous driving [95] and harmful meme detection [107]. Recent work has also focused on refining architectures to enhance informativeness [91] and contextual relevance [97], and on extending rationale generation to more complex data types, such as video [138]. Additional approaches, such as [117], incorporate visual explanations through bounding boxes, while others like [161] apply rationales to image quality assessment. The VQA-X dataset [176] is a popular benchmarking tool, providing a standard for comparison across studies in rationale-based explainability.

*Evaluation.* The field of rationale generation benefits from well-established text perceptual similarity metrics [178, 179], providing a solid baseline for evaluating generated explanations. The standard approach for assessing explanation quality involves calculating the similarity between generated rationales and ground-truth rationales found in datasets like VQA-X [176].

Furthermore, more specialized datasets are available for domain-specific applications, such as [180], which is tailored for autonomous driving contexts.

### 3.1.3. Chain of thought reasoning

*Definition.* A family of ante-hoc explainability techniques designed to make the predictions of DNNs interpretable by modifying their way to produce inference. This involves decomposing the network into multiple interpretable blocks, as illustrated in Table 7. Chain-of-thought explanation aims to elucidate the reasoning process that leads to the model’s predictions. The interpretability stems from the fact that humans can more easily understand and follow the sequential reasoning behind the decision. Such methodologies are frequently implemented in large language models to enhance the transparency of their decision-making processes.




Figure 7: **Scheme of the principle of an inherently interpretable model through chain of thought.** The model processes its input in multiple sequential steps, resulting in an iterative reasoning process.

*Background.* The initial developments of Chain of Thought (CoT) explanations originated in language-only tasks with large language models (LLMs) [181]. These methods, often referred to as zero-shot approaches, involve sequentially applying prompts to simulate a reasoning process closer to human-like thinking. In this paradigm, the explanation unfolds as a series of decomposed steps or actions (see Figure 7). A related paradigm, known as few-shot CoT, extends this by using a parallel decomposition of reasoning steps. With advancements in PFMs and their capability to process multimodal inputs, CoT reasoning has now been adapted for visual tasks [90, 87]. Additionally, increasingly complex reasoning structures have been developed to enhance outputs through advanced integration of reasoning blocks [80, 128, 102].

*Use of Pretrained Foundation Models.* Due to their close relationship with large language models, CoT techniques have naturally extended to multimodal PFMs. Notably, BLIP-2 has become particularly popular in CoT applications [123, 111, 143]. Additionally, models like GPT-4 are increasingly used to develop CoT-based techniques [83], especially as API-based prompting approaches simplify integration.

*Application and benchmark.* Building on a solid foundation from previous work in large language models, CoT-based methods in XAI have gained substantial traction in the literature. These approaches leverage step-by-step reasoning to improve both explainability and accuracy. Researchers have explored a variety of CoT-inspired enhancements, such as Socratic reasoning [128], visual/non-visual information separation [101], the integration of knowledge graphs [108], decision tree frameworks [106], and segmentation techniques [88]. Contrary to the common assumption that interpretability often reduces model accuracy, CoT methods have shown promise in maintaining or even improving accuracy when integrated with PFMs. This versatility has also led to the development of CoT approaches for specialized domains, including autonomous driving [102, 123, 94, 90] and mathematical reasoning [128, 74].

*Evaluation.* Given the complexity of capturing a ground truth that accurately reflects human reasoning, evaluating CoT methods is substantially more challenging than assessing simpler textual rationales. As a result, many studies rely on qualitative examples for evaluation, as seen in works such as [90, 101, 85]. In specific cases, researchers have devised evaluation methods involving sub-questions that aim to break down reasoning processes, sometimes even proposing these methods as potential benchmarks, as seen in [87, 123].

### 3.1.4. Prototypical networks

*Definition.* A family of ante-hoc explainability techniques designed to make the predictions of DNNs interpretable by modifying their structure. Specifically, the DNN is divided into three core components (Table 8): (1) an encoder that transforms inputs into fixed-size vectorized representations, (2) a mapper that translates the latent space vectors into semantic prototypes, and (3) an inference module that derives the final output from these prototypes. Unlike CBMs, this approach learns the set of prototypes during training. Interpretability arises from attributing the model’s predictions to specific prototypes activated during inference, offering insight into the decision-making process. These techniques can be applied to any model.




Figure 8: **Scheme of the principle of an inherently interpretable model through prototypes.** The input is embedded into a latent space and mapped to regions corresponding to previously learned prototypes, which are then used to produce the output.

*Background.* Prototypical networks were first introduced by [182] for few-shot and zero-shot learning, where the concept of prototypes is closely related to clustering techniques. This idea was later adapted for interpretable object recognition, such as in the work on ProtoNet [183], which probes training images of each class to identify common prototypes. Subsequent improvements have incorporated methods like decision trees [184] and vision transformers [185] to enhance model performance. However, these approaches still face challenges related to computational costs. To address these limitations, new solutions leveraging Prototypical Networks with PFMs have been proposed, offering more scalable and interpretable alternatives [130, 84, 105].

*Use of Pretrained Foundation Models.* One of the key benefits of using PFMs in prototypical networks is the ability to represent prototypes across multiple modalities, such as text using CLIP, while simultaneously reducing both computational and labeling costs [130]. Additionally, the incorporation of models like DINOv2 [186] and SAM [37], which enable the segmentation of relevant regions within an image, has been shown to enhance the identification of more expressive prototypes [84, 105].

*Application and benchmark.* The applications of prototypes using PFMs are diverse. [130] and [84] applied their methods to the CUB dataset [187], which has been widely used in previous research on prototypical networks. Additionally, [105] propose the application of prototypical networks to medical images.

*Evaluation.* Current methods are often limited to qualitative examples, as the prototype set is not fixed by the dataset, which complicates the evaluation of explanations. However, [130] addresses this challenge by proposing a quantitative evaluation using the deletion metric [64], which assesses the importance of the pixels highlighted by their explanations.

### 3.1.5. Others

Among the corpus of inherently explainable methods, there are certain approaches that are too specific to fit neatly into the families previously discussed. For example, Finetune [167] presents a method for fine-tuning diffusion models to enhance their interpretability. This is achieved by using CLIP to generate activations related to textual concepts, specifically applied to radiology images. Similarly, sViT [134] employs SAM (Segment Anything Model) to segment the input image, allowing for the clustering of the image into semantically meaningful regions, as opposed to the typical patch-based process used in vision transformers.

## 3.2. Post-hoc explanation methods

The complete list of post-hoc methods is presented in Table 3. Each method is associated with the taxonomy of [42], which includes scope, output format, functioning, and type of result.

### 3.2.1. Input perturbation

*Definition.* A family of post-hoc explainability techniques designed to make an explanation of any model without modifying the structure of the model by probing its behavior on a set of perturbed input variants. The process is typically divided into two steps (Table 9): (1) generating outputs for various perturbations of the input, and (2) training an auxiliary interpretable model to approximate the local behavior of the original model around the perturbed input space. Explanations are then derived by analyzing this local approximation model, focusing on the impact of each input feature on the model’s decision (feature attribution). These techniques can be applied to any model.




Figure 9: **Scheme of the principle of post-hoc explanation by perturbing input data.** Given an input, a set of perturbed samples is generated. The model’s behavior in response to these perturbations is then analyzed, and the resulting analysis provides explanations for the model’s inference.

*Background.* Input perturbation refers to a class of post-hoc techniques that aim to explain the inference of a given model by testing the model on a set of slightly perturbed variants of the input sample. This approach has gained significant interest, as the diversity of DNN architectures necessitates a flexible and robust process for producing sample-wise explanations. Early contributions to this field include methods like LIME [62] and SHAP [66], which have become widely adopted for their ability to provide interpretable explanations for opaque models. Subsequent works have focused on improving these methods, particularly by developing better approximations for high-dimensional inputs, such as images.

*Use of Pretrained Foundation Models.* Given the challenges associated with creating superpixels, PFMs dedicated to semantic segmentation, such as SAM [37], have proven useful for producing semantically meaningful decompositions of images. Consequently, extensions of SHAP have been developed using SAM [150, 153], which enhance the quality of explanations. In addition, [166] have proposed integrating semantic segmentation with LIME.

*Application and benchmark.* Due to the versatility of these methods, there are no specific datasets or applications that are strictly tied to them. While the papers presented here often focus on commonly used datasets like ImageNet or COCO, these techniques can be adapted to a wide range of datasets and tasks.

*Evaluation.* In the context of attribution-based XAI methods, a variety of quantitative evaluation metrics are commonly employed. [153] and [166] adopt the deletion metric [64] to assess the trustworthiness of explanations, which measures the drop in model accuracy when the most important pixels are occluded. This approach helps evaluate how crucial the identified features are to the model’s decision-making process. Additionally, [150] introduce a variant of this metric, named as Symmetric Relevance Gain. Note that other metrics, such as Noise Stability [188] and Preservation Check [189], are also used [166].

We focus here on post-hoc methods from our corpus of articles. The full list of methods is presented in Table 3. Notably, we associate each method with the taxonomy of [42], including scope, output format, functioning, and type of result.

### 3.2.2. Counterfactual examples

*Definition.* A family of post-hoc explainability techniques designed to make an explanation of any model without modifying the structure, by searching for counterfactual examples. To do so, an optimizing process is performed to search for a minimal perturbation that induces high changes in the prediction (for example a label shift in classification tasks), represented as  $do(Z = z_0 + \varepsilon)$ , where  $z_0$  is a fixed input value and  $\varepsilon$  is a small perturbation, using a common notation in causal inference [190]. A figure representing the process is available in Table 10. The resulting explanation is the pair constituted of a original image, the perturbed image, and the prediction given the original image and the prediction given the perturbed image. Explanations are derived from the fact that finding counterfactuals give to the users examples of causal interventions that rules the functioning of the model. These methods can be applied to any model.

*Background.* Counterfactual explanations seek to identify minimal perturbations in the input data that induce a significant shift in the model’s prediction. These methods have relevance across disciplines, including philosophy, psychology, and social sciences, where theories on counterfactual reasoning have been extensively explored [191, 192]. Recent advancements in machine learning, particularly those that enable the encoding of data into structured latent spaces, have catalyzed a new wave of counterfactual generation techniques. A foundational contribution in this domain is provided by [193], which leverages variational encoders to create counterfactual instances, initially focusing on tabular data. This approach has been further refined






Figure 10: **Schema of the principle of post-hoc explanation through counterfactuals.** A minimal perturbation is applied to the input to generate a variant that results in a significant change in the model’s inference compared to the original input.

and generalized; for instance, [194] integrates flow-based models to enhance the flexibility of counterfactual generation. In computer vision, latent space manipulation for counterfactual creation has also gained traction, as seen in the methods proposed by [195] and [196].

*Use of Pretrained Foundation Models.* For image inputs, the generation of counterfactuals heavily relies on advancements in image editing techniques. In this regard, diffusion models like Stable Diffusion [33] have shown significant promise. By optimizing for gradients within the diffusion steps that highlight model sensitivities, these methods can effectively generate meaningful counterfactuals [149, 151]. Another approach leverages PFMs to identify counterfactual directions that align with specific concepts. For instance, [155] utilize the CLIP embedding space to discover directions corresponding to concept addition in a model-agnostic manner (note that CLIP-QDA also proposes counterfactuals but is not model-agnostic). Similarly, [162] apply CLIP to interpret the latent space of StyleGAN, producing counterfactuals in the form of edited images.

