

VizXP: A Visualization Framework for Conveying Explanations to Users in Model Reconciliation Problems *

Ashwin Kumar, Stylianos Loukas Vasileiou, Melanie Bancilhon, Alvitta Ottley, William Yeoh

Washington University in St. Louis
 {ashwinkumar, v.stylianos, mbancilhon, alvitta, wyeoh}@wustl.edu

Abstract

Advancements in explanation generation for automated planning algorithms have moved us a step closer towards realizing the full potential of human-AI collaboration in real-world planning applications. Within this context, a framework called *model reconciliation* has gained a lot of traction, mostly due to its deep connection with a popular theory in human psychology, known as the *theory of mind*. Existing literature in this setting, however, has mostly been constrained to algorithmic contributions for generating explanations. To the best of our knowledge, there has been very little work on how to effectively convey such explanations to human users, a critical component in human-AI collaboration systems. In this paper, we set out to explore to what extent visualizations are an effective candidate for conveying explanations in a way that can be easily understood. Particularly, by drawing inspiration from work done in visualization systems for classical planning, we propose a visualization framework for visualizing explanations generated from model reconciliation algorithms. We demonstrate the efficacy of our proposed system in a comprehensive user study, where we compare our framework against a text-based baseline for two types of explanations – domain-based and problem-based explanations. Results from the user study show that users, on average, understood explanations better when they are conveyed via our visualization system compared to when they are conveyed via a text-based baseline.

Introduction

From its inception, *Explainable AI Planning* (XAIP) has garnered increasing interest due to its role in designing explainable systems that bridge the gap between theoretical and algorithmic planning literature and real-world applications. The primary motivation of XAIP systems has been centered around creating well integrated pipelines that, given different personas of human users (the explainees),¹ they can generate explanations of a plan for a given planning problem. One of the recurring themes in this context is

the *model reconciliation problem* (MRP) (Chakraborti et al. 2017) – a seminal work that utilizes a popular theory in human psychology, called the *theory of mind*,² and allows an agent (the explainer) to consider the “mental model” of the user³ in its explanation generation process. These explanations bring the model of the user closer to the agent’s model by transferring a minimum number of updates from the agent’s model to the user’s model. However, most of the effort on this topic has focused on algorithmic contributions for generating explanations. To the best of our knowledge, there has been very little work on how to effectively communicate and convey the explanations generated to users. For instance, the current state-of-the-art by Sreedharan et al. (2020) presents explanations as text, typically in the PDDL format, which can, arguably, increase the user’s misunderstanding of the task, especially for novice users.

A well-established educational principle, called the *multimedia learning principle*, posits that humans learn better from words and pictures, than from words alone (Mayer 1997). For example, Clark and Mayer (2016) showed that accompanying text-based instructions with pictures improved students’ performance on a test by a median amount of 89%. Interestingly, students got around 65% of answers correct after seeing a combination of text and pictures, compared to less than 40% of answers correct after reading a text comprised of words alone. Similar results have also been obtained in object assembly tasks (Brunyé, Taylor, and Rapp 2008). As such, there is strong evidence within the psychology community that the use of visual content has a profound effect on increasing retention and comprehension when compared to text alone.

Based on this principle, in this paper, we set out to explore to what extent visualizations constitute an effective candidate for conveying explanations (in an MRP setting) in a way that can be easily understood by human users. In particular, by drawing inspiration from work done in visualizing classical planning problems, we propose a visualization framework that can visualize the action-space and state-space of

*This research is partially supported by the National Science Foundation under awards 1812619, 2020289, and 2118201. Copyright © 2022, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.

¹The current norm in the XAIP literature considers the following three personas: *End user*, *domain designer*, and *algorithm designer* (Chakraborti, Sreedharan, and Kambhampati 2020).

²The theory of mind is the ability to attribute mental states (beliefs, intents, knowledge, etc.) to others and recognize that these mental states may differ from one’s own.

³The mental model is just the user’s version of the problem which the agent possess, and interestingly, it can be expressed as a graph, a PDDL model, or even a logic program.

planning problems, and use it as a medium for communicating explanations between an agent and a user. In addition, we introduce two taxonomies of explanations that can be visualized by our framework: (1) *Domain-based explanations*, which arise due to discrepancies between the action models of the agent and the user, and (2) *Problem-based explanations*, which arise due to differences in the initial or goal states of the agent and the user. Our proposed framework is agnostic to how explanations are generated, and it is thus *orthogonal* to all algorithmic contributions for model reconciliation problems. In summary, we make the following contributions: (1) We propose a visualization system for visualizing explanations in MRP settings; (2) We define two types of explanations – domain-based and problem-based explanations; (3) We demonstrate the efficacy of our proposed system in a comprehensive user study, where we compare our framework against a text-based baseline. Results from the user study show that users, on average, understood explanations better when they are conveyed via our visualization system compared to when they are conveyed via a text-based baseline.

