

IXAM: Interactive Explainability for Authorship Attribution Models

Milad Alshomary[†], Anisha Bhatnagar[§], Peter Zeng[‡],
Smaranda Muresan[†], Owen Rambow[‡], Kathleen McKeown[†]

[†]Columbia University, New York, USA

[‡]Stony Brook University, New York, USA

[§]University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA

Correspondence: ma4608@columbia.edu

Abstract

We present IXAM, an Interactive eXplainability framework for Authorship Attribution Models. Given an authorship attribution (AA) task and an embedding-based AA model, our tool enables users to interactively explore the model’s embedding space and construct an explanation of the model’s prediction as a set of writing style features at different levels of granularity. Through a user evaluation, we demonstrate the value of our framework compared to predefined stylistic explanations.

1 Introduction

Authorship attribution (AA) is the task of identifying the author of a given text. It involves an automatic analysis and comparison of writing style features of different documents. The task is particularly important for domains such as forensic linguistics, where an investigator might use evidence from texts as part of their testimony in criminal trials (Tiersma and Solan, 2002). State-of-the-art models for this task are embedding-based, where documents are matched based on their vector similarities in a learned latent space (Rivera-Soto et al., 2021; Wegmann et al., 2022). Therefore, these models are inherently black boxes and thus the ability to explain their predictions is entirely lacking. Despite the large body of research on explainability, very little work has been done to explain the latent space of AA models. Most of this work is exploratory, aiming to determine whether AA models capture specific style features (Lyu et al., 2023; Wegmann et al., 2022) in their latent space. Recently, Alshomary et al. (2025) proposed an approach to automatically construct an interpretable space from the AA model’s latent space and utilize it to explain the model’s prediction.

In this paper, we introduce IXAM¹, an open-source tool that enables users to construct interac-

tive explanations of the AA model’s predictions. Unlike the work of (Alshomary et al., 2025) that provides static explanations of the prediction, our system, through an interactive interface, allows users to explore different regions of the latent space and inspect their common writing style features, leading to more user involvement and richer explanations of the model’s prediction. As shown in Figure 8, users of our system can construct post-hoc explanations of the model’s prediction through (1) visualizing a two-dimensional approximation of the latent space, showing the texts in question with respect to a background corpus, (2) zooming into a specific cluster of authors to be analyzed by the system in terms of their common writing style, and (3) highlighting the analyzed writing style features in the given texts. Our system’s explanations rely on analyzing the common writing style of clusters of authors in the latent space through utilizing LLMs and the Gram2Vec framework (Zeng et al., 2025b). While the former provides context-relevant high-level style analysis of texts covering a wide range of feature types, the latter generates linguistic features directly traceable to the documents.

We design a user study to compare the user experience of our tool with the explainability framework of Alshomary et al. (2025). The evaluation involves providing users with an AA task consisting of a mystery author and three candidate authors, along with the model’s prediction and explanations. Users must determine whether the model’s prediction is correct, provide supporting explanations, and indicate their level of confidence in their decision. We conduct a small user study with three participants, each completing ten tasks (five for each system). After working on these tasks, participants completed a survey comparing their experience with the new tool versus the baseline framework. The results show that all three users highly value the features of our tools compared to the baseline. Further analysis demonstrated that the explanations

¹Link to the Tool: <https://huggingface.co/ExplainabilityForAATeam>




Figure 1: Our approach for building an interactive tool for exploring style explanations for AA models.

provided by our tool had a higher impact on users’ confidence scores compared to the baseline.

2 Related Work

SOTA authorship attribution systems are embedding-based: pre-trained transformer models that are fine-tuned on large corpora to learn style representations. [Rivera-Soto et al. \(2021\)](#) pool representations from multiple text spans and apply a contrastive objective to bring same-author embeddings closer together, while [Wegmann et al. \(2022\)](#) explicitly encourages the embedding space to encode stylistic rather than topical features. Despite their strong performance, these approaches rely on latent representations that offer limited explainability. Existing efforts to interpret such embeddings (e.g., [Wegmann et al., 2022](#)) do not evaluate the utility of these interpretations for end-user explanations. Another approach augments inherently interpretable systems by fine-tuning a transformer model to correct the interpretable system ([Zeng et al., 2025a](#)), but there is no immediate explanation of the correction. ([Patel et al., 2023a](#)) attempts to learn interpretable style embeddings by prompting LLMs.

