

Transparency Tools for Fairness in AI (Luskin[†])

Mingliang Chen^{2*}, Aria Shahverdi^{2*}, Sarah Anderson¹, Se Yong Park^{2,4}, Justin Zhang^{2,4}, Dana Dachman-Soled^{2**}, Kristin Lauter³, and Min Wu²

¹ University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN, USA

² University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

³ Microsoft Research, Redmond WA, USA

⁴ Montgomery Blair High School, Silver Spring, MD, USA

Abstract. We propose new tools for policy-makers to use when assessing and correcting fairness and bias in AI algorithms. The three tools are:

- A new definition of fairness called “controlled fairness” with respect to choices of protected features and filters. The definition provides a simple test of fairness of an algorithm with respect to a dataset. This notion of fairness is suitable in cases where fairness is prioritized over accuracy, such as in cases where there is no “ground truth” data, only data labeled with past decisions (which may have been biased).
- Algorithms for retraining a given classifier to achieve “controlled fairness” with respect to a choice of features and filters. Two algorithms are presented, implemented and tested. These algorithms require training two different models in two stages. We experiment with combinations of various types of models for the first and second stage and report on which combinations perform best in terms of fairness and accuracy.
- Algorithms for adjusting model parameters to achieve a notion of fairness called “classification parity.” This notion of fairness is suitable in cases where accuracy is prioritized. Two algorithms are presented, one which assumes that protected features are accessible to the model during testing, and one which assumes protected features are not accessible during testing.

We evaluate our tools on three different publicly available datasets. We find that the tools are useful for understanding various dimensions of bias, and that in practice the algorithms are effective in starkly reducing a given observed bias when tested on new data.

Keywords: Controlled Fairness · Machine Learning · Policy.

[†] Our suite of tools is christened “Luskin,” as this project began at the UCLA Meyer and Renee Luskin Conference Center.

^{*} These authors contributed equally to this work.

^{**} Dana Dachman-Soled and Aria Shahverdi were supported in part by NSF grants #CNS-1933033, #CNS-1840893, #CNS-1453045 (CAREER), by a research partnership award from Cisco and by financial assistance award 70NANB15H328 from the U.S. Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology.

1 Introduction

Machine Learning (ML) is a set of valuable mathematical and algorithmic tools, which use existing data (known as “training data”) to learn a pattern, and predict future outcomes on new data based on that pattern. ML algorithms are the foundation of a revolution in Artificial Intelligence (AI), which is replacing humans with machines. In business, public policy and health care, decision-makers increasingly rely on the output of a trained ML classifier to make important and life-altering decisions such as whether to grant an individual a loan, parole, or admission to a college or a hospital for treatment. In recent years it has become clear that, as we use AI or ML algorithms to make predictions and decisions, we perpetuate bias that is inherent in the training data.

In this paper, we propose new tools for policy-makers to use when assessing and correcting fairness and bias in AI algorithms. Datasets typically come in the form of databases with rows corresponding to individual people or events, and columns corresponding to the features or attributes of the person or event. Some features are considered sensitive and may be “protected,” such as race, gender, or age. Typically we are interested in preventing discrimination or bias based on “protected” features, at least in part due to the fact that it is illegal. Other features may be either highly correlated with protected features or may be relevant from a common sense point of view with the decision to be made by the classifier. By “protected classes” we refer to the different groups arising from the various settings of the protected feature.

The notion of fairness is a rather complex one and there are multiple aspects of fairness and/or perceived fairness related to machine learning (cf. [15,13,12,10,8]). This work is not intended as a survey and therefore we discuss only the fairness definitions most closely related to the current work. We focus on two angles, and argue that each is appropriate in different real-life settings:

Controlled Fairness. In cases where a machine learning algorithm is trained on data labeled with prior *decisions*, as opposed to an objective “ground truth,” our main concern is *parity*, across protected classes. For example, in a stop-question-frisk law enforcement setting, a classifier deciding whether or not a person should be frisked, is trained on past stop-question-frisk data. But whether a person was frisked or not in the past, depends on a (potentially biased) decision. Thus, this is a setting where achieving accuracy with respect to past decisions may not be desirable. Another setting in which *parity* is our main concern (taking precedence over accuracy) is a setting in which an organization is compelled to bear the risk of an incorrect decision, in order to improve societal welfare. For example, a bank may use a classifier to predict whether a person will default on a loan, and then use this information to determine whether to approve the loan. In this case, our main concern may be that the classifier achieves *parity* across protected classes, as long as the bank’s overall risk does not significantly increase.

Our fairness definition requires that controlling for certain “unprotected attributes” such as *type of crime* in the law-enforcement example, or *education* level in the loan example, the classifier’s 0/1 output rate with respect to a given

dataset is approximately the same across the protected classes. We believe this definition will be useful to practitioners as it provides an explicit test for fairness of a specific algorithm with respect to a specific dataset. Of course, we still want to achieve the best accuracy possible with respect to the prior decisions (since the point of training the machine learning model in the first place is to obtain an algorithm that emulates human decisions), while ensuring that the fairness conditions are met.

By controlling for “unprotected features,” we are taking the point of view that it can make sense to “filter” datasets based on “unprotected features” which seem relevant to making a good decision. Filtering simply selects various rows which satisfy certain conditions on the entries in specified columns. This can be viewed as a controlled experiment, which allows one to determine the bias stemming from the protected feature, as opposed to other confounding factors. After filtering, we propose to test for fairness with respect to protected features by checking whether ratios of outcomes are approximately the same across the protected classes.

Accuracy-Based Fairness. In cases where accuracy with respect to a ground truth is prioritized, the above definition may not be the right choice. In this case, the notion of fairness we consider ensures that the true positive rate (TPR) and false positive rate (FPR) are as close as possible across the protected classes, while overall accuracy remains high. We enforce this equivalent learning performance across all protected classes to the extent possible, sacrificing little on the high performance of the model on the majority protected class. This coincides with the *equalized odds* [12] and *classification parity* [5] notion that have previously been considered in the literature. An appropriate setting for applying this notion of fairness is in predicting recidivism, where there is arguably a more objective “ground truth.” Specifically, taking as an example the parole decisions, the machine learning algorithm is not trained on data labeled by the decisions themselves, but rather on data labeled according to whether or not a person who was released was subsequently re-arrested. Furthermore, the risk of making an incorrect decision is extremely high and cannot simply be absorbed as a loss, as in the case of loan defaults. It has been documented (and our own experiments support this) that in the recidivism case, when machine learning algorithms are trained on available data, non-whites have both higher TPR and FPR than whites. This implies that a larger fraction of non-whites than whites are predicted to re-commit a crime, when, in fact, they do not go on to re-commit a crime within two years. Equalizing the TPR and FPR for whites and non-whites (to the extent possible) — and simultaneously maintaining the overall prediction accuracy of the classifier — results in improved fairness outcomes across the protected classes.

1.1 The Toolkit

The three tools we introduce in this work are:

- A new definition of *controlled fairness* with respect to choices of protected features and filters. This definition provides a simple test of fairness of an algorithm with respect to a dataset.
- Algorithms for retraining a classifier to achieve “controlled fairness” with respect to a choice of features and filters. Two algorithms are presented, implemented and tested. These algorithms require training two different models in two stages. We experiment with combinations of various types of models for the first and second stage and report on which combinations perform best in terms of fairness and accuracy.
- Algorithms for adjusting model parameters to achieve “classification parity.” Two algorithms are presented, one which assumes that protected features are accessible to the model during testing, and one which assumes protected features are not accessible during testing.

We also implement and evaluate our tools on the Stop-Question-Frisk dataset from NYPD, the Adult Income dataset from the US Census and the COMPAS recidivism dataset. The Stop, Question and Frisk dataset is a public record of an individual who has been stopped by NYPD, and it contains detailed information about the incident, such as time of the stop, location of the stop, etc. The Adult Income dataset was taken from the 1994 Census Database, and each row has information about an individual such as marital status, education, etc. The COMPAS recidivism dataset records individuals’ basic information and their recidivism within two years. The basic information includes race, age, crime history, etc.

We find that the tools are useful for understanding various dimensions of bias, and that in practice the tools are effective for eliminating a given observed bias when tested on new data.

1.2 Prior Fairness Definitions and Our Contributions

Establishing a formal definition of fairness that captures our intuitive notions and ensures desirable outcomes in practice, is itself a difficult research problem. The legal and machine learning literature has proposed different and conflicting definitions of fairness [15,13,12,10,8]. We begin with an overview of some definitions of fairness from the literature and their relation to the notions studied in this work.

We first discuss the relationship of our new notion of “controlled fairness” to the prior notion of “statistical parity,” originally introduced in [8]. We then discuss our contributions with respect to definitions, algorithms and implementations in this regime.

Next, we discuss the prior notion of “classification parity” [5] and its relationship to our work on accuracy-based fairness. We discuss our contributions with respect to definitions, algorithms and implementations in this regime.

Statistical parity. The notion of statistical parity stems from the legal notion of “disparate impact” [2]. Other names in the literature for the same or similar notion include *demographic parity* [3,23] and *group fairness* [22]. This notion essentially requires that the outcome of a classifier is equalized across the protected classes. For example, it may require that the percentage of female and male applicants accepted to a college is approximately the same.

