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ABSTRACT

Many existing methods of counterfactual explanations ignore the intrinsic relationships between data attributes and thus fail to generate realistic counterfactuals. Moreover, the existing methods that account for relationships between data attributes require domain knowledge, which limits their applicability in complex real-world applications. In this paper, we propose a novel approach to realistic counterfactual explanations that preserve relationships between data attributes. The model directly learns the relationships by a variational auto-encoder without domain knowledge and then learns to disturb the latent space accordingly. We conduct extensive experiments on both synthetic and real-world datasets. The results demonstrate that the proposed method learns relationships from the data and preserves these relationships in generated counterfactuals.
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1 Introduction

In the light of widespread of deep learning models in various fields, including medical and engineering applications, the explainability of these models has become crucial [Strumbelj and Kononenko, 2014, Datta et al., 2016]. There are two directions of approaches that focus on providing explanations of the made decision, one focuses on local explanations such as local classification boundary (e.g. LIME [Ribeiro et al., 2016]), the other one focuses on a specific sample (e.g. SHAP [Lundberg and Lee, 2017]). Both approaches assign each predictor an importance value for a particular prediction. For example, if a bank loan was rejected for a specific client, then the bank can employ the SHAP values to explain the reasons behind this decision. Although these approaches are useful in helping to uncover mysterious machine learning models that are often treated as black boxes, there are a number of applications where information about feature importance is not sufficient and counterfactual explanations are more favorable. Going back to the example of credit predication: a client whose loan application is rejected, would like to know how can he improve his chances in getting his application approved next time, rather than just being presented with the importance of each factor in his application i.e. explaining why the loan was rejected rather than providing a recommendation on what exactly needs to be done to reach a positive decision next time. In other words, the method of counterfactual explanations focuses on answering the question - How could I get the desired target, given that I am in the current situation with respect to the used decision model?

Counterfactual explanations are extremely important in decision making, as they provide with suggestions on how an input vector (clients characteristics) has to be changed in obtaining a different output i.e. getting the loan application accepted. In a recent review on methods for counterfactual explanations [Verma et al., 2020], the nearest counterfactual explanation was identified as one of the most popular methods in generating counterfactuals. The method provides a nearest explanation with a desired output [Wachter et al., 2018] by optimising:

\[
\arg\min_{x^{CF}} \lambda(f(x^{CF}) - y^{CF})^2 + d(x, x^{CF}),
\]

(1)
where $x$ is the sample, $x^{CF}$ is the generated counterfactual, $y^{CF}$ is the target label for counterfactual and $\lambda$ is a scale factor that controls a trade-off of accuracy and closeness. Some other constraints such as sparsity and feasibility can be added to generate more favorable explanations. However, recent research raises concerns about feasibility in counterfactual explanations. In real-world applications, for example, in a medical application where we are giving suggestions to patients, we should consider that the blood pressure and blood mass index (BMI) are positively correlated. Therefore, we should not suggest decreasing blood pressure while increasing BMI. Though some methods assume that at least partial causal graph is available during training. While this indeed improves the quality of generated counterfactuals, it requires domain knowledge which is difficult to obtain, especially in areas such as biology or medicine. Practically, only labeled data is available. This practical limitation motivates us to search for methods of causal inference in order to infer the inner relationships between observed variables.

In this paper, we propose a counterfactual explanation method that assumes no prior knowledge on relationships between the variables in an application domain. To learn the relationships between data attributes, our method first trains a variational auto-encoder (VAE) that is based on DAG-GNN. Then, the proposed method learns a modulation network that takes the query data points and corresponding target labels as inputs, and disturb the latent representations of query data points so that counterfactuals can be constructed by the disturbed latent representations. To make sure that the generated counterfactuals preserve the learned relationships, we use adversarial training to match the counterfactual latent distribution to the query data latent distribution. The proposed approach thus can provide a realistic and satisfactory recommendation by generating counterfactuals without any prior domain knowledge.

