

Unfair Utilities and First Steps Towards Improving Them

Frederik Hytting Jørgensen
 Dept. of Mathematical Sciences
 University of Copenhagen
 Copenhagen, Denmark
 frederik.hytting@math.ku.dk

Sebastian Weichwald
 Dept. of Mathematical Sciences
 University of Copenhagen
 Copenhagen, Denmark
 sweichwald@math.ku.dk

Jonas Peters*
 Dept. of Mathematics
 ETH Zurich
 Zurich, Switzerland
 jonas.peters@stat.math.ethz.ch

June 2, 2023

Abstract

Many fairness criteria constrain the policy or choice of predictors. In this work, we propose a different framework for thinking about fairness: Instead of constraining the policy or choice of predictors, we consider which utility a policy is optimizing for. We define value of information fairness and propose to not use utilities that do not satisfy this criterion. We describe how to modify a utility to satisfy this fairness criterion and discuss the consequences this might have on the corresponding optimal policies.

1 Introduction

A challenge in algorithmic fairness is to formalize the notion of fairness. Often, one attribute S is considered protected (also called sensitive) and a quantity Y is to be predicted as \hat{Y} from some covariates \mathbf{X} . Many criteria for fairness correspond to constraints on the joint distribution of $(S, \mathbf{X}, Y, \hat{Y})$ that can often be phrased as (conditional) independence statements or take the causal structure of the problem into account [see, for example, Barocas et al., 2023, Verma and Rubin, 2018, Nilforoshan et al., 2022, for an overview].

In this work, we propose an alternative point of view that considers situations where an agent aims to optimize a policy as to maximize a known utility. In such scenarios, unwanted discrimination may occur if the utility itself is unfair. Suppose that the agent has access to a set of features that are considered essential for the problem at hand. Suppose further that, given these essential features, the utility incentivizes the agent to infer the protected attribute, that is, an optimal policy based on the essential features and the protected attribute receives a strictly higher expected utility than an optimal policy based on the essential features. We call such a utility unfair. We formalize this notion using value of information (VoI) [Howard, 1966] and call the corresponding criterion VoI-fairness. We discuss examples of VoI-unfair utilities that would lead to unwanted discrimination if used (Example 2.2, 3.11, and 4.4). We provide a graphical criterion for VoI-fairness for when the underlying causal structure is known. We discuss how VoI-unfair utilities may be improved to obtain VoI-fair utilities that are close to the original utility and apply this concept to concrete examples. (Appendix G contains an overview of all

*Parts of this work were done while JP was at the University of Copenhagen

examples in this paper.) Finally, we show that, in general, the proposed utility-centric approach yields different implications than existing concepts of fairness.

2 Setting and an example

We now introduce the model class that we use throughout the paper. We will consider variables \mathbf{X} , a decision D , and a utility U . Our setting is similar to a contextual bandit setup where we usually say ‘action’ instead of ‘decision’ and ‘reward’ instead of ‘utility’ [see, e.g., Sutton and Barto, 2018].¹ Formally, we consider a structural causal model [Pearl, 2009] with one node being the decision D and one sink node being the utility U , similar to the framework of Everitt et al. [2021]. However, we only consider interventions on the utility and decision nodes. Graphical models of a similar type have been discussed as influence diagram graphs and influence diagrams [Nilsson and Lauritzen, 2003, van Merwijk et al., 2022, Dawid, 2002].

Setting 2.1. We have variables $(\mathbf{X}, D, U) = (X_1, \dots, X_d, D, U)$, where D is the *decision* and U is the *utility*. One of the features, denoted by² $S \in \mathbf{X}$, is a *protected attribute*. We assume that S is a non-descendant of D in the graph defined below. We assume that \mathbf{X} , U , and D take values in \mathbb{R}^d , \mathbb{R} , and a finite set \mathcal{D} , respectively. Let $\mathbf{O}^D \subseteq \{X_1, \dots, X_d\}$ and $\mathbf{O}^U \subseteq \{X_1, \dots, X_d, D\}$ represent variables that can be used as input for the decision and the utility, respectively, which, in particular, implies that they are observed. We assume that $\mathbf{O}^D \subseteq \mathbf{O}^U$. Let $\Upsilon := \{v \mid v : \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{O}^U|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$ denote the set of utility mechanisms. For $v \in \Upsilon$, let $\mathbf{PA}^U \subseteq \mathbf{O}^U$ (the *parents of U*) be the unique smallest subset of \mathbf{O}^U for which there exists a function $v^* : \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{PA}^U|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $v^*(\mathbf{pa}^U) = v(\mathbf{o}^U)$ for all $\mathbf{o}^U \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{O}^U|}$, where \mathbf{pa}^U is the coordinate projection of \mathbf{o}^U onto \mathbf{PA}^U . We can then regard v as a function $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{PA}^U|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

We further consider measurable structural assignments $f_{\mathbf{X}} = (f_1, \dots, f_d)$ and jointly independent noise variables $(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_d)$ with distribution $P_{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{X}}} = P_1 \otimes \dots \otimes P_d$. Each variable $X_i \in \mathbf{X}$ is given by $X_i := f_i(\mathbf{PA}^i, \varepsilon_i)$ for some $\mathbf{PA}^i \subseteq \mathbf{X} \cup \{D\}$. Within each example that we discuss in this paper, we consider $\mathcal{C} := (f_{\mathbf{X}}, P_{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{X}}}, \mathbf{O}^D, \mathbf{O}^U, \mathcal{D})$ as fixed. Given \mathcal{C} and utility mechanism v , we let \mathcal{G} be the graph over \mathbf{X} , D , and U induced by $f_{\mathbf{X}}$, \mathbf{O}^D , and \mathbf{PA}^U . We assume that \mathcal{C} and v are such that \mathcal{G} is a DAG, in which U is a descendant of D , and U has no children (Everitt et al. [2021] call this a causal influence diagram). We indicate \mathbf{O}^D by red dashed arrows, see Figure 1, for example. Let $\Delta(\mathcal{D})$ denote the set of probability distributions on \mathcal{D} , and for $\mathbf{M} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \setminus \mathbf{DE}^D$, let $\Pi^{\mathbf{M}}$ denote the set of policies taking \mathbf{M} as input.³ If there exists a $d \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\pi(\mathbf{M})(d) = 1$, we may write $\pi(\mathbf{M}) = d$. Even though we have introduced \mathbf{O}^D as the input variables for D , we do not require that $\mathbf{M} \subseteq \mathbf{O}^D$; that is, we sometimes consider hypothetical situations where the decision is a function of variables that an actual decision could not be a function of. In the graph, we let \mathbf{O}^D be the parents of D . We call \mathbf{O}^D the *usable decision inputs* and $\mathbf{M} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \setminus \mathbf{DE}^D$ the *hypothetical decision inputs*. If $\pi \in \Pi^{\mathbf{O}^D}$ is a policy taking \mathbf{O}^D as input, we say that π is *realizable*.

In summary, we consider models of the form $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{M}, \pi, v)$ containing a background model \mathcal{C} , hypothetical decision inputs \mathbf{M} , a policy $\pi \in \Pi^{\mathbf{M}}$, and a utility mechanism $v \in \Upsilon$. Sometimes, we consider a class of models in which some components are left unspecified. For example, if the policy $\pi \in \Pi^{\mathbf{M}}$ is unspecified, we write $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{M}, \cdot_{\pi}, v)$. This construction with unspecified policy is sometimes called a structural causal influence model [Everitt et al., 2021], see also Saengkyongam et al. [2023].

Any model $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{M}, \pi, v)$ with $\mathcal{C} = (f_{\mathbf{X}}, P_{N_{\mathbf{X}}}, \mathbf{O}^D, \mathbf{O}^U, \mathcal{D})$ induces a structural causal model and a unique distribution over (\mathbf{X}, D, U) [Pearl, 2009, Bongers et al., 2021]. This distribution is described by the following procedure:

¹In this work, we assume that the structural assignment of the utility is known. This is usually not assumed in a reinforcement learning setting. This assumption comes without loss of generality: we can create an additional node $U := R$, where R is the reward, thereby translating a traditional problem in reinforcement learning into our framework.

²By slight abuse of notation, we sometimes regard vectors, such as \mathbf{X} , as a set.

³Formally, $\Pi^{\mathbf{M}} := \{\pi : \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{X}|} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{D}) \mid \exists \pi^{\mathbf{M}} : \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{M}|} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{D}) \text{ s.t. } \forall x \pi(x) \equiv \pi^{\mathbf{M}}(x^{\mathbf{M}})\}$. By slight abuse of notation, for such π , we write expressions such as $\pi(\mathbf{M})$.

We require that v depends non-trivially on all variables in \mathbf{PA}^U , but $\pi \in \Pi^{\mathbf{M}}$ is allowed to depend trivially on variables in \mathbf{M} .




