<u>Yanju Chen</u>, Xifeng Yan, Yu Feng University of California, Santa Barbara

CSB

# - Motivations - Deep Learning Models

- Data-Driven/-Hungry
- Deep & Large-Scale
- ... if they work

The predictions are wrong. What's going on?





Model Architecture of GPT3, ~175B Params

#### - Motivations -VQA: A Motivating Example (Visualization Question Answering)

• Given a stacked bar chart that represents opinions for future economic growth for different countries, a user describes her query based on the visualization in natural language:



• A Visualization Question Answering (VQA) task is to design an algorithm that automatically finds the answer to a natural language query based on a given visualization.



### - Motivations -**Existing Approaches & Challenges**

- Fully Supervised Machine Learning: SmBoP<sup>[1]</sup>, NL2code<sup>[2]</sup>
  - Requires manual annotated logic forms / programs as supervised training data
- Weakly Supervised Machine Learning: TAPAS<sup>[3]</sup>
  - Requires only question-answer pairs for training







**Fully Supervised** *Expensive and Hard to Get*  Weakly Supervised Cheap but Noisy

SmBoP: Semi-autoregressive Bottom-up Semantic Parsing. Rubin, O. et al. NAACL 2021.
 A Syntactic Neural Model for General-Purpose Code Generation. Yin, P. et al. ACL 2017.
 TaPas: Weakly Supervised Table Parsing via Pre-training. Herzig, J. et al. ACL 2020.

# - Motivations - **Observations**

- For mainstream weakly supervised approaches that directly output VQA answers, they are:
  - non-trivial for human beings to understand, and
  - hard to fix if there's error in model reasoning/answer.

Can we use program synthesis techniques to get "background explanation" programs based on the model's predictions?

input: visualization



output: model prediction

- In this work, we investigate such a slightly different problem setting where:
  - not all the predictions are correct (usually only <u>one</u> of them is correct, or even sometimes <u>none</u>), and
  - predictions may conflict with each other



A Simple Visualization and Its Table



project(aggregate(I, null, \*, \*), ["Country"])
 feasible for all: "Brazil", "Japan", "China", "U.S."

5 | Visualization Question Answering Using Introspective Program Synthesis

### - Motivations -A Straw-Man Proposal

Can we use program synthesis techniques to get "background explanation" programs based on the model's predictions?

input: visualization

output: model prediction

- The Straw-Man Proposal
  - 1. For every single prediction of the deep learning model, we trigger an off-the-shelf synthesizer to solve for program(s)
  - 2. Then we end up with a bunch of programs and (maybe) ask the user to pick the "best" one



- There are potential issues:
  - *Not scalable*: For cases where large number of predictions are produced, this won't scale well
  - <u>Model dependent</u>: If predictions do not contain the correct answer, synthesis done will be meaningless
  - <u>Unclear of best-fitting definition</u>: There's no formal definition of best-fitting program; need to connect 3 parties: <u>elements in visualization</u>, <u>language units in query</u> and <u>production rules in explanation programs</u>

6 | Visualization Question Answering Using Introspective Program Synthesis



A Simple Visualization and Its Table



**Model Predictions** 

## **Overview:** POE

- Fixing Deep Learning Model's (Noisy) Outputs via Introspective Program Synthesis
  - Search Space Induction via Abstract Program Synthesis
  - Finding Best Consistent Programs via **Optimal Program Synthesis**



#### - Synthesis Using POE -A Walkthrough of POE





Illustration of A Walkthrough of POE

# - Synthesis Using POE - A Walkthrough of POE

• Original TAPAS Outputs:

(0.78, Brazil), (0.67, Japan), (0.55, Greece), ...