The main contributions of this work are as follows:

- We propose a novel model that considers relationships between attributes and gives realistic counterfactual explanations of machine learning model.
- The model does not need any prior domain knowledge on predictors' correlation and is thus more flexible and useful in complex real-world settings where prior knowledge is difficult to obtain.
- The extensive experiments on both synthetic and real-world datasets demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed model.

## 2 Background and Related Work

### Causal relationships.
Causal relationships are usually represented by directed acyclic graph (DAG) $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, with $\mathcal{V}$ representing the nodes consisting of attributes $\{v_1, ..., v_L\}$, and $\mathcal{E}$ denoting the directed edges corresponding to causal relationships. The causal relationships between variables can be represented by structural causal model (SCM) $\text{Peters et al.}[2017]$:

$$v_j = f_j(P_j, \epsilon_j) \quad j = 1, ..., L,$$

where $P_j$ denotes parents of $v_j$ (the nodes that point to node $v_j$) and $\epsilon_j$ is its corresponding exogenous variable. The problem has been extensively studied over the past decades $\text{Spirtes et al.}[2000], \text{Mooij et al.}[2016], \text{Glymour et al.}[2019], \text{Zhu et al.}[2020]$. In this paper, our proposed method builds on an extension of VAE and implements DAG-GNN in accordance to $\text{Yu et al.}[2019]$. The method learns a DAG from data which represents the relationships between data attributes. Note that in this paper, we consider undirected relationships. The reason is because as we are seeking feasible counterfactuals in real-world applications, it is impossible to intervene a variable independent to its causes $\text{Mahajan et al.}[2019]$.

### Variational auto-encoder.
VAE proposed by $\text{Kingma and Welling}[2014]$ is a Bayesian neural network that learns to represent an observation $x$ as a latent variable $z$. The model aims at maximizing the likelihood $\log p(x)$. While the actual posterior $p(x|z)$ is intractable, VAE uses variational posterior $q(z|x)$ to approximate it. The training objective can be constructed by the Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO):

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; x, z) = \mathbb{E}_{q(z|x)} \left[ \log p(x|z) \right] - D_{KL}(q(\phi(z|x))||p(z))$$

where $\theta$ and $\phi$ are neural network parameters. In this paper, we build a generative model based on VAE, specifically built on DAG-GNN $\text{Yu et al.}[2019]$ then generate counterfactuals through the decoder by disturbing the latent representations.
**Counterfactual explanation in machine learning.** Counterfactual explanation in machine learning has received increasing attention in research, especially for high-impact areas such as financial or healthcare [Verma et al. (2020)]. A number of methods have been proposed to give an optimal solution to the problem of generating counterfactuals [Albini et al. (2020), Kommiya Mothilal et al. (2021), Parmentier and Vidal (2021), Wachter et al. (2018)] proposes to generate counterfactuals to explain models by solving the optimization problem formulated by Equation 1. Several extensions [Dandl et al. (2020), Mothilal et al. (2020), Grath et al. (2018)] have been proposed based on this criterion. Concerns about feasibility, actionability and sparsity in counterfactual explanations have been raised [Mahajan et al. (2019), Karimi et al. (2020), Keane and Smyth (2020)]. A counterfactual explanation is said to be feasible when it captures the relationships between attributes. Actionability aims at providing practical counterfactual and depends on the affordability of individuals on implementing the counterfactual [Ferrario and Loi (2020)]. For example, increasing the age for 20 years is expensive and meaningless for a person in real world. Sparsity applies when shorter explanations are more comprehensible to humans [Verma et al. (2020)], where ideally, the counterfactual changes only a small number of attributes. In this paper, we focus on generating feasible counterfactual. A similar task was investigated by [Albini et al. (2020)], that generated counterfactual explanations for a range of Bayesian network classifiers. While the method does focus on explanations built from relations of influence between variables, it is specifically designed for Bayesian network. On contrary, our method, in theory, can be used for any classifier that allows gradient back propagation. Another method proposed by [Mahajan et al. (2019)] requires expert knowledge. Instead our method can automatically learn the intrinsic relationships between attributes and unlike [Karimi et al. (2020), Karimi et al. (2020), Downs et al. (2020)], the proposed method does not rely on prior knowledge.