Figure 1: Graph induced by \mathcal{C} and v from Example 2.2. The graph contains utility node U and decision node D . The usable decision inputs are $\mathcal{O}^D = \{A\}$. In this made up example, when looking for an optimal policy in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{O}^D, \cdot_\pi, v)$, there could be (depending on the structural assignments), an incentive to infer parental status: Formally, we say that the graph admits value of information (VoI) for parental status relative to application material, see Definition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2. This would hold true even if we used Q as the decision input: The graph admits value of information for parental status relative to $\{Q\}$. If parental status has VoI relative to $\{Q\}$, we say that U is not $\{Q\}$ -VoI-fair, see Definition 3.3.

- (1) Fix the utility mechanism $v \in \Upsilon$.
- (2) Fix hypothetical decision inputs $\mathbf{M} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \setminus \mathbf{DE}^D$.
- (3) Fix the policy $\pi \in \Pi^{\mathbf{M}}$.
- (4) Sample $\mathbf{X} \setminus \mathbf{DE}^D$, decision $D \sim \pi(\mathbf{M})$, $\mathbf{DE}^D \setminus \{U\}$, and utility $U := v(\mathbf{PA}^U)$.

The sampling in (4) is done independently for different observations. We say that a policy $\pi \in \Pi^{\mathbf{M}}$ is optimal in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{M}, \cdot_\pi, v)$ if $\mathbb{E}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{M}, \pi, v)}(U) \geq \mathbb{E}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{M}, \pi', v)}(U)$ for all $\pi' \in \Pi^{\mathbf{M}}$. \circ

We now consider an example of the class of models described in Setting 2.1.

Example 2.2 (Parental status at hiring). Consider $(\mathcal{C}, \cdot_{\mathbf{M}}, \cdot_\pi, v)$ with unspecified policy and induced graph shown in Figure 1. Here, the usable decision inputs are $\mathcal{O}^D = \{A\}$. Quality of work and work hours cannot be used by the policy since the values of these variables are only realized after the decision. We further make the following simplifying assumptions (recognizing that they may be violated in reality): Qualifications and unknown factors cannot be used as these are unobserved, and parental status cannot be used because of legal restraints. Parental status may have an effect on application material, for example, through the number of years of work experience. We further assume that parental status has a direct effect on work hours but not on the quality of work.

Consider a hiring setting where the utility U is the number of satisfied customers, which is a function of the applicant's future quality of work Q , work hours W , and the hiring decision $D \in \{0, 1\}$; for example, $v(D, Q, W) := D \cdot Q \cdot W$. When we design policies to maximize the utility in this setting, there may, depending on the structural assignments, be an incentive to infer parental status (which carries information about work hours W) from the application material A . Formally, we will see that the graph admits that parental status has value of information relative to $\{A\}$ (see Definition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2). Furthermore, one could argue that Q , if it were available during decision time, should be used by the policy even though it may depend statistically on parental status. We will call such variables essential features. Since work hours is a (noisy) function of parental status and enters the utility, the graph admits that parental status has VoI relative to $\{Q\}$ (see Definition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2). So even in a hypothetical situation where we could use quality of work as a decision input, there may still be an incentive to infer parental status.

If, however, we remove the dependence on W and change the utility to $\tilde{v}(D, Q) := D \cdot Q$, parental status does not have VoI relative to $\{Q\}$. Under this utility, there would be no incentive to infer parental status if we knew quality of work: parental status does not have VoI relative to $\{Q\}$, see Proposition 3.4. \circ

3 Value of information fairness

3.1 Value of information

The concept of value of information dates back to Howard [1966]; see also Everitt et al. [2021]. A variable S has VoI relative to \mathbf{M} if one can obtain a strictly larger expected utility if the policy π is allowed to be a function of S in addition to \mathbf{M} compared to when π is only a function of \mathbf{M} . More formally, we have the following definition.

Definition 3.1 (Value of information, VoI). We say that a variable $S \in \mathbf{X} \setminus \mathbf{DE}^D$ has *value of information (VoI) in* $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{M}, \cdot_\pi, v)$ if

$$\max_{\pi \in \Pi^{\mathbf{M} \cup \{S\}}} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{M} \cup \{S\}, \pi, v)}(U) > \max_{\pi \in \Pi^{\mathbf{M}}} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{M}, \pi, v)}(U).$$

We sometimes say that S has VoI relative to \mathbf{M} as shorthand for ‘ S has VoI in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{M}, \cdot_\pi, v)$ ’.

We further say that a DAG \mathcal{G} over (\mathbf{X}, D, U) , where U is a descendant of D and U has no children, *admits value of information for S relative to $\mathbf{M} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \setminus \mathbf{DE}^D$* if there exists a background model \mathcal{C} and utility mechanism v such that S has VoI in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{M}, \cdot_\pi, v)$ and the induced graph equals \mathcal{G} . \circ

Whether S has VoI in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{M}, \cdot_\pi, v)$ does not depend on \mathbf{O}^D . The concept of VoI has already proven useful for analyzing algorithmic fairness: Ashurst et al. [2022] use it to analyze conditions under which algorithms may amplify disparities. We use it, instead, to analyze unfair utilities. The following proposition establishes a graphical criterion for the concept of admitting VoI.

Proposition 3.2 (Graphical criterion for admitting VoI). A DAG \mathcal{G} over (\mathbf{X}, D, U) , where U is a descendant of D and U has no children, admits VoI for $S \in \mathbf{X} \setminus \mathbf{DE}^D$ relative to $\mathbf{M} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \setminus (\mathbf{DE}^D \cup \{S\})$ if and only if

$$S \not\perp_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{PA}^D := \mathbf{M}}} U \mid \mathbf{M}. \quad (1)$$

Here, $\perp_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{PA}^D := \mathbf{M}}}$ denotes d -separation in the DAG $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{PA}^D := \mathbf{M}}$ obtained from \mathcal{G} by modifying the parents of D to be \mathbf{M} . \circ

We provide a proof in Appendix A. The statement follows from Theorem 9 in Everitt et al. [2021]. Saengkyongam et al. [2023] discuss a non-invariance property that is similar to (1) with S being the environment.

3.2 Value of information fairness

Assume that we are given a protected attribute $S \in \mathbf{X} \setminus \mathbf{DE}^D$ and a set of essential features⁴ $\mathbf{F} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \setminus (\mathbf{DE}^D \cup \{S\})$. If there is an incentive to infer S in the situation where the essential features are known, we say that a utility violates value of information fairness.

Definition 3.3 (Value of information fairness). Let \mathcal{C} and a set $\mathbf{F} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \setminus (\mathbf{DE}^D \cup \{S\})$ of *essential features* be given. We say that a utility $U := v(\mathbf{O}^U)$ satisfies *\mathbf{F} -VoI-fairness* if S does not have VoI in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{F}, \cdot_\pi, v)$. \circ

This definition does not depend on the policy being used. It does not depend on the usable decision inputs \mathbf{O}^D , either, that is, whether or not a utility satisfies VoI-fairness does not hinge on what variables are available for making decisions.

The following result provides a graphical criterion for VoI-fairness; it follows from Proposition 3.2.

Proposition 3.4 (Graphical criterion for VoI-fairness). Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{F}, \cdot_\pi, v)$ be given for $\mathbf{F} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \setminus (\mathbf{DE}^D \cup \{S\})$ and let \mathcal{G} be the induced graph. If

$$S \perp_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{PA}^D := \mathbf{F}}} U \mid \mathbf{F},$$

then v is \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair. \circ

⁴In some situations, even S might be an essential feature. We ignore these cases.




Figure 2: This figure depicts the graph \mathcal{G} of $(\mathcal{C}, \cdot_M, \cdot_\pi, v)$ from Example 3.8 with $\mathcal{O}^D = \{\text{Grade}, S\}$. \mathcal{G} does not admit VoI for S relative to $\{\text{Effort}\}$, so U is $\{\text{Effort}\}$ -VoI-fair, but \mathcal{G} does admit VoI for S relative to $\{\text{Grade}\}$. Indeed, an $\{\text{Effort}\}$ -VoI-fair policy will use S to obtain a better estimate of effort.

Proposition 3.4 implies that VoI-fairness holds if the utility is a function only of essential features and the decision.

Corollary 3.5. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{F}, \cdot_\pi, v)$ for $\mathbf{F} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \setminus (\mathbf{DE}^D \cup \{S\})$ be given. If $\mathbf{PA}^U \subseteq \mathbf{F} \cup \{D\}$, then U is \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair. \circ

We now illustrate the above concepts and results in the context of the hiring example from the previous section.

