

Addressing Strategic Manipulation Disparities in Fair Classification

Vijay Keswani and L. Elisa Celis

Yale University

Abstract

In real-world classification settings, individuals respond to classifier predictions by updating their features to increase their likelihood of receiving a particular (positive) decision (at a certain cost). Yet, when different demographic groups have different feature distributions or different cost functions, prior work has shown that individuals from minority groups often pay a higher cost to update their features. Fair classification aims to address such classifier performance disparities by constraining the classifiers to satisfy statistical fairness properties. However, we show that standard fairness constraints do not guarantee that the constrained classifier reduces the disparity in strategic manipulation cost. To address such biases in strategic settings and provide equal opportunities for strategic manipulation, we propose a constrained optimization framework that constructs classifiers that lower the strategic manipulation cost for the minority groups. We develop our framework by studying theoretical connections between group-specific strategic cost disparity and standard selection rate fairness metrics (e.g., statistical rate and true positive rate). Empirically, we show the efficacy of this approach over multiple real-world datasets.

1 Introduction

In the setting of prediction/classification, the goal is to construct a model that predicts a class label (for example, whether a loan application is successful or not) using the available demographic and task-specific features of the individuals. Any classifier that makes predictions for a given population, directly and indirectly, impacts the features of the population. The most direct way this happens is when individuals take steps to update their features in a manner that could potentially lead to them having a different prediction in the future. In binary classification, where positive class labels can denote *success* for the given task, individuals who have been negatively classified will attempt to update their features in a manner that increases their likelihood of receiving a positive decision.

As a concrete example, consider the setting of loan applications, where the features are individuals' demographics, annual income, debt ratio, credit history, number of dependents, and the number of open credit lines. The class label to be predicted is the likelihood of not defaulting on the loan. The number of open credit lines is a feature that is often positively correlated with the class label and individuals can increase their likelihood of positive loan application (or increase their *credit score*) by opening more credit lines (for the sake of simplicity, assume all the other features are unchanged; in real-world scenarios there will be simultaneous dependence on other variables as well here, e.g. whether the individual has been regular with their payments or not). However, opening credit lines requires additional investment on the part of the individuals Citron & Pasquale (2014). Another example is the setting of college admissions, where the features are individuals' demographics, school academic records, extra-curricular records, and scores from standardized tests like GRE. The class label to be predicted is the likelihood of academic "success" to determine college admissions. In this

case, while higher scores for standardized tests increase chances of a successful college application, students can take these tests multiple times and submit only the highest scores. Nevertheless, there is an additional investment required as every additional test attempt involves monetary and time expenses Vigdor & Clotfelter (2003). Feature manipulations of these kinds can also take the form of positive steps taken by individuals to improve their features (e.g., investing additional time in test preparation) Kleinberg & Raghavan (2020); Alon et al. (2020) or provide individuals with recourse and agency to address classifier decisions Ustun et al. (2019); Venkatasubramanian & Alfano (2020).

The above described process involves two main players: the institution constructing the classifier and the individuals’ reacting to the classifier. While the institution’s goal is to minimize the error of its prediction, individuals react to the classifier predictions by strategically manipulating their features to achieve a positive classification. In these *strategic settings*, often due to historical biases and structural inequalities, the classifier employed by the institution can pose relatively higher costs for strategic manipulation (i.e., increased costs to improve their feature values) for individuals from minority groups (such as race and gender minorities). Prior work has observed the presence of such classifier disparate performances in settings where the datasets used for training the classifier encode social biases or when minority groups pay larger costs to update their features Milli et al. (2019); Hu et al. (2019). For example, in the case of loan applications, historical discrimination against African-Americans in financial aspects often deter them from seeking new credit lines to support/improve their credit scores Yearwood (2019). Similarly, in the case of graduate school admissions, incorporation of GRE scores serves as a higher barrier for admission of students from marginalized groups Wilson (2020). These biases are a result of the historical lack of opportunities for the minority groups and classifiers that inherit such biases risk the possibility of further propagating and exacerbating them. Given the presence of biases in the predictions of trained classifiers, one can ask whether an institution can construct classifiers that provide equal opportunities for strategic manipulation to different groups and address the systemic disparities in investment required to improve their outcomes.

Fairness-constrained classification attempts to address such disparities in classifier performance by constraining the classifier to satisfy certain statistical fairness properties. For example, when constraining with respect to *statistical rate*, the classifiers are constrained to have an almost-equal selection rate for all groups Zafar et al. (2017); Dwork et al. (2012); Celis et al. (2019); Rezaei et al. (2020); Agarwal et al. (2018). Similarly, when constraining with respect to *equalized odds*, the classifiers are constrained to have equal false positive and true positive rates for all groups Hardt et al. (2016b); Celis et al. (2019); Rezaei et al. (2020). However, these fairness metrics operate in a *static* manner and do not take into account the response of the individuals to the classifier predictions or the disparity in costs that different groups pay for updating their features. *Correspondingly, the primary question we investigate is whether constraints that use standard static fairness metrics lead to classifiers that reduce the strategic manipulation costs for minority groups?*

Our Contributions. We first theoretically study the relationship between standard selection rate fairness metrics (like statistical rate and true positive rate) and the disparity in strategic manipulation costs between majority and minority groups when only one-dimensional features and group membership of individuals are provided (Section 3). Our analysis shows that threshold-based classifiers that have equal selection rate for all groups can still have higher strategic manipulation cost for the disadvantaged groups when feature distributions or cost functions differ across groups. (Theorem 3.4, 3.5). While prior work has studied strategic cost disparities, they only demonstrated that this disparity can be large in unconstrained settings Milli et al. (2019); Hu et al. (2019). Our

analysis shows that even “fair” classifiers constrained using selection rate fairness metrics can have large strategic cost disparities. To address this bias, we bound the strategic cost disparity using the statistical properties of the classifier and the cost function. Using these bounds as fairness constraints, we construct classifiers that have both low selection rate disparity and low strategic cost disparity. We also extend the results to multi-dimensional settings when the classifier is linear and the cost function is linear or quadratic (Section 4). Our theoretical results are complemented by empirical analysis on two real-world financial datasets: the FICO credit dataset Hardt et al. (2016b) and the Adult income dataset Ding et al. (2021) (Section 5). For both datasets, we show that fair classification with our proposed constraints lead to lower manipulation costs for the minority group.

Related Work. Prior work has analyzed the disparity in strategic manipulation costs for minority groups when the goal of the institution is to simply ensure a low error rate. Milli et al. (2019) and Hu et al. (2019) observe this phenomenon when the feature distributions or cost functions are biased against minority groups. However, their analysis is limited to classifiers that optimize institution utility; in contrast, we also study classifiers that optimize utility subject to standard fairness constraints. Estornell et al. (2021) observed that statistical parity constrained or equalized odds classifiers become less “fair” (with respect to the same metrics) than unconstrained classifiers due to feature distribution shifts resulting from strategic manipulations. While their result also looks at the impact of fair classification in strategic settings, they analyze the fairness of final individual outcomes using the selection rate metrics and do not evaluate the update costs disparity across groups. Our analysis is relatively more general since we evaluate the strategic costs incurred by each group and not just the eventual selection rate of each group. Static fairness constraints in non-strategic settings, that compare the selection rate of majority and minority groups, have been extensively studied in the context of constructing fair classifiers Kamishima et al. (2012); Dwork et al. (2012); Zafar et al. (2017); Kusner et al. (2017); Celis et al. (2019); Zhang et al. (2018); Agarwal et al. (2018); Rezaei et al. (2020). For non-strategic settings, Hu & Chen (2020) show that selection rate constrained classifiers may not improve the average quality of predictions received by the disadvantaged groups. We extend this direction to analyze the impact of fair classification in strategic settings.

Recent work on strategic settings has also studied classifiers that are robust to strategic updates Hardt et al. (2016a); Kleinberg & Raghavan (2020); Chen et al. (2020); Dong et al. (2018); Jagadeesan et al. (2021). The analysis in these papers is primarily from the viewpoint of an institution maximizing its utility given information about individuals’ behavior and these papers do not consider the fairness goal of reducing manipulation costs disparities with respect to protected attributes. Our paper, instead, considers the individuals’ perspective and addresses the cost disparities arising from group memberships. While we look at the one-step feedback models (i.e., individuals’ behavior given an institution’s classifier), performative prediction algorithms model multi-step feedback settings to construct classifiers that are stable over induced distributions Perdomo et al. (2020); Miller et al. (2021). For ease of analysis, we limit our study to one-step feedback settings.

2 Model formalization

Let $x \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the features of an individual in the population, $y \in \{0, 1\}$ denote the true class label to be predicted and $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ denote the protected attribute (assumed to be binary for our current analysis). The features, class labels, and protected attribute of the population are sampled from an underlying joint distribution \mathcal{D} and we use X, Y, Z to denote the random variables

associated with them. We will work with threshold-based classifiers $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ which set a threshold on the likelihood of any point achieving a positive class label ¹.

Individual cost functions. As mentioned earlier, individuals can update their features at a certain cost after observing a classifier prediction. Let $c : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} : \mathbb{R}$ denote the cost function such that $c(x, x')$ measures the cost of moving from x to x' . An individual’s utility for changing their features from x to x' can then be quantified as $u_x(f, x') := f(x') - c(x, x')$. Note that if $c(x, x') = 0$ and $f(x) = 1$, then the individual’s utility is maximized by not changing their features at all. In this setting, the individual’s response can be captured by Δ_f , where $\Delta_f(x) := \arg \max_{x'} u_x(f, x')$. Since we only aim to model feature updates that lead to improved classifier prediction, we will only study cost functions that have no feature update cost if the individual is already positively classified. In other words, the individuals are *rational* and aim to maximize their utility (this assumption is consistent with prior work on strategic settings Hardt et al. (2016a); Hu et al. (2019)).