*Application and benchmark.* To date, most methods in this domain have been demonstrated on well-known datasets like CELEB-A [197] and CUB [187], providing convenient, straightforward use cases. These datasets support methods by offering controlled scenarios with interpretable attributes, facilitating analysis and comparison. In terms of application tasks, the primary focus has been on image classification. However, these approaches hold potential for adaptation to a range of tasks involving image inputs, suggesting the feasibility of extending these techniques to other domains in visual processing like regression or semantic segmentation.

*Evaluation.* A key criterion for effective counterfactual generation is maintaining proximity to the original input image, which ensures the counterfactual’s relevance and interpretability. Consequently, popular evaluation metrics for counterfactual quality are derived from image quality assessment frameworks, such as the Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) [198] and the Learned Perceptual Image Patch Similarity [199], where a smaller distance generally indicates a more effective counterfactual. Given the importance of perceptual similarity, traditional distance metrics like Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio and Structural Similarity Index Measure are less commonly used in this context, as they may not capture semantic nuances as effectively.

### 3.2.3. Datasets for meta explanation

*Definition.* A family of post-hoc explainability techniques designed to explain the global functioning of a model without modifying the structure by probing its responses on an auxiliary

dataset specifically designed to reveal potential biases. Explanations are generated through statistical analysis of the model’s behavior across the entire dataset (Figure 11). These techniques can be applied to any model.




Figure 11: **Scheme of the principle of post-hoc explanation through meta explanations.** A dataset, generated through a prior process, is provided to the model. The model’s responses are then analyzed through statistical methods to produce a meta-explanation that offers insights into the model’s behavior.

*Background.* The prevalence of biases in deep neural networks has driven substantial interest in studying model sensitivity to various forms of bias, with foundational work by [200] exploring this topic early on. This line of research spurred the creation of datasets specifically designed to probe for bias, either by extending existing datasets [201] or through the development of entirely new ones [202]. Such datasets enable statistical analyses of a model’s behavior in response to biases, an approach sometimes referred to as “meta-explanation”, e.g., in the review by Speith [42]. However, due to the high costs associated with designing these datasets, progress has been limited. The advent of PFMs has mitigated some of these costs by facilitating artificial dataset creation for meta-explanation purposes, as illustrated by recent works in this area [164, 165, 152, 145].

*Use of Pretrained Foundation Models.* As previously noted, a fundamental aspect of meta explanations is the design of a probing dataset. Here, PFMs offer significant value by generating high-quality images with flexible customization options. For instance, [145] leverage stable diffusion to build a dataset featuring objects in varying contexts (e.g., with and without background), providing controlled conditions to study model biases. Similarly, [165] generate images that follow specific logical reasoning criteria, enhancing the robustness of bias analysis. Another advantage of PFMs is their ability to map both text and image data into a shared latent space, as demonstrated by [152], who use CLIP to represent model failures in this space as textual attributes, offering a more interpretable view of latent biases.

*Application and benchmark.* Currently, research on model biases in deep learning primarily targets the biases known to be particularly challenging, such as over-reliance on background features [145], societal biases that stem from dataset imbalances [152], and limitations in reasoning abilities [165]. Most of this work focuses on images representing everyday objects, including categories like food, transportation, and faces.

*Evaluation.* This type of explanation serves as a benchmark in itself, making direct comparisons between different meta-explanation techniques less meaningful. Instead, the evaluation of the quality of these methods is typically left to the discretion of the user, relying on qualitative examples to assess their effectiveness and relevance.

### 3.2.4. Neuron/layer interpretation

*Definition.* A family of post-hoc explainability techniques designed to explain the global functioning of a model without modifying the structure. These methods operate by identifying patterns that most strongly activate a specific neuron or layer within a DNN, as illustrated in Figure 12. Two primary strategies are commonly employed. The first involves optimization techniques, where the objective is to determine an input [157, 156] or latent space direction [112, 148] that maximizes the activation of the targeted pattern. In this case, the explanation is represented by the optimized input obtained through this process. The second strategy leverages a dataset of images, selecting the top-activating examples [163, 154]. Here, the explanation is provided by the subset of examples that elicit the strongest activations. These methods can be applied to any model.




Figure 12: **Scheme of the principle of post-hoc explanation through neuron or layer interpretation.** Given a specific layer or neuron to analyze, an optimization module is employed to probe the layer’s behavior. The output of this process provides insights into what the layer or neuron is sensitive to.

*Background.* As DNNs operate by extracting meaningful patterns to perform inference, a natural approach to understanding their behavior is to investigate which patterns trigger a selected layer or neuron. This type of analysis dates back to the earliest papers presenting foundational architectures, such as [203, 204]. Many approaches, often referred to as “feature visualization” [205], aim to reveal to the user the specific patterns a network focuses on during its processing. Despite the increasing width and complexity of modern networks, which make interpretation more challenging, numerous works continue to explore methods for interpreting layers. Notably, areas such as text-based interpretations and the relationship between prompts and latent space have become central themes in recent research.

*Use of Pretrained Foundation Models.* Compared to traditional feature visualization methods, the integration of PFMs allows for a more advanced analysis, extending beyond merely displaying the inputs to which the model is sensitive. PFMs enable the connection of these inputs to other modalities, offering a richer interpretability framework. For instance, CLIP can be used to relate the top-activating images to textual concepts, as seen in works by [147] and [154]. Additionally, CLIP enhances the optimization process in methods designed to interpret the relationship between prompts and generated images, particularly in text-to-image models [157, 156].

*Application and benchmark.* In terms of task types, we have identified two main areas of application. The first one is text-to-image translation, where neuron/layer interpretation is of particular interest due to the significance of prompt engineering. A deeper understanding of the relationship between the input prompt and the network’s behavior has substantial implications for the development of more effective prompt engineering techniques. The second type of task focuses on feature extraction, where the goal is to inspect a pretrained backbone model independently of the final output layer. Here, the focus is placed on understanding the behavior of specific portions of the network.

*Evaluation.* The evaluation of explanation quality is largely dependent on whether the method is applied to text-to-image generation or not. For image generation tasks, the quality of explanations often depends on the user’s intent, making perceptual distances and user studies key evaluation metrics. These evaluations focus on how well the generated explanations align with the intended manipulation or interpretation of the image. In contrast, for methods that inspect the backbone of a pretrained model, quantitative evaluations are more common. These evaluations often involve detecting expected samples or specific patterns on toy examples, providing a more objective measure of the method’s effectiveness in identifying meaningful network activations and features [154].

## 4. Evaluating explanations in the era of PFMs

### 4.1. Required axioms for XAI

Evaluating different XAI methods is important to measure their relative effectiveness. As pointed out by [14], initial evaluations of XAI techniques predominantly relied on qualitative demonstrations, presenting obstacles in conducting unbiased comparisons across different methods.

To address this challenge, efforts have been made to identify key properties that define a good explanation, particularly in terms of audience comprehension. In the literature, the quality of an explanation depends on many factors, encouraging researchers to articulate various axioms (or desiderata) that characterize the attributes of a satisfactory explanation. Prior works have defined a set of axioms deemed most pertinent [206, 6]. Consequently, due to the inherent subjectivity involved, many qualifiers exist, resulting in diverse axiom lists corresponding to the multitude of papers addressing this question. Explanation quality is inherently subjective, with different users prioritizing various aspects based on their preferences and needs. For instance, while one user may value *correctness*, ensuring the explanation accurately reflects the model’s behavior, another may prioritize *covariate complexity*, seeking the most plausible explanation for human understanding. Achieving all quality properties simultaneously poses a challenge, as meeting one requirement may conflict with another.

We propose to consolidate each list of axioms in an attempt to synthesize them into a comprehensive and representative compilation. To achieve this, we extracted the axioms expressed from existing surveys, denoted by the meta survey done by [207]. The compiled results are available in Table 4. By analyzing the axioms listed in Table 4, we identified common points

Table 4: Common XAI axioms in the literature.

Authors	Notions
Fel et al. [208]	Fidelity, Generalizability, Stability, Comprehensibility, Consistency
Liao et al. [206]	Faithfulness, Translucence, (Un)Certainty, Interactivity, Stability, Comprehensibility, Completeness, Actionability, Personalization, Coherence, Compactness, Novelty
Co-12 [14]	Correctness, Completeness, Consistency, Continuity, Contrastivity, Covariate complexity, Compactness, Composition, Confidence, Context, Coherence, Controllability
Arrieta et al. [6]	Trustworthiness, Causality, Transferability, Informativeness, Confidence, Fairness, Accessibility, Interactivity, Privacy awareness
Ali et al. [209]	Translucency, Portability, Explanatory Power, Algorithmic Complexity, Generalizability, Fidelity, Consistency, Accuracy, Stability, Comprehensibility, Certainty, Interpretability, Representativeness, Explanation using contrastiveness, Specificity, Sociological, Abnormality, Factuality, Fairness, Privacy, Reliability, Causality
Akhtar et al. [67]	Model Fidelity, Localisation, Stability, Conciseness, Sanity preservation, Axiomatic properties
Guidotti et al. [210]	Interpretability, Accuracy, Fidelity
Burkart et al. [211]	Trust, Causality, Transferability, Informativeness, Fair and Ethical Decision Making, Accountability, Making Adjustments, Proxy Functionality
Doshi-Velez & Kim et al. [212]	Fairness, Privacy, Reliability, Robustness, Causality, Usability, Trust
Zhou et al. [213]	Clarity, Broadness, Parsimony, Completeness, Soundness
Confalonieri et al [214]	Causal, Counterfactual, Social, Selective, Transparent, Semantic, Interactive
Markus et al. [215]	Clarity, Parsimony, Completeness, Soundness
Belle et al. [216]	Comprehensibility, Fidelity, Accuracy, Scalability, Generality
Vilone et al. [217]	Algorithmic transparency, Actionability, Causality, Completeness, Comprehensibility, Cognitive relief, Correctability, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Explicability, Explicitness, Faithfulness, Intelligibility, Interactivity, Interestingness, Interpretability, Informativeness, Justifiability, Mental Fit, Monotonicity, Persuasiveness, Predictability, Refinement, Reversibility, Robustness, Satisfaction, Scrutability / diagnosis, Security, Selection / simplicity, Sensitivity, Simplification, Soundness, Stability, Transparency, Transferability, Understandability
Rojat et al. [218]	Explainability, Interpretability, Trustworthiness, Interactivity, Stability, Robustness, Reproducibility, Confidence
Beaudouin et al. [219]	Accountability, Accuracy, Auditability, Fidelity, Inscrutability, Interpretability, Monotonicity, Robust, Simulatability, Traceability, Transparency, Usability
Bennetot et al. [220]	Objectivity, Intrinsicity, Validity, Completeness

that allowed us to categorize them into five overarching axioms: *trustworthiness*, *complexity*, *robustness*, *generalizability*, and *objectivity*:

- **Trustworthiness:** This axiom pertains to the XAI method’s ability to accurately reflect the underlying functioning of the model it aims to explain. It encompasses for example notions of accuracy, fidelity, and validity.
- **Robustness:** Robustness refers to the XAI method’s resilience against perturbations. It includes aspects like consistency and stability.
- **Complexity:** Complexity relates to the XAI method’s capacity to provide explanations that are both simple and informative. It involves notions of comprehensibility and confidence.
- **Generalizability:** Generalizability denotes the XAI method’s adaptability across a broad range of models. It encompasses aspects like transferability and coherence.
- **Objectiveness:** Objectiveness refers to the XAI method’s ability to generate explanations that elicit consensus among humans. It includes notions like representativeness and certainty.

