In the result tables you can see 4 factuals with the best counterfactual the model produced.

Table 1: Shows a factual and the corresponding counterfactual generated. This counterfactual was generated by the evolutionary algorithm. It is the result which appears to have the highest viability score.

Factual Sequence Activity	Amount	Resource	Outcome	Counterfactual Sequence Activity	Amount	Resource	Outcome
A-SUBMITTED A-PARTLYSUBMITTED A-PARTLYSUBMITTED A-PREACCEPTED A-FINALIZED O-SELECTED O-CREATED O-SELECTED O-CANCELLED O-CANCELLED O-CANCELLED O-CREATED O-SENT W-Nabellen offertes	20 000 20 000	112 112 112 112 9 9 9 9 9 9 1 112 112	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	A-SUBMITTED A-PARTLYSUBMITTED A-PREACCEPTED A-ACCEPTED O-SELECTED W-Completeren aanvraag W-Nabellen offertes O-SELECTED W-Nabellen offertes W-Nabellen offertes W-Nabellen offertes W-Nabellen offertes A-CANCELLED	11 838 23 074 17 859 12 755 10 052 17 745 -5 005 15 726 9 432 12 500 28 599 12 582 3 868	112 112 1861 935 112 149 779 11119 861 11319 11319	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
				A-APPROVED	8 820	913	0

Table 2: Shows a factual and the corresponding counterfactual generated. This counterfactuals was generated by the case-based model. The counterfactual seems far more viable than the one generated by the evolutionary algorithm.

Factual Sequence Activity	Amount	Resource	Outcome	Counterfactual Sequence Activity	Amount	Resource	Outcome
A-SUBMITTED	5 000	112	0				_
A-PARTLYSUBMITTED	5 000	112	0				
A-PREACCEPTED	5 000	112	0				
A-ACCEPTED	5 000	11169	0				
O-SELECTED	5 000	11169	0				
A-FINALIZED	5 000	11169	0				
O-CREATED	5 000	11169	0				
O-SENT	5 000	11169	0				
W-Completeren aanvraag	5 000	11169	0				
W-Nabellen offertes	5 000	912	0	A-SUBMITTED	9 200	112	1
W-Nabellen offertes	5 000	933	0	A-PARTLYSUBMITTED	9 200	112	1
O-SENT-BACK	5 000	11259	0	A-PREACCEPTED	9 200	112	1
W-Nabellen offertes	5 000	11259	0	A-ACCEPTED	9 200	931	1
W-Valideren aanvraag	5 000	138	0	O-SELECTED	9 200	931	1
W-Valideren aanvraag	5 000	138	0	A-FINALIZED	9 200	931	1
W-Nabellen incomplete dossiers	5 000	11181	0	O-CREATED	9 200	931	1
W-Nabellen incomplete dossiers	5 000	899	0	O-SENT	9 200	931	1
A-APPROVED	5 000	138	0	W-Completeren aanvraag	9 200	931	1
O-ACCEPTED	5 000	138	0	W-Nabellen offertes	9 200	913	1
A-REGISTERED	5 000	138	0	A-CANCELLED	9 200	112	1
A-ACTIVATED	5 000	138	0	O-CANCELLED	9 200	112	1
W-Valideren aanvraag	5 000	138	0	W-Nabellen offertes	9 200	913	1

Across all examples, we see the bias of the viability measure. Every counterfactual is shorter in length than their factual counterpart. We also see, that the value for *Amount* fluctuates heavily for the evolutionary generator. [FOR XIXI: Should I just average the amount?] Similar, holds for

the resource field. All models manage to capture the first three activities and its resource. Also, the counterfactual outcome is the opposite of the factual outcome in all cases. Hence, the each generator successfully inverts the model prediction. Furthermore, each model captures the starting events, quite well.

We see this in Table 1 and Table 2. Furthermore, the model with the highest feasibility among the Evolutionary Algorithm Generator generated counterfactuals, is also the one with the highest viability.

Table 2 displays a counterfactual generated by the Casebased-Search Generator . We see that its result appears to be more viable upon inspection. Here, all Amount variables are below the factual Amount. Hsieh et al. interprets this as a reasonable result. The authors state, that we can interpret the result as having better chances of a successful loan application process if we request a lower loan. The results for the Casebased-Search Generator tells us, that the viability measure does capture a notion of viability. However, it is not enough to generated realistic counterfactuals for models that optimize it.