

# Counterfactual Fairness Is Basically Demographic Parity

Lucas Rosenblatt<sup>1</sup> and R. Teal Witter<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Science and Engineering  
NYU Tandon, Brooklyn, NY

August 9, 2022

## Abstract

Making fair decisions is crucial to ethically implementing machine learning algorithms in social settings. In this work, we consider the celebrated definition of counterfactual fairness [Kusner et al., NeurIPS, 2017]. We begin by showing that an algorithm which satisfies counterfactual fairness also satisfies demographic parity, a far simpler fairness constraint. Similarly, we show that all algorithms satisfying demographic parity can be trivially modified to satisfy counterfactual fairness. Together, our results indicate that counterfactual fairness is basically equivalent to demographic parity, which has important implications for the growing body of work on counterfactual fairness. We then validate our theoretical findings empirically, analyzing three existing algorithms for counterfactual fairness against three simple benchmarks. We find that two simple benchmark algorithms outperform all three existing algorithms—in terms of fairness, accuracy, and efficiency—on several data sets. Our analysis leads us to formalize a concrete fairness goal: to preserve the order of individuals within protected groups. We believe transparency around the ordering of individuals within protected groups makes fair algorithms more trustworthy. By design, the two simple benchmark algorithms satisfy this goal while the existing algorithms for counterfactual fairness do not. Our code and results are available on this [repository](#).

## Introduction

A pressing challenge in the deployment of algorithms in social settings is the risk of “unfair” decisions with respect to protected attributes like race, gender, religion, sexual-orientation, or age. In this work, we consider the supervised learning problem of predicting outcomes from labelled observations where the existing outcomes are already biased. The observations consist of protected attributes and other remaining attributes like test scores, grade point averages, credit scores, health risks, and more context dependent variables. The goal is to “fairly” predict outcomes like student success, credit worthiness, and health care needs.

One approach is to ignore the protected attributes and train algorithms only on the remaining attributes i.e. “fairness through blindness” [DHP<sup>+</sup>12]. However, there could be variables like height or zip code which are proxies for protected attributes [PRT08, CDG18]. Even in the absence of these proxy variables, seemingly reasonable remaining predictive attributes like study time or prior health care can still depend on protected attributes. A natural consequentialist approach in the face of concerns over group equity is demographic parity, which ensures an identical distribution over the outcomes for each protected group. However, demographic parity has been critiqued because it can allow for blatantly unfair choices to individuals [DHP<sup>+</sup>12, CDG18].

Counterfactual fairness offers a solution by advocating for a causal perspective, which provides statistical tools to help us minimize the direct effects of protected attributes on decisions [KLRS17, NGS22], and comports with a Rawlsian perspective of moral philosophy [Raw04]. It follows a surge of papers over the




Figure 1: A causal model in a law school context. Directed edges between a source and a target denote a causal relationship in the sense that changing the value of the source (probabilistically) changes the value of the target. In this context, counterfactual fairness tries to make decisions based on knowledge (which cannot directly be measured) without biases from race or gender.

past decade that borrow intuition from moral philosophy to formally define what makes an algorithm fair [DHP<sup>+</sup>12, FFM<sup>+</sup>15, HPS16, MPB<sup>+</sup>21]. Drawing from [P<sup>+</sup>00]’s work on causal models, [KLRS17] imagine a counterfactual world where only the protected attributes of observations are changed. Then, an algorithm is counterfactually fair if it makes the same predictions for a hypothetical counterfactual version of an observation as it would for the real version of the observation. This individual notion of fairness promises to avoid the pitfalls of the group based fairness measures we described earlier, though the relationship between causality, counterfactuals and moral philosophy is complicated [KS21].

### Preliminaries and Notation

We follow notation laid out by [KLRS17] for our formal analysis. The data attributes are partitioned into  $A$  (the set of protected attributes),  $U$  (the set of latent attributes),  $X$  (the set of remaining variables), and  $Y$  (the outcomes). Figure 2 shows a general causal model. In order to maintain parity with [KLRS17], we will use the same data set they used as well as their law school causal model, depicted in Figure 1, as our running example.




Figure 2: A general causal model.

A counterfactually fair algorithm uses  $U$  to predict  $Y$  since every other attribute is influenced by the protected attributes  $A$ . However,  $U$  cannot be measured directly. The solution of counterfactual fairness is to model the joint distribution of each attribute in  $X$  induced by the values of  $A$  and  $U$ . Then  $U$  is estimated by the posterior distribution on instances of  $A$  and  $X$ .

Building a causal model requires domain expert knowledge to establish both the direction of relationships between attributes and the family of distributions (e.g., normal, Poisson, binomial, etc.) that generates the

distribution of each attribute. Once a causal model is determined, it is computationally intensive to learn the parameters of each distribution and then to estimate the posterior distribution of each attribute in  $U$ .

