

Formal Specification, Assessment, and Enforcement of Fairness for Generative AIs

Chih-Hong Cheng^a, Changshun Wu^b, Harald Ruess^c, Xingyu Zhao^d and Saddek Bensalem^b

^aChalmers University of Technology, Sweden

^bUniversité Grenoble Alpes, France

^cEntalus, USA

^dWMG, University of Warwick, UK

Abstract. Reinforcing or even exacerbating societal biases and inequalities will increase significantly as generative AI increasingly produces useful artifacts, from text to images and beyond, for the real world. We address these issues by formally characterizing the notion of fairness for generative AI as a basis for monitoring and enforcing fairness. We define two levels of fairness using the notion of infinite sequences of abstractions of AI-generated artifacts such as text or images. The first is the fairness demonstrated on the generated sequences, which is evaluated only on the outputs while agnostic to the prompts and models used. The second is the inherent fairness of the generative AI model, which requires that fairness be manifested when input prompts are neutral, that is, they do not explicitly instruct the generative AI to produce a particular type of output. We also study relative intersectional fairness to counteract the combinatorial explosion of fairness when considering multiple categories together with lazy fairness enforcement. Finally, fairness monitoring and enforcement are tested against some current generative AI models.

1 Introduction

Fairness is essential in AI to prevent bias and promote equality in the output from text to images [21, 4, 10, 20, 26, 15, 32, 39]. Achieving fairness requires careful algorithm design and training to minimize bias and avoid reinforcing stereotypes. A major challenge is to define and ensure fairness in generative AI systems [10, 3]. While traditional approaches use prompt variations to observe system behavior, these methods often fail to capture (1) the complex dynamics of interactions with generative AI and (2) the multifaceted nature of fairness.

We therefore present a novel framework for defining, evaluating, and enforcing fairness in generative AI systems. By viewing the repeated generation of artifacts (such as images) as a non-terminating process, we propose to use infinite strings over alphabets of abstract concepts to represent the sequence of input prompts and resulting images. This approach allows us to use formal specifications such as Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) [25] to define fairness regarding concept groups’ eventual and repeated appearances and to connect with the *frequency view* of fairness. We distinguish between the fairness manifested in the generated sequence and the AI’s inherent fairness. By inherent fairness, we refer to the condition where the input prompt does not influence the generative AI to bias the output toward a particular concept value (for example, a particular demographic group).

Most significantly, this notion of fairness is *conditional to individual concepts* (e.g., economically disadvantaged person or successful business leader) where all images manifest, implying that fairness in the context of generative AI is *not* a universal property.

We also address practical considerations such as the exponential number of category combinations (that is, intersectional fairness) and the finite length of the generated artifacts. For the first challenge, we use *combinatorial testing* [24] to create a *relative* form of intersectional fairness. For the second, we adopt the notion of $\mathbf{X}_w$ (weak next) in LTL_f (LTL over finite traces) [7, 11] to characterize the recurrence of concepts bounded by a finite distance. With such a mathematically precise formulation, we can not only perform fairness evaluation, but also algorithmically enforce fairness *lazily* by minimizing the interference with the generative AI model. More specifically, fairness enforcement uses counters to keep track of potential deadline violations for each value in the group, where enforcement needs to be triggered in advance by anticipating simultaneous deadline violations in the near future.

Based on these developments we have implemented a software prototype for evaluating and enforcing fairness for generative AI systems, and evaluated them on OpenAI’s ChatGPT 4.0 connected with DALL·E3, and on ZHIPU AI’s GLM-4.¹ Our evaluations clearly show that these generative AI models manifest biases that may be inherent in the training data collected, reflecting societal stereotypes. Most importantly, these evaluations strongly support the view that the notion of fairness for generative AI is indeed conditional on concepts. For example, fairness against gender or demographic groups is weak when image sequences are conditioned to the idea of “poor / economically disadvantaged”. In contrast, fairness is strongly manifested when image sequences are conditioned to the idea of “successful business leader”. We also observe that even for all-pair fairness by eventual appearance (the simplest form of relative intersectional fairness), models such as GLM-4 fail to achieve a coverage of 35%, and thus have considerable room for improvement. Finally, enforcement actions are annotated at the generative AI’s prompts as an enforcing statement for improved fairness.

Overall, the main contributions of this paper are as follows:

1. A sound technical framework that formalizes an interaction with a generative AI system as an infinite sequence of generated artifacts, as the basis for characterizing the fairness of infinite sequences

¹ GLM-4 is available at <https://open.bigmodel.cn/>



Figure 1. Image sequences of poor (economically disadvantaged) person generated using ChatGPT 4.0 connected with DALL·E3

and the generative AI model.

2. Solutions to practical challenges of fairness for generative AI, including restricting fairness to finite sequences, relative completeness criteria for intersectional fairness, and enforcing fairness with minimum interference.
3. A public repository on all our datasets, codes, and experimental results at <https://github.com/SEMTA-Group/FairGenAI>.

2 Related Work

Fairness in AI systems is a pressing issue with many unresolved challenges [3]. This is especially true for machine learning systems that are trained on data. Main areas of research focus include dataset bias [36, 35, 19, 9, 14, 29] as well as bias measurement and mitigation of models [22, 27, 37, 8, 26, 15, 32].

A popular framework for fairness assessment in generative AI uses sensitive attribute classifiers [12, 5, 30, 34, 33]. This involves the generation of a batch of samples from the target generative AI model followed by a sensitive attribute (SA) classifier to classify these samples. The expected value of the SA classifier’s output over the sample batch estimates the corresponding attributes, and assesses generator bias. However, these approaches do not consider *interaction*, where the prompts fed into the generative AI may be inherently biased to influence the generated result. We address this issue in a novel formal fairness characterization, where input prompts are unbiased. In addition, our formulation of fairness is always conditional on concepts, implying that fairness is not universal. For example, gender fairness is only manifested under images of “successful business leader” but not “poor person”. While we formalize the interaction as an infinite sequence and define fairness in terms of the possible and repeated occurrences of concept groups, our technical result also allows alignment with the frequency view of fairness. In addition, the infinite sequence view also allows us to design enforcement algorithms, where our technique of lazily interfering with the generative AI models (only when necessary) is motivated by the concept of shielding in safe reinforcement learning [1], which itself is rooted in LTL reactive synthesis and safety games [13].

