

A MINIMAX FRAMEWORK FOR QUANTIFYING RISK-FAIRNESS TRADE-OFF IN REGRESSION

BY EVGENII CHZHEN¹ AND NICOLAS SCHREUDER²

¹*Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, Laboratoire de mathématiques d'Orsay
evgenii.chzhen@universite-paris-saclay.fr*

²*Università di Genova, MaLga, DIBRIS
Institut Polytechnique de Paris, ENSAE, CREST
nicolas.schreuder@ensae.fr*

We propose a theoretical framework for the problem of learning a real-valued function which meets fairness requirements. This framework is built upon the notion of α -relative (fairness) improvement of the regression function which we introduce using the theory of optimal transport. Setting $\alpha = 0$ corresponds to the regression problem under the Demographic Parity constraint, while $\alpha = 1$ corresponds to the classical regression problem without any constraints. For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ the proposed framework allows to continuously interpolate between these two extreme cases and to study partially fair predictors. Within this framework we precisely quantify the cost in risk induced by the introduction of the fairness constraint. We put forward a statistical minimax setup and derive a general problem-dependent lower bound on the risk of any estimator satisfying α -relative improvement constraint. We illustrate our framework on a model of linear regression with Gaussian design and systematic group-dependent bias, deriving matching (up to absolute constants) upper and lower bounds on the minimax risk under the introduced constraint. We provide a general post-processing strategy which enjoys fairness, risk guarantees and can be applied on top of any black-box algorithm. Finally, we perform a simulation study of the linear model and numerical experiments of benchmark data, validating our theoretical contributions.

1. Introduction. Data driven algorithms are deployed in almost all areas of modern daily life and it becomes increasingly more important to adequately address the fundamental issue of historical biases present in the data (Barocas, Hardt and Narayanan, 2019). The goal of algorithmic fairness is to bridge the gap between the statistical theory of decision making and the understanding of justice, equality, and diversity. The literature on fairness is broad and its volume increases day by day, we refer the reader to (Barocas, Hardt and Narayanan, 2019, Mehrabi et al., 2019) for a general introduction on the subject and to (del Barrio, Gordaliza and Loubes, 2020, Oneto and Chiappa, 2020) for reviews of the most recent theoretical advances.

Basically, the mathematical definitions of fairness can be divided into two groups (Dwork et al., 2012): *individual fairness* and *group fairness*. The former notion reflects the principle that similar individuals must be treated similarly, which translates into Lipschitz type constraints on possible prediction rules. The latter defines fairness on population level via (conditional) statistical independence of a prediction from a sensitive attribute (e.g., gender, ethnicity). A popular formalization of such notion is through the *Demographic Parity* constraint, initially introduced in the context of binary classification (Calders, Kamiran and Pechenizkiy, 2009). Despite of some limitations (Hardt, Price and Srebro, 2016), the concept of Demographic Parity is natural and suitable for a range of applied problems (Köeppen, Yoshida and Ohnishi, 2014, Zink and Rose, 2019).

Keywords and phrases: Algorithmic fairness, risk-fairness trade-off, regressions, Demographic Parity, least-squares, optimal transport, minimax analysis, statistical learning.

In this work we study the regression problem of learning a real-valued prediction function, which complies with an approximate notion of Demographic Parity while minimizing expected squared loss.

Unlike its classification counterpart, the problem of fair regression has received far less attention in the literature. However, as argued by Agarwal, Dudik and Wu (2019), classifiers only provide binary decisions, while in practice final decisions are taken by humans based on predictions from the machine. In this case a continuous prediction is more informative than a binary one and justifies the need for studying fairness in the regression framework.

Notation. For any univariate probability measure μ we denote by F_μ (resp. F_μ^{-1}) the cumulative distribution function (resp. the quantile function) of μ . For two random variables U and V we denote by $\text{Law}(U \mid V=v)$ the conditional distribution of the random variable $U \mid V=v$ and we write $U \stackrel{d}{=} V$ to denote their equality in distribution. For any integer $K \geq 1$, we denote by Δ^{K-1} the probability simplex in \mathbb{R}^K and we write $[K] = \{1, \dots, K\}$. For any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ we denote by $a \vee b$ (resp. $a \wedge b$) the maximum (resp. the minimum) between a, b . We denote by $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the space of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d with finite second-order moment.

2. Problem statement and contributions. We study the regression problem when a sensitive attribute is available. The statistician observes triplets $(\mathbf{X}_1, S_1, Y_1), \dots, (\mathbf{X}_n, S_n, Y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \times \mathbb{R}$, which are connected by the following regression-type relation

$$Y_i = f^*(\mathbf{X}_i, S_i) + \xi_i, \quad i \in [n], \quad (1)$$

where $\xi_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\mathbf{E}[\xi_i \mid \mathbf{X}_i] = 0$ and $f^* : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the regression function. Here for each $i \in [n]$, \mathbf{X}_i is a feature vector taking values in \mathbb{R}^p , S_i is a sensitive attribute taking values in $[K]$, and Y_i is a real-valued dependent variable. A prediction is any measurable function of the form $f : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We define the risk of a prediction function f via the ℓ_2 distance¹ to the regression function f^* as

$$\mathcal{R}(f) := \|f - f^*\|_2^2 := \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbb{E}[(f(\mathbf{X}, S) - f^*(\mathbf{X}, S))^2 \mid S=s], \quad (\text{Risk measure})$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\cdot \mid S=s]$ is the expectation w.r.t. the distribution of the features \mathbf{X} in the group $S=s$ and $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_K)^\top \in \Delta^{K-1}$ is a probability vector, which weights the group-wise risks.

For any $s \in [K]$ define ν_s^* as $\text{Law}(f^*(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S=s)$ – the distribution of the optimal prediction inside the group $S=s$. Throughout this work we make the following assumption on those measures, which is, for instance, satisfied in linear regression with Gaussian design.

ASSUMPTION 2.1. *Measures $\{\nu_s^*\}_{s \in [K]}$ are non-atomic with finite second moments.*

2.1. Regression with fairness constraints. Any predictor f induces a group-wise distribution of the predicted outcomes $\text{Law}(f(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S=s)$ for $s \in [K]$. The high-level idea of *group fairness* notions is to bound or diminish an eventual discrepancy between these distributions.

We define the *unfairness* of a predictor f as the sum of the weighted distances between $\{\text{Law}(f(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S=s)\}_{s \in [K]}$ and their common barycenter w.r.t. the Wasserstein-2 distance²:

$$\mathcal{U}(f) := \min_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_2^2(\text{Law}(f(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S=s), \nu). \quad (\text{Unfairness measure})$$

¹The extension to ℓ_q losses is provided in Appendix G.

²See Appendix A.1 for a reminder on Wasserstein distances.

In particular, since the Wasserstein-2 distance is a metric on the space probability distributions with finite second-order moment $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, a predictor f is such that $\mathcal{U}(f) = 0$ if and only if it satisfies the Demographic Parity (DP) constraint defined as

$$(f(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s) \stackrel{d}{=} (f(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s'), \quad \forall s, s' \in [K]. \quad (\text{DP})$$

Exact DP is not necessarily desirable in practice and it is common in the literature to consider *relaxations* of this constraint. In this work we introduce the α -Relative Improvement (α -RI) constraint – a novel DP relaxation based on our unfairness measure. We say that a predictor f satisfies the α -RI constraint for some $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ if its unfairness is at most an α fraction of the unfairness of the regression function f^* , that is, $\mathcal{U}(f) \leq \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*)$. Importantly, the fairness requirement is stated relatively to the unfairness of the regression function f^* , which allows to make a more informed choice of α .

Formally, for a fixed $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, the goal of a statistician in our framework is to build an estimator \hat{f} using data, which enjoys two guarantees (with high probability)

$$\alpha\text{-RI guarantee: } \mathcal{U}(\hat{f}) \leq \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Risk guarantee: } \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}) \leq r_{n,\alpha,f^*}.$$

The former ensures that \hat{f} satisfies the α -RI constraint. In the latter guarantee we seek the sequence r_{n,α,f^*} being as small as possible in order to quantify *two effects*: the introduction of the α -RI fairness constraint and the *statistical estimation*. We note that r_{n,α,f^*} depends on the sample size n , the fairness parameter α , as well as the regression function f^* to be estimated, we clarify the reason for this dependency later in the text.

2.2. Contributions. The first natural question that we address is: assuming that the underlying distribution of $X \mid S$ and the regression function f^* are known, which prediction rule f_α^* minimizes the expected squared loss under the α -RI constraint $\mathcal{U}(f_\alpha^*) \leq \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*)$? To answer this question we shift the discussion to the population level and define a collection $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$ of *oracle α -RI* indexed by the parameter α as

$$f_\alpha^* \in \arg \min \{ \mathcal{R}(f) : \mathcal{U}(f) \leq \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) \}, \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, 1]. \quad (\text{Oracle } \alpha\text{-RI})$$

For $\alpha = 0$ the predictor f_0^* corresponds to the optimal fair predictor in the sense of DP while for $\alpha = 1$ the corresponding predictor f_1^* coincides with the regression function f^* . Those two extreme cases have been previously studied but, up to our knowledge, nothing is known about those “partially fair” predictors. Our study of the family $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$ serves as a basis for our statistical framework and analysis. It also reveals the intrinsic interplay of the fairness constraint with the risk measure.

The contributions of this work can be roughly split into three interconnected groups:

1. We provide a theoretical study of the family of oracle α -RI $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$ on the population level;
2. We introduce a minimax statistical framework and derive a general problem-dependent minimax lower bound for the problem of regression under the α -RI constraint;
3. We derive minimax optimal rate of convergence for the statistical model of linear regression with systematic group-dependent bias and Gaussian design under the α -RI constraint.

Properties of oracle α -RI $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$. It has been shown that, under the squared loss, the optimal fair predictor f_0^* can be obtained as the solution of a Wasserstein-2 barycenter problem (Chzhen et al., 2020a, Le Gouic, Loubes and Rigollet, 2020). In Section 4 we study the whole family $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$ for arbitrary choice of $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. To provide complete characterization of $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$ we derive Lemma 4.3, which could be of independent interest. This result can be summarized as follows: given a fixed collection of points a_1, \dots, a_K in an




Fig 1: Risk \mathcal{R} and unfairness \mathcal{U} of α -RI oracles $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$. Green curves (decreasing, convex) correspond to the risk, while orange curves (increasing, linear) correspond to the unfairness. Each pair of curves (solid, dashed, dashed dotted) corresponds to three regimes: high, moderate, and low unfairness of the regression function f^* respectively.

abstract metric space (\mathcal{X}, d) , if one walks along the (constant speed) geodesics starting from a_s and leading to their (weighted) barycenter until it reaches a proportion α of the full path, then these intermediate points b_1, \dots, b_K minimize the weighted distance to the initial points while being α -closer to their own barycenter. This abstract result enables us to characterize explicitly oracle α -RI $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$. In particular, we show that the family of oracle α -RI $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$ admits a simple structure: for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ the prediction f_α^* is the point-wise convex combination of the regression function $f^* \equiv f_1^*$ and the optimal fair predictor f_0^* , that is,

$$f_\alpha^*(\mathbf{x}, s) = \sqrt{\alpha} f_1^*(\mathbf{x}, s) + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) f_0^*(\mathbf{x}, s), \quad \forall (\mathbf{x}, s) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times [K].$$

The final contribution of Section 4 is the quantification of the risk-fairness trade-off on the population level. In particular, Lemma 4.5 establishes that for every $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ it holds that

$$\mathcal{R}(f_\alpha^*) = (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2 \mathcal{R}(f_0^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{U}(f_\alpha^*) = \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) .$$

Observe that f_0^* , which is the optimal fair predictor in terms of DP, has the highest risk and the lowest unfairness, while the situation is reversed for $f_1^* \equiv f^*$ – the risk is the lowest and the unfairness is the highest. Since the function $\alpha \rightarrow (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2$ grows rapidly in the vicinity of zero, even a mild relaxation of the exact fairness constraint ($\alpha = 0$) yields a noticeable improvement in terms of the risk while having a low unfairness inflation. For instance, the risk of $f_{1/2}^*$ is only around 8.5% of the risk of f_0^* , while its fairness is two times better than that of f^* . This observation is illustrated in Figure 1.

Minimax framework. In order to quantify the *statistical* price of fairness, in Section 5 we propose a minimax framework and in Section 5.1 we derive a general problem-dependent lower bound on the minimax risk of estimators satisfying the α -RI constraint. Statistical study of the model in Eq. (1) typically requires additional assumptions to provide meaningful statistical guarantees. Classically, one chooses a set \mathcal{F} of possible candidates for the regression function f^* (e.g., linear functions) and, possibly, introduces additional conditions on nuisance parameters of the model via some set Θ (e.g., variance of the noise). The goal of our lower bound is to understand fundamental limits of the problem of prediction under α -RI constraint in arbitrary statistical model for Eq. (1). To this end, we show in Theorem 5.3 that *any estimator \hat{f} satisfying the α -RI constraint with high probability must incur*

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}) \geq \delta_n(\mathcal{F}, \Theta) \vee (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2 \mathcal{U}(f^*) ,$$

where $\delta_n(\mathcal{F}, \Theta)$ is the rate one would obtain *without* restricting the set of possible estimators.

Application to linear model. The goal of Section 6 is to demonstrate that the general problem-dependent lower bound does indeed yield minimax optimal rates. To this end, we apply our machinery to the problem of linear regression with systematic bias formalized by the following linear model

$$Y_i = \langle \mathbf{X}_i, \beta^* \rangle + b_{S_i}^* + \xi_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where the ξ_i 's are i.i.d. zero mean Gaussian with variance σ^2 and the p -dimensional covariates $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d. Gaussian random vectors. We propose an estimator \hat{f} which, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, satisfies $\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}) \leq \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*)$ and achieves the following minimax optimal rate

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}) \asymp \left\{ \sigma^2 \left(\frac{p+K}{n} + \frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n} \right) \right\} \vee \left\{ (1-\sqrt{\alpha})^2 \mathcal{U}(f^*) \right\}.$$

Finally, we conduct a simulation study of the proposed estimator \hat{f} and compare its performance with more straightforward approaches in terms of unfairness and risk.

Ad-hoc procedure and experiments on CRIME dataset. The estimator that will be developed in the context of linear model with systematic bias relies heavily on the linear model and Gaussian features assumption. Thus, in Section 7, we propose a general post-processing estimator, which enjoys fairness and risk guarantees. Unlike the case of linear model, the optimality of these guarantees remains open. In Section 8, we provide empirical study of estimators from Sections 6 and 7, validating our theoretical claims numerically.

3. Prior and related works. Until very recently, contributions on fair regression were almost exclusively focused on the practical incorporation of proxy fairness constraints in classical learning methods, such as random forest, ridge regression, kernel based methods to name a few (Berk et al., 2017, Calders et al., 2013, Fitzsimons et al., 2018, Komiyama and Shima, 2017, Pérez-Suay et al., 2017, Raff, Sylvester and Mills, 2018). Several works empirically study the impact of (relaxed) fairness constraints on the risk (Bertsimas, Farias and Trichakis, 2012, Haas, 2019, Wick, Panda and Tristan, 2019, Zafar et al., 2017, Zliobaite, 2015). Yet, the problem of precisely quantifying the effect of such constraints on the risk has not been tackled.

More recently, statistical and learning guarantees for fair regression were derived (Agarwal, Dudik and Wu, 2019, Chiappa et al., 2020, Chzhen et al., 2020a,b, Fitzsimons et al., 2019, Le Gouic, Loubes and Rigollet, 2020, Plečko and Meinshausen, 2020). The closest works to our contribution are that of Chiappa et al. (2020), Chzhen et al. (2020a), Le Gouic, Loubes and Rigollet (2020), who draw a connection between the problem of exactly fair regression of demographic parity and the multi-marginal optimal transport formulation (Agueh and Carlier, 2011, Gangbo and Świąch, 1998).

As already mentioned in the previous section, considering predictors which satisfy the DP constraint incurs an unavoidable price in terms of the risk. Depending on the application at hand, this price might or might not be reasonable. However, since the notion of DP is completely fairness driven, it does not allow to quantify the price of considering “fairer” predictions than the regression function f^* . For this reason, several contributions relax this constraint, forcing a milder fairness requirement. A natural idea is to define a functional \mathcal{U} which quantifies the violation of the DP constraint and to declare a prediction approximately fair if this functional does not exceed a user pre-specified threshold. In recent years a large variety of such relaxations has been proposed: correlation based (Baharlouei et al., 2019, Komiyama et al., 2018, Mary, Calauzènes and El Karoui, 2019); Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance (Agarwal, Dudik and Wu, 2019); Mutual information (Steinberg, Reid and O’Callaghan,

2020, Steinberg et al., 2020); Total Variation distance (Oneto, Donini and Pontil, 2020, Oneto et al., 2020); Equality of means and higher moment matching (Berk et al., 2017, Calders et al., 2013, Donini et al., 2018, Fitzsimons et al., 2019, Olfat et al., 2020, Raff, Sylvester and Mills, 2018); Maximum Mean Discrepancy (Madras et al., 2018, Quadrianto and Sharmanska, 2017); Wasserstein distance (Chiappa et al., 2020, Chzhen et al., 2020a, Gordaliza et al., 2019, Le Gouic, Loubes and Rigollet, 2020).

3.1. Other notions of unfairness. The most common relaxations of the Demographic Parity constraint are based on the Total Variation (TV) and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) distances (Agarwal, Dudik and Wu, 2019, Agarwal et al., 2018, Chzhen et al., 2020b, Oneto, Donini and Pontil, 2020). There are various ways to use the TV or KS in order to build a functional \mathcal{U} , which quantifies the violation of the DP constraint. To compare those measures of discrepancy with the one that we introduce in our work, we define \mathcal{U}_{TV} and \mathcal{U}_{KS} as follows

$$\textbf{TV unfairness:} \quad \mathcal{U}_{TV}(f) := \sum_{s \in [K]} \text{TV}(\text{Law}(f(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s), \text{Law}(f(\mathbf{X}, S))) \quad ,$$

$$\textbf{KS unfairness:} \quad \mathcal{U}_{KS}(f) := \sum_{s \in [K]} \text{KS}(\text{Law}(f(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s), \text{Law}(f(\mathbf{X}, S))) \quad .$$

Using these notions, one wishes to study those predictors f which satisfy relaxed fairness constraint $\mathcal{U}_{\square}(f) \leq \varepsilon$, where \square is KS or TV and $\varepsilon \geq 0$ is a user specified parameter. Note that since both KS and TV are metrics, setting $\varepsilon = 0$ is equivalent to the DP constraint. Meanwhile, for $\varepsilon > 0$ these formulations allow some slack. It is known that the TV distance is rather strong and extremely sensitive to small changes in distributions which is the major drawback of the TV unfairness. This limitation can be addressed by the KS unfairness due to an obvious relation $\mathcal{U}_{KS}(f) \leq \mathcal{U}_{TV}(f)$.

In our work we argue that the introduced notion of unfairness \mathcal{U} is better suited for the problem of regression with squared loss under fairness constraint. Indeed, we prove in Lemma 4.5 that \mathcal{U} can be naturally connected to the squared risk and allows to give a precise quantification of the risk-fairness trade-off. This result is the major advantage of \mathcal{U} over both \mathcal{U}_{KS} and \mathcal{U}_{TV} . Nevertheless, it is still interesting to understand whether a more popular KS unfairness can be related to \mathcal{U} that we introduce. In Appendix we prove the following connection.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Fix some predictor $f : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Assume that $\text{Law}(f(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S=s) \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ and it admits density bounded by $C_{f,s} > 0$ for all $s \in [K]$, then³*

$$\mathcal{U}_{KS}(f) \leq \|1/w\|_{\infty} \sqrt{8\bar{C}_f} \cdot \mathcal{U}^{1/4}(f) \quad ,$$

where $\bar{C}_f = \sum_{s=1}^K w_s C_{f,s}$ and $1/w = (1/w_1, \dots, 1/w_K)^{\top}$.

The latter result indicates that if one can control the unfairness \mathcal{U} introduced in this work, one also has some control over the KS unfairness. Note that the leading constant of the previous bound depends on the predictor f . More precisely, this constant corresponds to the upper bound on the density of $f(\mathbf{X}, S)$.

Another advantage of the introduced unfairness measure, and, in particular, the notion of α -relative improvement is the fact that the parameter α has a clear practical interpretation, while the interpretation of ε is not intuitive. Of course, using \mathcal{U}_{KS} or \mathcal{U}_{TV} one can also define

³One can erase $\|1/w\|_{\infty}$ from the bound introducing these weights into the definition of $\mathcal{U}_{KS}(f)$.

unfairness of a predictor f relative to the regression function f^* . However, the interpretation of KS or TV unfairness relative to the unfairness of the Bayes rule is less meaningful. Indeed, intuitively, if a prediction function $f : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ introduces some group-wise disparities, then $c \cdot f$ for $c \gg 1$ should be even further *amplifying* these disparities. Yet, for all $c > 0$ we have $\mathcal{U}_{\text{KS}/\text{TV}}(c \cdot f) = \mathcal{U}_{\text{KS}/\text{TV}}(f)$, while the introduced notion of unfairness satisfies $\mathcal{U}(c \cdot f) = c^2 \mathcal{U}(f)$ for all $c > 0$. Due to completely different geometries induced by \mathcal{R} in the space of functions and by $\mathcal{U}_{\text{KS}/\text{TV}}$ in the space of distributions, precise theoretical study of such formulations is notoriously complicated if possible.

3.2. Optimal transport and fair regression. The use of optimal transport tools in the study of fairness is relatively recent. Initially, contributions in this direction were mainly dealing with the problem of binary classification (Gordaliza et al., 2019, Jiang et al., 2020). Later on, the tools of the optimal transport theory migrated to the setup of fair regression (Chiappa et al., 2020, Chzhen et al., 2020a, Le Gouic, Loubes and Rigollet, 2020). The main theoretical motivation to consider \mathcal{U} instead of the KS and TV unfairnesses lies in the following recent result.

THEOREM 3.2 (Chzhen et al. (2020a), Le Gouic, Loubes and Rigollet (2020)). *Let Assumption 2.1 be satisfied, then*

$$\min \left\{ \mathcal{R}(f) : (f(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s) \stackrel{d}{=} (f(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s') \ \forall s, s' \in [K] \right\} = \mathcal{U}(f^*) \quad . \quad (2)$$

Moreover, the distribution of the minimizer of the problem on the l.h.s. is given by

$$\arg \min_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_2^2(\text{Law}(f^*(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S=s), \nu) \quad .$$

An important consequence of Theorem 3.2 is that it puts the risk \mathcal{R} and the unfairness \mathcal{U} – two conflicting quantities – on the same scale. In particular, it allows to measure both fairness and risk using the same unit measurements, hence, study the trade-off between the two. In order to build our framework, we remark that since W_2 is a metric then the problem on the l.h.s. of Eq. (2) can be equivalently written as $\min \{ \mathcal{R}(f) : \mathcal{U}(f) \leq 0 \times \mathcal{U}(f^*) \}$. Moreover, one can observe that the regression function $f^* \in \min \{ \mathcal{R}(f) : \mathcal{U}(f) \leq 1 \times \mathcal{U}(f^*) \}$. Thus, a natural relaxation of the above formulation is the introduced notion of α -relative improvement, which interpolates between the exactly fair predictor f_0^* and the regression function $f_1^* \equiv f^*$. In this retrospect, the result of Chzhen et al. (2020a), Le Gouic, Loubes and Rigollet (2020) provides characterization of f_0^* but says nothing about the whole family of oracle α -RI $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$.