## Fairness Definitions

In this section, we formalize the definitions of demographic parity and counterfactual fairness. We use capital letters  $A$ ,  $X$ ,  $U$ , and  $Y$  to refer to sets of random variables, and we use lowercase letters  $a$ ,  $x$ ,  $u$ , and  $y$  to refer to realizations of these random variables. Consider a predictor  $\hat{Y} : A \times U \times X \rightarrow Y$ . If a predictor  $\hat{Y}$  does not use a particular set of random variables then we omit that set. We use  $\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a}(u)$  for some protected group  $a \in A$  to denote the prediction on  $u$  where attributes in  $A$  are set to  $a$ .

**Definition 1** (Demographic Parity [CKP09, Zli15, ZVRG15]). *Given a predictor  $\hat{Y} : X \times A \rightarrow Y$ , we say  $\hat{Y}$  satisfies demographic parity if, for all instances of protected attributes  $a$  and  $a'$ ,*

$$\Pr(\hat{Y}(x, a) = y | A = a) = \Pr(\hat{Y}(x, a') = y | A = a')$$

where the probability is taken over the conditional distribution of  $X$  and the possible randomness of  $\hat{Y}$ .

**Definition 2** (Counterfactual Fairness [KLRS17]). *Let  $A$ ,  $U$ ,  $X$ , and  $Y$  be sets of random variables in a given causal model with specified distributions for each attribute. Consider any protected group  $a' \in A$  and any outcome  $y \in Y$ . Then a predictor  $\hat{Y} : U \times A \rightarrow Y$  is counterfactually fair if for all observations  $x \in X$  and  $a \in A$ ,*

$$\Pr(\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a}(u) = y | X = x, A = a) = \Pr(\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a'}(u) = y | X = x, A = a)$$

where the probability is with respect to the posterior distribution of  $u$  induced by fixed observations  $x$  and  $a$ .

Definition 2 states that it must be the case that the final prediction of a counterfactually fair predictor  $\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a}(u)$  is distributed like  $\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a'}(u)$  when  $a \neq a'$  and where the distribution of  $u$  is induced by observations of  $X$  and  $A$ .

Now we have established the two primary definitions of fairness that we consider in our work. However, it is worth noting that difficulties in defining algorithmic fairness have led to many competing approaches. Furthermore, formal results have demonstrated the incompatibility of applying some fairness definitions in conjunction with others, which hints at irreconcilable philosophical groundings and a need for formalizations for different policy settings [KMR16, Cho16, CDG18].

Existing definitions can broadly be split into two camps: those that target group fairness and those that target individual fairness. The division makes sense and is motivated by practical use cases: we might want to define a distributional property with respect to individuals, or with respect to entire protected groups, but these properties might be at odds. For individual fairness, [DHP<sup>+</sup>12] posit that an algorithm is fair if people who are similar receive similar predictions. Operationally, they define an abstract distance metric  $d(x, y)$ , and if  $d(x, y)$  is small for individuals  $x, y$ , then their predictions should be similar,  $\hat{Y}(x) \approx \hat{Y}(y)$ . Defining an adequate and protected class sensitive  $d$ , however, is challenging.

In contrast, Definition 1 presents a common group fairness condition: demographic parity [CKP09, Zli15, ZVRG15]. Demographic parity requires that the predictions of each protected group are the same, but does not directly constrain predictions for individuals within those groups. It has been criticized because it can exclude optimal predictions and make the same predictions for high performing individuals in one protected group and their lower performing counterparts in another group [DHP<sup>+</sup>12]. There are other group fairness conditions like equalized odds which allows the protected attribute to be used through observed outcomes [HPS16]. However, equalized odds does not account for settings where bias is implicit in the observed outcomes of the data set [CDG18].

## Our Contributions

Our work starts with a simple observation on the distribution of latent variables: by their definition, latent variables must be independent of protected attributes for the model to be counterfactually fair. A careful look at this statement suggests a connection to demographic parity, which requires that predictions must be independent of protected attributes. An immediate natural question is

Do algorithms that satisfy demographic parity also satisfy counterfactual fairness?

But for an algorithm to even satisfy the definition of counterfactual fairness, we need a causal model, latent variables, and a way of estimating latent variables. Our first result answers the question in the affirmative if we trivially construct the necessary counterfactual fairness machinery.

The next natural question is whether the converse holds,

Do algorithms that satisfy counterfactual fairness also satisfy demographic parity?

We answer this question in the affirmative, as well. Together, the two results suggest that counterfactual fairness is basically demographic parity. This relationship is important for the fairness community since counterfactual fairness is often celebrated as a novel tool for fair decisions while demographic parity is considered simple and flawed.

We also analyze three existing algorithms for counterfactual fairness in comparison to three benchmark algorithms. The data set is based on the running law school example and we corroborate our findings on two additional data sets and causal models. Our analysis uses a relaxation of counterfactual fairness and Kruskal-Wallis H tests (as one-sided tests for independence). We find that two simple benchmark algorithms outperform the existing algorithms in terms of satisfying the requirements of counterfactual fairness, computational efficiency, and accuracy.