### 3 Method

As described in previous sections, the major issue of generating feasible counterfactual is that it is difficult to determine the intrinsic relationships of data due to the complex real-world environment. Prior methods [Mahajan et al. (2019), Karimi et al. (2020), Karimi et al. (2020), Downs et al. (2020)] have assumed full or at least some knowledge about the relationships, evidently this assumption is not always practical. A potential method is to use the causal inference methods such as [Mooij et al. (2016), Zhu et al. (2020)] to determine the directions and then use models to learn the relationships, which is similar to Karimi et al. (2020). However, it requires a number of models to learn relationships among all pairs of related data attributes separately, which is computationally expensive. Therefore, end-to-end model that can directly learn all the relationships is preferred.

We introduce the proposed approach to address the issue. Figure 1 presents an overview of our method. To learn the relationships, we employ DAG-GNN [Yu et al. (2019)] which is designed to learn the directed relationships between the data attributes. This model captures intrinsic relationships between the attributes i.e. the DAG with attributes as nodes. The adjacency matrix helps the model preserve the relationships and the VAE architecture makes it possible to generate counterfactuals. One may argue that conditional VAE [Sohn et al. (2015)] can also provide in-distribution counterfactuals. However, we argue that in-distribution does not directly imply correct relationship. Figure 2 demonstrates an example, where the yellow counterfactual is in-distribution but not a favorable feasible counterfactual. The DAG-GNN is firstly trained to learn the relationships between attributes and how it can reconstruct the samples from latent space. Then the counterfactuals are generated by disturbing the obtained latent space. To match the disturbed latent distribution to the
true latent distribution, we borrow the adversarial idea from adversarial auto-encoder (AAE) Makhzani et al. [2015] and use adversarial training. In the following sections, a rough introduction of DAG-GNN [Yu et al., 2019] is given. Then we introduce details on how the latent space can be perturbed by our proposed approach.

3.1 Stage 1: Base VAE Pretrain

VAE serves as the core model for generating counterfactuals. We first pretrain VAE that reconstructs a given sample that in turn will allow us to perturb the latent space representation in a way that the trained decoder produces a feasible counterfactual. We follow the construction process of DAG-GNN [Yu et al., 2019]. In this section, we provide only a brief descriptions of DAG-GNN, for more details, please refer to [Yu et al., 2019].

Typically, a sample $x$ is a vector where every attribute is represented by one dimension. The representation can be generalized to $m$ dimensions. Denote $V \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times m}$ to represent a sample with $L$ attributes and each attribute has $m$ dimensions. DAG-GNN considers the relationships between attributes by a structural equation model (SEM) of the form:

$$V = A^T V + Z,$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times L}$ denotes the adjacency matrix of directed relationships between nodes and $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times m}$ denotes the exogenous variables. Then the equation can be represented as $V = (I - A^T)^{-1}Z$. The decoder’s architecture can then be designed in a more general form by taking non-linear transformations:

$$V = f_{\text{caus}}^2((I - A^T)^{-1}f_{\text{caus}}^1(Z)),$$

where $f_{\text{caus}}^1$ and $f_{\text{caus}}^2$ are two parameterized functions that we choose to represent by a multilayer perceptron (MLP). Similarly, the encoder is constructed as:

$$Z = f_{\text{caus}}^4((I - A^T)f_{\text{caus}}^3(V)),$$

where $f_{\text{caus}}^3$ and $f_{\text{caus}}^4$ can be considered as inverses of $f_{\text{caus}}^2$ and $f_{\text{caus}}^1$. Note that as we perform non-linear transformations and $Z$ is treated as latent variables, the choice of hidden dimension $d$ of $Z$ is arbitrary and so $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$.