4. Oracle α -relative improvement. This section is devoted to the study of the α -relative improvement f_α^* on population level, that is, in this section we study

$$f_\alpha^* \in \arg \min \{ \mathcal{R}(f) : \mathcal{U}(f) \leq \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) \} \quad , \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, 1] \quad . \quad (3)$$

The next result establishes a closed form solution to the minimization Problem (3) under Assumption 2.1 for any value of $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *Let Assumption 2.1 be satisfied, then for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and all $(\mathbf{x}, s) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times [K]$ (up to a set of null measure) it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} f_\alpha^*(\mathbf{x}, s) &= \sqrt{\alpha} f^*(\mathbf{x}, s) + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} F_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1} \circ F_{\nu_s^*} \circ f^*(\mathbf{x}, s) \\ &= \sqrt{\alpha} f_1^*(\mathbf{x}, s) + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) f_0^*(\mathbf{x}, s) \quad . \end{aligned}$$




Fig 2: Impact of the weights $\mathbf{w} \in \Delta^{K-1}$ on the distribution of f_0^*

Recall that $f^* = f_1^*$, hence the α -relative improvement f_α^* is the point-wise convex combination of exactly fair prediction f_0^* and the regression function f_1^* . Besides, setting $\alpha = 0$ we recover the result of [Chzhen et al. \(2020a\)](#), [Le Gouic, Loubes and Rigollet \(2020\)](#) as a particular case of our framework. Let Assumption 2.1 be satisfied, then the set of oracle α -RI $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$ satisfies the following properties.

1. **Risk and fairness monotonicity:** if $\alpha \leq \alpha'$, then $\mathcal{R}(f_\alpha^*) \geq \mathcal{R}(f_{\alpha'}^*)$ and $\mathcal{U}(f_\alpha^*) \leq \mathcal{U}(f_{\alpha'}^*)$.
2. **Point-wise convexity:** for all $\alpha, \alpha' \in [0, 1]$ and all $\tau \in [0, 1]$ it holds that $\tau f_\alpha^* + (1 - \tau)f_{\alpha'}^* \in \{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$. Moreover $\tau f_\alpha^* + (1 - \tau)f_{\alpha'}^* = f_{\bar{\alpha}}^*$ with $\bar{\alpha} = (\tau\sqrt{\alpha} + (1 - \tau)\sqrt{\alpha'})^2$.
3. **Order preservation:** for all $s \in [K]$, $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^p$, if $f^*(\mathbf{x}, s) \geq f^*(\mathbf{x}', s)$, then for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ it holds that $f_\alpha^*(\mathbf{x}, s) \geq f_\alpha^*(\mathbf{x}', s)$.
4. **Average stability:** let μ_s^* be the expected value of ν_s^* . For all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and all $\mathbf{w}' = (w'_1, \dots, w'_K)^\top \in \Delta^{K-1}$ it holds that

$$\sum_{s=1}^K w'_s \mathbb{E}[f_\alpha^*(\mathbf{X}, S) | S = s] = \sqrt{\alpha} \left(\sum_{s=1}^K w'_s \mu_s^* \right) + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) \left(\sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mu_s^* \right).$$

In particular, setting $\mathbf{w}' = \mathbf{w}$, we get for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ the average stability:

$$\sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbb{E}[f_\alpha^*(\mathbf{X}, S) | S = s] = \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbb{E}[f^*(\mathbf{X}, S) | S = s].$$

The first property is intuitive and does not require the result of Proposition 4.1. The second property can be directly derived using the expression of f_α^* and it describes additional algebraic structure of the family $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$. The third group-wise order preserving property of f_α^* is particularly attractive. Its proof is straightforward after the observation that $F_{\nu_s^*}$ and $\sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} F_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1}$ are non-decreasing functions and the fact that the composition of two non-decreasing functions is non-decreasing. For the special case of $\alpha = 0$, this observation has already been made in ([Chzhen et al., 2020a](#)) and a practical algorithm that follows the group-wise order preservation property was proposed by [Plečko and Meinshausen \(2020\)](#). In the context of classification [Lipton, Chouldechova and McAuley \(2018\)](#) refer to this property as “rational ordering”. In words, this property says: given any two individuals $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^p$ from the same sensitive group $s \in [K]$, if the optimal prediction $f^*(\mathbf{x}, s)$ for \mathbf{x} is larger than that for \mathbf{x}' , then across all levels α of fairness parameter the oracle α -RI f_α^* is not changing this order. The last property of average stability admits an interesting interpretation. Let us interpret $f : \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as a salary assignment function (making it naturally positive).

In that case setting $\mathbf{w}' = \mathbf{w} = (1/K, \dots, 1/K)^\top$, we can interpret $\mathbb{E}[f^*(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s]$ as the average amount of money allocated for salaries within group $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Thus, in this context, the average stability property states that by enforcing fairness improvement property with equally distributed weights across groups $\mathbf{w} = (1/K, \dots, 1/K)^\top$, we do not need to augment the budget allocated for these salaries. The proof of the last property is also rather straightforward: for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$ define the mean of the distribution ν_s^* as $m_s^* := \mathbb{E}[f^*(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s]$, then

$$\mathbb{E}[f_\alpha^*(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s] = \sqrt{\alpha} m_s^* + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} \mathbb{E} \left[F_{\nu_{s'}}^{-1} \circ F_{\nu_s^*} \circ f^*(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s \right] .$$

To conclude, it suffices to notice that under Assumption 2.1 the random variable $(F_{\nu_{s'}}^{-1} \circ F_{\nu_s^*} \circ f^*(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s)$ is distributed according to $\nu_{s'}^*$.

4.1. Influence of the choice of weights. Note that the considered framework permits the statistician to pick different $\mathbf{w} \in \Delta^{K-1}$. To study this additional level of flexibility and freedom, we provide in this section the intuition for three natural choices:

- **Proportional:** $w_s = \mathbb{P}(S = s)$;
- **Inverse:** $w_s \sim 1/\mathbb{P}(S = s)$;
- **Equal weights:** $w_s = \frac{1}{K}$.

Since all of the α -RI prediction functions can be obtained as convex combination of f_0^* and the Bayes rule, it is sufficient to understand the underlying principle behind f_0^* . We focus on the case of two groups ($K = 2$), with the first group representing the minority ($\mathbb{P}(S = 1) \ll \mathbb{P}(S = 2)$). As already mentioned, the Bayes optimal prediction f^* induces two distributions ν_1^* and ν_2^* (e.g., distribution of salaries for minority and majority sub-populations). We schematically illustrate these distributions on top left plot of Fig. 2.

The choice of $w_s = \mathbb{P}(S = s)$ (bottom left on Fig. 2) leads to equalization of minority to majority—that is, the situation of the majority group is modified only slightly, while the minority gets pushed towards the majority; the choice $w_s \sim 1/\mathbb{P}(S = s)$ (bottom right on Fig. 2) leads to an inverse situation—majority is equalized to minority; the choice $w_s = 1/K$ (top right on Fig. 2) leads to a “middle ground” compromise, where both the majority and the minority are pushed toward their barycenter. The actual choice of the weights clearly depends on the given application and the social aspects of thereof. We hope that the provided intuition in conjunction with domain expertise can help the practitioner to make a more informed choice for the weights.

4.2. An abstract geometric lemma. The proof of Proposition 4.1 relies on an abstract geometric result, Lemma 4.3, which might be interesting on its own. First, let us introduce the following definition, which asks for existence of finitely supported barycenters in a metric space (\mathcal{X}, d) .

DEFINITION 4.2 (Barycenter property). *We say that a metric space (\mathcal{X}, d) satisfies the barycenter property if for any weights $\mathbf{w} \in \Delta^{K-1}$ and tuple $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_K) \in \mathcal{X}^K$ there exists a barycenter*

$$C_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{w}} \in \arg \min_{C \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(a_s, C) .$$

Moreover, for any tuple $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_K) \in \mathcal{X}^K$ we denote⁴ by $C_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{w}}$ a barycenter of \mathbf{a} weighted by $\mathbf{w} \in \Delta^{K-1}$.




Fig 3: Illustration of Lemma 4.3 for $(\mathcal{X}, d) = (\mathbb{R}^2, \|\cdot\|_2)$ and $\alpha \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$. The initial points a_1, a_2, a_3 are the vertices of an isosceles triangle. The weights are set as follows: $w_1 = 0.1$, $w_2 = 0.4$ and $w_3 = 0.5$.

LEMMA 4.3 (Abstract geometric lemma). *Let (\mathcal{X}, d) be a metric space satisfying the q -barycenter property. Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_K) \in \mathcal{X}^K$, $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_K)^\top \in \Delta^{K-1}$ and let $C_{\mathbf{a}}$ be a barycenter of \mathbf{a} with respect to weights \mathbf{w} . For a fixed $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ assume that there exists $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_K) \in \mathcal{X}^K$ which satisfies*

$$d(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) = d(a_s, b_s) + d(b_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \quad , \quad s = 1, \dots, K \quad , \quad (P_1)$$

$$d(b_s, a_s) = (1 - \alpha^{1/2})d(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \quad , \quad s = 1, \dots, K \quad . \quad (P_2)$$

Then, \mathbf{b} is a solution of

$$\inf_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{X}^K} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(b_s, a_s) : \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(b_s, C_{\mathbf{b}}) \leq \alpha \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \right\} \quad . \quad (4)$$

REMARK 4.4. *Property (P_1) essentially requires that each b_i lies on the geodesic between a_i and $C_{\mathbf{a}}$ while Property (P_2) specifies the location of b_i on this geodesic: b_i should be $(1 - \alpha^{1/q})$ times closer to a_i , than $C_{\mathbf{a}}$ to a_i . An illustration provided on Figure 3 describes these properties in Euclidean geometry. For general case, the straight lines should be replaced by geodesics. In Appendix G we extend our framework to ℓ_q -risks and provides an extension of Lemma 4.3 to handle losses other than ℓ_2 .*

The setting of Lemma 4.3 is quite general and only requires existence of barycenters (also known as the Fréchet means) for any finite weighted combination of points in accordance with Definition 4.2. For our purposes, Lemma 4.3 will be applied to the metric space $(\mathcal{X}, d) = (\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}), W_2)$. We refer to (Agueh and Carlier, 2011, Le Gouic and Loubes, 2017) who investigate and prove the existence of Wasserstein barycenters of random probabilities defined on geodesic spaces.

PROOF OF LEMMA 4.3. Fix some $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_K) \in \mathcal{X}^K$, $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_K)^\top \in \Delta^{K-1}$ and let $C_{\mathbf{a}}$ be a barycenter of \mathbf{a} with respect to weights \mathbf{w} . Fix $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and any $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_K) \in \mathcal{X}^K$ which satisfies properties (P_1) – (P_2) . Let $\mathbf{b}_k = (b_1^k, \dots, b_K^k) \in \mathcal{X}^K$ be a minimizing sequence of the problem (4) and for any $\mathbf{b}' = (b'_1, \dots, b'_K) \in \mathcal{X}^K$ denote by

⁴When there is no ambiguity in the weights \mathbf{w} we simply write $C_{\mathbf{a}}$.

$G(\mathbf{b}') = \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(b'_s, a_s)$ the objective function of the problem (4). Then, by the definition of a minimizing sequence, the following two properties hold

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} G(\mathbf{b}_k) = \inf_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{X}^K} \left\{ G(\mathbf{b}) : \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(b_s, C_{\mathbf{b}}) \leq \alpha \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \right\}, \quad (5)$$

$$\sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(b_s^k, C_{\mathbf{b}_k}) \leq \alpha \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6)$$

Furthermore, using properties (P_1) – (P_2) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(b_s, C_{\mathbf{b}}) &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(b_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \stackrel{(P_1)}{=} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s (d(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) - d(a_s, b_s))^2 \\ &\stackrel{(P_2)}{=} \alpha \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Lemma B.3 in appendix. Therefore, $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_s) \in \mathcal{X}^K$ is feasible for the problem (4). By Lemma B.2 it holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(a_s, C_{\mathbf{b}_k}) \right\}^{1/2} &\leq \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(a_s, b_s^k) \right\}^{1/2} + \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(b_s^k, C_{\mathbf{b}_k}) \right\}^{1/2} \\ &= G^{1/2}(\mathbf{b}_k) + \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(b_s^k, C_{\mathbf{b}_k}) \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

We continue using the definition of $C_{\mathbf{a}}$ and Eq. (6) to obtain for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \right\}^{1/2} \leq \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(a_s, C_{\mathbf{b}_k}) \right\}^{1/2} \leq G^{1/2}(\mathbf{b}_k) + \alpha^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \right\}^{1/2},$$

which after rearranging implies that

$$(1 - \alpha^{1/2}) \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \right\}^{1/2} \leq G^{1/2}(\mathbf{b}_k), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Finally, using property (P_2) we deduce that $G(\mathbf{b}) \leq G(\mathbf{b}_k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Recall that we have already shown that \mathbf{b} is feasible for the problem (4), hence taking the limit w.r.t. to k concludes the proof of Lemma 4.3. \square

The complete proof of Proposition 4.1 is omitted in the main body. We only provide a short intuition.

SKETCH OF THE PROOF. The idea of the proof is to apply Lemma 4.3 with $(\mathcal{X}, d) = (\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}), W_2)$ and with measures $a_s := \nu_s^*$, which belong to $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ due to Assumption 2.1. Then, we need to construct measures $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_K)^\top \in \mathcal{P}_2^K(\mathbb{R})$, which satisfy the properties (P_1) – (P_2) . To this end, let γ_s be the (constant-speed) geodesic between a_s and $C_{\mathbf{a}}$ i.e., $\gamma_s(0) = a_s$, $\gamma_s(1) = C_{\mathbf{a}}$. We define $b_s := \gamma_s(1 - \sqrt{\alpha})$ for $s \in [K]$, similarly to the intuition provided by Figure 3. One can verify that that $\mathbf{b} = (b_s)_{s \in [K]}$ satisfies (P_1) and (P_2) . Then,

by Lemma 4.3 we know that \mathbf{b} solves the minimization problem in Eq. (4). For the final part of the proof we propagate the optimality of \mathbf{b} in the space of distributions to the optimality of f_α^* in the space of predictions using the assumption that \mathbf{a} admits a density and an explicit construction of the geodesic γ_s . \square

4.3. Risk-fairness trade-off on the population level. The next key result of our framework establishes the risk-fairness trade-off provided by the parameter $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ on the population level. In particular, it establishes a simple user-friendly relation between the risk and unfairness of α -relative improvement. Note that such a result is not available neither for \mathcal{U}_{TV} nor for \mathcal{U}_{KS} , due to fundamentally different geometries of the squared risk and the aforementioned distances.

LEMMA 4.5. *Let Assumption 2.1 be satisfied, then for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ it holds that*

$$\mathcal{R}(f_\alpha^*) = (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2 \mathcal{R}(f_0^*) = (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2 \mathcal{U}(f^*) . \quad (7)$$

PROOF. Proposition 4.1 gives the following explicit expression for the best α -improvement of f^* :

$$f_\alpha^*(\mathbf{x}, s) = \sqrt{\alpha} f^*(\mathbf{x}, s) + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) f_0^*(\mathbf{x}, s) .$$

Plugging it in the risk gives

$$\mathcal{R}(f_\alpha^*) = \|f_\alpha^* - f^*\|_2^2 = (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2 \|f_0^* - f^*\|_2^2 = (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2 \mathcal{R}(f_0^*) .$$

This proves the first equality. Given the definition of f_0^* , the second equality is exactly the result stated in Theorem 3.2. \square

Recall that thanks to Theorem 3.2 we have $\mathcal{R}(f_0^*) = \mathcal{U}(f^*)$. Hence, the α -relative improvement f_α^* enjoys the following two properties

$$\mathcal{R}(f_\alpha^*) = (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2 \mathcal{R}(f_0^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{U}(f_\alpha^*) = \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) .$$

For instance, if $\alpha = 1/2$, that is, we want to half the unfairness of f^* , it incurs the risk which is equal to $\approx 8.5\%$ of the risk of exactly fair predictor f_0^* . We illustrate this general behaviour in Figure 1 (Section 2), where the risk and the unfairness of f_α^* are shown for different levels of $\mathcal{U}(f^*)$. A striking observation we can make from this plot is that, letting α vary between 0 and 1, the risk of f_α^* growth rapidly in the vicinity of zero, while it behaves almost linearly in a large neighbourhood of one. That is, one can find a prediction f whose unfairness $\mathcal{U}(f)$ is smaller than that of f^* by a constant multiplicative factor, without a large increase in risk.

4.4. Pareto efficiency: a systematic way to select α . Even though the parameter $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ has a clear interpretation in our framework, one still might have to figure out which α to pick in practice. The ultimate theoretical goal is to find a prediction f which simultaneously minimizes the risk \mathcal{R} and the unfairness \mathcal{U} . Yet, unless f^* satisfies $\mathcal{U}(f^*) = 0$, this goal is unreachable and some trade-offs must be examined. A standard approach to study such *multi-criteria optimization problems* is via the notion of *Pareto dominance* and *Pareto efficiency* (Osborne and Rubinstein, 1994). In words, the idea of Pareto analysis is to restrict the attention of a practitioner to some set of “good” predictors, termed *Pareto frontier* of the multi-criteria optimization problem, instead of considering all possible predictions. In this section, we show that the set of oracle α -RI $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0, 1]}$ is the Pareto frontier of the multi-criteria minimization problem with target functions $f \mapsto \mathcal{R}(f)$ and $f \mapsto \mathcal{U}(f)$.

Let us first introduce the terminology of the Pareto analysis specified for our setup. We say that a prediction f *Pareto dominates* a prediction f' if one of the following holds




Fig 4: Illustration of Pareto frontiers and Pareto dominance. *Left*: Orange (hatched) part is not realisable by any prediction f ; Each point of green (not hatched) part is realizable by some prediction f ; The curve that separates the two is the Pareto frontier. *Center*: The darker green (dotted) rectangle in the upper right corner is the set of predictors dominated by $f_{0.2}^*$. *Right*: Evolution of the Pareto frontier when $\mathcal{U}(f^*)$ decreases.

- $\mathcal{R}(f) \leq \mathcal{R}(f')$ and $\mathcal{U}(f) < \mathcal{U}(f')$;
- $\mathcal{R}(f) < \mathcal{R}(f')$ and $\mathcal{U}(f) \leq \mathcal{U}(f')$.

To denote the fact that f' is dominated by f we write $f' \prec f$. Moreover, we say that f' and f are *comparable* if either $f' \prec f$ or $f \prec f'$. Intuitively, whenever $f' \prec f$, the prediction f is strictly preferable, since it is at least as good as f' for both criteria and it is strictly better for at least one of them.

Note that not every two predictions are actually comparable, that is, the relation \prec only defines a partial-order. It is a known fact that partially ordered sets can be partitioned into well-ordered chains, that is, every pair within the chain is comparable and the restriction of \prec on this chain defines an order relation. In this set-theoretic terminology, a prediction f is *Pareto efficient* if it is *maximal* within some chain in the sense of the partial order \prec . In other words, a prediction f is *Pareto efficient* if it is not dominated by any other prediction. The set of all Pareto efficient predictions is called the *Pareto frontier* and is denoted by PF.

Note that it would be more accurate to say that f' \mathbb{P} -Pareto dominates f and f' is \mathbb{P} -Pareto efficient, since the above definitions are acting on the level of population and they do depend on the underlying distribution. We omit this notation for simplicity. In general, an analytic description of the Pareto frontier PF is not necessarily feasible. However, in our case, thanks to the analysis of the previous section, we can precisely describe the Pareto frontier of this problem.

PROPOSITION 4.6. *Let Assumption 2.1 be satisfied. Then, the Pareto frontier for the multi-criteria minimization problem with objective functions $\mathcal{R}(f)$ and $\mathcal{U}(f)$ is given by $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$.*

PROOF. On the one hand, by definition of f_α^* it holds that $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]} \subset \text{PF}$. On the other hand, let $f \in \text{PF}$ with $\mathcal{U}(f) \neq 0$ and let $\alpha_f := \mathcal{U}(f)/\mathcal{U}(f^*)$. Then by the definition of α_f it holds that $\mathcal{U}(f) = \alpha_f \mathcal{U}(f^*)$. Furthermore, by definition of $f_{\alpha_f}^*$ it holds that $\mathcal{R}(f_{\alpha_f}^*) \leq \mathcal{R}(f)$ and by Lemma 4.5 it holds that $\mathcal{U}(f_{\alpha_f}^*) = \alpha_f \mathcal{U}(f^*)$. Finally, since f is Pareto efficient it holds

that $\mathcal{R}(f) \leq \mathcal{R}(f_{\alpha_f}^*)$. If $f \in \text{PF}$ is such that $\mathcal{U}(f) = 0$, then it is as good as f_0^* in the sense of Pareto. The proof is concluded⁵. \square

Note that any predictor f defines a point $(\mathcal{U}(f), \mathcal{R}(f))$ in the coordinate system $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R})$. The left plot of Figure 4 illustrates the Pareto frontier and those values of $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R})$ that are attainable by some prediction f . We remark that the convexity of the Pareto frontiers curve is due to the specific trade-off provided by the parameter α . For a general multi-criteria optimization problem this convexity is not ensured. The right plot of Figure 4 demonstrates the evolution of the Pareto frontier when $\mathcal{U}(f^*)$ decreases.

Finally, Proposition 4.6 provides simple practical guidelines for the study of the trade-off given by α . Note that since thanks to Lemma 4.5 it holds that $\mathcal{R}(f_0^*) = \mathcal{U}(f^*)$ and $\mathcal{U}(f_1^*) = \mathcal{U}(f^*)$, then the practitioner needs to estimate only one quantity $\mathcal{U}(f^*)$ and trace the curve of Pareto frontier in order to establish the desired trade-off for the problem at hand.

4.5. Relation with fairness regularized problem. In this section we present one of the possible applications of the Pareto interpretation of the α -relative improvements. For each $\lambda \geq 0$, define (un)fairness regularized minimizer as

$$f^{*,\lambda} \in \arg \min_{f: \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} \{ \mathcal{R}(f) + \lambda \cdot \mathcal{U}(f) \} .$$

Note that the level sets of $f \mapsto \mathcal{R}(f) + \lambda \cdot \mathcal{U}(f)$ induce an affine function in the coordinates $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{U})$. This simple observation allows to establish the connection between minimizers of the penalized objective and α -relative improvements—minimizers of the constrained problem.

PROPOSITION 4.7. *Let Assumption 2.1 be satisfied. Then, for any $\lambda \geq 0$ it holds that*

$$f^{*,\lambda} \equiv f_{\alpha(\lambda)}^* \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha(\lambda) = (1 + \lambda)^{-2} .$$

As a sanity check, we observe that for $\lambda = 0$ we recover the Bayes optimal prediction $f^* \equiv f_1^* \equiv f^{*,0}$ and with λ approaching $+\infty$, we obtain the expression for the fair optimal prediction $f^{*,+\infty} \equiv f_0^*$.

5. Minimax setup. While the previous section was dealing with the general framework on the population level, the goal of this section is to put forward a minimax setup for the statistical problem of regression with the introduced fairness constraints.

Let $(X_1, S_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, S_n, Y_n)$ be i.i.d. sample with joint distribution $\mathbf{P}_{(f^*, \theta)}$, where the pair $(f^*, \theta) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta$ for some class \mathcal{F} and Θ . In this notation f^* is the regression function and θ is a nuisance parameter. For example \mathcal{F} can be the set of all affine or Lipschitz continuous functions and Θ defines additional assumptions on the model in Eq. (1) (see Section 6 for a concrete example). For a given fairness parameter $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and a given confidence parameter $t > 0$, the goal of the statistician is to construct an estimator⁶ \hat{f} , which simultaneously satisfies the following two properties

1. Uniform fairness guarantee:

$$\forall (f^*, \theta) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta \quad \mathbf{P}_{(f^*, \theta)} \left(\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}) \leq \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) \right) \geq 1 - t , \quad (8)$$

⁵To be more precise, one needs to introduce the equivalence relation \sim defined as $f \sim f'$ iff $\mathcal{R}(f) = \mathcal{R}(f')$ and $\mathcal{U}(f) = \mathcal{U}(f')$ and to perform the exact same proof on the quotient space. For the sake of presentation we omit this benign technicality.

⁶As usual, an estimator \hat{f} is a measurable mapping of data to the space of predictions.