Considering fairness along single dimensions such as gender or race in isolation clearly is not sufficient to ensure fairness at their intersections, such as groups of dark-skinned women [6, 2]. These kinds of intersections between gender and racial biases have received significant attention, particularly in the realm of machine learning systems for sensitive analysis tasks [17]. Furthermore, these intersections have been explored in language models such as BERT and GPT-2 [31]. The authors of [18] addressed intersectional occupational bias by examining the intersections of gender with religion,

sexuality, ethnicity, political affiliation, and continental name origin. The main challenge in intersectional fairness lies in the impracticality of directly ensuring fairness across all combinations of subgroups, as this approach leads to an exponential proliferation of subgroups with each additional axis of discrimination [16]. To address this combinatorial explosion, we develop a technique which is inspired by k -way combinatorial testing [24] to provide a less stringent version of intersectional fairness, which we call *relative intersectional fairness*.

3 Interacting with the Generative AI

We mathematically formulate the interaction with the generative AI by characterizing the essence of foundational models (LLMs) implemented with transformers, serving as the basis to define fairness.

Definition 1 (Generator). Let $f : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^* \times (\mathcal{I} \cup \{\perp\})$ be the **generator** (generative AI model) that takes an input string $s \in \Sigma^*$ and returns (i) an output string and (ii) an image (e.g., ChatGPT 4.0 connected with DALL·E3).

- Σ is the set of possible tokens in a textual language.
- $\mathcal{I} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{0, \dots, 255\}^{H \times W \times 3}$, where $H, W \in \mathbb{N}_+$ are the height and width of an image, and 3 represents that an image has three (RGB) channels. The symbol “ $\perp$ ” represents the special case of “null”, i.e., the image is not generated. In our subsequent formulation, we only consider the case where an image can be successfully generated.

We use $f^{img}(\cdot)$ to refer to the part producing the output image and use $f^{txt}(\cdot)$ to refer to the part producing the output text.

Our subsequent formulation is motivated by the observation that state-of-the-art generators are implemented using neural networks (e.g., transformers [38] and diffusion models [28]) and are thus memoryless. In a typical interaction flow with an LLM like GPT-4 or a similar model, each new input or question is considered in the context of the preceding conversation. Therefore, when one asks a follow-up question C after having received an answer B to the initial question A , the model essentially considers the concatenated sequence of inputs and outputs $A \cdot B \cdot C$ to generate its next textual output D .

Example 1 (Generating images for a poor person). As a motivating example, we take ChatGPT 4.0 with DALL·E3 as the generator f to synthesize images of economically disadvantaged people. Let Σ be the words in English, space, punctuation, numbers, and special symbols. An example of an input prompt can be $p_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} "[Q] \text{ Please generate an image of a poor person. } \boxed{\perp} "$. $f(p_1)$ generates an image and the following texts as answers.

- $a_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f^{txt}(p_1) = "[A] \text{ A person in old, tattered clothing standing in a city alley, surrounded by brick walls... } "$ (further details omitted)
- $img_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f^{img}(p_1)$ as illustrated in the top left of Fig. 1.

Subsequently, a follow-up input prompt can be the following:

$p_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} "[Q] \text{ Please generate an image of a poor person, different from the previous ones. } \boxed{\perp} "$. Following the mechanism as stated previously, $f(p_1 \cdot a_1 \cdot p_2)$ generates the following texts and an image.

- $a_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f^{txt}(p_1 \cdot a_1 \cdot p_2) = "[A] \text{ A young person sitting on the ground beside an empty street, their face reflecting a mix of hope and sorrow. They are wearing oversized... } "$ (further details omitted)

- $img_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f^{img}(p_1 \cdot a_1 \cdot p_2)$ as illustrated in the top row of Fig. 1.

We now mathematically precise the definition of the generation process. Let $p_1, p_2, \dots \in \Sigma^*$ form an infinite sequence of input prompts. Given the generator f , we abbreviate $f^{txt, \alpha}(p_\alpha)$ as the overall text sequence of prompt and answers, which can be defined using the following recursive process stated in Eq. (1). That is, $f^{txt, \alpha}(p_\alpha)$ concatenates all input prompts and the textual answers generated from f , by continuously feeding $p_1, \dots, p_\alpha$.

$$f^{txt, \alpha}(p_\alpha) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} p_\alpha \cdot f^{txt}(p_\alpha) & \text{if } \alpha = 1 \\ f^{txt, \alpha-1}(p_{\alpha-1}) \cdot p_\alpha & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

This allows us to mathematically define $f^{img, \alpha}(p_\alpha)$, following the recursive structure defined in Eq. (2), to be the α -th image generated by f by feeding input prompts $p_1, \dots, p_\alpha$.

$$f^{img, \alpha}(p_\alpha) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} f^{img}(p_\alpha) & \text{if } \alpha = 1 \\ f^{img}(f^{txt, \alpha-1}(p_{\alpha-1}) \cdot p_\alpha) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Example 2. Eq. (3) produces the $f^{txt, 2}(p_2)$ which can be further contaminated with p_3 to generate the textual response a_3 and the third image img_3 .

$$\begin{aligned} f^{txt, 2}(p_2) &= f^{txt, 1}(p_1) \cdot p_2 \cdot f^{txt}(f^{txt, 1}(p_1) \cdot p_2) \\ &= p_1 \cdot f^{txt}(p_1) \cdot p_2 \cdot f^{txt}(p_1 \cdot f^{txt}(p_1) \cdot p_2) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Remark We discuss some implementation-specific concerns in the following. Nevertheless, these concerns do not influence the validity of our formulation. (i) Within large language models, the concept of the *token window* refers to the fixed number of contiguous tokens a model can process at one time, beyond which earlier tokens are no longer considered, effectively “forgetting” them. (ii) State-of-the-art image generation is commonly implemented with a separate text-to-image generator $\mathcal{G}$ (e.g., diffusion model) that takes the produced text as input. Consider the first prompt being p_1 , then $f^{img}(p_1)$ equals $\mathcal{G}(f^{txt}(p_1))$.

4 The Different Facets of Fairness

We start by defining concept groups, which serve as the basis for characterizing the *group fairness* of an infinite image sequence as well as the fairness of the generator. Throughout the paper, we use $[a \dots b]$ to represent the set of integers ranging from a to b .