The institution’s aim, in the unconstrained setting, is to minimize error w.r.t. a given loss function \mathcal{L} (e.g., cross-entropy); i.e., find the classifier f that minimizes $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\mathcal{L}(f; X, Y)]$. When using unmanipulated data, this loss will be a proxy measure for $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[f(X) = Y]$, while for manipulated data, this loss will be a surrogate for $\mathbb{P}_{x,y}[f(\Delta_f(x)) = y]$ (i.e., the standard accuracy measure in strategic classification Hardt et al. (2016a); Miller et al. (2021); Levanon & Rosenfeld (2021)). However, to incorporate fairness in this optimization program, we need additional fairness constraints.

Remark 2.1 (Strategic classification). *Our theoretical analyses and results will not depend on the choice of the loss function and whether it measures error over manipulated or unmanipulated data. However, our empirical analysis will be limited to classifiers that only use unmanipulated data. This is because our empirical analysis considers the perspective of the individuals and not the institution. The institution provides a classifier that is fair with respect to selection rate fairness metrics. We evaluate the impact of this classifier on individuals from different groups and the average cost they have to pay to positively manipulate their features based on their group membership.*

Selection rate fairness metrics. The protected attribute $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ is the focus of our analysis of fairness. Standard fair classification algorithms measure and constrain fairness using metrics over group selection rates. For any sub-population condition $\psi : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, the (conditional) selection rate of a classifier f with respect to protected attribute group z can be defined as $h(f, z, \psi) := \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[f(X) = 1 \mid \psi(X, Y) = 1, Z = z]$. With respect to this condition, the conditional selection rate fairness of f can be defined as $H(f, \psi) = h(f, 0, \psi) - h(f, 1, \psi)$. For instance, if the condition is identity, i.e. $\psi(x, y) = 1$, then $h(f, z, \psi)$ simply measures the fraction of elements in group z that are positively classified and $H(f, \psi)$ in this case is the standard statistical rate metric. If the condition is $\psi(x, y) = \mathbf{1}(y = 1)$, then $h(f, z, \psi)$ measures the true positive rate for group z , and $H(f, \psi)$ is the true positive rate disparity across the protected attribute groups. Using the above definition of H , all standard *linear fairness metrics* considered in Celis et al. (2019) can be represented in additive form. When clear from context, we will use shorthand ψ to denote $\psi(\cdot, \cdot)$.

Strategic cost disparity. The power of strategic manipulation can be different for different demographic groups, which is the primary kind of bias we tackle in this paper. These biases can occur when the underlying distributions vary across groups, due to possibly different historical evolution trajectories followed by group-specific distributions, or when one group pays larger update costs than others. For example, on average the credit scores of White individuals is higher than the credit

¹Any classifier classes where the classifier returns a distribution over the labels (such as, logistic regression, Naive Bayes and MLPs) can also be used for our framework.

scores of Black individuals FRS (2007). This disparity leads to differences in classifier performances across groups and differences in “power” of strategically manipulating features Yearwood (2019).

For a classifier f , the expected cost incurred by individuals from group $Z = z$ can be quantified as $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[c(X, \Delta(X, f)) \mid Z = z]$, a quantity referred to as the *social burden* for the group z . Therefore, one measure of fairness we can look at in this strategic setting (as defined by Milli et al. (2019)) is the following gap $\mathbb{E}[c(X, \Delta_f(X)) \mid Z=0] - \mathbb{E}[c(X, \Delta_f(X)) \mid Z=1]$. Higher values (>0) of this quantity imply that individuals from group 0, on average, pay a larger cost to strategically manipulate their features than individuals from group 1. While the above measure evaluates the cost over all individuals in each group, different contexts might require focusing on different sub-populations of individuals from each group. For example, in the recidivism risk assessment setting Washington (2018), it might be relevant to analyze the average cost paid by a low-risk individual from the minority group who has been deemed high-risk to overturn the classifier decision. In this case, the expected cost $\mathbb{E}[c(X, \Delta_f(X)) \mid Y=1, Z=z]$ is more relevant (where $Y=1$ denotes low-risk). In general, we can define the social burden gap with respect to a given sub-population condition $\psi : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ to be $G(f, \psi) := \mathbb{E}[c(X, \Delta_f(X)) \mid \psi(X, Y) = 1, Z = 0] - \mathbb{E}[c(X, \Delta_f(X)) \mid \psi(X, Y) = 1, Z = 1]$. Our goal is to find classifiers for which $G(f, \cdot)$ is close to or less than 0. Reducing disparity in strategic cost disparity is important because currently strategic manipulation disproportionately benefits certain portions of the population Card & Rothstein (2007); Hoxby & Avery (2012). Equalizing manipulation costs ensures that majority groups do not solely take advantage of effective strategic manipulations and provides similar power to minority groups to address institution decisions.

3 Linking selection-rate fairness & social burden gap in one-dimensional setting

We first look at the case when the individuals’ features are one-dimensional and positive, i.e., $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. This setting models several real-world scenarios such as the use of credit scores for loan applications or exam scores for school admissions. Furthermore, when the likelihood of positive classification ($\mathbb{P}[Y=1 \mid X=x]$) can be computed (even approximately), one can use the likelihood as the feature for classification (similar to the model of Milli et al. (2019)). Secondly, we will assume outcome monotonicity of the cost function with respect to the feature: if $\tau > x_1 > x_2$, then $c(x_2, \tau) > c(x_1, \tau)$. In this case, threshold-based classifiers will classify all individuals with feature values greater than a specific threshold as positive and all individuals with feature values less than the threshold as negative. As mentioned before, we study cost functions that only have non-zero costs for the individuals classified negative. Hence, we assume that the cost function c has the following property: $c(x_1, x_2)$ is non-zero (and positive) only when $x_1 < x_2$; i.e., for a continuous and differentiable function $d : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we can say that $c(x_1, x_2) = d(x_1, x_2) \cdot \mathbf{1}(x_2 > x_1)$. Due to outcome monotonicity, the gradient of $c(x_1, x_2)$ with respect to x_1 will be negative. We note that these assumptions are similar to those considered in Milli et al. (2019), Hu et al. (2019).

Prior work has shown that two kinds of biases can lead to strategic manipulation cost disparities: *feature biases* and *cost function biases*. For the first part of the analysis, we focus on *feature biases* and we analyze the impact of *cost function biases* later in this section. Milli et al. (2019) showed that when one group’s features are disadvantaged, the social burden gap $G(\cdot)$ can be positive. This feature bias can be formally defined as follows.

Definition 3.1 (Feature bias). *For a sub-population condition ψ , there is feature bias against group $Z = 0$ in distribution \mathcal{D} if, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}, z \in \{0, 1\}$ s.t. $\Pr[X < x \mid Z = z, \psi(X, Y)=1] \in (0, 1)$, we have that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[X < x \mid Z=0, \psi(X, Y)=1] > \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[X < x \mid Z=1, \psi(X, Y)=1]$.*

Definition 3.1 formalizes settings where the disadvantaged group has their scores concentrated in sub-spaces that have lower likelihood of positive classification; e.g., credit score datasets exhibit this bias for African-Americans Hardt et al. (2016b). We restate the result of Milli et al. (2019) below, generalizing it to the case when cost analysis is limited by sub-population condition ψ .

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose we are given a classifier f_τ that uses a single threshold τ , a sub-population condition ψ , and a cost function $c(x_1, x_2) = d(x_1, x_2)\mathbf{1}(x_2 > x_1)$. If there is feature bias against group 0 in underlying distribution \mathcal{D} as defined in Definition 3.1 then for all $\tau \in \mathcal{X}$, $G(f_\tau, \psi) > 0$.*

Lemma 3.2 basically states that if there is feature bias against group 0 then using f_τ leads to higher expected strategic cost for group 0 than group 1. For the one-dimensional setting, the above result show that a single threshold based classifier can be discriminatory. However, if the classifier uses group-specific thresholds we show that it can achieve low social burden gaps. For a given $\tau_0, \tau_1 \in \mathcal{X}$, let f_{τ_0, τ_1} denote the classifier that uses threshold τ_0, τ_1 for group 0, 1 respectively.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose we are given a sub-population condition $\psi : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and a cost function $c(x_1, x_2) = d(x_1, x_2)\mathbf{1}(x_2 > x_1)$. Say there is feature bias against group 0 in distribution \mathcal{D} as defined in Definition 3.1. Then there exist $\tau_0, \tau_1 \in \mathcal{X}^2$ such that $G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) < 0$.*

Lemma 3.3 shows that appropriately selected group-specific thresholds can lead to relatively lower social burden for the disadvantaged groups. The proofs of both lemmas are presented in Appendix A. We next study whether group-specific classifiers that are fair with respect to selection rate fairness metric $H(f, \psi)$ also have low social burden gap $G(f, \psi)$.