• POE's Abstract Program Synthesis Outputs:

```
1 project(select(pivot(T, ◊, ◊), ◊, ◊, ◊), ◊)
2 project(select(T, ◊, ◊, ◊), ◊)
3 ...
```

• POE's Optimal Program Synthesis Outputs:

```
project(select(pivot(
```

T, "opinion", "%"), "Improve", eqmax, null), ["Country"])

```
project(select(pivot(
```

T, "opinion", "%"), "Worsen", eqmax, null), ["Country"])

9 | Visualization Question Answering Using Introspective Program Synthesis

```
 \begin{array}{ll} \langle Table \rangle & ::= \operatorname{project}(\langle Table \rangle, \langle ColList \rangle ) \\ & | & \operatorname{select}(\langle Table \rangle, \langle BoolOp \rangle, \langle ColInt \rangle, \langle ConstVal \rangle ) \\ & | & \operatorname{pivot}(\langle Table \rangle, \langle ColInt \rangle, \langle ColInt \rangle ) \\ & | & \operatorname{aggregate}(\langle Table \rangle, \langle ColList \rangle, \langle AggrOp \rangle, \langle ColInt \rangle ) \\ & | & \operatorname{aggregate}(\langle Table \rangle, \langle ColList \rangle, \langle AggrOp \rangle, \langle ColInt \rangle ) \\ & \langle AggrOp \rangle & ::= \operatorname{count} | \min | \max | \sup | \operatorname{mean} \\ & \langle BoolOp \rangle & ::= \langle | \, <= \, | \, == \, | \, >= \, | \, >| \, =| \, \operatorname{eqmin} \\ & \langle Table \rangle \in \operatorname{tables}, \langle ConstVal \rangle \in \operatorname{constants} \\ & \langle ColInt \rangle \in \operatorname{columns}, \langle ColList \rangle \in \operatorname{columns}^{n} \end{array}
```

Syntax of A Motivating Toy DSL

|            | •   | ,0  | 000  |
|------------|---|---|--|
| Brazil     | Improve   | 84  | blue   |
| Brazil     | Remain the same   | 12  | orange   |
| Brazil     | Worsen  | 5   | red  |
| China      | Improve   | 83  | blue   |
| China      | Remain the same   | 9   | orange   |
| China      | Worsen  | 2   | red  |
| Tunisia    | Improve   | 75  | blue   |
| Japan      | Improve   | 16  | blue   |
| Japan      | Improve   | 16  | blue   |
| Japan      | Remain the same   | 49  | orange   |
| Japan      | Worsen  | 33  | red  |
| Czech Rep. | Improve   | 13  | blue   |
| Czech Rep. | Remain the same   | 27  | orange   |
| Czech Rep. | Worsen  | 60  | red  |
| Greece     | Improve   | 9   | blue   |
| Greece     | Remain the same   | 10  | orange   |
|            | 0 0 0 0   | 1   |  |
|            | Brazil<br>Brazil<br>China<br>China<br>China<br>Tunisia<br>Japan<br>Japan<br>Japan<br>Czech Rep.<br>Czech Rep.<br>Czech Rep.<br>Greece<br>Greece | BrazilRemain the sameBrazilWorsenChinaImproveChinaRemain the sameChinaWorsenTunisiaImproveJapanImproveJapanImproveJapanRemain the sameJapanRemain the sameCzech Rep.ImproveCzech Rep.Remain the sameCzech Rep.Remain the sameCzech Rep.MorsenCzech Rep.Remain the sameCzech Rep.Remain the same | BrazilRemain the same12BrazilWorsen5ChinaImprove83ChinaRemain the same9ChinaWorsen2TunisiaImprove75JapanImprove16JapanRemain the same49JapanRemain the same49JapanRemain the same49JapanRemain the same27Czech Rep.Improve13Czech Rep.Remain the same27Czech Rep.Worsen60GreeceImprove9GreeceRemain the same10 |

Converted Table of the Visualization

### - Synthesis Using POE -System Workflow in POE

**10** | Visualization Question Answering Using Introspective Program Synthesis



A System Workflow in POE

#### - Synthesis Using POE -Abstract Program Synthesis with Noisy Specification

- Intuition: Narrow down program search space to such a sweet spot that:
  - respects the model outputs, and
  - promote synthesis efficiency.