Definition 2. Let $\text{cgf}_i : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow [0 \dots \text{CG}_i]$ be the **concept grouping function** that returns the index (*concept group value*) that an image belongs, where CG_i is a positive integer.

Example 1. (cont.) We consider three concept grouping functions and apply them in images within Fig. 1.

- Let $\text{cgf}_{\text{poor}} : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ return a simplified categorization based on the character of an image is considered economically disadvantaged, with the value having the following semantics.

- 0 : the person is not economically disadvantaged
- 1 : the person is economically disadvantaged

Then $\text{cgf}_{\text{poor}}(img_1) = \text{cgf}_{\text{poor}}(img_2) = 1$.

- Let $\text{cgf}_{\text{gender}} : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ return a simplified categorization based on the gender of an image character, with the value having the following semantics.

- 0 : female
- 1 : male
- 2 : other

Then $\text{cgf}_{\text{gender}}(img_1) = \text{cgf}_{\text{gender}}(img_2) = 1$.

- Let $\text{cgf}_{\text{age}} : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ return a simplified categorization based on the seniority of the character within the image, with the value having the following semantics.

- 0 : child
- 1 : adult
- 2 : elderly

Then $\text{cgf}_{\text{age}}(img_1) = 2$ and $\text{cgf}_{\text{age}}(img_2) = 0$.

4.1 Sequence-level Fairness

We establish the theoretical framework for defining fairness on an infinite sequence of images sharing a common characteristic.

Definition 3 (Sequence fairness with eventual appearance). Let cgf_1 and cgf_2 be two concept grouping functions, and let $ims \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} img_1 \cdot img_2 \dots \in \mathcal{I}^\omega$ be the infinite sequence of images where $\forall i \in \mathbb{N} : \text{cgf}_1(img_i) = cg$ where $cg \in [0 \dots \text{CG}_1]$. Then ims is **fair with eventual appearance** for concept group 2 under cgf_1 evaluated to cg , abbreviated as $\langle \frac{\text{cgf}_2}{\text{cgf}_1 \leftarrow cg} \rangle \Diamond$ -fair, if

$$\forall k \in [0 \dots \text{CG}_2] : \exists m \geq 1 : \text{cgf}_2(img_m) = k$$

Example 1. (cont.) Let $ims \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} img_1 \cdot img_2 \dots \in \mathcal{I}^\omega$ be an infinite image sequence for depicting different economically disadvantaged characters, where Fig. 1 shows the first 8 images. Therefore, $\forall i \in \mathbb{N} : \text{cgf}_{\text{poor}}(img_i) = 1$. We can conclude that ims is $\langle \frac{\text{gender}}{\text{cgf}_{\text{poor}} \leftarrow 1} \rangle \Diamond$ -fair, as we can find all considered gender types.

- $\text{cgf}_{\text{gender}}(img_3) = 0$ (female)
- $\text{cgf}_{\text{gender}}(img_1) = 1$ (male)
- $\text{cgf}_{\text{gender}}(img_6) = 2$ (other)

In addition, ims is $\langle \frac{\text{age}}{\text{cgf}_{\text{poor}} \leftarrow 1} \rangle \Diamond$ -fair, as we can find all considered age types.

- $\text{cgf}_{\text{age}}(img_2) = 0$ (child)
- $\text{cgf}_{\text{age}}(img_8) = 1$ (adult)
- $\text{cgf}_{\text{age}}(img_3) = 2$ (elderly)

As the definition utilizes infinite image sequences, one can go beyond fairness with eventual appearance by considering the *average*, *minimum*, or *maximum* distance of *repeated occurrence* of every concept group value. For instance, the following definition characterizes fairness by ensuring that the minimum distance of repeated occurrence is bounded by β for every possible concept group value.

Definition 4 (Sequence fairness by β -bounded repeated appearance).

Let cgf_1 and cgf_2 be two concept grouping functions, and let $ims \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} img_1 \cdot img_2 \dots \in \mathcal{I}^\omega$ be the infinite sequence of images where $\forall i \in \mathbb{N} : \text{cgf}_1(img_i) = cg$ where $cg \in [0 \dots \text{CG}_1]$. Then ims

is **fair with β -bounded repeated appearance** for concept group 2 under cgf_1 evaluated to cg , abbreviated as $\langle \frac{\text{cgf}_2}{\text{cgf}_1 \leftarrow \text{cg}} \rangle \square \Diamond_{\leq \beta}$ -fair, if

$$\begin{aligned} \forall k \in [0 \cdots \text{CG}_2] : \exists m : 1 \leq m \leq \beta \wedge \text{cgf}_2(\text{img}_m) = k \\ \wedge \\ \forall m_1 \geq 1 : (\text{cgf}_2(\text{img}_{m_1}) = k \rightarrow \\ \exists m_2 : m_1 < m_2 \leq m_1 + \beta : \text{cgf}_2(\text{img}_{m_2}) = k) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The following lemmas provide a sound upper bound on the *frequency* difference under β -bounded repeated appearance fairness, as well as lower-bounding the smallest β value.

Lemma 1. Let $\text{cgf}_2 : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow [0 \cdots \text{CG}_2]$ be the concept grouping function, and $\text{ims} \in \mathcal{I}^\omega$ be an infinite sequence of images. Given $\text{cg} \in [0 \cdots \text{CG}_2]$, define $\mathcal{F}(\text{cg}, \text{ims})$ using Eq. 5.

$$\mathcal{F}(\text{cg}, \text{ims}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{m \leq n : \text{cgf}_i(\text{img}_m) = \text{cg}\}|}{n} \quad (5)$$