To our knowledge, [Alshomary et al. \(2025\)](#) are among the few who generate explanations for model predictions, but their method depends on predefined clusters in the latent space. We emphasize that while there are some other methods for explaining authorship attribution, there have been no systems created to demonstrate their efficacy

when provided to real users.

3 System Description

In the following, we provide an overview of the task of authorship attribution (AA) and embedding-based AA models for this task. We then describe the main components of our proposed system. Finally, we describe how the system performs on a sample case study.

3.1 Authorship Attribution

Authorship attribution is the task of determining the author of a given piece of writing based on stylistic and linguistic features extracted from the text. In this paper, as shown in Figure 3, we adopt the following task format: given a mystery text and three candidate authors, select one of the candidates to be the author of the mystery text. As mentioned, embedding-based AA models learn from large corpora a function that maps documents into a latent embedding space and then use this function to predict the authors of new documents. Therefore, explaining a model prediction involves (1) identifying regions of interest in the embedding space, and (2) describing their shared authorial style.

3.2 Interactive Explainability System

As highlighted in Figure 8, our system takes as input (1) a background corpus to be used as context for identifying specific regions in the latent space, (2) an AA task defined by the mystery author and three candidate authors (task authors), and (3) any embedding-based AA model. Through interactive

exploration, users can visualize a 2D projection of the model’s latent space, zoom into a specific cluster of authors, and highlight common writing style features of these clusters in the task authors’ texts. Instead of a predefined single explanation, this interactivity allows users to construct a wider set of different hypotheses that explain the model’s prediction. In the following, we present relevant implementation details.

1. Latent Space Visualization. Our system first runs the background corpus and the task authors’ documents through the AA model to obtain their latent embeddings. It then projects the embeddings into a two-dimensional space using the t-SNE algorithm and visualizes the result in a scatter plot. As shown in Figure 8, this allows the user to inspect the distance between the mystery author, the predicted author, and other candidates, as well as to identify what clusters of background authors these task authors belong to. The user can then zoom and pan to a specific region in the latent space to analyze its common authorial style.

2. Analyzing the authorial style. When a user requests an analysis of a zoomed-in region in the latent space, our system computes two sets of representative writing style features for it. First, we obtain dynamically generated using large language models (LLMs). LLMs have been employed for writing style analysis in textual data (Alshomary et al., 2025; Patel et al., 2023b), as they obviate the need for a predefined set of stylistic features and are able to induce context-relevant style features. In our system, we provide gpt-4o² with texts from up to 10 authors within the selected zoomed-in region and prompt it to characterize the writing style that is shared across all 10 authors. Second, we use the interpretable Gram2vec approach of ?. Gram2Vec creates an interpretable linguistic representation of an author’s style. It extracts the normalized relative frequencies of grammatical features present in a given text. In our system, we compute the most frequent Gram2vec features in the texts of the authors in the zoomed-in region.

3. Highlighting style features in Texts. Upon request, given an LLM-generated or a Gram2Vec-generated style feature, our system highlights all text spans of the task authors’ texts that contain this feature. This highlighting allows the user to verify the exact part of the text that was claimed to have

the specific feature. We extract these spans from the texts of the task authors using the Gram2Vec library (for the Gram2Vec features) and prompting gpt-4o to find the spans relevant to each of the LLM-generated style features (see second Prompt in 5).