As mentioned earlier, one of the goals of fair classification is to provide equal opportunities for all demographic groups. For example, by equalizing selection rates across groups, we hope to force the classifier to provide successful outcomes to individuals from disadvantaged groups that would have not been selected in the unconstrained case due to feature biases in the dataset. However, it is not directly obvious whether achieving fairness with respect to selection rate based metrics (like statistical rate) leads to reduced strategic manipulation cost for the disadvantaged group. To that end, we study the relationship between selection rate fairness metrics $H(f, \psi)$ and social burden gap $G(f, \psi)$, for any given classifier f and sub-population condition ψ . The following theorem quantifies this relationship using properties of the cost function gradient.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose we are given group-specific thresholds τ_0, τ_1 and a sub-population condition $\psi : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and the cost function $c(x_1, x_2) = d(x_1, x_2)\mathbf{1}(x_2 > x_1)$. For a fixed x_2 , suppose that the gradient of d with respect to x_1 at any point in $(0, x_2)$ is in the range $[g_l, g_u]$, for some $g_l \leq g_u \leq 0$. Then, we can bound the social burden gap as follows*

$$\begin{aligned} G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) &\leq g_u \tau_1 H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) + (g_u \tau_1 - g_l \tau_0) P_0(\tau_0) - g_u E_{1, \tau_1} + g_l E_{0, \tau_0}, \text{ and} \\ G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) &\geq g_l \tau_1 H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) + (g_l \tau_1 - g_u \tau_0) P_0(\tau_0) - g_l E_{1, \tau_1} + g_u E_{0, \tau_0} \text{ where} \\ P_z(\tau) &= \mathbb{P}[X \in (0, \tau) \mid Z=z, \psi] \text{ and } E_{z, \tau} = \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \in [0, \tau], Z=z, \psi] P_z(\tau). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is presented in Appendix A. Note that here we do not assume feature bias (quantified by Definition 3.1) to be explicitly present and can handle generic feature distributions. To interpret the above theorem, consider the impact of different $H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi)$ values. For simplicity, suppose $\psi(x, y)=1$ for all (x, y) (i.e., $H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi)$ is the statistical rate). When $H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi)=0$, the classifier has an equal selection rate for group 0 and group 1. Consider the setting when d is linear, i.e., $d(x_1, x_2) = x_2 - x_1$. In this case, the upper and lower bounds are equal and the social burden gap is $(\tau_0 - \tau_1)P_0(\tau_0) - E_{0, \tau_0} + E_{1, \tau_1}$. Furthermore, since $H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi)=0$, we can simplify $G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi)$ to be $(\tau_0 - \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \in [0, \tau_0], Z=0] - \tau_1 + \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \in [0, \tau_1], Z=1])P_0(\tau_0)$.

In this equation, $(\tau_z - \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \in [0, \tau_z], Z=z])$ is the average distance of feature values of negative-

classified individuals of group z from the decision boundary. The difference between these distances for group 0 and group 1 depends on the choice of τ_0, τ_1 and group distributions. To intuitively understand this dependence, we provide synthetic simulations over a dataset generated using Gaussian distributions in Appendix C. The simulations show that as the variance of the underlying distributions increase, the social burden gap of classifiers, constrained to have $H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) \approx 0$, can also dramatically increase. This is why simply constraining $H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi)$ is not sufficient to obtain a classifier with low social burden gap. However, when $H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) < 0$, difference between the above distances is unlikely to be small since, (a) low H implies that τ_0 is higher or similar to τ_1 and (b) due to feature bias the feature values of group 0 are likely to be lower than group 1. Hence, $H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi)$ being greater than or equal to 0 is partly necessary (but not sufficient) to have low social burden gap.

Fair classification using Theorem 3.4. To construct a classifier that has high institution utility and low social burden gap, we can employ Theorem 3.4. Recall that loss function \mathcal{L} measure the error expected risk of any classifier. Standard fair classification algorithms already optimize error rate of f (i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\mathcal{L}(f; X, Y)]$) subject to constraints on $H(f, \psi)$. These classifiers can alternately use a modified constraint on the upper bound in Theorem 3.4 to obtain a classifier with low social burden gap, i.e., minimize $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\mathcal{L}(f; X, Y)]$ subject to $(g_u \tau_1 - g_l \tau_0)P_0(\tau_0) - g_u E_{1, \tau_1} + g_l E_{0, \tau_0} \leq 0$. Quantities $P_z(\tau_z)$ and E_{z, τ_z} can be computed empirically for a given dataset: $P_z(\tau_z), E_{z, \tau_z}$ are the fraction and empirical mean, respectively, of group z individuals who are negatively classified.

Extension to group-specific cost functions. In many settings, strategic cost disparity can be a result of *cost function biases*, i.e., from different groups having different cost functions. For example, African-Americans face larger barriers for access to credit than White Americans Cohen-Cole (2011). Our results can be extended to this group-specific costs setting as well.


Theorem 3.5. *Suppose we are given group-specific thresholds τ_0, τ_1 and a sub-population condition $\psi : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. Let $c_z(x_1, x_2) = d_z(x_1, x_2)\mathbf{1}(x_2 > x_1)$ denote the cost for group z individuals. For a fixed x_2 , suppose that the gradient of d with respect to x_1 at any point in $(0, x_2)$ is in the range $[g_{l,z}, g_{u,z}]$, for some $g_{l,z} \leq g_{u,z} \leq 0$ for all $z \in \{0, 1\}$. Then, social burden gap can be bounded as*

$$\begin{aligned} G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) &\leq g_{u,1} \tau_1 H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) + (g_{u,1} \tau_1 - g_{l,0} \tau_0) P_0(\tau_0) - g_{u,1} E_{1, \tau_1} + g_{l,0} E_{0, \tau_0}, \text{ and} \\ G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) &\geq g_{l,1} \tau_1 H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) + (g_{l,1} \tau_1 - g_{u,0} \tau_0) P_0(\tau_0) - g_{l,1} E_{1, \tau_1} + g_{u,0} E_{0, \tau_0} \text{ where} \\ P_z(\tau) &= \mathbb{P}[X \in (0, \tau) \mid Z=z, \psi] \text{ and } E_{z, \tau} = \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \in [0, \tau], Z=z, \psi] P_z(\tau). \end{aligned}$$

Note that if group 0 faces higher manipulation costs to move to the same point than group 1, then the absolute gradient of c_0 will be larger than absolute gradient of c_1 ; this can result in relatively higher social burden gaps than the case when cost function is same for both groups. For instance, suppose $d_0(x_1, x_2) = a(x_2 - x_1)$ and $d_1(x_1, x_2) = (x_2 - x_1)$ and $H(f, \psi) = 0$. If $a > 1$, then the social burden gap can be shown to be $(a(\tau_0 - \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \in [0, \tau_0], Z=0]) - (\tau_1 - \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \in [0, \tau_1], Z=1])) P_0(\tau_0)$ which is larger than the corresponding social burden gap when cost function is same for both groups.


4 Extension to multi-dimensional settings

Suppose that features are n -dimensional, for $n > 1$. For this multi-dimensional setting, we consider classifiers that threshold over a linear combination of the features of the individuals. We again assume that all features are outcome monotonic, i.e., increasing each feature value results in increase in likelihood of positive classification. Hence, we only consider manipulations from x_1 to x_2



(a) $\tau_0=\tau_1 \in \{1, \dots, 100\}$ (b) $(\tau_0, \tau_1) \in \{1, \dots, 100\}^2$ (c) Social burden gap vs τ_0 (d) Statistical rate vs τ_0

Figure 1: Statistical rate and social burden gap of all classifiers for the FICO dataset. Each point represents a classifier and the axes plot different properties of these classifiers. Plot (a) presents social burden gap $G(f, \psi_{sr})$ vs statistical rate $H(f, \psi_{sr})$ for classifiers that use the same threshold for both groups. Plots (b), (c), (d) present social burden gap $G(f, \psi_{sr})$ vs statistical rate $H(f, \psi_{sr})$ for classifiers that can use group-specific threshold. The range of statistical rate and social burden gap values achieved for these classifiers is larger.



(a) $\tau_0=\tau_1 \in \{1, \dots, 100\}$ (b) $(\tau_0, \tau_1) \in \{1, \dots, 100\}^2$ (c) Social burden gap vs τ_0 (d) True positive rate vs τ_0

Figure 2: True positive rate and social burden gap of all classifiers for the FICO dataset. Plot (a) presents social burden gap $G(f, \psi_{tpr})$ vs true positive rate $H(f, \psi_{tpr})$ for single-threshold classifiers. Once again, the true positive rate and social burden gap for these classifiers favors the majority group. Plot (b), (c), (d) present $G(f, \psi_{tpr})$ vs $H(f, \psi_{tpr})$ for classifiers that use group-specific thresholds.

when $x_2 \geq x_1$, i.e., for all $i \in [n]$, $x_1^{(i)} \geq x_2^{(i)}$.² Finally, the cost function is assumed to be linear, i.e, for an individual from group $z \in \{0, 1\}$, the cost function is $c_z(x_1, x_2) = d_z^\top (x_2 - x_1)$ if $x_2 \geq x_1$ and $c(x_1, x_2) = 0$ if $x_2 \leq x_1$, given $d_0, d_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (we study the quadratic cost function setting in Appendix B). Linear cost functions have been used in prior work to approximately model real-world strategic settings (e.g. for a spam detection task in Hardt et al. (2016a)) and for theoretical analysis in Hu et al. (2019); Estornell et al. (2021). Vector d_z can encode the different costs paid for updating different features. For example, in the credit score setting, opening new credit lines has lower costs than increasing annual income. In this multi-dimensional setting, we can prove the following result.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose we have a linear classifier f such that for an individual with x and group z , $f(x)=1$ if and only if $u^\top x \geq v_z$ and 0 otherwise. For an individual from group z with unmanipulated datapoint x , the cost to move to point x' is defined as $c_z(x, x') = d_z^\top (x' - x)$ if $x' \geq x$ and 0 otherwise, for $d_0, d_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $w_z^* := \max_{i \in [n]} u_i / d_{z,i}$. Then, $G(f, \psi) = -\frac{1}{w_1^*} (v_1 H(f, \psi)) - \delta$, where $\delta = \left(\frac{v_1}{w_1^*} - \frac{v_0}{w_0^*} \right) P_0 - \frac{1}{w_1^*} E_{1,v_1} + \frac{1}{w_0^*} E_{0,v_0}$, $P_z = \mathbb{P}[f(X)=0 | Z=z, \psi]$, $E_{z,\tau} = \mathbb{E}[(u^\top X) | f(X)=0, Z=z, \psi] P_0$.*

We obtain an equality relation here since the cost function is linear. The proof (presented in Appendix A) follows by reducing this case to the single-dimensional setting with $u^\top x$ as the feature.