Assume that ims is $\langle \frac{\text{cgf}_2}{\text{cgf}_1 \leftarrow \text{cg}} \rangle \square \Diamond_{\leq \beta}$ -fair, then following condition holds.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \text{cg}_x, \text{cg}_y \in [0 \cdots \text{CG}_2] : \\ |\mathcal{F}(\text{cg}_x, \text{ims}) - \mathcal{F}(\text{cg}_y, \text{ims})| \leq 1 - \frac{\text{CG}_2 + 1}{\beta} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Proof. The extreme case occurs when the concept group value 0 has the highest frequency of occurrence (i.e., $\text{cg}_x = 0$) while the rest of concept group values $1, \dots, \text{CG}_2$ have the lowest occurrence frequency. For each concept group value $\text{cg}_y \in [1 \cdots \text{CG}_2]$ having the lowest frequency, it implies that in Eq. (4), $m_2 = m_1 + \beta$, i.e., $\mathcal{F}(\text{cg}_y, \text{ims})$ has the smallest value of $\frac{1}{\beta}$. Consequently, the frequency of $\mathcal{F}(\text{cg}_x, \text{ims})$ can at most be $1 - (\text{CG}_2) \mathcal{F}(\text{cg}_y, \text{ims}) = 1 - \frac{\text{CG}_2}{\beta}$. Therefore, the frequency difference (if the limit exists) is bounded by $(1 - \frac{\text{CG}_2}{\beta}) - \frac{1}{\beta} = 1 - \frac{\text{CG}_2 + 1}{\beta}$. $\square$

Lemma 2. Let $\text{ims} \in \mathcal{I}^\omega$ be $\langle \frac{\text{cgf}_2}{\text{cgf}_1 \leftarrow \text{cg}} \rangle \square \Diamond_{\leq \beta}$ -fair where $\text{cgf}_2 : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow [0 \cdots \text{CG}_2]$. Then $\beta \geq \text{CG}_2 + 1$.

Proof. The smallest possible $\beta_{\min}$ occurs when concept group values occur in ims in a strictly round-robin fashion, implying that $\beta_{\min} = \text{size}([0 \cdots \text{CG}_2]) = \text{CG}_2 + 1$. $\square$

4.2 Generator-level Fairness

Observe that an image sequence ims can be *fair due to the explicit control of the input prompts* given (i.e., $p_1, p_2, \dots$); it thus can not fully reflect the inherent limitation of the generator f . Therefore, we aim to consider the fairness of a generator, under the consideration where the input prompts $p_1, p_2, \dots$ provide *no hints* on the concept group that fairness should be manifested. Before precisely characterizing the meaning of “hints”, we offer some examples to assist in understanding the idea.

Example 3. The following prompt sequences provide no hints on the gender ($\text{cgf}_{\text{gender}}$) and age (cgf_{age}) information.

- $p_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} "[Q] \text{ Please generate an image of a poor person. } \boxed{\leftarrow}"$
- $p_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} "[Q] \text{ Please generate an image of a poor person, different from the previous ones. } \boxed{\leftarrow}"$

- $\forall i > 2$, let $p_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p_2$

Example 4. The following prompts provide hints to bias the image generation of f towards a specific group based on the official demographic categorization used in the education statistics in the USA [23].

- [Q] Generate another image, where the person in the image should be "African American".
- [Q] Generate another image, where the person in the image should have black skin.
- [Q] Generate another image, where the person in the image should be within one of the commonly seen demographic groups in the USA, but should not have a looking like an Asian, white, Latino, or native American.

Definition 5 (Value-biased prompts). A prompt $p \in \Sigma^*$ is **value biased / non-neutral** subject to concept group $\text{cgf}_i(\cdot)$, iff the following condition holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \text{cg} \in [0 \cdots \text{CG}_i] : \\ \forall s_1, s_2 \in \Sigma^* : \text{cgf}_i(f^{\text{img}}(s_1 \cdot p)) = \text{cgf}_i(f^{\text{img}}(s_2 \cdot p)) = \text{cg} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Intuitively, the definition of a value-biased prompt implies that by using prompt p in the generation process, one guarantees that the immediately generated image, when evaluated on the concept group cgf_i , always² leads to manifesting concept group value cg .

The second type of biased prompts corresponds to the case of enforcing the output to resemble the value that had occurred in history without explicitly mentioning the value itself. An example can be [Q] Generate another image, where the image is the same as the previous image. Def. 6 characterizes the case of binding to a particular history occurring k steps before; one can further extend the definition to allow the history binding to be within a finite set of $\{k_1, \dots, k_\gamma\}$ steps.

Definition 6 (History-biased prompts). A prompt $p \in \Sigma^*$ is **k -history biased / non-neutral** subject to the concept group $\text{cgf}_i(\cdot)$, iff the following condition holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall p_1, p_2, \dots, p_j, \dots \in \Sigma^* : \\ \text{cgf}_i(f^{\text{img}, j}(p_j)) = \text{cgf}_i(f^{\text{img}, j+k}(p_j)) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Altogether, by clearly defining the meaning of a biased prompt, we can now define the *inherent fairness* of a generator, which requires that *when all input prompts are neural, fairness remains ensured*. Def. 7 characterizes eventual fairness, while it is a straightforward extension to characterize repeated fairness.

Definition 7 (Inherent fairness of the generator). Let cgf_1 and cgf_2 be two concept grouping functions, and let f be the generator function. Then f is **inherently fair with eventual appearance** for concept group 2 under cgf_1 evaluated to cg , abbreviated as $\langle \frac{\text{cgf}_2}{\text{cgf}_1 \leftarrow \text{cg}} \rangle \Diamond$ -fair, when the following conditions hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall p_1, p_2, \dots \in \Sigma^* : ((\forall i > 0 : \text{cgf}_1(f^{\text{img}, i}(p_i)) = \text{cg}) \\ \wedge \\ (\forall i > 0 : p_i \text{ is not biased subject to } \text{cgf}_2(\cdot))) \\ \rightarrow (\forall k \in [0 \cdots \text{CG}_2] : \exists m \geq 1 : \text{cgf}_2(f^{\text{img}, m}(p_m)) = k) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

² Here we omit technical details, but one can also have relaxations such as having a probabilistic guarantee.

In Eq. (9), the first conjunct before the implication ($\forall i > 0 : \text{cgf}_1(f^{img,i}(p_i)) = cg$) characterizes the situation where all images being generated with the sequence of input prompts, when applying $\text{cgf}_1(\cdot)$, result in concept group value cg . The term $f^{img,i}(p_i)$ follows the definition listed in Eq. (2). The second conjunct demands the prompts to be not biased (utilizing Def. 5 and 6). The right-hand side of the logical implication demands that fairness of eventual occurrence should hold in the generated image sequence, resembling the formulation in Def. 3.