2. Uniform risk guarantee:

$$\forall (f^*, \theta) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta \quad \mathbf{P}_{(f^*, \theta)} \left(\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}) \leq r_{n, \alpha, f^*}(\mathcal{F}, \Theta, t) \right) \geq 1 - t. \quad (9)$$

Eq. (8) states that the constructed estimator satisfies the fairness requirement with high probability uniformly over the class $\mathcal{F} \times \Theta$. Meanwhile, in Eq. (9) we seek for the smallest rate $r_{n, \alpha, f^*}(\mathcal{F}, \Theta, t)$ to quantify the statistical price of being α -relatively fair. Note that $r_{n, \alpha, f^*}(\mathcal{F}, \Theta, t)$ depends explicitly on f^* . This is explained by the fact that the fairness of \hat{f} is measured relatively to f^* , hence the price of this constraint also depends on the initial unfairness level of the regression function f^* .

The actual construction of the estimator \hat{f} is problem dependent and the proving that it satisfies Eqs. (8)–(9) requires a careful case-by-case study. In Section 6 we provide an example of such analysis for a simple statistical model of linear regression with systematic group-dependent bias.

5.1. Generic lower bound. While the upper bounds of Eqs. (8)–(9) require a problem dependent analysis, a general problem dependent lower bound can be derived. In this section we develop such lower bound. Let us first introduce some useful definitions.

ASSUMPTION 5.1 (Unconstrained rate). *For a fixed confidence level $t \in (0, 1)$ and a class (\mathcal{F}, Θ) , there exists a positive sequence $\delta_n(\mathcal{F}, \Theta, t)$ such that*

$$\inf_{\hat{f}} \sup_{(f^*, \theta) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta} \mathbf{P}_{(f^*, \theta)} \left(\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}) \geq \delta_n(\mathcal{F}, \Theta, t) \right) \geq t,$$

where the infimum is taken over all estimators.

Assumption 5.1 can be used with any sequence $\delta_n(\mathcal{F}, \Theta, t)$, however, we implicitly assume that $\delta_n(\mathcal{F}, \Theta, t)$ corresponds to the minimax optimal rate of estimation of f^* by any estimator (without constraints) in expected squared loss.

DEFINITION 5.2 (Valid estimators). *For some $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and confidence level $t' \in (0, 1)$ we say that an estimator \hat{f} is (α, t') -valid w.r.t. the class (\mathcal{F}, Θ) if*

$$\inf_{(f^*, \theta) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta} \mathbf{P}_{(f^*, \theta)} \left(\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}) \leq \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) \right) \geq 1 - t'.$$

The set of all (α, t') -valid estimators w.r.t. the class (\mathcal{F}, Θ) is denoted by $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{(\alpha, t')}$.

Definition 5.2 characterizes estimators which satisfy the α -RI constraint at least with constant probability uniformly over the class (\mathcal{F}, Θ) .

Equipped with Assumption 5.1 and Definition 5.2 we are in position to state the main result of this section, which establishes the statistical risk-fairness trade-off. As we will see in Section 6, supported by appropriate upper bounds, Theorem 5.3 yields optimal rates of convergence up to a multiplicative factor.

THEOREM 5.3. *Let Assumption 2.1 be satisfied. Let $\delta_n(\mathcal{F}, \Theta, t)$ be a sequence that satisfies Assumption 5.1. Then*

$$\inf_{\hat{f} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{(\alpha, t')}} \sup_{(f^*, \theta) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta} \mathbf{P}_{(f^*, \theta)} \left(\mathcal{R}^{1/2}(\hat{f}) \geq \delta_n^{1/2}(\mathcal{F}, \Theta, t) \vee (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*) \right) \geq t \wedge (1 - t').$$

Drawing an analogy with Lemma 4.5, the two terms of the derived bound have natural interpretations: the first term $\delta_n(\mathcal{F}, \Theta, t)$ is the price of statistical estimation; the second term $(1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2 \mathcal{U}(f^*)$ is the price of fairness. Consequently, the rate $r_{n,\alpha,f^*}(\mathcal{F}, \Theta, t)$ in Eq. (9) is lower bounded (up to a multiplicative constant factor) by $\delta_n^{1/2}(\mathcal{F}, \Theta, t) \vee (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*)$. The confidence parameter on the r.h.s. of the bound is $t \wedge (1 - t')$. The reasonable choice of t' is in the vicinity of zero, which corresponds to estimators satisfying the fairness constraint with high probability. Finally, observe that this bound is not conventional in the sense of classical statistics, where the bound would converge to zero with the growth of sample size. This behavior is not surprising, since the infimum is taken w.r.t. to (α, t') -valid estimators and not w.r.t. all possible estimators. One can draw an analogy of the obtained bound with recent results in robust statistics (Chen, Gao and Ren, 2016, 2018), where the minimax rate converges to a function of the proportion of outliers, which might be different from zero.

6. Application to linear model with systematic bias. *Additional notation.* We denote by $\|\cdot\|_2$ and by $\|\cdot\|_n = (1/\sqrt{n})\|\cdot\|_2$ the Euclidean and the normalized Euclidean norm. The standard scalar product is denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. We denote by $\mathbf{1}_p$ the vector of all ones of size p . For square matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $n \geq 1$, we write $\mathbf{A} \succ 0$ if \mathbf{A} is symmetric positive-definite.

The goal of this part is to provide an example of a complete statistical analysis for a regression problem under the α -RI constraint. In particular, we show how to apply the plug-and-play results of Section 5.1 in order to derive minimax rate optimal bounds under the α -RI constraint. To this end we apply the developed theory to the following model of linear regression with systematic group-dependent bias

$$Y = \langle \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + b_s^* + \xi, \quad (10)$$

where $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ is a feature vector independent from the sensitive attribute S with $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \succ 0$; $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ is an additive independent noise; and the vector $\mathbf{b}^* = (b_1^*, \dots, b_K^*)$ is the vector of systematic bias. We assume that the noise level σ is known to the statistician. Note that in this case the regression function f^* is given by the expression $f^*(\mathbf{x}, s) = \langle \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + b_s^*$ and Assumption 2.1 is satisfied. We assume that the observations are

$$\mathbf{Y}_s = \mathbf{X}_s \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + b_s^* \mathbf{1}_{n_s} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_s, \quad s = 1, \dots, K, \quad (11)$$

with $\mathbf{Y}_s, \boldsymbol{\xi}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s}$, $\mathbf{X}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s \times p}$, and $\mathbf{1}_{n_s}$ is the vector of all ones of size n_s . The rows of \mathbf{X}_s are i.i.d. realization of \mathbf{X} , the components of $\boldsymbol{\xi}_s$ are i.i.d. from $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. Additionally, we set $n = n_1 + \dots + n_K$ and $w_s = n_s/n$. The risk of $f: \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is then defined as

$$\mathcal{R}(f) = \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbb{E}(\langle \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + b_s^* - f(\mathbf{X}, s))^2.$$

REMARK 6.1. We set $w_s = n_s/n$ instead of $w_s = \mathbb{P}(S = s)$ to simplify the presentation and proofs of the main results. Note that if S_1, \dots, S_n is an i.i.d. sample, then $n_s = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}\{S_i = s\}$ and $\mathbb{E}[n_s/n] = \mathbb{P}(S = s)$, that is our choice of weights essentially corresponds to the scenario of i.i.d. sampling of sensitive attribute.

Using the terminology of Section 5.1 the joint distribution of data sample $\mathbf{P}_{(f^*, \boldsymbol{\theta})}$ is uniquely defined by $(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \mathbf{b}^*)$ and $(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \sigma)$. That is, $(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \mathbf{b}^*)$ defines the regression function f^* and $(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \sigma)$ is the nuisance parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. To simplify the notation we write $\mathbf{P}_{(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \mathbf{b}^*)}$ instead of $\mathbf{P}_{(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \mathbf{b}^*, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \sigma)}$.

The following result is the application of Proposition 4.1 to the model in Eq. (10).

PROPOSITION 6.2. *For all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, the α -relative improvement of f^* is given for all $(\mathbf{x}, s) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times [K]$ by*

$$f_\alpha^*(\mathbf{x}, s) = \langle \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \sqrt{\alpha} b_s^* + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) \sum_{s=1}^K w_s b_s^* .$$

In order to build an estimator \hat{f} , which improves the fairness of f^* , while providing minimal risk among such predictions, we first estimate parameters of model in Eq. (10) using least-squares estimators

$$(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}) \in \arg \min_{(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^K} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \|\mathbf{Y}_s - \mathbf{X}_s \boldsymbol{\beta} - b_s \mathbf{1}_{n_s}\|_{n_s}^2 . \quad (12)$$

Based on the above quantities we then define a family of linear estimators \hat{f}_τ parametrized by $\tau \in [0, 1]$ as

$$\hat{f}_\tau(\mathbf{x}, s) = \langle \mathbf{x}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \rangle + \sqrt{\tau} \hat{b}_s + (1 - \sqrt{\tau}) \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \hat{b}_s , \quad (\mathbf{x}, s) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] . \quad (13)$$

We would like to find a value of $\tau = \tau_n(\alpha)$ such that Eqs. (8)–(9) are satisfied. Note that the choice of $\tau = \alpha$ would not yield the desired fairness guarantee stated in Eq. (8). As it will be shown later, τ should be smaller than α , in order to account for finite sample effects and derive high confidence fairness guarantee. The next result shows that under the model in Eq. (10), the unfairness of \hat{f}_τ can be computed in a data-driven manner, which is crucial for the consequent choice of τ .

LEMMA 6.3. *For any $\tau \in [0, 1]$, the unfairness of \hat{f}_τ is given by*

$$\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_\tau) = \tau \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \left(\hat{b}_s - \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} \hat{b}_{s'} \right)^2 \quad \text{almost surely} .$$

Apart from being computable in practice, Lemma 6.3 provides an intuitive result that $\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_\tau)$ is the variance of the bias term $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$.

6.1. Upper bound. Linear regression is one of the most well-studied problems of statistics (Audibert and Catoni, 2011, Catoni, 2004, Györfi et al., 2006, Hsu, Kakade and Zhang, 2012, Mourtada, 2019, Nemirovski, 2000, Tsybakov, 2003). In the context of fairness, linear regression is considered in (Berk et al., 2017, Calders et al., 2013, Donini et al., 2018), where the fairness constraint is formulated via the approximate equality of group-wise means. In this section we establish a statistical guarantee on the risk and fairness of \hat{f}_τ for an appropriate data-driven choice of τ . Our theoretical analysis in this part is inspired by that of Hsu, Kakade and Zhang (2012), who derived high probability bounds on least squares estimator for linear regression with random design.

The following rate plays a crucial rule in the analysis of this section

$$\delta_n(p, K, t) = 8 \left(\frac{p}{n} + \frac{K}{n} \right) + 16 \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{K}{n}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + \frac{32t}{n} .$$

Not taking into account the confidence parameter $t > 0$, $\delta_n(p, K, t) \asymp (p + K)/n$ up to a constant multiplicative factor, which as it is shown in Theorem 6.5 is the minimax optimal rate for the model in Eq. (10) without the fairness constraint.

THEOREM 6.4 (Fairness and risk upper bound). *Define*

$$\hat{\tau} = \begin{cases} \alpha \left(1 + \frac{\sigma \delta_n^{1/2}(p, K, t)}{\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(\hat{f}_1) - \sigma \delta_n^{1/2}(p, K, t)} \right)^{-2} & \text{if } \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(\hat{f}_1) > \sigma \delta_n^{1/2}(p, K, t) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Consider $p, K \in \mathbb{N}, t \geq 0$ and define $\theta(p, K, t) = (4\sqrt{K} + 5\sqrt{t} + 6\sqrt{p})/(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{t})$. Assume that $\sqrt{n} \geq 2(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{t})/(\theta(p, K, t) - \sqrt{\theta^2(p, K, t) - 3})$. Then, for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, with probability at least $1 - 4\exp(-t/2)$ it holds that

$$\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_{\hat{\tau}}) \leq \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}^{1/2}(\hat{f}_{\hat{\tau}}) \leq 2\sigma(1 + \sqrt{\alpha})\delta_n^{1/2}(p, K, t) + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*) .$$

Theorem 6.4 simultaneously provides two results: first, it shows that the estimator $\hat{f}_{\hat{\tau}}$ is $(\alpha, 4e^{-t/2})$ -valid, that is, it satisfies the fairness constraint with high probability; second it provides the rate of convergence which consists of two parts. The first part of the rate, $\sigma \delta_n^{1/2}(p, K, t)$, is the price of statistical estimation of (β^*, b^*) , while the second part, $(1 - \sqrt{\alpha})\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*)$, is the price one has to pay when introducing the α -RI fairness constraint. In order to achieve the fairness validity, we need to loosen the value of α to reflect the base level of unfairness, that is, $\hat{\tau}$ is adjusted by $\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_1)$. Let us point out that the bound of Theorem 6.4 slightly differs from the conditions required by Eqs. (8)–(9). In particular, it provides a joint guarantee on risk and fairness.

Let us remark that the previous result requires n to be sufficiently large, similarly to the conditions in (Audibert and Catoni, 2011, Hsu, Kakade and Zhang, 2012). One can obtain a more explicit, but more restrictive bound on n by finding sufficient conditions under which the assumption on n is satisfied. For instance, rough computations show that it is sufficient to assume that $\sqrt{n} \geq 16\sqrt{K}$ and $\sqrt{n} \geq 12.5(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{t})$.

At last, we emphasize that the choice of $\hat{\tau}$ requires the knowledge of the noise level σ , that is, this choice is not adaptive. However, our proof can effortlessly be extended to the case when only an upper bound $\bar{\sigma}$ on the noise level σ is known. In this case σ should be replaced by $\bar{\sigma}$ in the definition of $\hat{\tau}$ and in the resulting rate. The question of adaptation to σ without any prior knowledge should be treated separately and is out of the scope of this work.

6.2. Lower bound. The goal of this section is to provide a lower bound, demonstrating that the result of Theorem 6.4 is minimax optimal up to a multiplicative constant factor. Recall that thanks to the general lower bound derived in Theorem 5.3 it is sufficient to prove a lower bound on the risk without constraining the set of possible estimators. Even though the problem of linear regression is well studied, to the best of our knowledge there is no known lower bound for the model in Eq. (10) which *i)* holds for the random design *ii)* is stated in probability *iii)* considers explicitly the confidence parameter t . Next theorem establishes such lower bound.

THEOREM 6.5. *For all $n, p, K \in \mathbb{N}, t \geq 0, \sigma > 0$ it holds that*

$$\inf_{\hat{f}} \sup_{(\beta^*, b^*) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^K, \Sigma \succ 0} \mathbf{P}_{(\beta^*, b^*)} \left(\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}) \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{3 \cdot 2^9 n} (\sqrt{p + K} + \sqrt{32t})^2 \right) \geq \frac{1}{12} e^{-t} ,$$

where the infimum is taken w.r.t. all estimators.

The proof of Theorem 6.5 relies on standard information theoretic results. In particular, in order to prove optimal exponential concentration we follow similar strategy as that of Bellec (2017), Kerkvicharian et al. (2014) who derived optimal exponential concentrations in the context of density aggregation and binary classification. Theorem 6.5 combined with generic lower bound derived in Theorem 5.3 yields the following corollary.




Fig 5: Dashed green and brown lines correspond to the risk and unfairness of f_α^* respectively. Solid green and brown lines correspond to the average risk and unfairness of $\hat{f}_{\tau(\alpha)}$ and the shaded region shows three standard deviations over 50 repetitions. On the left $\tau(\alpha) = \hat{\tau}$ and on the risk $\tau(\alpha) = \alpha$.

COROLLARY 6.6. Let $\bar{\delta}_n(p, K, t) = (\sqrt{(p+K)/n} + \sqrt{32t/n})^2 / (3 \cdot 2^9)$. For all $n, p, K \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \geq 0$, $\sigma > 0$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ it holds for all $t \geq 0$ and all $t' \leq 1 - e^{-t}/12$ that

$$\inf_{\hat{f} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\alpha, t'}} \sup_{(\beta^*, b^*) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^K, \Sigma \succ 0} \mathbf{P}_{(\beta^*, b^*)} \left(\mathcal{R}^{1/2}(\hat{f}) \geq \sigma \bar{\delta}_n^{1/2}(p, K, t) \vee (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*) \right) \geq \frac{1}{12} e^{-t}.$$

Comparing the upper bound of Theorem 6.4 and the lower bound of Corollary 6.6 we conclude that the two obtained rates are the same up to a multiplicative constant factor. Hence confirming the tightness of the results derived in Section 5.1.

6.3. Simulation study. In this section we perform simulation study to empirically validate our theoretical analysis⁷. Before continuing let us discuss the notion of signal-to-unfairness ratio. Setting $\beta^* = 0$ in the model (10), if the amplitudes of b_s^* is much smaller than the noise level σ^2 , then the observations Y_s are mainly composed of noise. While for the prediction problem it is not a problem, since our rates will scale with the noise level, it becomes important for the estimation of unfairness $\mathcal{U}(f^*)$. Motivated by this discussion, we define the noise-to-unfairness ratio as

$$\text{NUR}^2 := \sigma^2 / \mathcal{U}(f^*) .$$

⁷For our empirical validation and illustrations we have relied on the following python packages: scikit-learn (Pedregosa et al., 2011), numpy (Van Der Walt, Colbert and Varoquaux, 2011), matplotlib (Hunter, 2007), seaborn.




Fig 6: Dashed green and brown lines correspond to the risk and unfairness of f_α^* respectively. Solid green and brown lines correspond to the average risk and unfairness of $\hat{f}_{\tau(\alpha)}$ and the shaded region shows three standard deviations over 50 repetitions. On the left $\tau(\alpha) = \hat{\tau}$ while on the right $\tau(\alpha) = \alpha$.

The signal-to-unfairness ratio tells as how the level of unfairness compares to the noise level. The regime $\text{NUR} \gg 1$ means that the unfairness of the distributions is below the noise level, and it is statistically difficult to estimate it. In contrast, $\text{NUR} \ll 1$ implies that the unfairness dominates the noise. Instead of varying $\mathcal{U}(f^*)$ and σ we fix σ and perform our study for different values of NUR .

We follow the following protocol. For some fixed $K, n_1, \dots, n_K, p, \sigma, \text{NUR}$ we simulate the model in Eq. (11) with $\Sigma = \mathbf{I}_p$. In all the experiments we set $\beta^* = (1, \dots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$. For \mathbf{b}^* we first define $\mathbf{v} = (1, -1, 1, -1, \dots)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$ and set $\mathbf{b}^* = \mathbf{v} \sqrt{\sigma^2 / \text{NUR} \cdot \text{Var}_S(\mathbf{v})}$, where $\text{Var}_S(\mathbf{v})$ is the variance of \mathbf{v} with weights w_1, \dots, w_K . So that the unfairness of this model is exactly equal to σ^2 / NUR^2 . On each simulation round of the model, we compute the estimator in Eq. (13) with two choices of parameter τ :

1. **Proposed:** $\tau(\alpha) = \hat{\tau}$ from Theorem 6.4;
2. **Naive:** $\tau(\alpha) = \alpha$.

REMARK 6.7. While performing experiments we have noticed that setting $\hat{\tau}$ with $\delta_n(p, K, t)$ defined in Theorem 6.4 results in too pessimistic estimates in terms of unfairness, for this reason in all of our experiments we set $\delta_n(p, K, t) = (p/n) + (K/n)$, which is of the same order as that of Theorem 6.4.

Then, for each $\hat{f}_{\tau(\alpha)}$ we evaluate $\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{\tau(\alpha)})$ and $\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_{\tau(\alpha)})$. This procedure is repeated 50 times, which results in 50 values of $\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{\tau(\alpha)})$ and $\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_{\tau(\alpha)})$ for each $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. For these 50 values we compute mean and standard deviation. We considered $p = 10, K = 5, \sigma = 1$, and $\text{NUR} \in \{0.2, 0.5, 2\}$. Furthermore, for the choice of n_1, \dots, n_K we study the following two regimes

1. **Balanced:** $n_1 = \dots = n_5 = 100$.
2. **Unbalanced:** $n_1 = 5, n_2 = 45, n_3 = 100, n_4 = 100, n_5 = 250$.

The reason we consider two regimes is to confirm the theoretical findings of Theorem 6.4, which indicate that the rate is governed by $n_1 + \dots + n_K$ instead of their individual values. Finally, for a given fairness parameter function $\alpha \mapsto \tau(\alpha)$ we report cumulative risk increase over all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ defined as

$$\Delta\mathcal{R}(\tau) := \int_0^1 \left(\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{\tau(\alpha)}) - \mathcal{R}(f_\alpha^*) \right) d\alpha .$$

This quantity describes the cumulative risk loss of the rule $\tau(\alpha)$ across all the levels of fairness α compared to the best α -relative improvement f_α^* .

On Figures 5–6 we draw the evolution of the risk and of the unfairness when α traverses the interval $[0, 1]$. We also report $\Delta\mathcal{R}(\tau)$ defined above. Inspecting the plots we can see that the main disadvantage of the naive choice of $\tau = \alpha$ is its poor fairness guarantee, that is, in almost half of the outcomes, the unfairness of \hat{f}_α exceeded the prescribed value. In contrast, the proposed choice of $\tau(\alpha) = \hat{\tau}$ consistently improves the unfairness of the regression function f^* , empirically validating our findings in Theorem 6.4. However, good fairness results come at the cost of consistently higher risk. One can also see that the effect of unbalanced distributions is negligible for the considered model (it only affects the variance of the result). This is explained by the definition of the risk, which weights the groups proportionally to their frequencies. Finally, observing the behavior of naive approach for $\text{NUR} = 0.2$ and $\text{NUR} = 2$ we note that in the latter case the unfairness of \hat{f}_α starts to deviate from the true value (with consistently positive bias). Meanwhile, since the proposed choice $\tau(\alpha) = \hat{\tau}$ is more conservative, the bias remains negative, that is, the unfairness of f^* is still improved.

7. Post-processing method without model. The previous section was concerned with illustrating the minimax setup, introduced in Section 5, with a concrete choice of parametric model. In practice, however, and especially for benchmark problems, parametric assumptions can hardly be verified; therefore, a more generic estimation algorithm, which does not rely on the modeling assumptions, is desirable.

In what follows, we propose a generic post-processing algorithm which can be applied on top of *any* black-box estimation procedure. Note that, due to the appealing structure of α -RI, we only need to estimate the two prediction functions: the Bayes rule f^* and the fair optimal f_0^* . Then, an estimator of f_α^* can be built as a convex combination of the estimators of f^* and f_0^* . The literature on the estimation of the Bayes rule f^* is rather rich, thus, we only detail the estimation of f_0^* . Before proceeding, we introduce an additional bit of notation.

Additional notation. For any prediction function $f : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, any $q \in [1, \infty)$, define

$$\|f\|_q^q := \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbb{E}[|f(\mathbf{X}, S)|^q \mid S = s]$$

and $\|f\|_\infty := \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \inf \{b \in \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{P}(f(\mathbf{X}, S) < b \mid S = s) = 0\}$.

7.1. The algorithm. For each sub-population $s \in [K]$, let $(\mathbf{X}_1^s, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{2N_s}^s)$ be $2N_s$ i.i.d. feature vectors⁸ sampled from the distribution $(\mathbf{X} \mid S = s)$, independently from

⁸For simplicity and without loss of generality, we assume that an even number of observations is available for every sensitive attribute.

(\mathbf{X}, S, Y) and from all other observations. Note that we explicitly allow ourselves to sample from each sensitive group separately. This is not restrictive, since an i.i.d. sample from \mathbb{P} can be converted into the considered sampling scheme by conditioning on the number of available observations from each group.

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a fixed prediction function. Our goal is to build a post-processing operator $f \mapsto \hat{\Pi}(f) : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the post-processing estimator $\hat{\Pi}(f)$ satisfies the Demographic Parity constraint and its closeness to f_0^* is controlled by that of f to f^* . The rationale behind this goal is the representation of α -RI as a point-wise combination of f^* and f_0^* : if the considered function f is a good estimator of f^* and $\hat{\Pi}(f)$ of f_0^* , then, as a trivial consequence of the triangle inequality, we can effectively estimate all of the $\{f_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$.