Following the VAE construction procedure, the evidence lower bound (ELBO) is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{ELBO}} = -\text{KL}(q(Z|V)||p(Z)) + E_q(Z|V)\left[ \log p(V|Z) \right]$$

Specifically, the method takes $f_{\text{caus}}^1$ as identity mapping, $f_{\text{caus}}^2$ as an MLP, and $f_{\text{caus}}^3$, $f_{\text{caus}}^4$ as an MLP and identity mapping, respectively. For simplicity, the prior is assumed to be the standard normal distribution. In addition to the ELBO loss, an acyclicity constraint is added to make $A$ acyclic:

$$\text{tr}[(I + \alpha A \circ A)^L] - L = 0$$

Then, after well training by using all the losses listed above, we obtain a VAE that is capable of reconstructing the given samples as well as detecting the relationships between the data attributes.

3.2 Stage 2: Latent Space Disturbance

To avoid notation cluttering, in this subsection, we assume all attributes of data only have one dimension and denote $z \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d}$ as the latent representation of a sample $x \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times L}$. Our objective here is to train an effective modulation network denoted by $f_{\text{mod}}(\cdot)$ that can make a desired disturbance on the latent space. The network takes both the
We conduct our method on both synthetic and real-world datasets to answer the following research questions:

- RQ1: How effective is our method in preserving the relationships when generating counterfactuals?
- RQ2: How can our method provide suggestions in a real-world machine learning application?

4 Experiments

We conduct our method on both synthetic and real-world datasets to answer the following research questions:

- RQ1: How effective is our method in preserving the relationships when generating counterfactuals?
- RQ2: How can our method provide suggestions in a real-world machine learning application?
### Table 1: Statistics of datasets. Splits mean the splits of train/val/test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>Synthetic-toy</th>
<th>Synthetic-nonlinear</th>
<th>Sangiovese</th>
<th>Diabetes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Samples</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>11570</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train/val/test Splits</td>
<td>8:1:1</td>
<td>8:1:1</td>
<td>8:1:1</td>
<td>Leave-out-one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.1 Experiment Settings

**Datasets.** We evaluate our approach on two synthetic datasets including a toy dataset and a complex nonlinear dataset, a publicly-available real-world simulated Bayesian network dataset Sangiovese, and a real-world diabetes dataset Pima-Indians-Diabetes. The statistics of the datasets are shown in Table 1.

**Compared methods.** We implement the example-based Plain-CF method that was proposed in Wachter et al. [2018]. Hinge loss and $L_2$ norm are used. Following Dandl et al. [2020], we further implement another version Plain-CF$_K$ by adding an extra constraint on the distances to $k$-nearest neighbours to Plain-CF. We compare our method to the CF-VAE proposed in Mahajan et al. [2019]. This is a base model that does not consider possible relationships between the predictors. To be consistent with the experiment setting in Mahajan et al. [2019] which manually label 10% of the counterfactuals, we compare the example-based V AE (EB-VAE) by manually labeling 10% of the counterfactuals and retrain the CF-VAE.

**Evaluation metrics.** The proposed approach is evaluated on the test set both quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative metrics are as follows:

- **Validity**: is the percentage of counterfactuals that successfully get the target prediction.
- **Constraint Feasibility Score $S$**: is the percentage of counterfactuals that preserve the relationships, which is used to evaluate the ability of the method in capturing specific constraints Mahajan et al. [2019], Downs et al. [2020]. For example, the constraint feasibility score is 90% if 90% of the counterfactuals have two positively related attributes both increase or both decrease. For two relationships, the score will be calculated by $2 \frac{S_1 S_2}{S_1 + S_2}$ where $S_1$ and $S_2$ are the scores for the two relationships separately.
- **Euclidean Distance**: measures the distance between counterfactuals and original samples. The displayed distance is normalized by the maximum distance between pairs of true samples. This metric measures how much the original data point is perturbed to obtain a corresponding counterfactual.
- **Mahalanobis Distance**: is another distance metric which accounts for covariance in the data. The distance between two points is defined as $D(x_1, x_2) = \sqrt{(x_1 - x_2)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x_1 - x_2)}$ where $\Sigma$ denotes the covariance matrix computed over the whole dataset and $x_1$ and $x_2$ are data samples.

It is worth noting that the distances as evaluation metrics might not accurately reflect the quality of generated counterfactuals. There are cases when in order to preserve the relationships between the attributes, a larger perturbation is required to obtain a counterfactual and hence resulting in larger distances. Figure 2 demonstrates an example of a dataset with attributes that exhibit a linear relationship, a generated counterfactual marked by yellow is closer in terms of Euclidean distance than the one marked by green, however such counterfactual does not account for correlation between the attributes, while the green counterfactual preserves the correlation. The Mahalanobis distance on the other hand would produce a smaller distance for the green counterfactual as it accounts for the data covariance. The qualitative evaluations include the visualization of selected pairs of attributes of instances and their corresponding counterfactuals, as well as t-SNE visualization of the complete attribute space. To more intuitively understand how counterfactuals work, we draw arrows from samples to their corresponding counterfactuals (same samples are chosen for all the methods on a dataset).

**Details on implementation.** The models employed as black-box classifiers are two-layer MLPs with ReLU as the activation function. We set the dimensions of the hidden layer to 32 for synthetic datasets and 16 for Sangiovese dataset. The test accuracy for the two synthetic datasets were nearly 98%, while for Sangiovese it was around 83%. We used the official Pytorch implementation of DAG-GNN, both the encoder and the decoder are with two layers with hidden size of 16 neurons, and the latent size of 4 neurons (we did not tune these two hyperparameters). Both the modulation network and the discriminator are two-layer MLPs with equal numbers of hidden units. For synthetic datasets, the modulation

---

network was trained for 100 epochs while for Sangiovese, it was trained for 80 epochs. Grid search was used to tune
the hyperparameters of the two networks where the hidden sizes were chosen from [32, 64], the learning rates were
chosen from [5e-4, 1e-3, 2e-3] and the batch sizes were chosen from [16, 32]. The choice of hyperparameters
did not significantly affect the validity that reached nearly 100%, and hence we chose the hyperparameters to maximise
constraint feasibility score. The hyperparameters $\alpha_1$, $\alpha_2$ and $\alpha_3$ were set to 0.5, 1, and 0.5, respectively. The codes are

### 4.2 Performances Comparison (RQ1)

#### Synthetic 5-variable Toy Dataset.
The purpose of the experiment is to evaluate the proposed method on a toy dataset with linear relationships between the attributes. The data is generated using the following structural equations and noise distributions:

\[
\begin{align*}
X_1 &= U_1 \\
X_2 &= U_2 \\
X_3 &= 2X_1 - X_2 + U_3 \\
X_4 &= -2X_3 + U_4 \\
X_5 &= \sin(X_3) + U_5
\end{align*}
\]

The dataset contains 20000 samples where it is split into training set, validation set and testing set randomly by ratio
of 8:1:1. The samples are labeled to 1 when $\sin(X_i) > 0.5$ for more than 2 variables (without added Gaussian
noise). For this synthetic data, we want to capture the relationships between $X_3$ and $X_4$. If $X_3$ decrease/increase, $X_4$
increase/decrease.