Related Work

The fundamental problem we are addressing in this paper is formulated around the *model reconciliation problem* (MRP) (Chakraborti et al. 2017) within the XAIP literature. In an MRP, the plan of a planning agent is unacceptable to a human user due to differences in their models of the problem. As such, the agent needs to provide an explanation of that plan in terms of model differences. In this context, researchers have tackled MRP from various perspectives, such as traditional search-based methods (Sreedharan et al. 2020), MDP-based models and approaches (Sreedharan et al. 2019), and logic-based formulations (Vasileiou, Previti, and Yeoh 2021).⁴ Nonetheless, as we mentioned in the introduction, existing work has mostly focused on developing algorithms for generating explanations, and not on how they are to be conveyed to a human user; a common thread is that the explanations are communicated to users through text messages.

There has also been some effort by the planning and scheduling community to create user interfaces for planning and scheduling problems (Freedman et al. 2018). While some work aims to show users the space of alternate plans (Gopalakrishnan and Kambhampati 2018; Magnaguagno et al. 2020; Chakraborti et al. 2018), others aim to create systems to aid users in the creation of plans (e.g., Planimation (Chen et al. 2020)) or for assistance with domain modeling (e.g., Conductor (Bryce et al. 2017)).⁵ These kinds of systems are essential steps towards the creation of a unified planning interface, especially when humans are involved in the loop. For a system aiming to provide the complete planning pipeline to a user, a key require-

⁴As there is a fast-growing amount of work on MRP and XAIP in general, we refer the reader to the survey by Chakraborti, Sreedharan, and Kambhampati (2020) for more information.

⁵We use both Planimation and Conductor as inspiration for the VizXP framework and discuss the details in a later section.

ment for the XAIP community is the creation of systems to deliver explanations to users in an interactive and intuitive manner. Towards this goal, researchers have created systems using explanations for human-in-the-loop planning. For example, RADAR (Sengupta et al. 2017; Grover et al. 2020) and RADAR-X (Valmeekam et al. 2021) make use of contrastive explanations in addition to plan suggestions to develop decision-support systems for interactive explanatory dialogue with users. Another recent system (Eifler and Hoffmann 2020) discusses the design of an iterative planning interface that takes user preferences into account while helping them create plans via plan property dependencies. While these systems make use of interactive user interfaces, and the latter system uses a visualization to show plan execution, they all present explanations in text, and do not focus on how effectively the explanations are delivered. To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first attempt to investigate to what extent visualizations are an effective medium for conveying explanations to users in an MRP setting.

Preliminaries

Classical Planning

A *classical planning* problem, typically represented in PDDL (Ghallab et al. 1998), is a tuple $\Pi = \langle D, I, G \rangle$, which consists of the domain $D = \langle F, A \rangle$ – where F is a finite set of fluents representing the world states ($s \in F$) and A a set of actions – and the initial and goal states $I, G \subseteq F$. An action a is a tuple $\langle pre_a, eff_a^\pm \rangle$, where pre_a are the preconditions of a – conditions that must hold for the action to be applied; and eff_a^\pm are the addition (+) and deletion (−) effects of a – conditions that must hold after the action is applied. The solution to a planning problem Π is a plan $\pi = \langle a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle$ such that $\delta_\Pi(I, \pi) = G$, where $\delta_\Pi(\cdot)$ is the transition function of problem Π . The cost of a plan π is given by $C(\pi, \Pi) = |\pi|$. Finally, a cost-minimal plan $\pi^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\pi \in \{\pi' \mid \delta_\Pi(I, \pi') = G\}} C(\pi, \Pi)$ is called an optimal plan.

Model Reconciliation Problem

A *model reconciliation problem* (MRP) (Chakraborti et al. 2017) is defined by the tuple $\Psi = \langle \Phi, \pi \rangle$, where $\Phi = \langle M^R, M_H^R \rangle$ is a tuple of the agent’s model $M^R = \langle D^R, I^R, G^R \rangle$ and the human’s approximation of the agent’s model $M_H^R = \langle D_H^R, I_H^R, G_H^R \rangle$, and π is the optimal plan in M^R . For brevity, we will refer to M^R and M_H^R as the “agent” and “human”, respectively. A solution to an MRP is an explanation ϵ (e.g., a set of model information) such that when it is used to update the human’s model M_H^R to $\widehat{M}_H^{R, \epsilon}$, the plan π is optimal in both the agent’s model M^R and the updated human model $\widehat{M}_H^{R, \epsilon}$. The goal is to find a cost-minimal explanation, where the cost of an explanation is defined as the length of the explanation.

In addition to adding information to the user’s model, an explanation might also involve the removal of information from a user’s model such that it is consistent with the agent’s explanation (Vasileiou, Yeoh, and Son 2020). Therefore, our notion of explanation is defined as follows:

Definition 1 (Explanation). *Given an agent M^R , a user M_H^R , and an optimal plan π , assume that π is only optimal in M^R . Then, $\epsilon = \{\epsilon^+, \epsilon^-\}$ is an explanation from M^R to M_H^R for π if π is optimal in $\widehat{M}_H^{R,\epsilon} = (M_H^R \cup \epsilon^+) \setminus \epsilon^-$, where $\epsilon^+ \subseteq M^R$ and $\epsilon^- \subseteq M_H^R$.*

As such, ϵ^+ is the addition of model information to the user’s model from the agent’s model and ϵ^- is the removal of information from the user’s model. The latter is important in order to account for any inconsistencies arising when adding new information to the human’s model.