Example 3.6 (Parental status at hiring; Example 2.2 continued). We assume that quality of work, Q , is the only essential feature, $\mathbf{F} = \{Q\}$, and that parental status is a protected attribute. The graph admits VoI for parental status relative to $\{Q\}$, see Proposition 3.2. Assume that parental status does indeed have VoI relative to $\{Q\}$.⁵ Then, U is not $\{Q\}$ -VoI-fair. However, the utility $\tilde{U} := \tilde{v}(Q, D) = D \cdot Q$, is $\{Q\}$ -VoI-fair since S does not have VoI in $(\mathcal{C}, \{Q\}, \cdot_\pi, \tilde{v})$. We modified the utility such that it is a function of only D and essential features. By Corollary 3.5, this results in a $\{Q\}$ -VoI-fair utility. \circ

Given an \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair utility, we define an \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair policy as an optimal policy that is a function only of useful variables, that is, $\pi \in \Pi^H$ for a subset $H \subseteq \mathcal{O}^D$ where each variable $X \in H$ has VoI relative to $H \setminus \{X\}$. This requirement ensures that an \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair policy is not arbitrarily discriminating based on irrelevant features (see Appendix B for details). More precisely, we have the following definition.

Definition 3.7 (VoI-fair policy). Let background model $\mathcal{C} = (f_X, P_{N_X}, \mathcal{O}^D, \mathcal{O}^U, \mathcal{D})$, utility mechanism v , and essential features $\mathbf{F} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \setminus (\mathbf{DE}^D \cup \{S\})$ be given. Assume that v is an \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair utility. We say that $\pi \in \Pi^{\mathcal{O}^D}$ is a \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair policy if it is an optimal policy in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{O}^D, \cdot_\pi, v)$, and there exists a subset $H \subseteq \mathcal{O}^D$ such that $\pi \in \Pi^H \subseteq \Pi^{\mathcal{O}^D}$ and each variable $X \in H$ has VoI relative to $H \setminus \{X\}$. \circ

Whether a policy satisfies the above definition does not only depend on essential features \mathbf{F} but also on usable decision inputs \mathcal{O}^D , see Section 3.3 and Section 3.4. Sections 3.3–3.6 discuss various properties of VoI-fair policies. For example, a policy being \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair does not imply that we necessarily avoid all unwanted discrimination, see Section 3.4. Based on these insights, we propose the decision diagram in Figure 5.

3.3 A VoI-fair policy may need to be a non-constant function of S

Even when S does not have VoI relative to \mathbf{F} , it is still possible that S has VoI in the context where the decisions are actually being made, that is, relative to $\mathcal{O}^D \setminus \{S\}$. The corresponding \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair policy may then be a non-constant function of S , as the following example illustrates.

Example 3.8 (College admission based on grade and S). We consider the case of college admission based on high school grades and S , that is, $\mathcal{O}^D = \{S, \text{Grade}\}$, see Figure 2. Here, we consider as essential

⁵If, for example, $U = Q \cdot W + D$, then parental status would not have VoI relative to $\{Q\}$.




Figure 3: In Example 3.9, where $\mathbf{O}^D = \{\text{Hair length}\}$, it seems impossible to make fair decisions. Even though it may seem repugnant to base decisions on hair length only, it is not clear that it is worse than choosing a constant policy in Π^\emptyset . If physical strength is an essential feature, a VoI-fair policy will be a policy that tries to infer physical strength based on hair length.

features $\mathbf{F} = \{\text{Effort}\}$. We have that $S \perp_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{PA}^D := \{\text{Effort}\}}} U \mid \{\text{Effort}\}$, so any U that is a function only of effort is $\{\text{Effort}\}$ -VoI-fair by Proposition 3.4. But \mathcal{G} does admit VoI for S relative to $\mathbf{O}^D \setminus \{S\} = \{\text{Grade}\}$.

Let us assume the following assignments (using E as shorthand for effort and G for grade):

$$\begin{aligned} S &:= \varepsilon_S \sim \text{Unif}(\{-1, 1\}) & E &:= \varepsilon_E \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \\ G &:= E + \alpha S & U &:= v(D, E) = \mathbb{1}(D = 1) \cdot E, \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Here, αS is a term describing unwanted discrimination based on S . The policy $\pi(G, S) = \mathbb{1}(G - \alpha S \geq 0)$ is $\{\text{Effort}\}$ -VoI-fair since it is optimal in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{O}^D, \cdot_\pi, v)$. The fact that S has VoI relative to $\mathbf{O}^D \setminus \{S\}$ does not imply that the utility is not $\{\text{Effort}\}$ -VoI-fair. Indeed, if the policy did not use S , that is, if $\pi \in \Pi^{\{G\}}$, then the policy could not adjust for the discrimination αS in grade. However, observing S is not always sufficient to adjust for unwanted discrimination in the data, see Example C.2. \circ

3.4 A VoI-fair policy may be considered intuitively unfair

In some situations, the data available for a realizable policy, \mathbf{O}^D , may provide an insufficient foundation for choosing an intuitively fair policy. We now provide two examples, where a VoI-fair policy may be considered intuitively unfair. In Appendix C, we provide two more examples, considering unfairness due to unavailability of S and entangled unwanted discrimination in data. In all of these examples, we regard it as unclear which realizable policy should be preferred over the VoI-fair policy.

Example 3.9 (Unfairness due to unavailability of relevant data). Assume that we are hiring a person to perform physically demanding labor, and for some reason, we only have information about the applicant's hair length, $\mathbf{O}^D = \{\text{Hair length}\}$, see Figure 3. We assume that we have the following structural assignments (using P and H as shorthand for physical strength and hair length, respectively):

$$S := \varepsilon_S \sim \text{Unif}(\{-1, 1\}), \quad P := \theta_S^P S + \varepsilon_P, \quad H := \theta_S^H S + \varepsilon_H, \quad U := \mathbb{1}(D = 1) \cdot P,$$

where $\varepsilon_P, \varepsilon_H \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $\theta_S^H, \theta_S^P > 0$. Assume that physical strength is an essential feature, $\mathbf{F} = \{P\}$. Then $\pi(H) = \mathbb{1}(H > 0)$ is a $\{P\}$ -VoI-fair policy. Intuitively, it seems unfair to base a decision on hair length, and a person could, for example, influence the hiring decision by getting a hair cut before the interview. In this example, the available data seems insufficient for choosing a fair policy. \circ

Example 3.10 (Unfairness due to unequal data quality). Consider the structural assignments:

$$\begin{aligned} S &:= \varepsilon_S \sim \text{Ber}(0.99), & M &:= \varepsilon_M \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \\ G &:= \mathbb{1}(S = 0)(M + \sqrt{2}\varepsilon_{G_0}) + \mathbb{1}(S = 1)(M + \varepsilon_{G_1}), & U &:= \mathbb{1}(D = 1) \cdot (M - 1) \end{aligned}$$

with $\varepsilon_{G_0}, \varepsilon_{G_1} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and assume that the usable decision inputs are $\mathbf{O}^D = \{G, S\}$. The situation is similar to Example 3.8, but now, the grade is a noisy function of medical qualifications M (rather than effort), and it is more noisy for group $S = 0$ than for group $S = 1$. U is $\{M\}$ -VoI-fair and

$$\pi(G, S) = \mathbb{1}(S = 1)\mathbb{1}(G \geq 2) + \mathbb{1}(S = 0)\mathbb{1}(G \geq 3). \quad (2)$$




Figure 4: This figure depicts the graph of $(\mathcal{C}, \bullet_M, \bullet_\pi, v)$ from Example 3.11. The original utility suggests optimizing for a quantity that contains a human bias, causing the utility to not be $\{M\}$ -VoI-fair. Using the concept of VoI-fairness (Definition 3.3), we can identify this bias and adjust for it.

is an $\{M\}$ -VoI-fair policy since it is optimal in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{O}^D, \bullet_\pi, v)$ (and no policy using only either G or S is optimal). The same arguments apply if the groups have similar sizes. This policy seems intuitively unfair since $S \perp\!\!\!\perp M$ but $P(G \geq 2|S=1) > P(G \geq 3|S=0)$. It is not clear if there is a better realizable alternative. In Appendix D, we consider what would happen if we enforce demographic parity, equalized odds, or counterfactual fairness in this example. In summary, they all suggest different solutions than (2) and seem to have undesired consequences. \circ

3.5 An unfair utility and a possible improvement

The following example shows an unfair utility and suggests a way to improve it. The example further illustrates that the condition in Corollary 3.5 is not necessary for \mathbf{F} -VoI-fairness.