The results are shown in Table [2](#) (left). Nearly 100% of the generated counterfactuals by all methods under investigation
are valid. In terms of the constraint feasibility score, the proposed approach is among the best. Our method has the
smallest Euclidean distance. Figure [3](#) demonstrates that the counterfactuals generated by EB-VAE model tend to
cluster to a single point. Such counterfactuals, due to a lack of diversity, are hardly acceptable in practice. Besides,
by comparing the directions of the difference vectors between the original and the corresponding counterfactuals, it
is easy to see that the vectors of proposed method are more likely to indicate a similar relationship as the true linear
relationship existing in the data. Further, the counterfactuals generated by the proposed method exhibits a larger visual
overlap with the data distribution of the corresponding class. Figure [4](#) provides further intuition on the data distributions
projected by t-SNE to a two dimensional space. The counterfactuals and the samples of the corresponding class have
a significant overlap while preserving clear boundaries with the other class. These figures qualitatively support the
superiority of the proposed approach in generating realistic counterfactuals.

#### Synthetic 5-variable Non-linear Dataset.
This dataset includes more complex and non-linear relationships between variables. The SEM are as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
X_1 &= U_1 \\
X_2 &= X_1^2 + U_2 \\
X_3 &= \sin(-2X_1) + U_3 \\
X_4 &= U_4 \\
X_5 &= \frac{1}{e^{-1.5X_5}} + 2 + U_5
\end{align*}
\]

The dataset contains 20000 samples where we split it to training set, validation set and testing set randomly by rate
8:1:1. The samples are labeled to 1 when $\sin(X_i) > 0$ for all the 5 variables (without added Gaussian noise). This
data set includes two relationship constraints: (1) If absolute values of $X_1$ increase/decrease, $X_2$ increase/decrease, and
(2) if $X_4$ increase/decrease, $X_5$ increase/decrease.

### Table 2: Experimental results on synthetic data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Synthetic Toy</th>
<th>Synthetic Non-linear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid (%)</td>
<td>Const (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain-CF</td>
<td>97.25</td>
<td>51.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain-CF$_K$</td>
<td>99.45</td>
<td>58.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF-VAE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-VAE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>99.73</td>
<td>93.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Realistic Counterfactual Explanations

Figure 3: Visualization of related variables of the synthetic toy dataset. The arrows indicate the directions from true samples to counterfactuals. CF means the generated counterfactuals.

Figure 4: \(t\)-SNE visualization of synthetic toy dataset.

A summarized result can be seen in Table 2 (right). The results are similar to that of synthetic toy dataset. All the methods except the Plain-CF generate counterfactuals with almost 100% valid labels. Our method has the highest constraint feasibility score which indicates that our method best preserves the general relationships of attributes among all the methods. The distributions of the generated and the original samples are shown in Figure 3. Compared to other methods, the counterfactuals generated by our method has a larger intersection of the original sample distribution and the one produced by the counterfactuals. By comparing the arrows indicating the direction of the changes between the original samples and their corresponding counterfactuals, we observe that for the baseline methods, the samples tend to cluster into a small group and ignore the relationships, in particular for the pair \(X_4\) and \(X_5\). Our method, on the other hand, preserves the relationship. Having said that, all methods fail in capturing the non-linear relationships, however our method performs better than the compared methods.

**Simulated Bayesian Network Dataset.** Sangiovese is a conditional linear bayesian network analysing the quality of grapes. The dataset includes 10000 samples with 14 features and a categorical output for quality. We follow the data
Realistic Counterfactual Explanations
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Figure 5: The visualization related variables in synthetic non-linear dataset.

Table 3: Experimental results on Sangiovese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Valid (%)</th>
<th>Const (%)</th>
<th>Euclidean Dist</th>
<th>Mahalanobis Dist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain-CF</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30.52</td>
<td>0.2821</td>
<td>6.2232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain-CFk</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63.17</td>
<td>0.2665</td>
<td>5.0929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF-VAE</td>
<td>99.84</td>
<td>63.03</td>
<td>0.2169</td>
<td>4.7695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-VAE</td>
<td>99.97</td>
<td>67.19</td>
<td>0.1857</td>
<td>3.6738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>99.98</td>
<td>99.69</td>
<td>0.1961</td>
<td>1.9971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

splitting setting in [Mahajan et al. 2019]. We measure two monotonic relationships (1) between SproutN and BunchN where if SproutN increases/decreases, BunchN increases/decreases; (2) between SPAD06 and SPAD08, where the same trend hold.