## 4.2. Evaluation metrics

### 4.2.1. Overview

To go further than the simple characterization of methods, researchers have developed metrics to quantify the diverse properties of explanations, resulting in a multitude of measures. This progress in XAI evaluation has prompted the development of numerous libraries aimed at providing researchers with visualizations of metric performances, often presented as arrays

of characteristics [221]. These advancements have led to notable progress in the quantitative analysis of XAI methods.

In Table 5, we present an inventory of the predominant evaluation methods employed in the field of XAI. To compile this inventory, we systematically extracted each evaluation technique used in the methods outlined in Section and 2. Furthermore, we supplemented this list with the inclusion of widely recognized XAI evaluation methods, as identified through prominent evaluation libraries such as Quantus [221] and Xplique [222].

Table 5: **Evaluation methods for XAI.** **Axioms evaluated** refers to the axioms that the method fulfills according to our desirata and **Explanation modality** refers to the potential restrictions on the explanation format that the method requests. **Need GT** refers to the necessity to ground truth explanations to apply the metric.

Name method	Axioms evaluated	Explanation modality	Need GT
Avg-Sensitivity [223]	Robustness	All	No
BLEU [178]	Objectiveness	Text	Yes
CIDEr [224]	Objectiveness	Text	Yes
CLIP Score [19]	Objectiveness	Image, Text	Yes
Completeness [225]	Trustworthiness	All	No
Complexity [226]	Complexity	All	No
Consistency [227]	Robustness	All	No
Continuity [228]	Robustness	All	No
Deletion [64]	Trustworthiness	All	No
DSG [229]	Objectiveness	Image, Text	Yes
Effective Complexity [230]	Complexity	All	No
Efficient MPRT [231]	Generalization	All	No
Faithfulness Correlation [226]	Trustworthiness	All	No
Faithfulness Estimate [232]	Trustworthiness	All	No
FID [198]	Trustworthiness	Counterfactual Image	No
Infidelity [223]	Trustworthiness	All	No
Input Invariance [233]	Trustworthiness	All	No
Insertion [64]	Trustworthiness	All	No
IROF [234]	Trustworthiness	All	No
Jaccard similarity [103]	Objectiveness	Concept	Yes
Local Lipschitz Estimate [232]	Robustness	All	No
LPIPS [199]	Trustworthiness	Counterfactual Image	No
Max-Sensitivity [223]	Robustness	All	No
MeGe [208]	Generalization	All	No
METEOR [235]	Objectiveness	Text	Yes
Monotonicity Metric [236]	Robustness	All	No
MPRT [237]	Generalization	All	No
Non-Sensitivity [230]	Trustworthiness	All	No
PASTA-metric [238]	Objectiveness	Image, Concept	No
Pixel Flipping [239]	Trustworthiness	All	No
Random Logit Test [240]	Generalization	All	No
Reasoning metric [123]	Trustworthiness	Text	Yes
Reasoning performance [87]	Trustworthiness	Text	Yes
Recognition accuracy [130]	Objectiveness	Concept	Yes
ReCo [208]	Robustness	All	No
Region Perturbation [241]	Trustworthiness	All	No
RIS [242]	Robustness	All	No
ROAD [243]	Trustworthiness	All	No
ROUGE [179]	Objectiveness	Text	Yes
ROS [242]	Robustness	All	No
RRS [242]	Robustness	All	No
Selectivity [228]	Trustworthiness	All	No
Sensitivity [244]	Trustworthiness	All	No
SeeTRUE [245]	Objectiveness	Image, Text	Yes
Smooth MPRT [231]	Generalization	All	No
Sparseness [173]	Complexity	All	No
SPICE [246]	Objectiveness	Text	Yes
Sufficiency [227]	Trustworthiness	All	No
TIFA [160]	Objectiveness	Image, Text	Yes
Top K concepts [154]	Objectiveness	Concept	Yes
VIEScore [161]	Objectiveness	Image, Text	Yes
VisualGPTScore [247]	Objectiveness	Image, Text	Yes
VPEVAL [248]	Objectiveness	Image, Text	Yes

In Table 5, we can notice a significant disparity between the evaluation of *objectiveness* and the other axioms. While trustworthiness, complexity, robustness, and generalizability can be quantitatively assessed by examining the model’s response to perturbed inputs, objectiveness

presents a distinct challenge. This axiom, which involves human judgment, requires human-labeled data.

#### 4.2.2. Uses of evaluation metrics in PFMs-based XAI methods

As reported by [14], around 58% of research papers in the field have integrated quantitative evaluation methods into their studies. It is noteworthy that this statistic pertains to XAI techniques predating the emergence of PFMs-based approaches.

To investigate trends in the behavior of PFM-based XAI methods, we conducted a similar analysis to the one by [14], by assessing the prevalence of quantitative evaluation in recent studies. Our findings reveal that only 36% of the proposed methods include quantitative results.

Significantly, a notable discrepancy exists between different families of explanation methods. For example, while explanations based on text generation commonly employ measures rooted in text alignment metrics, CBMs encounter challenges in extending beyond qualitative explanations. This observed variance could be explained by divergent perspectives on explainability, often interpreted as the proximity of the decision-making process to human cognition. For instance, some methods, such as in Section 3.1.3, self-identify as explainable due to their incorporation of Chain-of-Thought reasoning, mirroring aspects of human decision-making processes. This aspect of explainability is more difficult to measure compared to feature activation maps, it is then harder to quantify the quality of the produced explanations.

Another notable challenge in evaluating PFMs-based XAI methods stems from the diversity of explanation types they generate. While traditional XAI techniques typically produce numerical explanations, PFMs-based approaches can encompass various modalities, including textual and visual outputs. Consequently, specific evaluation metrics tailored to each modality, such as [179, 178] for text-based explanations and [198] for image-based explanations, become essential. Additionally, metrics designed to evaluate explanations that span multiple modalities are beginning to emerge. Then, [238] introduces a metric that unifies concept-based and saliency-based evaluation, bridging the gap between these two approaches. Another emerging trend is the development of specialized benchmarks tailored for vision-language tasks, which assess text-image alignment [245, 248, 229, 247]. Such datasets are particularly well-suited for evaluating tasks like Visual Question Answering (VQA) and text-to-image generation, ensuring comprehensive testing of multimodal model capabilities.

## 5. Observations

*Text-image multimodality.* From a broader viewpoint, image language models are the predominant solutions this survey highlights. This dominance finds its rationale in the maturity of this domain, notably marked by the success of GPT [28]. Additionally, the intrinsic nature of textual information as a form of explanation contributes to this prevalence. This fusion has facilitated the adaptation and extension of various XAI techniques originally derived from the field of language-based models, such as the CoT methodology.

*Reduction of training requirements.* Concerning model-based methods, the integration of PFMs appears to extend the line of methods adapted to dedicated architectures trained on specific datasets. For instance, before PFMs, CBMs were applied to datasets equipped with inherent attributes. However, a paradigm shift is evident in the approach, departing from previous methods that required end-to-end training. The use of PFMs introduces a notable shift from prior approaches in two significant ways:

- Elimination of training on restricted datasets: unlike previous methodologies reliant on constrained datasets, PFMs alleviate the necessity of training on specific, limited datasets.




Figure 13: Summary of works that tackle issues raised by the use of PFM in XAI.

- Partial model training: leveraging PFMs enables the practice of not training the entire model from scratch. Effective solutions are attainable through the use of frozen or fine-tuned PFMs, removing the need for exhaustive retraining.

*Task automation.* Concerning post-hoc methods, there is a notable novelty, stemming from the expanded capabilities enabled by PFMs, such as generating lifelike images from textual inputs. Within the spectrum of post-hoc XAI methods leveraging PFMs, these models consider PFMs as tools capable of executing high-level tasks automatically, such as labeling or generating images.

## 6. Challenges

In this section, we outline a set of key challenges and limitations associated with PFMs, as identified through a comprehensive analysis of the surveyed literature. Each subsection focuses on a specific aspect of PFMs that either poses a limitation or represents a promising avenue for future research. For each challenge, we highlight in Section 6.1 and Figure 13 relevant works that propose solutions or provide insights into addressing these issues. In Section 6.2, we address several points that we consider interesting yet untackled in the current literature.

### 6.1. Challenges currently tackled in the state of the art

#### 6.1.1. Adaptation of actual attribution based techniques

Even today, post-hoc attribution methods, such as GradCAM [63], B-cos [271] or SHAP [66], remain some of the most widely used techniques for explaining deep neural networks (DNNs) in computer vision. While these methods are recognized for their robustness, they were primarily designed and evaluated on older architectures, such as ResNet50 [22], which may introduce a bias favoring these networks [238]. The increasing prevalence of transformer-based architectures, which form the backbone of many PFMs, necessitates revisiting these attribution techniques to address potential shortcomings. For instance, [267, 265] identified a phenomenon called pixel flipping in CLIP models, where attention maps can unintentionally invert, undermining their interpretability. Efforts to adapt saliency-based techniques for CLIP, such as GScoreCAM [266] or LeGrad [270], exemplify the need for tailored approaches. Concerning B-cos, [268] proposes a variant of the original method that does not require retraining a model, allowing B-cosification of PFMs. Similarly, emerging architectures like diffusion models have prompted new explorations of saliency-based explanations, as demonstrated by [264] or [269]. Another pressing challenge is the multimodal nature of modern PFMs, which process both image and text inputs. Methods must evolve to simultaneously highlight relevant pixels and text tokens used during inference [263, 262].



### 6.1.2. *Spurious correlations/bias*

A critical aspect of PFMs lies in their ability to base inferences on relevant and meaningful features. For example, in image classification tasks, we expect models to classify images by recognizing features intrinsic to the target object. However, this expectation is often violated, as illustrated by the well-known “Wolf vs. Husky” example [62], where a model incorrectly focuses on the presence of snow—a spurious feature correlated with images of huskies—rather than on the actual object features. This highlights the prevalence of biases and spurious correlations in model predictions, prompting numerous studies to investigate their extent in PFMs. For instance, tailored datasets have been used to uncover biases in models like CLIP, revealing systematic issues regarding spurious correlations [261, 260]. Similarly, visual question-answering (VQA) PFMs, including BLIP, GPT-4, and LLaVa, exhibit notable shortcomings. Research has identified failures in handling unanswerable questions [256], visual diagrams [257], stereotypical biases [258], and intent recognition [259]. Understanding these biases is crucial, especially given the extensive use of these models as foundations for methods discussed in Section 2.

