

Generating Part-Based Global Explanations Via Correspondence

Kunal Rathore , Prasad Tadepalli

Oregon State University
{rathorek, tadepall}@oregonstate.edu

Abstract

Deep learning models are notoriously opaque. Existing explanation methods often focus on localized visual explanations for individual images. Concept-based explanations, while offering global insights, require extensive annotations, incurring significant labeling cost. We propose an approach that leverages user-defined part labels from a limited set of images and efficiently transfers them to a larger dataset. This enables the generation of global symbolic explanations by aggregating part-based local explanations, ultimately providing human-understandable explanations for model decisions on a large scale.

1 Introduction

Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) have achieved impressive results in various fields, including medical diagnosis [Bakator and Radosav, 2018], computational medicine [Yang *et al.*, 2021], self-driving cars [Ni *et al.*, 2020], and safety-critical industries [Biondi *et al.*, 2020]. However, their growing complexity raises concerns about their “black-box” nature, hindering user understanding and trust. This necessitates the development of explainable methods for DNNs, particularly in human-interactive and safety-critical contexts.

Saliency maps are prominent tools for producing post hoc explanations for Convolution Neural Network (CNN) image classification models, often generated using gradient or perturbation-based approaches [Springenberg *et al.*, 2014; Simonyan *et al.*, 2013; Zeiler and Fergus, 2014; Selvaraju *et al.*, 2017]. The gradient-based approach leverages the gradients of the model’s output with respect to the input image, and the magnitude of gradients is used to indicate the pixel-level importance in an image. Shitole *et al.* [2021] argue that a single saliency map provides an incomplete understanding, since there are often many other maps that can explain a classification equally well. They employ a beam search algorithm to systematically search for multiple *minimal sufficient explanations* (MSXs) for each image organized into a structured attention graph (SAG). However, this explanation approach faces two major limitations; a) MSXs only provide explanations for a single image and need other approaches for global



Figure 1: Image of a Bee-Eater from PartImageNet dataset (left) and annotation of the same image with body part labels (right).

insights; b) SAGs offer limited user-friendliness, requiring more time for comprehension.

Based on the scope of interpretability, explanation methods are categorized into local [Baehrens *et al.*, 2010; Ribeiro *et al.*, 2016] and global explanations [Kim *et al.*, 2018; Lakkaraju *et al.*, 2016]. **Local** explanations expose the parts of the input responsible for the model predictions on a specific instance. In contrast, **global** explanations focus on identifying general decision patterns that apply to an entire dataset. For instance, global explanations can indicate to what extent the long-heavy curved beak is responsible in identifying a Wood Stork bird category by a given model. The global explanations can aid in evaluating, validating, and building trust in AI models. In this paper, we address the problem of generating succinct post hoc global explanations for the predictions of the model in terms of the object parts. A brute-force solution involves manually mapping the local image segment-level explanations into object parts, which is labor-intensive. Our approach takes advantage of the fact that the deep features learned by the model contain high-level concepts such as parts of the object [Erhan *et al.*, 2009]. Hence, we employ a multilayer CNN feature matching approach called the Hyperpixel Flow (HPF) [Min *et al.*, 2019] that matches the part labels of a small number of annotated images with unlabeled query images. However, the HPF algorithm works well only on visually similar images. Hence, before invoking it, we extract visually similar images for the query image from the annotated set of images.

In the next phase, we create local explanations using a beam search algorithm [Shitole *et al.*, 2021]. These expla-

nations are subsequently transformed into part-based expressions using the part matching found in the previous step. Finally, global explanations on the dataset are derived by employing the Greedy Set Cover algorithm [Young, 2008]. In summary, our contributions are as follows.

- We implemented a system called GEPC (Global Explanations via Part Correspondence) to produce part-based global explanations of an image classification model by combining local explanation search with part correspondence and greedy set cover.
- We employed a novel training-set, test-set methodology for evaluating global explanations, and used it to show the effectiveness of our approach on multiple datasets.