The quantitative results are shown in Table 3. As previously, the methods achieve around near 100% validity. Similarly to previous analysis, our methods achieves a comparable Euclidean distance. However, in terms of the Mahalanobis distance, our method has outperformed other methods. Besides, the constraint feasibility score of our method is nearly 100%, which indicates that our method perfectly captures the correlations between variables. From the figure, we see that the counterfactuals from EB-VAE of both labels tend to group together while our method still keeps a clear
boundary between the two labels. To highlight, by comparing the example movements from samples to counterfactuals, we can observe that for our method, most of the movements are along with the slope of the relationships, which indicates that our method well captures the relationships between the two variables. The results show our method’s superior power in preserving the relationships between variables.

4.3 Results on Diabetes Dataset (RQ2)

**Dataset description.** The dataset collected by Smith et al. [1988] contains medical records for Pima Indians with and without diabetes. Overall, the dataset contains 768 records, out of which 268 are diabetic and 500 are not. The records that contained missing values were removed, resulting in 336 records. Each patient’s record consists of 8 attributes. We selected the following 7 of them: number of times pregnant, plasma glucose concentration at 2 hours in an oral glucose tolerance test, diastolic blood pressure, triceps skin fold thickness, 2-hour serum insulin, body mass index (BMI), and age. The target variable is the patients’ class i.e. diabetic or not.

Before proceeding to generating and testing counterfactuals, we first conducted a qualitative analysis of the dataset in order to compare the observed relationships to prior domain knowledge on diabetes. Diabetes is a disease that is caused by either pancreas not being able to produce enough insulin or by organism not being able to use the produced insulin. Figure 7 demonstrates pairwised correlations among the attributes, as can be seen most of the pairs exhibit positive correlation. In particular, there is a strong linear relationship between insulin and glucose and hence in order to change the label from positive to negative, both glucose and insulin should be decreased. Further, it is easy to observe that
besides having thinner skin, young people are less likely to be diabetic, and hence the counterfactuals that flip patients with diabetes to healthy might require to decrease the age. Given that decreasing age is infeasible, the changes that decrease the age are penalised. This prior expert knowledge is important in order to generate meaningful counterfactuals.

It is also known that blood pressure and BMI are positively correlated, which is also observed in the chart ($\rho = 0.27$). Interestingly, the number of pregnancies is correlated with blood pressure ($\rho = 0.3$), moreover women with a larger number of pregnancies are slightly more likely to have diabetes, which implies that the counterfactual might result in a decreased number of pregnancies in order to flip the predicted label from diabetic to healthy, such changes should also be penalised. Another interesting aspect that follows from figure 7 is that blood pressure does not well separate healthy cohort and patients with diabetes, and hence should not undergo a significant change in a counterfactual compared to the original sample.

We measure the constraint feasibility score by the pairs of blood pressure and BMI since from the domain knowledge we know that blood pressure and BMI are positively correlated ($\rho = 0.27$), and hence in a counterfactual, the blood pressure and BMI should both increase or decrease. Since the number of samples is small, we use leave-one-out
### Table 4: Results on Diabetes dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Valid (%)</th>
<th>Cont (%)</th>
<th>Euclidean Dist</th>
<th>Mahalanobis Dist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CF-VAE</td>
<td>97.70</td>
<td>58.16</td>
<td>0.1288</td>
<td>3.2385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-VAE</td>
<td>99.74</td>
<td>60.97</td>
<td>0.1337</td>
<td>3.3189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>99.74</td>
<td>88.44</td>
<td>0.1279</td>
<td>2.4042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Visualization of baseline and our method on diabetes dataset. Positive CF indicates the generated counterfactuals which are predicted to have diabetes while negative CF indicates counterfactuals which are predicted to be healthy.

algorithm, which takes one sample for testing the model while the rest of samples are used in training, this procedure is repeated over all samples, and an average accuracy is computed.

