

FedFair: Training Fair Models In Cross-Silo Federated Learning

Linyang Chu^{*}, Lanjun Wang[†], Yanjie Dong[‡], Jian Pei[§], Zirui Zhou[‡], Yong Zhang[‡]

^{*}McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada.

[†]Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd., Beijing, China.

[‡]Huawei Technologies Canada Co., Ltd., Burnaby, Canada.

[§]Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada.

chul9@mcmaster.ca, lanjun.wang@huawei.com, yanjie.dong@huawei.com,
jpei@cs.sfu.ca, zirui.zhou@huawei.com, yong.zhang3@huawei.com.

Abstract—Building fair machine learning models becomes more and more important. As many powerful models are built by collaboration among multiple parties, each holding some sensitive data, it is natural to explore the feasibility of training fair models in cross-silo federated learning so that fairness, privacy and collaboration can be fully respected simultaneously. However, it is a very challenging task, since it is far from trivial to accurately estimate the fairness of a model without knowing the private data of the participating parties. In this paper, we first propose a federated estimation method to accurately estimate the fairness of a model without infringing the data privacy of any party. Then, we use the fairness estimation to formulate a novel problem of training fair models in cross-silo federated learning. We develop FedFair, a well-designed federated learning framework, which can successfully train a fair model with high performance without any data privacy infringement. Our extensive experiments on three real-world data sets demonstrate the excellent fair model training performance of our method.

Index Terms—federated learning, model fairness, cross-silo

I. INTRODUCTION

Fairness and collaboration are among the top priorities in machine learning and AI applications. As accurate machine learning models are deployed in more and more important applications, enhancing and ensuring fairness in machine learning models becomes critical for AI for social good [1].

At the same time, in order to build effective machine learning models for sophisticated applications, such as finance and medicare, more often than not, many parties, such as financial institutions or medical care organizations, have to collaborate and contribute their own private data. A key to successful collaborations is to fully protect the privacy of every party. However, it is a grand challenge to facilitate collaboration among parties to build fair machine learning models while preserving their data privacy.

There are many recent breakthroughs in enhancing fairness in machine learning models (see [1] for a survey and Section II-A for a brief review). There are also many efforts in cross-silo federated learning [2] to enable privacy preserving collaboration between tens or hundreds of companies and organizations in building effective machine learning models. However, only very recently there are some initiatives to develop federated learning methods for building fair machine learning models.

Can we easily extend the existing fairness enhancing methods to accommodate the need of collaboration and privacy preservation? As analyzed in Section II-A, the existing fairness enhancing methods are mainly designed with an assumption of a unified available training data set, and thus cannot easily

address the need of distributed collaboration, such as cross-silo federated learning, as well as privacy preservation for participating parties.

Alternatively, can we easily extend the existing federated learning, the prominent collaboration and privacy preserving framework, to enforce fairness in model building? Unfortunately, the answer is still no. As analyzed in Section II-B, the existing federated learning methods do not consider the fairness of machine learning models at all. Moreover, in order to obtain fairness of a model as the intermediate result on the training data of each party, a straightforward design may likely infringe privacy of the parties, such as leaking the distribution information about the data of the parties. As discussed in Section II-B, even AgnostiFair [3], the only existing method claiming to combine federated learning and fairness, is pretty primitive and does not guarantee the requirement of privacy preservation.

In this paper, we tackle the novel problem of training fair models in cross-silo federated learning. We systematically model the problem and develop a comprehensive solution that theoretically guarantees both the fairness and privacy preservation requirements. Our key idea is to carefully design the fairness constraint so that it can be enforced in the whole learning process in a federated manner. In other words, the fairness constraint is implemented in a fully collaborative and privacy preserving way. Moreover, the problem of training fair models in cross-silo federated learning presents a challenging optimization problem to maximize accuracy and ensure fairness. To solve the problem we develop an elegant solution based on alternating gradient projection [4] in optimization.

We make the following contributions. First, we propose a federated estimation method to accurately estimate the fairness of a model without infringing the data privacy of any party. Second, we prove that the federated estimation method is more accurate than locally estimating the fairness of a model on individual parties, which leads to a superior fair model training performance in cross-silo federated learning. Third, by incorporating the model fairness estimation as a fairness constraint with a widely adopted federated loss function [5], we formulate our novel FedFair problem. We also develop an effective federated learning framework to tackle this problem without infringing the data privacy of any party. Last, we conduct extensive experiments to demonstrate the superior fair model training performance of FedFair on three real-world datasets.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We review related works in Section II. In Section IV, we formulate the

problem. We develop the practical solutions in Section V and report systematic experimental results in Section VI. We conclude the paper in Section VIII.