Example 3.11 (Hiring medical staff). Consider the following variables from a hiring setting:

$S := \varepsilon_S \sim \text{Unif}(\{-1, 1\})$	Protected attribute of applicant.
$M' := \theta_S^{M'} S + \varepsilon_{M'}$	Objective measure of medical qualifications.
$N' := \theta_S^{N'} S + \varepsilon_{N'}$	How much the interviewers like the applicant.
$M := \theta_{M'}^M M' + \varepsilon_M$	Recovery rate of applicant's patients.
$N := \theta_{N'}^N N' + \varepsilon_N$	An evaluation by colleagues.
$U := v(D, M, N) = \mathbb{1}(D=1) \cdot (\theta_N^U N + \theta_M^U M)$	Job performance evaluation after first year.

see Figure 4. We assume $\varepsilon_{M'}, \varepsilon_{N'}, \varepsilon_M, \varepsilon_N \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $\theta_S^{M'}, \theta_S^{N'}, \theta_{M'}^M, \theta_{N'}^N, \theta_M^U, \theta_N^U > 0$. We assume that $\mathbf{O}^D = \{M', N', S\}$, $\mathcal{D} = \{0, 1\}$, and that the recovery rate is the only essential feature, that is, $\mathbf{F} = \{M\}$. We assume that colleagues and interviewers have an unwanted bias in their evaluations, corresponding to the term $\theta_S^{N'} S$. Because of this bias, S has VoI in $(\mathcal{C}, \{M\}, \bullet_\pi, v)$, so U is not $\{M\}$ -VoI-fair. One possible way to modify U is to instead consider

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{U} &:= \tilde{v}(M, N, S) = \mathbb{1}(D=1) \cdot (\theta_M^U M + \theta_N^U N - \theta_S^{N'} \theta_{N'}^N \theta_N^U S) \\ &= \mathbb{1}(D=1) \cdot (\theta_{M'}^M \theta_M^U M' + \theta_{N'}^N \theta_N^U N' - \theta_S^{N'} \theta_{N'}^N \theta_N^U S) \end{aligned}$$

As $\tilde{U} = \mathbb{1}(D=1) \cdot (\theta_N^U (\varepsilon_N + \theta_{N'}^N \varepsilon_{N'}) + \theta_M^U M)$, S does not have VoI in $(\mathcal{C}, \{M\}, \bullet_\pi, \tilde{v})$, so \tilde{U} is $\{M\}$ -VoI-fair. The corresponding $\{M\}$ -VoI-fair policy is

$$\tilde{\pi}(M', N', S) = \mathbb{1} \left(\theta_{M'}^M \theta_M^U M' + \theta_{N'}^N \theta_N^U N' - \theta_S^{N'} \theta_{N'}^N \theta_N^U S \geq 0 \right).$$

The optimal policy in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{O}^D, \bullet_\pi, v)$ is

$$\pi(M', N', S) = \mathbb{1} \left(\theta_{M'}^M \theta_M^U M' + \theta_{N'}^N \theta_N^U N' \geq 0 \right).$$

The difference between the two policies, $-\theta_S^{N'} \theta_{N'}^N \theta_N^U S$, is a penalty/bonus given on the basis of S to correct for the unwanted bias in evaluations by colleagues and interviewers. Here, the algorithmic nature

of the hiring method, the quantifications of variables, and explicit knowledge of the utility’s structural assignment make it possible to adjust for biases in a way that would not be possible in a non-algorithmic setting.

Other $\{M\}$ -VoI-fair utilities exist. Given an original utility v , in Section 4, we discuss the notion of an \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair utility corresponding to v (see Example 4.2 for a continuation of this example).

Under the original utility v , even an oracle policy $D = 1 :\Leftrightarrow v(D = 1, M, N) > 0$, that is, hiring exactly those people who would get a positive score under the original performance measure, would be intuitively unfair because the performance measure includes an unwanted human bias. Hiring exactly those who would get a positive score under the modified performance measure,

$$D = 1 :\Leftrightarrow \tilde{v}(D = 1, M, N, S) > 0, \quad (3)$$

seems intuitively fair but is not realizable. \circ

3.6 A VoI-fair policy may be a realizable policy closest to the unrealizable oracle policy

In Example 3.11, the oracle policy (3) under the modified utility \tilde{U} is intuitively fair but not realizable. Now, consider a general situation where the utility has the form $U = \mathbb{1}(D = 1)\hat{U}$ for some function \hat{U} and U is \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair for essential features $\mathbf{F} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \setminus (\mathbf{DE}^D \cup \{S\})$. We propose to measure the distance of a policy to the oracle policy as

$$\delta := \mathbb{1}(D = 1)\mathbb{1}(\hat{U} < 0)|\hat{U}| + \mathbb{1}(D = 0)\mathbb{1}(\hat{U} > 0)\hat{U}. \quad (4)$$

This quantity may be called *undesert*. Since $\delta = -\mathbb{1}(D = 1)\hat{U} + \mathbb{1}(\hat{U} > 0)\hat{U}$, an optimal policy minimizes the expected amount of undesert. Thus, no realizable policy is better than a VoI-fair policy from the perspective of minimizing undesert. It is possible that a VoI-fair policy yields

$$\mathbb{E}(\delta \mid S = 1) \neq \mathbb{E}(\delta \mid S = 0), \quad (5)$$

for example, which may seem intuitively unfair: Members of one group receive more undeserved treatment in expectation, but as long as $S \in \mathbf{O}^D$ both sides of the inequality in Equation (5) are minimized by a VoI-fair policy.

4 Improving utilities

In Section 3.5, we have seen an example of how an unfair utility can be modified to become VoI-fair. Often, there are several \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair utilities (for example, a constant utility is always \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair, for any $\mathbf{F} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \setminus (\mathbf{DE}^D \cup S)$). How do we decide which one to use? We now introduce corresponding VoI-fair utilities as one possibility. Given a utility v that is not \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair, we aim to find an \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair utility \tilde{v} such that $v(\mathbf{O}^U)$ and $\tilde{v}(\mathbf{O}^U)$ are similar under all policies.

Definition 4.1 (Corresponding VoI-fair utility). Let background model \mathcal{C} , utility mechanism v , and essential features $\mathbf{F} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \setminus (\mathbf{DE}^D \cup \{S\})$ be given. Let $\Upsilon_{\mathbf{F}} \subseteq \Upsilon$ be the set of utility mechanisms that are \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair. A modified utility mechanism $\tilde{v} \in \Upsilon_{\mathbf{F}}$ is an v -corresponding \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair utility if

$$\tilde{v} \in \arg \min_{v' \in \Upsilon_{\mathbf{F}}} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi^{\mathbf{O}^D}} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{O}^D, \pi, \cdot_v)}(v(\mathbf{O}^U) - v'(\mathbf{O}^U))^2.$$

\circ

In practice, it is sometimes easier to find a v -corresponding \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair utility when we restrict the set of utilities to a subset $\Upsilon^* \subseteq \Upsilon$. In this case, we say that $\tilde{v} \in \Upsilon_{\mathbf{F}}^* \subseteq \Upsilon^*$ is the v -corresponding \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair utility in Υ^* .

Example 4.2 (Hiring medical staff, Example 3.11 continued). We have seen one possible way to modify the utility such that it satisfies \mathbf{F} -VoI-fairness. Consider now the following class of utilities

$$\Upsilon^* := \{(S, N, M) \mapsto \mathbb{1}(D = 1)(w_1 S + w_2 N + w_3 M) \mid (w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3\}.$$

Then,

$$\tilde{v}(D, S, N, M) := \mathbb{1}(D = 1) \left(-\theta_S^{N'} \theta_N^N \theta_N^U S + \theta_N^U N + \left(\theta_M^U + \frac{\text{cov}(N, M) \theta_N^U}{\text{var}(M)} \right) M \right)$$

is the unique v -corresponding \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair utility in Υ^* , see Appendix E.1 (throughout the paper, we identify objects that are equal up to measure zero). This utility differs from the utility found in Example 3.11 only by the term $\frac{\text{cov}(N, M) \theta_N^U}{\text{var}(M)}$. In Appendix E.2, we obtain this v -corresponding \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair utility based on simulated data. \circ

Which utilities satisfy Definition 4.1 may depend on which features one considers essential. A questionable choice for the set of essential features can lead to a v -corresponding \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair utility that seems unintuitive. We illustrate this with the following example.

Example 4.3. (The essential features may affect which utilities are v -corresponding \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair). Consider the setting from Example 3.9. If we consider physical strength essential for the task, $\mathbf{F} = \{P\}$, then a $\{P\}$ -VoI-fair policy uses hair length to infer physical strength. If physical strength is not considered an essential feature, the v -corresponding \emptyset -VoI-fair utility in

$$\Upsilon^* := \{(D, S, H, P) \mapsto \mathbb{1}(D = 1)(w_1 S + w_2 H + w_3 P) \mid (w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3\}$$

is $\tilde{U} := \tilde{v}(D, S, P) := \mathbb{1}(D = 1)(P - \theta_S^P S)$. All \emptyset -VoI-fair policies under \tilde{v} are policies in Π^\emptyset . \circ

In Example 4.2, the original utility is a function of several features that have been reweighted to obtain a v -corresponding \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair utility. We now provide an example, in which the utility depends on an outcome Y (that we may want to predict from the available data) and the v -corresponding \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair utility is obtained by adding an offset wS , that is, $\tilde{v}(D, Y, S) = \mathbb{1}(D = 1)(Y + wS)$.

Example 4.4 (Improving the utility for college admission). Suppose we are choosing a subset of applicants for admission to a university's mathematics department. We have three features for each applicant $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ on which we can base our policy.