5 Practical Considerations

5.1 Accessing Fairness on Finite Image Sequences

While the previously stated theoretical framework is based on infinite sequences of images, in practice, accessing fairness is commonly done on image sequences of finite length. In this situation, it is natural to change in Def. 3 from $\mathcal{I}^\omega$ (infinite word) to $\mathcal{I}^*$ (finite word) so that eventual appearance should be manifested in the finite image sequence. The problem occurs in definitions related to the repeated occurrence (e.g., Def. 4), where manifesting repeated occurrence on finite traces is impossible.³ On finite traces, defining fairness with repeated appearance requires *an assumption on extrapolating what happens if the finite image sequence is further extended*.

For Def. 4 on fairness with β -bounded repeated appearance, however, recall that bounded response $\Diamond_{\leq \beta} \phi$ in LTL over infinite words can be rewritten using the *next* ($\mathbf{X}$) operator, i.e., $\phi \vee \mathbf{X}\phi \vee \mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}\phi \vee \dots \vee \mathbf{X}^\beta \phi$. To apply it in finite traces, the idea of the *weak-next* $\mathbf{X}_w$ operator as defined in LTL over finite traces [11] is useful, where $\mathbf{X}_w \phi$ holds automatically when considering being at the *last position* of the string (i.e., let π be a finite trace and $\text{len}(\pi)$ returns the length of the trace. Then $\pi, m \models \mathbf{X}_w \phi$ iff (i) $m < \text{len}(\pi) - 1$ and $\pi, m+1 \models \phi$, or (ii) $m = \text{len}(\pi) - 1$). This is based on the belief that if we extend the trace by 1, it is possible that the next symbol can satisfy ϕ . This leads to the following modified definition.

Definition 8 (Finite sequence fairness by β -bounded repeated appearance). Let cgf_1 and cgf_2 be two concept grouping functions, and let $ims \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} img_1 \cdot img_2 \dots \in \mathcal{I}^*$ be the finite sequence of images where $\forall i \in \mathbb{N} : \text{cgf}_1(img_i) = cg$ where $cg \in [0 \dots CG_1]$. Then ims is **fair with β -bounded repeated appearance** for concept group 2 under cgf_1 evaluated to cg , abbreviated as $\langle \frac{\text{cgf}_2}{\text{cgf}_1 \Leftarrow cg} \rangle \Box \Diamond_{\leq \beta}$ -fair, iff (1) $\text{len}(ims) > \beta$, and (2) the condition characterized in Eq. (10) holds.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall k \in [0 \dots CG_2] : \exists m : 1 \leq m \leq \beta \wedge \text{cgf}_2(img_m) = k & \\ \wedge & \\ \forall m_1 \geq 1 : (\text{cgf}_2(img_{m_1}) = k \rightarrow & \\ ((\exists m_2 : m_1 < m_2 \leq m_1 + \beta : \text{cgf}_2(img_{m_2}) = k) & \\ \vee & \\ m_1 + \beta > \text{len}(ims))) & \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Comparing Eq. (4) and Eq. (10), the difference in the finite version lies in the disjunction ($\vee$) of condition $(m_1 + \beta > \text{len}(ims))$, reflecting that if the occurrence m_1 is close to the end of the image sequence, it is impossible to see β subsequent images. Similar to the semantic of $\mathbf{X}_w$, we opportunistically consider it can occur if the image sequence is prolonged.

³ It is well known in the theory of linear temporal logic of finite traces [7] that the meaning of response property (i.e., $\Box \Diamond$ in LTL) has different interpretations when defining infinite and finite traces.




Figure 2. Example illustrating the concept of β -bounded repeated appearance in a finite sequence of 11 images

Example 5. Consider the finite image sequence as illustrated in Fig. 2, where let $\text{cgf}_{\text{shape}} : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \{0 \text{ (circle)}, 1 \text{ (other)}\}$ and $\text{cgf}_{\text{color}} : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \{0 \text{ (white)}, 1 \text{ (yellow)}\}$. Then the image sequence in Fig. 2 is $\langle \frac{\text{cgf}_{\text{color}}}{\text{cgf}_{\text{shape}} \Leftarrow 0} \rangle \Box \Diamond_{\leq 6}$ -fair. This is because the image sequence length is larger than 6, and for every color occurrence, the next occurrence occurs within a distance of 6. Note that for the final occurrence of “yellow” that makes $m_1 = 8$ in Eq. (10), the second term in the disjunction holds as $m_1 + \beta = 8 + 6 = 14 > \text{len}(ims) = 11$.

5.2 Relative Intersectional Fairness

So far, the $\langle \frac{\text{cgf}_2}{\text{cgf}_1 \Leftarrow cg} \rangle \Diamond$ -fairness have been used to ensure the presence of all concept group values when considering a single categorization with cgf_2 . We can extend the concept to build fairness of manifesting *fairness in criterion pairs* $\langle \frac{\text{cgf}_x, \text{cgf}_y}{\text{cgf}_w \Leftarrow cg} \rangle$ and in *criterion triplets* $\langle \frac{\text{cgf}_x, \text{cgf}_y, \text{cgf}_z}{\text{cgf}_w \Leftarrow cg} \rangle$, where the definition immediately follows (e.g., Def. 9). As an example, consider the gender and age as two category groups, the extension on fairness in criterion pairs $\langle \frac{\text{cgf}_{\text{gender}}, \text{cgf}_{\text{age}}}{\text{cgf}_w \Leftarrow cg} \rangle$ then demands fairness to be observed in image sequences with all combinations defined by the following set $\{(cg_x, cg_y)\}$ with $cg_x \in \{\text{female}, \text{male}, \text{other}\}$ and $cg_y \in \{\text{child}, \text{adult}, \text{elderly}\}$.

Definition 9 (Sequence paired fairness with eventual appearance). Let cgf_w , cgf_x and cgf_y be three concept grouping functions, and let $ims \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} img_1 \cdot img_2 \dots \in \mathcal{I}^*$ be the finite sequence of images where $\forall i \in \mathbb{N} : \text{cgf}_w(img_i) = cg$ where $cg \in [0 \dots CG_w]$. Then ims is **paired-fair with eventual appearance** for concept group x and y under cgf_w evaluated to cg , abbreviated as $\langle \frac{\text{cgf}_x, \text{cgf}_y}{\text{cgf}_w \Leftarrow cg} \rangle \Diamond$ -fair, if the following condition holds.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall k_1 \in [0 \dots CG_x], k_2 \in [0 \dots CG_y] : & \\ \exists m \geq 1 : \text{cgf}_x(img_m) = k_1 \wedge \text{cgf}_y(img_m) = k_2 & \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Given cgf_w and additional K concept grouping functions $\text{cgf}_1, \dots, \text{cgf}_K$, one can extend Def. 9 and analogously define $\langle \frac{\text{cgf}_1, \dots, \text{cgf}_K}{\text{cgf}_w \Leftarrow cg} \rangle \Diamond$ -fairness, which demands that all combinations of concept group values should eventually appear. This leads to a concept similar to avoiding intersectional biases defined in the literature [18, 2, 3]. However, given K concept grouping functions with each having a binary assignment $\{0, 1\}$, it is well known that *combinatorial explosion* exists, meaning that there is a need to manifest 2^K assignments to achieve intersectional fairness.