II. RELATED WORKS

In this section, we briefly review the related works on fairness related machine learning models.

A. Fairness Enhancing Methods

Fairness has been recognized more and more important in machine learning and AI [1]. Correspondingly, fairness enhancing methods improve fairness in machine learning models. Please see [1] for a thorough survey. The existing methods can be categorized into three groups, namely pre-processing methods [6]–[12], post-processing methods [13]–[16] and in-processing methods [17]–[21].

The pre-processing methods [6]–[12] enhance fairness of models by rectifying training data. The early methods [6], [7] modify the labels of some training instances that are close to the decision boundary. The recent works [8]–[12] adjust the feature representations of training data to reduce the influence of fairness-sensitive features on the model training process. Those methods collect and pre-process all training data together, and thus are not applicable to federated learning, since in federated learning the private data sets of participating parties are not allowed to be exposed to or collected by any other parties.

The post-processing methods [13]–[16], [22] revise the prediction scores of a machine learning model to make predictions fairer than those by the original model. For example, Hardt et al. [15] flip some decisions of a classifier to make it fairer. Corbett et al. [13] and Menon et al. [16] comprehensively consider the influence of modifying prediction scores on prediction accuracy. Those methods are compatible with many trained models. However, since they are applied at a late stage in the learning process, those methods usually cannot obtain a good fairness and may sometimes sacrifice considerable accuracy of a model [19].

In-processing methods [10], [11], [17]–[21], [23]–[25] customize machine learning algorithms to directly train fair models. For example, Agarwal et al. [23] propose a reduction method for building fair classifiers. Based on the reduction method, Agarwal et al. [24] further propose an in-process minimax optimization formulation to enhance the fairness of regression tasks. Quadrianto et al. [21] extend logistic regression into a multi-objective loss function, which combines fair representation learning with an in-process model training algorithm. Most in-processing methods are tightly coupled with specific machine learning algorithms and need to know all training data [1]. Therefore, they are not applicable to federated learning, either, due to infringements of the data privacy of participating parties.

Our method also customizes the learning process to directly train fair models. However, it is dramatically different from the in-processing methods, since our method lets multiple parties collaborate to train fair models without infringing their data privacy.

B. Fair Models and Federated Learning

There is a rich body of literature on federated learning. Please see [2], [26] for excellent surveys. Here, we focus on connecting fair models and federated learning.

The classical federated learning methods [5], [26]–[29] are mostly designed to protect privacy instead of training fair models. A straight-forward extension to train fair models is to apply fairness constraints locally on each participating party. However, as discussed later in Subsection V-C, this leads to an inferior fairness performance due to the inaccurate model fairness measurements computed locally on each participating party.

The AgnosticFair method [3] attempts to train fair models that adapts well on unknown testing data by assigning a reweighing value on each training data instance in both the loss function and the fairness constraint. However, it cannot fully protect data privacy because learning the reweighing values needs strong prior knowledge on the data distribution and also requires sensitive information that leaks the data distribution of every participating party.

Mohri et al. [30] induce a weak notion of fairness for machine learning models as a side product by minimizing the maximum training loss incurred on the protected classes. However, this only mitigates the training procedure bias but cannot guarantee a good fairness of trained models [30].

The collaborative fairness methods [30]–[36] focus on balancing the rewards paid to the participating parties based on their contributions to the federated learning process. A typical line of works [31]–[33] combine incentive schemes with game theory to determine the payoff received by each party commensurate according to the contribution. Using a similar idea, Lyu et al. [35] and Sim et al. [36] achieve a better collaborative fairness performance by directly using model accuracy as the reward for the parties. Some other works [30], [34] advocate egalitarian equity in the collaboration by optimizing the performance of the party with the worst performance. The collaborative fairness task is substantially different from our study, because our task focuses on enhancing the fairness of a machine learning model, but the collaborative fairness task focuses on the fairness of the collaboration relationship among participating parties in the federated learning process.

III. PRELIMINARY: MODEL FAIRNESS MEASUREMENTS

Many fairness measurements have been proposed in literature [9], [15], [25], [37]–[40]. But only a few of them are suitable for training fair models in a federated learning framework. In this section, we review existing fairness measures and discuss their applicability to training fair models in a federated manner.