### 6.1.3. *Reasoning capabilities*

In addition to identifying biases in VQA PFMs, there is growing concern about their reasoning capabilities. To address this, several benchmarks have been developed to evaluate reasoning in diverse contexts, including daily scenes [87], puzzles [259], and mathematical problems [255]. Results from these studies indicate that VQA PFMs face significant challenges when attempting to solve such tasks in a zero-shot setting. However, the use of chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting has been shown to substantially improve performance, aligning with observations made for certain models discussed in Section 3.1.3.

### 6.1.4. *Background knowledge*

A related concept to spurious correlations and biases is the notion of background knowledge. Introduced by [257], this term refers to the global understanding of concepts that PFMs acquire through training on extensive datasets. According to [257], background knowledge often leads PFMs to use shortcuts when answering questions, particularly for tasks involving visual diagrams, resulting in erroneous responses. Identifying and analyzing such background knowledge has become an active area of research. For instance, works like [253] and [252] investigate optimizing CLIP or stable diffusion neurons to activate specific abstract concepts, employing techniques akin to those discussed in Section 3.2.4. Another approach involves creating tailored datasets designed to decouple saliency and semantics [251] or exploring prompt preferences in diffusion models to reveal latent tendencies.

### 6.1.5. *Alignment with Human Cognition*

Finally, another emerging challenge is understanding the similarities between human brain processes and PFMs. While this topic has garnered interest, research remains scarce due to the high costs and experimental complexities involved. A notable example is the work of [249], which investigates the relationship between neural activations in various PFM backbones and brain MRI responses to identical image stimuli.

## 6.2. *Open challenges*

### 6.2.1. *Towards more mathematically grounded explanations*

From a comprehensive perspective, XAI methods based on PFMs prioritize functionality over mathematical groundings. Traditional XAI methods like SHAP rely on mathematical theories to elucidate their operations, yielding explanations in the form of numerical values. In contrast, PFMs-based XAI methods tend to offer comprehensive systems, such as textual

captions, as explanations. While this approach to designing XAI methods promotes understandability and facilitates explanations for highly intricate models, it inevitably sparks questions regarding trustworthiness and fidelity.

### 6.2.2. *Towards incorporation of new modalities*

Existing methods are closely linked to the capabilities of current PFMs, yet the advent of novel approaches has expanded the scope of potential applications. A notable example is SAM [37], which enables zero-shot image segmentation.

In addition, just as language reinforces the development of image-centric XAI, the recent incorporation of new modalities like depth or sound [34] holds the promise of advancing explainability in AI systems. However, a notable limit in this domain is the challenge of generating datasets that match the scale and richness of existing image and vision datasets.

### 6.2.3. *Quantitative evaluation*

This trend can also be observed on the side of evaluation, where studies on PFMs-based methods tend to include fewer measurements beyond qualitative examples. Notably, objectiveness is often measured, but other axioms are much less evaluated. In a global manner, PFMs-based XAI methods struggle to be evaluated quantitatively, notably due to the difficulty of conciliating multimodality.

### 6.2.4. *Detect spurious explanations*

Given the inherent propensity of PFMs to exhibit biases (see Section 6.1.2), it is reasonable to hypothesize that PFM-based XAI methods may be susceptible to producing spurious explanations—those that rely not on genuine correlations within a given input, but rather on implicit associations learned during the pretraining of the foundation model. For instance, can we confidently assert that the concept scores generated by a CLIP-based CBM correspond to actual patterns present in an image? Consequently, an open challenge in this domain lies in the identification and mitigation of such potential spurious explanations.

## 7. Conclusions

The growing interest in integrating explainability into large models is undoubtedly commendable, particularly considering that frequently used methods remain entirely opaque [18]. However, it is crucial to acknowledge an inherent tension regarding the role of PFMs in XAI methods. While PFMs are lauded for their capacity to accomplish high-level tasks like multi-modal integration, their utilization demands caution due to the inherent opacity they introduce in the model.

Current efforts to explain PFMs have resulted in substantial progress. However, pursuing a comprehensive deep-learning theory that renders PFMs transparent appears to be a distant goal. Then, an alternative approach to gain more control over PFMs-based XAI methods involves focusing not on understanding the inner workings of PFMs themselves but on modeling their outputs, namely the latent spaces they produce. Previous research [19] underscores the remarkable effectiveness of PFMs in transforming high-entropy data, such as image datasets, into significantly lower-entropy embeddings. Moreover, these latent spaces appear amenable to modeling through simple distributions [82]. Advancements in modeling the latent space hold considerable promise for the framework of inherently explainable models. By gaining insights into the distribution process within the transparent segment of the model, it becomes feasible to conceptualize our entire algorithm as the combination of a opaque model and a mathematically explainable model.

Another notable observation is the tendency to justify explainability through the notion of human-like reasoning, as described in Section 3.1.3. However, it is essential to exercise

caution with such arguments, as the parallel between DNNs and the human brain remains largely unproven. Particular caution must also be kept in the use of PFMs for computing high-level tasks in post-hoc methods. While PFMs offer generalization properties that render them suitable for tasks like labeling, users must remain conscious of the absence of guarantees regarding their performance across all use cases.

## 8. Acknowledgements

This research has been financed by a Hi!Paris and ANR IA PhD grant.

## References

- [1] Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, G. Hinton, Deep learning, *Nature* 521 (2015) 436–444.
- [2] W. Wang, J. Dai, Z. Chen, Z. Huang, Z. Li, X. Zhu, X. Hu, T. Lu, L. Lu, H. Li, et al., Internimage: Exploring large-scale vision foundation models with deformable convolutions, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 14408–14419.
- [3] M. Wortsman, G. Ilharco, S. Y. Gadre, R. Roelofs, R. Gontijo-Lopes, A. S. Morcos, H. Namkoong, A. Farhadi, Y. Carmon, S. Kornblith, et al., Model soups: averaging weights of multiple fine-tuned models improves accuracy without increasing inference time, in: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2022, pp. 23965–23998.
- [4] A. Sauer, K. Schwarz, A. Geiger, Stylegan-xl: Scaling stylegan to large diverse datasets, in: *ACM SIGGRAPH 2022 Conference Proceedings*, 2022, pp. 1–10.
- [5] D. Castelvechi, Can we open the black box of ai?, *Nature News* 538 (2016) 20.
- [6] A. B. Arrieta, N. Diaz-Rodriguez, J. Del Ser, A. Bennetot, S. Tabik, A. Barbado, S. Garcia, S. Gil-Lopez, D. Molina, R. Benjamins, et al., Explainable artificial intelligence (xai): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible ai, *Information Fusion* 58 (2020) 82–115.
- [7] A. Preece, D. Harborne, D. Braines, R. Tomsett, S. Chakraborty, Stakeholders in explainable ai, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00184* (2018).
- [8] A. Rawal, J. McCoy, D. B. Rawat, B. M. Sadler, R. S. Amant, Recent advances in trustworthy explainable artificial intelligence: Status, challenges, and perspectives, *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence* 3 (2021) 852–866.
- [9] S. C.-H. Yang, N. E. T. Folke, P. Shafto, A psychological theory of explainability, in: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2022, pp. 25007–25021.
- [10] D. Wang, Q. Yang, A. Abdul, B. Y. Lim, Designing theory-driven user-centric explainable ai, in: *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2019, pp. 1–15.
- [11] B. H. Van der Velden, H. J. Kuijf, K. G. Gilhuijs, M. A. Viergever, Explainable artificial intelligence (xai) in deep learning-based medical image analysis, *Medical Image Analysis* 79 (2022) 102470.
- [12] S. Atakishiyev, M. Salameh, H. Yao, R. Goebel, Explainable artificial intelligence for autonomous driving: A comprehensive overview and field guide for future research directions, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11561* (2021).

- [13] L. A. Hendricks, K. Burns, K. Saenko, T. Darrell, A. Rohrbach, Women also snowboard: Overcoming bias in captioning models, in: Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV), 2018, pp. 771–787.
- [14] M. Nauta, J. Trienes, S. Pathak, E. Nguyen, M. Peters, Y. Schmitt, J. Schlötterer, M. van Keulen, C. Seifert, From anecdotal evidence to quantitative evaluation methods: A systematic review on evaluating explainable ai, *ACM Computing Surveys* 55 (2023) 1–42.
- [15] H. Liu, C. Li, Q. Wu, Y. J. Lee, Visual instruction tuning, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [16] S. Liu, Z. Zeng, T. Ren, F. Li, H. Zhang, J. Yang, Q. Jiang, C. Li, J. Yang, H. Su, et al., Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection, in: *European Conference on Computer Vision*, Springer, 2025, pp. 38–55.
- [17] J. Schneider, C. Meske, P. Kuss, Foundation models: A new paradigm for artificial intelligence, *Business & Information Systems Engineering* (2024) 1–11.
- [18] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, et al., Language models are few-shot learners, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020) 1877–1901.
- [19] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark, et al., Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision, in: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021, pp. 8748–8763.
- [20] C. Zhou, Q. Li, C. Li, J. Yu, Y. Liu, G. Wang, K. Zhang, C. Ji, Q. Yan, L. He, et al., A comprehensive survey on pretrained foundation models: A history from bert to chatgpt, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09419* (2023).
- [21] K. Simonyan, A. Zisserman, Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556* (2014).
- [22] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, J. Sun, Deep residual learning for image recognition, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [23] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly, et al., An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929* (2020).
- [24] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, L. Fei-Fei, Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database, in: *2009 IEEE Conference on Computer vision and Pattern Recognition*, Ieee, 2009, pp. 248–255.
- [25] H. Zhao, Y. Zhang, S. Liu, J. Shi, C. C. Loy, D. Lin, J. Jia, Pscanet: Point-wise spatial attention network for scene parsing, in: *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 267–283.
- [26] K. He, R. Girshick, P. Dollár, Rethinking imagenet pre-training, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 4918–4927.
- [27] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, I. Polosukhin, Attention is all you need, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30 (2017).