We also introduce a notion of preserving group ordering. Put simply, it requires that an individual who performs better than another individual in the *same* protected group under unfair labels must also perform better than that individual under fair labels. We believe that this definition is important for transparency and consistency, laying the foundations for trust in fair algorithms. Why? Because inexplicable decisions in purportedly “fair” decision making processes can mask unforeseen technical bias [AN18, BXS<sup>+</sup>20]. Interestingly, we show that preserving group ordering can be mutually exclusive with counterfactual fairness for certain causal models. Empirically, we find the existing algorithms for counterfactual fairness have remarkably unstable orderings while the simple benchmark algorithms are consistent by design.

## Outline

- We first show that all counterfactually fair predictors satisfy demographic parity and all predictors satisfying demographic parity can be trivially modified to satisfy counterfactual fairness.
- We subsequently analyze six algorithms (including those presented in [KLRS17]) in the context of the following two questions:
  - How do these algorithms satisfy three special fairness constraints (counterfactual fairness, demographic parity, and the independence required for latent variables) while still maintaining reasonably accurate predictions?
  - How do these algorithms compare on the predictions they make at the individual level?

We corroborate our empirical results on additional data sets in the context of healthcare and loans. All our code and results are available on this **repository**.

## Related Work

Since its introduction, counterfactual fairness has been highly influential. Many recent works on equity in statistics and machine learning directly use or modify only slightly Definition 2 to enable training classifiers and other decision making algorithms [ZB18, Chi19, WZW19, CMKC20, BYF20, MC21, CSFK21, vKBK<sup>+</sup>22]. [ZB18] create a procedure for identifying discrimination and applying causal explanations, and then use counterfactuals to design repairs while offering evaluations of this system on a host of examples. [WZW19] and [Chi19] expand theoretical groundings for counterfactual fairness, with the former improving on the latent attribute identifiability by offering bounds and techniques. Prior work also expands counterfactual fairness to deal with between-group rankings [YLS20]. Furthermore, task specific variations and implementations of Definition 2 also exist for the medical domain [PDDS19], variational autoencoders in computer vision [KSJ<sup>+</sup>21], generative-adversarial networks [XWY<sup>+</sup>19], and even natural language processing [SHJY21, HZJ<sup>+</sup>19].

There are several existing concerns about counterfactual fairness. Recent work by [NGSG22] present a result that unites many causal notions of fairness, and further cautions that a gap exists between the effects of these popular approaches on fairness and their consequences, highlighting both practical and mathematical limitations. In [KS21], the authors conclude that counterfactual fairness may require what they deem to be an “incoherent theory” of social categories, i.e., some social categories may not admit counterfactual manipulation. In [KBK<sup>+</sup>20], they examine the sensitivity of counterfactual fairness to “unmeasured confounding.” This is when a true causal effect between variables can be at least partially described by a non-zero correlation between two of the  $\epsilon$ -“error” variables calculated during one possible counterfactual fairness process, which can affect the independence guarantee from  $A$ . We position our work as an important addition to this existing set of papers expressing concerns with and limitations of counterfactual fairness.

## Demographic Parity Is Counterfactual Fairness

Our results start with a simple observation about the definition of latent variables. In the original counterfactual fairness paper, the authors state that “ $U$  is a set of latent background variables, which are factors not caused by any variable in the set  $V(= A \cup X)$  of observable variables” [KLRS17]. They mean “caused” in the sense of causal models where a variable causes another variable if changing the first variable leads to a (probabilistic) change in the second variable. Put simply:

**Criteria 3.** *Latent variables must be independent of protected attributes.*

This criteria is key to understanding counterfactual fairness. At its core, counterfactual fairness attempts to explain behavior from protected attributes  $A$  and latent variables  $U$ . The protected attributes contain information on features *outside* of individuals’ control which would be unfair to base decisions on while the latent variables contain information on features *within* an individual’s control which are fair to base decisions on. From this perspective, it is clear that latent variables must be independent of protected attributes. Otherwise, this would imply that the inherent ‘worthiness’ of latent variables would problematically depend on protected attributes like race, gender, and age.

With Criteria 3 in hand, we show that any predictor which satisfies demographic parity also satisfies counterfactual fairness after a trivial modification.

Note that a predictor which satisfies counterfactual fairness must have an internal method of estimating latent variables and a causal model. So to say that a predictor which satisfies demographic parity also satisfies counterfactual fairness, we must introduce such a method and causal model. We do so in the proof of the first theorem in a trivial way.