More formally, we want to build a (possibly randomized) operator $\hat{\Pi}$ which satisfies, for every $f : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $q \in [1, +\infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Law} \left(\hat{\Pi}(f)(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s \right) &= \text{Law} \left(\hat{\Pi}(f)(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s' \right) \quad \forall s, s' \in [K] , \\ \mathbb{E} \left\| \hat{\Pi}(f) - f_0^* \right\|_q &\leq \text{Error}_q(f, f^*) + \text{Remainder}(N_1, \dots, N_K) , \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Error}_q(f, f^*)$ represents the quality of the base estimator, which is supposed to be a good approximation of the Bayes rule f^* . Ideally, we want to have $\text{Error}_q(f, f^*) = C \cdot \|f - f^*\|_q$ for some $C \geq 1$. We will achieve such a goal for $q = 1$, while for $q > 1$, the error term will be slightly different.

REMARK 7.1. *Note that the first condition is stated with respect to the joint distribution of $\hat{\Pi}(f)(\mathbf{X}, S)$, i.e., it involves all the randomness present in $\hat{\Pi}(f)(\mathbf{X}, S)$.*

Estimator construction. Let $\zeta, (\zeta_i^s)_{i=1, \dots, 2N_s; s=1, \dots, K}$ be i.i.d. real valued random variables distributed uniformly on $[-\sigma, \sigma]$ for some $\sigma > 0$ to be specified. For each $f : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, each $s \in [K]$ and $i \in [2N_s]$, define the following random variables

$$\tilde{f}_i^s := f(\mathbf{X}_i^s, s) + \zeta_i^s \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}, s) := f(\mathbf{x}, s) + \zeta \quad \forall (\mathbf{x}, s) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] .$$

Using the above quantities, we build the following estimators: for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}_{1, \nu_s^f}(t) &:= \frac{1}{N_s + 1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \mathbb{I} \{ \tilde{f}_i^s < t \} + U^s \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \mathbb{I} \{ \tilde{f}_i^s = t \} \right) \right) , \\ \hat{F}_{2, \nu_s^f}(t) &:= \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{i=N_s+1}^{2N_s} \mathbb{I} \{ \tilde{f}_i^s \leq t \} , \end{aligned}$$

where $(U^s)_{s \in [K]}$ are i.i.d. random variables, distributed uniformly on $[0, 1]$ and independent from all the previously introduced random variables. Consequently, for each $f : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we define for all $(\mathbf{x}, s) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times [K]$

$$\hat{\Pi}(f)(\mathbf{x}, s) = \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} \hat{F}_{2, \nu_{s'}^f}^{-1} \circ \hat{F}_{1, \nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}, s) . \quad (14)$$

The form of our estimator was inspired by the explicit formula obtained for the fair optimal predictor f_0^* (see Proposition 4.1). It can be seen as its empirical counterpart with additional randomization.

From now on our goal is to establish the desired guarantees on the operator $\hat{\Pi}$. A more in-depth study of this procedure is left for future works. We begin by providing an *exact* demographic parity guarantee.

THEOREM 7.2 (Demographic parity guarantee). *For any $f : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, any joint distribution \mathbb{P} of (\mathbf{X}, S, Y) and any $\sigma > 0$, it holds that*

$$\text{Law} \left(\hat{\Pi}(f)(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s \right) = \text{Law} \left(\hat{\Pi}(f)(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s' \right) \quad \forall s, s' \in [K] .$$

The above theorem may appear as “magical” at first sight as it holds under no assumption. To obtain such a result, we leverage distribution-free properties on rank and order statistics presented in Lemma E.1 in Appendix. This approach was inspired by the literature on conformal prediction (Barber et al., 2021, Lei and Wasserman, 2014, Lei et al., 2018, Vovk, Gammernan and Shafer, 2005) in which similar tools are used. Theorem 7.2 and the estimator in Eq. (14) improve upon the estimator of Chzhen et al. (2020a), for which only approximate fairness is established.

Since our fairness guarantee on its own is not necessarily informative (constant predictions trivially satisfy it), we complement it with a post-processing estimation bound to assess the predictive performance of our estimator. Unlike the previous result, which was assumption-free, we need an additional assumption stated below.

ASSUMPTION 7.3. *For all $s \in [K]$, the measures ν_s^* are supported on an interval in \mathbb{R} , admit density w.r.t. Lebesgue measure which is lower and upper bounded by $\underline{\lambda}_s > 0$ and $\bar{\lambda}_s > 0$ respectively.*

Note that the requirement of the existence of an upper-bounded density is not particularly restrictive. The most restrictive part of this assumption is the lower bound on this density. The reason we introduce it can be intuitively understood from asymptotic normality results on order statistics (see e.g., Van der Vaart, 2000, Section 21.2 and Corollary 21.5) which show that the limiting variance depends on the inverse density evaluated at the quantile that one wishes to estimate. In particular, it explodes when this density approaches zero. In our case, we actually need to estimate the whole quantile function (since f_0^* is based on it, see Prop. 4.1), hence we require that the density is uniformly lower bounded. It appears that the most important implication of the lower bounded density that we use is the $\underline{\lambda}_s^{-1}$ -Lipschitz continuity of the quantile function of ν_s^* . Due to this reason, it is certainly possible to relax the lower boundedness assumption by Hölder smoothness condition on the quantile function of ν_s^* . We leave this investigation for future works.

THEOREM 7.4 (Estimation guarantee). *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 7.3 be satisfied, then for any base prediction rule $f : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, any $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and any $q \in [1, \infty)$, the proposed post-processing procedure satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \|\hat{\Pi}(f) - f_0^*\|_q &\leq C_{\underline{\lambda}}^q \left(\|f - f^*\|_q + \min \left\{ \|f - f^*\|_{q-1}^{1-1/q} + \sigma^{1-1/q}, \|f - f^*\|_{\infty} + \sigma \right\} \mathbb{I}\{q > 1\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s N_s^{-1/2} \right\} + \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s N_s^{-q/2} \right\}^{1/q} + \sigma \right) , \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{\underline{\lambda}}^q$ depends only on $(\underline{\lambda}_s)_s, (\bar{\lambda}_s)_s$ from Assumption 7.3 and $q \in [1, \infty)$.

Note that for $q = 1$ we get a “truly” post-processing guarantee—the quality of the post-processed prediction function in ℓ_1 -norm is controlled by the quality of the initial function in ℓ_1 -norm. For the case $q > 1$, the bound slightly deteriorates and comprises two parts. One that involves a $(q-1)$ -norm to the power $1 - \frac{1}{q}$ and the other one involves a ∞ -norm. Note

that, following [Stone \(1977\)](#), it is always possible to build an estimator f of f^* using an independent set of labeled data which is consistent in $(q-1)$ -norm. However, due to the presence of $1 - \frac{1}{q}$ in the exponent, the potential rate of convergence might be far from optimal. To this end, we included the term with ∞ -norm. Indeed, under smoothness assumptions on f^* and extra conditions on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{X}|S}$ it is possible to build estimators f of f^* in ∞ -norm only loosing an extra logarithmic factor (see e.g., [Tsybakov, 2009](#)) compared to the estimation in $q < \infty$ norm. Furthermore we note that the constants in the above bound do not depend on the number of groups K . The dependency on K is implicit in the quality of estimation of f^* by f and is explicit in the parametric part of the rate. As an example consider $w_s = \mathbb{P}(S = s)$, $N_s = N \cdot \mathbb{P}(S = s)$, and $q = 1$. In that case the remainder term can be bounded by $\sqrt{K/N}$ —the standard parametric rate.

8. Empirical study on real data. In this section we perform empirical study on the `Communities` and `Crime` dataset from UCI Machine Learning Repository⁹. We study the post-processing procedure described in Eq. (14) as well as the estimator from Eq. (13) that we designed in the context of linear regression with systematic bias in Section 6 (we refer to the latter estimator as BLS). The post-processing algorithm in Eq. (14) relies on some base estimator f and we set $\hat{f}_\alpha := \sqrt{\alpha}f + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})\hat{\Pi}(f)$. That is, for $\alpha = 1$ we recover $\hat{f}_\alpha \equiv f$ —the base estimator itself. Thus, the BLS and each base estimator + post-processing induce a family of estimators parametrized by $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. In what follows we study these families of estimators.

8.1. Statistics about predictions. We split the dataset \mathcal{D} into three disjoint parts: $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{unlab}}$, and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ (of sizes 50%, 30%, 20% respectively). The first, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, is used to fit an initial estimator f of f^* ; the second, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{unlab}}$, is used to perform the post-processing $\hat{\Pi}(f)$ described in Eq. (14) (we set $\sigma = 10^{-6}$); the last, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$, is used to compute various statistics related to the performance and fairness of estimators. For the estimator from Section 6 we use both $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ for the train, since it is a one-shot estimator, which does not require data splitting.

Let $\mathbf{w} \in \Delta^{K-1}$ be a weight vector. For any predictor $f : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we measure its performance with weighted mean-squared error on the test data

$$\widehat{\text{MSE}}(f) = \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \hat{\mathbb{E}}[(Y - f(\mathbf{X}, S))^2 | S = s] ,$$

where $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$ is evaluated on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$. The unfairness estimator (see Appendix G for details on this estimator) of $f : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$\hat{\mathcal{U}}(f) = \int_0^1 \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s |\hat{F}_{\nu_s^f}^{-1}(t) - y| dt ,$$

where $\hat{F}_{\nu_s^f}^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the generalized inverse of $\hat{F}_{\nu_s^f}(t) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}^s|} \sum_{(\mathbf{X}, S, Y) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}^s} \mathbb{I}\{f(\mathbf{X}, S) \leq t\}$ with $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}^s = \{(\mathbf{X}, S, Y) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}} : S = s\}$. Note that as long as the image measure of each $\{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{X}|S=s}\}_{s \in [K]}$ under $f(\cdot, s)$ is supported on an interval and its density is positive, $\hat{\mathcal{U}}(f)$ is a consistent estimator (conditionally on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{unlab}}, f$) of $\mathcal{U}(f)$ as a consequence of ([Bobkov and Ledoux, 2019](#), Theorem 5.2) and Lemma G.6 (in Appendix G). Unless stated otherwise, we fix $\mathbf{w} = (1/K, \dots, 1/K)^\top$.

⁹Data source: <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/communities+and+crime>




Fig 8: Evolution of the empirical distributions of the post-processing method for different choices of $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ coupled with the RF as the base estimator.

8.2. BLS estimator from Section 6. The BLS estimator from Section 6 strongly relies on the linear model with systematic bias. Nevertheless, it appears that after properly pre-processing the data, this estimator can actually yield reasonable performance both in terms of risk and unfairness. Given the linear model in Eq. (10), the data pre-processing is rather straightforward: we need to (at least) make sure that the group-wise means of the feature vectors are (approximately) zero. This is achieved by estimating these means on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ and subtracting these estimated means from all the features on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$. After fitting the BLS estimator from Eq. (13), we display the histograms of group-wise distributions of the predicted values on Figure 7. As expected, the BLS estimator does not modify the shape of the group-wise distributions—it only changes their means, which are displayed by the triangles pointing downwards. It is interesting to note that such a simple method, with a proper data pre-processing step, can deliver a reasonable performance both in terms of risk and fairness. Nevertheless, if the equalization of the distributions (and not only means) is mandatory for the given application, one should consider instead the ad-hoc procedure that we study in the next section.





Fig 7: Group-wise distribution of BLS from Eq. (13) for three values of α .

8.3. Ad-hoc estimator from Section 7.1: distribution equalization. We tested our post-processing procedure with two different base methods: random forest (RF) and k -Nearest



(a) Performance frontier of three methods: RF+post-process; kNN+post-process; BLS from Eq. (13) for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

(b) Performance frontier of three methods: RF+post-process; kNN+post-process; BLS from Eq. (13) for $\alpha \in [0, 0.1]$.

Fig 9: Performance frontiers of different families of estimators

Neighbours (kNN)¹⁰. We fitted each method on the training set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ using 3-fold CV procedure to optimize hyper-parameters.

First, on Figure 8, we display the evolution of the group-wise distributions computed on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ (Fig. 8a) and on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{unlab}}$ (Fig. 8b) when α varies from 1 (no fairness adjustment) to 0 (estimation of fair optimal). Due to the form of the post-processing procedure, it is expected that the post-processing estimator achieves near perfect distribution matching when evaluated on the unlabeled data. This phenomenon is displayed on Fig. 8b. Furthermore, on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$, which was never used during the training stage, the post-processing algorithm also displays a visually (and quantitatively, as indicated by risk and unfairness measures) superior performance.

8.4. The performance frontier. We repeat the splitting of the whole dataset \mathcal{D} into the three sets for 100 times and, for each $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, average the resulting unfairness and MSE. Then, for each method and each $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ we obtain a point in the coordinates $(\widehat{\text{MSE}}, \hat{U})$ and the resulting curves (parametrized by α) are displayed in Figure 9. We note that the estimator BLS from Section 6 performs reasonably well and even dominates the post-processing based on the kNN in the regime of moderately low values α . At the same time, the post-processing coupled with the RF as the base method uniformly dominates both kNN+post-processing and BLS—model-based method of Section 6. Furthermore, on Figure 9b one can clearly see the main drawback of the BLS estimator—it fails to achieve a very low level of unfairness (as a point of reference compare the largest unfairness of RF and the smallest of BLS). Such a behaviour is not surprising since the Gaussian features assumption is probably violated and thus, the best we can hope for in general situation is the group-wise mean equalization.

8.5. Ad-hoc estimator from Section 7.1: verifying properties. Even though the ad-hoc procedure in Section 7.1 directly mimics the expression for the α -RI, it is actually a randomized prediction. Hence, as suggested by one of the reviewers, it is interesting to empirically verify the order-preservation and the mean stability properties announced in Section 4.

Order preservation. Note that, while the order preservation property was stated for the α -RI relevant to the Bayes optimal f^* , it should be understood relative to the base estimator for the

¹⁰As before, we rely on `scikit-learn` package (Pedregosa et al., 2011) to implement those base methods.




Fig 10: Order preservation for the ad-hoc method




Fig 11: Mean stability of the ad-hoc method

post-processing procedure. To this end, we fit the post-processing operator $\hat{\Pi}$ on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{unlab}}$ and, for three values of α , display

$$f(\mathbf{x}, s) \quad \text{vs} \quad \hat{f}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, s) = \sqrt{\alpha} f(\mathbf{x}, s) + \hat{\Pi}(f)(\mathbf{x}, s) \quad (\mathbf{x}, s) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times [K],$$

evaluated on $(\mathbf{x}, s) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$, where f is a base-estimator trained on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$. If the order preservation property holds, we expect to see a monotone curve for all $\alpha \in [0, 1)$. Note that the curve for the reference value $\alpha = 1$ corresponds to that of the identity mapping. Figure 10 displays the obtained results. We observe, as expected, that the order-preservation property is approximately satisfied.

Mean stability. Concerning the mean stability, we display the following quantity

$$\left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{s=1}^K \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\hat{f}_\alpha(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s] \right) \bigg/ \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{s=1}^K \hat{\mathbb{E}}[f(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s] \right) \quad \alpha \in [0, 1],$$

where $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$ is evaluated on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$. We evaluate this quantity 100 times to account for randomness that is present within \hat{f}_α . Ideally, the above quantity should be equal to one for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$,

which signifies that the mean stays stable along all the values of $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. We display these results on Figure 11 and observe that the mean stability property is indeed present with the standard deviation being at most 5%.

9. Conclusion. In this work, we proposed a theoretical framework for rigorous analysis of regression problems under fairness requirements. Our framework allows to interpolate between regression under the Demographic Parity constraint and unconstrained regression, using a univariate parameter between zero and one. Within this framework we precisely quantified the risk-fairness trade-off and derived general plug-n-play lower bound. To demonstrate the generality of our results we provided minimax analysis of the linear model with systematic group-dependent bias. Finally, we have proposed a post-processing algorithm which enjoys strong theoretical guarantees and performed empirical validations both on simulated and benchmark data. For future work, it would be interesting to extend our analysis to other statistical models, providing estimators with high confidence fairness improvement.

REFERENCES

- AGARWAL, A., DUDIK, M. and WU, Z. S. (2019). Fair Regression: Quantitative Definitions and Reduction-Based Algorithms. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- AGARWAL, A., BEYGELZIMER, A., DUDÍK, M., LANGFORD, J. and WALLACH, H. (2018). A reductions approach to fair classification. *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- AGUEH, M. and CARLIER, G. (2011). Barycenters in the Wasserstein space. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* **43** 904–924.
- AUDIBERT, J. and CATONI, O. (2011). Robust linear least squares regression. *The Annals of Statistics* **39** 2766–2794.
- BAHARLOUEI, S., NOUIEHED, M., BEIRAMI, A. and RAZAVIYAYN, M. (2019). Rényi Fair Inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.12005*.
- BARBER, R., CANDÈS, E., RAMDAS, A. and TIBSHIRANI, R. (2021). The limits of distribution-free conditional predictive inference. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA* **10** 455–482.
- BAROCAS, S., HARDT, M. and NARAYANAN, A. (2019). *Fairness and Machine Learning*. [fairmlbook.org](http://www.fairmlbook.org) <http://www.fairmlbook.org>.
- BELLEÇ, P. (2017). Optimal exponential bounds for aggregation of density estimators. *Bernoulli* **23** 219–248.
- BERK, R., HEIDARI, H., JABBARI, S., JOSEPH, M., KEARNS, M., MORGENSTERN, J., NEEL, S. and ROTH, A. (2017). A convex framework for fair regression. In *Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency in Machine Learning*.
- BERTSIMAS, D., FARIAS, V. and TRICHAKIS, N. (2012). On the efficiency-fairness trade-off. *Management Science* **58** 2234–2250.
- BOBKOV, S. and LEDOUX, M. (2019). *One-Dimensional Empirical Measures, Order Statistics, and Kantorovich Transport Distances*. *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*. American Mathematical Society.
- CALDER, T., KAMIRAN, F. and PECHENIZKIY, M. (2009). Building classifiers with independency constraints. In *IEEE international conference on Data mining*.
- CALDER, T., KARIM, A., KAMIRAN, F., ALI, W. and ZHANG, X. (2013). Controlling attribute effect in linear regression. In *IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*.
- CATONI, O. (2004). *Statistical learning theory and stochastic optimization*. *Ecole d’été de probabilités de Saint-Flour XXXI-2001*. Springer Collection : Lecture notes in mathematics n°1851.
- CHEN, M., GAO, C. and REN, Z. (2016). A general decision theory for Huber’s ϵ -contamination model. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **10** 3752–3774.
- CHEN, M., GAO, C. and REN, Z. (2018). Robust covariance and scatter matrix estimation under Huber’s contamination model. *The Annals of Statistics* **46** 1932–1960.
- CHIAPPA, S., JIANG, R., STEPLETON, T., PACCHIANO, A., JIANG, H. and ASLANIDES, J. (2020). A general approach to fairness with optimal transport. In *AAAI*.
- CHZHEN, E., DENIS, C., HEBIRI, M., ONETO, L. and PONTIL, M. (2020a). Fair Regression with Wasserstein Barycenters. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- CHZHEN, E., DENIS, C., HEBIRI, M., ONETO, L. and PONTIL, M. (2020b). Fair Regression via Plug-in Estimator and Recalibration With Statistical Guarantees. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- DEL BARRIO, E., GORDALIZA, P. and LOUBES, J. (2020). Review of Mathematical frameworks for Fairness in Machine Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.13755*.

- DONINI, M., ONETO, L., BEN-DAVID, S., SHAW-ETAYLOR, J. S. and PONTIL, M. (2018). Empirical risk minimization under fairness constraints. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- DWORK, C., HARDT, M., PITASSI, T., REINGOLD, O. and ZEMEL, R. (2012). Fairness through awareness. In *Proceedings of the 3rd innovations in theoretical computer science conference* 214–226.
- FITZSIMONS, J., ALI, A. A., OSBORNE, M. and ROBERTS, S. (2018). Equality Constrained Decision Trees: For the Algorithmic Enforcement of Group Fairness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.05041*.
- FITZSIMONS, J., ALI, A. A., OSBORNE, M. and ROBERTS, S. (2019). A general framework for fair regression. *Entropy* **21** 741.
- FRÉCHET, M. (1957). Sur la distance de deux lois de probabilité. *Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires des Seances de l'Academie des Sciences* **244** 689–692.
- GANGBO, W. and ŚWIĘCH, A. (1998). Optimal maps for the multidimensional Monge-Kantorovich problem. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics: A Journal Issued by the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences* **51** 23–45.
- GILBERT, E. (1952). A comparison of signalling alphabets. *The Bell system technical journal* **31** 504–522.
- GORDALIZA, P., DEL BARRIO, E., FABRICE, G. and LOUBES, J. M. (2019). Obtaining fairness using optimal transport theory. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- GYÖRFI, L., KOHLER, M., KRZYŻAK, A. and WALK, H. (2006). *A distribution-free theory of nonparametric regression*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- HAAS, C. (2019). The Price of Fairness-A Framework to Explore Trade-Offs in Algorithmic Fairness. *arXiv preprint arXiv*.
- HARDT, M., PRICE, E. and SREBRO, N. (2016). Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- HSU, D., KAKADE, S. and ZHANG, T. (2012). Random design analysis of ridge regression. In *Conference on learning theory* 9–1.
- HUNTER, J. D. (2007). Matplotlib: A 2D graphics environment. *Computing in Science & Engineering* **9** 90–95.
- JIANG, R., PACCHIANO, A., STEPLETON, T., JIANG, H. and CHIAPPA, S. (2020). Wasserstein fair classification. *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence Conference*.
- KERKYACHARIAN, G., TSYBAKOV, A., TEMLYAKOV, V., PICARD, D. and KOLTCHINSKII, V. (2014). Optimal exponential bounds on the accuracy of classification. *Constructive Approximation* **39** 421–444.
- KLOECKNER, B. (2010). A geometric study of Wasserstein spaces: Euclidean spaces. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa-Classe di Scienze* **9** 297–323.
- KOMIYAMA, J. and SHIMAO, H. (2017). Two-stage Algorithm for Fairness-aware Machine Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.04924*.
- KOMIYAMA, J., TAKEDA, A., HONDA, J. and SHIMAO, H. (2018). Nonconvex Optimization for Regression with Fairness Constraints. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- KÖEPPEN, M., YOSHIDA, K. and OHNISHI, K. (2014). Evolving Fair Linear Regression for the Representation of Human-Drawn Regression Lines. In *2014 International Conference on Intelligent Networking and Collaborative Systems* 296–303.
- LAURENT, B. and MASSART, P. (2000). Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *Annals of Statistics* 1302–1338.
- LE GOUIC, T. and LOUBES, J. (2017). Existence and consistency of Wasserstein barycenters. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **168** 901–917.
- LE GOUIC, T., LOUBES, J. and RIGOLLET, P. (2020). Projection to Fairness in Statistical Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.11720*.
- LEI, J. and WASSERMAN, L. (2014). Distribution-free prediction bands for non-parametric regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B: Statistical Methodology* 71–96.
- LEI, J., G’SSELL, M., RINALDO, A., TIBSHIRANI, R. and WASSERMAN, L. (2018). Distribution-free predictive inference for regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **113** 1094–1111.
- LIPTON, Z., CHOULDECHOVA, A. and MCAULEY, J. (2018). Does mitigating ML’s impact disparity require treatment disparity? In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 8136–8146.
- MADRAS, D., CREAGER, E., PITASSI, T. and ZEMEL, R. (2018). Learning Adversarially Fair and Transferable Representations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* 3384–3393.
- MARY, J., CALAUZÈNES, C. and EL KAROUI, N. (2019). Fairness-aware learning for continuous attributes and treatments. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* 4382–4391.
- MEHRABI, N., MORSTATTER, F., SAXENA, N., LERMAN, K. and GALSTYAN, A. (2019). A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.09635*.
- MOURTADA, J. (2019). Exact minimax risk for linear least squares, and the lower tail of sample covariance matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.10754*.
- NEMIROVSKI, A. (2000). TOPICS IN NON-PARAMETRIC STATISTICS. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **1738** 86–282.