Encountering this, we thus borrow the technique from k -way combinatorial testing [24] to provide a weaker form of intersectional fairness (*relative intersectional fairness*) whose satisfaction requires only a polynomially bounded number of images. Def. 10 ensures that for every pair (2-way combinations) of concept group functions, all concept group value combinations are eventually manifested. The universal quantifier $x, y \in [1 \dots K], x \neq y$ in Def. 10 only selects pairs of concept group functions as the conditions to be satisfied.

Definition 10 (Sequence all-paired fairness with eventual appearance). Given cgf_w and additional K concept grouping functions

Algorithm 1 Ensuring $\langle \frac{cgf_2}{cgf_1 \leftarrow cg} \rangle \square \Diamond \leq \beta$ -fairness

```

1: let  $c[0 \dots CG_2] \leftarrow \beta, \alpha \leftarrow 1$ 
2: while true do
3:    $p_\alpha \leftarrow$  Get prompt from the user for image generation, aiming
     to achieve  $cgf_1(\cdot) = cg$ 
4:   for  $k = CG_2$  to 1 do
5:     if  $\exists$  distinct  $cg_{21}, \dots, cg_{2k} : c[cg_{21}] = c[cg_{22}] = \dots =$ 
        $c[cg_{2k}] = k$  then
6:        $cg_2 \leftarrow \text{random}\{cg_{21}, \dots, cg_{2k}\}$ 
7:        $p_\alpha \leftarrow p_\alpha \cdot$  "Enforce the generated image s.t.
          $cg_2(\cdot) = cg_2$ "
8:       break
9:    $img_\alpha \leftarrow f^{img, \alpha}(p_\alpha)$ 
10:  for  $cg = CG_2$  to 0 do
11:    if  $cgf_2(img_\alpha) = cg$  then
12:       $c[cg] \leftarrow \beta$ 
13:    else
14:       $c[cg] \leftarrow c[cg] - 1$ 
15:   $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha + 1$ 

```

```

/* 0 Asian, 1 Caucasian, 2 African American, 3 Latino */    $\beta = 50$ 
c[0] = 50, c[1] = 50, c[2] = 50, c[3] = 50
    ↓  $img_1$  (Asian)
c[0] = 50, c[1] = 49, c[2] = 49, c[3] = 49
    ↓  $img_2$  (Asian)
c[0] = 50, c[1] = 48, c[2] = 48, c[3] = 48
    ...
    ↓  $img_{47}$  (Asian)
c[0] = 50, c[1] = 3, c[2] = 3, c[3] = 3   [Enforce "Caucasian"]
    ↓  $img_{48}$  (Caucasian)
c[0] = 49, c[1] = 50, c[2] = 2, c[3] = 2   [Enforce "Latino"]
    ↓  $img_{49}$  (Latino)
c[0] = 48, c[1] = 49, c[2] = 1, c[3] = 50 [Enforce "African American"]
    ↓  $img_{49}$  (African American)
c[0] = 47, c[1] = 48, c[2] = 50, c[3] = 49

```

Figure 3. Example illustrating how Algo. 1 is applied

$cgf_1, \dots, cgf_K$, let $ims \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} img_1 \cdot img_2 \dots \in \mathcal{I}^*$ be the finite sequence of images where $\forall i \in \mathbb{N} : cgf_w(img_i) = cg$ where $cg \in [0 \dots CG_w]$. Then ims is **all-paired-fair with eventual appearance** for concept groups $[1 \dots K]$ under cgf_w evaluated to cg , abbreviated as $\langle \frac{\forall x, y \in [1 \dots K] : cgf_x, cgf_y}{cgf_w \leftarrow cg} \rangle \Diamond$ -fair, if the following condition holds.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \forall x, y \in [1 \dots K], x \neq y : \\
& \forall k_1 \in [0 \dots CG_x], k_2 \in [0 \dots CG_y] : \quad (12) \\
& \exists m \geq 1 : cgf_x(img_m) = k_1 \wedge cgf_y(img_m) = k_2
\end{aligned}$$

5.3 Enforcing Fairness with Repeated Appearance

Finally, while previously stated definitions assume the prompts to be not biased (cf. Def. 5), one can also explicitly create prompts biased towards a specific concept group value to *enforce* fairness, where we focus on enforcing $\langle \frac{cgf_2}{cgf_1 \leftarrow cg} \rangle \square \Diamond \leq \beta$ -fairness as characterized in Def. 4.

Note that one trivial way is to explicitly control every prompt to manifest round-robin behavior. An example for cgf_2 being $cgf_{age}(\cdot)$ would be to enforce the generator to create the images strictly using the following ordering of values: “child”, “adult”, “elderly”. Our interest, however, is to aim for *minimum interference*. We aim to use only biased (enforcing) prompts when necessary. Algo. 1 presents our fairness enforcement method.

Initially (line 1), define an array c ranging from 0 to CG_2 , with initial values set to β . $c[i]$ tracks the deadline before the concept group value i shall manifest. The algorithm continues by using an infinite loop to extract prompts from the user (lines 2, 3). The for-loop and the following condition (lines 4, 5) try to detect if there are multiple concept group values whose deadline is approaching. When there exist k concept group values whose deadline equals k (line 5), it is then *mandatory* to use biased / non-neutral prompts to ensure one of the concept group values is selected in the corresponding image generation process, as reflected in lines 6 and 7. Note that the for-loop at line 4 iterates from $k = CG_2$ to 1 (not the other way round), as it is important to signal the issue as early as possible. Finally, an image is produced (line 9), and for the corresponding concept group value cg , the counter $c[cg]$ is reset to β (line 12) while counters of other values are subtracted by 1.