**Theorem 4.** *Any predictor  $\hat{Y}' : X \times A \rightarrow Y$  that satisfies demographic parity can be modified into a method for estimating latent variables and a predictor  $\hat{Y} : U \times A \rightarrow Y$  that is counterfactually fair.*

*Proof.* Our estimate of the latent variables  $u$ , given protected attributes  $a$  and remaining attributes  $x$ , is  $u = \hat{Y}'(x, a)$ . Then the predictor  $\hat{Y} : U \times A \rightarrow Y$  is given by the identity function  $\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a}(u) = u$ . Because  $\hat{Y}'$  satisfies demographic parity, we know  $\Pr(u|a) = \Pr(u|a')$  for  $a, a' \in A$ . That is, latent variables are independent of protected attributes which meets Criteria 3. Further,  $\hat{Y}$  satisfies counterfactual fairness because  $\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a}(u) = u = \hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a'}(u)$ .  $\square$

The next theorem proves the converse of Theorem 4; namely, any counterfactually fair predictor also satisfies demographic parity.

**Theorem 5.** *Consider a method for estimating latent variables and a counterfactually fair predictor  $\hat{Y} : U \times X \rightarrow Y$ . Then the resulting predictor  $\hat{Y}' : X \times A \rightarrow Y$  satisfies demographic parity.*

*Proof.* Since the predictor is counterfactually fair, we know

$$\Pr(\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a}(u) = y|x, a) = \Pr(\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a'}(u) = y|x, a) \quad (1)$$

for all  $y \in Y$  where the realization of latent variables  $u \in U$  is estimated from observations  $a \in A$  and  $x \in X$ . Taking a weighted sum<sup>1</sup> of the right side of Equation (1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in X} \Pr(x|a) \Pr(\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a}(u) = y|x, a) &= \sum_{x \in X} \Pr(x, \hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a}(u) = y|a) \\ &= \Pr(\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a}(u) = y|a) = \Pr(\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a}(u) = y). \end{aligned}$$

The first equality holds because  $\Pr(x|a) \Pr(y|x, a) = \Pr(x, y|a)$  for random events  $x, y, a$ . The last equality holds by Criteria 3 and since the (possible) randomness of  $\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a}(u)$  only comes from  $u$  and the assignment  $A \leftarrow a$ . The final equality gets us close to demographic parity but the predictions could still depend on the assignment. We repeat the same steps for the left side of Equation (1) and find that

$$\Pr(\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a}(u) = y) = \Pr(\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a'}(u) = y).$$

This tells us that the distribution of predictions made by a counterfactually fair algorithm are independent of protected attributes. That is, demographic parity holds.  $\square$

Note that the contrapositive of Theorem 5 gives us a simple way to test whether a predictor is counterfactually fair.

## Algorithms for Counterfactual Fairness

In this section, we empirically analyze six algorithms in the context of counterfactual fairness on the running law school example. We compare them in terms of how well they achieve demographic parity (Definition 1), counterfactual fairness (Definition 2), and independence between protected attributes and latent variables (Criteria 3). We also compare the algorithms' test accuracy and the resulting trade-offs between fairness and performance. Finally, we investigate how predictions on individuals differ between the algorithms.

### The Algorithms

The first three algorithms—referred to as “Levels 1, 2 and 3”—come from the original counterfactual fairness paper [KLRS17]. The next two algorithms are simple heuristics for demographic parity while the final algorithm is a straightforward learner without fairness constraints.

For all the algorithms we analyze, we use a linear regression model,  $\ell_2$ -norm loss, and Adam optimizer for learning. We describe the algorithms next.

<sup>1</sup>If  $X$  contains continuous random variables, an analogous statement holds via integration.

Listing 1: Converting unfair predictions to fair predictions when labels are normally distributed.

```

1 Input:  $n$  group identities  $a_i \in A$  and unfair labels  $\bar{y}_i$  for samples  $i \in [n]$ 
2 Output: predictions  $\hat{y}_i$  that satisfy demographic parity
3  $\mu \leftarrow \text{mean}(\{\bar{y}_i : i \in [n]\})$ 
4  $\sigma \leftarrow \text{std}(\{\bar{y}_i : i \in [n]\})$ 
5 for  $a$  in  $A$  do
6    $\mu_a \leftarrow \text{mean}(\{\bar{y}_i : a_i = a\})$ 
7    $\sigma_a \leftarrow \text{std}(\{\bar{y}_i : a_i = a\})$ 
8   for  $i$  in  $\{i : a_i = a\}$  do
9      $\hat{y}_i = \mu + \sigma(\bar{y}_i - \mu_a)/\sigma_a$ 

```

Listing 2: Converting unfair predictions to fair predictions under any distribution of labels.

```

1 Input:  $n$  group identities  $a_i \in A$  and unfair labels  $\bar{y}_i$  for samples  $i \in [n]$ 
2 Output: predictions  $\hat{y}_i$  that satisfy demographic parity
3  $CDF \leftarrow$  empirical CDF of  $\{y_i : i \in [n]\}$ 
4 for  $a$  in  $A$  do
5    $CDF_a \leftarrow$  empirical CDF of  $\{y_i : a_i = a\}$ 
6   for  $i$  in  $\{i : a_i = a\}$ 
7      $\hat{y}_i \leftarrow CDF(CDF_a^{-1}(\bar{y}_i))$ 

```

**Level 1** Since evaluating the relationships between variables in a causal model is computationally expensive, the first level only uses the remaining variables that are independent of protected attributes to learn the outcomes. In practice, scenarios where remaining variables are not at least partially conditioned on protected attributes are so rare as to be virtually non-existent. Instead, we implement Level 1 by using all remaining variables (without any protected attributes). This approach has been called “fairness through unawareness” [GHZGW16] and fails to make fair decisions because protected attributes are often redundantly encoded [PRT08].