²We make this assumption for simplicity and to use the results of Hu et al. (2019) for our analysis. One can alternately use $c(x_1, x_2) = \sum_{i=1}^n d_i \cdot |x_1^{(i)} - x_2^{(i)}|$ and obtain the same results.

5 Empirical analysis

5.1 FICO Credit Dataset

Dataset. We use the FICO credit data Hardt et al. (2016b) for preliminary analysis of classifiers that are fair with respect to standard fairness metrics and classifiers that are fair with respect to social burden gap. This dataset contains 116k credit scores corresponding to White individuals and 16k credit scores corresponding to Black/African-American individuals and a binary class label for loan default for each individual (pre-processing details are provided in Appendix D). As shown by prior work Milli et al. (2019), this dataset exhibits feature bias against African-American individuals.


Methodology. Around 20k random samples from the dataset are removed to create a test partition. Each classifier is composed of two thresholds (τ_0, τ_1) . Threshold τ_0 is for credit scores of African-American individuals and threshold τ_1 is for credit scores of White individuals. A classifier assigns a positive class label to an individual if the individual’s credit score is larger than the classifier’s threshold for the individual’s group. Since the credit scores lie in the range from 1 to 100, we evaluate all possible classifiers, with τ_0, τ_1 in the set $\{1, 2, \dots, 100\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, 100\}$, and record their properties. We use the linear cost function $c(x, x') := \mathbf{1}(x > x') \cdot (x - x')$ for this section and provide results for the quadratic separable cost function in Appendix D. We analyze the performance of classifiers for two kinds of sub-population conditions: (a) ψ_{sr} which is always 1, i.e., $\psi_{sr}(x, y) = 1$, for all x, y , and (b) ψ_{tpr} which is 1 only if true class label is 1, i.e., $\psi_{sr}(x, y) = \mathbf{1}(y = 1)$. $H(f, \psi_{sr})$ measures the statistical rate and $H(f, \psi_{tpr})$ measures the true positive rate disparity.

Results. *Statistical rate $H(\cdot, \psi_{sr})$ vs social burden gap $G(\cdot, \psi_{sr})$.* Plot 1a presents the results for classifiers that use the same threshold for both groups. As discussed in Lemma 3.2, these classifiers always have social burden gap ≥ 0 and lead to higher strategic manipulation cost for African-American individuals. Furthermore, even the statistical rate of these classifiers is low implying that all classifiers using single thresholds select White individuals at a higher rate. Plot 1b presents fairness metrics for classifiers that use group-specific thresholds. Here, we observe that the range of values achieved for statistical rate and low social burden gap is much larger. A classifier with a high statistical rate favoring the disadvantaged group (> 0.5) also has a low social burden gap (< -10) for this dataset. However, almost equal group selection rates do not imply parity with respect to social burden. For classifiers with statistical rate close to 0, the social burden gap ranges from $[-12, 30]$.

True positive rate $H(\cdot, \psi_{tpr})$ vs social burden gap $G(\cdot, \psi_{tpr})$. With ψ_{tpr} , we compute costs for individuals who are incorrectly negatively classified. From Plot 2a, we again see that single-threshold classifiers have social burden gap ≥ 0 . Plot 2b, however, shows that there exist group-specific thresholds that result in low social burden gap and high true positive rate for African-American individuals.

Plots 1c, d and 2c, d present the relationship between the group thresholds and the fairness metrics. Increasing group 0 threshold leads to an increase in relative social burden for group 0 and a decrease in its statistical/true positive rate as the fraction of positive classifications decreases.

Constructing classifiers with low social burden gap. We next empirically analyze the inequalities in Theorem 3.4. Suppose the goal of the institution is to maximize accuracy subject to the constraint that social burden gap is $\leq g$, for some $g \in \mathbb{R}$. Since group 0 is the marginalized one, the institution aims to achieve non-positive social burden gap to address the disparities in strategic manipulation costs across the protected attribute groups. As shown in Theorem 3.4, this can alternately be



(a) Stat. rate vs $G(f, \psi_{sr})$ (b) Accuracy vs $G(f, \psi_{sr})$ (c) TPR vs $G(f, \psi_{tpr})$ (d) Accuracy vs $G(f, \psi_{tpr})$

Figure 3: Performance of classifiers that satisfy the modified fairness constraints. Plots (a),(b) present the statistical rate and accuracy vs social burden gap $G(f, \psi_{sr})$ for all classifiers for which condition (1) is satisfied with $\psi = \psi_{sr}$. Plots (c),(d) present the true positive rate (TPR) and accuracy vs social burden gap $G(f, \psi_{tpr})$ for all classifiers for which condition (1) is satisfied with $\psi = \psi_{tpr}$.

achieved by setting the upper bound $g_u \tau_1 H(f, \psi) + (g_u \tau_1 - g_l \tau_0) P_0(\tau_0) - g_u E_{1, \tau_1} + g_l E_{0, \tau_0}$. For the linear cost function, note that $g_u = g_l = 1$. Therefore, we are alternately constraining

$$\tau_1 H(f, \psi) - (\tau_1 - \tau_0) P_0(\tau_0) + E_{1, \tau_1} - E_{0, \tau_0} \leq g. \quad (1)$$

For $g=0$, Figure 3a,b plots the accuracy and social burden gap of all classifiers that satisfy the above conditions for ψ_{sr} and ψ_{tpr} . The plot shows that all classifiers that satisfy the constraint on the upper bound from Theorem 3.4 satisfy the condition $G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi_{sr}) < 0$. Furthermore, even in this case the classifier that optimizes this constrained problem has high accuracy; For ψ_{sr} the accuracy of the optimal constrained classifier is 0.86 and $G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi_{sr}) = -0.21$ and for ψ_{tpr} the accuracy of the optimal constrained classifier is 0.86 and $G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi_{tpr}) = -0.03$.

5.2 Adult Income Dataset

Dataset. For analysis of multi-dimensional data, we use the Adult Income dataset. We use the new version of this dataset developed and preprocessed by Ding et al. (2021). This dataset consists information of around 251k individuals from the state of California surveyed in 2019. The classification task is to predict whether the income of an individual is above \$50k or not. The strategic features available are “class of worker”, “occupation”, and “hours worked per week” (other five features are listed in Appendix E). We use race as the protected attribute, limiting the dataset to White (93% of the dataset; $z = 1$) and Black/African-American (7% of the dataset; $z = 0$) individuals.

Methodology. The cost function used is linear and group-specific. Let $d' \in \mathbb{R}^9$ be the underlying cost vector such that $d'_i = 100$ if i represents “class of worker” feature, $d'_i = 10$ if i represents “occupation”, $d'_i = 1$ if i represents “hours per week”, $d'_i = \infty$ for other non-strategic features. d' assigns higher cost factor depending on difficult of updating a feature value. The cost function for group 0 is $c_0(x, x') := 2 \cdot d'^T (x' - x)$ and cost function for group 1 is $c_1(x, x') := d'^T (x' - x)$. In this case, African-American individuals pay twice the cost that White individuals pay for the same feature update. The dataset is partitioned into 80-20 random train-test split. Once again, suppose $\psi_{sr}(x, y) = 1$ for all (x, y) . We will restrict the classifiers to be from the linear family and use the logistic log-loss function $L(f; x, y) := -y \log \sigma(f(x)) - (1-y) \log(1 - \sigma(f(x)))$ to measure prediction error of f (here $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the standard sigmoid function). We analyze the following different classifiers. Classifier $f_{uncons} := \arg \min_f \mathbb{E}[L(f; X, Y)]$ will denote the unconstrained classifier. For pre-specified desired statistical rate $\epsilon \in [-1, 1]$, classifier $f_{sr} := \arg \min_f \mathbb{E}[L(f; X, Y)]$ subject to $H(f, \psi_{sr}) \geq \epsilon$. Finally, for a pre-specified $g \in \mathbb{R}$, we construct classifiers with social burden gap $G(f, \psi_{sr}) \leq g$. To do so, we use the result from Section 4 and construct classifier $f_{strat} := \arg \min_f \mathbb{E}[L(f; X, Y)]$ subject

Table 1: Classification accuracies, statistical rates and social burden gaps for the unconstrained classifier f_{uncons} , classifier constrained to achieve statistical rate ≥ 0 f_{sr} , fair classifier from Rezaei et al. (2020) f_{RFMZ} , and classifier constrained to achieve low social burden gap using our method f_{strat} .