2 Related Work

Explanation methods in the literature are sometimes characterized by the chronology of the explanation step w.r.t. the model training. *Inherent* or *intrinsic* explanation methods provide explanations while training, while *post hoc* methods explain any pre-trained neural network’s decisions [Camburu *et al.*, 2019].

Some explanation methods are *gradient-based* in that they compute gradients of the output score of different units w.r.t. the input image [Selvaraju *et al.*, 2017], while others are *perturbation-based*, i.e., they alter parts of the input to determine the effect of change on the model decision, subsequently representing the contribution of each part [Fong and Vedaldi, 2017]. Other methods such as LIME [Zhang *et al.*, 2019] and ANCHORS [Ribeiro *et al.*, 2018] build local surrogate models in lieu of explanations.

Concept-based explanation methods aim to align user-defined concepts with the model’s decision. Techniques such as TCAV [Kim *et al.*, 2018], Net2Vec [Fong and Vedaldi, 2018], and IBD [Zhou *et al.*, 2018] interpret the internal states of deep neural networks in terms of high-level concepts.

Recently, [Taesiri *et al.*, 2022] proposed that visual correspondence-based explanations improve their robustness. This motivates us to explore the potential of using correspondence to generate part-based concepts on larger datasets. Part-based object recognition is a classical approach in which the objective is to collect information at the local level and to form a classification model [Yan *et al.*, 2015; Shu *et al.*, 2013; Felzenszwalb *et al.*, 2009]. Despite many implementations for tasks such as segmentation, classification, and object detection, part-based approaches have never been explored for generating post hoc human-readable explanations.

3 Global Explanations via Part Correspondence

Our GEPC approach consists of deriving multiple local explanations for each image, mapping them to object parts, and finding a succinct global explanation that covers the predictions of the model on the entire dataset. The system pipeline is illustrated in Figure 2 and consists of image segmentation, finding a visually similar annotated gallery image for each query image, corresponding parts of the query image to the gallery image, finding local explanations for each image by




Figure 2: Overall flow diagram for the proposed method. This consists of five steps: unsupervised segmentation, computing nearest neighbor, part correspondence, computing local explanations, and extracting global symbolic explanations.



Figure 3: Visual similarity (across the row), these images belong to the Bee-Eater category from the ImageNet dataset. Each row shows images having same viewing angle and same object orientations.

beam search and deriving a global explanation from the local explanations via greedy search. These steps are detailed in the rest of this section.

3.1 Part correspondence

There exist several methods for label transfer, typically done by matching features in images and known as the feature / keypoint correspondence [Ma *et al.*, 2021].

Due to performance reasons, most of these methods require supervised or weakly supervised learning. However, since we focus on a post hoc approach using a pre-trained model, we employ the Hyperpixel flow [Min *et al.*, 2019] technique that helps map the learned high-level features across visually similar images.

HPF performs matching over the deep features, motivated by the fact that different layers of the DNN model learn low-level features to high-level concepts in images. This method is inspired by the hypercolumns [Hariharan *et al.*, 2015] used in object segmentation and detection. They illustrated that hypercolumns that combine features from multiple layers of CNN improve object detection and part labeling.

Given an image, CNN’s intermediate outputs $(\mathbf{f}^0, \mathbf{f}^1, \dots, \mathbf{f}^{L-1})$ are pooled and upsampled to create a hyperimage, combining Z spatial features.

$$\mathbf{F} = [\mathbf{f}^{l_0}, \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{f}^{l_1}), \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{f}^{l_2}), \dots, \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{f}^{l_{Z-1}})] \quad (1)$$




Figure 4: Row 1: the closest neighbors to the query image in the Kite category from ImageNet dataset; Row 2: the upsampled output as the summed weights $\sum_l w^l$ overlapped on the corresponding images.