Taxonomy of Explanations

Most MRP algorithms look at explaining either optimal or valid plans to human users (Chakraborti et al. 2017). Towards that end, such explanations, using insights from social sciences (Miller 2019), are considered according to three main properties: *Social explanations* for modeling the expectations of the explainee; *selective explanations* for choosing the explanations among several competing hypotheses; and *contrastive explanations* for differentiating the properties of two competing hypotheses. Among these properties, contrastive explanations have received a lot of attention (Hoffmann and Magazzeni 2019). However, all explanations share two common elements; They either express discrepancies between the domain-action models of the agent and the user (i.e., *domain-based* explanations) or involve differences in the initial and/or goal state assumptions of the planning problems of the agent and the user (i.e., *problem-based* explanations). Below, we formalize these two notions as characteristics of explanations stemming from MRP scenarios.

Domain-based Explanations: Assume an agent M^R , a user M_H^R , and a plan π that is optimal in M^R but not M_H^R . We say that an explanation from M^R to M_H^R for π is a *domain-based* explanation, denoted by ϵ_d , if all of its elements involve the action dynamics in M^R and/or M_H^R . In other words, the elements of the explanation must involve addition (or removal) of actions, preconditions of actions, or effects of actions to (or from) M_H^R . Note that we make the assumption that explanations involving the addition or removal of an entire action can be specified as a set of preconditions and/or effects accompanied by the name of the action.

Problem-based Explanations: Assume an agent M^R , a user M_H^R , and a plan π that is optimal only in M^R but not M_H^R . We say that an explanation is a *problem-based* explanation, denoted by ϵ_p , if all of its elements involve the addition (or removal) of initial and/or goal states to (or from) M_H^R .

These categories make intuitive sense as any planner takes, as input, a domain file and a problem file, which fully specify the planning problem Π . We will utilize these two types of explanations while evaluating our visualization framework. The information conveyed in domain-based explanations would translate across problem instances and would be something more commonly needed for novices learning about the domain, while problem-based explanations could arise regardless of expertise level due to misun-

derstanding the problem. We also note that these two kinds of explanations are not isolated, and some MRPs can have solutions that include both types of explanations.

There is one other scenario in which explanations are needed: when the user makes mistakes in creating the plan even after having knowledge of the model. We posit our visualization framework to be able to aid humans in this regard as well, but for the purpose of analysis, we focus on the two categories discussed above.

Further, the information provided in all explanations discussed above falls into one of the following two categories:

- **Action-Space Information:** Given a planning problem Π , and an associated domain D containing actions $A = \langle pre_A, eff_A^+ \rangle$, the action-space information corresponds to information about the preconditions and effects for each action in D . Domain-based explanations will contain this kind of information.
- **State-Space Information:** Given a planning problem Π , a plan π , and a sequence of states S involved in the execution of π , the state-space information corresponds to information about the predicates in each state in S . Problem-based explanations, which address errors in the initial and goal state, contain this kind of information.

It is easy to see the parallels between the two kinds of explanations and the two kinds of information discussed above. These categories are also interlinked vis-a-vis the fact that the state influences what actions are possible, and the action dynamics decide what the next state will be. Thus, an ideal system for presenting explanations should be able to convey both types of information to the users, while maintaining the link between them. In the next section, we discuss two existing visualization systems that present action-space and state-space information and use those ideas to motivate the design of a framework capable of visualizing plans and their execution as well as presenting explanations, using both state-space and action-space information.

Visualization Framework

In this section, we describe a framework that can be utilized to design and deploy visualizations for presenting explanations to users. Borrowing elements from existing work in plan visualization, such a framework should be able to show all kinds of explanations discussed in the previous section. Given an explanation based on the user’s plan and the agent’s plan, it should support the visualization of the following information for the human user’s model: (1) Plan length; (2) Wrong/missing initial/goal state; (3) Wrong/missing preconditions; (4) Wrong/missing effects; and (5) Wrong/missing actions.

As noted earlier, most MRP-based explanations are *contrastive* and, typically, involve a *foil* provided by the human user in terms of an alternative plan (Sreedharan, Srivastava, and Kambhampati 2018). In addition, the context of the user’s own plan may help them in better understanding the agent’s explanation. Hence, the user’s plan provides an excellent window for presenting explanations, a fact that is useful for the visualization techniques proposed in the following sections.




Figure 1: Illustration of Conductor (Bryce et al. 2017).

Action-Space Visualization: Fact Flows

“Fact routes” from Conductor (Bryce et al. 2017) provide an easy way to visually represent preconditions as “stations” on each action that need to be filled, and effects as routes originating from that action. Conductor, combined with Marshal (Bryce, Benton, and Boldt 2016), is aimed at helping users create domains and plans concurrently. Using fact routes to show the evolution of facts over time, it aims to use interactions with users to facilitate creating correct plans and domains. We found that Conductor’s framework was limited by the fact that the length of the plan, as well as the number of predicates involved, increases the number of fact routes to the extent that it might overwhelm users (see Figure 1). This makes it unsuitable for all but the simplest of domains that contain few predicates and have short plans.