Technical Specifications Our tool uses caching at three levels: (1) t-SNE projections of the entire embedding space, (2) author subsets in zoomed areas, and (3) writing style features and related text spans from GPT-4o and Gram2Vec, all scoped to the user’s AA task and specific zoomed region if applicable. The interface is a modular web app using the Gradio framework. It is optimized for interactive, per-task, and per-region exploration on standard CPU hardware. Besides predefined AA models and tasks, the tool allows users to work with any HuggingFace-based Sentence Transformer model and upload their own AA tasks.

3.3 Case Study

We showcase our tool on an AA case study (Figure 3), using the AA model from Wegmann et al. (2022) as the black-box predictor to be explained³.

First, as shown in Figure 2, **the user can explore a 2D projection of the AA model’s latent space**, visually navigating clusters of authors and salient regions in the space. The task authors (the mystery author and the three candidates) are highlighted in this projection. The user immediately sees that the mystery author and candidate 3 form a tight cluster, together with several background authors (gray dots in the figure), providing a clear visual rationale for the model’s prediction. In contrast, candidates 1 and 2 appear isolated and scattered elsewhere in the space.

Second, **the user can inspect the characteristic writing style of any region in the latent space** by zooming into it. A particularly relevant region is the neighborhood shared by the mystery author and candidate 3. Zooming into this area, as shown in Figure 2, surfaces representative style features, grouped by generation method. Here, the user uncovers a distinctive style: frequent exclamations, expressions of uncertainty, direct address to the reader, and heavy use of quotation.

Third, **the user can highlight the exact spans in the task authors’ texts that exhibit each representative style feature**, as illustrated in Figure 3. This enables direct visualization of how

²<https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>

³A detailed video presentation can be found [here](#)




Figure 2: Our tool allows users to visualize the latent space of the AA model (top left), inspect a relevant subregion to see its common writing style features (top right), and show example spans from the text of the task authors for each of the features

strongly each text reflects the identified style patterns. Through this interaction, the user can ground the model’s prediction in concrete evidence: the mystery author and candidate 3 share a common writing style defined by exclamation marks, expressions of uncertainty, direct reader address, and extensive quotation.

4 Evaluation

Through a user study, we compare the user experience of our interactive explanation tool IXAM with predefined static explanations (Alshomary et al., 2025). We design an evaluation study where we present users with (1) an authorship attribution task consisting of a mystery author and three candidates, (2) the model’s prediction, and (3) the evaluated explanation system. The user’s task is then to determine whether the model predicted the correct candidate, provide a supporting explanation, and indicate their level of confidence in the decision. The confidence assessment indicates whether the explanations had a positive impact on the user’s decision. Additionally, participants must complete a survey about their experience in interacting with the system, comparing it with the baseline.

Data and AA model For the user study, we take the AA model proposed by Wegmann et al. (2022) as the black-box to be explained. We use the Reddit corpus collected by Baumgartner et al. (2020),

which contains posts and comments from Reddit users, as the background corpus and for the AA tasks. To construct the background corpus, we sample 10k authors from the training split with a minimum of 3 texts and a maximum of 10. We apply the clustering approach of (Alshomary et al., 2021) to discover salient regions in the latent space and eliminate outlier authors (authors not assigned to any cluster), resulting in 2252 authors. This background corpus, along with its clustering labels, is used in both our explainability system and the baseline. The task authors are randomly sampled from the test split.

Pre-defined Explanation Baseline To construct the baseline explanations, we follow (Alshomary et al., 2025), who proposed a framework for explaining embedding-based AA models through identifying salient regions in the latent space by clustering training authors and describing their writing style using LLMs. Unlike IXAM, this approach relies on precomputed clusters of training authors to explain the prediction. In particular, given a training corpus of authors’ texts, we generate a latent representation of these authors using the AA model and cluster them to identify salient regions in the latent space. We then prompt gpt-4o to describe the common writing style of this cluster of authors. Finally, to generate style explanations for a given AA task, we compute the latent representation for




Figure 3: An task example consisting of a mystery and three candidate authors. For presentation purpose, we show the highlighting of spans of the top three features of both LLM and Gram2Vec feature types. The top three LLM-derived style features are "Exclamations", "Expressions of uncertainty", and "Direct address". The top three Gram2Vec features are "Part-of-Speech Bigram:Punctuation followed by Proper noun", "Morphology Tag:Quotation punctuation type", and "Morphology Tag:Initial punctuation". It is clear that the Mystery Author's texts and Candidate 3's texts have the most spans highlighted of the different feature types.

each task author and identify their closest precomputed cluster. The style explanation for each author is then the style description of its closest cluster. We present sample explanations in Figure 6.