The quantitative evaluations are presented in Table 4. The validity for the methods are all nearly 100% and is not informative so we did not put them in the table. As it can be seen, around 74% of the counterfactuals satisfy the positive relationship between blood pressure and BMI. While the best baseline method attains about 60% counterfactuals that satisfy the relationship. The Mahalanobis distance of our method are significantly smaller than those of all the other baselines.

To qualitatively compare the methods, we plotted the counterfactuals on the blood pressure vs BMI (fig. 8). Since blood pressure and BMI are positively correlated, we expected the counterfactuals to maintain this linear relationship, and hence the changes in these attributes in the counterfactual sample compared to the corresponding original one, should be along the direction representing the correlation. While our method maintained the correlation, the generated counterfactuals for other baselines, did not preserve the correlation, qualitatively demonstrating the efficiency of our method in learning the internal relationships between the two attributes and generating proper counterfactuals. It should also be noted that the class label could flip due to a change in other patient’s characteristic while keeping blood pressure and BMI constant.
We further provide two examples of generated counterfactuals (Table 5) in order to demonstrate a use-case of our model being applied in consulting patients. In both examples, our model suggests to decrease glucose and insulin, following our domain knowledge that glucose directly contributes to diabetes. Besides, it can be observed that the blood pressure, and skin thickness do decrease, which matches our observations in Figure 7, as blood pressure and skin thickness seem to be associated with diabetes and correlated with each other ($\rho = 0.21$). Similarly, the decrease in both blood pressure and BMI, demonstrates that the model learns the correlation between the two attributes as well their associations with diabetes. Example 2 also illustrates a limitation of our method in terms of reduced age, which should not be possible. This happens, even though a constraint was added to penalise unacceptable changes. In particular, nearly a third of the counterfactuals are generated with a slightly decreased age. This is especially true for counterfactuals flipping diabetes to healthy. We see that in generating counterfactuals for healthy, about 88% of the counterfactuals chose to increase the age. However, for diabetic counterfactuals, almost all the counterfactuals resulted in decreased age. The model often generates such counterfactuals due to a strong correlation between age and the target value i.e. young people are less likely to have diabetes (fig. 7). Since the objective of this paper is to study the relationships between attributes, we will leave the unary (attribute that can only change in one direction) constraint for future work.

To summarize, our method successfully captures the relationship between attributes (specifically the blood pressure and BMI). The generated counterfactuals preserve the relations that exist in the data and can be a good reference to suggest a patient what needs to be changed to become healthy. While we found age and pregnancies sometimes decrease, we will leave it to future work and constrain the predictors so that such attribute should either stay constant or could only change in one direction.

### 5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we propose a novel method for generating counterfactuals that preserves the relationships between variables learned from data. Firstly a VAE is trained and then a modulation network is trained to perturb the latent space in order to generate counterfactuals. We conducted experiments on both synthetic and real datasets. The results show the superiority of the proposed method in generating realistic counterfactual explanations that preserve relationships while explaining machine learning models.

The proposed approach can be further extended as follows: (1) While we considered only tasks with two labels, it would be useful to extend the proposed model in a more complex multiple-label settings. (2) The model could be modified to generate several counterfactual from a single sample. (3) From a practical perspective, we plan to apply the proposed model to datasets of electronic medical records of patients with various diseases. The proposed model will provide
medical experts with counterfactual explanations that will help patients to make necessary but minimal changes in either their lifestyles or treatments to further improve a probability of a positive health outcome.
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