Example 6. Fig. 3 illustrates an example on how Algo. 1 is applied to enforce fairness, where $cgf_2 : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow [0 \dots 3]$, with $\beta = 50$. Initially, $c[0] = c[1] = c[2] = c[3] = 50$. With the first prompt, enforcement is not triggered; as the first image has $cgf_2(img_1) = 0$, $c[1], c[2], c[3]$ are set to 49 while $c[0]$ is reset to 50. When the generator continuously produces images of Asians, it eventually leads to the situation $c[1] = c[2] = c[3] = 3$, where the condition at line 5 of Algo. 1 is enabled, implying the need to enforce fairness. Then, one of the concept group values is taken from random to be enforced, where in Fig. 3, the first value being taken equals 1 (Caucasian).

6 Evaluation

We have considered fairness on two image-based generative AI tools, namely ChatGPT 4.0 connected with DALL-E3 from OpenAI as well as GLM-4 from ZHIPU AI, where Fig. 4 illustrates some of the image sequences produced by these tools when feeding neutral prompts similar to Ex. 3. For images of successful business leaders in the second row Fig. 4, the prompt resembles Ex. 3 by only replacing the term “poor person” with “successful business leader”. We have drawn multiple image sequences using neutral prompts, where the length of each image sequence is at least 40.

First, we observed that fairness is not universally enabled on all concepts in a generative AI model, as satisfaction can be conditional to certain concept group values. This confirms the appropriateness of our definition, which is always conditioned to a particular concept group value.

- **(Different degree of gender fairness)** When considering gender to be binary (male, female) based on the facial characteristics, for “successful business leader”, within all sequences, the minimum β value that satisfies Def. 8 is tightly centered around 5. However, for “poor person”, female figures are substantially less presented⁴, reflecting the minimum β value for image sequences being between 13 and 20.

⁴ In our evaluation, we explicitly removed generated images where the subject can not be recognized with gender, as well as images with more characters because the generated image did not follow the instructions from the prompt.



Figure 4. Image sequences of a poor person (top row) and successful business leaders (middle row) created by ChatGPT 4.0 connected with DALL-E3, as well as image sequence of the successful person (of any occupation) created by GLM-4 (bottom row)

- **(Different degree of demographic fairness)** For demographics, when it comes to “successful business leader”, fairness with repeated appearance can be manifested, even for the concept group value “native American”, as demonstrated in the 11th image at the second row of Fig. 4. This contrasts with the case of a “poor person”, where even fairness with eventual appearance can not be manifested due to missing images in the concept group value in some image sequences.

Second, we observed that even when using the relative intersectional fairness criterion defined in Def. 10, generative AI models still struggle to include all combinations of pair-wise features. In our experiment, we generated multiple image sequences of length 80 using the GLM-4 model for “successful person”, where we considered four concept group functions including demographics, gender, occupation⁵, and the character being fuller-figured. The prompt explicitly hints the generative AI model to consider diversities at least in these four aspects. We normalize the value by dividing it with $\sum_{x \in [1 \dots K]} \sum_{y \in [1 \dots K], y > x} (CG_x + 1)(CG_y + 1)$ in Def. 10, as the denominator represents the number of all-paired combinations needed. The tendency increase is illustrated in Fig. 5, where each line corresponds to the behavior of one image sequence. With the maximum possible value being 1, we observed that the coverage is always below 0.4. Apart from one sequence, the coverage largely saturates after 25 images (reflected as a horizontal line), implying that the subsequent generated images highly resemble the first 25 images regarding concept group values (e.g., repeating doctors). Our results suggest a huge potential for the GLM-4 generative model to improve intersectional fairness in its image generation process.

Finally, we have also implemented the enforcement mechanism in Algo. 1 to guarantee fairness, where Fig. 6 illustrates a qualitative example: Due to β being set to 3, the algorithm forces the model to construct the fourth image (img_4) with a male-looking figure by annotating a prompt “The person has a strong male looking” at the end of the neutral prompt.

7 Concluding Remarks

Our formal approach to fairness in generative AI uniquely defines fairness through the lens of infinite sequences, allowing for a dynamic assessment of fairness over time. By distinguishing between the fairness demonstrated in generated sequences and the inherent




Figure 5. The tendency of all-paired-fairness increase with GLM-4 generated image samples on “successful person”; the orange line is shorter as GLM-4 refuses to generate images further upon request



Figure 6. Enforcing gender fairness in image generation by setting $\beta = 3$

fairness of the AI system, we have established a comprehensive method that recognizes the nuanced nature of fairness as conditioned by specific concepts. In addition, our formal approach addresses the challenge of intersectional fairness through combinatorial testing, providing a scalable method for dealing with the combinatorial explosion in category combinations. This is critical to ensuring that our fairness measures remain effective even as the complexity of AI systems and the diversity of fairness dimensions increase. Initial experimental evaluations show that inherent biases can be effectively managed with our fairness enforcement techniques. Designed to anticipate and mitigate fairness violations, these techniques ensure that generative AI maintains balance across gender or demographic groups without undue interference.

A critical path forward is the practical application of our enforcement techniques within large organizations to ensure that fairness can

⁵ We followed the definition of major groups by International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO) <https://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/stat/isco/docs/resol08.pdf>

be actively managed at scale. Another direction for future work is to extend fairness definitions to an "average arrival view" that focuses on the average time between concept occurrences. Finally, conducting long-term studies on the impacts of fairness interventions would inform the continuous refinement of our approaches.