- [28] A. Radford, J. Wu, R. Child, D. Luan, D. Amodei, I. Sutskever, et al., Language models are unsupervised multitask learners, OpenAI blog 1 (2019) 9.
- [29] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, K. Toutanova, Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding, arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805 (2018).
- [30] D. Li, Y. Zhang, H. Peng, L. Chen, C. Brockett, M.-T. Sun, B. Dolan, Contextualized perturbation for textual adversarial attack, arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.07502 (2020).
- [31] A. Ravichander, E. Hovy, K. Suleman, A. Trischler, J. C. K. Cheung, On the systematicity of probing contextualized word representations: The case of hypernymy in bert, in: Proceedings of the Ninth Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics, 2020, pp. 88–102.
- [32] J. Li, D. Li, S. Savarese, S. Hoi, Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models, in: International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2023, pp. 19730–19742.
- [33] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, B. Ommer, High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models, in: CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2021, pp. 10674–10685.
- [34] R. Girdhar, A. El-Nouby, Z. Liu, M. Singh, K. V. Alwala, A. Joulin, I. Misra, Imagebind: One embedding space to bind them all, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2023, pp. 15180–15190.
- [35] S. Reed, K. Zolna, E. Parisotto, S. G. Colmenarejo, A. Novikov, G. Barth-marion, M. Giménez, Y. Sulsky, J. Kay, J. T. Springenberg, et al., A generalist agent, Transactions on Machine Learning Research (2022).
- [36] H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar, et al., Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971 (2023).
- [37] X. Zou, J. Yang, H. Zhang, F. Li, L. Li, J. Wang, L. Wang, J. Gao, Y. J. Lee, Segment everything everywhere all at once, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36 (2024).
- [38] N. Ravi, V. Gabeur, Y.-T. Hu, R. Hu, C. Ryali, T. Ma, H. Khedr, R. Rädle, C. Rolland, L. Gustafson, et al., Sam 2: Segment anything in images and videos, arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00714 (2024).
- [39] J. Achiam, S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F. L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Altenschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat, et al., Gpt-4 technical report, arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774 (2023).
- [40] P. Agrawal, S. Antoniak, E. B. Hanna, B. Bout, D. Chaplot, J. Chudnovsky, D. Costa, B. De Monicault, S. Garg, T. Gervet, et al., Pixtral 12b, arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.07073 (2024).
- [41] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, W. Chen, Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685 (2021).
- [42] T. Speith, A review of taxonomies of explainable artificial intelligence (xai) methods, in: Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 2022, pp. 2239–2250.

- [43] J. Yu, Z. Wang, V. Vasudevan, L. Yeung, M. Seyedhosseini, Y. Wu, Coca: Contrastive captioners are image-text foundation models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01917 (2022).
- [44] A. Ramesh, P. Dhariwal, A. Nichol, C. Chu, M. Chen, Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents, arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125 1 (2022) 3.
- [45] J. Betker, G. Goh, L. Jing, T. Brooks, J. Wang, L. Li, L. Ouyang, J. Zhuang, J. Lee, Y. Guo, et al., Improving image generation with better captions, Computer Science. <https://cdn.openai.com/papers/dall-e-3.pdf> 2 (2023) 8.
- [46] J.-B. Alayrac, J. Donahue, P. Luc, A. Miech, I. Barr, Y. Hasson, K. Lenc, A. Mensch, K. Millican, M. Reynolds, et al., Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35 (2022) 23716–23736.
- [47] J. Wang, Z. Yang, X. Hu, L. Li, K. Lin, Z. Gan, Z. Liu, C. Liu, L. Wang, Git: A generative image-to-text transformer for vision and language, arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.14100 (2022).
- [48] A. Nichol, P. Dhariwal, A. Ramesh, P. Shyam, P. Mishkin, B. McGrew, I. Sutskever, M. Chen, Glide: Towards photorealistic image generation and editing with text-guided diffusion models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.10741 (2021).
- [49] H. Tan, M. Bansal, Lxmert: Learning cross-modality encoder representations from transformers, arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.07490 (2019).
- [50] D. Zhu, J. Chen, X. Shen, X. Li, M. Elhoseiny, Minigpt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592 (2023).
- [51] C. Li, H. Xu, J. Tian, W. Wang, M. Yan, B. Bi, J. Ye, H. Chen, G. Xu, Z. Cao, et al., mplug: Effective and efficient vision-language learning by cross-modal skip-connections, arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12005 (2022).
- [52] P. Wang, A. Yang, R. Men, J. Lin, S. Bai, Z. Li, J. Ma, C. Zhou, J. Zhou, H. Yang, Ofa: Unifying architectures, tasks, and modalities through a simple sequence-to-sequence learning framework, in: International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2022, pp. 23318–23340.
- [53] A. Kirillov, E. Mintun, N. Ravi, H. Mao, C. Rolland, L. Gustafson, T. Xiao, S. Whitehead, A. C. Berg, W.-Y. Lo, et al., Segment anything, arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02643 (2023).
- [54] C. Chen, B. Zhang, L. Cao, J. Shen, T. Gunter, A. M. Jose, A. Toshev, J. Shlens, R. Pang, Y. Yang, Stair: Learning sparse text and image representation in grounded tokens, arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13081 (2023).
- [55] L. H. Li, M. Yatskar, D. Yin, C.-J. Hsieh, K.-W. Chang, Visualbert: A simple and performant baseline for vision and language, arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.03557 (2019).
- [56] H. Zhao, H. Chen, F. Yang, N. Liu, H. Deng, H. Cai, S. Wang, D. Yin, M. Du, Explainability for large language models: A survey, ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology 15 (2024) 1–38.
- [57] E. Poeta, G. Ciravegna, E. Pastor, T. Cerquitelli, E. Baralis, Concept-based explainable artificial intelligence: A survey, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12936 (2023).

- [58] F. Galton, Regression towards mediocrity in hereditary stature., *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 15 (1886) 246–263.
- [59] P. McCullagh, *Generalized Linear Models*, Routledge, 2019.
- [60] J. R. Quinlan, Induction of decision trees, *Machine Learning* 1 (1986) 81–106.
- [61] A. d. Garcez, S. Bader, H. Bowman, L. C. Lamb, L. de Penning, B. Illuminoo, H. Poon, C. G. Zaverucha, Neural-symbolic learning and reasoning: A survey and interpretation, *Neuro-Symbolic Artificial Intelligence: The State of the Art* 342 (2022) 327.
- [62] M. T. Ribeiro, S. Singh, C. Guestrin, “Why should I trust you?”: Explaining the predictions of any classifier, in: *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, San Francisco, CA, USA, August 13-17, 2016, 2016, pp. 1135–1144.
- [63] R. R. Selvaraju, M. Cogswell, A. Das, R. Vedantam, D. Parikh, D. Batra, Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2017, pp. 618–626.
- [64] V. Petsiuk, A. Das, K. Saenko, Rise: Randomized input sampling for explanation of black-box models, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.07421* (2018).
- [65] P. Cortez, M. J. Embrechts, Opening black box data mining models using sensitivity analysis, in: *2011 IEEE Symposium on Computational Intelligence and Data Mining (CIDM)*, IEEE, 2011, pp. 341–348.
- [66] S. M. Lundberg, S.-I. Lee, A unified approach to interpreting model predictions, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30 (2017).
- [67] N. Akhtar, A survey of explainable ai in deep visual modeling: Methods and metrics, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13445* (2023).
- [68] A. Chatzimparmpas, R. M. Martins, I. Jusufi, A. Kerren, A survey of surveys on the use of visualization for interpreting machine learning models, *Information Visualization* 19 (2020) 207–233.
- [69] W. Saeed, C. Omlin, Explainable ai (xai): A systematic meta-survey of current challenges and future opportunities, *Knowledge-Based Systems* 263 (2023) 110273.
- [70] G. Joshi, R. Walambe, K. Kotecha, A review on explainability in multimodal deep neural nets, *IEEE Access* 9 (2021) 59800–59821.
- [71] J. Choi, J. Raghuram, Y. Li, S. Banerjee, S. Jha, Adaptive concept bottleneck for foundation models, in: *ICML 2024 Workshop on Foundation Models in the Wild*, 2024.
- [72] J. Fumanal-Idocin, J. Andreu-Perez, O. Cord, H. Hagraas, H. Bustince, et al., Artxai: Explainable artificial intelligence curates deep representation learning for artistic images using fuzzy techniques, *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems* (2023).
- [73] T. Li, M. Ma, X. Peng, Beyond accuracy: Ensuring correct predictions with correct rationales, in: *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.

- [74] X. Zhao, X. Huang, T. Fu, Q. Li, S. Gong, L. Liu, W. Bi, L. Kong, Bba: Bi-modal behavioral alignment for reasoning with large vision-language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13577 (2024).
- [75] I. Kim, J. Kim, J. Choi, H. J. Kim, Concept bottleneck with visual concept filtering for explainable medical image classification, in: International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention, Springer, 2023, pp. 225–233.
- [76] A. Achille, G. V. Steeg, T. Y. Liu, M. Trager, C. Klingenberg, S. Soatto, Interpretable measures of conceptual similarity by complexity-constrained descriptive auto-encoding, arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08919 (2024).
- [77] Y. Cui, S. Liu, L. Li, Z. Yuan, Ceir: Concept-based explainable image representation learning, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10747 (2023).
- [78] J. Liu, T. Hu, Y. Zhang, X. Gai, Y. Feng, Z. Liu, A chatgpt aided explainable framework for zero-shot medical image diagnosis, arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01981 (2023).
- [79] Z. Ren, Y. Su, X. Liu, Chatgpt-powered hierarchical comparisons for image classification, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36 (2024).
- [80] M. Liu, D. Chen, Y. Li, G. Fang, Y. Shen, Chartthinker: A contextual chain-of-thought approach to optimized chart summarization, arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11236 (2024).
- [81] S. Menon, C. Vondrick, Visual classification via description from large language models, in: The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, 2022.
- [82] R. Kazmierczak, E. Berthier, G. Frehse, G. Franchi, Clip-qda: An explainable concept bottleneck model, Transactions on Machine Learning Research (2024).
- [83] Y. Zhang, M. Jiang, Q. Zhao, Learning chain of counterfactual thought for bias-robust vision-language reasoning, in: A. Leonardis, E. Ricci, S. Roth, O. Russakovsky, T. Sattler, G. Varol (Eds.), Computer Vision – ECCV 2024, Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 2025, pp. 334–351.
- [84] E. Mannix, H. Bondell, Scalable and robust transformer decoders for interpretable image classification with foundation models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04125 (2024).
- [85] J. Ge, H. Luo, S. Qian, Y. Gan, J. Fu, S. Zhan, Chain of thought prompt tuning in vision language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07919 (2023).
- [86] W. Harvey, F. Wood, Visual chain-of-thought diffusion models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16187 (2023).
- [87] Y. Chen, K. Sikka, M. Cogswell, H. Ji, A. Divakaran, Measuring and improving chain-of-thought reasoning in vision-language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.04461 (2023).
- [88] L. Li, Cpseg: Finer-grained image semantic segmentation via chain-of-thought language prompting, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision, 2024, pp. 513–522.
- [89] X. Fu, B. Zhou, S. Chen, M. Yatskar, D. Roth, Dynamic clue bottlenecks: Towards interpretable-by-design visual question answering, arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14882 (2023).