	CLASSIFIER	ACCURACY	STAT. RATE	BURDEN GAP
BASELINES	f_{uncons}	0.84 \pm 0.00	-0.11 \pm 0.01	2.23 \pm 0.04
	f_{sr}	0.83 \pm 0.01	0.01 \pm 0.03	1.12 \pm 0.15
	f_{RFMZ}	0.83 \pm 0.00	-0.08 \pm 0.01	1.88 \pm 0.08
OUR METHOD	f_{strat}	0.82 \pm 0.00	0.24 \pm 0.01	0.04 \pm 0.01

to $-\frac{1}{w_1^*}(v_1 H(f, \psi)) - \delta \leq g$ (quantities w_1^*, v_1, δ are defined in Theorem 4.1). We will set $\epsilon=0$ and $g=0$ to analyze classifiers with equal selection rate and zero social burden gap in this section, and present variation of performance with these parameters in Appendix E. To compare with another fair classification baseline, we also implement the fair logistic regression algorithm of Rezaei et al. (2020) with statistical rate constraints; we will call this classifier f_{RFMZ} . We report the mean and standard error of accuracy, statistical rate, and social burden gap of all classifiers over 100 random train-test splits. Implementation details of all methods are provided in Appendix E.

Results. Table 1 presents the performance of classifiers $f_{uncons}, f_{sr}, f_{RFMZ}, f_{strat}$. First note that the unconstrained classifier f_{uncons} has average statistical rate -0.11 (i.e., selection rate of African-American individuals much lower than the selection rate of White individuals) and the average social burden gap is 2.23 (i.e, cost of strategic manipulation is higher for African-Americans). Hence, fairness interventions are necessary in this case to achieve equal performance. For classifier f_{sr} , the statistical rate is close to 0; however, the social burden gap is still greater than 0 in this case, once showing that almost equal selection rate does not necessarily imply low social burden gap. Similarly, baseline f_{RFMZ} has high social burden gap despite having better statistical rate than the unconstrained classifier. In comparison, our classifier f_{strat} has statistical rate is 0.24, i.e., selection rate for African-Americans is higher. Furthermore, using our constraints, classifier f_{strat} achieves social burden gap close to 0 on average. Hence, both groups pay almost equal cost for strategic manipulation. In terms of accuracy, f_{uncons} achieves the highest accuracy at 0.84 but the accuracy of f_{strat} is only slightly lower (0.82), implying minimal loss in accuracy due to fairness constraints.

6 Discussion, Limitations, and Future Work

We study the impact of fair classifiers on individuals’ ability to positively manipulate their features based on their group membership. In settings when feature distributions or cost functions are biased against minority groups, we observe that classifiers can have (almost) equal selection rates for all groups but can still have relatively higher costs for strategic manipulation for minority groups. We propose modified fairness constraints to construct classifiers that reduce this disparity and show its efficacy over FICO and Adult datasets. Beyond the presented analysis, our framework has advantages that allow for easy use in applications. For instance, the bounds on the social burden gap require minimal information about the individuals’ cost function and can handle settings where cost functions vary across individuals but are gradient-bounded. This feature simplifies fair classification construction process for the institution as it does not need to model the complete behavior of every individual. Secondly, while the social burden gap being 0 implies equal manipulation costs for all groups, in some cases, a gap of less than 0 may be necessary. In multi-feedback settings, the

predictions at one time-step affect the classifier training at the next time-step Perdomo et al. (2020). For datasets encoding historical inequalities, the bias can amplify across feedback iterations. In these cases, constructing a classifier with a negative social burden gap can help tackle the historical biases.

Our framework also has certain limitations. Strategic manipulations can potentially be used to “game” a classifier Hardt et al. (2016a) and, by reducing manipulation costs for some groups, our methods can lead to increased “gamification” in certain cases. Yet, recent papers have suggested classifier designs that incentivize positive manipulations by individuals Kleinberg & Raghu-
van (2020) (instead of “gaming”); using our framework with these classifiers can ensure that all groups have equal opportunities to improve their features. While we consider binary protected attributes in our analysis, our results can be partly extended to non-binary attributes. This is because the non-binary protected attribute setting can be reduced to the binary setting by considering pairwise comparison of measures for different protected attribute values. However, due to multiple comparisons, the bounds for $G(\cdot, \cdot)$ will be weaker and future work can explore ways to improve these bounds for non-binary attributes. Finally, extensions of our framework for generic cost functions in multi-dimensional settings can also be further studied.

References

- Agarwal, A., Beygelzimer, A., Dudík, M., Langford, J., and Wallach, H. A reductions approach to fair classification. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 60–69. PMLR, 2018.
- Alon, T., Dobson, M., Procaccia, A., Talgam-Cohen, I., and Tucker-Foltz, J. Multiagent evaluation mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pp. 1774–1781, 2020.
- Barocas, S., Hardt, M., and Narayanan, A. Fairness in machine learning. *Nips tutorial*, 1:2, 2017.
- Card, D. and Rothstein, J. Racial segregation and the black–white test score gap. *Journal of Public Economics*, 91(11-12):2158–2184, 2007.
- Celis, L. E., Huang, L., Keswani, V., and Vishnoi, N. K. Classification with fairness constraints: A meta-algorithm with provable guarantees. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pp. 319–328, 2019.
- Chen, Y., Liu, Y., and Podimata, C. Learning strategy-aware linear classifiers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15265–15276, 2020.
- Citron, D. K. and Pasquale, F. The scored society: Due process for automated predictions. *Wash. L. Rev.*, 89:1, 2014.
- Cohen-Cole, E. Credit card redlining. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 93(2):700–713, 2011.
- Ding, F., Hardt, M., Miller, J., and Schmidt, L. Retiring adult: New datasets for fair machine learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
- Dong, J., Roth, A., Schutzman, Z., Waggoner, B., and Wu, Z. S. Strategic classification from revealed preferences. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pp. 55–70, 2018.
- Dwork, C., Hardt, M., Pitassi, T., Reingold, O., and Zemel, R. Fairness through awareness. In *Proceedings of the 3rd innovations in theoretical computer science conference*, pp. 214–226, 2012.
- Estornell, A., Das, S., Liu, Y., and Vorobeychik, Y. Unfairness despite awareness: Group-fair classification with strategic agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.02746*, 2021.
- FRS, B. o. G. *Report to the congress on credit scoring and its effects on the availability and affordability of credit*. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 2007.
- Hardt, M., Megiddo, N., Papadimitriou, C., and Wootters, M. Strategic classification. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM conference on innovations in theoretical computer science*, pp. 111–122, 2016a.
- Hardt, M., Price, E., and Srebro, N. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. In *NIPS*, 2016b.
- Hoxby, C. M. and Avery, C. The missing” one-offs”: The hidden supply of high-achieving, low income students. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2012.
- Hu, L. and Chen, Y. Fair classification and social welfare. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 535–545, 2020.
- Hu, L., Immorlica, N., and Vaughan, J. W. The disparate effects of strategic manipulation. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 259–268, 2019.

- Jagadeesan, M., Mendler-Dünner, C., and Hardt, M. Alternative microfoundations for strategic classification. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4687–4697. PMLR, 2021.
- Kamishima, T., Akaho, S., Asoh, H., and Sakuma, J. Fairness-aware classifier with prejudice remover regularizer. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pp. 35–50. Springer, 2012.
- Kleinberg, J. and Raghavan, M. How do classifiers induce agents to invest effort strategically? *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation (TEAC)*, 8(4):1–23, 2020.
- Kusner, M. J., Loftus, J., Russell, C., and Silva, R. Counterfactual fairness. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- Levanon, S. and Rosenfeld, N. Strategic classification made practical. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 6243–6253. PMLR, 2021.
- Miller, J., Perdomo, J. C., and Zrnic, T. Outside the echo chamber: Optimizing the performative risk. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.08570*, 2021.
- Milli, S., Miller, J., Dragan, A. D., and Hardt, M. The social cost of strategic classification. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 230–239, 2019.
- Perdomo, J., Zrnic, T., Mendler-Dünner, C., and Hardt, M. Performative prediction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 7599–7609. PMLR, 2020.
- Rezaei, A., Fathony, R., Memarrast, O., and Ziebart, B. Fairness for robust log loss classification. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pp. 5511–5518, 2020.
- Ustun, B., Spangher, A., and Liu, Y. Actionable recourse in linear classification. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pp. 10–19, 2019.
- Venkatasubramanian, S. and Alfano, M. The philosophical basis of algorithmic recourse. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pp. 284–293, 2020.
- Vigdor, J. L. and Clotfelter, C. T. Retaking the sat. *Journal of Human resources*, 38(1):1–33, 2003.
- Washington, A. L. How to argue with an algorithm: Lessons from the compas-propublica debate. *Colo. Tech. LJ*, 17:131, 2018.
- Wilson, R. Predicting graduate school success: A critical race analysis of the graduate record examination. 2020.
- Yearwood, L. T. Many minorities avoid seeking credit due to generations of discrimination. why that keeps them back, 2019. URL <https://www.cnbc.com/2019/09/01/many-minorities-avoid-seeking-credit-due-to-decades-of-discrimination.html>.
- Zafar, M. B., Valera, I., Ródriguez, M. G., and Gummadi, K. P. Fairness constraints: Mechanisms for fair classification. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 962–970. PMLR, 2017.
- Zhang, B. H., Lemoine, B., and Mitchell, M. Mitigating unwanted biases with adversarial learning. In *Proceedings of the 2018 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pp. 335–340, 2018.