- $S_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(2/3)$, the protected attribute.
- T_i : A score from a mathematics test taken as part of the admission process.
- R_i : A score based on the applicant's resume.

Based on the three features, we try to predict Y_i , representing whether applicant i would graduate if admitted. We assume that the minority group $S = 0$ is the disadvantaged group. For illustrative purposes, we assume that there are $n = 100\,000$ applicants and that we admit exactly half of them. We assume that $(S_1, T_1, R_1, Y_1), \dots, (S_n, T_n, R_n, Y_n)$ are identically distributed and

$$Y \in \{0, 1\}^n, \quad D = \pi(S, T, R) \in \{0, 1\}^n, \quad U := D^\top Y$$

using notation $S := (S_1, \dots, S_n)$ and similar. Here, the policy is a function of the entire feature vectors. We specify the data-generating model in Appendix F.1. Under the induced distribution, S_i and Y_i are not independent, that is, there is a difference in graduation between the two groups. We do not interpret the assignments in Appendix F.1 as the causal mechanisms of the data-generating process but only as a model for the observational distribution.

Assume for now that we choose $\{Y\}$ to be the set of essential features. Then, U is $\{Y\}$ -VoI fair. We now investigate the implications of $\mathbf{F} = \{Y\}$. The data-generating process in Appendix F.1 implies that for all i, t, r ,

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_i \mid S_i = 0, T_i = t, R_i = r) > \mathbb{E}(Y_i \mid S_i = 1, T_i = t, R_i = r),$$

that is, under an optimal policy based on S , T , and R , the university will, given $T_i = t$ and $R_i = r$, be more likely to admit a person from the minority group. We do not think that this would be considered intuitively unfair. (Some may interpret this inequality as the university applying affirmative action, but this conclusion may be misleading since it is not a deliberate choice by the university but a consequence of optimally predicting graduation given the available data.) However, if resume scores R_i were unavailable, U is still $\{Y\}$ -VoI fair but it turns out that

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_i \mid S_i = 0, T_i = t) < \mathbb{E}(Y_i \mid S_i = 1, T_i = t);$$

that is, under an optimal policy based on S , and T , the university will, given $T_i = t$, be more likely to admit a person from the majority group. In other words, a $\{Y\}$ -VoI-fair policy would use a higher test score threshold for admitting applicants from the minority group compared to the majority group if $\mathcal{O}^D = \{S, T\}$. That the utility creates this incentive may be considered intuitively unfair.

Let us now, instead, consider $\{T\}$ as the set of essential features, which avoids this incentive. Then, U is not $\{T\}$ -VoI fair (it is not $\{R, T\}$ -VoI fair, either). We now find a $\{T\}$ -VoI-fair utility in the class $\Upsilon^* = \{D^\top(Y + wS) \mid w \in \mathbb{R}\}$ by using simulated data from the data-generating process, see Appendix F.2. When considering a specific realization of the data-generating process and $\mathcal{O}^D = \{S, T, R\}$, the U -corresponding $\{T\}$ -VoI-fair utility in Υ^* results in 61 fewer total graduates and 452 more graduates from the minority group (compared to the optimal policy under the original utility). We provide all numbers in Table 3; Appendix F.3 contains results on different realizations.

There is a trade-off between avoiding intuitively unfair discrimination and a slight decrease in the total number of people graduating. In this example, VoI-fairness provides a principled approach for making the trade-off by requiring that S does not have VoI relative to $\{T\}$. Nilforoshan et al. [2022] also advocate for adding a term wS to the utility, but, to the best of our knowledge, they do not provide a method or framework for choosing w . Even though the choice of essential features is sometimes debatable (as in this example), we think it is useful to anchor the discussion on a concrete set of essential features. \circ

5 Summary and future work

We have proposed value of information fairness, a formal criterion that utilities should satisfy and have presented corresponding graphical criteria. In concrete examples, we have investigated how an unfair utility could be improved. The flow chart in Figure 5 outlines a possible approach for handling questions of fairness based on our findings. VoI-fairness should not be applied blindly: even if a utility is VoI-fair, one needs to scrutinize if the corresponding optimal policy is ethically acceptable, see step (2) of Figure 5.

There are several open questions related to the framework we introduced. For example: (1) How can we infer a v -corresponding \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair utility from observed data? (2) When can a VoI-fair policy be considered ethically acceptable (see Figure 5)? (3) How can we collect data such that VoI-fair policies will be considered ethically acceptable? (4) Corresponding VoI-fair utilities can be defined using other metrics, too (this may be necessary if D is continuous); what do different choices entail?

We believe that considering utilities, rather than focusing exclusively on policies, adds an important puzzle piece to the literature on algorithmic fairness and could help to reduce unwanted discrimination

⁶In this paper, we do not propose a formal criterion that policies must satisfy to be considered fair/ethically acceptable (existing fairness definitions have focused on constraining the policy [Verma and Rubin, 2018]). In some situations, it seems that an \mathbf{F} -VoI-fair policy is not intuitively fair (see Section 3.4), but it is not clear to us that there is an alternative realizable policy that better captures our intuitive notion of fairness.

⁷Technically, one needs to make sure that the optimal policy is not using variables that do not have VoI, see Definition 3.7 and Appendix B.

⁸See Example 4.3 where the VoI-fair policy changes depending on which features we consider essential. VoI-fairness is an attempt at formalizing one criterion that a utility should satisfy. A utility can be unfair in ways that VoI-fairness does not detect. In Example 3.11, $U = 1(D = 1) \cdot (-M)$ is a $\{\text{Medical qualifications}\}$ -VoI-fair utility, but it would probably be considered unethical to have a preference for hiring unqualified doctors. In this case, you need to reconsider the original utility.

⁹See Section 3.6; see Example 3.10 for why requiring additional fairness constraints may be undesirable.




Figure 5: Possible approach for handling decision problems with protected attributes. We discuss some open problems related to this framework in the section on future work.

in real-world applications.

Acknowledgements

We thank Niklas Pfister and Jonathan Richens for helpful comments and discussions. This research was supported by the Pioneer Centre for AI, DNRF grant number P1. During part of this project FHJ and JP were supported by a research grant (18968) from VILLUM FONDEN.

References

- Carolyn Ashurst, Ryan Carey, Silvia Chiappa, and Tom Everitt. Why fair labels can yield unfair predictions: Graphical conditions for introduced unfairness. In *Proceedings of the AAAI 2022 Conference*, pages 9494–9503, 2022.
- Solon Barocas, Moritz Hardt, and Arvind Narayanan. *Fairness and Machine Learning*. MIT Press, 2023. URL <http://www.fairmlbook.org>.
- Stephan Bongers, Patrick Forré, Jonas Peters, and Joris M. Mooij. Foundations of structural causal models with cycles and latent variables. *Annals of Statistics*, 49(5):2885–2915, 2021.
- 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 582–592, 2020.
- Philip Dawid. Influence diagrams for causal modelling and inference. *International Statistical Review*, 70(2):161–189, 2002.
- Tom Everitt, Ryan Carey, Eric Langlois, Pedro A Ortega, and Shane Legg. Agent incentives: A causal perspective. In *Proceedings of the AAAI 2021 Conference*, pages 11487–11495, 2021.
- Ronald A. Howard. Information value theory. *Transactions on Systems Science and Cybernetics*, 2:22–26, 1966.
- Matt J. Kusner, Joshua Loftus, Chris Russell, and Ricardo Silva. Counterfactual fairness. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, pages 4069–4079, 2017.
- Brent Mittelstadt, Sandra Wachter, and Chris Russell. The unfairness of fair machine learning: Levelling down and strict egalitarianism by default. SSRN preprint, ID: 4331652, 2023.
- Hamed Nilforoshan, Johann Gaebler, Ravi Shroff, and Sharad Goel. Causal conceptions of fairness and their consequences. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 16848–16887, 2022.
- Dennis Nilsson and Steffen L. Lauritzen. Evaluating influence diagrams using limids. In *16th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence.*, pages 436–445, 2003.
- Judea Pearl. *Causality*. Cambridge University Press, second edition, 2009.
- Sorawit Saengkyongam, Nikolaj Thams, Jonas Peters, and Niklas Pfister. Invariant policy learning: A causal perspective. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2023.
- Richard S. Sutton and Andrew G. Barto. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. The MIT Press, second edition, 2018.
- Chris van Merwijk, Ryan Carey, and Tom Everitt. A complete criterion for value of information in soluble influence diagrams. In *Proceedings of the AAAI 2022 Conference*, pages 10034–10041, 2022.
- Sahil Verma and Julia Rubin. Fairness definitions explained. In *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Software Fairness*, page 1–7, 2018.