- [90] G. Zheng, B. Yang, J. Tang, H.-Y. Zhou, S. Yang, Ddcot: Duty-distinct chain-of-thought prompting for multimodal reasoning in language models, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023) 5168–5191.
- [91] Z. Wang, J. Xiao, T. Chen, L. Chen, Decap: Towards generalized explicit caption editing via diffusion mechanism, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.14920* (2023).
- [92] W. Han, D. Guo, C.-Z. Xu, J. Shen, Dme-driver: Integrating human decision logic and 3d scene perception in autonomous driving, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03641* (2024).
- [93] S. Grover, V. Vineet, Y. S. Rawat, Navigating hallucinations for reasoning of unintentional activities, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19405* (2024).
- [94] Y. Ma, Y. Cao, J. Sun, M. Pavone, C. Xiao, Dolphins: Multimodal language model for driving, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00438* (2023).
- [95] Z. Xu, Y. Zhang, E. Xie, Z. Zhao, Y. Guo, K. K. Wong, Z. Li, H. Zhao, Drivegpt4: Interpretable end-to-end autonomous driving via large language model, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01412* (2023).
- [96] C. Han, J. C. Liang, Q. Wang, M. Rabbani, S. Dianat, R. Rao, Y. N. Wu, D. Liu, Image translation as diffusion visual programmers, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.09742* (2024).
- [97] F. Zhang, J. Liu, Q. Zhang, E. Sun, J. Xie, Z.-J. Zha, Ecenet: Explainable and context-enhanced network for multi-modal fact verification, in: *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2023, pp. 1231–1240.
- [98] A. K. Thakur, F. Ilievski, H.-Å. Sandlin, Z. Sourati, L. Luceri, R. Tommasini, A. Mer-moud, Multimodal and explainable internet meme classification, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.05612* (2022).
- [99] K. Uehara, N. Goswami, H. Wang, T. Baba, K. Tanaka, T. Hashimoto, K. Wang, R. Ito, T. Naoya, R. Umagami, et al., Advancing large multi-modal models with explicit chain-of-reasoning and visual question generation, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10005* (2024).
- [100] J. Yow, N. P. Garg, M. Ramanathan, W. T. Ang, et al., Extract–explainable trajectory corrections from language inputs using textual description of features, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03701* (2024).
- [101] J. Hu, J. Lin, S. Gong, W. Cai, Relax image-specific prompt requirement in sam: A single generic prompt for segmenting camouflaged objects, in: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, 2024, pp. 12511–12518.
- [102] H. Hwang, S. Kwon, Y. Kim, D. Kim, Is it safe to cross? interpretable risk assessment with gpt-4v for safety-aware street crossing, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06794* (2024).
- [103] K. P. Panousis, D. Ienco, D. Marcos, Hierarchical concept discovery models: A concept pyramid scheme, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02116* (2023).
- [104] J. Kil, F. Tavazoei, D. Kang, J.-K. Kim, Ii-mmr: Identifying and improving multi-modal multi-hop reasoning in visual question answering, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11058* (2024).
- [105] Y. Ando, N. J.-Y. Park, G. O. Chong, S. Ko, D. Lee, J. Cho, H. Han, Interpretable pap smear cell representation for cervical cancer screening, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10269* (2023).

- [106] X. Fu, B. Zhou, S. Chen, M. Yatskar, D. Roth, Interpretable by design visual question answering, arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14882 (2023).
- [107] H. Lin, Z. Luo, W. Gao, J. Ma, B. Wang, R. Yang, Towards explainable harmful meme detection through multimodal debate between large language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13298 (2024).
- [108] D. Mondal, S. Modi, S. Panda, R. Singh, G. S. Rao, Kam-cot: Knowledge augmented multimodal chain-of-thoughts reasoning, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12863 (2024).
- [109] T. Oikarinen, S. Das, L. Nguyen, L. Weng, Label-free concept bottleneck models, in: International Conference on Learning Representations, 2023.
- [110] Y. Yang, A. Panagopoulou, S. Zhou, D. Jin, C. Callison-Burch, M. Yatskar, Language in a bottle: Language model guided concept bottlenecks for interpretable image classification, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2023, pp. 19187–19197.
- [111] X. Chen, Y. Liu, Y. Yang, J. Yuan, Q. You, L.-P. Liu, H. Yang, Reason out your layout: Evoking the layout master from large language models for text-to-image synthesis, arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17126 (2023).
- [112] H. Li, C. Shen, P. Torr, V. Tresp, J. Gu, Self-discovering interpretable diffusion latent directions for responsible text-to-image generation, arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17216 (2023).
- [113] A. Yan, Y. Wang, Y. Zhong, C. Dong, Z. He, Y. Lu, W. Y. Wang, J. Shang, J. McAuley, Learning concise and descriptive attributes for visual recognition, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, 2023, pp. 3090–3100.
- [114] C. Kassab, M. Mattamala, L. Zhang, M. Fallon, Language-extended indoor slam (lexis): A versatile system for real-time visual scene understanding, arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15065 (2023).
- [115] L. Lian, B. Li, A. Yala, T. Darrell, Llm-grounded diffusion: Enhancing prompt understanding of text-to-image diffusion models with large language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13655 (2023).
- [116] M. Chiquier, U. Mall, C. Vondrick, Evolving interpretable visual classifiers with large language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.09941 (2024).
- [117] C. Lai, S. Song, S. Meng, J. Li, S. Yan, G. Hu, Towards more faithful natural language explanation using multi-level contrastive learning in vqa, in: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, volume 38, 2024, pp. 2849–2857.
- [118] L. Hu, S. Lai, W. Chen, H. Xiao, H. Lin, L. Yu, J. Zhang, D. Wang, Towards multi-dimensional explanation alignment for medical classification, in: The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, 2024.
- [119] Y. Wu, Y. Liu, Y. Yang, M. S. Yao, W. Yang, X. Shi, L. Yang, D. Li, Y. Liu, J. C. Gee, et al., A concept-based interpretable model for the diagnosis of choroid neoplasias using multimodal data, arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05606 (2024).
- [120] H. Zhu, R. Togo, T. Ogawa, M. Haseyama, Multimodal natural language explanation generation for visual question answering based on multiple reference data, *Electronics* 12 (2023) 2183.

- [121] T. Norrenbrock, M. Rudolph, B. Rosenhahn, Q-senn: Quantized self-explaining neural networks, in: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, volume 38, 2024, pp. 21482–21491.
- [122] J. Xu, C. Lan, W. Xie, X. Chen, Y. Lu, Retrieval-based video language model for efficient long video question answering, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04931 (2023).
- [123] M. Nie, R. Peng, C. Wang, X. Cai, J. Han, H. Xu, L. Zhang, Reason2drive: Towards interpretable and chain-based reasoning for autonomous driving, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03661 (2023).
- [124] A. Yan, Y. Wang, Y. Zhong, Z. He, P. Karypis, Z. Wang, C. Dong, A. Gentili, C.-N. Hsu, J. Shang, et al., Robust and interpretable medical image classifiers via concept bottleneck models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03182 (2023).
- [125] C. Patrício, L. F. Teixeira, J. C. Neves, Towards concept-based interpretability of skin lesion diagnosis using vision-language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.14339 (2023).
- [126] D. Banerjee, S. Teso, B. Sayin, A. Passerini, Learning to guide human decision makers with vision-language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16501 (2024).
- [127] P. Qi, Z. Yan, W. Hsu, M. L. Lee, Sniffer: Multimodal large language model for explainable out-of-context misinformation detection, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2024, pp. 13052–13062.
- [128] J. Qi, Z. Xu, Y. Shen, M. Liu, D. Jin, Q. Wang, L. Huang, The art of socratic questioning: Recursive thinking with large language models, in: Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, 2023, pp. 4177–4199.
- [129] K. P. Panousis, D. Ienco, D. Marcos, Sparse linear concept discovery models, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, 2023, pp. 2767–2771.
- [130] Q. Wan, R. Wang, X. Chen, Interpretable object recognition by semantic prototype analysis, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision, 2024, pp. 800–809.
- [131] B. Chen, Z. Xu, S. Kirmani, B. Ichter, D. Driess, P. Florence, D. Sadigh, L. Guibas, F. Xia, Spatialvlm: Endowing vision-language models with spatial reasoning capabilities, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12168 (2024).
- [132] U. Bhalla, A. Oesterling, S. Srinivas, F. P. Calmon, H. Lakkaraju, Interpreting clip with sparse linear concept embeddings (splice), arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10376 (2024).
- [133] M. Vandenhirtz, S. Laguna, R. Marcinkevičs, J. E. Vogt, Stochastic concept bottleneck models, in: The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, 2024.
- [134] Y. K. Kim, J. M. Di Martino, G. Sapiro, Vision transformers with natural language semantics, arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17863 (2024).
- [135] M. Moayeri, K. Rezaei, M. Sanjabi, S. Feizi, Text-to-concept (and back) via cross-model alignment, in: International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2023, pp. 25037–25060.

- [136] M. Liang, Y. Wu, et al., Toa: task-oriented active vqa, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [137] P. Natarajan, A. Nambiar, Vale: A multimodal visual and language explanation framework for image classifiers using explainable ai and language models, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.12808* (2024).
- [138] S. Wang, Q. Zhao, M. Q. Do, N. Agarwal, K. Lee, C. Sun, Vamos: Versatile action models for video understanding, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13627* (2023).
- [139] T. Meng, Y. Tao, R. Lyu, W. Yin, Few-shot image classification and segmentation as visual question answering using vision-language models, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10287* (2024).
- [140] D. Rose, V. Himakunthala, A. Ouyang, R. He, A. Mei, Y. Lu, M. Saxon, C. Sonar, D. Mirza, W. Y. Wang, Visual chain of thought: Bridging logical gaps with multimodal infillings, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02317* (2023).
- [141] H. Shao, S. Qian, H. Xiao, G. Song, Z. Zong, L. Wang, Y. Liu, H. Li, Visual cot: Unleashing chain-of-thought reasoning in multi-modal language models, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16999* (2024).
- [142] D. Srivastava, G. Yan, T.-W. Weng, Vlg-cbm: Training concept bottleneck models with vision-language guidance, in: *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- [143] P. Wu, Y. Mu, B. Wu, Y. Hou, J. Ma, S. Zhang, C. Liu, Voronav: Voronoi-based zero-shot object navigation with large language model, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02695* (2024).
- [144] Y. Bie, L. Luo, Z. Chen, H. Chen, Xcoop: Explainable prompt learning for computer-aided diagnosis via concept-guided context optimization, in: *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, Springer, 2024, pp. 773–783.
- [145] A. Arias-Duart, V. Gimenez-Abalos, U. Cortés, D. Garcia-Gasulla, Assessing biases through visual contexts, *Electronics* 12 (2023) 3066.
- [146] S. Balasubramanian, S. Basu, S. Feizi, Decomposing and interpreting image representations via text in vits beyond clip, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01583* (2024).
- [147] T. Oikarinen, T.-W. Weng, Clip-dissect: Automatic description of neuron representations in deep vision networks, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.10965* (2022).
- [148] R. Gandikota, J. Materzynska, T. Zhou, A. Torralba, D. Bau, Concept sliders: Lora adaptors for precise control in diffusion models, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12092* (2023).
- [149] K. Farid, S. Schrodi, M. Argus, T. Brox, Latent diffusion counterfactual explanations, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06668* (2023).
- [150] S. Blücher, J. Vielhaben, N. Strodthoff, Decoupling pixel flipping and occlusion strategy for consistent xai benchmarks, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06654* (2024).
- [151] M. Augustin, V. Boreiko, F. Croce, M. Hein, Diffusion visual counterfactual explanations, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022) 364–377.