Figure 5: Correspondence: Matching spatial features over images, here centroid of each superpixel from query image are queried for matching pixel on gallery image (parts annotated)

where \mathbf{U} denotes a function that upsamples the input feature map to the size of \mathbf{f}^{l_0} , the base map. Each spatial position p in the hyperimage corresponds to image coordinates \mathbf{x}_p and a hyperpixel feature \mathbf{f}_p , where $\mathbf{f}_p = \mathbf{F}(x_p)$. The hyperpixel at position p is denoted as $\mathbf{h}_p = (\mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{f}_p)$. The key idea of matching is to re-weight appearance similarity by Hough space voting to enforce geometric consistency. Let $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$ be two sets of hyperpixels, and $m = (h, h')$ be a hyperpixel match where h and h' are respectively elements of \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}' . Given a Hough space χ of possible offsets between the two hyperpixels, the confidence for match m , is computed as:

$$p(m|D) \propto p(m_a) \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \chi} p(m_g|\mathbf{x}) \sum_{m \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}'} p(m_a) p(m_g|\mathbf{x}) \quad (2)$$

where $p(m_a)$ represents the confidence in the appearance matching and $p(m_g|\mathbf{x})$ is the confidence for geometric matching with an offset \mathbf{x} , measuring how close the offset induced by m is to \mathbf{x} . Here, appearance matching confidence is derived using exponentiated cosine distance over hyperpixel features.

$$p(m_a) = \text{ReLU} \left(\frac{\mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{f}'}{\|\mathbf{f}\| \|\mathbf{f}'\|} \right)^d \quad (3)$$

We employ the HPF algorithm [Min *et al.*, 2019], which leverages the features learned from the model in multiple layers to match the corresponding parts in the images. SLIC [Achanta *et al.*, 2012] technique is used to generate segments




Figure 6: Transferred part labels to an unlabeled query image, after matching each superpixel gets a part label




Figure 7: Three Minimal Sufficient Explanations for a single input image of Bee Eater class on the left for the Resnet50 model.

of each query image. Centroids (C_x, C_y) of each query image segment act as predictor keypoints in Hyper-pixel flow, enabling matching corresponding regions to transfer parts from the gallery image to the query image.

3.2 Computing Minimal Sufficient Explanations

Our local explanations consist of a minimal set of regions that are sufficient for the model to produce a high score for the correct class. We call them Minimal Sufficient Explanations (MSXs).¹ It has been shown that there are often multiple such MSXs for a single input image [Shitole *et al.*, 2021]. We extend the concept of MSXs to sets of superpixels found by SLIC and follow [Shitole *et al.*, 2021] to derive as many MSXs as we can find for each image using beam search.

Formally, the MSX of an image x for the class c w.r.t. classifier π is defined as a minimal set of superpixels that achieves a high prediction confidence ($\pi_c(N_i) > P_h \pi_c(x)$) w.r.t. using the entire image, where we set $P_h = 0.9$. That means that if the classifier is provided with a perturbed image where the rest of the image except the superpixels in the MSX are blurred out, it will produce a score of at least 90% of the score on the original image. Furthermore, no strict subset of the superpixels in the MSX would give such a high score. For each image, the beam search identifies potentially multiple sets of superpixels as MSXs. Figure 7 illustrates the MSXs collected for a single input image with the Resnet50 image classification model.

3.3 Computing global explanations

After collecting MSXs for each image, we convert them to human-readable symbolic MSXs by mapping the superpixels in the MSX to the corresponding part labels, e.g., $\{\text{Bird-Head}, \text{Bird-Wing}, \text{Bird-Beak}\}$. A symbolic MSX of an image

¹We abbreviate Minimal Sufficient Explanation as MSX and not as MSE to deconflict it from mean squared error.

Algorithm 1 Greedy Set Cover Algorithm

Input: \mathbb{U} - set of uncovered images;
 a family $S = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m\}$ of all symbolic MSX expressions.
Output: R - set of symbolic MSX that covers maximum images.