A Proof of Proposition 3.2

Everitt et al. [2021] prove that a DAG \mathcal{G} over (\mathbf{X}, D, U) , where U is a descendant of D and U has no children, admits VoI for $S \in \mathbf{X} \setminus \mathbf{DE}^D$ relative to $\mathbf{M} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \setminus (\mathbf{DE}^D \cup \{S\})$ if and only if

$$S \not\perp_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{PA}^D := \mathbf{M} \cup \{S\}}} U \mid \mathbf{M} \cup \{D\}.$$

Since we assume that $S \notin \mathbf{M}$ this simplifies to the following d-separation.

Proposition 3.2. A DAG \mathcal{G} over (\mathbf{X}, D, U) , where U is a descendant of D and U has no children, admits VoI for $S \in \mathbf{X} \setminus \mathbf{DE}^D$ relative to $\mathbf{M} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \setminus (\mathbf{DE}^D \cup \{S\})$ if and only if

$$S \not\perp_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{PA}^D := \mathbf{M}}} U \mid \mathbf{M}.$$

Here, $\perp_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{PA}^D := \mathbf{M}}}$ denotes d -separation in the DAG $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{PA}^D := \mathbf{M}}$ obtained from \mathcal{G} by modifying the parents of D to be \mathbf{M} .

Proof. Assume that \mathcal{G} admits VoI for S relative to \mathbf{M} . Then,

$$S \not\perp_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{PA}^D := \mathbf{M} \cup \{S\}}} U \mid \mathbf{M} \cup \{D\}.$$

Since in this statement, we condition on $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{PA}^D \setminus \{S\}$ and D , an open path cannot go through the edge $S \rightarrow D$. Thus, there also exist an open path in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{PA}^D := \mathbf{M}}$:

$$S \not\perp_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{PA}^D := \mathbf{M}}} U \mid \mathbf{M} \cup \{D\}.$$

If there is an open path between S and U given $\mathbf{M} \cup \{D\}$, then this path is also open given \mathbf{M} . The only ways an open path could be blocked by no longer conditioning on D are

- (1) if D is a collider relative to the path, or
- (2) if the path goes through a collider that is an ancestor of D .

(1) is impossible as we also condition on $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{PA}^D$. If (2) occurs, then either the collider is in $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{PA}^D$ and the path is still open, or the collider is an ancestor of a node in $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{PA}^D$, which also implies that the path is still open. So

$$S \not\perp_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{PA}^D := \mathbf{M}}} U \mid \mathbf{M}.$$

Assume now that $S \perp_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{PA}^D := \mathbf{M}}} U \mid \mathbf{M}$. An open path between S and U given $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{PA}^D$ cannot go through D . Therefore, this path is also open given $\mathbf{M} \cup \{D\}$:

$$S \not\perp_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{PA}^D := \mathbf{M}}} U \mid \mathbf{M} \cup \{D\}.$$

Finally, adding an edge $S \rightarrow D$ does not block any paths. □

B On the definition of VoI-fair policies

We now provide an example to illustrate why we require that all variables $X \in \mathbf{H} \subseteq \mathbf{O}^D$ have VoI relative to $\mathbf{H} \setminus \{X\}$ in Definition 3.7.

$$\begin{aligned} S &:= \varepsilon_S \sim \text{Unif}\{0, 1\} \\ E &:= \varepsilon_E \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \\ U &:= v(D, E) = \mathbb{1}(D = 1) \cdot E \end{aligned}$$

Assume that $\mathbf{O}^D = \{S\}$, see Figure 6. U is $\{\text{Effort}\}$ -VoI-fair.

$$\pi(S) = \mathbb{1}(S = 1)$$




Figure 6: This graph visualizes the example in Appendix B. Here, we can construct an optimal policy depending on S , but this seems intuitively unfair. Since there also exist optimal policies in Π^\emptyset that do not use S , we require that the $\{\text{Effort}\}$ -VoI-fair policy is in Π^\emptyset , see Definition 3.7.

is an optimal policy in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{O}^D, \cdot_\pi, v)$, but in this example, it seems intuitively unfair to base the decisions on S since S does not have VoI relative to \emptyset . Therefore, in this example, if π is an $\{\text{Effort}\}$ -VoI-fair policy, $\pi \in \Pi^\emptyset$.

If there is an optimal policy in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{O}^D, \cdot_\pi, v)$, then it is always possible to find a subset $\mathbf{H} \subseteq \mathcal{O}^D$ and a policy $\pi \in \Pi^\mathbf{H}$ such that every variable $X \in \mathbf{H}$ have VoI relative to $\mathbf{H} \setminus \{X\}$ and π is optimal in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{O}^D, \cdot_\pi, v)$. This follows immediately from the definition of VoI.

C Further details on Section 3.4

Example C.1. (Unfairness due to unavailability of S). Consider Example 3.8 but with $\mathcal{O}^D = \{\text{Grade}\}$. Then, the policy $\pi(G) = \mathbb{1}(G \geq 0)$ is $\{\text{Effort}\}$ -VoI-fair but seems unacceptable. This policy does not manage to adjust for the unwanted discrimination αS in grade. In this case, it seems that no policy in $\Pi^{\mathcal{O}^D}$ is acceptable, and we suggest that we need to collect better data (see Figure 5).

This example also highlights a known fundamental problem with fairness through unawareness: If the policy is not allowed to be a function of S , this may reduce our ability to choose an intuitively fair policy because we cannot adjust for biases in the data (Kusner et al. [2017] make a similar point). \circ

Example C.2 (Unfairness due to entangled unwanted discrimination in data.). Consider again Example 3.8 with $\mathcal{O}^D = \{\text{Grade}, S\}$. Assume now that

$$G := \mathbb{1}(S = 1) \cdot E + \mathbb{1}(S = -1) \mathbb{1}(E > 0) \cdot (-E) + \mathbb{1}(S = -1) \mathbb{1}(E \leq 0) \cdot E,$$

corresponding to a situation where people from group $S = -1$ with effort $E > 0$ are experiencing unwanted discrimination. If we, for example, observe $(S = -1, G = -1)$, the posterior will be $P(E = 1 \mid S = -1, G = -1) = P(E = -1 \mid S = -1, G = -1) = 0.5$. Any optimal policy in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{O}^D, \cdot_\pi, v)$ is $\{\text{Effort}\}$ -VoI-fair. Thus, there are policies that are $\{\text{Effort}\}$ -VoI-fair even though they do not admit anyone from group $S = -1$. In this example, we consider it unclear what the intuitively fairest policy in $\Pi^{\mathcal{O}^D}$ is. \circ

D Further details on Example 3.10

D.1 Consequences of fairness constraints

Equalized odds and counterfactual fairness: The policy in (2) does not satisfy some existing definitions of fairness. For example, it does not satisfy

$$S \perp\!\!\!\perp D \mid M, \tag{6}$$

which is sometimes called counterfactual equalized odds [Coston et al., 2020]. It does not satisfy counterfactual fairness [Kusner et al., 2017],

$$P(D_{S:=0} = 1) = P(D_{S:=1} = 1) \tag{7}$$

(with $D_{S:=0}$ and $D_{S:=1}$ being the counterfactuals of D had S been 0 or 1, respectively), either. If a realizable policy $\pi \in \Pi^{\mathcal{O}^D}$ is to satisfy counterfactual fairness, then $\pi \in \Pi^\emptyset$, that is, the policy is purely random (see Appendix D.2).¹⁰ If we assume a threshold policy, $\pi(G, S) = \mathbb{1}(S = 1, G \geq c_1) + \mathbb{1}(S = 0, G \geq c_0)$ for $c_1, c_0 \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$, based on $\mathcal{O}^D = \{S, G\}$, then equalized odds can also only be satisfied if $\pi \in \Pi^\emptyset$ (see Appendix D.3). Since $\mathbb{E}(M - 1) < 0$, the optimal policy under either equalized odds or counterfactual fairness would be $\pi(G, S) = 0$, corresponding to never making a hire. While this might be a good meta-incentive to collect better data, it does not seem like a serious answer to the question of what should be done given the data available. It is possible to satisfy equalized odds using a threshold policy by adding extra independent noise $\varepsilon^* \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ to the grade measurement for group $S = 1$ such that $\text{var}(\varepsilon_{G_1} + \varepsilon^*) = \text{var}(\sqrt{2}\varepsilon_{G_0})$. This increases the amount of undesert (see Section 3.6) in group $S = 1$, $\mathbb{E}(\delta \mid S = 1)$, without affecting group $S = 0$ [Mittelstadt et al., 2023].