A Proofs and other theoretical results

A.1 Proof of Lemma 3.2

Proof. Let p_z denote $\mathbb{P}[X \mid \psi(X, Y) = 1, Z = z]$. Note that the threshold τ is same for all individuals here. The cost assigned to group $Z = z$ by this classifier can be quantified as the distance of x to threshold τ due to the monotonicity assumption and since this move maximizes individual's utility.

$$B_z = \mathbb{E}[c(x, z) \mid \psi, Z = z] = \int_{\mathcal{X}} c(x, \tau) p_z(x) dx = \int_0^\tau d(x, \tau) p_z(x) dx.$$

The second equality follows from the fact that individuals with $f(x) = 1$ pay zero cost. Performing integration by parts, we get

$$B_z = \int_0^\tau d(x, \tau) p_z(x) dx = - \int_0^\tau \frac{\partial d(x, \tau)}{\partial x} P_z(x) dx,$$

where $P(x) = \int_0^x p(x) dx$ is the cumulative density function. Therefore, the disparity will be

$$\begin{aligned} G(f_\tau, \psi) &= B_0 - B_1 \\ &= \int_0^\tau \frac{\partial d(x, \tau)}{\partial x} P_1(x) dx - \int_0^\tau \frac{\partial d(x, \tau)}{\partial x} P_0(x) dx = \int_0^\tau \frac{\partial d(x, \tau)}{\partial x} (P_1(x) - P_0(x)) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\frac{\partial d(x, \tau)}{\partial x}$ is negative due to the monotonicity assumption and $P_1(x) < P_0(x)$ by definition of feature bias. Hence, we get the result of Milli et al. (2019) that $G(f_\tau, \psi) > 0$.

□

A.2 Proof of Lemma 3.3

Proof. Let p_z denote $\mathbb{P}[X \mid \psi(X, Y) = 1, Z = z]$. For the strategic cost function c , suppose that the gradient of the function c with respect to x_1 at any point is in the range $[g_l, g_u]$, for some $g_l \leq g_u \leq 0$. The cost assigned to group $Z = z$ by this classifier can be quantified as the distance of x to threshold τ_z due to the monotonicity assumption.

$$B_z = \mathbb{E}[c(x, z) \mid \psi, Z = z] = \int_{\mathcal{X}} c(x, \tau_z) p_z(x) dx = \int_0^{\tau_z} d(x, \tau_z) p_z(x) dx.$$

The second equality follows from the fact that individuals with $f(x) = 1$ pay zero cost. Performing integration by parts, we get

$$B_z = \int_0^{\tau_z} d(x, \tau_z) p_z(x) dx = - \int_0^{\tau_z} \frac{\partial d(x, \tau_z)}{\partial x} P_z(x) dx,$$

where $P(x) = \int_0^x p(x) dx$ is the cumulative density function. Therefore, the disparity will be

$$G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) = B_0 - B_1 = \int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{\partial d(x, \tau_1)}{\partial x} P_1(x) dx - \int_0^{\tau_0} \frac{\partial d(x, \tau_0)}{\partial x} P_0(x) dx$$

When $\tau_0 = \tau_1$, we get positive social burden gap from Lemma 3.2. When $\tau_0 < \tau_1$, the expression can take different values depending on choice of these thresholds.

$$\begin{aligned} G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) &= B_0 - B_1 \leq g_u \int_0^{\tau_1} P_1(x) dx - g_l \int_0^{\tau_0} P_0(x) dx \\ &\leq g_u \int_0^{\tau_1} P_0(x) dx - g_l \int_0^{\tau_0} P_0(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

since $P_1(x) \leq P_0(x)$. Using change of variables, let $x' = x \cdot g_u/g_l$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) &\leq g_u \int_0^{\tau_1} P_0(x) dx - g_l \int_0^{\tau_0} P_0(x) dx \\ &= g_u \int_0^{\tau_1} P_0(x) dx - g_u \int_0^{\tau_0 g_u/g_l} P_0(x') dx' = g_u \int_{\tau_0 g_u/g_l}^{\tau_1} P_0(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since, $g_u < 0$, the above term is non-positive if $\tau_0 \leq \frac{g_l}{g_u} \tau_1$.

□

A.3 Proof of Theorem 3.4

Proof. Let p_z denote $\mathbb{P}[X \mid \psi(X, Y) = 1, Z = z]$.

$$\begin{aligned} G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) &= \mathbb{E}[c(X, \tau_0) \mid \psi, Z = 0] - \mathbb{E}[c(X, \tau_1) \mid \psi, Z = 1] \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} c(x, \tau_0) p_0(x) dx - \int_{\mathcal{X}} c(x, \tau_1) p_1(x) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} d(x, \tau_0) \mathbf{1}(x < \tau_0) p_0(x) dx - \int_{\mathcal{X}} d(x, \tau_1) \mathbf{1}(x < \tau_1) p_1(x) dx \\ &= \int_0^{\tau_0} d(x, \tau_0) p_0(x) dx - \int_0^{\tau_1} d(x, \tau_1) p_1(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Analyzing each term individually, we get

$$\int_0^{\tau_z} d(x, \tau_z) p_z(x) dx = d(x, \tau_z) P_z(x) \Big|_0^{\tau_z} - \int_0^{\tau_z} \frac{\partial d(x, \tau_z)}{\partial x} P_z(x) dx.$$

For the second term,

$$g_l \int_0^{\tau_z} P_z(x) dx \leq \int_0^{\tau_z} \frac{\partial d(x, \tau_z)}{\partial x} P_z(x) dx \leq g_u \int_0^{\tau_z} P_z(x) dx.$$

Integrating by parts, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\tau_z} P_z(x) dx &= [x P_z(x) - \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \in [0, x], Z = z, \psi] \mathbb{P}[X \in [0, x], Z = z, \psi]]_0^{\tau_z} \\ &= \tau_z P_z(\tau_z) - \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \in [0, \tau_z], Z = z, \psi] \mathbb{P}[X \in [0, \tau_z], Z = z, \psi]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $E_{z, \tau_z} := \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \in [0, \tau_z], Z = z, \psi] \mathbb{P}[X \in [0, \tau_z], Z = z, \psi] = \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \in [0, \tau_z], Z = z, \psi] P_z(\tau_z)$.

Since $P_z(0) = 0$ and $d(\tau_z, \tau_z) = 0$, we have that

$$G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) = \int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{\partial d(x, \tau_1)}{\partial x} P_1(x) dx - \int_0^{\tau_0} \frac{\partial d(x, \tau_0)}{\partial x} P_0(x) dx.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) &= \mathbb{P}[f = 1 \mid Z = 0, \psi] - \mathbb{P}[f = 1 \mid Z = 1, \psi] \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}[f(X) = 1 \mid X = x, Z = 0, \psi] p_0(x) dx - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}[f(X) = 1 \mid X = x, Z = 1, \psi] p_1(x) dx \\ &= \int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} p_0(x) dx - \int_{\tau_1}^{\infty} p_1(x) dx \\ &= \int_0^{\tau_1} p_1(x) dx - \int_0^{\tau_0} p_0(x) dx = P_1(\tau_1) - P_0(\tau_0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using the above inequalities, we get that the following upper bound.

$$\begin{aligned}
G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) &\leq g_u \tau_1 P_1(\tau_1) - g_u E_{1, \tau_1} - g_l \tau_0 P_0(\tau_0) + g_l E_{0, \tau_0} \\
&= g_u \tau_1 P_1(\tau_1) - g_l \tau_0 P_0(\tau_0) - g_u E_{1, \tau_1} + g_l E_{0, \tau_0} \\
&= g_u \tau_1 H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) + g_u \tau_1 P_0(\tau_0) - g_l \tau_0 P_0(\tau_0) - g_u E_{1, \tau_1} + g_l E_{0, \tau_0} \\
&\leq g_u \tau_1 H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) + (g_u \tau_1 - g_l \tau_0) P_0(\tau_0) - g_u E_{1, \tau_1} + g_l E_{0, \tau_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned}
G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) &\geq g_l \tau_1 P_1(\tau_1) - g_l E_{1, \tau_1} - g_u \tau_0 P_0(\tau_0) + g_u E_{0, \tau_0} \\
&= g_l \tau_1 P_1(\tau_1) - g_u \tau_0 P_0(\tau_0) - g_l E_{1, \tau_1} + g_u E_{0, \tau_0} \\
&= g_l \tau_1 H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) + g_l \tau_1 P_0(\tau_0) - g_u \tau_0 P_0(\tau_0) - g_l E_{1, \tau_1} + g_u E_{0, \tau_0} \\
&\geq g_l \tau_1 H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) + (g_l \tau_1 - g_u \tau_0) P_0(\tau_0) - g_l E_{1, \tau_1} + g_u E_{0, \tau_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

A.4 Proof of Theorem 3.5

Proof. Let p_z denote $\mathbb{P}[X \mid \psi(X, Y) = 1, Z = z]$.

$$\begin{aligned}
G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) &= \mathbb{E}[c_0(X, \tau_0) \mid \psi, Z = 0] - \mathbb{E}[c_1(X, \tau_1) \mid \psi, Z = 1] \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{X}} c_0(x, \tau_0) p_0(x) dx - \int_{\mathcal{X}} c_1(x, \tau_1) p_1(x) dx \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{X}} d_0(x, \tau_0) \mathbf{1}(x < \tau_0) p_0(x) dx - \int_{\mathcal{X}} d_1(x, \tau_1) \mathbf{1}(x < \tau_1) p_1(x) dx \\
&= \int_0^{\tau_0} d_0(x, \tau_0) p_0(x) dx - \int_0^{\tau_1} d_1(x, \tau_1) p_1(x) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