Existing model fairness measurements can be categorized into two major groups. The individual fairness [37], [38] measures the fairness of a model by evaluating how likely a pair of similar instances receive similar predictions from the model. The group fairness [9], [15], [25], [39], [40] measures model fairness by evaluating how balanced the predictions of a model are on a pre-defined pair of protected groups (e.g., ‘female’ versus ‘male’). It is well recognized that individual fairness measurements are less stable than group fairness measurements [1], [41]. Thus, in this paper, we focus on group fairness measurements.

Many group fairness measurements such as disparate impact [9], demographic parity [37], [39], [40], equal odds and equal opportunities [15] are developed based on the prediction accuracy of a model. However, since the prediction accuracy of a model is a non-smooth and non-differentiable function, it is very difficult, if not impossible at all, to formulate such a

fairness measurement as a fairness constraint embedded into a federated model training algorithm.

To tackle this problem, some methods [3], [42] convert prediction accuracy based measurements into smooth surrogate constraints. But the fairness performance of the trained models is limited by the approximation error between the surrogate constraints and the original fairness measurements [25].

Xu et al. [41] and Cotter et al. [43] propose a series of fairness measurements that can be smoothly integrated into a training process. However, those methods are still not applicable to our task, because they require to know some proportions of instances contained in each of the protected groups and thus infringe the data privacy of the participating parties by revealing the distributions of their private data over the protected groups.

Hashimoto et al. [44] and Baharlouei et al. [45] develop several measurements that do not consider the base prediction accuracy of a model, thus they cannot always ensure fairness, and may potentially cripple the optimization objective of a training process [15], [37].

As discussed later in Section IV-A, we formulate a novel problem of federated fair model training. Our model adopts the general fairness measurement named DGEO [25], and successfully adapts DGEO to achieve an outstanding federated fair model training performance without infringing the data privacy of any client.

IV. PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this section, we first review the fairness constraint based on a general fairness measurement named **difference of generalized equal opportunities** (DGEO) [25]. Then, we formulate the problem of federated fair model training.

A. The DGEO Constraint

Denote by (\mathbf{x}, s, y) a triple of random variables drawn from an unknown distribution \mathcal{D} , where $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a d -dimensional vector of features, $s \in \{a, b\}$ is the membership of \mathbf{x} between a pair of pre-defined **protected groups** (e.g., a for “female” and b for “male”), and $y \in \{1, \dots, C\}$ is the class label of \mathbf{x} . A sample of (\mathbf{x}, s, y) is called a **data instance** (instance for short).

Denote by $f_\theta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a model parametrized by a set of parameters θ . For a loss function $\ell(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y) \in \mathbb{R}$, the DGEO [25] of f_θ with respect to the instances contained in the protected groups $\{a, b\}$ and belonging to a **protected class** $c \in \{1, \dots, C\}$.

Definition 1. Let $L^{s,c}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[\ell(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y) | s, y = c]$ be the expected conditional loss of a model f_θ on the samples in a protected group s with a protected class label c . The DGEO of the model f_θ with respect to the class c is the absolute difference between $L^{a,c}(\theta)$ and $L^{b,c}(\theta)$, that is, $|L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)|$.

A smaller DGEO means f_θ commits more similar errors on each of the two protected groups of instances contained in a class c , which further indicates f_θ is fairer with respect to the instances in class c [25]. Oppositely, a larger DGEO means f_θ is more unfair.

Donini et al. [25] propose the notion of **DGEO constraint**. For a given threshold $\epsilon \geq 0$ indicating the maximum unfairness we can tolerate, a model f_θ is said to be **ϵ -fair** if it satisfies

$$|L^{a,c}(f_\theta) - L^{b,c}(f_\theta)| \leq \epsilon. \quad (1)$$

B. Federated Fair Model Training

Now we formulate the task of training fair models in cross-silo federated learning (*federated fair model training* for short). Essentially, the task allows a group of parties called **clients** to collaborate through a cloud server to train a fair and accurate model without infringing the data privacy of any client.

Formally, denote by U_1, \dots, U_N a group of N clients, and by B_1, \dots, B_N the private data sets owned by the clients. We consider a classical setting of federated learning [26], where each data set B_i consists of a set of data instances that are independently and identically drawn from an unknown distribution \mathcal{D} . The i -th data set B_i is a set of m_i instances.