- [152] S. Jain, H. Lawrence, A. Moitra, A. Madry, Distilling model failures as directions in latent space, arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.14754 (2022).
- [153] A. Sun, P. Ma, Y. Yuan, S. Wang, Explain any concept: Segment anything meets concept-based explanation, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [154] N. Kalibhat, S. Bhardwaj, C. B. Bruss, H. Firooz, M. Sanjabi, S. Feizi, Identifying interpretable subspaces in image representations, in: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, 2023, pp. 15623–15638.
- [155] S. Kim, J. Oh, S. Lee, S. Yu, J. Do, T. Taghavi, Grounding counterfactual explanation of image classifiers to textual concept space, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 10942–10950.
- [156] Y. Wen, N. Jain, J. Kirchenbauer, M. Goldblum, J. Geiping, T. Goldstein, Hard prompts made easy: Gradient-based discrete optimization for prompt tuning and discovery, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [157] Y. Wang, S. Shen, B. Y. Lim, Reprompt: Automatic prompt editing to refine ai-generative art towards precise expressions, in: *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2023, pp. 1–29.
- [158] Y. Luo, R. An, B. Zou, Y. Tang, J. Liu, S. Zhang, Llm as dataset analyst: Subpopulation structure discovery with large language model, in: *European Conference on Computer Vision*, Springer, 2025, pp. 235–252.
- [159] M. Liu, Z. Zhong, J. Li, G. Franchi, S. Roy, E. Ricci, Organizing unstructured image collections using natural language, arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.05217 (2024).
- [160] Y. Hu, B. Liu, J. Kasai, Y. Wang, M. Ostendorf, R. Krishna, N. A. Smith, Tifa: Accurate and interpretable text-to-image faithfulness evaluation with question answering, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 20406–20417.
- [161] M. Ku, D. Jiang, C. Wei, X. Yue, W. Chen, Viescore: Towards explainable metrics for conditional image synthesis evaluation, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14867 (2023).
- [162] J. Luo, Z. Wang, C. H. Wu, D. Huang, F. De la Torre, Zero-shot model diagnosis, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 11631–11640.
- [163] T. R. Shaham, S. Schwettmann, F. Wang, A. Rajaram, E. Hernandez, J. Andreas, A. Torralba, A multimodal automated interpretability agent, in: *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [164] A. Chegini, S. Feizi, Identifying and mitigating model failures through few-shot clip-aided diffusion generation, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05464 (2023).
- [165] J. Gao, Q. Wu, A. Blair, M. Pagnucco, Lora: A logical reasoning augmented dataset for visual question answering, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [166] P. Knab, S. Marton, C. Bartelt, Dseg-lime—improving image explanation by hierarchical data-driven segmentation, arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07733 (2024).

- [167] M. Dombrowski, H. Reynaud, J. P. Müller, M. Baugh, B. Kainz, Trade-offs in fine-tuned diffusion models between accuracy and interpretability, in: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, volume 38, 2024, pp. 21037–21045.
- [168] J. Echterhoff, A. Yan, K. Han, A. Abdelraouf, R. Gupta, J. McAuley, Driving through the concept gridlock: Unraveling explainability bottlenecks in automated driving, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision, 2024, pp. 7346–7355.
- [169] N. Kumar, A. C. Berg, P. N. Belhumeur, S. K. Nayar, Attribute and simile classifiers for face verification, in: 2009 IEEE 12th International Conference on Computer Vision, IEEE, 2009, pp. 365–372.
- [170] C. H. Lampert, H. Nickisch, S. Harmeling, Learning to detect unseen object classes by between-class attribute transfer, in: 2009 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, IEEE, 2009, pp. 951–958.
- [171] P. W. Koh, T. Nguyen, Y. S. Tang, S. Mussmann, E. Pierson, B. Kim, P. Liang, Concept bottleneck models, in: International Conference on Machine Learning, 2020, pp. 5338–5348.
- [172] M. Losch, M. Fritz, B. Schiele, Interpretability beyond classification output: Semantic bottleneck networks, arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.10882 (2019).
- [173] P. Chalasani, J. Chen, A. R. Chowdhury, X. Wu, S. Jha, Concise explanations of neural networks using adversarial training, in: International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2020, pp. 1383–1391.
- [174] E. H. Shortliffe, B. G. Buchanan, A model of inexact reasoning in medicine, *Mathematical biosciences* 23 (1975) 351–379.
- [175] M. Van Lent, W. Fisher, M. Mancuso, An explainable artificial intelligence system for small-unit tactical behavior, in: Proceedings of the national conference on artificial intelligence, Menlo Park, CA; Cambridge, MA; London; AAAI Press; MIT Press; 1999, 2004, pp. 900–907.
- [176] D. H. Park, L. A. Hendricks, Z. Akata, A. Rohrbach, B. Schiele, T. Darrell, M. Rohrbach, Multimodal explanations: Justifying decisions and pointing to the evidence, in: Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2018, pp. 8779–8788.
- [177] T. T. H. Nguyen, T. Clement, P. T. L. Nguyen, N. Kemmerzell, V. B. Truong, V. T. K. Nguyen, M. Abdelaal, H. Cao, Langxai: Integrating large vision models for generating textual explanations to enhance explainability in visual perception tasks, arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12525 (2024).
- [178] K. Papineni, S. Roukos, T. Ward, W.-J. Zhu, Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation, in: Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 2002, pp. 311–318.
- [179] C.-Y. Lin, Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries, in: Text summarization branches out, 2004, pp. 74–81.

- [180] J. Kim, A. Rohrbach, T. Darrell, J. Canny, Z. Akata, Textual explanations for self-driving vehicles, in: *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 563–578.
- [181] J. Wei, X. Wang, D. Schuurmans, M. Bosma, F. Xia, E. Chi, Q. V. Le, D. Zhou, et al., Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022) 24824–24837.
- [182] J. Snell, K. Swersky, R. Zemel, Prototypical networks for few-shot learning, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30 (2017).
- [183] C. Chen, O. Li, D. Tao, A. Barnett, C. Rudin, J. K. Su, This looks like that: deep learning for interpretable image recognition, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32 (2019).
- [184] M. Nauta, R. Van Bree, C. Seifert, Neural prototype trees for interpretable fine-grained image recognition, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 14933–14943.
- [185] M. Xue, Q. Huang, H. Zhang, L. Cheng, J. Song, M. Wu, M. Song, Protopformer: Concentrating on prototypical parts in vision transformers for interpretable image recognition, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.10431* (2022).
- [186] M. Oquab, T. Darcet, T. Moutakanni, H. Vo, M. Szafraniec, V. Khalidov, P. Fernandez, D. Haziza, F. Massa, A. El-Nouby, et al., Dinov2: Learning robust visual features without supervision, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07193* (2023).
- [187] C. Wah, S. Branson, P. Welinder, P. Perona, S. Belongie, The caltech-ucsd birds-200-2011 dataset (2011).
- [188] Y. Zhang, F. Xu, J. Zou, O. L. Petrosian, K. V. Krinkin, Xai evaluation: evaluating black-box model explanations for prediction, in: *2021 II International Conference on Neural Networks and Neurotechnologies (NeuroNT)*, IEEE, 2021, pp. 13–16.
- [189] Y. Goyal, Z. Wu, J. Ernst, D. Batra, D. Parikh, S. Lee, Counterfactual visual explanations, in: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, 2019, pp. 2376–2384.
- [190] J. Peters, D. Janzing, B. Schölkopf, *Elements of Causal Inference: Foundations and Learning Algorithms*, The MIT Press, 2017.
- [191] J. Pearl, *Causal inference in statistics: An overview* (2009).
- [192] J. Woodward, *Making things happen: A theory of causal explanation*, Oxford university press, 2005.
- [193] M. Pawelczyk, K. Broelemann, G. Kasneci, Learning model-agnostic counterfactual explanations for tabular data, in: *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2020*, 2020, pp. 3126–3132.
- [194] T. D. Duong, Q. Li, G. Xu, Ceflow: A robust and efficient counterfactual explanation framework for tabular data using normalizing flows, in: *Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, Springer, 2023, pp. 133–144.
- [195] X. Zhao, K. Broelemann, G. Kasneci, Counterfactual explanation via search in gaussian mixture distributed latent space, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13390* (2023).

- [196] F. Yang, N. Liu, M. Du, X. Hu, Generative counterfactuals for neural networks via attribute-informed perturbation, *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter* 23 (2021) 59–68.
- [197] C.-H. Lee, Z. Liu, L. Wu, P. Luo, Maskgan: Towards diverse and interactive facial image manipulation, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 5549–5558.
- [198] M. Heusel, H. Ramsauer, T. Unterthiner, B. Nessler, S. Hochreiter, Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30 (2017).
- [199] R. Zhang, P. Isola, A. A. Efros, E. Shechtman, O. Wang, The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 586–595.
- [200] C. Szegedy, Intriguing properties of neural networks, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6199* (2013).
- [201] K. Xiao, L. Engstrom, A. Ilyas, A. Madry, Noise or signal: The role of image backgrounds in object recognition, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09994* (2020).
- [202] G. Franchi, X. Yu, A. Bursuc, A. Tena, R. Kazmierczak, S. Dubuisson, E. Aldea, D. Filiat, Muad: Multiple uncertainties for autonomous driving, a benchmark for multiple uncertainty types and tasks, in: *33rd British Machine Vision Conference*, 2022.
- [203] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, G. E. Hinton, Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 25 (2012).
- [204] M. Zeiler, Visualizing and understanding convolutional networks, in: *European conference on computer vision/arXiv*, volume 1311, 2014.
- [205] C. Olah, A. Mordvintsev, L. Schubert, Feature visualization, *Distill* 2 (2017) e7.
- [206] Q. V. Liao, Y. Zhang, R. Luss, F. Doshi-Velez, A. Dhurandhar, Connecting algorithmic research and usage contexts: a perspective of contextualized evaluation for explainable ai, in: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing*, volume 10, 2022, pp. 147–159.
- [207] P. Q. Le, M. Nauta, V. B. Nguyen, S. Pathak, J. Schlotterer, C. Seifert, Benchmarking explainable ai: a survey on available toolkits and open challenges, in: *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2023.
- [208] T. Fel, D. Vigouroux, R. Cadène, T. Serre, How good is your explanation? algorithmic stability measures to assess the quality of explanations for deep neural networks, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2022, pp. 720–730.
- [209] S. Ali, T. Abuhmed, S. El-Sappagh, K. Muhammad, J. M. Alonso-Moral, R. Confalonieri, R. Guidotti, J. Del Ser, N. Díaz-Rodríguez, F. Herrera, Explainable artificial intelligence (xai): What we know and what is left to attain trustworthy artificial intelligence, *Information Fusion* 99 (2023) 101805.
- [210] R. Guidotti, A. Monreale, S. Ruggieri, F. Turini, F. Giannotti, D. Pedreschi, A survey of methods for explaining black box models, *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 51 (2018) 1–42.