More formally, the *independence* notion that underlies the definition of statistical parity (see e.g. [1]) requires that, in the case of binary classification:

$$\mathbb{P}\{R = 1 \mid A = a\} = \mathbb{P}\{R = 1 \mid A = b\}. \quad (1)$$

Here, A corresponds to the protected feature, which can be set to value a or b . R is the random variable corresponding to the output of the classifier on an example sampled from some distribution $\mathcal{D}$. Thus, the left side of Equation (1) corresponds to the probability that a classifier outputs 1 on an example sampled from $\mathcal{D}$, *conditioned on the protected feature of the example being set to value a* . Similarly, the right side of Equation (1) corresponds to the probability that a classifier outputs 1 on an example sampled from $\mathcal{D}$, *conditioned on the protected feature of the example being set to value b* .

Assuming rows of a database are sampled as i.i.d. random variables from distribution $\mathcal{D}$, the left hand side probability in (1) can be approximated as the **ratio of the number of rows in the database for which the classifier outputs 1 and the protected feature is set to a to the number of rows in the database for which the protected feature is set to a** . Analogously, the right hand side probability in (1) can be approximated as the **ratio of the number of rows for which the classifier outputs 1 and the protected feature is set to b to the number of rows for which the protected feature is set to b** . These empirical ratios are the basis of our controlled fairness definition (which will be introduced formally in Section 3).

The independence-based notions discussed above have been criticized in the machine learning literature, mainly due to the fact that they inherently sacrifice accuracy, since the *true classification* may itself be deemed “unfair” under these definitions. Our notion of “controlled fairness” is a refinement of these notions (as it allows, in addition, filtering on unprotected features), and indeed may preclude achieving perfect accuracy. Due to this limitation, our notion should only be applied in situations where “fairness” is prioritized over “accuracy.” For example, in some situations such as college admissions, there is no “ground truth” to measure accuracy against, only data about previous admission decisions, which may themselves have been biased. Therefore, in such settings, our goal should not be solely to achieve optimal accuracy with respect to past decisions.

Other objections to these notions include the fact that it may not always be desirable to equalize the outcomes across the protected classes. In our above example, if 20% of the female applicants have GPA of at least 3.5 and SAT scores of at least 1500, while only 10% of the male applicants have GPA of at least 3.5 and SAT scores of at least 1500, then one may argue that it is “fair” for a larger percentage of the female applicants to be accepted than the male.

Our notion of fairness remedies exactly this situation, by allowing “controls” or “filters” to be placed on features that are considered “unprotected.” In the

above example, a “filter” selects the set of rows satisfying the condition that the GPA is at least 3.5 and SAT score at least 1500. Then, among those selected rows, we require that the percentage of accepted females and males is approximately the same.

In summary, our work on *controlled fairness* makes the following contributions and/or distinctions beyond the notion of statistical parity and other notions previously considered in the literature:

1. We introduce a definition of “controlled fairness” that allows one to identify a “filtering” condition on unprotected features that permits one to enforce parity of outcomes across subgroups of the protected classes. (Unlike other definitions in [11] which enforces an intersection on protected features.) This addresses some of the objections to the statistical parity notion, since it does not mandate naïve equalization across the protected classes, but allows for subtleties in how fairness across protected classes is evaluated.
2. Our proposed notion prioritizes equality in predictions, and does not consider a data-generating mechanism or a ground-truth data. We emphasize that the focus is on stating whether a classifier achieves the controlled fairness notion with respect to a given dataset. Thus, we are not mainly concerned with accuracy in this setting and consider it especially appropriate to apply this notion in cases where there is no “ground truth” data, but only data on prior decisions (which may have been biased).
3. We propose two algorithms to retrain a classifier in settings when the originally trained classifier is not fair with respect to our fairness notion.
4. We test our algorithms on real-world data and report the outcomes. Our algorithms require training two different models in two stages. We experiment with combinations of various types of models for the first and second stage and report on which combinations perform best in terms of fairness and accuracy.

Comparison with ϵ -conditional parity. We note that our proposed definition is perhaps most similar to the notion of ϵ -conditional parity, introduced by [16]. The main difference between our notions is that our notion is concrete: It specifies whether a specific classifier does or does not achieve “controlled fairness” with respect to a specific dataset. On the other hand, the notion of [16] defines the fairness of a classifier with respect to its output distribution on instances drawn from various conditional distributions. This makes it less useful as a tool for checking and enforcing fairness with respect to a particular dataset.

Classification parity. Other notions of fairness considered in the machine learning literature include *classification parity*, *calibration*, *calibration within groups* and *balance for the positive/negative class* [5,15]. These notions of fairness prioritize accuracy with respect to a “ground truth,” since a classifier that outputs the true labels will always satisfy the definition. In our work, we recognize the subtleties in the application of the various fairness notions (i.e. not every fairness notion is suitable for application in all situations). We therefore consider applying

these accuracy-based notions, specifically, the notion of *classification parity* (as opposed to our previously introduced notion of controlled fairness), in the case that accuracy is prioritized. *Classification parity* ensures that certain common measures of predictive performance are (approximately) equal across the protected groups. Under this definition, a classifier that predicts recidivism, for example, would be required to produce similar false positive rates for white and black parole applicants. In particular, we will focus on obtaining a classifier whose learning performances across the protected classes are as similar as possible. In other words, we should not be able to distinguish which class of instances is being tested just from the learning performance statistics.

In summary, our work on *classification parity* has the following contributions:

1. We formulate a *weak* and *strong* condition on classification parity and propose two approaches for achieving improved fairness in classifiers.
2. The first algorithm trains a single classifier and then tunes the decision thresholds for each of the protected classes to achieve classification parity. This methodology can be shown to improve fairness for each of the protected classes by equalizing the true positive/false positive rates across classes. However, in order to know which thresholds to apply on an input instance, the classifier must know the values of the protected features.
3. The second algorithm is applicable in the case that it is not legally or socially acceptable to use different classifiers for each of the protected classes, or in the case in which the protected features are simply not known to the classifier. In the algorithm, a single classifier is trained by incorporating a trade-off between accuracy and fairness. The fairness is quantitatively measured by the *equalized distribution* (a notion we introduce in Section 4) of positive/negative instances across the protected classes.

1.3 Additional Related Work

Prior work on achieving statistical parity and removing discrimination. Prior work has suggested entirely different algorithms to achieve similar goals as the goal of this work, which is to obtain classifiers that achieve the controlled fairness definition. For example, the recent work of Wang et al. [18], focuses on the statistical parity notion and suggests to search for a perturbed distribution, which they call a “counterfactual distribution” on which disparity of the classifier across the classes is minimized. Then, for each input to the classifier, they perform a pre-processing step that modifies the features of the input example according to the counterfactual distribution and then run the original classifier on the modified input. The recent work of Udeshi et al. [17] takes as input a potentially unfair classifier and searches the input space to find “discriminatory examples”—two inputs that are highly similar, differ with respect to the protected feature, and are classified differently. Then, using “corrected” labels on these discriminatory examples, the original classifier can be retrained to improve its performance.

In contrast to the work of Wang et al. [18], our approach does not require a preprocessing step to be applied to the test input by the end-user. Instead,

the final classifier can run as before on a test input. This allows for simplicity and backwards compatibility for the end-user, and would be a more socially acceptable solution, since no overt modification of inputs is performed by the end-user (the only modifications occur during training).

In contrast to both the works of Udeshi et al. [17] and Wang et al. [18], our approach is conceptually simple, and can be performed by running a standard training algorithm as-is to generate the final model that is outputted. There is no additional search step that receives the description of the model and must find either the so-called “counterfactual distribution,” or “discriminatory examples,” both of which require additional complex and non-standard algorithms. This makes our approach more suitable as part of a toolkit for policy-makers.

Prior work on achieving accuracy-based fairness. A large number of researches have investigated different variations of accuracy-based fairness and improved the fairness achieved by classifiers. These fair algorithms mainly fall into two categories: those that have prior knowledge of the protected feature in test stage [12,9] and those that do not have prior knowledge [21,4,20,19].

Hardt et al. [12] focused on tuning the classifier to satisfy fairness constraints after the classifier has been trained. The basic idea is to find proper thresholds on receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve where the classifier meets classification parity. Dwork et al. [9] proposed an algorithm to select a set of classifiers out of a larger set of classifiers according to a joint loss function that balances accuracy and fairness. The advantage is that two works can be applied to any given classifiers since no retraining or modification is needed for the classifiers. However, these methods require access to the protected feature in test stage. Hardt et al. [12] did not balance the accuracy and fairness during the process of threshold searching, and also does not guarantee to obtain the optimal solution. Dwork et al. [9] needed large overhead in training multiple classifiers for all the data groups. In contrast, our classification parity based method only requires one trained classifier and the post-processing can provide the unique optimal solution balancing accuracy and fairness.

Learning a new representation for the data is another approach in fairness learning [21,4], removing the information correlated to the protected feature and preserving the information of data as much as possible. For example, Zemel et al. [21] introduced a mutual information concept in learning the fair representation of the data. The advantage of this approach is that it can be applied before the classifier learning stage and no prior knowledge of the protected feature is required during test-time. The weakness is the lack of the flexibility in accuracy and fairness tradeoff.