To remedy this, we introduce a simplification to Conductor. Instead of tracking all fact routes as individual columns, we visualize just the routes moving into and going out of each action as *fact flows*. Optionally, a user interaction like a click may show the history of the fact route for any particular action, thus retaining all relevant information for users who require it. This reduces clutter and allows us to present longer plans with domains that can contain larger number of predicates within a limited space. For example, consider a fact flow $\text{in}(\text{truck1}, \text{city2})$, and an action that does not use truck location as precondition; Conductor would show this fact flow before the action, while in our simplification, this unnecessary fact flow would be hidden.

In order to visualize explanations, we propose two methods: (1) *Highlight-based* and (2) *Port-based* methods. Using the former, the precondition/effect flows are highlighted based on whether they are unaffected (colored grey), wrong (colored red), required/missing (colored yellow), or required/present (colored green). The latter method employs “ports” for the preconditions and effect of each action, an extension of the “stations” used in Conductor. Ports can be colored based on whether they are unaffected (colored blue), wrong (colored red) or required (colored green), and fact flows can be either missing (not plugged in) or present



Figure 2: An action-space visualization example, with preconditions at the top of each action, and effects at the bottom. Deletion effects are represented as a flow fading out. Top: The highlight-based explanation visualization; Bottom: The port-based explanation visualization.

(plugged in). Figure 2 shows an example of the same information conveyed using both methods. Note that we present this just as a stylistic choice.

One additional modification we make to Conductor’s design is the introduction of the fact flows to the initial state. This allows us to visualize any predicates affected by a problem-based explanation by treating the initial state as a pseudo-action for which “preconditions” need to be added or removed (i.e., modifications to the initial state).

State-Space Visualization: Abstraction

While the action-space framework is sufficient to visualize all explanations, it fails to show information about the state of the world at certain times throughout the execution of the plan. Many planning domains contain features that can enable humans to think about them in terms of physical abstractions. Simple classical domains like BlocksWorld and Logistics naturally lend themselves to the physical space, presenting users the ability to keep track of the current state of the world by tracking their positions in their mental space. Moreover, planning visualization interfaces like Planimation (Chen et al. 2020) and WebPlanner (Magnaguagno et al. 2020) utilize state-space visualizations to assist in planning and display plan execution. Planimation, in particular, allows users to create visualizations for plans using an animation profile to specify how different elements are visualized.

Inspired by such systems, we propose an abstraction-based plan visualization which we extend to display explanations as well.

We describe states and transitions between states using *containers* (objects in the world that can “contain” others), *contents* (objects that can be “contained” in others), and *links* (ways for contents to move between containers). We note that state-space visualizations like Planimation also fall within the framework described here.

Abstract Space: The positional relationships between various objects (e.g., On, In, etc.) and the motion of objects between *containers* form the basis of the state-space abstraction visualization. We present one hierarchy-based approach




Figure 3: A state-space visualization example. Left: The initial state; Right: The goal state.

for visualizing state-space information for planning domains that possess these kinds of relationships. Concretely, this approach requires the following properties:

- Domain objects are classified as either *containers*, *contents*, or both.
- Domain objects are either *movable* objects or *immovable* objects.
- All domain actions must move items between containers.
- Predicates must identify and fully specify the relationship between objects for any state.

Note that in some cases it might be necessary to introduce pseudo-predicates to allow for the last property. For example, in BlocksWorld, `onTable(a)` can be “reified” to `onTable(a, table)` with “table” being a dummy object created to represent the implicit table. This is only needed for the visualization, and need not change the planning process.

It is also possible to relax the requirement for all actions to move items between containers, if they modify “properties” of objects. However, this can only be done if the property lends itself to visualization, e.g. color or on/off status, which can be easily shown using a change in color or an added status indicator. However, this is highly domain dependent, and there might be properties that cannot be visualized.

Any planning domain satisfying the above properties can be used to create a visual representation of the state of the world at any given step. We can visualize a network of containers connected by edges that movable contents or containers can traverse, with each edge-type represented by certain actions (e.g., in Logistics, the `move-airplane` action moves an airplane between two locations), with each action causing an object to move across one of these edges, with optional animations.

This is a basic setup and may be specialized and modified for each domain. For example, Figure 3 shows the initial/goal states for a Logistics problem.

Within the state-space visualization, it is much easier to see “why” some positional relationships are not true. Simple preconditions like the requirement for different actions to have objects “in” certain locations are intuitively shown in the state if true, and effects of an action can be clearly seen

with the motion of objects across these edges. This can help users during plan creation.

For presenting explanations within the state-space visualization, we employ the highlighting technique discussed in the action-space visualization. For each state in the execution of the plan, starting from the initial state, we display the current state with respect to the actions that are executed in the human’s plan, using the agent’s domain. We assume if an action’s preconditions are not met, none of its effects take place. Each object involved in a missing/wrong precondition or effect is shown similarly to the highlight-based approach in the action-space visualization, and a tooltip can further reveal information about the explanation.

Integrated Action- and State-Space Visualization

We now present *Visualizations for eXplainable Planning* (VizXP), a visualization framework that combines the action-space and state-space elements discussed previously. It can visualize plans and their execution as well as present explanations to human users, using both state-space and action-space information. The inclusion of the action-space information also conveniently presents a simple way for users to select and view different states after the execution of each action. Highlights in the action-space visualization provide an overview of the steps where the users’ plan went wrong, with the state-space visualization providing more detail about what exactly went wrong. In addition, VizXP also allows users to debug and correct their plans during the creation phase.