From the proof of Theorem 3.4, we know that

$$G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) = \int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{\partial d_1(x, \tau_1)}{\partial x} P_1(x) dx - \int_0^{\tau_0} \frac{\partial d_0(x, \tau_0)}{\partial x} P_0(x) dx.$$

Using the inequalities from the proof of Theorem 3.4, we get that the following upper bound.

$$\begin{aligned}
G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) &\leq g_{u,1} \tau_1 P_1(\tau_1) - g_{u,1} E_{1, \tau_1} - g_{l,0} \tau_0 P_0(\tau_0) + g_{l,0} E_{0, \tau_0} \\
&\leq g_{u,1} \tau_1 H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) + (g_{u,1} \tau_1 - g_{l,0} \tau_0) P_0(\tau_0) - g_{u,1} E_{1, \tau_1} + g_{l,0} E_{0, \tau_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned}
G(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) &\geq g_{l,1} \tau_1 P_1(\tau_1) - g_{l,1} E_{1, \tau_1} - g_{u,0} \tau_0 P_0(\tau_0) + g_{u,0} E_{0, \tau_0} \\
&\geq g_{l,1} \tau_1 H(f_{\tau_0, \tau_1}, \psi) + (g_{l,1} \tau_1 - g_{u,0} \tau_0) P_0(\tau_0) - g_{l,1} E_{1, \tau_1} + g_{u,0} E_{0, \tau_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

A.5 Proof of Theorem 4.1

We will use the result of Hu et al. (2019) for this analysis. In particular, they prove the following theorem.

Theorem A.1 (Hu et al. (2019)). *Suppose we have a linear classifier $f_{u,v}$ such that $f(u, v) = 1$ if $u^\top x \geq v$ and 0 otherwise. Consider a candidate with unmanipulated feature vector x and linear costs $c(x, x') = d^\top(x' - x)$ to move to vector $x' \geq x$ for a given $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $K = \arg \max_{i \in [n]} u_i/d_i$. Then the candidate's best strategy for manipulation is to move to point x' , where*

$$x' := x + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{t_i}{d_i} e_i,$$

where e_i is the unit vector for component i , $t_i \geq 0$ for all $i \in [n]$, $t_i = 0$ for $i \notin K$, and $u^\top x' = v$.

Proof. We will use Theorem A.1 to prove our result for the multi-dimensional setting. Note that we have group-specific classifiers of the form $u^\top x \geq v_0$ for group 0 and $u^\top x \geq v_1$ for group 1.

Let $K_z := \arg \max_{i \in [n]} u_i/d_{z,i}$. Then for an individual with feature x and group z such that $f(x) = 0$, the cost paid by this individual to achieve a positive classification is $\sum_{i \in K_z} t_i$ (from Theorem A.1). Also note that $x' = x + \sum_{i \in K_z} \frac{t_i}{d_{z,i}} e_i$. Then

$$u^\top (x + \sum_{i \in K_z} \frac{t_i}{d_{z,i}} e_i) = v_z \implies u^\top x + \sum_{i \in K_z} \frac{u_i}{d_{z,i}} t_i = v_z \implies \sum_{i \in K_z} t_i = \frac{1}{w_z^\star} (v_z - u^\top x),$$

where $w_z^\star = \max_{i \in [n]} u_i/d_{z,i}$.

To reduce the single-dimensional setting, suppose the individual's feature is basically $v = u^\top x$. The cost for update is then

$$\frac{1}{w_z^\star} (v_z - v).$$

The gradient of this cost function with respect to v is $g_{u,z} = g_{l,z} = -\frac{1}{w_z^\star}$. Then, using Theorem 3.5 we can bound the social burden gap as follows

$$\begin{aligned} G(f_{u,v_0,v_1}, \psi) &\leq -\left(\frac{1}{w_1^\star} v_1 H(f_{u,v_0,v_1}, \psi) + (\frac{1}{w_1^\star} v_1 - \frac{1}{w_0^\star} v_0) P_0 - \frac{1}{w_1^\star} E_{1,v_1} + \frac{1}{w_0^\star} E_{0,v_0}\right), \\ G(f_{u,v_0,v_1}, \psi) &\geq -\left(\frac{1}{w_1^\star} v_1 H(f_{u,v_0,v_1}, \psi) + (\frac{1}{w_1^\star} v_1 - \frac{1}{w_0^\star} v_0) P_0 - \frac{1}{w_1^\star} E_{1,v_1} + \frac{1}{w_0^\star} E_{0,v_0}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $E_{z,\tau} = \mathbb{E}[(u^\top X) \mid f(X) = 0, Z = z, \psi] \mathbb{P}[f(X) = 0 \mid Z = z, \psi]$.

Therefore,

$$G(f_{u,v_0,v_1}, \psi) = -\frac{1}{w_1^\star} (v_1 H(f_{u,v_0,v_1}, \psi)) - \delta,$$

where $\delta = \left(\frac{v_1}{w_1^\star} - \frac{v_0}{w_0^\star}\right) P_0 - \frac{1}{w_1^\star} E_{1,v_1} + \frac{1}{w_0^\star} E_{0,v_0}$

□

B Result for quadratic functions for the multi-dimensional setting

In the multi-dimensional setting, assume that the cost function is a generalized squared interpoint distance (or the square of the Mahalanobis distance between two points); i.e., for a given positive definite matrix B , the cost of moving from feature x to x' is $c(x, x') = (x' - x)^\top B(x' - x)$ if $x' \geq x$ and 0 otherwise. In this multi-dimensional setting, we can prove the following result.

Theorem B.1. *Suppose we have a linear classifier f such that for an individual with x and group z , $f(x) = 1$ if and only if $u^\top x \geq v_z$ and 0 otherwise. For an individual from group z with unmanipulated datapoint x , the cost to move to point $x' \geq x$ is defined as $c(x, x') = (x' - x)^\top B(x' - x)$ if $x' \geq x$ and 0 otherwise, for symmetric positive-definite $B \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Then,*

$$G(f, \psi) \leq -\frac{2 \max_x (v_z - u^\top x)}{u^\top B^{-1} u} (v_0 H(f, \psi) - v_0 P_1 + E_0),$$

where $E_z := \mathbb{E}[u^\top X \mid \psi, Z = z, f(X) = 0] P_z$ and $P_z := \mathbb{P}[f(X) = 0 \mid \psi, Z = z]$.

Proof. Let p_z denote $\mathbb{P}[X \mid \psi(X, Y) = 1, Z = z]$. Suppose we have an individual with feature x such that $f(x) = 0$. Then the ideal update for the individual $x' := \min_{x': f(x')=1} (x - x')^\top B(x - x')$.

Using the Lagrangian method, for a parameter $\lambda > 0$, the Langrangian function for this optimization program is

$$L(\lambda, x') := (x - x')^\top B(x - x') + \lambda(u^\top x' - v).$$

Taking the derivative with respect to x' we get

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial x'} = 2B(x - x') + \lambda u.$$

Setting the derivative to zero, we get

$$\begin{aligned} x' &= x + \frac{1}{2}\lambda B^{-1}u, \\ \lambda &= \frac{2(v_z - u^\top x)}{u^\top B^{-1}u}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the strategic cost incurred by this individual is

$$\frac{1}{4}\lambda^2 u^\top B^{-1}u = \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{2(v_z - u^\top x)}{u^\top B^{-1}u} \right)^2 u^\top B^{-1}u = \frac{(v_z - u^\top x)^2}{u^\top B^{-1}u}.$$

Using this expression, the cost paid to update x is reduced to a single quantity that uses $u^\top x$ for every individual. Let $w = u^\top x$. Then with w as feature, we can directly use the one-dimensional case. In particular, gradient of cost function is upper bounded by $g_{u,z} = 0$ and lower bounded by $g_{l,z} = -\frac{2\max_x(v_z - u^\top x)}{u^\top B^{-1}u}$. Let $E_z := \mathbb{E}[u^\top X \mid \psi, Z = z, f(X) = 0]P_z$ and $P_z := \mathbb{P}[f(X) = 0 \mid \psi, Z = z]$. Therefore using Theorem 3.5,

$$\begin{aligned} G(f, \psi) &\leq g_{u,1}v_1H(f, \psi) + (g_{u,1}v_1 - g_{l,0}v_0)P_0 - g_{u,1}E_1 + g_{l,0}E_0 \\ &= -g_{l,0}v_0P_0 + g_{l,0}E_0 \\ &= g_{l,0}v_0(H(f, \psi) - P_1) + g_{l,0}E_0 \\ &= -\frac{2\max_x(v_z - u^\top x)}{u^\top B^{-1}u}(v_0H(f, \psi) - v_0P_1 + E_0). \end{aligned}$$

□


C Synthetic simulations

To intuitively explain different components of Theorem 3.4, we design a simulation using a synthetic data generation process.

Setup. Suppose that features of group $z \in \{0, 1\}$ are sampled from $N(\mu_z, \sigma_z)$, where $\mu_0, \mu_1, \sigma_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\sigma_1 = \sigma_0/2$. Let X_z denote the features of group z . Suppose that higher feature values imply a higher probability of class label 1, i.e., for element x_i from group z , y_i is 1 with probability $(x_i + \min(X_z))/(\max(X_z) + \min(X_z))$. Say we sample 500 elements for each group.