A direct way to tradeoff accuracy and fairness is to incorporate a constraint or a regularization of fairness term into the training optimization objective of the classifier. The fairness term is described as classification parity, such as demographic parity [20], equalized odds [12] and predictive rate parity [19]. Note that these methods also do not require access to the protected feature in the test stage. In our work, we propose a new definition of fairness that ensures a strong version of classification parity, which we call *equalized distribution*. Compared

with the prior art on classification parity, such as equalized odds [12], equalized distribution is a stronger condition on classification parity, requiring that the classifier achieves equivalent performance statistics (e.g., TPR and FPR) among all the groups, independent of the decision threshold settings of the classifier.

1.4 Organization

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the notation we use throughout the paper. In Section 3, we begin by presenting our new definition of *controlled fairness*. We then present two algorithms to obtain classifiers that achieve the controlled fairness notion (See Sections 3.1 and 3.2). Next, we describe the datasets used to evaluate the performance of our algorithms in Section 3.3. In Section 3.4 we discuss the reasoning behind our high-level implementation choices and in Section 3.5 we evaluate the performance—fairness and accuracy—of the proposed algorithms. In Section 4 we propose two algorithms to achieve classification parity in classifier training, and we show the experimental results on the fairness improvements with the proposed methods.

2 Preliminaries

Notation. Dataset D is represented as a matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{s \times n}$. It has features $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ (corresponding to columns $1, \dots, n$), rows $D^1, \dots, D^s$ and columns $D_1, \dots, D_n$. The j -th entry of the i -th row is denoted by $D[i][j]$. We denote by $\#\{D\}$ the number of rows in D (similarly for a set $\mathcal{S}$, we denote by $\#\mathcal{S}$ the cardinality of the set). In practice, some features are considered protected, while others are considered unprotected. We denote by $F^P \subseteq \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ the set of protected features and by $F^N \subseteq \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ the set of unprotected features.

Database operators. In the database literature, the output of a SQL “Select” query with condition $cond$ on dataset D is represented as the output of operator $\sigma_{cond}(D)$. A SQL “Select” query with condition $cond$ on dataset D returns a dataset that consists of all rows of D satisfying condition $cond$, i.e. if the entries in certain columns satisfy the condition set for those columns. Thus, $|\sigma_{cond}(D)|$ means the number of rows of D satisfying condition $cond$.

Classifiers and Risk Assignment Algorithms A Classifier is an algorithm which takes as input a row in dataset and returns a discrete set of values as its output (in our case we assume binary classifier—yes/no), representing the predicted class for the input. Similarly, a risk assignment algorithm takes as input a row in dataset and returns a real number (interpreted as a probability of being a yes/no instance) between 0 and 1. A risk assignment algorithm is denoted by A and the corresponding classifier is represented by A^C . Specifically, classifier A^C is obtained from risk assignment algorithm A as follows,

$$A^C(D^i) = \begin{cases} 1, & A(D^i) \geq \text{threshold} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Syntax for learning algorithms. A learning algorithm $\mathcal{M}$ is an algorithm that takes as input a *labeled dataset* $D^+ \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times (n+1)}$ and outputs a binary classifier C . The labeled dataset D^+ consists of rows $D^{1,+}, \dots, D^{s,+}$ and columns $D_1^+, \dots, D_{n+1}^+$. Each row $D^{i,+} \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0, 1\}$ is called an *example*. An example $D^{i,+} = D^i || b^i$ consists of a feature vector $D^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that corresponds to a setting of the features $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ and a label b^i .

3 Controlled Fairness

In this section, we introduce our new fairness definition, present algorithms for obtaining classifiers that achieve this notion and evaluate the performance of our algorithms on real datasets.

We introduce the following definition of controlled fairness for a binary classification setting:

Definition 1 (Controlled Fairness). Let $D \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times n}$ be a dataset, let cond_N be a set of conditions on some unprotected features in F^N and let cond_P be a condition on a protected feature in F^P . Let $\neg \text{cond}_P$ denote the negation of the condition. Let $D^+ \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times (n+1)}$ denote the labeled dataset obtained by running (binary) classifier C on dataset D .

Define the datasets DNP , $\neg \text{DNP}$ to be the output of the SQL “Select” queries

$$\text{DNP} := \sigma_{\text{cond}_N, \text{cond}_P}(D^+) \quad \neg \text{DNP} := \sigma_{\text{cond}_N, \neg \text{cond}_P}(D^+)$$

We require that $\#\{\text{DNP}\} > 0$ and $\#\{\neg \text{DNP}\} > 0$.

Define the ratio of a dataset as follows:

$$\text{ratio}(D) = \frac{\#\{k \mid D[k][n+1] = 1\}}{\#\{D\}}$$

We say that C is a fair classifier with respect to D , cond_P , cond_N if:

$$\text{ratio}(\text{DNP}) \approx \text{ratio}(\neg \text{DNP})$$

We next introduce two algorithms for achieving controlled fairness. We then implement and experimentally validate our algorithms on multiple datasets.

Let $D_{(1)}$ be a dataset and let $A_{(1)}$ be a risk assignment algorithm trained on this dataset. $A_{(1)}^C$ is the corresponding classifier, which we assume does not achieve the controlled fairness notion as it was defined in Definition 1.

Specifically, given a new dataset $D_{(2)}$, we label the dataset with the output of the classifier $A_{(1)}^C$ to obtain $D_{(2)}^+$. Since classifier $A_{(1)}^C$ does not achieve the controlled fairness notion (see Definition 1) with respect to $D_{(2)}$ (if it did, we would be done) we have that

$$\text{ratio}(\text{DNP}_{(2)}) \not\approx \text{ratio}(\neg \text{DNP}_{(2)}),$$

where

$$\text{DNP}_{(2)} := \sigma_{\text{cond}_N, \text{cond}_P}(D_{(2)}^+) \quad \neg\text{DNP}_{(2)} := \sigma_{\text{cond}_N, \neg\text{cond}_P}(D_{(2)}^+)$$

Our goal is to remove the bias from $A_{(1)}^C$, even though we do not have access to unbiased training data. In the following two subsections we present two algorithms to solve this problem. Specifically, we would like to leverage $A_{(1)}^C$ to train a new classifier $C_{(2)}$ that remains accurate but is unbiased. The idea of the following algorithms are to use $A_{(1)}^C$ to selectively relabel the dataset $D_{(2)}^+$ such that the biased is removed. We denote the relabeled dataset by $D_{(3)}^+$ and we refer to $D_{(3)}^+$ as a *synthetic* dataset, since the labels of $D_{(3)}^+$ do not correspond to either the original labels or the labels produced by a classifier. Specifically, we will consider two ways of constructing $D_{(3)}^+$ such that the following is satisfied:

$$\text{ratio}(\text{DNP}_{(3)}) \approx \text{ratio}(\neg\text{DNP}_{(3)}),$$

where

$$\text{DNP}_{(3)} := \sigma_{\text{cond}_N, \text{cond}_P}(D_{(3)}^+) \quad \neg\text{DNP}_{(3)} := \sigma_{\text{cond}_N, \neg\text{cond}_P}(D_{(3)}^+)$$

We then train a new classifier $C_{(2)}$ on the synthetic dataset. We expect $C_{(2)}$ to achieve the controlled fairness definition with respect a newly sampled dataset $D_{(4)}$ which has never been seen by the classifier, while accuracy with respect to the true labels remains high. We will validate these expectations with our experimental results in Section 3.5. In the following, we describe two algorithms for generating the synthetic labeled dataset $D_{(3)}^+$.

3.1 Algorithm 1: Synthetic Data via Selective Risk Adjustment

In this section we present our first proposed algorithm. The idea of this algorithm is to adjust the risk values associated with one of the protected classes, compute new labels based on the adjusted risk values and output the resulting database as $D_{(3)}^+$. Recall that $A_{(1)}$ is trained on dataset $D_{(1)}$ and that labeled dataset $D_{(2)}^+$ is obtained by applying classifier $A_{(1)}^C$ on a new dataset $D_{(2)}$. Specifically, the labeled dataset is computed as follows:

$$D_{(2)}^+[i][n+1] = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } A_{(1)}(D_{(2)}^i) \geq \text{threshold} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

For the case of logistic regression the **threshold** in the above equation is usually set at 0.5.

Since we assumed classifier $A_{(1)}^C$ does not already achieve the controlled fairness definition, we have WLOG that $\text{ratio}(\text{DNP}_{(2)}) \geq \text{ratio}(\neg\text{DNP}_{(2)})$. In particular:

$$\frac{\#\{k \mid A_{(1)}(\text{DNP}_{(2)}^k) \geq \text{threshold}\}}{\#\{\text{DNP}_{(2)}\}} \geq \frac{\#\{k \mid A_{(1)}(\neg \text{DNP}_{(2)}^k) \geq \text{threshold}\}}{\#\{\neg \text{DNP}_{(2)}\}} \quad (2)$$

Let

$$\alpha := \frac{\#\{\text{DNP}_{(2)}\} \cdot \#\{k \mid A_{(1)}(\neg \text{DNP}_{(2)}^k) \geq \text{threshold}\}}{\#\{\neg \text{DNP}_{(2)}\}}$$

To obtain synthetic dataset $D_{(3)}^+$, we first compute Δ such that the following holds:

$$\#\{k \mid (A_{(1)}(\text{DNP}_{(2)}^k) - \Delta) \geq \text{threshold}\} \approx \alpha \quad (3)$$

In order to compute Δ we sort $\text{DNP}_{(2)}$ according to the risk value outputted by $A_{(1)}$ on each entry and find the maximal value of $\text{threshold}'$ such that $\#\{k \mid A_{(1)}(\text{DNP}_{(2)}^k) \geq \text{threshold}'\} \approx \alpha$. Then Δ can be computed as $\Delta = \text{threshold}' - \text{threshold}$. Figure 1 shows an example of the distribution of $A_{(1)}(\text{DNP}_{(2)})$ and pictorially represents the method of finding Δ .




