Recommendation Fairness: From Static to Dynamic

ABSTRACT
Driven by the need to capture users’ evolving interests and optimize their long-term experiences, more and more recommender systems have started to model recommendation as a Markov decision process and employ reinforcement learning to address the problem. Shouldn’t research on the fairness of recommender systems follow the same trend from static evaluation and one-shot intervention to dynamic monitoring and non-stop control? In this paper, we portray the recent developments in recommender systems first and then discuss how fairness could be baked into the reinforcement learning techniques for recommendation. Moreover, we argue that in order to make further progress in recommendation fairness, we may want to consider multi-agent (game-theoretic) optimization, multi-objective (Pareto) optimization, and simulation-based optimization, in the general framework of stochastic games.

CCS CONCEPTS
• Information systems → Recommender systems; • Computing methodologies → Reinforcement learning.
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1 INTRODUCTION
Fairness in recommendation is one of the most important aspects of evaluating and providing socially responsible recommender systems. In this short position paper, we briefly review the research about recommendation fairness over the last five years and present our opinions about where this area should go next. The central idea is that the paradigm of recommendation fairness will be shifting from static evaluation and one-shot intervention to dynamic monitoring and non-stop control.

2 THE RISE OF REINFORCEMENT LEARNING FOR RECOMMENDATION
The mainstream approach to building recommender systems is to formulate recommendation as matrix completion [39], i.e., given a matrix of users by items where the value at cell $(i, j)$ represents the $i$-th user’s rating of the $j$-th item, predict the missing cell values based on the existing cell values. Such a matrix completion problem is often solved by matrix factorization [45, 69] algorithms. Recently, the nonlinear neural variants of matrix factorization [15, 34, 35] for recommendation have attracted a lot of attention, though some researchers have their reservations [56, 70].

Today, modern recommender systems underpinning various web or mobile apps are expected to become more personalized and interactive so as to better serve the users. Consequently, traditional recommendation techniques based on matrix completion which assume users’ preferences being static and aim to maximize their immediate satisfaction would no longer work well.

Reinforcement learning (RL) [80] — an area of machine learning which is concerned with optimal decision making over time in a dynamic environment — offers a promising approach to tackling the problems of personalization and interactivity by capturing users’ evolving interests and optimizing their long-term experiences [99]. Inspired by the great successes of reinforcement learning, particularly when it is combined with deep learning [33, 48] such as in AlphaGo [74], reinforcement learning based recommender systems [46, 95, 96] have just started to gain popularity in the last couple of years.

2.1 Recommendation as an MDP
To apply reinforcement learning to recommender systems, we need to model recommendation as a Markov decision process (MDP) [80]. For example, in a video recommender system [11, 57], the state space $S$ describes the users each accompanied with their contextual status (e.g., the time when the recommendation is made and the query text entered by the user), and the action space $A$ consists of all possible video items available for recommendation. The state representing each user evolves as the user interacts with the recommender system; different users will have different states. Using reinforcement learning, we seek a policy $\pi(a|s)$ which returns a distribution of video items $a \in A$ for each given user state $s \in S$. The objective is that the learned policy $\pi$ can maximize the expected discounted cumulative reward over potentially infinite time horizon, where the immediate reward for taking action $a$ at state $s$ (i.e., recommending item $a$ to user $s$) is defined by a reward function $R : S \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

2.2 Reinforcement Learning Algorithms in Recommender Systems
Many different reinforcement learning algorithms have been employed by a variety of recommender systems in recent years. The simplest ones [5, 32] utilize contextual (multi-armed) bandits [47, 77] which solve the special case of one-step reinforcement learning; some [100–102] use value-based methods such as the Deep Q
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ricss of fairness [9] have been proposed in order to build fairness-

aware recommender systems. Such recommendation fairness met-

rics can be defined at two levels: individual fairness and group

fairness. Generally speaking, the techniques for counteracting bias

and promoting fairness in recommendation so far are largely in

the form of constrained optimization [93]: either maximizing utility

(which is for the most part the relevance of recommended items to

users) subject to a set of fairness constraints [10, 30], or maxi-

mizing fairness subject to a lower bound of utility [103], or jointly

optimizing both for an overall satisfaction [27]. Those works mostly

make fairness adjustments to traditional matrix completion based

recommender systems. Their concept of recommendation fairness

is static in the sense that the protected groups are fixed during the

recommendation process.

3.2 Dynamic Recommendation Fairness

Little research has been conducted to investigate the fairness of re-

inforcement learning based recommender systems where the pro-

tected groups may change over time. In dynamic environments

where the distribution of population is shifting or the decisions be-

ing made have feedback effects, counter-intuitive phenomena (like

the Simpson’s paradox) could occur and biases could be iteratively

amplified. For example, imposing static fairness criteria myopically

at every step may actually exacerbate unfairness [16, 17, 54, 65, 83, 97].

Note that although there exist a few papers talking about fair-

ness in reinforcement learning in general, not all those fairness def-

initions are related to the fair treatment of different users or items

(grouped by sensitive protected attributes) in recommendation. For

example, the “meritocratic” fairness of reinforcement learning [38]

does not seem to be very relevant to our fairness concern for re-

ommender systems.

Liu et al. [55] have proposed a fairness-aware recommendation

framework based on reinforcement learning to dynamically bal-

ance recommendation accuracy and user fairness in the long run.