Demographic parity: It may seem that since $M \perp\!\!\!\perp S$, an intuitively fair policy must satisfy demographic parity, that is, $S \perp\!\!\!\perp D$. But the policies in $\Pi^{\mathcal{O}^D}$ that satisfy demographic parity seem to be neither fair nor realistic. The only way to satisfy demographic parity would be to either hire people from group $S = 0$ that are unqualified (in expectation) or reject people from group $S = 1$ that are qualified (in expectation). This is especially counterintuitive if $\text{var}(\varepsilon_{G_0}) \gg \text{var}(\varepsilon_{G_1})$. We probably would not want to hire someone who we expect does in fact not have the required medical qualifications. On the other hand, if we only hire people from group $S = 0$ that we expect to be qualified, demographic parity would imply that we have to reject many people from group $S = 1$ who we expect to be qualified doctors, which seems unfair and may not be economically feasible. Demographic parity would be an attractive property to satisfy in this example (indeed, an oracle policy would satisfy demographic parity), but we do not think that this is something that one should force upon the algorithm by doing constrained optimization. When we have to choose a realizable policy $\pi \in \Pi^{\mathcal{O}^D}$, it is too late to satisfy demographic parity. We think that future work should investigate how to collect data such that optimal policies under VoI-fair utilities result in intuitively fair policies. In this example, it seems that we should try to reduce $\text{var}(\varepsilon_{G_0})$.

D.2 Further details on counterfactual fairness

We consider the setup from Example 3.10 and want to show that counterfactual fairness implies choosing a policy in Π^\emptyset . Assume that $\pi \in \Pi^{\{S, G\}}$ satisfies counterfactual fairness. Then,

$$P(\pi(G_{S:=0}, 0) \equiv \pi(G_{S:=1}, 1)) = 1.$$

Since the normal distribution and the Lebesgue measure are equivalent measures, this implies that

$$\pi(x, 0) \equiv \pi(y, 1)$$

for almost all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid \pi(x, 0) \equiv \pi(y, 1) \text{ for almost all } y \in \mathbb{R}\} \\ B_x &:= \{y \in \mathbb{R} \mid \pi(x, 0) \equiv \pi(y, 1)\} \\ B &:= \{y \in \mathbb{R} \mid \pi(x, 0) \equiv \pi(y, 1) \text{ for almost all } x \in \mathbb{R}\} \\ A_y &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid \pi(x, 0) \equiv \pi(y, 1)\} \end{aligned}$$

Take $x_1 \in A$, $y \in B_{x_1} \cap B$, and $x_2 \in A_y$. We then have that

$$\pi(x_1, 0) \equiv \pi(y, 1) \equiv \pi(x_2, 0).$$

Since A_y has full measure, we conclude that

$$\pi(x_1, 0) \equiv \pi(x_2, 0)$$

¹⁰Nilforoshan et al. [2022] show that under mild assumptions, π cannot be a function of S or descendants of S if it is to satisfy counterfactual fairness.

for almost all $x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies that there exists $p_0 \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$\pi(x, 0)(1) = p_0$$

for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. An analogous argument shows that

$$\pi(x, 1)(1) = p_1$$

for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. So $\pi \in \Pi^{G,S}$ is almost surely equal to a $\pi' \in \Pi^{\{S\}}$, and since a policy satisfying counterfactual fairness is not allowed to depend on S only, we also have that $\pi \in \Pi^{G,S}$ is almost surely equal to a $\pi'' \in \Pi^\emptyset$.

D.3 Further details on counterfactual equalized odds

Assume that $\pi \in \Pi^{G,S}$ satisfies counterfactual equalized odds,

$$\pi(G, S) \perp\!\!\!\perp S \mid M$$

Assume that there are constants $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(g, 1) &= \begin{cases} 1 & g \geq c_1 \\ 0 & g < c_1 \end{cases} \\ \pi(g, 0) &= \begin{cases} 1 & g \geq c_0 \\ 0 & g < c_0 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

First, assume that $c_1, c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Counterfactual equalized odds implies that there is an $e > c_1, c_0$ such that

$$P(\varepsilon_{G_1} \in [c_1 - e, \infty)) = P(\sqrt{2}\varepsilon_{G_0} \in [c_0 - e, \infty)).$$

Since $\text{var}(\sqrt{2}\varepsilon_{G_0}) > \text{var}(\varepsilon_{G_1})$, this implies that $c_0 < c_1$. Likewise, there must be an $e < c_1, c_0$ such that

$$P(\varepsilon_{G_1} \in [c_1 - e, \infty)) = P(\sqrt{2}\varepsilon_{G_0} \in [c_0 - e, \infty)),$$

but now this implies $c_0 > c_1$. So either $c_0 \in \{-\infty, \infty\}$ or $c_1 \in \{-\infty, \infty\}$. Counterfactual equalized odds implies that $c_0 = \infty$ if and only if $c_1 = \infty$, and similarly, $c_0 = -\infty$ if and only if $c_1 = -\infty$. So $\pi \in \Pi^\emptyset$.

E Further Details on Example 4.2

E.1 Derivation of the corresponding VoI-fair utility

Let $v_{\mathbf{w}} \in \Upsilon^*$ with $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ be given by $v_{\mathbf{w}} : (D, S, N, M) \mapsto \mathbb{1}(D = 1)(w_1 S + w_2 N + w_3 M)$. The optimal policy in $(\mathcal{C}, \{S, M\}, \bullet_\pi, v_{\mathbf{w}})$ is

$$\pi(S, M) = \mathbb{1}(\mathbb{E}(w_1 S + w_2 M + w_3 N \mid S, M) > 0)$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}(w_1 S + w_2 N + w_3 M \mid S, M) \\ &= w_1 S + w_2 \theta_S^{N'} \theta_{N'}^N S + w_3 M. \end{aligned}$$

So, $v_{\mathbf{w}} \in \Upsilon^*$ is $\{M\}$ -VoI-fair if and only if

$$w_1 = -w_2 \theta_S^{N'} \theta_{N'}^N$$

Under the policy that hires everyone (which maximizes the term appearing in Definition 4.1), we can expand the expectation of the squared difference of the modified and original utility as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}(\theta_N^U N + \theta_M^U M - w_1 S - w_2 N - w_3 M)^2 \\
&= (\theta_M^U - w_3)^2 \left((\theta_{M'}^M, \theta_S^{M'})^2 + (\theta_{M'}^M)^2 + 1 \right) \\
&+ (\theta_N^U - w_2)^2 \left((\theta_{N'}^N, \theta_S^{N'})^2 + (\theta_{N'}^N)^2 + 1 \right) \\
&+ w_1^2 \\
&+ 2(\theta_M^U - w_3)(\theta_N^U - w_2)(\theta_S^{N'} \theta_{N'}^N, \theta_S^{M'} \theta_{M'}^M) \\
&- 2w_1(\theta_M^U - w_3)\theta_S^{M'} \theta_{M'}^M \\
&- 2w_1(\theta_N^U - w_2)\theta_S^{N'} \theta_{N'}^N
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting $w_1 \leftarrow -w_2 \theta_S^{N'} \theta_{N'}^N$, and minimizing with respect to w_2 and w_3 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
w_2 &= \theta_N^U \\
w_3 &= \theta_M^U + \frac{\text{cov}(N, M) \theta_N^U}{\text{var}(M)}.
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$\tilde{v}(D, S, N, M) := \mathbb{1}(D = 1) \left(-\theta_N^U \theta_S^{N'} \theta_{N'}^N S + \theta_N^U N + \left(\theta_M^U + \frac{\text{cov}(N, M) \theta_N^U}{\text{var}(M)} \right) M \right)$$

is the unique v -corresponding $\{M\}$ -VoI-fair utility in Υ^* .

E.2 Estimation of the corresponding VoI-fair utility by simulation

We can illustrate the result from the previous section with simulated data. To do so, we recall that finding the v -corresponding $\{M\}$ -VoI-fair utility $v_{\mathbf{w}}$ in Υ^* corresponds to minimizing $\mathbb{E}(\theta_N^U N + \theta_M^U M - w_1 S - w_2 N - w_3 M)^2$ under the constraint that S does not have VoI relative to $\{M\}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}
L_1(\mathbf{w}) &:= \left(\beta_{\mathbf{w},1}^M - \beta_{\mathbf{w},1}^{(S,M)} \right)^2 + \left(\beta_{\mathbf{w},M}^M - \beta_{\mathbf{w},M}^{(S,M)} \right)^2 \\
&+ \left(\beta_{\mathbf{w},S}^{(S,M)} \right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the β coefficients are such that $\mathbb{E}_{\pi=1}(U_{\mathbf{w}} | S, M) = \beta_{\mathbf{w},1}^{(S,M)} + \beta_{\mathbf{w},S}^{(S,M)} S + \beta_{\mathbf{w},M}^{(S,M)} M$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\pi=1}(U_{\mathbf{w}} | M) = \beta_{\mathbf{w},1}^M + \beta_{\mathbf{w},M}^M M$ with $U_{\mathbf{w}} := v_{\mathbf{w}}(D, S, N, M)$. Here, the subscript $\pi = 1$ indicates that the expectation is taken under the policy that hires everyone. $L_1(\mathbf{w}) = 0$ if and only if S does not have VoI relative to $\{M\}$. Let

$$L_2(\mathbf{w}) := \mathbb{E}(\theta_N^U N + \theta_M^U M - w_1 S - w_2 N - w_3 M)^2.$$