User Study Since a single task involves reading the texts of four authors and exploring the expla-

nation of the model prediction, it takes up to 10 minutes. Therefore, we conducted a small user study with three participants, each working on 10 AA tasks, five tasks for each evaluated system, of which three were correctly predicted by the model, and two were incorrectly predicted. The users in

User	Baseline			IXAM (Our Tool)		
	Acc.	Conf/Correct	Conf/Wrong	Acc.	Conf/Correct	Conf/Wrong
U1	1.0	4.7	5.0	0.8	5.0	3.0
U2	0.8	3.3	3.0	0.8	4.7	3.0
U3	0.8	4.7	5.0	1.0	5.0	3.5

Table 1: The accuracy of the annotators of identifying if the model predicts correctly (Acc.), and the reported confidence (scale of 1 to 5) on when the model made correct (Conf/Correct) and wrong (Conf/Wrong) predictions.

our evaluation were graduate students with experience in natural language processing and familiarity with the authorship attribution task. The user study begins with the participant completing 5 tasks with the aid of predefined explanations presented in Label Studio⁴. In the second part, one of the authors of the paper demoed our interactive interface to the participant, then the participant was asked to work on the second set of five AA tasks using IXAM. Finally, the participant answered a set of questions as shown in Figure 4 on a 5-point Likert scale.

Results The answers for the survey questions are in Figure 4. The three annotators gave scores of 4 or 5 when rating the helpfulness of the explanations provided by our interface, while giving low scores (1 and 2) for the baseline explanations. Moreover, we assessed the agreement among participants regarding which style features were deemed relevant to the model’s prediction. For the baseline explanations, there is a 3% overlap in the selected style features, which is significantly lower than the 38% overlap observed when using IXAM for explanations. This high level of agreement highlights the plausibility of the explanations IXAM provides.

The results of participants’ accuracy in identifying whether the model predicted correctly are not conclusive (Table 1). The accuracy score for U1 decreased when IXAM was used, while it increased for U3 and remained unchanged for U2. However, when we look at the users’ reported confidence, an interesting distinction emerges. For the baseline, there was no major distinction in confidence between the cases where the system predictions were correct and when they were not correct. In contrast, for IXAM, we see a clear decrease in confidence when the system makes a wrong prediction. This suggests that IXAM’s explanations are more readily interpretable by the users than the baseline explanations, since IXAM’s explanations for the wrong predictions should in fact make less sense.

⁴<https://labelstud.io/>




Figure 4: Survey questions along with the scores distributions given by the three participants in the study.

5 Discussion and Conclusion

In this paper, we present a demo system for analyzing the latent space of AA models to better understand their predictions. The system lets users inspect the latent space via 2D projections, examine stylistic features common to specific subregions, and highlight text spans that exhibit these features. It supports diverse users, including forensic linguists and technical developers, by helping them investigate cases and interpret model behavior. Because existing AA explainability tools are limited, we compare against a simple baseline with precomputed, cluster-based explanations; its static nature is a major drawback relative to our interactive tool. A user study shows participants strongly prefer our system over the baseline.

6 Limitations

Our tool provides strongly plausible explanations to the model’s prediction, yet due to its post-hoc nature, these explanations might not be faithful to the model’s prediction. An extension to our work could consider performing suggested edits on the texts and testing the model’s prediction to analyze the causality between these features and the prediction. The 2D projection of the latent space, while a useful approximation of salient regions in the space, is still an estimate that might generate noise. In our experiments, we worked with Reddit data as the background training corpus, which represents a similar domain to the training data of the AA model. However, in scenarios where we don’t have the training data of the black box model, there might be a domain shift, and this would maybe lead to misalignment.