The constantly changing user preferences and fairness statuses are

jointly represented as the states in the MDP model of recommenda-

tion. Furthermore, a two-fold reward function is designed to com-

bine accuracy and fairness. Also on the user-side of fairness but not

particularly for recommender systems, Wen et al. [82] studied re-

inforcement learning under group fairness constraints. They show

how fairness constraints from the supervised learning setting such

as demographic parity and equality of opportunity can be extended

to the MDP setting. The algorithms developed by them to solve the

MDP problem can ensure that the learned policy does not favor

the majority sub-population over the minority sub-population. Zhang

et al. [97] investigated specifically the dynamics of group qualifica-

tion rates [65, 83] under the more general partially-observed MDP

setting. Moreover, there also exist some studies of fairness-aware

(contextual) multi-armed bandits [5, 31, 32, 47, 77] — a simplified

form of reinforcement learning — where the fairness constraint is

defined as a minimum rate at which a task/resource is assigned to a

user [13, 14, 51, 66, 89].

Ge et al. [29] have made an attempt on dynamic recommenda-

tion fairness of not users but items. Their work focuses on the the

fairness to different groups of items divided according to their de-

grees of popularity which dynamically change during the recom-

mendation process: popular items could become unpopular after a

while and vice versa. To achieve long-term fairness in terms of

item exposure, the MDP model of recommendation is augmented

with a set of fairness constraints each of which is an auxiliary fair-

ness cost function bounded by the corresponding limit. Such a con-

strained MDP problem can be solved by performing constrained

policy optimization with an actor-critic architecture.

When a recommender system starts to utilize reinforcement learn-

ing to optimize its users’ long-term engagement, there will be a risk

of the unethical phenomenon “user tampering” [8, 24] whereby the

recommender system tries to actively manipulate its users’ prefer-

ences via its recommendations in order to gain maximum accumu-

lated reward. For example, a news recommender system may be

tempted to (politically) polarize its users with the early recom-

mendations so that the system’s later recommendations catering to such polarization. Ob-

viously, fairness issues will arise if different users are affected by

user tampering differently. How to ensure dynamic recommenda-

tion fairness while addressing user tampering is still an open ques-

tion.

3.3 Looking Ahead

3.3.1 Multi-Agent (Game-Theoretic) Optimization. Since recommender

systems are by their nature multi-sided platforms or marketplaces [64,

76] involving at least the consumers (customers) of items as well as

the producers (providers) of items [6, 79], there have been some

works on optimizing the static fairness for all stakeholders of the re-

commender system [7, 58, 60, 67, 78]. The usual approach to

multi-sided static fairness is to use a linear interpolation of all

stakeholders’ fairness metrics [67, 78, 85] as the optimization ob-

jective or constraint. That is probably not sophisticated enough to

handle the intricacies of dynamic fairness in reinforcement learn-

ing.

We think that the principled approach to multi-sided dynamic

fairness for recommender systems is to consider it as a multi-agent
reinforcement learning (MARL) [91] problem, as in [40, 94, 104]. This implies adopting the mathematical framework of stochastic games [50, 53, 72] which generalize MDPs to multiple interacting decision makers. Note that to maximize the total social welfare while ensuring each agent (player) get a fair share of opportunities, we may want to go beyond Nash equilibrium and embrace the more general correlated equilibrium which is also computationally more efficient. The advantages of correlated equilibrium over Nash equilibrium in terms of fairness could be illustrated by the classic “battle of the sexes” game [50, 72]. Furthermore, behavior game theory may be useful for analyzing multi-sided dynamic fairness in real-life recommender systems. As revealed by the observation of human playing the “ultimatum bargaining” game, people have the tendency to pursue fairness even when it contradicts with the subgame perfect equilibrium that maximizes their monetary payoffs [50, 72].

3.3.2 Multi-Objective (Pareto) Optimization. It is probably also time to leave the constrained optimization [27, 93] approach to recommendation fairness behind and seek the Pareto optimization [12] of multiple objectives including the utility and the fairness. Even when fairness is the only goal of our concern, researchers have rigorously proved that there are inherent conflicts among some common fairness metrics and it is often impossible to optimize them simultaneously [25, 43]. A few early works have emerged [73, 86] and more should follow the steps.

3.3.3 Simulation Environment. To fully comprehend and tackle the complexities of dynamic fairness in recommendation, it is highly desirable to develop a simulation environment for such multi-agent multi-objective recommender systems where a number of fairness metrics could be continuously monitored and optimized. Although Google has released Fairness-Gym [17] for the simulation of simple dynamic fairness tasks (loan application [54], college admission [37, 61], and attention allocation [22, 23]), a simulator dedicated to dynamic fairness in recommendation is not available, yet. This would require more fundamental research on understanding user behavior and building user models in recommender systems [4, 19, 68]. It also looks promising to incorporate fairness metrics and models into some newly emerging probabilistic simulators of multi-agent recommender systems such as RecSim NG [62].

4 CONCLUSION

The recent developments in the area of recommendation fairness exhibits a clear trend towards the dynamic view of fairness. Accordingly, the underlying mathematical framework of fair recommendation will probably move from matrix completion to Markov decision process and then to stochastic games. Such new models and algorithms for fairness may not only improve different kinds of recommender systems but also have impacts upon the broader field of Responsible AI.
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