Fig. 1. Note that the quantity $\#\{k \mid A_{(1)}(\text{DNP}_{(2)}^k) \geq \text{threshold}'\}$ is represented by the area under the curve and to the right of the vertical line passing through $(\text{threshold}', 0)$. Therefore, we set the value of $\text{threshold}'$ so that the area of the marked region is equal to α . Then Δ is set to $\text{threshold}' - \text{threshold}$.

$\text{DNP}_{(3)}$ is equivalent to $\text{DNP}_{(2)}$, except for the final column (the $(n+1)$ -st column), which corresponds to the labels. The labels of $\text{DNP}_{(3)}$ are defined as follows:

$$\text{DNP}_{(3)}[i][n+1] = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } A_{(1)}(\text{DNP}_{(2)}^i) - \Delta \geq \text{threshold} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

It is straightforward to see that the following property is satisfied

$$\frac{\#\{k \mid \text{DNP}_{(3)}[k][n+1] = 1\}}{\#\{\text{DNP}_{(3)}\}} \approx \frac{\#\{k \mid \neg \text{DNP}_{(2)}[k][n+1] = 1\}}{\#\{\neg \text{DNP}_{(2)}\}}.$$

$D_{(3)}^+$ is then defined to be a concatenation of the following datasets.

$$D_{(3)}^+ := \text{DNP}_{(3)} \mid \neg \text{DNP}_{(2)} \mid \sigma_{\neg \text{cond}_N}(D_{(2)}^+)$$

The synthetic dataset $D_{(3)}^+$ will be used to train a new classifier $C_{(2)}$. Algorithm 1 shows pseudocode for this algorithm. The FILTER function takes a dataset D , and returns the rows which satisfies whatever conditions *cond* is passed to it as input. The CHECKFAIR function takes two dataset and the label column and check whether the fairness notion, as it is introduced in Definition 1, is satisfied. The CHECKFAIR function returns 1 if fairness notion is achieved and returns 0, otherwise.

3.2 Algorithm 2: Synthetic Data via Risk Based Flipping

In this section, we present our second proposed algorithm. The idea of this algorithm is to preserve the original labels of the datapoints in $D_{(2)}$ (as opposed to using $A_{(1)}^C$ to fully relabel the dataset) and flip only the minimal number of datapoints within one of the protected classes to construct $D_{(3)}^+$ that satisfies

$$\text{ratio}(\text{DNP}_{(3)}) \approx \text{ratio}(\neg \text{DNP}_{(3)}).$$

$A_{(1)}$ will be utilized to provide a risk score that helps decide which datapoints should be flipped.

Recall that as in the previous sections classifier $A_{(1)}^C$ is trained on dataset $D_{(1)}$. In this section, we assume a new *labeled* dataset $D_{(2)}^+$ is given, labeled with the true labels. If labeled dataset $D_{(2)}^+$ is not biased, then we can trivially set $D_{(3)}^+ := D_{(2)}^+$. Therefore, we assume WLOG that the following holds

$$\frac{\#\{k \mid \text{DNP}_{(2)}[k][n+1] = 1\}}{\#\{\text{DNP}_{(2)}\}} \geq \frac{\#\{k \mid \neg \text{DNP}_{(2)}[k][n+1] = 1\}}{\#\{\neg \text{DNP}_{(2)}\}}.$$

Similar to the previous algorithm we fix the right hand side:

$$\alpha := \frac{\#\{\text{DNP}_{(2)}\} \cdot \#\{k \mid \neg \text{DNP}_{(2)}[k][n+1] = 1\}}{\#\{\neg \text{DNP}_{(2)}\}}$$

The above indicates that we should construct $\text{DNP}_{(3)}$ such that it has α number of rows with label 1. Since there are currently $\#\{k \mid \text{DNP}_{(2)}[k][n+1] = 1\}$ rows in $\text{DNP}_{(2)}$ with label 1, we must flip the labels for $\beta = \alpha - \#\{k \mid \text{DNP}_{(2)}[k][n+1] = 1\}$ number of rows from 1 to 0. To do so, we first divide $\text{DNP}_{(2)}$ into disjoint datasets based on its labels and flip enough samples only from the dataset with label of 1. Let cond_L be the condition that selects the datapoints of $\text{DNP}_{(2)}$ with

Algorithm 1 Synthetic Data via Selective Risk Adjustment

```

1: procedure MAIN( $D, A, colnum, rownum, th, cond_P, cond_N$ )
2:   Call RISKASSIGNMENT( $D, A, colnum, rownum$ )
3:   Call INITIALIZELABELS( $D, colnum, rownum, th$ )
4:   Call SYNTHETICGEN( $D, colnum, rownum, th, cond_P, cond_N$ )
5:    $C \leftarrow$  LEARN( $D, colnum + 1, rownum$ )
6:   Output  $C$ 
7: end procedure

8: procedure RISKASSIGNMENT( $D, A, colnum, rownum$ )
9:   for  $i = 1$  to  $rownum$  do
10:    Set  $D[i][colnum + 2] = A(D[i][1], \dots, D[i][colnum])$ 
11:   end for
12: end procedure

13: procedure INITIALIZELABELS( $D, colnum, rownum, th$ )
14:   for  $i = 1$  to  $rownum$  do
15:    if  $D[i][colnum + 2] \geq th$  then
16:      Set  $D[i][colnum + 1] = 1$ 
17:    else
18:      Set  $D[i][colnum + 1] = 0$ 
19:    end if
20:   end for
21: end procedure

22: procedure SYNTHETICGEN( $D, colnum, rownum, th, cond_P, cond_N$ )
23:   Set  $DNP = \text{FILTER}(D, cond_N, cond_P)$ 
24:   Set  $\neg DNP = \text{FILTER}(D, cond_N, \neg cond_P)$ 
25:   Set  $\neg DN = \text{FILTER}(D, \neg cond_N)$ 
26:   if CHECKFAIR( $DNP, \neg DNP, colnum + 1$ ) = 0 then
27:     sum = 0
28:     for  $i = 1$  to  $\#\{\neg DNP\}$  do
29:       if  $\neg DNP[i][colnum + 2] \geq th$  then
30:         sum = sum + 1
31:       end if
32:     end for
33:      $\alpha = \frac{\#\{DNP\} \cdot \text{sum}}{\#\{\neg DNP\}}$ 
34:     Sort  $DNP$  according to  $colnum + 2$  from largest to smallest
35:      $th' = DNP[\text{round}(\alpha)][colnum + 2]$ 
36:      $\Delta = th' - th$ 
37:     for  $i = 1$  to  $\#\{DNP\}$  do
38:        $DNP[i][colnum + 2] = DNP[i][colnum + 2] - \Delta$ 
39:     end for
40:     Call INITIALIZELABELS( $DNP, colnum, \#\{DNP\}, th$ )
41:      $D := \text{Concatenate}(DNP, \neg DNP, \neg DN)$ 
42:   end if
43: end procedure

```

label of 1 and $\neg cond_L$ be the condition that selects datapoints with label of 0. Then we construct the following two datasets from $DNP_{(2)}$,

$$DNPL_{(2)} := \sigma_{cond_N, cond_P, cond_L}(D_{(2)}^+) \quad \neg DNPL_{(2)} := \sigma_{cond_N, cond_P, \neg cond_L}(D_{(2)}^+)$$

Then, we sort $DNPL_{(2)}$ according to the score of each data point, as assigned by $A_{(1)}$, from smallest to largest. $DNPL_{(3)}$ is equivalent to (the sorted version of) $DNPL_{(2)}$, except for the final column (the $(n+1)$ -st column), which corresponds to the labels. The labels of $DNPL_{(3)}$ are defined as follows:

$$DNPL_{(3)}[i][n+1] = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } i \leq \beta \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We then define $DNP_{(3)}$ as follows: $DNP_{(3)} := DNPL_{(3)} | \neg DNPL_{(2)}$ and it is straightforward to see that the following property is satisfied

$$\frac{\#\{k \mid DNP_{(3)}[k][n+1] = 1\}}{\#\{DNP_{(3)}\}} \approx \frac{\#\{k \mid \neg DNP_{(2)}[k][n+1] = 1\}}{\#\{\neg DNP_{(2)}\}}.$$

Similar to the previous algorithm, we define the synthetic dataset $D_{(3)}^+$ to be a concatenation of the following datasets.

$$D_{(3)}^+ := DNP_{(3)} \quad | \quad \neg DNP_{(2)} \quad | \quad \sigma_{\neg cond_N}(D_{(2)}^+)$$

The new dataset $D_{(3)}^+$ will be used to train a new classifier $C_{(2)}$. Algorithm 2 shows pseudocode for this algorithm. The `FILTER` function takes a dataset D , and returns the rows which satisfies whatever conditions $cond$ is passed to it as input. The `CHECKFAIR` function takes two dataset and the label column and check whether the fairness notion, as it is introduced in Definition 1, is satisfied. The `CHECKFAIR` function returns 1 if fairness notion is achieved and returns 0, otherwise.