We can see how problem-based explanations would be better represented in the state-space visualization, showing the complete start and goal state, in addition to any errors. Similarly, the action-space visualization would be better for understanding domain-based errors, making it clear which conditions were wrong, for which action. However, both visualizations work together in synergy, augmenting the information provided by the other with context.

Finally, we note that depending on the application, an additional visualization might present the agent’s correct plan alongside the human’s plan, similar to contrastive explanation methods. This can then be used to display the ‘required’ information with the human’s plan only visualizing the missing and wrong information. This is required for domain-based explanations that involve actions not in the user’s plan.

The visualization is an augmentation to explanations, and should be used as an aid in helping users comprehend them. Here we also provide some intuition for extending the framework to methods of explanation not included in our evaluation with the prototype:

- For contrastive explanations with foils that are not complete user plans, we present two alternatives. The first is to create the corresponding hypothetical plan and compare the agent’s plan with it. Otherwise, it is also possible to just visualize the portion of the two plans that differs, omitting the common initial part of the plan and tail, if any.
- In our analysis, we provide one-shot explanations, however it is possible to present sequential explanations using




Figure 4: A view of the explanation visualization in the user study. (1) The state-space visualization; (2) The action-space visualization; (3) The text-based explanation.

the same framework, if an algorithm exists to generate such explanations.

Evaluation Setup: User Study

We now discuss the setup for our evaluation, where we compared VizXP against a text-based benchmark, an approach commonly used by current state-of-the-art systems (Eifler and Hoffmann 2020; Valmeekam et al. 2021), through a user study conducted on the online crowdsourcing platform Prolific (Palan and Schitter 2018). The goal of the evaluation is to investigate to what degree MRP explanations presented by VizXP are effective and easily understood by humans compared to the text-based benchmark. Based on insights from other research communities, such as the multimedia learning principled described in the Introduction section, we hypothesize that *participants will perform significantly better with VizXP compared to the text-based baseline.*

Knowledge of the Human Model: Existing MRP solvers require knowledge of the human model M_H^R , which is a difficult assumption to satisfy in practice. To combat this, in the user study, we first described a tweaked “wrong” model to the user and asked them to create a plan using that model. We used users’ ability to create a plan that is valid in the provided model as a proxy for them having the said model, and only considered participants who succeeded in doing this as candidates for the study. We realize that this has the potential to bias the study towards people who can create plans in the first place, but we make this trade-off to satisfy the conditions for model reconciliation.

Once users created a plan with the wrong model, they were provided MRP explanations and were asked to answer a series of questions as well as correct their plans based on those explanations. The users’ answers to those questions as well as their ability to correct their plans reflect their understanding of the explanations provided.

Domain and Problem: Our choice of domain was the Logistics domain (McDermott 2000), which we simplified to make it less complex for people with no background in planning.

Predicates *in-city*, *in*, and *at* were combined into one *in* predicate to avoid confusion. We renamed *airports* to *hubs* and changed the corresponding predicates to allow for some ambiguity to introduce errors in the




Figure 5: A view of the plan editor for the user study. (1) Action selection; (2) The initial and goal states; (3) User’s current plan; (4) Test visualization showing validity of the plan.

domain. We created a simple problem with two cities containing two locations each. One location within each city is a hub. Figure 3 shows the initial and goal states for this problem. There are two airplanes and two trucks distributed across the locations, and one package that needs to be transported to the goal city. We considered two changes for the “wrong” model of the user:

- **C1:** We modified the action *move-airplane* by removing its precondition that the source and destination location must be hubs. Therefore, a domain-based explanation is needed to correct this error.
- **C2:** We changed the initial location of the package, thereby requiring a problem-based explanation to correct this error.

Prototype Implementation: We used elements from VizXP to create a visualization system for the selected domain. For the state-space visualization, we used circles to mark cities and locations and icons for trucks, airplanes, and packages. There were two types of links: Transporting objects between locations (visible); and loading and unloading packages from trucks or airplanes (invisible). An alternate design could further separate these out by type, having different edges for the *move-airplane* action and for the *move-truck* action, but we chose to use only two kinds for the sake of simplicity. We used animations to show objects moving between containers. For the action-space visualization, we used a limited version of the system where only the flows into the current action (preconditions) are visualized. Since none of the explanations would involve any change to the effects of actions, we decided to omit effect flows from the visualization. Figure 4 shows a view of the visualization presenting an explanation. We created the implementation to run on a browser, using Flask and Python as back-end, and D3.js and JavaScript for the front-end.

As VizXP is agnostic to the choice of algorithm to generate MRP explanations, we used one of the existing state-of-the-art solvers to generate the explanations. To display the

		Pop. Size	Correction Ratio	Comp. Score
VizXP	all users	87	0.701	5.402
	CS users	30	0.800	5.400
	domain-based exp.	44	0.681	5.091
	problem-based exp.	43	0.721	5.720
Text	all users	83	0.627	4.759
	CS users	41	0.585	4.340
	domain-based exp.	40	0.625	4.475
	problem-based exp.	43	0.628	5.023

Table 1: User study results.

explanations, we chose the highlight-based approach, with tooltips providing additional information.