Definition 2 (Federated Fair Model Training Task). Given a pair of protected groups $\{a, b\}$, a protected class $c \in \{1, \dots, C\}$, and a threshold $\epsilon \geq 0$ indicating the maximum unfairness that can be tolerated, the **federated fair model training task** allows a group of clients U_1, \dots, U_N to collaborate to train a model f_θ , such that

- 1) The data instances in the private data set of each client, as well as any information about the distribution of the private data set, are not exposed to any other clients or any third party.
- 2) f_θ is ϵ -fair for the instances in the class c .

The first requirement is exactly the data privacy-preserving requirement in conventional federated learning [5], [26]–[29]. The second requirement is about model fairness, which is not considered by the conventional federated learning tasks.

The above task can be formulated as a constrained optimization problem as follows.

$$\min_{\theta} L(\theta) \quad (2a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } |L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)| \leq \epsilon, \quad (2b)$$

where $L(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[\ell(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y)]$ is the expected loss of f_θ over the unknown distribution \mathcal{D} , and the DGEO constraint in Equation (2b) requires the trained model f_θ to be ϵ -fair.

It is difficult to find a solution to Equation (2), because we cannot compute the exact values of $L(\theta)$ and $L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)$ without knowing \mathcal{D} . To find a practical solution, we need to accurately estimate the values of $L(\theta)$ and $L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)$ while preserving the data privacy of all the clients.

V. FEDFAIR: A PRACTICAL SOLUTION

In this section, we develop practical solutions to the federated fair model training task. We start with an analysis of the problem. Then, we present a local estimation method. Last, we develop our practical solution.

A. Problem Analysis

To develop a practical solution to the federated fair model training problem, let us first analyze the opportunities and challenges in estimating $L(\theta)$ and $L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)$.

Similar to [5], [27]–[29], we can compute a **federated loss** that estimates $L(\theta)$ by

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{m_{\text{total}}} \hat{L}_i(\theta), \quad (3)$$

where $m_{\text{total}} = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i$ is the total number of data instances owned by all clients, and $\hat{L}_i(\theta) = \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{(\mathbf{x}, s, y) \in B_i} \ell(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y)$ is the empirical loss of f_θ on the private data set B_i .

Computing the federated loss does not infringe the data privacy of any client, because each empirical loss $\hat{L}_i(\theta)$ is privately computed by the corresponding client U_i , and all empirical losses are sent to the cloud server to compute the federated loss.

For every client, the cloud server only knows the empirical loss of the client and the number of instances in the private data set. In other words, the client does not expose any instance or any data distribution information.

The real challenge is to accurately estimate $L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)$ without infringing the data privacy of any client. In the rest of this section, we first introduce a baseline method to estimate $L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)$ and discuss the limitations of this method. Then, we present our federated estimation method to estimate $L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)$ more accurately. Last, we develop an optimization method to find a good solution to the federated fair model training task.

B. A Local Estimation Approach

To estimate $L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)$ on the unknown distribution \mathcal{D} while keeping the data privacy of all clients, a baseline method is to let every client U_i use its private data set B_i to compute its **local estimation** by $\hat{L}_i^{a,c}(\theta) - \hat{L}_i^{b,c}(\theta)$, where $\hat{L}_i^{a,c}(\theta)$ and $\hat{L}_i^{b,c}(\theta)$ are the estimators of the expected conditional losses $L^{a,c}(\theta)$ and $L^{b,c}(\theta)$, respectively.

The estimators $\hat{L}_i^{a,c}(\theta)$ and $\hat{L}_i^{b,c}(\theta)$ are computed on the private data set B_i by $\hat{L}_i^{s,c}(\theta) = \frac{1}{m_i^{s,c}} \sum_{(\mathbf{x}, s, c) \in B_i} \ell(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), c)$, where $s \in \{a, b\}$ indicates the group membership of a data instance (\mathbf{x}, s, c) , and $m_i^{s,c}$ is the number of data instances in B_i that belong to a group s and have a class label c .

Since all instances in B_i are independently and identically drawn from \mathcal{D} , the local estimation is unbiased, that is, $\mathbb{E}(\hat{L}_i^{a,c}(\theta) - \hat{L}_i^{b,c}(\theta)) = L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)$.