3.3 Choice of dataset

Stop, Question and Frisk Dataset. The *Stop, Question and Frisk* dataset is a publicly available dataset that consists of information collected by New York Police Department officers since 2003 [6]. We selected the data from year 2012 as it had a sufficient number of entries for training purposes. The original dataset from 2012 had 532,911 rows and 112 columns and after cleaning 477,840 rows remained. Additionally, we selected 33 relevant columns, based on the description which is provided with the dataset. Each row of the dataset represents an individual who has been stopped by an officer and includes detailed information about the incident such as time of stop, reason for stop, crime they are suspected of, etc.

Figure 2 shows the majority of the people in the dataset (i.e. a majority of people who were stopped by an officer) are non-white. In addition, a significantly higher proportion of non-whites are frisked compared to whites. Figure 3 shows

Algorithm 2 Synthetic Data via Risk Based Flipping

```

1: procedure MAIN( $D, A, colnum, rownum, th, cond_P, cond_N, cond_L$ )
2:   Call RISKASSIGNMENT( $D, A, colnum, rownum$ )
3:   Call SYNTHETICGEN( $D, colnum, rownum, th, cond_P, cond_N, cond_L$ )
4:    $C \leftarrow \text{LEARN}(D, colnum + 1, rownum)$ 
5:   Output  $C$ 
6: end procedure

7: procedure RISKASSIGNMENT( $D, A, colnum, rownum$ )
8:   for  $i = 1$  to  $rownum$  do
9:     Set  $D[i][colnum + 2] = A(D[i][1], \dots, D[i][colnum])$ 
10:  end for
11: end procedure

12: procedure SYNTHETICGEN( $D, colnum, rownum, th, cond_P, cond_N, cond_L$ )
13:   Set  $\text{DNP} = \text{FILTER}(D, cond_N, cond_P)$ 
14:   Set  $\text{DNPL} = \text{FILTER}(D, cond_N, cond_P, cond_L)$ 
15:   Set  $\neg\text{DNPL} = \text{FILTER}(D, cond_N, cond_P, \neg cond_L)$ 
16:   Set  $\neg\text{DNP} = \text{FILTER}(D, cond_N, \neg cond_P)$ 
17:   Set  $\neg\text{DN} = \text{FILTER}(D, \neg cond_N)$ 
18:   if CHECKFAIR( $\text{DNP}, \neg\text{DNP}, colnum + 1$ ) = 0 then
19:     sum = 0
20:     for  $i = 1$  to  $\#\{\neg\text{DNP}\}$  do
21:       if  $\neg\text{DNP}[i][colnum + 1] == 1$  then
22:         sum = sum + 1
23:       end if
24:     end for
25:      $\alpha = \frac{\#\{\text{DNP}\} \cdot \text{sum}}{\#\{\neg\text{DNP}\}}$ 
26:      $\beta = \alpha - \#\{\text{DNPL}\}$ 
27:     Sort DNPL according to  $colnum + 2$  from smallest to largest
28:     for  $i = 1$  to  $\beta$  do
29:        $\text{DNPL}[i][colnum + 1] = 0$ 
30:     end for
31:      $D := \text{Concatenate}(\text{DNPL}, \neg\text{DNPL}, \neg\text{DNP}, \neg\text{DN})$ 
32:   end if
33: end procedure

```

that when we filter on the type of crime an individual is suspected of, e.g. assault vs. non-assault, Non-Whites are still more likely to be frisked. Finally, Figure 4 presents the percentage of frisked individuals within each race Figure 3. It can be seen that White individuals are less likely to be frisked, even when suspected of the same type of crime (assault).




Fig. 2. Number of people who got frisked in each race




Fig. 3. Number of people who got frisked conditioned on being suspected of committing an assault




Fig. 4. Comparison of frisked ratio between races conditioned on being suspected of committing an assault

Adult Income Dataset. The *Adult Income* dataset was taken from the 1994 Census Database and contains 15 columns of demographic information collected by the census. The dataset contains 48,842 entries. The task for this dataset was to predict whether a given individual earned more than \$50K per year. We chose this dataset since such a classifier can then be used, for example, to decide whether an individual gets approved for a loan. Three columns were dropped from the dataset when training the models. Native country was dropped because it did not contain a lot of information, as the vast majority of individuals were from the United States, and using the column as a training feature would have added a high degree of dimensionality. Education level was also dropped because

the same information was encoded in a separate numeric column. Finally, `fnlwgt` - the statistical weight assigned to each individual by the census - was dropped because it had extremely low correlation with the target column.

Figure 5 shows that the majority of individuals in the dataset are white, and a greater proportion of White people make more than \$50K per year than Non-whites. Figure 6 shows the same plot filtered on education level (only for the subset of the dataset with more than 10 years of education). Figure 7 represent the percentage for each race for the Figure 6. It can be seen that a higher percentage of White individuals versus Non-White make more than \$50K, even when controlling for education level.




Fig. 5. Number of people by race and income level




Fig. 6. Number of people by race and income level conditioned on having more than 10 years of education




Fig. 7. Comparison of ratio of income levels conditioned on having more than 10 years of education

3.4 Type of models for our Algorithms

Algorithm 1 and 2 both require two trained models, denoted $A_{(1)}$ and $C_{(2)}$. In this section, we will consider the choice of the *type* of model used for $A_{(1)}$ and

$C_{(2)}$. Recall that $A_{(1)}$ is a risk assignment algorithm. This means we have to select a type of model which outputs continuous values representing the probability of each output class. Luckily, two of the most popular types of models “Logistic Regression (LR)” and “Multi-layer Perceptron (MLP),” have this property. While $C_{(2)}$ is only required to be a classifier, we still consider the same two types of models for it. Therefore, there are 4 different choices for the types for $A_{(1)}/C_{(2)}$: LR/LR, LR/MLP, MLP/LR, MLP/MLP. As our experimental data will show, some combinations of types perform significantly better than others, both in the case of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2. In the following we will provide a high-level explanation for why both Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 perform better when $C_{(2)}$ is of type MLP.

For illustrative purposes, we use the *Adult Income Dataset* to construct a simplified model in which only two features - age and hours per week - are considered. In this case, age is the protected feature and hours per week is the unprotected feature. We will observe that the synthetic dataset constructed by Algorithm 1 and 2 is difficult for a LR-type model to learn.

Algorithm 1 Recall that in this case we find an optimal value of Δ and use it to perturb the dataset $D_{(2)}^+$, which is labeled with the output of $A_{(1)}^C$. Figure 8 shows the prediction of the first classifier, i.e. $A_{(1)}^C$ on dataset $D_{(2)}$. The decision boundary for that classifier is also represented in the same figure. Figure 9 shows the new labels produced after applying Δ to subset of dataset $D_{(2)}$ to generate a synthetic dataset $D_{(3)}^+$. Note that applying Δ creates non linear decision boundaries (observe the blue triangular region that appears), resulting in a dataset that cannot be learned to high accuracy with logistic regression.




Fig. 8. $A_{(1)}^C$ predictions on dataset $D_{(2)}$




Fig. 9. $A_{(1)}^C$ Predictions adjusted by applying Δ to get synthetic dataset $D_{(3)}^+$

Algorithm 2 Recall that in this case we keep the original labels of dataset $D_{(2)}^+$ and flip only a minimal number of labels (using $A_{(1)}$ to decide which labels to

flip). Figure 10 shows the decision boundary of $A_{(1)}^C$ as well as original labels of $D_{(2)}^+$. Figure 11 shows the new labels generated by flipping enough sample points in the subset of dataset $D_{(2)}^+$ to generate synthetic dataset $D_{(3)}^+$. Similar to the previous algorithm, flipping these labels creates non linear decision boundaries (a blue triangular region again appears, although fainter than before), resulting in a dataset that cannot be learned to high accuracy with logistic regression.




Fig. 10. $A_{(1)}^C$ decision boundary with original labels of $D_{(2)}$




Fig. 11. $A_{(1)}^C$ decision boundary and flipping labels of $D_{(2)}$ to get synthetic dataset $D_{(3)}^+$

It is therefore crucial for the second classifier to be able to find these non-linear boundaries as well. As supported by the experimental data, Multi-layer Perceptron, which potentially has non-linear decision boundaries, is therefore a good choice for the type of the second classifier $C_{(2)}$.

3.5 Experimental Result

In this section we present the result of both of the algorithms explained earlier. In each of the tables there are protected features shown in the first column. For both of the datasets we chose to use “race” as a protected feature, with “W” representing White and “NW” representing non-White. The unprotected features and corresponding conditions, shown by “Filter” in the Table, are different for each dataset. For the *Stop, Question and Frisk* dataset, the unprotected feature is *type of crime* and the corresponding condition is whether an individual is suspected of committing an assault, represented by “A” or not suspected of assault, represented by “NA.” For the *Adult Income* dataset, the unprotected feature is *education level* and the corresponding condition is whether an individual has more than 10 years of education, represented by “E” or not, represented by “UE” in the tables. We also report the accuracy of each trained model, represented by “Acc” in the tables, in terms of the Area under Curve (AUC) of each model.

The accuracy is measured with respect to the original labels. In each case we report the **ratio**, as it is introduced in Definition 1, of each dataset given the conditions on its columns. The final goal is to have a classifier which achieves fairness notion as it was introduced in Definition 1. Specifically, **ratio** should be approximately the same across the protected classes. For the choice of model type, as explained in Section 3.4, we consider 4 different combinations.