- 1: $R = \emptyset$.
 - 2: **while** $\mathbb{U} \neq \emptyset$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots, l$ **do**
 - 3: select $R_i = \operatorname{argmax}_{j=1, \dots, m} |S_j \cap \mathbb{U}|$
 - 4: $\mathbb{U} \leftarrow \mathbb{U} \setminus R_i$
 - 5: $R \leftarrow R \cup \{R_i\}$
 - 6: **end while**
 - 7: **return** R
-

Class_id	Class Label	Label transfer accuracy
n02690373	airliner	0.9030
n01608432	kite	0.9188
n04285008	sports_car	0.9504
n04612504	yawl	0.8678
n03769881	minibus	0.9091
n02089867	walker_hound	0.8410

Table 1: Average accuracy of part label transfer for different classes in PartImageNet dataset

identifies a minimal set of parts that is sufficient to recognize the class of that image by the given model and can be interpreted as a conjunction of propositions that represent part names. For a global explanation, we seek the shortest decision list of symbolic MSXs that collectively cover the data set.

Since finding the shortest decision list is an NP-hard problem [Slavík, 1996], we employ a greedy set cover algorithm [Young, 2008], which iteratively selects the symbolic MSX that covers most of the remaining images, until all image instances are covered. Algorithm 1 outputs a decision list which, although not guaranteed to be the smallest, can be interpreted as a propositional formula in monotone (positive literals only) disjunctive normal form, where each conjunct is a symbolic MSX in terms of part names. Collectively, the decision list covers all images in the input dataset.

4 Experimental Results

4.1 Dataset description

For producing part-based explanations, we utilized three different datasets. Stanford Cars dataset contains 16,185 images of 196 car classes [Krause *et al.*, 2013], split into 8,144 training images and 8,041 testing images. Caltech-UCSD Birds 200-2011 (CUB-200) is an image dataset with 200 bird species and 11788 images [Wah *et al.*, 2011]. From each class in these two datasets, we created a condensed subset for annotation by randomly selecting 15% of the images. Part annotations on these sample sets were performed on the Roboflow platform, where users could define labels and annotate each image as needed. For example, a bird image has been labeled with $\{head, wings, tail, beak, eye, foot, chest, background\}$




Figure 8: Global part-based explanations of Resnet50 classification model for the Bee Eater class followed by the proportion of test data that is explained by each rule.




Figure 9: Global explanations of Resnet50 model based on object parts and their relationships for the Bee Eater class followed by the proportion of test data that is explained by each rule.

We prioritize high-level features for improved correspondence accuracy among multiple meaningful concepts. We evaluated the part label transfer approach with existing part annotations in the PartImageNet dataset [He *et al.*, 2022], which contains 158 classes from ImageNet [Russakovsky *et al.*, 2015] with approximately 24,000 images with part annotations per pixel. We also used PartImageNet as gallery data to continue part transfer in the ImageNet dataset and generated explanations for different DNN models. The pre-labeled PartImageNet data helped us evaluate the proposed method on a relatively larger dataset.

4.2 Evaluation of label transfer

We evaluated parts transfer using the label transfer accuracy metric [Liu *et al.*, 2011]. This metric measures the count of correctly predicted pixel labels against the total number of predicted pixels in an image. In our case, we count the correctly predicted segment labels in lieu of the pixel labels. Table 1 illustrates the performance of label transfer accuracy for a few categories using the HPF approach in the PartImageNet dataset. Overall, HPF using Resnet101 [He *et al.*, 2016] scores an average of 84.28% on the part labels transfer task for 158 categories.

4.3 Evaluation of Global Explanations

We split each dataset into 70:30 train-test sets within each class and generated global explanations as a decision list. The global explanations were evaluated for coverage over the




Figure 11: Cross validation of coverage of Resnet50 predictions for a few classes in three different datasets: A) ImageNet, B) CUB200, C) Stanford Cars.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded through the NSF grant CNS-1941892 and the ARO grant W911NF2210251.