**Level 2** The second level uses the full power of causal models, but suffers from expensive and intensive computations; it requires domain expertise to specify the joint distributions over all variables for the causal model. Remaining variables are distributed according to subsets of latent variables and protected attributes. By using the known protected attributes, the remaining variables, and the causal model, Level 2 estimates likely values of latent variables. Then only the latent variables are used to learn a predictor over the set of possible outcomes.

**Level 3** The third level is a compromise between the simplicity of Level 1 and complexity of Level 2. Level 3 uses the relationships in the causal model to express the remaining variables of each individual as a deterministic function of related protected attributes and a special explanation term. The deterministic function is learned from protected attributes to explain the remaining variable. Then the difference between the deterministic function and an individual’s remaining variable is their explanation term. These explanation terms are used to learn the outcomes.

The next two algorithms are simple heuristics for demographic parity.

**Listing 1** The first listing assumes the distribution of outcomes in every protected group is normally distributed. Then we can achieve demographic parity by simply calculating the normalized score of each individual within their protected group and converting it to the outcome distribution of the full population.

**Listing 2** The second listing drops the assumption on the distribution of each protected group. Instead, Listing 2 estimates the cumulative density function (CDF) of each protected group and converts an individual’s relative position within their group to the same position within the full population.

Listing 1 is appropriate when the outcomes are normally distributed while Listing 2 is appropriate in general but cannot distinguish noise from signal in distributions.

**Full Linear Model** The final algorithm uses a linear model on all protected attributes and remaining variables to learn outcomes. We expect the full linear model to mimic the unfair behavior of the underlying data but achieve the best test accuracy.




Figure 3: Density plots for the distributions over predictions made by the six algorithms we consider. The root mean squared error (rMSE) is given next to each title and in Table 2. Groups 1, 2, 3, and 4 correspond to protected groups over the Cartesian product of binary race and gender.

## Measures of Fairness

We use several empirical tests to measure how well each of the algorithms achieves different definitions of fairness.

We first define a relaxation of counterfactual fairness introduced in [RKLS17].

**Definition 6** ( $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -Approximate Counterfactual Fairness (ACF)). *A predictor  $\hat{Y} : X \times A \rightarrow Y$  satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -ACF if*

$$\Pr(|\hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a}(u) - \hat{Y}_{A \leftarrow a'}(u)| \leq \epsilon | x, a) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Notice that calculating  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -ACF requires an internal estimate of latent variables. The only algorithms that have a nontrivial estimate of latent variables are Level 2 and Level 3. Since both Level 2 and Level 3 use *only* the latent variables in learning the outcomes, changing the protected attribute has no effect and both algorithms are  $(0, 0)$ -ACF.

For testing demographic parity and whether latent variables are independent of protected attributes, we use the Kruskal-Wallis H test [KW52].

**Definition 7** (Kruskal-Wallis H Statistic). *The H statistic is given by*

$$(N - 1) \frac{\sum_{i=1}^g n_i (\bar{r}_i - \bar{r})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^g \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (r_{ij} - \bar{r})^2}$$

where  $N$  is the total number of observations,  $g$  is the number of groups,  $n_i$  is the number of observations in group  $i$ ,  $r_{ij}$  is the rank (among all observations) of observation  $j$  from group  $i$ ,  $\bar{r}_i$  is the average rank of observations in group  $i$ , and  $\bar{r}$  is the average rank of all observations.

Using the Kruskal-Wallis H statistic, we can calculate the probability that every group comes from a distribution with the same median. Since the latent variables are independent of the protected attributes if and only if the distributions of the protected groups are the same, a small probability from the Kruskal-Wallis H test implies that the latent variables and protected attributes are not independent. We also use the test to determine whether an algorithm satisfies demographic parity. Note it is possible that all groups come from distributions with the same median but that the distributions are in fact different so the test has one-sided error.

We present our results of the Kruskal-Wallis H tests in Table 1. The first three data rows tell us the probability that Criteria 3 holds. It is very likely that the latent variables in each protected group come from distributions with the same median in Level 2, suggesting that Level 2 satisfies Criteria 3 in addition to counterfactual fairness. In contrast, it is unlikely (probability  $< .05$ ) that the two latent variables in Level 3 are independent of protected attributes, suggesting that Level 3 does not satisfy Criteria 3. Note that Level 3 is an example of an algorithm that ostensibly satisfies counterfactual fairness but the latent variables do not meet the necessary condition of Criteria 3.