To measure the performance of our algorithms, we divide our dataset into 3 batches of size 40%, 40%, 20%. The first 40% of dataset is $D_{(1)}$ and is used to construct the first classifier $A_{(1)}^C$. The second 40% of dataset is $D_{(2)}$ and is used to first check the fairness notion for $A_{(1)}^C$ and construct the new dataset, i.e. $D_{(3)}^+$. The last 20% is $D_{(4)}$ which is being used for testing the fairness of both $A_{(1)}^C$ and $C_{(2)}$. All the numbers we report correspond to the performance of the classifier with respect to the dataset $D_{(4)}$, which has never been seen by the classifier.

Stop, Question and Frisk Dataset Table 1 shows the performance—fairness and accuracy—for Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 on the *Stop, Question and Frisk Dataset* when the first model, $A_{(1)}$, is of type *Logistic Regression*. The first 2 columns are obtained from the original labels of the data. They show that when we filter on “Assault”, the **ratio** of individuals who got frisked is 45% and 52% for White and Non-White, respectively—a gap of 7%. The next 2 columns are obtained from the labels generated by $A_{(1)}^C$ on the dataset. In this case, when we filter on “Assault”, the **ratio** of frisked individuals is 25% and 38% for White and Non-White, respectively—a gap of 13%. By selecting the second model, $C_{(2)}$, to be of type *Logistic Regression*, the ratios become 20% and 27% for Algorithm 1 and 19% and 25% for Algorithm 2. Note that while the difference in the ratios is not significantly reduced (as expected when using a second model of type LR). Once we choose MLP as the type of the second model, $C_{(2)}$, the ratios become 25% and 27% for Algorithm 1 and 42% and 46% for Algorithm 2, reducing the gap to 2% and 4%, respectively. Note that the gap is comparable for the two algorithms, Algorithm 2 is preferable, since the ratios of 42% and 46% are much closer to the original ratios of 45% among Whites (the ratio in the original data), which we are trying to match. Indeed, the accuracy of the second model produced by Algorithm 1 is about 2% lower than the accuracy of the second model produced by Algorithm 2. Note that some drop in accuracy is expected, since we are measuring accuracy with respect to the original labels, and our goal is to ensure fairness (which is not satisfied by the original labels).

Table 2 shows the performance—fairness and accuracy—for Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 on the *Stop, Question and Frisk Dataset* when the first model, $A_{(1)}$, is of type *Multi-layer Perceptron*. The first 2 columns are obtained from the original labels of the data. They show that when we filter on “Assault”, the **ratio** of individuals who got frisked is 45% and 52% for White and Non-White, respectively—a gap of 7%. The next 2 columns are obtained from the labels generated by $A_{(1)}^C$ on the dataset. In this case, when we filter on “Assault”, the **ratio** of frisked individuals is 25% and 38% for White and Non-White, respectively—a gap of 13%. By selecting the second model, $C_{(2)}$, to be of type *Logistic Regression*,

Table 1. Performance of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 on Stop, Question and Frisk Dataset when the first model is of type *Logistic Regression*

		Original Data		$A_{(1)}^C$ (LR)		$C_{(2)}$ (LR)		$C_{(2)}$ (MLP)	
Algorithm 1	Acc			0.8186		0.8181		0.7972	
	Filter	NA	A	NA	A	NA	A	NA	A
	W	0.456	0.445	0.321	0.258	0.320	0.199	0.323	0.246
	NW	0.588	0.520	0.525	0.380	0.525	0.271	0.525	0.271
Algorithm 2	Acc			0.8186		0.8183		0.8160	
	Filter	NA	A	NA	A	NA	A	NA	A
	W	0.456	0.445	0.321	0.258	0.327	0.188	0.466	0.423
	NW	0.588	0.520	0.525	0.380	0.528	0.247	0.604	0.458

the ratios become 23% and 31% for Algorithm 1 and 19% and 24% for Algorithm 2. Note that the difference in the ratios is not significantly reduced (as expected when using a second model of type LR). Once we choose MLP as the type of the second model, $C_{(2)}$, the ratios become 38% and 40% for Algorithm 1 and 47% and 48% for Algorithm 2, reducing the gap to 2% and 1%, respectively. Note that while the gap and the overall accuracy is comparable for the two algorithms, Algorithm 2 is preferable, since the ratios of 47% and 48% are much closer to the original ratios of 45% among Whites (the ratio in the original data), which we are trying to match.

Table 2. Performance of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 on Stop, Question and Frisk Dataset when the first model is of type *Multi-Layer Perceptron*

		Original Data		$A_{(1)}^C$ (MLP)		$C_{(2)}$ (LR)		$C_{(2)}$ (MLP)	
Algorithm 1	Acc			0.8167		0.8157		0.8168	
	Filter	NA	A	NA	A	NA	A	NA	A
	W	0.456	0.445	0.401	0.412	0.362	0.230	0.401	0.378
	NW	0.588	0.520	0.567	0.502	0.536	0.305	0.566	0.396
Algorithm 2	Acc			0.8167		0.8183		0.8172	
	Filter	NA	A	NA	A	NA	A	NA	A
	W	0.456	0.445	0.401	0.412	0.326	0.188	0.433	0.473
	NW	0.588	0.520	0.567	0.502	0.527	0.242	0.625	0.476

Adult Income Dataset. Table 3 shows the performance—fairness and accuracy—for Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 on the *Adult Income Dataset* when the first model, $A_{(1)}$, is of type *Logistic Regression*. The first 2 columns are obtained from

the original labels of the data. They show that when we filter on “Education”, the ratio of individuals who earn more than 50k is 44% and 36% for White and Non-White, respectively—a gap of 8%. The next 2 columns are obtained from the labels generated by $A_{(1)}^C$ on the dataset. In this case, when we filter on “Education”, the ratio of individuals who earn more than 50k is 62% and 46% for White and Non-White, respectively—a gap of 16%. By selecting the second model, $C_{(2)}$, to be of type *Logistic Regression*, the ratios become 63% and 52% for Algorithm 1 and 61% and 53% for Algorithm 2. Note that the difference in the ratios is only slightly reduced (as expected when using a second model of type LR). Once we choose MLP as the type of the second model, $C_{(2)}$, the ratios become 62% and 58% for Algorithm 1 and 46% and 41% for Algorithm 2, reducing the gap to 4% and 5%, respectively. Note that while the gap and accuracy is comparable for the two algorithms, Algorithm 2 is preferable, since the ratios of 46% and 41% are much closer to the original ratios of 44% among Whites (the ratio in the original data), which we are trying to match.

Table 3. Performance of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 on Adult Income Dataset when the first model is of type *Logistic Regression*

		Original Data		$A_{(1)}^C$ (LR)		$C_{(2)}$ (LR)		$C_{(2)}$ (MLP)	
Algorithm 1	Acc			0.9005		0.8917		0.8998	
	Filter	UE	E	UE	E	UE	E	UE	E
	W	0.165	0.442	0.279	0.620	0.302	0.630	0.281	0.620
	NW	0.088	0.358	0.143	0.463	0.195	0.515	0.160	0.578
Algorithm 2	Acc			0.9005		0.8995		0.8984	
	Filter	UE	E	UE	E	UE	E	UE	E
	W	0.165	0.442	0.279	0.620	0.260	0.610	0.100	0.457
	NW	0.088	0.358	0.143	0.463	0.200	0.526	0.049	0.414

Table 4 shows the performance—fairness and accuracy—for Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 on *Adult Income* when the first model, $A_{(1)}$, is of type *Multi-layer Perceptron*. Similarly, the ratio of individuals who earn more than 50k is 44% and 27% for White and Non-White, respectively. Using a second model of type *Logistic Regression* reduces the difference to 5%. Using a second model of type *Multi-layer Perceptron* reduces the difference even further to 2% for Algorithm 2. There is also no significant drop in terms of accuracy of the classifier.

Table 4 shows the performance—fairness and accuracy—for Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 on the *Adult Income Dataset* when the first model, $A_{(1)}$, is of type *Multi-layer Perceptron*. The first 2 columns are obtained from the original labels of the data. They show that when we filter on “Assault”, the ratio of individuals who earn more than 50k is 44% and 36% for White and Non-White, respectively—a gap of 8%. The next 2 columns are obtained from the labels

generated by $A_{(1)}^C$ on the dataset. In this case, when we filter on “Education”, the ratio of individuals who earn more than $50k$ is 44% and 28% for White and Non-White, respectively—a gap of 16%. By selecting the second model, $C_{(2)}$, to be of type *Logistic Regression*, the ratios become 55% and 50% for Algorithm 1 and 61% and 53% for Algorithm 2. Note that the difference in the ratios is only slightly reduced in the case of Algorithm 2 (as expected when using a second model of type LR). Once we choose MLP as the type of the second model, $C_{(2)}$, the ratios become 46% and 40% for Algorithm 1 and 44% and 41% for Algorithm 2, reducing the gap to 6% and 3%, respectively. Note that while the gap and the overall accuracy is comparable for the two algorithms, Algorithm 2 is preferable, since the ratios of 44% and 41% are much closer to the original ratios of 44% among Whites (the ratio in the original data), which we are trying to match.