- OLFAT, M., SLOAN, S., HESPAÑHOL, P., PORTER, W., VASUDEVAN, R. and ASWANI, A. (2020). Covariance-Robust Dynamic Watermarking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.13908*.
- ONETO, L. and CHIAPPA, S. (2020). Fairness in Machine Learning. In *Recent Trends in Learning From Data* 155–196. Springer.
- ONETO, L., DONINI, M. and PONTIL, M. (2020). General fair empirical risk minimization. In *2020 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)* 1–8. IEEE.
- ONETO, L., DONINI, M., PONTIL, M. and MAURER, A. (2020). Learning Fair and Transferable Representations with Theoretical Guarantees. In *2020 IEEE 7th International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA)* 30–39. IEEE.
- OSBORNE, M. and RUBINSTEIN, A. (1994). A Course in Game Theory Technical Report, The MIT Press.
- PEDREGOSA, F., VAROQUAUX, G., GRAMFORT, A., MICHEL, V., THIRION, B., GRISEL, O., BLONDEL, M., PRETTENHOFER, P., WEISS, R., DUBOURG, V., VANDERPLAS, J., PASSOS, A., COUNAPEAU, D., BRUCHER, M., PERROT, M. and DUCHESNAY, E. (2011). Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **12** 2825–2830.
- PÉREZ-SUAY, A., LAPARRA, V., MATEO-GARCÍA, G., MUÑOZ-MARÍ, J., GÓMEZ-CHOVA, L. and CAMPS-VALLS, G. (2017). Fair kernel learning. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*.
- PLEČKO, D. and MEINSHAUSEN, N. (2020). Fair data adaptation with quantile preservation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **21** 1–44.
- QUADRIANTO, N. and SHARMANSKA, V. (2017). Recycling privileged learning and distribution matching for fairness. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 677–688.
- RAFF, E., SYLVESTER, J. and MILLS, S. (2018). Fair forests: Regularized tree induction to minimize model bias. In *AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*.
- RIGOLLET, P. and HÜTTER, J. (2015). High dimensional statistics. *Lecture notes for course 18S997*.
- SANTAMBROGIO, F. (2015). Optimal transport for applied mathematicians.
- STEINBERG, D., REID, A. and O’CALLAGHAN, S. (2020). Fairness Measures for Regression via Probabilistic Classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.06089*.
- STEINBERG, D., REID, A., O’CALLAGHAN, S., LATTIMORE, F., MCCALMAN, L. and CAETANO, T. (2020). Fast Fair Regression via Efficient Approximations of Mutual Information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.06200*.
- STONE, C. (1977). Consistent nonparametric regression. *Ann. Statist.* 595–620.
- TSYBAKOV, A. (2003). Optimal rates of aggregation. In *Learning theory and kernel machines* 303–313. Springer.
- TSYBAKOV, A. (2009). *Introduction to nonparametric estimation*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York.
- VAN DER VAART, A. W. (2000). *Asymptotic statistics* **3**. Cambridge university press.
- VAN DER WALT, S., COLBERT, C. and VAROQUAUX, G. (2011). The NumPy array: a structure for efficient numerical computation. *Computing in Science & Engineering* **13** 22.
- VARSAMOV, R. (1957). Estimate of the number of signals in error correcting codes. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **117** 739–741.
- VERSHYNIN, R. (2010). Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1011.3027*.
- VILLANI, C. (2003). *Topics in Optimal Transportation*. American Mathematical Society.
- VOVK, V., GAMMERMAN, A. and SHAFER, G. (2005). *Algorithmic learning in a random world*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- WICK, M., PANDA, S. and TRISTAN, J. (2019). Unlocking Fairness: a Trade-off Revisited. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32 8783–8792. Curran Associates, Inc.
- ZAFAR, M. B., VALERA, I., GOMEZ RODRIGUEZ, M. and GUMMADI, K. P. (2017). Fairness beyond disparate treatment & disparate impact: Learning classification without disparate mistreatment. In *International Conference on World Wide Web*.
- ZINK, A. and ROSE, S. (2019). Fair regression for health care spending. *Biometrics* **n/a**.
- ZLIOBAITE, I. (2015). On the relation between accuracy and fairness in binary classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.05723*.

Supplementary material for “A minimax framework for quantifying risk-fairness trade-off in regression”

CONTENTS

section.1	section.2	subsection.2.1	subsection.2.2	section.3	subsection.3.1	subsection.3.2	section.4	subsection.4.1	subsection.4.2
A	Reminder								1
A.1	The Wasserstein-2 distance								1
A.2	Tail inequalities								2
B	Proofs for Section 4								3
B.1	Auxiliary results								3
B.2	Proof of Proposition 4.1								4
B.3	Proof of Proposition 4.7								5
C	Proof of Theorem 5.3								5
D	Proofs for Section 6								6
D.1	Proof of Lemma 6.3								6
D.2	Auxiliary results for Theorem 6.4								7
D.3	Proof of Theorem 6.4								13
D.4	Auxiliary results for Theorem 6.5								14
D.5	Proof of Theorem 6.5								15
E	Proofs for ad-hoc procedure								16
E.1	Demographic parity guarantee								16
E.2	Risk guarantee								18
F	Relation between \mathcal{U}_{KS} and \mathcal{U}								22
G	Extension to ℓ_q losses								23
H	Additional empirical results								26
H.1	Real data description								26
H.2	Ad-hoc estimator from Section 7.1: choices of weights								26

APPENDIX A: REMINDER

A.1. The Wasserstein-2 distance. *Additional notation.* For any $s \in [K]$, we denote by $\mu_{\mathbf{X}|s}$ the conditional distribution of the feature vector \mathbf{X} knowing the attribute s . For a probability measure μ on \mathbb{R}^p and a measurable function $g : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $g\#\mu$ the push-forward (image) measure. That is for all measurable set $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}$ it holds that $(g\#\mu)(\mathcal{C}) := \mu\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p : g(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{C}\}$.

We recall basic results on the Wasserstein-2 distance on the real line. We recall that the Wasserstein-2 distance between probability distributions μ and ν in $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the space of measures on \mathbb{R}^d with finite second moment, is defined as

$$W_2^2(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 d\pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \right\}, \quad (15)$$

where $\Gamma(\mu, \nu)$ denotes the collection of measures on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with marginals μ and ν . See (Santambrogio, 2015, Villani, 2003) for more details about Wasserstein distances and optimal transport.

The following lemma gives a closed form expression for the Wasserstein-2 distance between two univariate Gaussian distributions.

LEMMA A.1 (Fréchet (1957)). *For any $m_0, m_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \sigma_0, \sigma_1 \geq 0$ it holds that*

$$W_2^2\left(\mathcal{N}(m_0, \sigma_0^2), \mathcal{N}(m_1, \sigma_1^2)\right) = (m_0 - m_1)^2 + (\sigma_0 - \sigma_1)^2.$$

The next lemma gives a closed form expression for the barycenter of K univariate Gaussian distributions. It shows in particular that such barycenter is also a univariate Gaussian distribution.

LEMMA A.2 (Agueh and Carlier (2011)). *Let $w \in \mathbb{R}^K$ be a probability vector, then the solution of*

$$\min_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_2^2(\mathcal{N}(m_s, \sigma_s^2), \nu) \quad ,$$

is given by $\mathcal{N}(\bar{m}, \bar{\sigma}^2)$ with

$$\bar{m} = \sum_{s=1}^K w_s m_s \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\sigma} = \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \sigma_s \quad .$$

Finally we state a lemma giving an explicit form for the transport map to the barycenter of probability distributions supported on the real line and the corresponding constant speed geodesics. See (Agueh and Carlier, 2011, Section 6.1).

LEMMA A.3. *Let a_1, \dots, a_K be non-atomic probability measures on the real line that have finite second moments, and let w_1, \dots, w_K be positive reals that sum to 1. Denote by \bar{a} a barycenter of those measures (w.r.t. to the Wasserstein-2 distance). For any $s \in [K]$, the transport map from a_s to the barycenter \bar{a} is given by*

$$T_{a_s \rightarrow \bar{a}} = \left(\sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} F_{s'}^{-1} \circ F_s \right) \quad ,$$

where F_s is the cumulative distribution function of a_s and F_s^{-1} denotes the generalized inverse of F_s defined as

$$F_s^{-1}(t) = \inf\{x : F_s(x) \geq t\} \quad .$$

In particular, the constant speed geodesic $\gamma_s(\cdot)$ from a_s to \bar{a} is given by

$$\gamma_s(t) = ((1-t)\text{Id} + tT_{a_s \rightarrow \bar{a}}) \# a_s, \quad t \in [0, 1] \quad .$$

A.2. Tail inequalities. The next result can be found in (Laurent and Massart, 2000, Lemma 1).

LEMMA A.4. *Let ζ_1, \dots, ζ_p be i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables. Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_p)^\top$ be component-wise non-negative, then*

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\sum_{j=1}^p a_j (\zeta_j^2 - 1) \geq 2 \|\mathbf{a}\|_2 \sqrt{t} + 2 \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty t \right) \leq \exp(-t), \quad \forall t \geq 0 \quad .$$

In particular, setting $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_p)^\top$ and applying the previous result with $a_1 = \dots = a_p = 1$ we get

$$\mathbf{P} (\|\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|_2^2 \geq p + 2\sqrt{pt} + 2t) \leq \exp(-t), \quad \forall t \geq 0$$

We need one result from random matrix theory to control the smallest and largest singular values of a Gaussian matrix, see (Vershynin, 2010, Corollary 5.35).

LEMMA A.5. *Let \mathbf{A} be an $N \times m$ matrix whose entries are independent standard normal random variables. Then,*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A}) \leq \sqrt{N} - \sqrt{m} - t\right) \vee \mathbf{P}\left(\sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{A}) \geq \sqrt{N} + \sqrt{m} + t\right) \leq \exp(-t^2/2), \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

APPENDIX B: PROOFS FOR SECTION 4

B.1. Auxiliary results. The next result is taken from (Le Gouic, Loubes and Rigollet, 2020, Theorem 3).

LEMMA B.1. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any measurable function. Let Assumption 2.1 be satisfied, then*

$$\mathcal{R}(f) \geq \sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_2^2\left(f(\cdot, s) \# \mu_{\mathbf{X}|s}, f^*(\cdot, s) \# \mu_{\mathbf{X}|s}\right).$$

LEMMA B.2 (Minkowski's inequality). *Let (\mathcal{X}, d) be a metric space. Fix integers $K \geq 2$, $q \in [1, +\infty)$, a weight vector $\mathbf{w} \in \Delta^{K-1}$ and define the mapping $d_{\mathbf{w},q} : \mathcal{X}^K \times \mathcal{X}^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as*

$$d_{\mathbf{w},q}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(a_s, b_s) \right\}^{1/q}, \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{X}^K.$$

Then, $d_{\mathbf{w},q}$ is a pseudo-metric on the product space \mathcal{X}^K .

PROOF. The mapping $d_{\mathbf{w},q}$ is clearly symmetric and non-negative. We only have to check the triangle inequality. Fix arbitrary $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{X}^K$. Then, by triangular inequalities on the distance d and Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(a_s, b_s) &\leq \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d(a_s, c_s) d^{q-1}(a_s, b_s) + \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d(c_s, b_s) d^{q-1}(a_s, b_s) \\ &\leq \left(\left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(a_s, c_s) \right\}^{1/q} + \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(c_s, b_s) \right\}^{1/q} \right) \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(a_s, b_s) \right\}^{1-\frac{1}{q}}. \end{aligned}$$

That is, after rearranging we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbf{w},q}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) &= \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(a_s, b_s) \right\}^{1/q} \leq \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(a_s, c_s) \right\}^{1/q} + \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(c_s, b_s) \right\}^{1/q} \\ &= d_{\mathbf{w},q}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}) + d_{\mathbf{w},q}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b}). \end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA B.3. *Fix some $q \in [1, +\infty)$. Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_K) \in \mathcal{X}^K$, $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_K)^\top \in \Delta^{K-1}$. Assume that $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_K) \in \mathcal{X}^K$ satisfies (P_1) – (P_2) , then*

$$\left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(b_s, C_{\mathbf{b}}) \right\}^{1/q} = \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(b_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \right\}^{1/q}.$$

PROOF. Let $C_{\mathbf{b}}$ be a barycenter of $(b_s)_{s \in [K]}$ with weights $(w_s)_{s \in [K]}$, then by Lemma B.2 it holds that

$$\left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(a_s, C_{\mathbf{b}}) \right\}^{1/q} \leq \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(a_s, b_s) \right\}^{1/q} + \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(b_s, C_{\mathbf{b}}) \right\}^{1/q}. \quad (16)$$

The following chain of inequalities holds thanks to Eq. (16) and properties (P_1) – (P_2)

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(b_s, C_{\mathbf{b}}) \right\}^{1/q} &\geq \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(a_s, C_{\mathbf{b}}) \right\}^{1/q} - \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(a_s, b_s) \right\}^{1/q} \\ &\geq \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \right\}^{1/q} - \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(a_s, b_s) \right\}^{1/q} \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha^{1/q}} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(b_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \right\}^{1/q} - \frac{1 - \alpha^{1/q}}{\alpha^{1/q}} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(b_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \right\}^{1/q} \\ &= \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(b_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \right\}^{1/q}. \end{aligned}$$

The converse inequality follows from the definition of $C_{\mathbf{b}}$, which concludes the proof. \square

B.2. Proof of Proposition 4.1. Let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. For any $s \in [K]$, define

$$a_s = f^*(\cdot, s) \# \mu_{\mathbf{X}|s} = \nu_s^*, \quad (17)$$

Let γ_s be the (constant-speed) geodesic between a_s and $C_{\mathbf{a}}$ i.e., $\gamma_s(0) = a_s$, $\gamma_s(1) = C_{\mathbf{a}}$ and $W_2(\gamma_s(t_1), \gamma_s(t_2)) = |t_2 - t_1| W_2(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}})$ for any $t_1, t_2 \in [0, 1]$. Note that the uniqueness of the geodesic come from the particular structure of the Wasserstein-2 space on the real line, see e.g., (Kloeckner, 2010, Section 2.2). We define $b_s := \gamma_s(1 - \sqrt{\alpha})$ for $s \in [K]$. Let us show that $\mathbf{b} = (b_s)_{s \in [K]}$ satisfies the properties (P_1) – (P_2) of the Geometric Lemma 4.3 when considering $\mathbf{a} = (a_s)_{s \in [K]}$ with the weights $(w_s)_{s \in [K]}$ and $d \equiv W_2$. By construction of $b_s = \gamma_s(1 - \sqrt{\alpha})$, we have

$$W_2(b_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) = \sqrt{\alpha} W_2(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}), \quad (18)$$

$$W_2(b_s, a_s) = (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) W_2(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}). \quad (19)$$

This shows that $\mathbf{b} = (b_s)_{s \in [K]}$ satisfies (P_1) and (P_2) . Therefore, using Lemma 4.3 we get

$$\sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_2^2(b_s, a_s) = \inf_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{P}_2^K(\mathbb{R})} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_2^2(b_s, a_s) : \sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_2^2(b_s, C_{\mathbf{b}}) \leq \alpha \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^2(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \right\}. \quad (20)$$

Finally, thanks to the Assumption 2.1 which says that $a_s = \nu_s^*$ is atomless the constant speed geodesic γ_s between a_s and $C_{\mathbf{a}}$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_s(t) &= \left((1-t) \text{Id} + t \left(\sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} F_{a_{s'}}^{-1} \circ F_{a_s} \right) \right) \# a_s \\ &= \left\{ \left((1-t) \text{Id} + t \left(\sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} F_{a_{s'}}^{-1} \circ F_{a_s} \right) \right) \circ f^*(\cdot, s) \right\} \# \mu_{\mathbf{X}|s}, \quad t \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned}$$

See Appendix A.1 for details about the first equality. Substituting $t = 1 - \sqrt{\alpha}$ to γ_s , the expression for b_s is

$$b_s = \left\{ \left(\sqrt{\alpha} \text{Id} + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) \left(\sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} F_{a_{s'}}^{-1} \circ F_{a_s} \right) \right) \circ f^*(\cdot, s) \right\} \# \mu_{\mathbf{X}|s} . \quad (21)$$

We define f_α^* for all $(\mathbf{x}, s) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times [K]$ as

$$f_\alpha^*(\mathbf{x}, s) = \sqrt{\alpha} f^*(\mathbf{x}, s) + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} F_{a_{s'}}^{-1} (F_{a_s}(f^*(\mathbf{x}, s))) , \quad (22)$$

then after Eq. (21) it holds that $b_s = f_\alpha^*(\cdot, s) \# \mu_{\mathbf{X}|s}$ and

$$W_2^2(b_s, a_s) = \mathbb{E} [(f^*(\mathbf{X}, S) - f_\alpha^*(\mathbf{X}, S))^2 | S = s] . \quad (23)$$

with $\mathcal{U}(f_\alpha^*) = \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*)$. Moreover, Lemma B.1 implies that for any f such that $\mathcal{U}(f) \leq \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(f^*(X, S) - f(X, S))^2 &\geq \sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_2^2(b_s, a_s) = \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbb{E} [(f^*(\mathbf{X}, S) - f_\alpha^*(\mathbf{X}, S))^2 | S = s] \\ &= \mathcal{R}(f_\alpha^*) . \end{aligned}$$

Thus, f_α^* is the optimal fair prediction with α relative improvement. The proof is concluded.

B.3. Proof of Proposition 4.7.

PROOF. For $\lambda = 0$, the statement trivially holds. Fix some $\lambda \in (0, +\infty)$. Following the Pareto frontier interpretation, the minimum of the functional $\mathcal{R}(f) + \lambda \cdot \mathcal{U}(f)$ equals to some $F^* \geq 0$ if and only if, in the coordinates $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{U})$, the line $\{(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{U}) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \mathcal{R} + \lambda \cdot \mathcal{U} = F^*\}$ is tangent to the Pareto frontier curve $\{((1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2, \alpha) \cdot \mathcal{U}(f^*)\}_{\alpha \in [0, 1]}$. Thus, writing this condition explicitly, it should hold that

$$-\lambda = 1 - \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{U}(f^*)}{\mathcal{U}(f^*, \lambda)}} .$$

Hence, at the minimum $f^{*, \lambda}$ of $\mathcal{R}(f) + \lambda \cdot \mathcal{U}(f)$ it holds that $\mathcal{U}(f^{*, \lambda}) = \frac{1}{(1 + \lambda)^2} \cdot \mathcal{U}(f^*)$. \square

APPENDIX C: PROOF OF THEOREM 5.3

To ease the notation we write δ_n instead of $\delta_n(\mathcal{F}, \Theta, t)$. We also define

$$\Psi(\hat{f}, (f^*, \boldsymbol{\theta})) := \mathbf{P}_{(f^*, \boldsymbol{\theta})} \left(\mathcal{R}^{1/2}(\hat{f}) \geq \delta_n^{1/2} \vee (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*) \right) .$$

We split the proof according to two complementary cases.

Case 1: there exists $(f^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta$ such that $\delta_n \leq (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2 \mathcal{U}(f^*)$. In this case, for such couple $(f^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta$ and for any estimator $\hat{f} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{(\alpha, t')}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\hat{f}, (f^*, \boldsymbol{\theta})) &\geq \mathbf{P}_{(f^*, \boldsymbol{\theta})} \left(\mathcal{R}^{1/2}(\hat{f}) \geq \delta_n^{1/2} \vee (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*), \mathcal{U}(\hat{f}) \leq \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{def. of } f_\alpha^*}{\geq} \mathbf{P}_{(f^*, \boldsymbol{\theta})} \left(\mathcal{R}^{1/2}(f_\alpha^*) \geq \delta_n^{1/2} \vee (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*), \mathcal{U}(\hat{f}) \leq \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 4.5}}{=} \mathbf{P}_{(f^*, \boldsymbol{\theta})} \left(\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}) \leq \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) \right) \mathbb{I}\{\delta_n \leq (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2 \mathcal{U}(f^*)\} . \end{aligned}$$

Note that by definition of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(\alpha, t')}$ it holds that

$$\forall \hat{f} \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(\alpha, t')}, \forall (f^*, \theta) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta, \quad \mathbf{P}_{(f^*, \theta)} \left(\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}) \leq \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) \right) \geq 1 - t'.$$

Since in the considered case there exists a couple $(f^*, \theta) \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(\alpha, t')} \times \Theta$ such that $\delta_n \leq (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2 \mathcal{U}(f^*)$, by definition of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(\alpha, t')}$ we have

$$\inf_{\hat{f} \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(\alpha, t')}} \sup_{(f^*, \theta) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta} \Psi(\hat{f}, (f^*, \theta)) \geq 1 - t'. \quad (24)$$

Case 2: for any couple $(f^*, \theta) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta$ it holds that $\delta_n > (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2 \mathcal{U}(f^*)$. In this case, for any couple $(f^*, \theta) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta$ and for any estimator $\hat{f} \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(\alpha, t')}$,

$$\Psi(\hat{f}, (f^*, \theta)) = \mathbf{P}_{(f^*, \theta)} \left(\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}) \geq \delta_n \right).$$

By definition of δ_n it holds in this case that

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\hat{f} \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(\alpha, t')}} \sup_{(f^*, \theta) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta} \Psi(\hat{f}, (f^*, \theta)) &\geq \inf_{\hat{f}} \sup_{(f^*, \theta) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta} \Psi(\hat{f}, (f^*, \theta)) \\ &= \inf_{\hat{f}} \sup_{(f^*, \theta) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta} \mathbf{P}_{(f^*, \theta)} \left(\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}) \geq \delta_n \right) \geq t. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Putting two cases together, and in particular using Eqs. (24) and (25) we obtain

$$\inf_{\hat{f} \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{(\alpha, t')}} \sup_{(f^*, \theta) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta} \Psi(\hat{f}, (f^*, \theta)) \geq \begin{cases} 1 - t' & \text{if } \exists (f^*, \theta) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta \text{ s.t. } \delta_n \leq (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2 \mathcal{U}(f^*) \\ t & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

We conclude the proof observing that the *r.h.s.* of the last inequality is lower bounded by $t \wedge (1 - t')$.

APPENDIX D: PROOFS FOR SECTION 6

Additional notation. We denote by \mathbb{S}^{p-1} the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^p . For any matrix \mathbf{A} we denote by $\|\mathbf{A}\|_{\text{op}}$, the operator norm of \mathbf{A} . We denote by $\chi^2(p)$ the standard chi-square distribution with p degrees of freedom and by $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ the multivariate Gaussian with mean μ and covariance Σ . We denote by \mathbf{I}_p the identity matrix of size $p \times p$.

D.1. Proof of Lemma 6.3. Throughout the proof we implicitly condition on the observations. Let $\tau \in [0, 1]$. For each $s \in [K]$ we set $\hat{m}_s = \sqrt{\tau} \hat{b}_s + (1 - \sqrt{\tau}) \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \hat{b}_s$. Note that for all $s \in [K]$, $(\hat{f}_\tau(\mathbf{X}, S) | S = s) \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{m}_s, \langle \hat{\beta}, \Sigma \hat{\beta} \rangle)$. Therefore, by the definition of the unfairness and Lemma A.2

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_\tau) &= \min_{\nu} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_2^2 \left(\mathcal{N}(\hat{m}_s, \langle \hat{\beta}, \Sigma \hat{\beta} \rangle), \nu \right) \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_2^2 \left(\mathcal{N}(\hat{m}_s, \langle \hat{\beta}, \Sigma \hat{\beta} \rangle), \mathcal{N}(\bar{m}, \langle \hat{\beta}, \Sigma \hat{\beta} \rangle) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{m} = \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \hat{m}_s$. We conclude the proof by noticing that thanks to Lemma A.1 it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} W_2^2 \left(\mathcal{N}(\hat{m}_s, \langle \hat{\beta}, \Sigma \hat{\beta} \rangle), \mathcal{N}(\bar{m}, \langle \hat{\beta}, \Sigma \hat{\beta} \rangle) \right) &= (\hat{m}_s - \bar{m})^2 \\ &= \left\{ \sqrt{\tau} \hat{b}_s + (1 - \sqrt{\tau}) \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \hat{b}_s - \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \hat{b}_s \right\}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is concluded.

D.2. Auxiliary results for Theorem 6.4.