References

- Milad Alshomary, Narutatsu Ri, Marianna Apidianaki, Ajay Patel, Smaranda Muresan, and Kathleen McKeown. 2025. Latent space interpretation for stylistic analysis and explainable authorship attribution. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 1124–1135.
- Milad Alshomary, Shahbaz Syed, Arkajit Dhar, Martin Potthast, and Henning Wachsmuth. 2021. [Counter-argument generation by attacking weak premises](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 1816–1827, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jason Baumgartner, Savvas Zannettou, Brian Keegan, Megan Squire, and Jeremy Blackburn. 2020. The pushshift reddit dataset. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media*, volume 14, pages 830–839.
- Qing Lyu, Marianna Apidianaki, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2023. Representation of lexical stylistic features in language models’ embedding space. In *Proceedings of the 12th Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics (*SEM 2023)*, pages 370–387.
- Ajay Patel, Delip Rao, Ansh Kothary, Kathleen McKeown, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2023a. [Learning interpretable style embeddings via prompting LLMs](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 15270–15290, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ajay Patel, Delip Rao, Ansh Kothary, Kathleen McKeown, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2023b. Learning interpretable style embeddings via prompting llms. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 15270–15290.
- Rafael A. Rivera-Soto, Olivia Elizabeth Miano, Juanita Ordonez, Barry Y. Chen, Aleem Khan, Marcus Bishop, and Nicholas Andrews. 2021. [Learning universal authorship representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 913–919, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peter Meijes Tiersma and Lawrence Solan. 2002. The linguist on the witness stand: forensic linguistics in american courts. *Language*, 78(2):221–239.
- Anna Wegmann, Marijn Schraagen, and Dong Nguyen. 2022. [Same author or just same topic? towards content-independent style representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP*, pages 249–268, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peter Zeng, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Jihu Mun, Gourab Dey, Nikita Soni, Niranjana Balasubramanian, Owen Rambow, and H. Schwartz. 2025a. [Residualized similarity for faithfully explainable authorship verification](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2025*, pages 15824–15837, Suzhou, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peter Zeng, Hannah Stortz, Eric Sclafani, Alina Shabaeva, Maria Elizabeth Garza, Daniel Greeson, and Owen Rambow. 2025b. [Gram2vec: An interpretable document vectorizer](#).

A Prompts Used in the paper

The following are the prompts used to distill LLM-based style features.

Prompt 1: Identifying Common Style Features

You are a forensic linguist who knows how to analyze linguistic and stylometric similarities between texts.

Identify {max_num_feats} writing style features that are common between the authors' texts.

Author Texts:
{author_texts}

Prompt 2: Identifying example text spans

You are a linguistic specialist. Given a writing sample and a list of descriptive features, identify the exact text spans that demonstrate each feature.

Important:

- The headers like "Document 1:" etc are NOT part of the original text - ignore them.
- For each feature, even if there is no match, return an empty list.
- Only return exact phrases from the text.
- Use the EXACT feature names as JSON keys - do not paraphrase or shorten them.

Respond in this EXACT JSON format
(use these exact keys, populate the lists with the extracted text spans):
{feature: [] for feature in features}

Text:
\"\"\"{text}\"\"\"

Style Features:
{features}

Figure 5: Prompts that are used in our system

Mystery Author

Text: No! Ordinary 'dict's are not guaranteed to be ordered by the Python spec.
Text: Feature request: make it so that pressing enter on the keyboard in that text field had the same effect as pressing "go to ...".
Text: Good job! You should remove them from your repo's history too - I think you can use 'git-filter-branch' to do so, although I can't remember for sure.
Text: It's not, LifeRPG is a separate app. (Habit is awesome too though!)
Text: Huh, doesn't work for me :(Nexus 5, stock Nougat, Google Keyboard.