Study Design: The study was designed to have two groups: The experimental group using VizXP and the control group using text. Each group was tested on two types of “wrong” models, modified using changes **C1** and **C2** (see “Domain and Problem” paragraph), each requiring a different type of explanation. Therefore, we have **four scenarios** in total, which we tested independently. We created two tasks for each user as follows:

- **Task 1:** Participants were asked to create a plan based on the modified domain and problem information provided to them using a simple plan editing interface. This interface also allows users to “test” their plans, which will provide information about the errors in their plans due to their misunderstanding of the provided domain and problem information. Depending on the scenario, this interface might be either VizXP⁶ (shown in Figure 5) or a sequence of steps with markers for incorrect actions. A participant succeeded in Task 1 if they created and submitted a valid plan given their domain and problem. Users that succeeded in Task 1 continue to Task 2, and users that failed in Task 1 were filtered out and ignored. This is important since MRP explanation-generation algorithms assume that the user’s model is known.
- **Task 2:** We informed the participants that the initial domain and problem information provided to them contained errors and presented explanations for those errors using either VizXP or text based on the group of the participant. They were then asked a series of questions to evaluate their understanding of the explanation provided (**Task 2a**). Then, they were shown the plan editor again and asked to correct their plan, this time without the ability to “test” their plans for correctness (**Task 2b**). A participant succeeded in Task 2b if their corrected plan is valid in the agent’s model.

To incentivize participants to provide answers to the best of their ability, we provided a bonus to participants who succeeded in Task 1 and an additional bonus to participants who also succeeded in Task 2b. Further, we also included

⁶Users in the experimental group are shown VizXP in Task 1 to ensure that they are familiar with the system before receiving an explanation using that interface to eliminate any learning effects.

two questions for attention checks in the study, where participants were asked to type a particular string or select a particular answer in a multiple-choice question. Participants who wrongly answered both questions were removed.

Each participant had the following interactions in the study: (1) They arrive at the webpage following the link from Prolific, where they enter their demographics and some information on their educational background. (2) To ensure that they have the background necessary to solve the tasks, they are given tutorials on classical planning, the logistics domain, and the plan editing interface. (3) Following the tutorials, they are asked to complete Task 1. (4) If they succeeded in Task 1, they are asked to complete Tasks 2a and 2b. (5) All participants, including those who failed Task 1, are then asked to provide feedback on the system’s usability (Holzinger, Carrington, and Müller 2020) and are informed of their payments before being redirected back to Prolific.

Participants: We conducted the study with 200 participants (66 female, 132 male, 2 non-binary) with each of the four scenarios getting 50 random participants. Out of the 200 participants, only results from 170 participants were used as 30 participants failed Task 1 and/or wrongly answered the questions on attention checks.

Measures: To measure comprehension of explanations provided, we used the following measures:

- **Correction Ratio:** Proportion of users who succeeded in Task 1 who also succeeded in Task 2b.
- **Comprehension Score:** Number of questions users answered correctly in Task 2a.

Evaluation Results

We now discuss the results of our evaluations using the measures above to evaluate the performance of VizXP in aiding users understand explanations provided.⁷ For statistical significance, we used a p -value of 0.05 as a threshold.

Table 1 summarizes our results for four different groups of users who succeeded in Task 1: *all users*, the subgroup of users with a *computer science* (CS) background, the subgroup of users who were given the model with change **C1** and *domain-based explanations*, and the subgroup of users who were given the model with change **C2** and *problem-based explanations*. For each group of users, we report the population size of that group and our three measures. We now discuss the results for each of those measures:

- **Correction Ratio:** More users were able to accurately correct their plans with VizXP (= 70.1%) than with the text-based baseline (= 62.7%). This difference is not statistically significant with a two-proportion z -test ($p = 0.303$), but the difference is similar for both domain-based and problem-based explanations. Among the subgroup of users with a CS background, the difference is larger – 80.0% of users succeeded in correcting their plans with VizXP compared to 58.5% with the text-based baseline.

⁷The results for the study and the code for the prototype implementation can be found at <https://github.com/YODA-Lab/VizXP-User-Study>




Figure 6: Comprehension score distribution for all users.

The likely reason is that a fraction of users without a CS background failed to sufficiently understand the planning problem and succeeded in Task 1 due to the aid of the “test” functionality in the plan editing interface. It is also possible that CS users performed better with VizXP because of their familiarity with graph-like visualizations.

- Comprehension Score:** Similar to the previous two measures, users scored better on this measure with VizXP (= 5.402 out of 7 questions answered correctly on average) compared to with the text-based baseline (= 4.759). This difference is statistically significant ($\chi^2(1, N = 170) = 5.2252, p = 0.0223$, and $\epsilon^2 = 0.0371$ with Kruskal-Wallis H non-parametric tests). This difference and statistical significance is further amplified among the subgroup of users with a CS background. Figure 6 plots the distribution of comprehension scores for all users.