LEMMA D.1 (Fixed design analysis). *Define the following matrix of size $(p + K) \times (p + K)$*

$$\hat{\Psi} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbf{X}_s^\top \mathbf{X}_s / n_s & \mathbf{O} \\ \mathbf{O}^\top & \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{O} = [w_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \dots, w_K \bar{\mathbf{X}}_K] \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times K}$ and $\mathbf{W} = \text{diag}(w_1, \dots, w_K)$. For all $t \geq 0$ it holds that

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\|\hat{\Psi}^{1/2} \hat{\Delta}\|_2^2 \geq \sigma^2 \left\{ \left(\frac{p}{n} + \frac{K}{n} \right) + 2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{K}{n}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + 4 \frac{t}{n} \right\} \middle| \mathbf{X}_{1:K} \right) \leq 2 \exp(-t),$$

where $\hat{\Delta} = (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*, \hat{\mathbf{b}} - \mathbf{b}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^K$ and $\mathbf{X}_{1:K} = (\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_K)$.

PROOF. By optimality of $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\mathbf{b}})$ and the linear model assumption in Eq. (11) it holds that

$$\sum_{s=1}^K w_s \left\| \mathbf{Y}_s - \mathbf{X}_s \hat{\beta} - \hat{b}_s \mathbf{1}_{n_s} \right\|_{n_s}^2 \leq \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \|\xi_s\|_{n_s}^2.$$

After simplification, the above yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \left\| \mathbf{X}_s (\beta^* - \hat{\beta}) + (b_s^* - \hat{b}_s) \mathbf{1}_{n_s} \right\|_{n_s}^2 &\leq 2 \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \left\langle \mathbf{X}_s (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) + (\hat{b}_s - b_s^*) \mathbf{1}_{n_s}, \xi_s / n_s \right\rangle \\ &= 2 \left\langle \hat{\beta} - \beta^*, \sum_{s=1}^K \mathbf{X}_s^\top \xi_s / n \right\rangle + 2 \sum_{s=1}^K w_s (\hat{b}_s - b_s^*) \bar{\xi}_s, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\xi}_s = (1/n_s) \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} (\xi_s)_i$. Using Young's inequality, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \left\langle \hat{\beta} - \beta^*, \sum_{s=1}^K \mathbf{X}_s^\top \xi_s / n \right\rangle &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \|\mathbf{X}_s (\beta^* - \hat{\beta})\|_{n_s}^2 + 2 \left(\frac{\left\langle \hat{\beta} - \beta^*, \sum_{s=1}^K \mathbf{X}_s^\top \xi_s / n \right\rangle}{\sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^K w_s \|\mathbf{X}_s (\beta^* - \hat{\beta})\|_{n_s}^2}} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \|\mathbf{X}_s (\beta^* - \hat{\beta})\|_{n_s}^2 + 2 \sup_{\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left(\frac{\left\langle \Delta, \sum_{s=1}^K \mathbf{X}_s^\top \xi_s / n \right\rangle}{\sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^K w_s \|\mathbf{X}_s \Delta\|_{n_s}^2}} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

We also observe that again thanks to Young's inequality

$$2 \sum_{s=1}^K w_s (\hat{b}_s - b_s^*) \bar{\xi}_s \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s (\hat{b}_s - b_s^*)^2 + 2 \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \bar{\xi}_s^2.$$

Putting everything together, we have shown that

$$\|\hat{\Psi}^{1/2} \hat{\Delta}\|_2^2 \leq 2 \sup_{\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left(\frac{\left\langle \Delta, \sum_{s=1}^K \mathbf{X}_s^\top \xi_s / n \right\rangle}{\sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^K w_s \|\mathbf{X}_s \Delta\|_{n_s}^2}} \right)^2 + 2 \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \bar{\xi}_s^2. \quad (26)$$

Notice that since $\xi_s \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{n_s})$, then conditionally on $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_K$,

$$\sum_{s=1}^K \mathbf{X}_s^\top \xi_s / n \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{\sigma}{n} \left(\sum_{s=1}^K \mathbf{X}_s^\top \mathbf{X}_s \right)^{1/2} \zeta,$$

where $\zeta \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_p)$. Besides, since $w_s = n_s/n$, it holds for all $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ that

$$\sum_{s=1}^K w_s \|\mathbf{X}_s \Delta\|_{n_s}^2 = \Delta^\top \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^K \mathbf{X}_s^\top \mathbf{X}_s \right) \Delta = \left\| \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=1}^K \mathbf{X}_s^\top \mathbf{X}_s \right)^{1/2} \Delta \right\|_2^2.$$

The above implies that conditionally on $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_K$,

$$\sqrt{U} := \sup_{\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{\left\langle \Delta, \sum_{s=1}^K \mathbf{X}_s^\top \xi_s / n \right\rangle}{\sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^K w_s \|\mathbf{X}_s \Delta\|_{n_s}^2}} \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{\left\langle \left(\sum_{s=1}^K \mathbf{X}_s^\top \mathbf{X}_s \right)^{1/2} \Delta, \zeta \right\rangle}{\left\| \left(\sum_{s=1}^K \mathbf{X}_s^\top \mathbf{X}_s \right)^{1/2} \Delta \right\|_2}. \quad (27)$$

Note that for any random variable ζ taking values in \mathbb{R}^p ,

$$\sup_{\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{\left\langle \left(\sum_{s=1}^K \mathbf{X}_s^\top \mathbf{X}_s \right)^{1/2} \Delta, \zeta \right\rangle}{\left\| \left(\sum_{s=1}^K \mathbf{X}_s^\top \mathbf{X}_s \right)^{1/2} \Delta \right\|_2} \leq \|\zeta\|_2 \text{ almost surely.} \quad (28)$$

Furthermore, recalling that $\bar{\xi}_s \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, 1/n_s)$ we get

$$V := \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \bar{\xi}_s^2 \sim \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \chi^2(K). \quad (29)$$

For any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left(\|\hat{\Psi}^{1/2} \hat{\Delta}\|_2^2 \geq 2(u+v) \mid \mathbf{X}_{1:K} \right) &\stackrel{(26)}{\leq} \mathbf{P} (2(U+V) \geq 2(u+v) \mid \mathbf{X}_{1:K}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbf{P} \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{n} \chi^2(p) \geq u \mid \mathbf{X}_{1:K} \right) + \mathbf{P} \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{n} \chi^2(K) \geq v \mid \mathbf{X}_{1:K} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where inequality (a) uses Eqs. (27) and (29) and the fact that $\mathbf{P}(U+V \geq u+v) \leq \mathbf{P}(U \geq u) + \mathbf{P}(V \geq v)$ for all random variables U, V and all $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$. Finally, setting $u = u_n(\sigma, p, t)$, $v = v_n(\sigma, p, t)$ with

$$u_n(\sigma, p, t) = \frac{\sigma^2 p}{n} + 2\sigma^2 \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + 2\frac{\sigma^2 t}{n}, \quad v_n(\sigma, K, t) = \frac{\sigma^2 K}{n} + 2\sigma^2 \sqrt{\frac{K}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + 2\frac{\sigma^2 t}{n},$$

we obtain the stated result after application of Lemma A.4 in appendix

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\|\hat{\Psi}^{1/2} \hat{\Delta}\|_2^2 \geq 2(u_n(\sigma, p, t) + v_n(\sigma, p, t)) \mid \mathbf{X}_{1:K} \right) \leq 2 \exp(-t). \quad \square$$

THEOREM D.2 (From fixed to random design). *Define,*

$$\delta_n(p, K, t) = 8 \left(\frac{p}{n} + \frac{K}{n} \right) + 16 \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{K}{n}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + \frac{32t}{n}.$$

Consider $p, K \in \mathbb{N}, t \geq 0$ and define $\theta(p, K, t) = (4\sqrt{K} + 5\sqrt{t} + 6\sqrt{p})/(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{t})$. Assume that $\sqrt{n} \geq 2(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{t})/(\theta(p, K, t) - \sqrt{\theta^2(p, K, t) - 3})$, then with probability at least $1 - 4 \exp(-t/2)$

$$\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\beta^* - \hat{\beta})\|_2^2 + \sum_{s=1}^K w_s (b_s^* - \hat{b}_s)^2 \leq \sigma^2 \delta_n(p, K, t).$$

PROOF. Define the $(p + K) \times (p + K)$ matrix

$$\Psi = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (30)$$

then under notation of Lemma D.1 we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\Psi}^{1/2} \hat{\Delta}\|_2^2 &= \hat{\Delta}^\top \Psi^{1/2} \Psi^{-1/2} \hat{\Psi} \Psi^{-1/2} \Psi^{1/2} \hat{\Delta} \\ &= \hat{\Delta}^\top \Psi^{1/2} \Psi^{-1/2} (\hat{\Psi} - \Psi) \Psi^{-1/2} \Psi^{1/2} \hat{\Delta} + \hat{\Delta}^\top \Psi \hat{\Delta} \\ &\geq \left(1 + \lambda_{\min} \left(\Psi^{-1/2} (\hat{\Psi} - \Psi) \Psi^{-1/2} \right)\right) \|\Psi^{1/2} \hat{\Delta}\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

If we set $\hat{\Sigma} = \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbf{X}_s^\top \mathbf{X}_s / n_s$, then

$$\Psi^{-1/2} (\hat{\Psi} - \Psi) \Psi^{-1/2} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \Sigma^{-1/2} (\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \Sigma^{-1/2} & 2\Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{W}^{-1/2} \\ \hline 2\mathbf{W}^{-1/2} \mathbf{O}^\top \Sigma^{-1/2} & \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right].$$

Furthermore, by Courant-Fisher theorem it holds that

$$\lambda_{\min} \left(\Psi^{-1/2} (\hat{\Psi} - \Psi) \Psi^{-1/2} \right) \geq \lambda_{\min} \left(\Sigma^{-1/2} (\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \Sigma^{-1/2} \right) - 4\|\Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{W}^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}}. \quad (32)$$

Using the definition of \mathbf{O} we can write

$$\Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{W}^{-1/2} = [w_1^{1/2} \Sigma^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_1, \dots, w_K^{1/2} \Sigma^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_K].$$

Note that the random variable on right hand side of Eq. (32) is independent from ξ_1, \dots, ξ_K . Recall that since $w_s = n_s/n$ and $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma/n)$, then for all $s = 1, \dots, K$ it holds that

$$w_s^{1/2} \Sigma^{-1/2} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_s \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_p/n),$$

and these vectors are independent. Hence, the matrix $\Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{W}^{-1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times K}$ has i.i.d. Gaussian entries with variance $1/n$. Therefore, by Lemma A.5 we get

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\|\Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{W}^{-1/2}\|_{\text{op}} \geq \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{K}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} \right) \leq \exp(-t/2). \quad (33)$$

Furthermore, we observe that

$$\Sigma^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma} \Sigma^{-1/2} \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_i \zeta_i^\top,$$

where $\zeta_i \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_p)$. It implies that

$$\Sigma^{-1/2} (\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \Sigma^{-1/2} \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_i \zeta_i^\top - \mathbf{I}_p = \frac{1}{n} (\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z} - n\mathbf{I}_p),$$

where \mathbf{Z} is a matrix of size $n \times p$ with i^{th} -row being equal to ζ_i^\top . Note that the spectral theorem and the relation between eigenvalues of $\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z}$ and the singular values of \mathbf{Z} imply that

$$n\lambda_{\min} \left(\Sigma^{-1/2} (\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \Sigma^{-1/2} \right) \stackrel{d}{=} \lambda_{\min} (\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z} - n\mathbf{I}_p) = \sigma_{\min}^2(\mathbf{Z}) - n.$$

where $\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{Z})$ is the maximal singular value of \mathbf{Z} . Applying Lemma A.5 from appendix we get for all $t \geq \sqrt{n} - \sqrt{p}$ that $\mathbf{P} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sigma_{\min}^2(Z) \leq \frac{1}{n} (\sqrt{n} - \sqrt{p} - t)^2 \right)$ equals to

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\frac{1}{n} (\sigma_{\min}^2(Z) - n) \leq \frac{p}{n} + 2\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{t^2}{n} - 2\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} - 2\frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \leq \exp(-t^2/2) .$$

Changing variables $t^2 \mapsto t$ we get

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\lambda_{\min} \left(\Sigma^{-1/2} \left(\widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma \right) \Sigma^{-1/2} \right) \leq \frac{p}{n} + 2\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + \frac{t}{n} - 2\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} - \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} \right) \leq \exp(-t/2) . \quad (34)$$

Combining Eqs. (32), (33), and (34) we deduce that

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\lambda_{\min} \left(\Psi^{-1/2} \left(\widehat{\Psi} - \Psi \right) \Psi^{-1/2} \right) \leq \psi_n(p, K, t) \right) \leq 2 \exp(-t/2) ,$$

where $\psi_n(p, K, t) = \frac{p}{n} - 6\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} - 4\sqrt{\frac{K}{n}} + \frac{t}{n} - 5\sqrt{\frac{t}{n}}$. Applying Lemma D.3 we deduce that under the assumption on n that $\psi_n(p, K, t) \geq -0.75$. Thus,

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\lambda_{\min} \left(\Psi^{-1/2} \left(\widehat{\Psi} - \Psi \right) \Psi^{-1/2} \right) \leq -0.75 \right) \leq 2 \exp(-t/2) .$$

Combining the above fact with Eq. (31) and Lemma D.1 we conclude that with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-t) - 2 \exp(-t/2)$

$$\|\Psi^{1/2} \widehat{\Delta}\|_2^2 \leq \sigma^2 \left\{ 4 \left(\frac{p}{n} + \frac{K}{n} \right) + 8 \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{K}{n}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + 16 \frac{t}{n} \right\} = \sigma^2 \frac{\delta_n(p, K, t)}{2} .$$

The statement of the lemma follows from the fact that

$$\|\Psi^{1/2} \widehat{\Delta}\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\beta^* - \widehat{\beta})\|_2^2 + \sum_{s=1}^K w_s (b_s^* - \widehat{b}_s)^2 \right) .$$

□

LEMMA D.3. Consider $p, K \in \mathbb{N}, t \geq 0$ and define

$$\theta(p, K, t) = \frac{4\sqrt{K} + 5\sqrt{t} + 6\sqrt{p}}{\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{t}} .$$

For all $n, K, p \in \mathbb{N}, t \geq 0$, the following two conditions are equivalent

- $n \geq \left(\frac{2(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{t})}{\theta(p, K, t) - \sqrt{\theta^2(p, K, t) - 3}} \right)^2 ;$
- $\frac{p}{n} - 6\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} - 4\sqrt{\frac{K}{n}} + \frac{t}{n} - 5\sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} \geq -0.75.$

PROOF. To simplify the notation and to save space we write θ instead of $\theta(p, K, t)$. Let $x = n^{-1/2}$, we want to solve

$$x^2(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{t})^2 - x(6\sqrt{p} + 4\sqrt{K} + 5\sqrt{t}) \geq -0.75$$

Set $y = x(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{t})$, then thanks to the definition of θ , the previous inequality amounts to

$$y^2 - \theta y + 0.75 \geq 0 .$$

The roots of the polynomial above are

$$x_-, x_+ = \frac{\theta \pm \sqrt{\theta^2 - 3}}{2},$$

which are both positive. The polynomial is non-negative outside the interval $(x_-, x_+) \subset \mathbb{R}_+$. Hence, a sufficient condition is to have

$$y \leq \frac{\theta - \sqrt{\theta^2 - 3}}{2}.$$

Substituting $x = n^{-1/2}$ and the expression for θ we conclude. \square

LEMMA D.4 (General unfairness control). *Under notation of Lemma 6.3 it holds that, for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$,*

$$\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_\alpha) \leq \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) \left\{ 1 + \text{NUR} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{s=1}^K w_s (\hat{b}_s - b_s^*)^2}{\sigma^2}} \right\}^2, \quad \text{almost surely.} \quad (35)$$

Moreover,

$$\left| \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(\hat{f}_1) - \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*) \right| \leq \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s (\hat{b}_s - b_s^*)^2 \right\}^{1/2}, \quad \text{almost surely.} \quad (36)$$

PROOF. Let U and V be discrete random variables such that $\mathbf{P}(U = \hat{b}_s, V = b_{s'}) = w_s \delta_{s,s'}$, for any $s, s' \in [K]$. Note that, in particular, $\mathbf{P}(U = \hat{b}_s) = w_s$ and $\mathbf{P}(V = b_s^*) = w_s$. Then, according to Lemma 6.3 and the definition of \hat{f}_α it holds that

$$\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_\alpha) = \alpha \text{Var}(U) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_\alpha) = \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) = \alpha \text{Var}(V).$$

Therefore, with our notations we have

$$\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_\alpha) - \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) = \alpha (\text{Var}(U) - \text{Var}(V)). \quad (37)$$

Furthermore, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ we have that $\text{Var}(U)$ equals to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(U - V + V) &= \text{Var}(U - V) + 2\mathbf{E}[(U - V - \mathbf{E}[U] + \mathbf{E}[V])(V - \mathbf{E}[V])] + \text{Var}(V) \\ &\leq \text{Var}(U - V) + 2\sqrt{\text{Var}(U - V) \text{Var}(V)} + \text{Var}(V) \\ &\leq \sum_{s=1}^K w_s (\hat{b}_s - b_s^*)^2 + 2\sqrt{\mathcal{U}(f^*)} \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^K w_s (\hat{b}_s - b_s^*)^2 + \text{Var}(V)} \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Finally, combining Eqs. (37) and (38) we deduce

$$\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_\alpha) \leq \alpha \left(\sum_{s=1}^K w_s (\hat{b}_s - b_s^*)^2 + 2\sqrt{\mathcal{U}(f^*)} \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^K w_s (\hat{b}_s - b_s^*)^2 + \mathcal{U}(f^*)} \right).$$

The proof of Eq. (35) is concluded after factorizing the square of the *r.h.s.* of the above bound. To prove Eq. (36), we set $\alpha = 1$ in Eq. (35) to get

$$\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(\hat{f}_1) \leq \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*) + \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s (\hat{b}_s - b_s^*)^2 \right\}^{1/2}.$$

The converse bound derived in a similar fashion using $\text{Var}(V) \leq \text{Var}(U - V) + 2\sqrt{\text{Var}(U - V) \text{Var}(U)} + \text{Var}(U)$. \square

LEMMA D.5 (General risk control). *Under notation of Lemma 6.3 it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_\alpha) &\leq \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbb{E}(\langle \mathbf{X}, \beta^* - \hat{\beta} \rangle + (b_s^* - \hat{b}_s))^2 \\ &\quad + 2(1-\sqrt{\alpha}) \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^K w_s (b_s^* - \hat{b}_s)^2} \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^K w_s \left(\hat{b}_s - \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} \hat{b}_{s'} \right)^2} \\ &\quad + (1-\sqrt{\alpha})^2 \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \left(\hat{b}_s - \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} \hat{b}_{s'} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Recall the expression for \hat{f}_α

$$\hat{f}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, s) = \langle \mathbf{x}, \hat{\beta} \rangle + \sqrt{\alpha} \hat{b}_s + (1-\sqrt{\alpha}) \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \hat{b}_s.$$

Using this expression, we can write for the risk of \hat{f}_α

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_\alpha) &= \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbb{E} \left(\langle \mathbf{X}, \beta^* - \hat{\beta} \rangle + (b_s^* - \hat{b}_s) + (1-\sqrt{\alpha}) \left(\hat{b}_s - \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} \hat{b}_{s'} \right) \right)^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbb{E}(\langle \mathbf{X}, \beta^* - \hat{\beta} \rangle + (b_s^* - \hat{b}_s))^2 + 2(1-\sqrt{\alpha}) \sum_{s=1}^K w_s (b_s^* - \hat{b}_s) \left(\hat{b}_s - \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} \hat{b}_{s'} \right) \\ &\quad + (1-\sqrt{\alpha})^2 \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \left(\hat{b}_s - \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} \hat{b}_{s'} \right)^2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbb{E}(\langle \mathbf{X}, \beta^* - \hat{\beta} \rangle + (b_s^* - \hat{b}_s))^2 + (1-\sqrt{\alpha})^2 \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \left(\hat{b}_s - \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} \hat{b}_{s'} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + 2(1-\sqrt{\alpha}) \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^K w_s (b_s^* - \hat{b}_s)^2} \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^K w_s \left(\hat{b}_s - \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} \hat{b}_{s'} \right)^2} \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that \mathbf{X} is centered and (b) is due to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. \square

THEOREM D.6 (Risk-unfairness bound for any τ). *Recall the definition of $\delta_n(p, K, t)$*

$$\delta_n(p, K, t) = 8 \left(\frac{p}{n} + \frac{K}{n} \right) + 16 \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{K}{n}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + \frac{32t}{n}.$$

On the event

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\beta^* - \hat{\beta})\|_2^2 + \sum_{s=1}^K w_s (b_s^* - \hat{b}_s)^2 \leq \sigma^2 \delta_n(p, K, t) \right\},$$

it holds that

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_\tau) \leq \left(\sigma \delta_n^{1/2}(p, K, t) + (1 - \sqrt{\tau}) \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(\hat{f}_1) \right)^2.$$

$$\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_\tau) \leq \tau \mathcal{U}(f^*) \left(1 + \text{NUR} \delta_n^{1/2}(p, K, t)\right)^2.$$

PROOF. We recall that Lemma 6.3 gives, for any $\tau \in [0, 1]$,

$$\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_\tau) = \tau \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \left(\hat{b}_s - \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} \hat{b}_{s'} \right)^2. \quad (39)$$

Let us start by proving the first part of the statement. Using Lemma D.5 to upper bound the risk $\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_\tau)$ and the definition of \mathcal{A} to control this upper bound, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_\tau) &\leq \sigma^2 \delta_n(p, K, t) + 2\sigma \sqrt{\delta_n(p, K, t)} \left((1 - \sqrt{\tau}) \sqrt{\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_1)} \right) + (1 - \sqrt{\tau})^2 \mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_1) \\ &= \left(\sigma \sqrt{\delta_n(p, K, t)} + (1 - \sqrt{\tau}) \sqrt{\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_1)} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The second part of the statement follow by applying Lemma D.4 and Theorem D.2 to get

$$\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_\tau) \leq \tau \mathcal{U}(f^*) \left(1 + \text{NUR} \sqrt{\delta_n(p, K, t)}\right)^2. \quad (40)$$

□

D.3. Proof of Theorem 6.4. We set $\hat{f} := \hat{f}_1$ and $\delta_n = \delta_n(p, K, t)$. The proof relies on Eq. (36) of Lemma 6.3. Using notations of Theorem D.6 we also define the event

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\beta^* - \hat{\beta})\|_2^2 + \sum_{s=1}^K w_s (b_s^* - \hat{b}_s)^2 \leq \sigma^2 \delta_n(p, K, t) \right\} \quad (41)$$

which holds with probability at least $1 - 4 \exp(-t)$.