A Simple Visualization and Its Table

Model Outputs: "H

"Brazil", "Japan", "China", "U.S."

#### Abstract Synthesis Breakdown:

 $\Leftrightarrow$  feasible for all examples

project(>)
feasible for all examples

project(aggregate(I, null, ◊₀, ◊₁), ["Country"])
 feasible for "Brazil", "Japan", "China"



🖸 Query

### - Synthesis Using POE -**Optimal Program Synthesis** for Explanation Refinement

- Intuition: Maximize consistency between explanation, visualization and query.
- Hard Constraints (Syntactic Correctness)
- Soft Constraints (Semantic Approximation)
  - **NSYN**: Near-Synonym Linguistic Engine
  - A linguistic engine that determines whether two • linguistic units are near-synonyms (semantically similar)

NSyn("high", "highest") > NSyn("high", "low")

Objective Function

$$\overline{\sum_{w \in V_w} \sum_{t \in V_t} (1 - \operatorname{NSyn}(w, t)) \cdot x_w^t} +$$

Maximize consistency matching.



**Triangle Alignments between Three Parties** 

More common abstract programs are preferred.

 $PPL(P) \cdot u^P$ 

 $p \in V_P$ 

## Evaluation

- Research Questions
  - **RQ1**. **Performance**: How does POE compare against state-of-the-art tools on visualization queries?
  - **RQ2**. **Effectiveness**: Can POE rectify wrong answers proposed by other tools?
  - **RQ3**. **Explainability**: Does POE synthesize explanations that well capture the question intentions and make sense to human end-users?
  - RQ4. Ablation: How significant is the benefit of abstract synthesis and optimal alignment?
- Benchmarks
  - **629** Visualization Question Answering Tasks from VisQA<sup>[1]</sup>
    - Real-World Data Sources
    - Non-Trivial Questions from Real Users
    - Wide Coverage of Question Types

[1] Answering Questions about Charts and Generating Visual Explanations. Kim, D.H. et al. CHI 2020.

# - Evaluation - **Performance**

- Comparison against TAPAS<sup>[1]</sup> and VisQA<sup>[2]</sup>
  - VisQA: +8%
  - POE (top-1): +23%
  - POE (top-3): +27%
- Stats of Different Questions Types
  - Retrieval
  - Comparison
  - Aggregation
  - Other
  - Total

14 | Visualization Question Answering Using Introspective Program Synthesis



#### POE can greatly boost performance of weakly supervised models.

| question type | tatal  | VisQA      | TIDIO | Poe     |
|---------------|--------|------------|-------|---------|
|               | totai  | (baseline) | IAPAS | (top-1) |
| retrieval     | 183    | 101        | 98    | 123     |
|               | (29%)  | (55%)      | (54%) | (67%)   |
| comparison    | 87     | 50         | 0     | 71      |
|               | (14%)  | (57%)      | (0%)  | (82%)   |
| aggregation   | 253    | 92         | 119   | 161     |
|               | (40%)  | (36%)      | (47%) | (64%)   |
| other         | 106    | 31         | 12    | 15      |
|               | (17%)  | (29%)      | (11%) | (14%)   |
| total         | 629    | 274        | 229   | 370     |
|               | (100%) | (44%)      | (36%) | (59%)   |

Performance Comparison on Different Question Types

POE is effective across different types of benchmarks.

[1] **TaPas: Weakly Supervised Table Parsing via Pre-training**. Herzig, J. et al. ACL 2020.

[2] Answering Questions about Charts and Generating Visual Explanations. Kim, D.H. et al. CHI 2020.

# **Discussions & Conclusions**

- Discussions
  - Incomprehensive Questions
  - Limitation of NLP Modules
- Conclusions: A Tool for Visualization Question Answering via Introspective Program Synthesis
  - helps understand deep learning model's VQA predictions
  - fixes potentially wrong predictions by refinement

https://github.com/chyanju/Poe

POE is open-sourced and publicly available.