Table 4. Performance of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 on Adult Income Dataset when the first model is of type *Multi-Layer Perceptron*

		Original Data		$A_{(1)}^C$ (MLP)		$C_{(2)}$ (LR)		$C_{(2)}$ (MLP)	
Algorithm 1	Acc			0.8994		0.8927		0.9036	
	Filter	UE	E	UE	E	UE	E	UE	E
	W	0.165	0.442	0.086	0.442	0.131	0.549	0.087	0.457
	NW	0.088	0.358	0.071	0.276	0.118	0.500	0.083	0.403
Algorithm 2	Acc			0.8994		0.8991		0.8982	
	Filter	UE	E	UE	E	UE	E	UE	E
	W	0.165	0.442	0.086	0.442	0.259	0.605	0.095	0.435
	NW	0.088	0.358	0.071	0.276	0.203	0.526	0.047	0.410

4 Fairness via Classification Parity

In this section, we investigate the fairness issue from statistical learning perspective. In Bayesian decision theory for binary classification, one sample s is classified into negative class ω_0 or positive ω_1 by one decision threshold, which is determined according to the posterior probability distribution. For example, given the distribution and the threshold shown in Fig. 12(a), we have the relation of true positive (TP), true negative (TN), false positive (FP) and false negative (FN). Specially for the minimum error classifier, the decision threshold is set as Fig. 12(b), where $P(\omega_0|s) = P(\omega_1|s)$. When the decision threshold is tuned, the true positive rate (TPR) and false positive rate (FPR) are altered accordingly.

In general, a binary classifier C can be considered as a mapping function of the input sample x to the posterior probability or score s , i.e., $C : x \rightarrow s$. Denote y and $\hat{y}$ are the corresponding label and classifier prediction of x , and




Fig. 12. The posterior distribution and the decision threshold. (a) Relations of TP and FP with the given threshold. (b) The threshold of the minimum error classifier.

$y, \hat{y} \in \{0, 1\}$. The classifier's output scores from the group of data formulates the score distribution shown in Fig. 12. The decision criterion is

$$\hat{y} = \begin{cases} 0, & s = C(x) < t \\ 1, & s = C(x) \geq t \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where t is the decision threshold. When we tune the decision threshold for one trained classifier C , we can obtain different TPR and FPR according to the score distribution, which formulates C 's ROC curve.

4.1 Classification Parity

Suppose the dataset D are separated into multiple completely exhaustive mutually exclusive groups $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_K$ based on the protected attribute. For example, if one classifier has higher TPR and FPR in the group D_k than the other group $D_i, i \neq k$, the classifier is prone to provide positive inferences in D_k . We refer to the above condition as *positively biased* in D_k . Prior art of the fairness definition, such as demographic parity [20], equalized odds [12] and predictive rate parity [19], can alleviate the biased prediction in the classifier by equalizing the performance statistics of the classifier among all the groups. However, these classification parity conditions guarantees that the classifier only satisfies the parity condition at one specific threshold setting. If we modify the decision threshold, the classification parity condition no longer holds in the classifier performance.

From Bayesian decision theory perspective, one fundamental reason of the bias predictions in ML models comes from the intrinsic disparities of the score distributions from the given classifier among all the groups. To achieve fairness in ML, one feasible solution is to alleviate the discrepancy of the score distributions in different groups. Once the distributions are equalized, the classifier performances

are identical and indistinguishable among all the groups, whatever the decision threshold is. We propose the definition of equalized distribution as follows.

Definition 2 (Equalized distribution). *A binary classifier C achieves equalized distribution, if the score distributions are identical among all the groups $D_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K$, i.e.,*

$$\text{pdf}(C(D_i)) = \text{pdf}(C(D_j)), \forall i, j = 1, 2, \dots, K \quad (5)$$

where pdf stands for probability density function, which computes the data distribution.

More strictly, equalized distribution enforces the equalization of the group-wise score distributions from the classifier. One implication is that equalized distribution makes the prior art of the classification parity, such as demographic parity, equalized odds, always holds true whatever the decision threshold is. Hence, unlike the prior art of the parity notions, “equalized distribution” is *threshold-invariant*. The equalized distribution requires the classifier to offer equivalent and indistinguishable learning performance statistics among all the groups $D_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ independent of the decision threshold. To contrast the notion of the prior art of the classification parity and the proposed equalized distribution, we refer to the prior art as the weak condition of classification parity, and equalized distribution as the strong condition.

Based on the classification parity, we propose the fairness ML algorithms in two possible scenarios: with and without prior knowledge of the protected attribute in test stage.

4.2 With Prior Knowledge of the Protected Attribute

In this scenario, we assume that we have the prior knowledge of the protected attribute of the input samples in the test stage. We enforce equalized odds (i.e., weak classification parity) on the classifier. Given a trained classifier C , the condition of equalized odds can be satisfied by tuning the decision thresholds for different groups. We denote the number of correct predictions in group $D_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ with the decision threshold t_k as $N(D_k, t_k)$. Then the classification accuracy can be written as

$$E_a = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K N(D_k, t_k)}{\sum_{k=1}^K |D_k|} \quad (6)$$

To achieve the equalized odds, we tune the thresholds $t_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ to shrink the discrepancy of TPR and FPR among all the groups, which can be represented as the fairness term

$$E_f = \sum_{k=2}^K \left(|\text{TPR}(D_1, t_1) - \text{TPR}(D_k, t_k)| + |\text{FPR}(D_1, t_1) - \text{FPR}(D_k, t_k)| \right) \quad (7)$$

where $\text{TPR}(D_k, t_k)$ and $\text{FPR}(D_k, t_k)$ denote true positive rate and false positive rate in group D_k with the decision threshold t_k . In practice, we trade-off the classification accuracy and the fairness term. Hence, given the trained classifier C , the fairness problem becomes an optimization problem

$$\max_{t_k, k=1,2,\dots,K} E_a - \lambda E_f \quad (8)$$

where λ is a hyperparameter. Since Eqn. 8 is a nonlinear and non-differentiable problem, we apply particle swarm optimization (PSO) [14] to find the best set of thresholds $\{t_k\}_{k=1,2,\dots,K}$ for K groups in terms of reducing the difference of TPR and FPR between two groups.

4.3 Without Prior Knowledge of the Protected Attribute

In this scenario, we assume that no prior knowledge of the protected attribute of the input samples is provided in the test stage. Different from Section 4.2, we enforce strong classification parity on the trained classifier. The equalized distribution condition sufficiently guarantees that the classifier can achieve classification parity among all the groups using one universal and non-specific threshold.

How can we formulate the constraint in terms of equalized distribution? We propose to approximate the continuous score distributions using the discrete histograms. Denote the sample x_i and the corresponding decision score s_i provided by the given classifier C , i.e., $s_i = C(x_i)$. The count of the scores in the bin $(c - \frac{\Delta}{2}, c + \frac{\Delta}{2})$ can be expressed as

$$n_c = \sum_i \text{rect}_c(s_i) \quad (9)$$

where c, Δ are the center and the bandwidth of the bin, and $\text{rect}_c(\cdot)$ is a rectangular function

$$\text{rect}_c(s) = \begin{cases} 1, & s \in (c - \frac{\Delta}{2}, c + \frac{\Delta}{2}) \\ 0, & \text{o.w} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Since such function is not differentiable, we approximate it with Gaussian function, i.e.,

$$n_c = \sum_i \text{gauss}_c(s_i) = \sum_i \exp\left(-\frac{(s_i - c)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \quad (11)$$

Thus, the histogram of the decision score in group D_k can be expressed as

$$\text{hist}(D_k) = \sum_c \sum_{x \in D_k} \text{gauss}_c(C(x)) \quad (12)$$

We normalize the histogram as

$$\text{norm_hist}(D_k) = \frac{1}{|D_k|} \text{hist}(D_k) \quad (13)$$

We use L_2 loss to constraint the equalization of the score distributions in two groups, i.e.

$$E_f = \sum_{k=2}^K \left(\|norm_hist(D_{1,p}) - norm_hist(D_{k,p})\|_2^2 + \|norm_hist(D_{1,n}) - norm_hist(D_{k,n})\|_2^2 \right) \quad (14)$$

where $D_{k,p}$ denotes the set of positive samples in group D_k and $D_{k,n}$ denotes the set of negative samples in D_k . Like Section 4.2, we formulate the minimization problem, trade-off the classification accuracy and the fairness term.

$$L = \alpha E_a + (1 - \alpha) E_f \quad (15)$$

where E_a is the accuracy term, such as mean square error (MSE) or logistic loss, and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. As the loss function L is continuous, gradient based methods can be employed to search the solution.

4.4 Experimental Results

We conducted the experiments on the COMPAS dataset [7]. The COMPAS records the recidivation of 7214 criminals in total. Each line of record documents the criminal’s information of race, sex, age, number of juvenile felony criminal charges (juv_fel_count), number of juvenile misdemeanor criminal charges (juv_misd_count), number of non-juvenile criminal charges (priors_count), the previous criminal charge (charge_id), the degree of the charge (charge_degree) and the ground truth of two-year recidivation (two_year_recid). In the experiments, we chose race as the protected attribute and, for simplicity, only focused on two race groups, “white” and “black”, excluding the records of other races. Hence, we totally used 6150 samples to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed fairness ML algorithms in two groups. In the experiments, we randomly splited the dataset into 60% training, 20% validation, and 20% test.

Feature Preprocessing Among the unprotected features of one criminal record, binary features, i.e., sex and charge_degree, are employed 0-1 encoding. Continuous features, i.e., age, juv_fel_count, juv_misd_count and priors_count are applied with data standardization. The categorical feature, charge_id, is encoded with one-hot encoding, leading to a 430-D feature vector. Thus, the total dimension of the feature vector is 436. Then, we applied principle component analysis (PCA) to reduce the 436-D feature vector to 20-D feature vector.