The trends above generally apply for the two subgroups who were given domain- and problem-based explanations also. However, there are not much noticeable differences between the two subgroups, indicating that VizXP performed equally well for both subgroups, as did the text-based baseline.

Discussions

While the statistically significant results with the comprehension score measure are consistent with our expectations, we were surprised by the lack of statistical significance on the results with the correction ratio measures. We suspect the reason is that a non-trivial number of users succeeded in Task 1 despite not understanding the planning problem well due to the aid of the “test” functionality. Further, the statistical significance tests used are sensitive to the population sizes. Should the correction ratios remain unchanged for larger population sizes, then the differences between the users using VizXP and the users using the text-based baseline will also become more statistically significant. Therefore, we anticipate that the results for the correction ratio measure will be statistically significant with a larger user study and a better way of ensuring users do not clear Task 1 by trial-and-error.

Additionally, we were surprised to find that 11 users answered at least 6 of the 7 comprehension questions correctly, implying that they understood the explanations well, but failed to accurately correct their plans. This observation implied that their error is due to typos and not misunderstanding of the explanations. This observation thus hints that the

comprehension score measure, for which VizXP is statistically better than the text-based baseline, is more accurate at measuring how well users understand the explanations provided than the correction ratio measure.

Finally, we would also like to highlight that while user studies have been conducted in the XAIP literature, they are at a much smaller scale as they are meant to be feasibility studies, or done with subject experts. For example, Eifler and Hoffmann (2020) and Chakraborti et al. (2019) conducted user studies with only 6 and 39 users, respectively. Therefore, this paper spearheads the need for larger-scale user studies that are necessary for measuring the efficacy of explanations with human users, laying foundations for interactive two-way dialogues with users in future XAIP systems.

We note some limitations of this work as well. In the user study, we require users to create full alternate plans, but in many contrastive explanation systems, users are also able to provide partial foils. It is possible to envision a system designed using VizXP that can use partial foils by splitting the plan at the point of interest and comparing the partial plans, but further work is required to test that ability and its applicability to real systems. Further, we design the user study to ensure the users have a model similar to the one we desire. In practice, obtaining the human model is an open problem in XAIP, which we hope future work will address.

Additionally, it is possible to broaden the scope of the container-based visualization via augmentations, to generalize it to more planning domains. For example, it is not trivial to fit object properties like color or capacity (e.g. fuellevel in NoMystery) into the container framework. However, not all information needs to be captured in the abstraction. With simple augmentations to denote properties (like a blip with current fuel), even such properties can be described in the state space visualization. However, that is domain-specific, and thus will need to be done on a case-by-case basis.

Conclusions

In this paper, we proposed VizXP, a visualization framework for visualizing MRP explanations. Through a combination of state-space and action-space visualizations, we showed how one can visualize both domain-based and problem-based explanations. Through a comprehensive user study, we evaluated the performance of VizXP and found that users, on average, understood explanations better when using VizXP than when using a text-based baseline, which is commonly used by existing state-of-the-art systems. Further, the improvement of VizXP over the baseline is even more pronounced in users with a computer science background, indicating its usefulness for experienced users. In conclusion, this paper makes the important contribution of improving the medium by which explanations are conveyed to users, orthogonal to most existing work focusing on advancing the state of the art in generating explanations, and laying the necessary foundations for successful deployment of XAIP systems in the real world.

Ethics Statement

The discourse around the morality of autonomous (planning) systems and, particularly, explanation generation systems is open-ended and evolving over time. In the following, we discuss a moral value that, we believe, should be regarded as an ethical pillar for such systems. Explanation generation systems should adhere to the moral value of truthfulness. In essence, the systems should not allow for false explanations in order to attend to the user's satisfaction or persuasion. In other words, the explanations generated should be consistent with the ground truth. Now, the ground truth should be carefully encoded into the system's model, and it is our responsibility as developers to ensure its accuracy to the best of our knowledge. On the other hand, it is important to mention that systems like ours, that is, systems using a user's mental model to generate and communicate explanations, may omit certain information from users, which can lead them to come to wrong conclusions on their own, possibly due to incorrect assumptions in their mental models. However, while this is a possible risk of such systems, it is a risk commonly found in human-human interactions as well. Nevertheless, and to reiterate, all information given to a user by our system will be truthful with respect to the system's model. In our view, the value of truthful explanations in explanation generation systems is not only morally righteous, but it can also yield positive consequences. For example, it may be easier for such systems to engender trust, a characteristic of utmost importance in today's AI agenda.