When $\mu_0 < \mu_1$, there will likely be feature bias in any dataset produced using data-generating process and any classifier f trained over this dataset will have to use group-specific thresholds to achieve statistical parity. Suppose the cost function for strategic manipulation is linear.

To illustrate this distribution and classifiers trained on them, we present properties of two different classifiers for one dataset sampled from the above distribution. The first classifier is trained to achieve maximum accuracy subject to the constraint that $|H(f, \psi)| \leq 0.4$; here ψ is the identity function. The second classifier is trained to achieve maximum accuracy subject to the constraint that $|G(f, \psi)| \leq 4$. In other words, the first classifier uses constraints on the statistical rate of the classifier while the second classifier uses constraints on the social burden gap of the classifier. From Figure 4a,b, we can see that these classifiers can have different group thresholds.



(a) Stat. rate constrained classifier (b) Thm 3.4 constrained classifier (c) Variance vs social burden gap

Figure 4: Performance of statistical rate constrained classifier and classifier constrained using our method on a synthetic one-dimensional dataset. Plots (a), (b) show the data distribution and classifier thresholds for one random iteration. Plot (c) plots the mean and standard deviation of social burden gap of classifiers that are constrained using statistical rate metric and classifiers that are constrained using Theorem 3.4 upper bound.




(a) $\tau_0=\tau_1 \in \{1, \dots, 100\}$ (b) $(\tau_0, \tau_1) \in \{1, \dots, 100\}^2$ (c) Social burden gap vs τ_0 (d) Statistical rate vs τ_0

Figure 5: Statistical rate and social burden gap of all classifiers for the FICO dataset for quadratic cost function. Each point represents a classifier and the axes plot different properties of these classifiers. Plot (a) presents social burden gap $G(f, \psi_{sr})$ vs statistical rate $H(f, \psi_{sr})$ for classifiers that use the same threshold for both groups. Plots (b), (c), (d) present social burden gap $G(f, \psi_{sr})$ vs statistical rate $H(f, \psi_{sr})$ for classifiers that can use group-specific threshold.

To understand Theorem 3.4 using this example, note that Theorem 3.4 contains the following quantities: $(\tau_z - \mathbb{E}[X|X \in [0, \tau_z], Z=z])$ - the average distance of feature values of negative-classified individuals from group z from the decision boundary. As we mentioned earlier, the difference between these distances for group 0 and group 1 can be small or large depending on the choice of τ_0, τ_1 and group distributions. In particular, for the above data-generating process, this difference will be increase as σ_0 increases, since within group variance will increase and the group 0 distances will grow faster than group 1 distances (since $\sigma_1 = \sigma_0/2$). Hence, as σ_0 , increases, the social burden gap of a classifier can increase even when statistical rate remains small. We empirically observe this phenomenon in Figure 4c, where we see that increasing σ_0 leads to an increase in social burden gap of statistical-rate constrained classifier. However, we also see that classifiers constrained using Theorem 3.4 do not have high social burden gap, demonstrating that using Theorem 3.4 for forming fairness constraints leads to classifiers with low social burden gaps for all σ_0 values.


D Additional details and empirical results for FICO dataset

Dataset details. The dataset was initially built from the analysis presented in the Report to the Congress on Credit Scoring and Its Effects on the Availability and Affordability of Credit



(a) $\tau_0 = \tau_1 \in \{1, \dots, 100\}$ (b) $(\tau_0, \tau_1) \in \{1, \dots, 100\}^2$ (c) Social burden gap vs τ_0 (d) True positive rate vs τ_0

Figure 6: True positive rate and social burden gap of all classifiers for the FICO dataset for quadratic cost function. Plot (a) presents social burden gap $G(f, \psi_{tpr})$ vs true positive rate $H(f, \psi_{tpr})$ for single-threshold classifiers. Plot (b), (c), (d) present $G(f, \psi_{tpr})$ vs $H(f, \psi_{tpr})$ for classifiers that use group-specific thresholds.



(a) Stat. rate vs $G(f, \psi_{sr})$ (b) Accuracy vs $G(f, \psi_{sr})$ (c) TPR vs $G(f, \psi_{tpr})$ (d) Accuracy vs $G(f, \psi_{tpr})$

Figure 7: Performance of classifiers that satisfy the modified fairness constraints. Plot (a,b) present statistical rate and accuracy vs social burden gap $G(f, \psi_{sr})$ for all classifiers for which condition (1) is satisfied with $\psi = \psi_{sr}$ for quadratic cost function. Plot (c,d) present true positive rate and accuracy vs social burden gap $G(f, \psi_{tpr})$ for all classifiers for which condition (1) is satisfied with $\psi = \psi_{tpr}$ for quadratic cost function.

by the Federal Reserve Barocas et al. (2017). In particular, the dataset contains FICO scores of TransUnion, a US-based credit scoring agency, provided to the Federal Reserve on request. It is unclear if the individuals whose credit score information is present in the dataset were duly informed by TransUnion; however, the published dataset does not contain any identifiable personal information.

Preprocessing. This dataset Hardt et al. (2016b)³ contains cumulative density functions for credit scores of African-American and Caucasian individuals as well as the likelihood of *defaulting* on a loan conditional on race and credit score. Using the cumulative density functions, we sample around 116k credit scores corresponding to white individuals and 16k credit scores corresponding to black individuals to create a dataset. Using the likelihood of default, we also sample a binary outcome for each individual in the dataset and use it as the class label for the classification task. The FICO dataset code and builder are available under the MIT License.

Results with quadratic strategic cost function. We also provide additional results for the setting when cost function is quadratic and separable, i.e.

$$c(x, x') = \begin{cases} (x'^2 - x^2), & \text{if } x' > x, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The classifiers considered here use group specific thresholds in the set $(\tau_0, \tau_1) \in \{1, 3, \dots, 100\} \times \{1, 3, \dots, 100\}$. Figure 5 plots the statistical rate and social burden gap of all classifiers and Figure 6

³<https://github.com/fairmlbook/fairmlbook.github.io/tree/master/code/creditscore/data>

plots the true positive rate and social burden gap of all classifiers. Once again we see that group-specific thresholds can lead to lower social burden gap than single-threshold classifiers.

Figure 7 presents the performance of classifiers that constrain the upper bound in Theorem 3.4 to be less than 0. In this case, there are fewer classifiers that are feasible with respect to the modified constraints (compared to the linear case) since the bounds on cost gradient g_u (-2) and g_l (-100) are relatively looser.

Resources used to run experiments. All experiments were run on a MacBook system with 1.8 GHz processor and 8GB RAM.

E Additional details and empirical results for Adult dataset

Features. The list of features used for classification over the Adult dataset are age, class of worker, educational attainment, marital status, occupation, place of birth, usual hours worked per week past 12 months, gender. For feature descriptions, we refer the reader to Ding et al. (2021).

The Adult dataset is available under the MIT License. It was created and curated using the American Community Survey (ACS) by US Census. As detailed in Section 3 of Ding et al. (2021), participation in ACS is often mandatory for those selected, but the collected information is appropriate anonymized.

Implementation details. We use the SLSQP function in the Python scipy package to solve our constrained optimization problems ⁴. The parameters used for SLSQP function are: number of iterations = 100, ftol = 1e-3, eps = 1e-3. All variables, other than class label and protected attribute, are normalized using the mean and standard deviation of the columns of the training partition. For the implementation of Rezaei et al. (2020) classifier, we use the publicly-available code for their algorithm - <https://github.com/arezae4/fair-logloss-classification>. The parameter C in their algorithm is set to be 0.005, as recommended in their code.

Resources used to run experiments. All experiments were run on a MacBook system with 1.8 GHz processor and 8GB RAM.

Additional results. Recall that we defined, f_{sr} as $f_{sr} := \arg \min_f \mathbb{E}[L(f; X, Y)]$ subject to $H(f, \psi_{sr}) \geq \epsilon$ for pre-specified $\epsilon \in [-1, 1]$. Here ϵ denotes the desired statistical rate. Figure 8 plots the accuracy and social burden gap vs statistical rate of classifiers f_{sr} for different ϵ values in the set $\{-0.5, -0.4, \dots, 0.4, 0.5\}$. As we can see from the plots, social burden gap and accuracy decrease with increasing statistical rate. However, for classifiers with statistical rate 0, social burden gap on average is still greater than 0

For a pre-specified $g \in \mathbb{R}$ we define f_{strat} as $f_{strat} := \arg \min_f \mathbb{E}[L(f; X, Y)]$ subject to $-\frac{1}{w_1^*} (v_1 H(f, \psi)) - \delta \leq g$ (quantities w_1^*, v_1, δ are defined in Theorem 4.1). Here g denotes the desired social burden gap. Figure 9 plots the accuracy and statistical rate vs social burden gap of classifiers f_{strat} for different g values.

⁴<https://docs.scipy.org/doc/scipy/reference/optimize.minimize-slsqp.html>




Figure 8: Results for Adult dataset. We plot the performance of unconstrained and fairness constrained classifiers. For the statistical rate constrained classifiers, we vary the desired statistical rate parameter and measure the social burden gap and accuracy of the resulting classifiers.




Figure 9: Results for Adult dataset. We plot the performance of unconstrained and fairness constrained classifiers. For the social burden gap constrained classifiers, we vary the desired social burden gap and measure the statistical rate and accuracy of the resulting classifiers.