# **Interpreting Blackbox Models via Model Extraction**

Osbert Bastani<sup>1,4</sup>, Carolyn Kim<sup>2</sup>, Hamsa Bastani<sup>3,4</sup> <sup>1</sup>Massachusetts Institute of Technology, <sup>2</sup>Stanford University, <sup>3</sup>IBM Research, <sup>4</sup>University of Pennsylvania

# Summary

### Motivation

- Despite having high accuracy, blackbox machine learning  $\bullet$ models lack interpretability.
- This is a concern when such models are used for consequential decisions, e.g., medical diagnosis.

### Algorithm

- We propose interpreting blackbox models by extracting a decision tree that approximates the model.
- We avoid overfitting by actively sampling new data points and labeling them using the model.



### • Related literature

- Directly learning interpretable models (Ustun-Rudin 2016)
- Interpreting specific test points (Ribeiro et al., 2016)
- Computing influence scores for features (Friedman 2001) or training points (Koh-Liang 2017)

# **Problem Formulation**

### • Inputs

- Blackbox classifier  $f: \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$
- Training set  $(X, Y) \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$
- Depth *D* of the decision tree to be extracted

### • Output

- An axis-aligned decision tree  $T(X) \approx f(x)$
- Use *T* to understand *f*

# **Exact Greedy Decision Tree**

#### Estimate input distribution

- Fit a Gaussian mixture model P to X
- Components of *P* are axis-aligned Gaussians
- Iteratively construct tree
  - Initialization:  $T^* = \{N\}$  contains a single node
  - **Growth step:** Choose a leaf node N in  $T^*$ , and replace N with • an internal node and two new leaf nodes
- Single growth step
  - For each node N, let  $P_N = P \mid (x \text{ satisfies } C_N)$ , i.e., P conditioned on x flowing to N in  $T^*$
  - Choose N to be the node with highest gain (according to  $P_N$ ) if replaced as described below
  - Choose an axis-aligned branch that maximizes the gain
  - Choose labels for new leaf nodes to be the majority labels •

### **Estimated Greedy Decision Tree**

- Approximation
  - Estimate gains above using *m* random samples  $x \sim P_N$
  - To sample  $x \sim P_N$ , sample a component of  $P_N$ , and sample a
  - point from that component (which is a truncated Gaussian)
  - Corresponding label is y = f(x)
- **Theorem:** As  $m \to \infty$ , the estimated tree converges to  $T^*$

## **Comparison to CART**

- **Datasets:** 6 UCI datasets and 3 classical control problems
- Blackbox models: random forest and neural net
- **Tree sizes:** ranging from 16 to 64 nodes
- **Metric:** test set performance ( $F_1$  score, MSE, or reward)



# **Example Use Cases**

#### • Detect use of invalid features (e.g., response as a feature)

- We use a breast cancer dataset containing two response variables indicating recurrence. We trained a random forest where one response was incorrectly included as a feature for predicting the other. Then, we extract a decision tree.
- The invalid feature occurred in every extracted tree, and as the top branch in 6 of the 10 trees.

#### • Understand use of prejudiced features

- We use a student grade dataset where gender is a feature. We train a random forest to predict grade with gender as a feature, and extract decision trees.
- Gender occurs at the fourth or fifth level in 7 of 10 trees.
- Using the trees, we estimate that the gender variable has a large effect on 18.3% to 39.1% of students, with an effect size ranging from 0.44 to 0.77 grade points on this subgroup.

#### **Comparing different models trained on the same dataset**

- We train random forests and neural nets on a wine dataset.
- Random forests achieved an  $F_1$  score of at least 0.961, whereas neural nets were bimodal; 5 had  $F_1$  score of at least 0.955, and the remaining had an  $F_1$  score of at most 0.741.
- In the extracted trees, the occurrence of the feature "chlorides" was highly correlated with poor performance.

#### Understanding a control policy

• The tree extracted from the Cartpole policy says to move the cart to the left exactly when

(pole velocity  $\leq -0.286$ ) V (pole angle  $\leq -0.071$ )

• In other words, move the cart to the left when the pole is already on the left, or when the pole is moving quickly towards the left.

### References

Ustun & Rudin. Supersparse linear integer models for optimized medical scoring systems. Machine Learning, 2016.

Ribeiro, Singh, & Guestrin. Why should I trust you?: Explaining the predictions of any classifier. KDD, 2016. Friedman. Greedy function approximation: a gradient boosting machine. Annals of statistics, 2001. Koh & Liang. Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions. ICML, 2017