The last six rows in Table 1 tell us whether each algorithm satisfies demographic parity. As expected, Level 1 and the Full Linear Model are *remarkably* unlikely to satisfy demographic parity. In line with the results for latent variables, we see that Level 3 also is unlikely to satisfy demographic parity. Finally, Level 2 likely satisfies demographic parity. This is to be expected since the assumptions of Theorem 5—namely, counterfactual fairness and Criteria 3—hold. Of course, Listings 1 and 2 are very likely to satisfy demographic parity by design.

Variable	H Statistic	$p$ -value
Level 2 Latent Variable	.347	.951
Level 3 Latent UGPA	10.8	.0126
Level 3 Latent LSAT	84.6	$3.21 \times 10^{-18}$
Level 1 Predictions	221	$9.81 \times 10^{-48}$
Level 2 Predictions	.346	.951
Level 3 Predictions	69.3	$5.97 \times 10^{-15}$
Listing 1 Predictions	.165	.983
Listing 2 Predictions	.035	.998
Full Predictions	829	$2.53 \times 10^{-179}$

Table 1: Kruskal-Wallis H test results for different variables. The  $p$ -value indicates the likelihood of observing the H statistic if the variable was distributed the same in every group. Every number is reported to three significant figures.

Table 2 gives the root mean squared error (rMSE) of every algorithm we consider. As expected, the Full Linear Model without fairness constraints has the lowest error. Listing 1 and Listing 2 also give relatively low error. In contrast, Level 2 has the highest error. So far, Level 2 simultaneously satisfies Definition 1, Definition 2, and Criteria 3 but we see this is at the expense of accuracy.

## Individual Predictions

We have seen how the algorithms we consider perform differently in terms of three fairness measures. But how do the algorithms differ on the actual outcomes for individuals?

Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lst 1	Lst 2	Full
.933	.936	.908	.919	.921	.881

Table 2: The root mean squared error (rMSE) for each algorithm predicted to three significant figures.

Figure 4 visualizes the change in relative ordering of predicted outcomes for 40 randomly chosen individuals in Group 1 (Black men) in the law school example. Notably, the relative ordering is constant between Listing 1, Listing 2, and the Full Linear Model, as expected. However, the relative ordering is *highly* unstable for Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3. This suggests that while Level 2 and Level 3 achieve counterfactual fairness, they do so in dramatically different ways. One explanation is that Level 2 satisfies Criteria 3 while Level 3 does not.




Figure 4: We randomly sample 40 individuals from Group 1 (Black men) in the law school example and visualize how the relative order of their predicted outcomes changes based on the algorithm making predictions.

We find it surprising that Level 2 does not agree with Listing 1 and Listing 2 on the relative order of outcomes. All three algorithms satisfy demographic parity, Criteria 3, and, by Theorem 4, counterfactual fairness (when Listing 1 and Listing 2 are trivially modified). How could it be that two algorithms are both fair under the same definitions while making radically different predictions on individuals?

This question suggests the following natural definition.

**Definition 8** (Preserving Group Ordering). *Given unfair labels, we say an algorithm preserves group ordering if the relative ordering within each protected group under the unfair labels is the the same as the relative ordering of individuals induced by the algorithm’s predictions.*

Put differently, if individuals are in the same protected class, then their relative ordering from a (possibly) unfair predictor should induce the same relative ordering as the fair predictor. That is, if an individual performs better under the same unfair conditions as another individual, they should perform better in a hypothetical world where those unfair conditions were removed.

We believe that preserved within-group orderings are preferable to the highly unstable orderings in the levels of [KLR17]. One reason to prefer preserved orderings is that even soft guarantees for relative orderings of within group individuals leads to more transparent, trustworthy and ultimately *useful* fair algorithms [AN18, BXS<sup>+</sup>20].

Observe that Listing 1 and Listing 2 satisfy Definition 8 by design. This contrasts with Levels 1, 2, and 3 which radically change the relative ordering of individuals within a protected group. In Proposition 9, we show that there is a causal model where counterfactual fairness is mutually exclusive with Definition 8. This suggests that for some causal models, achieving counterfactual fairness and preserving relative group ordering are incompatible.

Note that Proposition 9, combined with the fact that Listing 1 and 2 satisfy demographic parity and preserve group order, does not refute Theorem 4 since the method of estimating latent variables in the proof of the theorem uses a trivial causal model.