We use the local estimations computed on the private data sets of all the clients to build N **local DGEO constraints** as $|\hat{L}_i^{a,c}(\theta) - \hat{L}_i^{b,c}(\theta)| \leq \epsilon, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.

By incorporating these constraints with the federated loss in Equation (3), we convert the problem in Equation (2) into the following **locally constrained optimization (LCO) problem**.

$$\min_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{m_{\text{total}}} \hat{L}_i(\theta) \quad (4a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } |\hat{L}_i^{a,c}(\theta) - \hat{L}_i^{b,c}(\theta)| \leq \epsilon, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\} \quad (4b)$$

We will show in Section V-D that the LCO problem can be easily solved without infringing the data privacy of any client.

What is the chance that a feasible solution to the LCO problem may achieve a good fairness performance on the distribution \mathcal{D} ? We have the following result.

Theorem 1. Denote by $\sigma_i^2, i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, the variance of the estimation $\hat{L}_i^{a,c}(\theta) - \hat{L}_i^{b,c}(\theta)$, and by $\sigma_{\min}^2 = \min(\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_N^2)$ the minimum variance. For any feasible solution θ to the LCO problem and any real number $r > 0$, $P(|L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)| < \epsilon + r) \geq 1 - \frac{\sigma_{\min}^2}{r^2}$.

Proof. Denote by $\mu(\theta) = L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)$, and by $R_i(\theta) = \hat{L}_i^{a,c}(\theta) - \hat{L}_i^{b,c}(\theta)$ for a client $U_i, i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Here, $\mu(\theta)$ is a random variable because θ is sampled from the random feasible region defined by Equation (4b).

Since all the data instances in the data set B_i are independently and identically drawn from \mathcal{D} , $\mathbb{E}(R_i(\theta)) = \mu(\theta)$ always holds for every sample of θ .

By substituting $\mathbb{E}(R_i(\theta)) = \mu(\theta)$ into Chebyshev's inequality, we have $P(|R_i(\theta) - \mu(\theta)| < r) \geq 1 - \frac{\sigma_i^2}{r^2}$ for every sample of θ and any real number $r > 0$.

Since a feasible solution θ to the LCO problem always satisfies $|R_i(\theta)| \leq \epsilon$, if θ satisfies $|R_i(\theta) - \mu(\theta)| < r$, then $|\mu(\theta)| < \epsilon + r$ always holds. This further indicates $P(|\mu(\theta)| < \epsilon + r) \geq P(|R_i(\theta) - \mu(\theta)| < r)$, which means $P(|\mu(\theta)| < \epsilon + r) \geq 1 - \frac{\sigma_i^2}{r^2}$. Plugging $\mu(\theta) = L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)$ into this inequality, we have $P(|L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)| < \epsilon + r) \geq 1 - \frac{\sigma_i^2}{r^2}$, which holds for all the values of i in $\{1, \dots, N\}$.

This gives N independent inequalities that hold for the clients U_1, \dots, U_N , respectively. In all these N inequalities, the tightest one is $P(|L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)| < \epsilon + r) \geq 1 - \frac{\sigma_{\min}^2}{r^2}$, because the other $N - 1$ inequalities automatically hold when this inequality holds. The theorem follows. \square

According to Theorem 1, a solution θ to the LCO problem will be $(\epsilon + r)$ -fair with a probability no smaller than a lower bound $1 - \frac{\sigma_{\min}^2}{r^2}$. Unfortunately, this lower bound may be small in practice, because the variances $\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_N^2$ can be large when the numbers of private data instances owned by clients are not large enough. As a result, solving the LCO problem may have only a small probability to achieve a good model fairness performance.

Moreover, the LCO problem may even be infeasible when a large number of clients introduce a large number of local DGEO constraints, where the intersection of the feasible regions induced by these constraints may have a good chance to be empty due to the large variances $\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_N^2$.

C. The Federated Estimation Method

Can we compute an unbiased estimation on $L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)$ with a lower variance so that we can achieve a good model fairness performance with a much higher probability?

We can compute an unbiased estimation, named **federated estimation**, on $L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)$ by

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\hat{L}_i^{a,c}(\theta) - \hat{L}_i^{b,c}(\theta) \right) \quad (5)$$

This estimation is the average of the local estimations computed by all the clients. It is also unbiased, because every local estimation is an unbiased estimation on $L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)$.

Similar to computing the federated loss, we compute the federated estimation on the cloud server. This does not infringe the data privacy of any client because the local estimations are privately computed by the clients before they are sent to the cloud server.