Case 1. Assume that $\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(\hat{f}) > \sigma \delta_n^{1/2}(p, K, t)$. Note that thanks to Theorem D.6, and the definition of $\hat{\tau}$ we derive on the event \mathcal{A} that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_{\hat{\tau}}) &\leq \hat{\tau} \mathcal{U}(f^*) \left(1 + \sigma \sqrt{\frac{\delta_n}{\mathcal{U}(f^*)}}\right)^2 = \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) \left(1 + \sigma \sqrt{\frac{\delta_n}{\mathcal{U}(f^*)}}\right)^2 \left(1 + \frac{\sigma \delta_n^{1/2}}{\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(\hat{f}) - \sigma \delta_n^{1/2}}\right)^{-2} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*) \left(1 + \sigma \sqrt{\frac{\delta_n}{\mathcal{U}(f^*)}}\right)^2 \left(1 + \frac{\sigma \delta_n^{1/2}}{\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*)}\right)^{-2} \\ &= \alpha \mathcal{U}(f^*). \end{aligned}$$

In the last equation, inequality (a) follows from Eq. (36) of Lemma 6.3 and thanks to the fact that on the event \mathcal{A} it holds that $\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(\hat{f}) \leq \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*) + \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s (\hat{b}_s - b_s^*)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \leq \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*) + \sigma \delta_n^{1/2}$. For the risk we have thanks to Theorems D.6 that

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{\hat{\tau}}) \leq \left(\sigma \sqrt{\delta_n} + (1 - \sqrt{\hat{\tau}}) \sqrt{\mathcal{U}(\hat{f})} \right)^2. \quad (42)$$

Furthermore, we note that

$$\sqrt{\hat{\tau} \mathcal{U}(\hat{f})} = \sqrt{\alpha} \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{U}(\hat{f})}}{1 + \frac{\sigma \sqrt{\delta_n}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{U}(\hat{f})} - \sigma \sqrt{\delta_n}}} = \sqrt{\alpha} \left(\sqrt{\mathcal{U}(\hat{f})} - \sigma \sqrt{\delta_n} \right)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \sqrt{\alpha} \left(\sqrt{\mathcal{U}(f^*)} - 2\sigma\sqrt{\delta_n} \right) , \quad (43)$$

where inequality (b) again follows from Eq. (36) of Lemma 6.3 and thanks to the fact that on the event \mathcal{A} it holds that $\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(\hat{f}) \geq \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*) - \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s (\hat{b}_s - b_s^*)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \geq \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*) - \sigma\delta_n^{1/2}$. Recall, that we have already shown that on the event \mathcal{A} we have

$$\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(\hat{f}) \leq \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*) + \sigma\delta_n^{1/2} . \quad (44)$$

Combining Eqs. (43) and (44) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})\sqrt{\mathcal{U}(\hat{f})} &\leq \sqrt{\mathcal{U}(f^*)} + \sigma\sqrt{\delta_n} - \sqrt{\alpha} \left(\sqrt{\mathcal{U}(f^*)} - 2\sigma\sqrt{\delta_n} \right) \\ &= (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})\sqrt{\mathcal{U}(f^*)} + (1 + 2\sqrt{\alpha})\sigma\sqrt{\delta_n} \end{aligned}$$

Thus since the function $(\sigma\delta_n^{1/2} + \cdot)^2$ is increasing on $[-\sigma\sqrt{\delta_n}, \infty)$ we get from Eq. (42) that

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{\hat{\tau}}) \leq \left(2(1 + \sqrt{\alpha})\sigma\sqrt{\delta_n} + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})\sqrt{\mathcal{U}(f^*)} \right)^2 ,$$

which concludes the proof of the first case.

Case 2. if $\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(\hat{f}) \leq \sigma\delta_n^{1/2}(p, K, t)$, then

$$\hat{f}_0(\mathbf{x}, s) = \langle \mathbf{x}, \hat{\beta} \rangle + \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \hat{b}_s .$$

Furthermore, on the event \mathcal{A} thanks to Theorem D.6 it holds that $0 = \mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_0) \leq \alpha\mathcal{U}(f^*)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_0) &\leq \left(\sigma\delta_n^{1/2} + \mathcal{U}^{1/2}(\hat{f}) \right)^2 = \left(\sigma\delta_n^{1/2} + \sqrt{\alpha}\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(\hat{f}) + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(\hat{f}) \right)^2 \\ &\leq \left((1 + \sqrt{\alpha})\sigma\delta_n^{1/2} + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(\hat{f}) \right)^2 \\ &\leq \left((1 + \sqrt{\alpha})\sigma\delta_n^{1/2} + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) \left(\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*) + \sigma\delta_n^{1/2} \right) \right)^2 \\ &= \left(2\sigma\delta_n^{1/2} + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha})\mathcal{U}^{1/2}(f^*) \right)^2 . \end{aligned}$$

The proof is concluded by application of Theorem D.2 to control the probability of event \mathcal{A} .

D.4. Auxiliary results for Theorem 6.5. Let us first present auxiliary results used for the proof of Theorem 6.5. The next lemma is known as Varshamov-Gilbert Lemma (Gilbert, 1952, Varshamov, 1957), its statement is taken from (Rigollet and Hütter, 2015, Lemma 4.12), see also (Tsybakov, 2009, Lemma 2.9).

LEMMA D.7. *Let $d \geq 1$ be an integer. There exist binary vectors $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_M \in \{0, 1\}^d$ such that*

1. $\rho(\omega_j, \omega_{j'}) \geq d/4$ for all $j \neq j'$,
2. $M = \lfloor e^{d/16} \rfloor \geq e^{d/32}$,

where $\rho(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Hamming's distance on binary vectors.

The next lemmas can be found in (Bellec, 2017, Lemma 5.1), see also (Kerkycharian et al., 2014, Lemma 3).

LEMMA D.8. *Let (Ω, \mathcal{A}) be a measurable space and $M \geq 1$. Let A_0, \dots, A_M be disjoint measurable events. Assume that $\mathbf{Q}_0, \dots, \mathbf{Q}_M$ are probability measures on (Ω, \mathcal{A}) such that*

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \text{KL}(\mathbf{Q}_j, \mathbf{Q}_0) \leq \kappa < \infty .$$

Then,

$$\max_{j=0, \dots, M} \mathbf{Q}_j(A_j^c) \geq \frac{1}{12} \min(1, M \exp(-3\kappa)) .$$

Define the diagonal matrix $\mathbf{W} = \text{diag}(w_1, \dots, w_K)$.

LEMMA D.9. *Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer and $s > 0$ be a positive number. Let $M \geq 1$ and $(\beta_j, \mathbf{b}_j) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^K$, $j = 0, \dots, M$, such that $\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\beta_j - \beta_k)\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{W}^{1/2}(\mathbf{b}_j - \mathbf{b}_k)\|_2^2 \geq 4s$ for $j \neq k$. Assume that*

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \text{KL}(\mathbf{P}_{(\beta_j, \mathbf{b}_j)}, \mathbf{P}_{(\beta_0, \mathbf{b}_0)}) \leq \kappa < \infty .$$

Then, for any estimator \hat{f} ,

$$\max_{j=0, \dots, M} \mathbf{P}_{(\beta_j, \mathbf{b}_j)} \left(\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}) \geq s \right) \geq \frac{1}{12} \min(1, M \exp(-3\kappa)) .$$

PROOF. Denote by A_j the event $\mathcal{R}_j(\hat{f}) < s$ for $j = 1, \dots, M$. Note that the events A_0, \dots, A_M are pair-wise disjoint. Indeed, if they were not there would exist indices j and j' , with $j \neq j'$, such that, on the non-empty event $A_j \cap A_{j'}$,

$$\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\beta_j - \beta_{j'})\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{W}^{1/2}(\mathbf{b}_j - \mathbf{b}_{j'})\|_2^2 \leq 2\mathcal{R}_j(\hat{f}) + 2\mathcal{R}_{j'}(\hat{f}) < 4s \quad (45)$$

contradicting our assumption on the (β_j, \mathbf{b}_j) and $(\beta_{j'}, \mathbf{b}_{j'})$. We conclude applying Lemma D.8. \square

D.5. Proof of Theorem 6.5. Define the $(p+K) \times (p+K)$ matrix

$$\Psi = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix} , \quad (46)$$

Apply Lemma D.7 to obtain $\omega_0, \dots, \omega_M$ with $M+1 \geq e^{(p+K)/32}$ and such that $\rho(\omega_j, \omega_k) \geq (p+K)/4$. Let $\mathbf{B}_0 = (\beta_0, \mathbf{b}_0), \dots, \mathbf{B}_M = (\beta_M, \mathbf{b}_M)$ be such that

$$\mathbf{B}_j = \varphi \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2}{n}} \left(1 + \sqrt{t/(p+K)} \right) \Psi^{-1/2} \omega_j, \quad (47)$$

with $p+K \leq 32 \log(M)$ and $\varphi > 0$ to be determined later.

On the one hand we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\beta_j - \beta_k)\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{W}^{1/2}(\mathbf{b}_j - \mathbf{b}_k)\|_2^2 &= \frac{\varphi^2 \sigma^2}{n} (1 + \sqrt{t/(p+K)})^2 \rho(\omega_j, \omega_{j'}) \\ &\geq \frac{\varphi^2 \sigma^2}{n} (1 + \sqrt{t/(p+K)})^2 (p+K)/4 \\ &= \frac{\varphi^2 \sigma^2}{4n} (\sqrt{p+K} + \sqrt{t})^2 . \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, recall that $\mathbb{P}_{Y|\mathbf{X}, S=s} = \mathcal{N}(\langle \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta} \rangle + b_s, \sigma^2)$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{X}} = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$, then, for a given $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^K$ the joint distribution of observations is

$$\mathbf{P}_{(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{b})} = \bigotimes_{s=1}^K (\mathcal{N}(\langle \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta} \rangle + b_s, \sigma^2) \otimes \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}))^{\otimes n_s}.$$

Given $\mathbf{B} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{b})$, $\mathbf{B}' = (\boldsymbol{\beta}', \mathbf{b}')$ in $\mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^K$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\mathbf{P}_{(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{b})}, \mathbf{P}_{(\boldsymbol{\beta}', \mathbf{b}')}) &= \sum_{s=1}^K n_s \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})} \left[\widetilde{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{N}(\langle \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta} \rangle + b_s, \sigma^2), \mathcal{N}(\langle \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta}' \rangle + b'_s, \sigma^2)) \right] \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^K n_s \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})} \left(\frac{(\langle \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}' \rangle + b_s - b'_s)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^K n_s \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}')\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{(b_s - b'_s)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \\ &= n \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}')\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2} + \frac{\|\mathbf{W}^{1/2}(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}')\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \\ &= \frac{n}{2\sigma^2} \|\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{1/2}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}')\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\varphi^2}{2} (\sqrt{p+K} + \sqrt{t})^2 \leq \varphi^2(p+K) + \varphi^2 t \leq 32\varphi^2 \log(M) + \varphi^2 t. \end{aligned}$$

Let \hat{f} be any estimator and define the risks

$$\mathcal{R}_j(\hat{f}) = \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) - \langle \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_j \rangle - (b_j)_S)^2 \mid S = s \right], \quad j = 1, \dots, M.$$

Set $u_n(p, K, t, \varphi, \sigma) = \frac{\varphi^2 \sigma^2}{16n} (\sqrt{p+K} + \sqrt{t})^2$. Applying Lemma D.9 after reducing the supremum to a finite number of hypothesis, we get for all estimators \hat{f} that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \mathbf{b}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^K} \mathbf{P}_{(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \mathbf{b}^*)} \left(\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}) \geq u_n(p, K, t, \varphi, \sigma) \right) &\geq \max_{j=0, \dots, M} \mathbf{P}_{(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)} \left(\mathcal{R}_j(\hat{f}) \geq u_n(p, K, t, \varphi, \sigma) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{12} \min(1, M \exp(-96\varphi^2 \log(M) - 3\varphi^2 t)) \end{aligned}$$

Setting $\varphi = 1/\sqrt{96}$, we obtain

$$\sup_{(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \mathbf{b}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^K} \mathbf{P}_{(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \mathbf{b}^*)} \left(\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}) \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{1536n} (\sqrt{p+K} + \sqrt{t})^2 \right) \geq \frac{1}{12} \exp\left(-\frac{t}{32}\right).$$

The proof is concluded.

APPENDIX E: PROOFS FOR AD-HOC PROCEDURE

E.1. Demographic parity guarantee. The proof of Theorem 7.2 relies on (Vovk, Gammernan and Shafer, 2005, Lemma 8.7) which is recalled below. We provide an alternative elementary proof of this result.

LEMMA E.1. *Let $n \geq 1$. Let V_1, \dots, V_n, V_{n+1} be exchangeable real-valued random variables and U distributed uniformly on $[0, 1]$ be independent from V_1, \dots, V_n, V_{n+1} , then the statistics*

$$T(V_1, \dots, V_n, V_{n+1}, U) = \frac{1}{n+1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}\{V_i < V_{n+1}\} + U \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}\{V_i = V_{n+1}\} \right) \right) ,$$

is distributed uniformly on $[0, 1]$.

PROOF OF LEMMA E.1. Set $V \sim \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \delta_{V_i}$ be independent from U and denote by $F_{V|\mathbf{V}}$ the cumulative distribution function of V conditionally on $\mathbf{V} := (V_1, \dots, V_n, V_{n+1})$. Define the following statistics

$$\mathcal{T}(v, u) = \mathbf{P}(V < v | \mathbf{V}) + u\mathbf{P}(V = v | \mathbf{V}) , \quad \forall (u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^2 .$$

Note that $\mathcal{T}(V_{n+1}, U) = T(V_1, \dots, V_n, V_{n+1}, U)$. In what follows we show that $\mathcal{T}(V_{n+1}, U)$ is distributed uniformly on $[0, 1]$. Fix some $t \in [0, 1]$. Define $v(t) = F_{V|\mathbf{V}}^{-1}(t+)$ and

$$u(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathbf{P}(V = v(t) | \mathbf{V}) = 0 \\ \frac{t - \mathbf{P}(V < v(t) | \mathbf{V})}{\mathbf{P}(V = v(t) | \mathbf{V})} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

One can verify that by construction of $(u(t), v(t)) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ the event

$$\{\mathcal{T}(V, U) \leq t\} \iff \{V < v(t)\} \sqcup (\{V = v(t)\} \cap \{U < u(t)\}) ,$$

where \sqcup stands for the disjoint union of two sets. Thus, since the events $\{V < v(t)\}$ and $\{V = v(t)\} \cap \{U < u(t)\}$ are disjoint and U is distributed uniformly on $[0, 1]$ and is independent from V, \mathbf{V} it holds that

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T}(V, U) \leq t | \mathbf{V}) = \mathbf{P}(V < v(t) | \mathbf{V}) + \mathbf{P}(U < u(t) | \mathbf{V})\mathbf{P}(V = v(t) | \mathbf{V}) = t .$$

Integrating the above equality we get $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T}(V, U) \leq t) = t$. To conclude, we first notice that thanks to the definition of V it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T}(V, U) \leq t) &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T}(V, U) \leq t | \mathbf{V})] \\ &= \frac{1}{n+1} \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T}(V_i, U) \leq t | \mathbf{V}) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T}(V_i, U) \leq t) . \end{aligned}$$

Since, the random variables V_1, \dots, V_n, V_{n+1} are exchangeable and the Bernoulli random variables $\mathbb{I}\{\mathcal{T}(V_i, U) \leq t\}$ for $i \in [n]$ are also exchangeable and are distributed identically, then

$$t = \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T}(V, U) \leq t) = \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T}(V_i, U) \leq t) = \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T}(V_{n+1}, U) \leq t) .$$

The proof is concluded. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 7.2. To prove the claimed guarantee, we will show that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance between $\text{Law}(\hat{\Pi}(f)(\mathbf{X}, S) | S = s)$ and $\text{Law}(\hat{\Pi}(f)(\mathbf{X}, S) | S = s')$ equals to zero for any $s \neq s' \in [K]$. For conciseness we define for all $s \neq s' \in [K]$

$$\text{KS}_{s,s'} := \text{KS} \left(\text{Law}(\hat{\Pi}(f)(\mathbf{X}, S) | S = s), \text{Law}(\hat{\Pi}(f)(\mathbf{X}, S) | S = s') \right) .$$

Note that, according to the definition of $\hat{\Pi}$ in Eq. (14), we have for any $(\mathbf{x}, s) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times [K]$

$$\hat{\Pi}(f)(\mathbf{x}, s) = \hat{Q} \circ \hat{F}_{1, \nu_s^f} \circ f(\mathbf{x}, s) ,$$

with $\hat{Q}(\cdot) = \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} \hat{F}_{2, \nu_{s'}^f}^{-1}(\cdot)$. Note that, thanks to the splitting of the data into two parts, \hat{Q} is independent from $(\hat{F}_{1, \nu_s^f} \circ f(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s)$ for each $s \in [K]$.

Fix some $s \in [K]$ and, for all $i = 1, \dots, N_s$, set $V_i = \tilde{f}_i^s$ with $V_{N_s+1} \stackrel{d}{=} (\tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s)$ independent from $(V_i)_{i=1, \dots, N_s}$. Since the random variables $V_1, \dots, V_{N_s}, V_{N_s+1}$ are exchangeable (they are even independent), Lemma E.1 implies that for all $s \in [K]$

$$(\hat{F}_{1, \nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s) \text{ is distributed uniformly on } [0, 1] .$$

The above arguments yield for all $s, s' \in [K]$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KS}_{s, s'} &= \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbf{P} \left(\hat{\Pi}(f)(\mathbf{X}, S) \leq t \mid S = s \right) - \mathbf{P} \left(\hat{\Pi}(f)(\mathbf{X}, S) \leq t \mid S = s' \right) \right| \\ &= \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbf{P} \left(\hat{F}_{1, \nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) \leq \hat{Q}^{-1}(t) \mid S = s \right) - \mathbf{P} \left(\hat{F}_{1, \nu_{s'}^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) \leq \hat{Q}^{-1}(t) \mid S = s' \right) \right| \\ &= \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbf{E}[\hat{Q}^{-1}(t) \mid S = s] - \mathbf{E}[\hat{Q}^{-1}(t) \mid S = s'] \right| = 0 . \end{aligned}$$

The first equality uses the definition of $\hat{\Pi}$; the second uses the fact that \hat{Q} is monotone by construction and (Van der Vaart, 2000, Lemma 21.1(i)); and the third one invokes the independence of \hat{Q} from $\hat{F}_{1, \nu_s^f} \circ f(\mathbf{X}, S)$ conditionally on $S = s$ for any $s \in [K]$, Lemma E.1, and the independence of \hat{Q} from S . The proof is concluded. \square

E.2. Risk guarantee.

PROOF OF THEOREM 7.4. The proof of this result follows similar lines as that of (Chzhen et al., 2020a, Theorem 4.4). However, since our estimator is different, then several adaptations need to be introduced. Furthermore, our guarantees are stated for general ℓ_q -norms.

By the triangle inequality we can write

$$\mathbf{E} \left\| \hat{\Pi}(f) - f_0^* \right\|_q \leq \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} \mathbf{E} \left\| \underbrace{\hat{F}_{2, \nu_{s'}^f}^{-1} \circ \hat{F}_{1, \nu_{s'}^f} \circ \tilde{f} - F_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1} \circ F_{\nu_s^*} \circ f^*}_{=: \mathbb{A}_{s'}} \right\|_q , \quad (48)$$

where we introduced the short-hand notation $\mathbb{A}_{s'}$. Furthermore, by definition of $\|\cdot\|_q$ for each $s' \in [K]$, we can write

$$\mathbb{A}_{s'}^q = \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbb{A}_{(s', s)}^q , \quad (49)$$

where for all $s, s' \in [K]$, we defined

$$\mathbb{A}_{(s', s)}^q = \mathbf{E} \left[\left| \hat{F}_{2, \nu_{s'}^f}^{-1} \circ \hat{F}_{1, \nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) - F_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1} \circ F_{\nu_s^*} \circ f^*(\mathbf{X}, S) \right|^q \mid S = s \right] . \quad (50)$$

From now on, our goal is to provide a suitable bound on $\mathbb{A}_{(s', s)}^q$. To do so, using the fact that $(u + v + w)^q \leq 3^{q-1}u^q + 3^{q-1}v^q + 3^{q-1}w^q$, we further bound $\mathbb{A}_{(s', s)}^q$ by $a_{(s', s)} + b_{(s', s)} + c_{(s', s)}$,

defined as

$$\begin{aligned} a_{(s',s)} &= 3^{q-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \hat{F}_{2,\nu_{s'}^f}^{-1} \circ \hat{F}_{1,\nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) - \hat{F}_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1} \circ \hat{F}_{1,\nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) \right|^q \mid S = s \right] , \\ b_{(s',s)} &= 3^{q-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \hat{F}_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1} \circ \hat{F}_{1,\nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) - F_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1} \circ \hat{F}_{1,\nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) \right|^q \mid S = s \right] , \\ c_{(s',s)} &= 3^{q-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| F_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1} \circ \hat{F}_{1,\nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) - F_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1} \circ F_{\nu_s^*} \circ f^*(\mathbf{X}, S) \right|^q \mid S = s \right] . \end{aligned}$$

In the above decomposition, we introduced the empirical quantile function $\hat{F}_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1}$ of $\nu_{s'}^*$, defined as the generalized inverse of

$$t \mapsto \frac{1}{N_{s'}} \sum_{i=N_{s'}+1}^{2N_{s'}} \mathbb{I} \left\{ f^*(\mathbf{X}_i^{s'}, s') \leq t \right\} .$$

Thus, for now, we have managed to show that for all $s' \in [K]$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[A_{s'}] &\leq \mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s (a_{(s',s)} + b_{(s',s)} + c_{(s',s)}) \right\}^{1/q} \\ &\leq \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbf{E}[a_{(s',s)}] \right\}^{1/q} + \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbf{E}[b_{(s',s)}] \right\}^{1/q} + \mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s c_{(s',s)} \right\}^{1/q} . \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

We proceed by bounding each of these terms separately. **Bounding $\mathbf{E}[a_{(s',s)}]$.** In order to bound $\mathbf{E}[a_{(s',s)}]$ we observe that conditionally on $(S = s, \mathbf{X}_{N_{s'}+1}^{s'}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{2N_{s'}}^{s'}, \zeta_{N_{s'}+1}^{s'}, \dots, \zeta_{2N_{s'}}^{s'}, f)$, by Lemma E.1, the random variable $(\hat{F}_{1,\nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s)$ is distributed uniformly on $[0, 1]$ (note that this is achieved by splitting the unlabeled sample into two parts and will be re-used for bounding $b_{(s',s)}$). Hence, the following equality holds for $\mathbf{E}[a_{(s',s)}]$:

$$\mathbf{E}[a_{(s',s)}] = 3^{q-1} \mathbf{E} \left[\int_0^1 \left| \hat{F}_{2,\nu_{s'}^f}^{-1}(t) - \hat{F}_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1}(t) \right|^q dt \right] .$$

Applying (Bobkov and Ledoux, 2019, Theorem 2.10) and the representation of the Wasserstein- q distance as the minimum over all couplings of the q -th moment of the difference, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[\int_0^1 \left| \hat{F}_{2,\nu_{s'}^f}^{-1}(t) - \hat{F}_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1}(t) \right|^q dt \right] &\leq \mathbf{E} \left[\frac{1}{N_{s'}} \sum_{i=N_{s'}+1}^{2N_{s'}} \left| f(\mathbf{X}_i^{s'}, s') + \zeta_i^{s'} - f^*(\mathbf{X}_i^{s'}, s') \right|^q \right] \\ &= 2^{q-1} \mathbb{E} [|f(\mathbf{X}, S) - f^*(\mathbf{X}, S)|^q \mid S = s'] + 2^{q-1} \sigma^q , \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses the fact that $(\mathbf{X}_i^{s'})_{i=N_{s'}+1}^{2N_{s'}}$ are i.i.d. from $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{X} \mid S=s'}$ and that $\zeta_i^{s'}$ are bounded in $[-\sigma, \sigma]$. Thus, we have shown that

$$\mathbf{E}[a_{(s',s)}] \leq 6^{q-1} \mathbb{E}[|f(\mathbf{X}, S) - f^*(\mathbf{X}, S)|^q \mid S = s'] + 6^{q-1} \sigma^q , \quad (52)$$

which bounds the first term in Eq. (51).