**Proposition 9.** *There is a causal model where a counterfactually fair algorithm does not maintain the relative ordering of predictions within each group.*

*Proof.* We construct an example causal model. The simplified protected attribute is binary Height ( $H = \{\text{Short, Tall}\}$ ), the inherent attributes are continuous Problem Solving (PS) and Charisma (C), the observable variable is continuous Networking (N), and the outcome is continuous Employability (E). Let the directed acyclic graph and functions be given by the following description: Networking is twice Charisma if height is tall and Charisma otherwise ( $N = 2C$  if  $H = \text{Tall}$  and  $C$  otherwise). Employability is simply Networking plus Problem Solving ( $E = N + PS$ ). Consider two people, both with height  $H = \text{Short}$ : Person 1 has Problem Solving 9 and Charisma 1 while Person 2 has Problem Solving 4 and Charisma 5. In the real world, where both Person 1 and Person 2 are Short, they have Employability scores of 10 and 9, respectively. However, in the counterfactual world where both are Tall, their Employability scores are 11 and 14, respectively. The counterfactual change in this model induces a different ordering with respect to the target variable Employability on individuals in the same protected group.  $\square$

**Additional Experiments** So far we have reported on the extensive empirical experiments we ran on the law school data set. We corroborate our findings by running the same set of experiments on two more examples. The first example is data from the Home Credit Default Risk data set<sup>2</sup>. We simulated a “domain expert” process of causal analysis and constructed a credit risk causal model by hand (using observations from the data). The second example is synthetic data generated *directly* from a causal model we built, modeling a hypothetical healthcare context loosely motivated by [OPVM19], and represents the “ideal” circumstance where the causal model posited over the data is certainly correct. We show the causal models in Figure 5. The remaining figures and results are included for reproducibility in the the same **repository** as the rest of our results.




Figure 5: The causal diagrams for the default risk example (on the left) and healthcare example (on the right).

## Conclusion

Counterfactual fairness has been celebrated as novel and promising while demographic parity has been treated as simple and flawed. Our work shows how the two definitions of fairness are basically equivalent. We think it is a promising avenue for future work to identify similarities between other definitions of fairness.

In terms of how we actually make fair decisions, our work provides a deep analysis of three existing algorithms to achieve counterfactual fairness in comparison to three benchmark algorithms. We find that the existing algorithms generally do not satisfy the requirements of counterfactual fairness and, if they do,

<sup>2</sup><https://www.kaggle.com/c/home-credit-default-risk>

sacrifice accuracy and computational efficiency. In contrast, two simple benchmark algorithms outperform the existing algorithms in fairness, accuracy, and efficiency. We also introduce a method for comparing algorithms at the level of individual predictions. Our empirical findings suggest a natural definition of preserving group orderings which can be mutually exclusive with counterfactual fairness. We believe that it is preferable to have a transparent and consistent policy when making decisions about individuals. Therefore we leave open the problem of designing novel algorithms that are competitive with simple benchmarks in terms of fairness, performance, and preserving group orderings.

## References

- [AN18] Behnoush Abdollahi and Olfa Nasraoui. Transparency in fair machine learning: the case of explainable recommender systems. In *Human and machine learning*, pages 21–35. Springer, 2018.
- [BXS<sup>+</sup>20] Umang Bhatt, Alice Xiang, Shubham Sharma, Adrian Weller, Ankur Taly, Yunhan Jia, Joydeep Ghosh, Ruchir Puri, José MF Moura, and Peter Eckersley. Explainable machine learning in deployment. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 648–657, 2020.
- [BYF20] Emily Black, Samuel Yeom, and Matt Fredrikson. Fliptest: fairness testing via optimal transport. *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 2020.
- [CDG18] Sam Corbett-Davies and Sharad Goel. The measure and mismeasure of fairness: A critical review of fair machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.00023*, 2018.
- [Chi19] Silvia Chiappa. Path-specific counterfactual fairness. In *AAAI*, 2019.
- [Cho16] Alexandra Chouldechova. Fair prediction with disparate impact: A study of bias in recidivism prediction instruments, 2016.
- [CKP09] Toon Calders, Faisal Kamiran, and Mykola Pechenizkiy. Building classifiers with independency constraints. In *2009 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops*, pages 13–18. IEEE, 2009.
- [CMKC20] Amanda Coston, Alan Mishler, Edward H Kennedy, and Alexandra Chouldechova. Counterfactual risk assessments, evaluation, and fairness. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 582–593, 2020.
- [CSFK21] Yoichi Chikahara, Shinsaku Sakaue, Akinori Fujino, and Hisashi Kashima. Learning individually fair classifier with path-specific causal-effect constraint. In *AISTATS*, 2021.
- [DHP<sup>+</sup>12] Cynthia Dwork, Moritz Hardt, Toniann Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Richard Zemel. Fairness through awareness. In *Proceedings of the 3rd innovations in theoretical computer science conference*, pages 214–226, 2012.
- [FFM<sup>+</sup>15] Michael Feldman, Sorelle A Friedler, John Moeller, Carlos Scheidegger, and Suresh Venkatasubramanian. Certifying and removing disparate impact. In *proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 259–268, 2015.