According to the protected feature (e.g. race), the dataset D is divided into the “white” group D_w and the “black” group D_b . Our goal is to obtain a binary classifier to offer fair predictions of the two-year recidivation in D_w and D_b .

With Prior Knowledge We investigated two machine learning models in this scenario: logistic regression and SVM. We first trained the model with the training set as normal, and then tuned the decision thresholds on the validation set. The finalized classifier was tested on the test set. During the tuning, we set $\lambda = 1$ in Eqn. 8 to trade-off the accuracy and the classification parity.




Fig. 13. The state of the classifier on the ROC curves on the validation set. The Crosses represent the states before tuning, and circles represent the states after tuning. (a) Logistic regression classifier. (b) SVM classifier.

Table 5 presents the performance of the classifiers before and after tuning. Before tuning, the logistic regression classifier has the default decision threshold 0.5, while the SVM classifier has the default decision threshold 0. According to the statistics of TPR and FPR before tuning, we can see both of the classifiers are positively biased in the group “black” to “white”. The tuning algorithm is employed on the validation set to shrink the discrepancy between two groups. Fig. 13 shows the state of the classifier on the ROC curves before and after tuning on the validation set. We can see that the tuning algorithm help two points merge to an overlap point on the curves to fulfill the classification parity. After the tuning algorithm on the validation set, the gaps of TPR and FPR on test set between two groups were successfully reduced from around 0.2 to no more than 0.05, but the drop of the overall accuracy is insignificant. Specifically, the logistic regression classifier only decreases 1.7% on classification accuracy and the SVM classifier lowers the accuracy by 2.3%.

To sum up, the proposed tuning method enforces the fairness by tuning the decision thresholds of one given model for all the groups. It can be applied after any trained classifiers without modified them. On the other hand, the main disadvantage is that it requires access to the protected attribute of the samples in test stage. Although the tuning method can, to some extent, alleviates the biased prediction in ML model, the model itself still has distinguishable learning performances in two groups in terms of the score distributions.

Table 5. The performance of the classifiers before and after tuning

Tuning		Logistic				SVM			
		THR	Acc	TPR	FPR	THR	Acc	TPR	FPR
Before	White	0.5	67.9%	0.407	0.178	0	67.6%	0.346	0.143
	Black	0.5		0.716	0.337	0		0.620	0.252
After	White	0.503	66.2%	0.401	0.160	-0.281	65.3%	0.456	0.205
	Black	0.588		0.445	0.147	0.300		0.478	0.198

¹THR: Decision threshold²Acc: Total classification accuracy³TPR: True positive rate⁴FPR: False positive rate

Without Prior Knowledge In this scenario, we conducted experiments with logistic regression classifier. The accuracy term E_a in Eqn. 15 is the logistic loss for binary classification, i.e.,

$$E_a = \sum_i y_i \log C(x_i) + (1 - y_i) \log(1 - C(x_i)) \quad (16)$$

where C is the trained classifier, and (x_i, y_i) is the sample and label pair in the whole dataset D . We set the bandwidth of the bin in the histogram Δ as 0.02. Since the output of the logistic regression classifier is confined in the range $[0, 1]$, the center of the bins are 0.01, 0.03, 0.05, ..., 0.97 and 0.99. In the training, we applied momentum gradient descent to optimize the loss function in Eqn. 15, with learning rate $\mu = 1$ and momentum = 0.9. The number of learning iteration is 2k.




Fig. 14. The influence of the hyperparameter α on the performance of the classifier. (a) The overall accuracy of the classifier with different α . (b) The fairness indicator of the classifier with different α , i.e., the difference of TPR/FPR between two groups.

We conducted the experiments with different values of the hyperparameter α to explore the influence of α on the performance of the classifier, which is shown in Fig. 14. When α is 1, the classifier is the normal classifier with minimum

error. When α is close to 0, the classifier is a mapping to equalize the score distributions in two groups, emphasizing the strong classification parity. When α increases from 0 to 1, weighing more on the accuracy loss, the accuracy of the classifier first increases significantly and then saturates to an upper bound after $\alpha = 0.2$. As for the classification parity, the differences of TPR/FPR between two groups also enlarge as α increases, indicating the deteriorate the fairness in ML classifier. Besides, the score distributions of the white and the black in test set with different α values are presented in Figure 15. We can see that the smaller α , the closer the score distributions of the positive/negative samples in “white” and “black” groups. Balancing the accuracy and fairness, we recommend that the best range of α is $0.1 - 0.2$.




Fig. 15. The score distributions of the white and the black in test set with different α , (a) $\alpha = 0.01$, (b) $\alpha = 0.1$, (c) $\alpha = 0.2$, and (d) $\alpha = 1$.

From the experiments, we can see that the proposed training method can provide a classifier equalizing the distribution of the output scores among the groups. Ideally, the classifier has equal and indistinguishable learning performance statistics, e.g., TPR and FPR, among all the protected attributes.

5 Acknowledgements

This work was initiated at the Workshop for Women in Math and Public Policy. We would like to thank IPAM and The Luskin Center for hosting the workshop as well as the organizers Mary Lee and Aisha Najera Chesler for their tireless efforts. We also thank the anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments, which helped to significantly improve the presentation.

References

1. Solon Barocas, Moritz Hardt, and Arvind Narayanan. *Fairness and Machine Learning*. fairmlbook.org, 2019. <http://www.fairmlbook.org>.
2. Solon Barocas and Andrew D. Selbst. Big Data’s Disparate Impact. *SSRN eLibrary*, 2014.
3. Toon Calders, Faisal Kamiran, and Mykola Pechenizkiy. Building classifiers with independency constraints. In *ICDM Workshops 2009, IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops, Miami, Florida, USA, 6 December 2009*, pages 13–18, 2009.
4. Flavio Calmon, Dennis Wei, Bhanukiran Vinzamuri, Karthikeyan Natesan Ramamurthy, and Kush R Varshney. Optimized pre-processing for discrimination prevention. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3992–4001, 2017.
5. Sam Corbett-Davies and Sharad Goel. The measure and mismeasure of fairness: A critical review of fair machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.00023*, 2018.
6. New York Police Department. Stop, Question and Frisk Data. <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/nypd/stats/reports-analysis/stopfrisk.page>.
7. Julia Dressel and Hany Farid. The accuracy, fairness, and limits of predicting recidivism. *Science Advances*, 4(1):eaao5580, 2018.
8. Cynthia Dwork, Moritz Hardt, Toniann Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Richard S. Zemel. Fairness through awareness. In *Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science 2012, Cambridge, MA, USA, January 8-10, 2012*, pages 214–226, 2012.
9. Cynthia Dwork, Nicole Immorlica, Adam Tauman Kalai, and Max Leiserson. Decoupled classifiers for group-fair and efficient machine learning. In *Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*, pages 119–133, 2018.
10. Michael Feldman, Sorelle A. Friedler, John Moeller, Carlos Scheidegger, and Suresh Venkatasubramanian. Certifying and removing disparate impact. In *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Sydney, NSW, Australia, August 10-13, 2015*, pages 259–268, 2015.
11. James Foulds and Shimei Pan. An intersectional definition of fairness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.08362*, 2018.
12. Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nati Srebro. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3315–3323, 2016.
13. Matthew Joseph, Michael J. Kearns, Jamie H. Morgenstern, and Aaron Roth. Fairness in learning: Classic and contextual bandits. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2016, December 5-10, 2016, Barcelona, Spain*, pages 325–333, 2016.
14. James Kennedy. Particle swarm optimization. *Encyclopedia of Machine Learning*, pages 760–766, 2010.

15. Jon Kleinberg, Sendhil Mullainathan, and Manish Raghavan. Inherent trade-offs in the fair determination of risk scores. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.05807*, 2016.
16. Ya'acov Ritov, Yuekai Sun, and Ruofei Zhao. On conditional parity as a notion of non-discrimination in machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.08519*, 2017.
17. Sakshi Udeshi, Pryanshu Arora, and Sudipta Chattopadhyay. Automated directed fairness testing. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2018, Montpellier, France, September 3-7, 2018*, pages 98–108, 2018.
18. Hao Wang, Berk Ustun, and Flávio P. Calmon. Repairing without retraining: Avoiding disparate impact with counterfactual distributions. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2019, 9-15 June 2019, Long Beach, California, USA*, pages 6618–6627, 2019.
19. Muhammad Bilal Zafar, Isabel Valera, Manuel Gomez Rodriguez, and Krishna P Gummadi. Fairness beyond disparate treatment & disparate impact: Learning classification without disparate mistreatment. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 1171–1180. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, 2017.
20. Muhammad Bilal Zafar, Isabel Valera, Manuel Gomez Rodriguez, and Krishna P Gummadi. Fairness constraints: Mechanisms for fair classification. In *20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 962–970, 2017.
21. Rich Zemel, Yu Wu, Kevin Swersky, Toni Pitassi, and Cynthia Dwork. Learning fair representations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 325–333, 2013.
22. Richard S. Zemel, Yu Wu, Kevin Swersky, Toniann Pitassi, and Cynthia Dwork. Learning fair representations. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2013, Atlanta, GA, USA, 16-21 June 2013*, pages 325–333, 2013.
23. Indre Zliobaite. On the relation between accuracy and fairness in binary classification. *CoRR*, abs/1505.05723, 2015.