Next, we analyze the variance of the federated estimation.

Lemma 1. Denote by $\sigma_{\text{avg}}^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^2$ the average of the variances $\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_N^2$. Then, the variance σ_{fed}^2 of the federated estimation is $\frac{\sigma_{\text{avg}}^2}{N}$.

Proof. Since the private data sets B_1, \dots, B_N are independently and identically drawn from \mathcal{D} , the local estimations computed on these private data sets are independent from each other. Therefore, we can derive

$$\sigma_{fed}^2 = \mathbb{V} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\hat{L}_i^{a,c}(\theta) - \hat{L}_i^{b,c}(\theta) \right) \right] = \frac{\sigma_{avg}^2}{N}$$

□

According to Lemma 1, σ_{fed}^2 monotonically decreases when the number of clients increases. In other words, the federated estimation becomes more accurate when more clients join the federation.

We use the federated estimation to develop a **federated DGEO constraint** as $\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\hat{L}_i^{a,c}(\theta) - \hat{L}_i^{b,c}(\theta) \right) \right| \leq \epsilon$, and further incorporate this constraint with the federated loss in Equation (3) to convert the constrained optimization problem in Equation (2) into the following **FedFair problem**.

$$\min_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{m_{\text{total}}} \hat{L}_i(\theta) \quad (6a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\hat{L}_i^{a,c}(\theta) - \hat{L}_i^{b,c}(\theta) \right) \right| \leq \epsilon \quad (6b)$$

The following theorem analyzes the model fairness performance of a solution to the FedFair problem.

Theorem 2. *For any feasible solution θ to the FedFair problem and any $r > 0$, $P(|L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)| < \epsilon + r) \geq 1 - \frac{\sigma_{avg}^2}{Nr^2}$.*

Proof. Following the proof of Theorem 1 and Chebyshev's inequality, $P(|L^{a,c}(\theta) - L^{b,c}(\theta)| < \epsilon + r) \geq 1 - \frac{\sigma_{fed}^2}{r^2}$ holds for any $r > 0$. By Lemma 1, the theorem follows. □

To compare the model fairness performance of the FedFair approach and the LCO approach using Theorems 1 and 2, we have to analyze the difference between σ_{avg}^2 and σ_{min}^2 , which depends on the differences among $\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_N^2$. Since we use the same formula to compute every local estimation based on the data instances drawn from the same distribution \mathcal{D} , the differences among $\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_N^2$ are determined by the differences among the numbers of data instances owned by different clients.

In typical federated learning applications [5], [26], [27], clients often have similar amounts of data. This produces small differences among $\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_N^2$, which further means σ_{avg}^2 and σ_{min}^2 are close to each other. Because of the factor of N in Lemma 1, the variance $\sigma_{fed}^2 = \frac{\sigma_{avg}^2}{N}$ of the federated estimation is much smaller than the minimum variance σ_{min}^2 of the local estimations. In consequence, based on Theorems 1 and 2, a solution to the FedFair problem can have a much higher probability to achieve good model fairness performance than a solution to the LCO problem.

D. Solving the FedFair and LCO Problems

In this subsection, we discuss how to solve the FedFair problem and the LCO problem without infringing the data privacy of any client. We first convert the FedFair problem to

a nonconvex-concave min-max problem. Then, we apply the alternating gradient projection (AGP) algorithm [4] to tackle the min-max problem without infringing the data privacy of any client. We also extend AGP to tackle the LCO problem in a similar privacy-preserving way.

AGP [4] is designed to obtain a δ -stationary point of a nonconvex-concave minmax problem in $\mathcal{O}(\delta^{-4})$ iterations. It alternatively updates primal and dual variables by employing simple projected gradient steps at each iteration.

Denote by $\hat{D}_i(\theta) = \hat{L}_i^{a,c}(\theta) - \hat{L}_i^{b,c}(\theta)$, $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, the local estimation of the client U_i . We rewrite the federated DGEO constraint in the FedFair problem to

$$-\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{D}_i(\theta) \leq \epsilon, \quad (7)$$

which represents two constraints on θ .