- [GHZGW16] Nina Grgic-Hlaca, Muhammad Bilal Zafar, Krishna P Gummadi, and Adrian Weller. The case for process fairness in learning: Feature selection for fair decision making. In *NIPS symposium on machine learning and the law*, volume 1, page 2, 2016.
- [HPS16] Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nati Srebro. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29:3315–3323, 2016.
- [HZJ<sup>+</sup>19] Po-Sen Huang, Huan Zhang, Ray Jiang, Robert Stanforth, Johannes Welbl, Jack Rae, Vishal Maini, Dani Yogatama, and Pushmeet Kohli. Reducing sentiment bias in language models via counterfactual evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.03064*, 2019.
- [KBK<sup>+</sup>20] Niki Kilbertus, Philip J Ball, Matt J Kusner, Adrian Weller, and Ricardo Silva. The sensitivity of counterfactual fairness to unmeasured confounding. In *Uncertainty in artificial intelligence*, pages 616–626. PMLR, 2020.
- [KLRS17] Matt J Kusner, Joshua R Loftus, Chris Russell, and Ricardo Silva. Counterfactual fairness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.06856*, 2017.
- [KMR16] Jon Kleinberg, Sendhil Mullainathan, and Manish Raghavan. Inherent trade-offs in the fair determination of risk scores, 2016.
- [KS21] Atoosa Kasirzadeh and Andrew Smart. The use and misuse of counterfactuals in ethical machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 228–236, 2021.
- [KSJ<sup>+</sup>21] Hyemi Kim, Seungjae Shin, Joonho Jang, Kyungwoo Song, Weonyoung Joo, Wanmo Kang, and Il-Chul Moon. Counterfactual fairness with disentangled causal effect variational autoencoder. In *AAAI*, 2021.
- [KW52] William H Kruskal and W Allen Wallis. Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 47(260):583–621, 1952.
- [MC21] Vishwali Mhasawade and Rumi Chunara. Causal multi-level fairness. In *Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 784–794, 2021.
- [MPB<sup>+</sup>21] Shira Mitchell, Eric Potash, Solon Barocas, Alexander D’Amour, and Kristian Lum. Algorithmic fairness: Choices, assumptions, and definitions. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 8:141–163, 2021.
- [NGSG22] Hamed Nilforoshan, Johann D. Gaebler, Ravi Shroff, and Sharad Goel. Causal conceptions of fairness and their consequences. In *ICML*, 2022.
- [OPVM19] Ziad Obermeyer, Brian Powers, Christine Vogeli, and Sendhil Mullainathan. Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science*, 366(6464):447–453, 2019.
- [P<sup>+</sup>00] Judea Pearl et al. Models, reasoning and inference. *Cambridge, UK: CambridgeUniversity-Press*, 19:2, 2000.
- [PDDS19] Stephen R. Pfohl, Tony Duan, Daisy Yi Ding, and Nigam Haresh Shah. Counterfactual reasoning for fair clinical risk prediction. *ArXiv*, abs/1907.06260, 2019.

- [PRT08] Dino Pedreshi, Salvatore Ruggieri, and Franco Turini. Discrimination-aware data mining. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 560–568, 2008.
- [Raw04] John Rawls. A theory of justice. In *Ethics*, pages 229–234. Routledge, 2004.
- [RKLS17] Chris Russell, Matt J Kusner, Joshua Loftus, and Ricardo Silva. When worlds collide: integrating different counterfactual assumptions in fairness. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [SHJY21] Leda Sari, Mark Hasegawa-Johnson, and Chang D Yoo. Counterfactually fair automatic speech recognition. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 29:3515–3525, 2021.
- [vKBK<sup>+</sup>22] Julius von Kügelgen, Umang Bhatt, Amir-Hossein Karimi, Isabel Valera, Adrian Weller, and Bernhard Scholkopf. On the fairness of causal algorithmic recourse. In *AAAI*, 2022.
- [WZW19] Yongkai Wu, Lu Zhang, and Xintao Wu. Counterfactual fairness: Unidentification, bound and algorithm. In *IJCAI*, 2019.
- [XWY<sup>+</sup>19] Depeng Xu, Yongkai Wu, Shuhan Yuan, Lu Zhang, and Xintao Wu. Achieving causal fairness through generative adversarial networks. In *IJCAI*, 2019.
- [YLS20] Ke Yang, Joshua R Loftus, and Julia Stoyanovich. Causal intersectionality for fair ranking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.08688*, 2020.
- [ZB18] Junzhe Zhang and Elias Bareinboim. Fairness in decision-making - the causal explanation formula. In *AAAI*, 2018.
- [Zli15] Indre Zliobaite. On the relation between accuracy and fairness in binary classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.05723*, 2015.
- [ZVRG15] Muhammad Bilal Zafar, Isabel Valera, Manuel Gomez Rodriguez, and Krishna P Gummadi. Learning fair classifiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.05259*, 1(2), 2015.