References

- [1] Mohammed Alshiekh, Roderick Bloem, Rüdiger Ehlers, Bettina Könighofer, Scott Niekum, and Ufuk Topcu, 'Safe reinforcement learning via shielding', in *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32, (2018).
- [2] Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru, 'Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification', in *Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT)*, pp. 77–91. PMLR, (2018).
- [3] Maarten Buyt and Tijl De Bie, 'Inherent limitations of AI fairness', *Communications of the ACM*, **67**(2), 48–55, (2024).
- [4] Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, et al., 'A survey on evaluation of large language models', *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, (2023).
- [5] Kristy Choi, Aditya Grover, Trisha Singh, Rui Shu, and Stefano Ermon, 'Fair generative modeling via weak supervision', in *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pp. 1887–1898. PMLR, (2020).
- [6] Kimberlé Crenshaw, 'Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics', in *Feminist Legal Theories*, 23–51, Routledge, (2013).
- [7] Giuseppe De Giacomo, Moshe Y Vardi, et al., 'Linear temporal logic and linear dynamic logic on finite traces.', in *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, volume 13, pp. 854–860, (2013).
- [8] Jasmina S Ernst, Sascha Marton, Jannik Brinkmann, Eduardo Velasques, Damien Foucard, Martin Kraemer, and Marian Lambert, 'Bias mitigation for large language models using adversarial learning', in *AEQUITAS Workshop on Fairness and Bias in AI*, (2023).
- [9] Simone Fabbrizzi, Symeon Papadopoulos, Eirini Ntoutsi, and Ioannis Kompatsiaris, 'A survey on bias in visual datasets', *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, **223**, 103552, (2022).
- [10] Emilio Ferrara, 'Fairness and bias in artificial intelligence: A brief survey of sources, impacts, and mitigation strategies', *Sci*, **6**(1), 3, (2023).
- [11] Valeria Fionda and Gianluigi Greco, 'LTL on finite and process traces: Complexity results and a practical reasoner', *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, **63**, 557–623, (2018).
- [12] Eric Frankel and Edward Vendrow, 'Fair generation through prior modification', *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, **31**, (2018).
- [13] Erich Grädel, Wolfgang Thomas, and Thomas Wilke, *Automata, logics, and infinite games: a guide to current research*, volume 2500, Springer, 2003.
- [14] He He, Sheng Zha, and Haohan Wang, 'Unlearn dataset bias in natural language inference by fitting the residual', in *Workshop on Deep Learning Approaches for Low-Resource Natural Language Processing, DeepLo@ EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019*, pp. 132–142. ACL, (2021).
- [15] Dong Huang, Qingwen Bu, Jie Zhang, Xiaofei Xie, Junjie Chen, and Heming Cui, 'Bias assessment and mitigation in llm-based code generation', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14345*, (2023).
- [16] Michael Kearns, Seth Neel, Aaron Roth, and Zhiwei Steven Wu, 'Preventing fairness gerrymandering: Auditing and learning for subgroup fairness', in *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pp. 2564–2572. PMLR, (2018).
- [17] Svetlana Kiritchenko and Saif Mohammad, 'Examining gender and race bias in two hundred sentiment analysis systems', in *Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics (*SEM)*, pp. 43–53, (2018).
- [18] Hannah Rose Kirk, Yennie Jun, Filippo Volpin, Haider Iqbal, Elias Benussi, Frederic Dreyer, Aleksandar Shredritski, and Yuki Asano, 'Bias out-of-the-box: An empirical analysis of intersectional occupational biases in popular generative language models', *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, **34**, 2611–2624, (2021).
- [19] Yi Li and Nuno Vasconcelos, 'REPAIR: Removing representation bias by dataset resampling', in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 9572–9581, (2019).
- [20] Yingji Li, Mengnan Du, Rui Song, Xin Wang, and Ying Wang, 'A survey on fairness in large language models', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10149*, (2023).
- [21] Paul Pu Liang, Chiyu Wu, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, 'Towards understanding and mitigating social biases in language models', in *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pp. 6565–6576. PMLR, (2021).
- [22] Tomasz Limisiewicz, David Mareček, and Tomáš Musil, 'Debiasing algorithm through model adaptation', in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, (2023).
- [23] NECS. Definitions for new race and ethnicity categories. <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/report-your-data/race-ethnicity-definitions>, 2024. Accessed: 2024.03.03.
- [24] Changhai Nie and Hareton Leung, 'A survey of combinatorial testing', *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, **43**(2), 1–29, (2011).
- [25] Amir Pnueli, 'The temporal logic of programs', in *Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (SFCS)*, pp. 46–57. IEEE, (1977).
- [26] Aida Ramezani and Yang Xu, 'Knowledge of cultural moral norms in large language models', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01857*, (2023).
- [27] Leonardo Ranaldi, Elena Sofia Ruzzetti, Davide Venditti, Dario Onorati, and Fabio Massimo Zanzotto, 'A trip towards fairness: Bias and debiasing in large language models', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13862*, (2023).
- [28] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer, 'High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models', in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 10684–10695, (2022).
- [29] Brooklyn Sheppard, Anna Richter, Allison Cohen, Elizabeth Allyn Smith, Tamara Kneese, Carolyne Pelletier, Ioana Baldini, and Yue Dong, 'Subtle misogyny detection and mitigation: An expert-annotated dataset', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09443*, (2023).
- [30] Shuhan Tan, Yujun Shen, and Bolei Zhou, 'Improving the fairness of deep generative models without retraining', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.04842*, (2020).
- [31] Yi Chern Tan and L Elisa Celis, 'Assessing social and intersectional biases in contextualized word representations', *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, **32**, (2019).
- [32] Yan Tao, Olga Viberg, Ryan S Baker, and Rene F Kizilcec, 'Auditing and mitigating cultural bias in llms', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.14096*, (2023).
- [33] Christopher Teo, Milad Abdollahzadeh, and Ngai-Man Man Cheung, 'On measuring fairness in generative models', *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, **36**, (2023).
- [34] Christopher TH Teo, Milad Abdollahzadeh, and Ngai-Man Cheung, 'Fair generative models via transfer learning', in *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pp. 2429–2437, (2023).
- [35] Tatiana Tommasi, Novi Patricia, Barbara Caputo, and Tinne Tuytelaars, 'A deeper look at dataset bias', *Domain Adaptation in Computer Vision Applications*, 37–55, (2017).
- [36] A Torralba and AA Efros, 'Unbiased look at dataset bias', in *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 1521–1528, (2011).
- [37] Eddie Ungless, Amy Rafferty, Hrichika Nag, and Björn Ross, 'A robust bias mitigation procedure based on the stereotype content model', in *Workshop on Natural Language Processing and Computational Social Science (NLP+ CSS)*, pp. 207–217, (2022).
- [38] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin, 'Attention is all you need', *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, **30**, (2017).
- [39] Jizhi Zhang, Keqin Bao, Yang Zhang, Wenjie Wang, Fuli Feng, and Xiangan He, 'Is chatgpt fair for recommendation? evaluating fairness in large language model recommendation', in *ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys)*, pp. 993–999, (2023).