References

- Brunyé, T. T.; Taylor, H. A.; and Rapp, D. N. 2008. Repetition and Dual Coding in Procedural Multimedia Presentations. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 22(7): 877–895.
- Bryce, D.; Benton, J.; and Boldt, M. W. 2016. Maintaining Evolving Domain Models. In *IJCAI*, 3053–3059.
- Bryce, D.; Bonasso, P.; Adil, K.; Bell, S.; and Kortenkamp, D. 2017. In-situ domain modeling with fact routes. In *Workshop on User Interfaces and Scheduling and Planning (UISP)*, 15–22.
- Chakraborti, T.; Fadnis, K.; Talamadupula, K.; Dholakia, M.; Srivastava, B.; Kephart, J.; and Bellamy, R. 2018. Visualizations for an Explainable Planning Agent. In *IJCAI*, 5820–5822.
- Chakraborti, T.; Sreedharan, S.; Grover, S.; and Kambhampati, S. 2019. Plan Explanations as Model Reconciliation. In *HRI*, 258–266.
- Chakraborti, T.; Sreedharan, S.; and Kambhampati, S. 2020. The Emerging Landscape of Explainable Automated Planning & Decision Making. In *IJCAI*, 4803–4811.
- Chakraborti, T.; Sreedharan, S.; Zhang, Y.; and Kambhampati, S. 2017. Plan Explanations as Model Reconciliation: Moving Beyond Explanation as Soliloquy. In *IJCAI*, 156–163.
- Chen, G.; Ding, Y.; Edwards, H.; Chau, C. H.; Hou, S.; Johnson, G.; Sharukh Syed, M.; Tang, H.; Wu, Y.; Yan, Y.; Gil, T.; and Nir, L. 2020. Planimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.04600*.
- Clark, R. C.; and Mayer, R. E. 2016. *E-Learning and the Science of Instruction: Proven Guidelines for Consumers and Designers of Multimedia Learning*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Eifler, R.; and Hoffmann, J. 2020. Iterative Planning with Plan-Space Explanations: A Tool and User Study. In *International Workshop on Explainable AI Planning (XAIP)*.
- Freedman, R. G.; Chakraborti, T.; Talamadupula, K.; Magazzeni, D.; and Frank, J. D. 2018. User Interfaces and Scheduling and Planning: Workshop Summary and Proposed Challenges. In *AAAI Spring Symposia*, 373–377.
- Ghallab, M.; Howe, A.; Knoblock, C.; McDermott, D.; Ram, A.; Veloso, M.; Weld, D.; and Wilkins, D. 1998. PDDL – The Planning Domain Definition Language. Technical Report TR-98-003, Yale Center for Computational Vision and Control.
- Gopalakrishnan, S.; and Kambhampati, S. 2018. TGE-viz: Transition Graph Embedding for Visualization of Plan Traces and Domains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.09900*.
- Grover, S.; Sengupta, S.; Chakraborti, T.; Mishra, A. P.; and Kambhampati, S. 2020. RADAR: Automated Task Planning for Proactive Decision Support. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 35(5-6): 387–412.
- Hoffmann, J.; and Magazzeni, D. 2019. Explainable AI Planning (XAIP): Overview and the Case of Contrastive Explanation. In Krotzsch, M.; and Stepanova, D., eds., *Reasoning Web. Explainable Artificial Intelligence*, volume 11810 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 277–282. Springer.
- Holzinger, A.; Carrington, A.; and Müller, H. 2020. Measuring the Quality of Explanations: The System Causability Scale (SCS). *KI-Künstliche Intelligenz*, 34(2): 193–198.
- Magnaguagno, M. C.; Pereira, R. F.; Móre, M. D.; and Meneguzzi, F. 2020. *Web Planner: A Tool to Develop, Visualize, and Test Classical Planning Domains*, 209–227. Springer International Publishing.
- Mayer, R. E. 1997. Multimedia Learning: Are We Asking the Right Questions? *Educational Psychologist*, 32(1): 1–19.
- McDermott, D. M. 2000. The 1998 AI Planning Systems Competition. *AI Magazine*, 21(2): 35–35.
- Miller, T. 2019. Explanation in Artificial Intelligence: Insights from the Social Sciences. *Artificial Intelligence*, 267: 1–38.
- Palan, S.; and Schitter, C. 2018. Prolific.ac—A Subject Pool for Online Experiments. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 17: 22–27.
- Sengupta, S.; Chakraborti, T.; Sreedharan, S.; Vadlamudi, S. G.; and Kambhampati, S. 2017. RADAR-A Proactive Decision Support System for Human-in-the-Loop Planning. In *AAAI Fall Symposia*, 269–276.
- Sreedharan, S.; Chakraborti, T.; Muise, C.; and Kambhampati, S. 2020. Expectation-Aware Planning: A Unifying Framework for Synthesizing and Executing Self-Explaining Plans for Human-Aware Planning. In *AAAI*, 2518–2526.
- Sreedharan, S.; Hernandez, A. O.; Mishra, A. P.; and Kambhampati, S. 2019. Model-Free Model Reconciliation. In *IJCAI*, 587–594.
- Sreedharan, S.; Srivastava, S.; and Kambhampati, S. 2018. Hierarchical Expertise Level Modeling for User Specific Contrastive Explanations. In *IJCAI*, 4829–4836.
- Valmeekam, K.; Sreedharan, S.; Sengupta, S.; and Kambhampati, S. 2021. RADAR-X: An Interactive Interface Pairing Contrastive Explanations with Revised Plan Suggestions. In *AAAI*, 16051–16053.
- Vasileiou, S. L.; Previti, A.; and Yeoh, W. 2021. On Exploiting Hitting Sets for Model Reconciliation. In *AAAI*, 6514–6521.
- Vasileiou, S. L.; Yeoh, W.; and Son, T. C. 2020. On the Relationship Between KR Approaches for Explainable Planning. In *International Workshop on Explainable AI Planning (XAIP)*.