Explanation of the style

The authors' writing styles are distinguished by a blend of informal language and vibrant humor, forming an accessible and entertaining narrative voice. [...] They enrich their narrative by interweaving intertextual references, drawing from cultural touchstones and external media to provide context and depth. This layered storytelling is supported by a diverse sentence structure, balancing brevity with detail to sustain interest and dynamism. [...] Collectively, these stylistic features create a narrative voice that is both engaging and distinctively lively, inviting readers into a dialogue rather than a monologue.

Candidate 1

Text: Blow... watching them pick, process, paste, powder, pack, plane, and play Can't You Hear Me Knockin' through the whole thing was pretty epic.
Text: If the sun is up, we're up, and feed me, after that you can go back to sleep. Hard food isn't food. Hard food is emergency backup food for if you leave me home too long without refilling my soft food dish.
Text: The Members Only jacket is choice..... I had a black one myself.
Text: I'm 43 years old and find this to be true for me as well.

Explanation of the Style The writing style of these authors is characterized by a dynamic interplay of informal language and vivid emotional expression, rendering their work inherently approachable and deeply personal. [...] Interspersed with enthusiastic interjections such as "Wow" and "Exquisite!" along with stark emotional outbursts like "FUCK THEM!", the authors convey their impassioned perspectives with raw authenticity. [...] This is further amplified by their deft use of direct address, posing questions and thoughts like "Is that better?" to forge an intimate connection, sparking personal reflection or humor, leaving a lasting impact.

Candidate 2

Text: My mantra was to always follow the old adage of never reading the comments on articles especially if it involves race. Then, [...]. You're shining something on a social issue which needs to be addressed. As they say, "light is the best disinfectant" and "truth does not fear investigation."
Keep going.
As an Asian guy, the shows I found the most interesting growing up was all about urban black culture. Boyz N The Hood. Juice. Friday. Menace II Society. Dead Presidents. New Jack City. Do The Right Thing. Baby Boy.
Text: It's assumed that anything worth knowing is already known by white people. If they aren't aware of something specific, it's most likely useless.
Or someone cheated by knowing it first.

Explanation of the style The authors' writing style is characterized by a friendly, conversational tone that invites readers into an almost intimate dialogue, blurring the lines between spoken and written word. Through the use of informal language peppered with colloquialisms, slang, and relaxed punctuation, they cultivate a warm, approachable voice that feels personal and engaging. [...] Ultimately, their prose is imbued with a spectrum of emotions — from humor to empathy — which resonate loudly with readers, rendering their writing not just a medium of information, but a vivid tapestry of experiences and heartfelt expression.

Candidate 3 (Predicted Author)

Text: Awesome, thank you! You get the Most Responsive Dev award™ :)
Text: "TSF Launcher 3D Shell" is apparently closer to "Shell Launcher" than "Shell Launcher". Nobody does search better than Google /s
Text: Why rely on implementation details when there's a trivial way to do what you want in a portable manner?
Text: Nope, none at all.
I don't actually know that, but it seems like the kind of thing that won't happen unless you're Sundar Pichai.
Text: You should still use OrderedDict anyway - this is only an implementation detail!

Explanation of the style The writing style paints a portrait of intimacy and engagement, marked by an informal and conversational tone that invites readers into a dialogue rather than a monologue. [...] They frequently link out to external sources, weaving in a tapestry of multimedia elements to add depth and context to their narratives. This openness extends to their use of parenthetical comments, strategically inserted to inject humor, add depth, or clarify their points without breaking the rhythm of the prose. [...], which infuse each piece with a light-heartedness that makes even the most complex subjects relatable and enchanting for readers.

Figure 6: Example baseline explanations for the model's prediction on one of the AA tasks




Figure 7: Our tool allows users to visualize the latent space of the AA model and inspect a relevant subregion to see its common writing style features.




Figure 8: Our tool allows users to show example spans from the text of the task authors for each of the features