References

- [Achanta *et al.*, 2012] Radhakrishna Achanta, Appu Shaji, Kevin Smith, Aurelien Lucchi, Pascal Fua, and Sabine Süsstrunk. Slic superpixels compared to state-of-the-art superpixel methods. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 34(11):2274–2282, 2012.
- [Baehrens *et al.*, 2010] David Baehrens, Timon Schroeter, Stefan Harmeling, Motoaki Kawanabe, Katja Hansen, and Klaus-Robert Müller. How to explain individual classification decisions. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:1803–1831, 2010.
- [Bakator and Radosav, 2018] Mihalj Bakator and Dragica Radosav. Deep learning and medical diagnosis: A review of literature. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, 2(3), 2018.
- [Biondi *et al.*, 2020] Alessandro Biondi, Federico Nesti, Giorgiomaria Cicero, Daniel Casini, and Giorgio Buttazzo. A safe, secure, and predictable software architecture for deep learning in safety-critical systems. *IEEE Embedded Systems Letters*, 12(3):78–82, 2020.
- [Camburu *et al.*, 2019] Oana-Maria Camburu, Eleonora Giunchiglia, Jakob Foerster, Thomas Lukasiewicz, and Phil Blunsom. Can i trust the explainer? verifying post-hoc explanatory methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.02065*, 2019.
- [Erhan *et al.*, 2009] Dumitru Erhan, Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Pascal Vincent. Visualizing higher-layer features of a deep network. *University of Montreal*, 1341(3):1, 2009.
- [Felzenszwalb *et al.*, 2009] Pedro F Felzenszwalb, Ross B Girshick, David McAllester, and Deva Ramanan. Object detection with discriminatively trained part-based models. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 32(9):1627–1645, 2009.
- [Fong and Vedaldi, 2017] Ruth C Fong and Andrea Vedaldi. Interpretable explanations of black boxes by meaningful perturbation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 3429–3437, 2017.
- [Fong and Vedaldi, 2018] Ruth Fong and Andrea Vedaldi. Net2vec: Quantifying and explaining how concepts are encoded by filters in deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8730–8738, 2018.
- [Hariharan *et al.*, 2015] Bharath Hariharan, Pablo Arbeláez, Ross Girshick, and Jitendra Malik. Hypercolumns for object segmentation and fine-grained localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 447–456, 2015.
- [He *et al.*, 2016] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [He *et al.*, 2022] Ju He, Shuo Yang, Shaokang Yang, Adam Kortylewski, Xiaoding Yuan, Jie-Neng Chen, Shuai Liu, Cheng Yang, Qihang Yu, and Alan Yuille. Partimagenet: A large, high-quality dataset of parts. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 128–145. Springer, 2022.
- [Huang *et al.*, 2017] Gao Huang, Zhuang Liu, Laurens Van Der Maaten, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Densely connected convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4700–4708, 2017.
- [Kim *et al.*, 2018] Been Kim, Martin Wattenberg, Justin Gilmer, Carrie Cai, James Wexler, Fernanda Viegas, and Rory sayres. Interpretability beyond feature attribution: Quantitative testing with concept activation vectors (TCAV). In Jennifer Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2668–2677. PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018.