- [211] N. Burkart, M. F. Huber, A survey on the explainability of supervised machine learning, *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 70 (2021) 245–317.
- [212] F. Doshi-Velez, B. Kim, Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning, arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608 (2017).
- [213] J. Zhou, A. H. Gandomi, F. Chen, A. Holzinger, Evaluating the quality of machine learning explanations: A survey on methods and metrics, *Electronics* 10 (2021) 593.
- [214] R. Confalonieri, L. Coba, B. Wagner, T. R. Besold, A historical perspective of explainable artificial intelligence, *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 11 (2021) e1391.
- [215] A. F. Markus, J. A. Kors, P. R. Rijnbeek, The role of explainability in creating trustworthy artificial intelligence for health care: a comprehensive survey of the terminology, design choices, and evaluation strategies, *Journal of biomedical informatics* 113 (2021) 103655.
- [216] V. Belle, I. Papantonis, Principles and practice of explainable machine learning, *Frontiers in big Data* 4 (2021) 688969.
- [217] G. Vilone, L. Longo, Explainable artificial intelligence: a systematic review, arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.00093 (2020).
- [218] T. Rojat, R. Puget, D. Filliat, J. Del Ser, R. Gelin, N. Díaz-Rodríguez, Explainable artificial intelligence (XAI) on timeseries data: A survey, arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.00950 (2021).
- [219] V. Beaudouin, I. Bloch, D. Bounie, S. Cléménçon, F. d’Alché Buc, J. Eagan, W. Maxwell, P. Mozharovskiy, J. Parekh, Flexible and context-specific ai explainability: a multidisciplinary approach, arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.07703 (2020).
- [220] A. Bennetot, G. Franchi, J. Del Ser, R. Chatila, N. Diaz-Rodriguez, Greybox XAI: A neural-symbolic learning framework to produce interpretable predictions for image classification, *Knowledge-Based Systems* 258 (2022) 109947.
- [221] A. Hedström, L. Weber, D. Krakowczyk, D. Bareeva, F. Motzkus, W. Samek, S. Lapuschkin, M. M. M. Höhne, Quantus: An explainable ai toolkit for responsible evaluation of neural network explanations and beyond, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24 (2023) 1–11. URL: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v24/22-0142.html>.
- [222] T. Fel, L. Hervier, D. Vigouroux, A. Poche, J. Plakoo, R. Cadene, M. Chalvidal, J. Colin, T. Boissin, L. Bethune, A. Picard, C. Nicodeme, L. Gardes, G. Flandin, T. Serre, Xplique: A deep learning explainability toolbox, *Workshop on Explainable Artificial Intelligence for Computer Vision (CVPR)* (2022).
- [223] C.-K. Yeh, C.-Y. Hsieh, A. Suggala, D. I. Inouye, P. K. Ravikumar, On the (in) fidelity and sensitivity of explanations, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32 (2019).
- [224] R. Vedantam, C. Lawrence Zitnick, D. Parikh, Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2015, pp. 4566–4575.
- [225] M. Sundararajan, A. Taly, Q. Yan, Axiomatic attribution for deep networks, in: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, 2017, pp. 3319–3328.

- [226] U. Bhatt, A. Weller, J. M. Moura, Evaluating and aggregating feature-based model explanations, arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00631 (2020).
- [227] S. Dasgupta, N. Frost, M. Moshkovitz, Framework for evaluating faithfulness of local explanations, in: International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2022, pp. 4794–4815.
- [228] G. Montavon, W. Samek, K.-R. Müller, Methods for interpreting and understanding deep neural networks, Digital signal processing 73 (2018) 1–15.
- [229] J. Cho, Y. Hu, J. M. Baldridge, R. Garg, P. Anderson, R. Krishna, M. Bansal, J. Pont-Tuset, S. Wang, Davidsonian scene graph: Improving reliability in fine-grained evaluation for text-to-image generation, in: The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, 2024.
- [230] A.-p. Nguyen, M. R. Martínez, On quantitative aspects of model interpretability, arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.07584 (2020).
- [231] A. Hedström, L. Weber, S. Lapuschkin, M. Höhne, Sanity checks revisited: An exploration to repair the model parameter randomisation test, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06465 (2024).
- [232] D. Alvarez Melis, T. Jaakkola, Towards robust interpretability with self-explaining neural networks, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31 (2018).
- [233] P.-J. Kindermans, S. Hooker, J. Adebayo, M. Alber, K. T. Schütt, S. Dähne, D. Erhan, B. Kim, The (un) reliability of saliency methods, Explainable AI: Interpreting, explaining and visualizing deep learning (2019) 267–280.
- [234] L. Rieger, L. K. Hansen, Irof: a low resource evaluation metric for explanation methods, arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.08747 (2020).
- [235] S. Banerjee, A. Lavie, Meteor: An automatic metric for mt evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments, in: Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization, 2005, pp. 65–72.
- [236] V. Arya, R. K. Bellamy, P.-Y. Chen, A. Dhurandhar, M. Hind, S. C. Hoffman, S. Houde, Q. V. Liao, R. Luss, A. Mojsilović, et al., One explanation does not fit all: A toolkit and taxonomy of ai explainability techniques, arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.03012 (2019).
- [237] J. Adebayo, J. Gilmer, M. Muelly, I. Goodfellow, M. Hardt, B. Kim, Sanity checks for saliency maps, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31 (2018).
- [238] R. Kazmierczak, S. Azzolin, E. Berthier, A. Hedström, P. Delhomme, N. Bousquet, G. Frehse, M. Mancini, B. Caramiaux, A. Passerini, et al., Benchmarking xai explanations with human-aligned evaluations, arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.02470 (2024).
- [239] S. Bach, A. Binder, G. Montavon, F. Klauschen, K.-R. Müller, W. Samek, On pixel-wise explanations for non-linear classifier decisions by layer-wise relevance propagation, PloS one 10 (2015) e0130140.
- [240] L. Sixt, M. Granz, T. Landgraf, When explanations lie: Why many modified bp attributions fail, in: International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2020, pp. 9046–9057.

- [241] W. Samek, A. Binder, G. Montavon, S. Lapuschkin, K.-R. Müller, Evaluating the visualization of what a deep neural network has learned, *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 28 (2016) 2660–2673.
- [242] C. Agarwal, N. Johnson, M. Pawelczyk, S. Krishna, E. Saxena, M. Zitnik, H. Lakkaraju, Rethinking stability for attribution-based explanations, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.06877* (2022).
- [243] Y. Rong, T. Leemann, V. Borisov, G. Kasneci, E. Kasneci, A consistent and efficient evaluation strategy for attribution methods, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.00449* (2022).
- [244] M. Ancona, E. Ceolini, C. Öztireli, M. Gross, Towards better understanding of gradient-based attribution methods for deep neural networks, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.06104* (2017).
- [245] M. Yarom, Y. Bitton, S. Changpinyo, R. Aharoni, J. Herzig, O. Lang, E. Ofek, I. Szpektor, What you see is what you read? improving text-image alignment evaluation, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [246] P. Anderson, B. Fernando, M. Johnson, S. Gould, Spice: Semantic propositional image caption evaluation, in: *Computer Vision–ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11-14, 2016, Proceedings, Part V 14*, Springer, 2016, pp. 382–398.
- [247] Z. Lin, X. Chen, D. Pathak, P. Zhang, D. Ramanan, Revisiting the role of language priors in vision-language models, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01879* (2023).
- [248] J. Cho, A. Zala, M. Bansal, Visual programming for step-by-step text-to-image generation and evaluation, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [249] H. Yang, J. Gee, J. Shi, Brain decodes deep nets, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.01280* (2023).
- [250] X. Zhu, P. Sun, C. Wang, J. Liu, Z. Li, Y. Xiao, J. Huang, A contrastive compositional benchmark for text-to-image synthesis: A study with unified text-to-image fidelity metrics, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02338* (2023).
- [251] G. Opiełka, J. Loke, S. Scholte, Saliency suppressed, semantics surfaced: Visual transformations in neural networks and the brain, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.18772* (2024).
- [252] D. S. Martinez Pandiani, N. Lazzari, M. v. Erp, V. Presutti, Hypericons for interpretability: decoding abstract concepts in visual data, *International Journal of Digital Humanities* 5 (2023) 451–490.
- [253] A. Ghiasi, H. Kazemi, E. Borgia, S. Reich, M. Shu, M. Goldblum, A. G. Wilson, T. Goldstein, What do vision transformers learn? a visual exploration, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.06727* (2022).
- [254] K. Ahrabian, Z. Sourati, K. Sun, J. Zhang, Y. Jiang, F. Morstatter, J. Pujara, The curious case of nonverbal abstract reasoning with multi-modal large language models, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12117* (2024).
- [255] R. Zhang, D. Jiang, Y. Zhang, H. Lin, Z. Guo, P. Qiu, A. Zhou, P. Lu, K.-W. Chang, P. Gao, et al., Mathverse: Does your multi-modal llm truly see the diagrams in visual math problems?, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14624* (2024).

- [256] X. He, Q. Zhang, A. Jin, Y. Yuan, S.-M. Yiu, et al., Tubench: Benchmarking large vision-language models on trustworthiness with unanswerable questions, arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04107 (2024).
- [257] B. Giledereli, Y. Hou, Y. Tu, M. Sachan, Do vision-language models really understand visual language?, arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.00193 (2024).
- [258] Y. Jiang, Z. Li, X. Shen, Y. Liu, M. Backes, Y. Zhang, Modscan: Measuring stereotypical bias in large vision-language models from vision and language modalities, arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.06967 (2024).
- [259] Q. Gao, Y. Li, H. Lyu, H. Sun, D. Luo, H. Deng, Vision language models see what you want but not what you see, arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.00324 (2024).
- [260] M. Zhang, B. Colman, A. Shahriyari, G. Bharaj, et al., Common-sense bias discovery and mitigation for classification tasks, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13213 (2024).
- [261] M. Moayeri, W. Wang, S. Singla, S. Feizi, Spuriousity rankings: Sorting data to measure and mitigate biases, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [262] H. Chefer, S. Gur, L. Wolf, Generic attention-model explainability for interpreting bi-modal and encoder-decoder transformers, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, 2021*, pp. 397–406.
- [263] Y. Wang, T. G. Rudner, A. G. Wilson, Visual explanations of image-text representations via multi-modal information bottleneck attribution, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [264] J.-H. Park, Y.-J. Ju, S.-W. Lee, Explaining generative diffusion models via visual analysis for interpretable decision-making process, *Expert Systems with Applications* 248 (2024) 123231.
- [265] Y. Li, H. Wang, Y. Duan, X. Li, Clip surgery for better explainability with enhancement in open-vocabulary tasks, arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05653 (2023).
- [266] P. Chen, Q. Li, S. Biaz, T. Bui, A. Nguyen, gscorecam: What objects is clip looking at?, in: *Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Computer Vision, 2022*, pp. 1959–1975.
- [267] Y. Li, H. Wang, Y. Duan, H. Xu, X. Li, Exploring visual interpretability for contrastive language-image pre-training, arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.07046 (2022).
- [268] S. Arya, S. Rao, M. Boehle, B. Schiele, B-cosification: Transforming deep neural networks to be inherently interpretable, in: *38th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, 2024*.
- [269] S. Dewan, R. Zawar, P. Saxena, Y. Chang, A. Luo, Y. Bisk, Diffusionpid: Interpreting diffusion via partial information decomposition, arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05191 (2024).
- [270] W. Boussetham, A. Boggust, S. Chaybouti, H. Strobelt, H. Kuehne, Legrad: An explainability method for vision transformers via feature formation sensitivity, arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03214 (2024).
- [271] M. Böhle, M. Fritz, B. Schiele, B-cos networks: Alignment is all we need for interpretability, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2022*, pp. 10329–10338.