Bounding $\mathbf{E}[b_{(s',s)}]$. Identical argument with the use of Lemma E.1 and (Bobkov and Ledoux, 2019, Theorem 2.10) allows us to deduce that

$$\mathbf{E}[b_{(s',s)}] = 3^{q-1} \mathbf{E}[W_q^q(\hat{\nu}_{s'}, \nu_{s'}^*)] ,$$

with $\hat{\nu}_{s'}$ being the measure defined by its cumulative distribution $\hat{F}_{\nu_{s'}^*}$. To conclude, we deploy (Bobkov and Ledoux, 2019, Theorem 5.3), which states that

$$\mathbf{E}[W_q^q(\hat{\nu}_{s'}, \nu_{s'}^*)] \leq \left(\frac{5q}{\sqrt{N_{s'} + 2}} \right)^q J_q(\nu_{s'}^*) ,$$

where

$$J_q(\nu_{s'}^*) := \int_0^1 \left(\frac{\sqrt{t(1-t)}}{F'_{\nu_{s'}^*} \circ F_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1}(t)} \right)^q dt ,$$

$F'_{\nu_{s'}^*}$ is the derivative of $F_{\nu_{s'}^*}$. Note that Assumption 7.3 guarantees that the integral $J_q(\nu_{s'}^*)$ is finite since it states that the measure $\nu_{s'}^*$ is supported on an interval and that the associated density is lower bounded by $\underline{\lambda}_s$. Thus, we have shown that

$$\mathbf{E}[b_{(s',s)}] \leq \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{15q}{\sqrt{N_{s'} + 2}} \right)^q J_q(\nu_{s'}^*) ,$$

implying the following bound on the second term in Eq. (51):

$$\left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbf{E}[b_{(s',s)}] \right\}^{1/q} \leq 3^{-1/q} \frac{15q}{\sqrt{N_{s'} + 2}} J_q^{1/q}(\nu_{s'}^*) . \quad (53)$$

Bounding $\mathbf{E}[c_{(s',s)}]$. By assumption, for each $s' \in [K]$ the measures $\nu_{s'}^*$ are supported on an interval and admit a density which is lower bounded by $\underline{\lambda}_{s'}$. Thus, the quantile function $F_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1}$ is $\underline{\lambda}_{s'}^{-1}$ -Lipschitz. Introduce the following function

$$t \mapsto F_{\nu_s^f}(t) = \mathbf{P}(f(\mathbf{X}, S) + \zeta \leq t \mid S = s) .$$

By triangle inequality and $\underline{\lambda}_{s'}^{-1}$ -Lipschitz property of $F_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1}$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} c_{(s',s)} &\leq 6^{q-1} \underline{\lambda}_{s'}^{-q} \mathbf{E} \left[\left| \hat{F}_{1, \nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) - F_{\nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) \right|^q \mid S = s \right] \\ &\quad + 6^{q-1} \underline{\lambda}_{s'}^{-q} \mathbf{E} \left[\left| F_{\nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) - F_{\nu_s^*} \circ f^*(\mathbf{X}, S) \right|^q \mid S = s \right] . \end{aligned}$$

The first term in the above decomposition is controlled by Hoeffding inequality conditionally on $(S = s, \mathbf{X}, \zeta)$. To do so, we observe that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left| \hat{F}_{1, \nu_s^f}(t) - F_{\nu_s^f}(t) \right|^q &\leq 2^{q-1} \mathbf{E} \left| \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} (\mathbb{I}\{f(\mathbf{X}_i^s, s) + \zeta_i^s \leq t\} - \mathbf{P}(f(\mathbf{X}, S) + \zeta \leq t \mid S = s)) \right|^q \\ &\quad \leq \frac{2}{(2N_s)^{q/2}} \int_0^\infty \exp(-t^{2/q}) dt \text{ by integrating Hoeffding's inequality} \\ &\quad + \frac{2^{q-1}}{(N_s + 1)^q} \leq \frac{2^{q-1}}{N_s^{q/2}} \left(\int_0^\infty \exp(-t^{2/q}) dt + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{N_s} \right)^{q/2} \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Since the above holds for any t and due to the enforced splitting, we deduce that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\left| \hat{F}_{1, \nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) - F_{\nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) \right|^q \mid S = s \right] \leq \frac{2^{q-1}}{N_s^{q/2}} \left(\int_0^\infty \exp(-t^{2/q}) dt + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{N_s} \right)^{q/2} \right) .$$

It remains to bound

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\left| F_{\nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) - F_{\nu_s^*} \circ f^*(\mathbf{X}, S) \right|^q \mid S = s \right] ,$$

which is independent from the data. We apply Lemma E.2 with $A = \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S)$, $B = f^*(\mathbf{X}, S)$, $M = \|f - f^*\|_\infty + \sigma$ to deduce that $\mathbb{E} \left[\left| F_{\nu_s^f} \circ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{X}, S) - F_{\nu_s^*} \circ f^*(\mathbf{X}, S) \right|^q \mid S = s \right]$ is bounded by

$$C(\bar{\lambda}_s, q) \begin{cases} \|f(\cdot, s) - f^*(\cdot, s)\|_{1, \mu_s} + \sigma & q = 1 \\ \min \left\{ \|f(\cdot, s) - f^*(\cdot, s)\|_{q-1, \mu_s}^{q-1} + \sigma^{q-1}, \|f(\cdot, s) - f^*(\cdot, s)\|_{\infty, \mu_s}^q + \sigma^q \right\} & q \in (1, \infty) \end{cases} ,$$

where $\mu_s = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{X}|S=s}$, for all $g : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and all probability measures μ on \mathbb{R}^p

$$\|g\|_{q, \mu} := \left(\int g(x) d\mu(x) \right)^{1/q} \quad \text{and} \quad \|g\|_{\infty, \mu} := \inf \{b \in \mathbb{R} : \mu(g(x) < b) = 0\} .$$

Combining the deduced bounds. Combining Eq. (52), (53), the bound above derived for $c_{(s', s)}$ with Eqs. (48)–(51) we deduce that for constants $C_q(\underline{\lambda}, \bar{\lambda})$, $C'_q(\underline{\lambda})$, $C''_q(\underline{\lambda}) > 0$ that depend only on $\underline{\lambda} := (\lambda_s)_s$, $\bar{\lambda} := (\bar{\lambda}_s)_s$, q

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} \mathbb{A}_{s'} &\leq C_q(\underline{\lambda}, \bar{\lambda}) \left(\|f - f^*\|_q + \left\{ (\|f - f^*\|_{q-1}^{1-1/q} + \sigma^{1-1/q}) \wedge (\|f - f^*\|_\infty + \sigma) \right\} \mathbb{I}\{q > 1\} + \sigma \right) \\ &\quad + C'_q(\underline{\lambda}) \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s N_s^{-1/2} \right\} + C''_q(\underline{\lambda}) \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s N_s^{-q/2} \right\}^{1/q} . \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the above into Eq. (48) we conclude. \square

LEMMA E.2. *Let (A, B) be two real valued random variables (with an arbitrary coupling) with cumulative distribution function F_A and F_B respectively. Assume that B admits a density w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure which is upper bounded by C_B . Then, for all $q \in [1, +\infty)$ it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}[|F_A(A) - F_B(B)|^q] \leq \begin{cases} 2C_B \mathbb{E}|A - B| & q = 1 \\ C_q C_B^{q-1} \mathbb{E}|A - B|^{q-1} & q \in (1, +\infty) \end{cases} ,$$

where C_q depends only on q . Furthermore, if (A, B) is such that $|A - B| \leq M$ almost surely, then

$$\mathbb{E}[|F_A(A) - F_B(B)|^q] \leq \begin{cases} 2C_B \mathbb{E}|A - B| & q = 1 \\ \min \left\{ C_q C_B^{q-1} \mathbb{E}|A - B|^{q-1}, 4^q C_B^q M^q \right\} & q \in (1, +\infty) \end{cases} ,$$

PROOF. Case: $q = 1$. Let (\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}) be an independent copy of (A, B) , then, since $\mathbb{I}\{a \leq a'\} - \mathbb{I}\{b \leq b'\} \leq \mathbb{I}\{|b - b'| \leq |a - b| + |a' - b'|\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|F_A(A) - F_B(B)|^q] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathbf{P}(\tilde{A} \leq A \mid A) - \mathbf{P}(\tilde{B} \leq B \mid B) \right|^q \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{P} \left(|B - \tilde{B}| \leq |A - B| + |\tilde{A} - \tilde{B}| \mid (A, B) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbf{P} \left(|B - \tilde{B}| \leq |A - B| + |\tilde{A} - \tilde{B}| \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, since $\mathbb{I}\{a \leq b + c\} \leq \mathbb{I}\{2a \leq b\} + \mathbb{I}\{2b \leq c\}$ for all $a, b, c \geq 0$ we continue as

$$\mathbb{E}[|F_A(A) - F_B(B)|^q] \leq \mathbf{P} \left(2|B - \tilde{B}| \leq |A - B| \right) + \mathbf{P} \left(2|B - \tilde{B}| \leq |\tilde{A} - \tilde{B}| \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 2\mathbf{P}\left(2|\tilde{B} - B| \leq |A - B|\right) \\
&= 2\mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{P}\left(2|B - \tilde{B}| \leq |A - B| \mid (A, B)\right)\right] \\
&\leq 4C_B\mathbf{E}|A - B|,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds thanks to the assumption that the density of B (and hence of \tilde{B}) is bounded by C_B , which in turn implies that $F_B(\cdot)$ is C_B -Lipschitz.

Case: $q \in (1, \infty)$. At first we proceed similarly:

$$\mathbf{E}[|F_A(A) - F_B(B)|^q] \leq \mathbf{E}\left[\left\{\mathbf{P}\left(|B - \tilde{B}| \leq |A - B| + |\tilde{A} - \tilde{B}| \mid (A, B)\right)\right\}^q\right].$$

Furthermore, for any $\delta > 0$, we can deduce by Markov's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}\left(|B - \tilde{B}| \leq |A - B| + |\tilde{A} - \tilde{B}| \mid (A, B)\right) &\leq \mathbf{P}(|B - \tilde{B}| \leq \delta \mid B) \\
&\quad + \mathbf{P}\left(\delta \leq |A - B| + |\tilde{A} - \tilde{B}| \mid (A, B)\right) \\
&\leq 2C_B\delta + \frac{\mathbf{E}[(|A - B| + |\tilde{A} - \tilde{B}|)^{q-1} \mid (A, B)]}{\delta^{q-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Minimizing the above expression over $\delta > 0$ we deduce that

$$\mathbf{P}\left(|B - \tilde{B}| \leq |A - B| + |\tilde{A} - \tilde{B}| \mid (A, B)\right) \leq C_B^{1-(1/q)} C_q' \left(\mathbf{E}[(|A - B| + |\tilde{A} - \tilde{B}|)^{q-1} \mid (A, B)]\right)^{1/q},$$

where $C_q' = q((q-1)/2)^{1/q}$. Thus, the claimed bound:

$$\mathbf{E}[|F_A(A) - F_B(B)|^q] \leq C_B^{q-1} (C_q')^q \mathbf{E}[(|A - B| + |\tilde{A} - \tilde{B}|)^{q-1}] \leq C_q C_B^{q-1} \mathbf{E}|A - B|^{q-1}.$$

Case: $|A - B| \leq M$ **almost surely**. In this case the result follows from the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[|F_A(A) - F_B(B)|^q] &\leq \mathbf{E}\left[\left\{\mathbf{P}\left(|B - \tilde{B}| \leq |A - B| + |\tilde{A} - \tilde{B}| \mid (A, B)\right)\right\}^q\right] \\
&\leq \mathbf{E}\left[\left\{\mathbf{P}\left(|B - \tilde{B}| \leq 2M \mid (A, B)\right)\right\}^q\right] \leq 4^q C_B^q M^q.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is concluded. \square

APPENDIX F: RELATION BETWEEN \mathcal{U}_{KS} AND \mathcal{U}

LEMMA F.1. *Let μ, ν be two univariate measures such that μ admits a density w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure bounded by C_μ , then*

$$\text{KS}(\mu, \nu) \leq 2\sqrt{C_\mu \mathcal{W}_1(\mu, \nu)}.$$

PROPOSITION F.2. *Fix some measurable $f : \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Assume that $a_s = f(\cdot, s) \# \mu_s \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ and it admits density bounded by $C_{f,s}$ for all $s \in [K]$, then*

$$\mathcal{U}_{\text{KS}}(f) \leq \|1/w\|_\infty \sqrt{8\bar{C}_f} \cdot \mathcal{U}^{1/4}(f),$$

where $\bar{C}_f = \sum_{s=1}^K w_s C_{f,s}$.

PROOF. We set $a_s = \text{Law}(f(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S=s)$ and $a = \sum_{s=1}^K w_s a_s$. Therefore, thanks to assumption of the proposition and Lemma F.1 we can write

$$\mathcal{U}_{\text{KS}}(f) := \sum_{s=1}^K \text{KS}(a_s, a) \leq \|1/w\|_\infty \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \text{KS}(a_s, a) \leq 2\|1/w\|_\infty \sum_{s=1}^K w_s C_{f,s}^{1/2} W_1^{1/2}(a_s, a) .$$

Furthermore we can write for any measure $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_{\text{KS}}(f) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2\|1/w\|_\infty \sum_{s=1}^K w_s C_{f,s}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} W_1(a_s, a_{s'}) \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2\|1/w\|_\infty \sum_{s=1}^K w_s C_{f,s}^{1/2} \left\{ W_1(a_s, \nu) + \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} W_1(a_{s'}, \nu) \right\}^{1/2} . \end{aligned}$$

In the above inequalities (a) follows from the convexity of $W_1(a_s, \cdot)$ (see e.g., Bobkov and Ledoux, 2019, Section 4.1) and (b) uses the triangle inequality. Applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_{\text{KS}}(f) &\leq 2\|1/w\|_\infty \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s C_{f,s} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \left(W_1(a_s, \nu) + \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} W_1(a_{s'}, \nu) \right) \right\}^{1/2} \\ &= 2^{3/2} \|1/w\|_\infty \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s C_{f,s} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_1(a_s, \nu) \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 2^{3/2} \|1/w\|_\infty \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s C_{f,s} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_1^2(a_s, \nu) \right\}^{1/4} , \end{aligned}$$

where (c) uses the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality one more time. Finally, setting ν as the Wasserstein-2 barycenter of a_1, \dots, a_K and using the fact that $W_1(\mu, \nu) \leq W_2(\mu, \nu)$ we deduce that

$$\mathcal{U}_{\text{KS}}(f) \leq 2^{3/2} \|1/w\|_\infty \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s C_{f,s} \right\}^{1/2} \mathcal{U}^{1/4}(f) .$$

The proof is concluded. \square

APPENDIX G: EXTENSION TO ℓ_q LOSSES

In this section we provide an extension of the derived theory for the case of ℓ_q losses with $q \in [1, +\infty)$. In other words, instead of the ℓ_2 -based risk and unfairness we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_q(f) &= \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \mathbb{E} [|f(\mathbf{X}, S) - f^*(\mathbf{X}, S)|^q \mid S = s] , \\ \mathcal{U}_q(f) &= \min_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}_q(\mathbb{R})} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_q^q(\text{Law}(f(\mathbf{X}, S) \mid S = s), \nu) . \end{aligned}$$

In this section we will work under the following assumption, which is a straightforward adaptation of Assumption 2.1 to handle $q \in [1, \infty) \setminus \{2\}$.

ASSUMPTION G.1. *The measures $\{\nu_s^*\}_{s \in [K]}$ are non-atomic and have finite q -moments.*

THEOREM G.2 (*q*-Optimal and the trade-off). *Fix some $q \in [1, \infty)$ and let Assumption 2.1 be satisfied. Then, for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, a $f_{\alpha,q}^*$ solution of*

$$\min_{f: \mathbb{R}^p \times [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} \{ \mathcal{R}_q(f) : \mathcal{U}_q(f) \leq \alpha \cdot \mathcal{U}_q(f^*) \} \quad ,$$

can be written for all $(\mathbf{x}, s) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times [K]$ as

$$f_{\alpha,q}^*(\mathbf{x}, s) = \alpha^{1/q} f^*(\mathbf{x}, s) + (1 - \alpha^{1/q}) \cdot \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} \left| F_{\nu_{s'}^*}^{-1} \circ F_{\nu_s^*} \circ f^*(\mathbf{x}, s) - y \right|^q \right\} . \quad (54)$$

Furthermore, it holds that

$$\mathcal{R}_q(f_{\alpha,q}^*) = (1 - \alpha^{1/q})^q \cdot \mathcal{U}_q(f^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{U}_q(f_{\alpha,q}^*) = \alpha \cdot \mathcal{U}_q(f^*) .$$

REMARK G.3. *Note that this result is a strict generalization of Proposition 4.1. Furthermore, it should be noted that for $q = 1$ the optimization problem appearing in Eq. (54) (description of $f_{\alpha,1}^*$) does not necessarily admit a unique minimizer (whenever K is even). Meanwhile, for $q > 1$ the objective function is strictly convex and the minimizer is a singleton. We also observe that all the properties except the fourth one established in Section 4 still hold for $f_{\alpha,q}^*$. The fourth property—mean stability—is intrinsic to the case $q = 2$, as the minimizer appearing in Eq. (54) admit a closed form expression. Note also that the ad-hoc procedure developed in Section 7.1 for $q = 2$ can be straightforwardly extended to any $q \in [1, \infty)$.*

PROOF OF THEOREM G.2. The proof is almost identical to that of Proposition 4.1. Thus, we only develop the modifications that need to be introduced. In particular, as for the case of $q = 2$, our goal is to apply Lemma G.5 below (instead of Lemma 4.3). To this end, we need a way to build geodesics in $(\mathcal{P}_q(\mathbb{R}), W_q)$ and suitable expressions for q -barycenters. The first part (geodesics) is addressed by (Santambrogio, 2015, Theorem 5.27) (instead of (Kloeckner, 2010, Section 2.2)) and gives identical description of geodesics for all $q \in [1, \infty)$. A closed form expressions for q -barycenters $(\mathcal{P}_q(\mathbb{R}), W_q)$ is derived in Lemma G.6 (used instead of Lemma A.3) which we prove below. \square

DEFINITION G.4 (*q*-barycenter). *Fix some $q \in [1, \infty)$. We say that a metric space (\mathcal{X}, d) satisfies the q -barycenter property if for any weights $\mathbf{w} \in \Delta^{K-1}$ and tuple $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_K) \in \mathcal{X}^K$ there exists a barycenter*

$$C_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{w}} \in \arg \min_{C \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(a_s, C) .$$

Moreover, for any tuple $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_K) \in \mathcal{X}^K$ we denote¹¹ by $C_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{w}}$ a barycenter of \mathbf{a} weighted by $\mathbf{w} \in \Delta^{K-1}$.

LEMMA G.5 (Abstract geometric lemma). *Fix some $q \in [1, +\infty)$. Let (\mathcal{X}, d) be a metric space satisfying the q -barycenter property. Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_K) \in \mathcal{X}^K$, $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_K)^\top \in \Delta^{K-1}$ and let $C_{\mathbf{a}}$ be a q -barycenter of \mathbf{a} with respect to weights \mathbf{w} . For a fixed $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ assume that there exists $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_K) \in \mathcal{X}^K$ which satisfies*

$$d(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) = d(a_s, b_s) + d(b_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \quad , \quad s = 1, \dots, K \quad , \quad (P_1^q)$$

$$d(b_s, a_s) = (1 - \alpha^{1/q}) d(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \quad , \quad s = 1, \dots, K \quad . \quad (P_2^q)$$

¹¹When there is no ambiguity in the weights \mathbf{w} we simply write $C_{\mathbf{a}}$.

Then, \mathbf{b} is a solution of

$$\inf_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{X}^K} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(b_s, a_s) : \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(b_s, C_{\mathbf{b}}) \leq \alpha \sum_{s=1}^K w_s d^q(a_s, C_{\mathbf{a}}) \right\} . \quad (55)$$

PROOF. The proof is identical to that of Lemma 4.3. Formally, it amounts to replacing all occurrences of $q = 2$ by general $q \in [1, \infty)$. \square

The next lemma is reminiscent to (Le Gouic and Loubes, 2017, Theorem 8), where the authors study the existence of q -barycenters in rather general metric spaces. In our case, however, the underlying space is \mathbb{R} and hence a finer characterisation can be obtained.

LEMMA G.6. *Let $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_K \in \mathcal{P}_q(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathbf{w} \in \Delta^{K-1}$. Assume that μ_1, \dots, μ_K admit density w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure, then for any $q \in [1, \infty)$ the quantile function $F_{\nu^*}^{-1}$ of a minimizer ν^* of*

$$\nu \mapsto \sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_q^q(\mu_s, \nu) ,$$

can be written for all $t \in (0, 1)$ as

$$F_{\nu^*}^{-1}(t) \in \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s |F_{\mu_s}^{-1}(t) - y|^q .$$

Furthermore, for all $s \in [K]$ the following mapping is an optimal transport map (in W_q sense) from μ_s to ν^* :

$$T_{\mu_s \mapsto \nu^*}(x) \in \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{s'=1}^K w_{s'} |F_{\mu_{s'}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu_s}(x) - y|^q \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R} .$$

PROOF. It is clear that by definition $F_{\nu^*}^{-1}$ is monotone non-decreasing, hence, given its domain, it is indeed a quantile function. Furthermore, note that $\nu^* \in \mathcal{P}_q(\mathbb{R})$. Indeed, for all $s \in [K]$ we have by definition of $T_{\mu_s \mapsto \nu^*}$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^q d\nu^*(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} |T_{\mu_s \mapsto \nu^*}(x)|^q d\mu_s(x) \leq 2^q \sum_{s' \in [K]} w_{s'} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |F_{\mu_{s'}}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu_s}(x)|^q d\mu_s(x) \\ &= 2^q \sum_{s' \in [K]} w_{s'} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^q d\mu_{s'}(x) < \infty , \end{aligned}$$

since each $\mu_{s'} \in \mathcal{P}_q(\mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, using (Bobkov and Ledoux, 2019, Theorem 2.10), it holds for all $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_q(\mathbb{R})$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_q^q(\mu_s, \nu) &= \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \int_0^1 |F_{\mu_s}^{-1}(t) - F_{\nu}^{-1}(t)|^q dt \geq \int_0^1 \min_y \sum_{s=1}^K w_s |F_{\mu_s}^{-1}(t) - y|^q dt \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^K w_s \int_0^1 |F_{\mu_s}^{-1}(t) - F_{\nu^*}^{-1}(t)|^q dt \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^K w_s W_q^q(\mu_s, \nu^*) . \end{aligned}$$

The last assertion of the lemma follows from (Santambrogio, 2015, Theorem 5.27). \square

APPENDIX H: ADDITIONAL EMPIRICAL RESULTS

BALANCED						
α	Oracle		Proposed		Naive	
	$\mathcal{R}(f_\alpha^*)$	$\mathcal{U}(f_\alpha^*)$	$\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_{\hat{\tau}})$	$\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_{\hat{\tau}})$	$\mathcal{R}(\hat{f}_\alpha)$	$\mathcal{U}(\hat{f}_\alpha)$
0	2.0	0.0	2.13 ± 0.03	0.0 ± 0.0	2.13 ± 0.03	0.0 ± 0.0
0.2	0.61	0.4	0.87 ± 0.05	0.31 ± 0.02	0.74 ± 0.04	0.40 ± 0.03
0.4	0.27	0.8	0.52 ± 0.05	0.62 ± 0.05	0.40 ± 0.04	0.81 ± 0.05
0.6	0.10	1.2	0.34 ± 0.04	0.93 ± 0.07	0.24 ± 0.04	1.21 ± 0.08
0.8	0.02	1.6	0.23 ± 0.04	1.25 ± 0.09	0.16 ± 0.03	1.61 ± 0.11
1	0.0	2.0	0.17 ± 0.03	1.56 ± 0.12	0.14 ± 0.03	2.02 ± 0.14

TABLE 1

Summary for $p = 10$, $K = 5$, $\text{NUR} = 0.5$. We report the mean and the standard deviation.

Table 1 presents the numeric results for $p = 10$, $K = 5$, $\text{NUR} = 0.5$ for estimator developed in Section 6 and in the context of the simulated data. We remark the striking drop in the risk for $\alpha = 0.2$, indicating that a slight relaxation of the Demographic Parity constraint results in a significant improvement in terms of the risk. Of course, the justification of such a relaxation must be considered based on the application at hand.

H.1. Real data description. Communities and Crime dataset combines socio-economic data from the 1990 US Census, law enforcement data from the 1990 US LEMAS survey, and crime data from the 1995 FBI UCR. We removed columns with missing values as well as the only non-numerical variable, `communityname`. After this pre-processing step the dataset consists of 1994 observations characterized each by 101 ($d = 101$) numeric variables. All variables were normalized into the interval $[0, 1]$. The target variable measures the total number of violent crimes per 100K population. For a given observation/community, we define the sensitive variable ($K = 2$) as the indicator that the percentage of population that is African American is above the average of this percentage over the whole dataset, similarly to Berk et al. (2017).

H.2. Ad-hoc estimator from Section 7.1: choices of weights. We tested three choices of weights which are described in Section 4.1. Figure 12 can be seen as an empirical counterpart to Figure 2 discussed in details Section 4.1. Overall, the conclusions about the choices of weights remain the same and the actual choice is ultimately left to the statistician and domain experts.




Fig 12: Three main choices of weights for the post-processing method applied on top of the random forest base estimator.