- [Krause *et al.*, 2013] Jonathan Krause, Jia Deng, Michael Stark, and Li Fei-Fei. Collecting a large-scale dataset of fine-grained cars. 2013.
- [Lakkaraju *et al.*, 2016] Himabindu Lakkaraju, Stephen H Bach, and Jure Leskovec. Interpretable decision sets: A joint framework for description and prediction. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 1675–1684, 2016.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2011] Ce Liu, Jenny Yuen, and Antonio Torralba. Nonparametric scene parsing via label transfer. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 33(12):2368–2382, 2011.
- [Ma *et al.*, 2021] Jiayi Ma, Xingyu Jiang, Aoxiang Fan, Junjun Jiang, and Junchi Yan. Image matching from hand-crafted to deep features: A survey. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 129:23–79, 2021.
- [Min *et al.*, 2019] Juhong Min, Jongmin Lee, Jean Ponce, and Minsu Cho. Hyperpixel flow: Semantic correspondence with multi-layer neural features. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, October 2019.
- [Ni *et al.*, 2020] Jianjun Ni, Yinan Chen, Yan Chen, Jinxiu Zhu, Deena Ali, and Weidong Cao. A survey on theories and applications for self-driving cars based on deep learning methods. *Applied Sciences*, 10(8), 2020.
- [Ribeiro *et al.*, 2016] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos 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*, pages 1135–1144, 2016.
- [Ribeiro *et al.*, 2018] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. Anchors: High-precision model-agnostic explanations. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- [Russakovsky *et al.*, 2015] Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael Bernstein, Alexander C. Berg, and Li Fei-Fei. ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge. *International Journal of Computer Vision (IJCV)*, 115(3):211–252, 2015.
- [Selvaraju *et al.*, 2017] Ramprasaath R Selvaraju, Michael Cogswell, Abhishek Das, Ramakrishna Vedantam, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 618–626, 2017.
- [Shitole *et al.*, 2021] Vivswan Shitole, Fuxin Li, Minsuk Kahng, Prasad Tadepalli, and Alan Fern. One explanation is not enough: Structured attention graphs for image classification. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 11352–11363. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
- [Shu *et al.*, 2013] Guang Shu, Afshin Dehghan, and Mubarak Shah. Improving an object detector and extracting regions using superpixels. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3721–3727, 2013.
- [Simonyan and Zisserman, 2014] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [Simonyan *et al.*, 2013] Karen Simonyan, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. Deep inside convolutional networks: Visualising image classification models and saliency maps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6034*, 2013.
- [Slavík, 1996] Petr Slavík. A tight analysis of the greedy algorithm for set cover. In *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 435–441, 1996.
- [Springenberg *et al.*, 2014] Jost Tobias Springenberg, Alexey Dosovitskiy, Thomas Brox, and Martin Riedmiller. Striving for simplicity: The all convolutional net. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6806*, 2014.
- [Taesiri *et al.*, 2022] Mohammad Reza Taesiri, Giang Nguyen, and Anh Nguyen. Visual correspondence-based explanations improve ai robustness and human-ai team accuracy. In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 34287–34301. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022.
- [Wah *et al.*, 2011] C. Wah, S. Branson, P. Welinder, P. Perona, and S. Belongie. Caltech-ucsd birds-200-2011. Technical Report CNS-TR-2011-001, California Institute of Technology, 2011.
- [Yan *et al.*, 2015] Junjie Yan, Yinan Yu, Xiangyu Zhu, Zhen Lei, and Stan Z Li. Object detection by labeling superpixels. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5107–5116, 2015.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2021] Sijie Yang, Fei Zhu, Xinghong Ling, Quan Liu, and Peiyao Zhao. Intelligent health care: Applications of deep learning in computational medicine. *Frontiers in Genetics*, Volume 12 - 2021, 2021.
- [Young, 2008] Neal E Young. Greedy set-cover algorithms (1974-1979, chvátal, johnson, lovász, stein). *Encyclopedia of algorithms*, pages 379–381, 2008.
- [Zeiler and Fergus, 2014] Matthew D Zeiler and Rob Fergus. Visualizing and understanding convolutional networks. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6-12, 2014, Proceedings, Part I 13*, pages 818–833. Springer, 2014.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2019] Yujia Zhang, Kuangyan Song, Yiming Sun, Sarah Tan, and Madeleine Udell. ” why should you trust my explanation?” understanding uncertainty in lime explanations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.12991*, 2019.
- [Zhou *et al.*, 2018] Bolei Zhou, Yiyou Sun, David Bau, and Antonio Torralba. Interpretable basis decomposition for

visual explanation. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 119–134, 2018.