$L_2(\mathbf{w})$ is the expected squared difference between $v_{\mathbf{w}}(N, M, S)$ and $v(N, M)$ under the policy that hires everyone (which maximizes the term appearing in Definition 4.1). Finding the v -corresponding $\{M\}$ -VoI-fair utility in Υ^* corresponds to minimizing $L_2(\mathbf{w})$ subject to $L_1(\mathbf{w}) = 0$. Assume for simplicity that we have $n = 10\,000$ observations from the constant policy $\pi(M', N', S) = 1$. We estimate the v -corresponding $\{M\}$ -VoI-fair utility in Υ^* by minimizing the loss

$$\widehat{L}(\mathbf{w}, K) := K \widehat{L}_1(\mathbf{w}) + \widehat{L}_2(\mathbf{w}),$$

where $\widehat{L}_1(\mathbf{w})$ is obtained by fitting linear regressions, $\widehat{L}_2(\mathbf{w})$ is the empirical mean, and $K \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant chosen to enforce $\widehat{L}_1(\mathbf{w}) < \epsilon$ for a given $\epsilon > 0$, see Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Algorithm for estimating v -corresponding $\{M\}$ -VoI-fair utility

Input: n observations $((S, M, N)_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$; $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$.

```
1:  $K \leftarrow 1$ 
2:  $\text{solution\_found} \leftarrow \text{false}$ 
3: while  $\text{solution\_found} = \text{false}$  do
4:   Find a  $\mathbf{w}$  that minimizes  $\widehat{L}(\mathbf{w}, K)$ 
5:   if  $\widehat{L}_1(\mathbf{w}) > \epsilon$  then
6:      $K \leftarrow 2K$ 
7:   else
8:      $\text{solution\_found} \leftarrow \text{true}$ 
9:   end if
10: end while
11: Return  $\mathbf{w}$ 
```

We run the algorithm on 100 different sets of observations and $\epsilon = 0.0001$, see Table 1 and Table 2. The code is provided at github.com/FrederikHJ/Unfair-Utilities. It runs on a standard laptop in less than 5 minutes. The empirical estimates match the theoretical derivations from above. In a realistic setting, we usually do not have observations from the policy $\pi = 1$ and would need to estimate the distribution of (S, M, N) .

Table 1: Here, we simulate data using the parameters $(\theta_S^{N'}, \theta_S^{M'}, \theta_{N'}^N, \theta_{M'}^M, \theta_N^U, \theta_M^U) = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)$, so that the original utility equals $v(D, N, M) = \mathbb{1}(D = 1)(5N + 6M)$. We run the simulation and estimation 100 times using $n = 10\,000$ observations. We report the mean estimate and, in parentheses, the empirical 5% and 95% quantiles.

	w_1	w_2	w_3
Analytic	-15	5	7.48
Estimate	-15.00 (-15.62, -14.46)	5.00 (-4.99, 5.01)	7.48 (7.43, 7.55)

Table 2: Here, we simulate data using the parameters $(\theta_S^{N'}, \theta_S^{M'}, \theta_{N'}^N, \theta_{M'}^M, \theta_N^U, \theta_M^U) = (6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1)$, so that the original utility equals $v(D, N, M) = \mathbb{1}(D = 1)(2N + M)$. We run the simulation and estimation 100 times using $n = 10\,000$ observations. We report the mean estimate and, in parentheses, the empirical 5% and 95% quantiles.

	w_1	w_2	w_3
Analytic	-48	2	4.06
Estimate	-47.96 (-48.78, -47.16)	2.00 (1.99, 2.01)	4.06 (4.00, 4.11)

Table 3: We modify the utility U from Example 4.4 by adding a term $-0.071S$, making the utility $\{T\}$ -VoI-fair. We apply optimal policies under the original and modified utility.

	Utility	
	Original	Modified
Number of students graduating from both groups	25 578	25 517
Number of students admitted from minority group	11 334	13 496
Number of students admitted and graduating from minority group	5 073	5 525

F Further details on Example 4.4

F.1 Data-generating process

We consider the following assignments for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
S_i &:= \varepsilon_{S_i} \sim \text{Ber}\left(\frac{2}{3}\right) \\
S_i^* &:= \mathbb{1}(S_i = 1) - \mathbb{1}(S_i = 0) \\
E_i &:= \varepsilon_{E_i} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \\
\varepsilon_{T_i} &\sim \mathcal{N}(0.3, 1) \\
T_i &:= E_i + \varepsilon_{T_i} S_i^* \\
\varepsilon_{R_i} &\sim \mathcal{N}(1, 1) \\
R_i &:= E_i + \varepsilon_{R_i} S_i^* \\
\varepsilon_{Y_i^*} &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 2) \\
Y_i^* &:= E_i + 0.5R_i + 0.5T_i + \varepsilon_{Y_i^*} \\
Y_i &:= \mathbb{1}(Y_i^* > \widehat{F_{Y^*}^{-1}}(0.7)),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{F_{Y^*}^{-1}}$ is the ‘empirical’ quantile function based on Y_1^*, \dots, Y_n^* , and S_i^* is a transformation of S_i such that $S_i^* \in \{-1, 1\}$, where E_i are variables introducing additional dependence between the variables.

F.2 Approximation of w

This appendix shows how to approximate w given knowledge about the data-generating process. In practice, this derivation may not be feasible because, for example, we may not have access to data from the policy that admits every applicant. We want to find w such that S does not have VoI relative to $\{T\}$ under utility $\widetilde{U}_w := \widetilde{v}_w(D, Y, S) := D^\top(Y + wS)$. We simulate a training set and a test set ($n = 100\,000$ for each) from the policy that admits everyone, $\pi(S, T, R) = 1$. Based on the training data, we fit logistic models to estimate $\mathbb{E}(Y_i | T_i)$, $\mathbb{E}(Y_i | S_i, T_i)$, $\mathbb{E}(S_i | T_i)$, and $\mathbb{E}(Y_i | S_i, T_i, R_i)$. The optimal policy in $(\mathcal{C}, \{T\}, \bullet_\pi, v_w)$ is the policy that admits applicant j if and only if $\mathbb{E}(Y_j | T_j) + w\mathbb{E}(S_j | T_j)$ is larger than the median of $(\mathbb{E}(Y_i | T_i) + w\mathbb{E}(S_i | T_i))_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$. Similarly, the optimal policy in $(\mathcal{C}, \{S, T\}, \bullet_\pi, v_w)$ is a policy that admits applicant j if and only if $\mathbb{E}(Y_j | S_j, T_j) + wS_j$ is larger than the median of $(\mathbb{E}(Y_i | S_j, T_i) + wS_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$. So we can use the estimated expected values to approximate the optimal policies $\pi_w^{\{T\}}$ and $\pi_w^{\{S, T\}}$ in $(\mathcal{C}, \{T\}, \bullet_\pi, v_w)$ and $(\mathcal{C}, \{S, T\}, \bullet_\pi, v_w)$, respectively. On the test data, we estimate $E_{\pi_w^{\{T\}}}(\widetilde{U}_w)$ and $E_{\pi_w^{\{S, T\}}}(\widetilde{U}_w)$ and choose (using automatic differentiation) w such that $E_{\pi_w^{\{S, T\}}}(\widetilde{U}_w) = E_{\pi_w^{\{T\}}}(\widetilde{U}_w)$.

F.3 Multiple realizations of simulations

We run the entire simulations and estimations of ω 100 times. We report averages and empirical 5% and 95% quantiles rounded to the nearest whole number: On average, 77 (34–123) fewer persons end up graduating after modifying the utility, 2128 (1898–2349) more persons from the minority group are admitted, and 432 (372–483) more persons from the minority group graduate. The code is provided at github.com/FrederikHJ/Unfair-Utilities. It runs on a standard laptop in less than 5 minutes.

G Overview of examples

Table 4: Overview of the examples

Example 2.2	Introduces the setting.
Example 3.6	Shows how the utility from Example 2.2 can be modified to be VoI-fair.
Example 3.8	Illustrates that a VoI-fair policy may need to be a function of S .
	O^D may provide an insufficient foundation for choosing intuitively fair policies. We provide four examples:
Example 3.9	Illustrates unfairness due to unavailability of relevant data.
	Illustrates unfairness due to unequal data quality.
Example 3.10	It also shows that our notion yields different implication than demographic parity, equalized odds, and counterfactual fairness.
Example C.1	Illustrates unfairness due to unavailability of S .
Example C.2	Illustrates unfairness due to entangled unwanted discrimination in data.
Example 3.11	Shows how a human bias may make a utility unfair and discusses a modification that makes the utility VoI-fair.
Example 4.2	Provides the v -corresponding VoI-fair utility for Example 3.11.
Example 4.3	Shows that the v -corresponding VoI-fair utility depends on the choice of \mathbf{F} . If the VoI-fair policy seems intuitively unfair, it may be that you should reconsider \mathbf{F} .
Example 4.4	Illustrates a possible improvement of the utility for college admission by using test scores as the essential feature.