In this way, the FedFair problem can be equivalently converted to a min-max problem

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{\lambda_a, \lambda_b \geq 0} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda_a, \lambda_b), \quad (8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda_a, \lambda_b) = & \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{m_{\text{total}}} \hat{L}_i(\theta) + \lambda_a \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{D}_i(\theta) - \epsilon \right) \\ & - \lambda_b \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{D}_i(\theta) + \epsilon \right), \end{aligned}$$

is a Lagrangian function with the Lagrange multipliers λ_a and λ_b introduced for the two constraints in Equation (7), respectively.

The Lagrangian function is nonconvex in terms of θ and concave in terms of λ_a and λ_b . Thus, the problem in Equation (8) is a nonconvex-concave min-max problem that can be directly solved using the AGP [4].

Each iteration of AGP updates θ , λ_a and λ_b using the gradients computed from a regularized loss function

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}(\theta, \lambda_a, \lambda_b) = \mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda_a, \lambda_b) - \frac{\gamma}{2}(\lambda_a^2 + \lambda_b^2), \quad (9)$$

where $\frac{\gamma}{2}(\lambda_a^2 + \lambda_b^2)$ is a regularization term that makes $\bar{\mathcal{L}}(\theta, \lambda_a, \lambda_b)$ strongly concave with respect to λ_a and λ_b to achieve a faster convergence speed, and $\gamma \geq 0$ is a small hyper-parameter to control the level of regularization.

Specifically, the k -th iteration of AGP consists of one gradient step to update θ and one projected gradient descent step to update λ_a and λ_b .

The first step updates θ with a step size α by

$$\theta^{k+1} = \theta^k - \alpha \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i(\theta^k), \quad (10)$$

where

$$\nabla_i(\theta^k) = \frac{m_i}{m_{\text{total}}} \nabla \hat{L}_i(\theta^k) + \frac{\lambda_a^k - \lambda_b^k}{N} \nabla \hat{D}_i(\theta^k) \quad (11)$$

is the gradient computed by the client U_i . Here, $\nabla \hat{L}_i(\theta^k)$ and $\nabla \hat{D}_i(\theta^k)$ are respectively the gradients of $\hat{L}_i(\theta^k)$ and $\hat{D}_i(\theta^k)$ with respect to θ^k . These gradients are computed by the client U_i using B_i .

Algorithm 1: Tackling the FedFair Problem

Input: The clients U_1, \dots, U_N holding the private data sets B_1, \dots, B_N , respectively; a pre-defined pair of groups $\{a, b\}$; a class $c \in \{1, \dots, C\}$; the hyper parameters α, β and γ of AGP [4]; and a cloud server Q .

Output: A fair model f_θ that achieves a small DEGO on D with respect to the groups $\{a, b\}$ and the class c .

```
1  $Q$  initializes  $\theta^1, \lambda_a^1$  and  $\lambda_b^1$  in the same way as AGP [4].
2 for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$  do
3    $Q$  broadcasts  $\theta^k, \lambda_a^k$  and  $\lambda_b^k$  to the clients.
4   Each client  $U_i$  uses  $B_i$  to compute  $\hat{D}_i(\theta^k), \nabla \hat{D}_i(\theta^k)$ 
   and  $\nabla \hat{L}_i(\theta^k)$ , and send them to  $Q$ .
5    $Q$  updates  $\theta^{k+1}, \lambda_a^{k+1}$  and  $\lambda_b^{k+1}$  by (10), (12) and (13),
   respectively.
6 end
7 return The fair model  $f_\theta$ .
```

The second step updates λ_a and λ_b with the a step size β by

$$\lambda_a^{k+1} = \max \left((1 - \gamma\beta)\lambda_a^k + \frac{\beta}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{D}_i(\theta^k) - \beta\epsilon, 0 \right) \quad (12)$$

and

$$\lambda_b^{k+1} = \max \left((1 - \gamma\beta)\lambda_b^k - \frac{\beta}{N} \sum_i \hat{D}_i(\theta^k) - \beta\epsilon, 0 \right). \quad (13)$$

The above iteration continues until AGP converges. Algorithm 1 shows how we deploy AGP in a federated learning framework to tackle the FedFair problem.

The LCO problem can be solved in a similar way as the FedFair problem by using AGP [4].

First, we introduce a pair of Lagrange multipliers, denoted by λ_{a_i} and λ_{b_i} , $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, for each local DGEO constraint rewritten as $-\epsilon \leq \hat{L}_i^{a,c}(\theta) - \hat{L}_i^{b,c}(\theta) \leq \epsilon$.

Then, we can adapt Algorithm 1 by replacing Equation (11) by $\nabla_i(\theta^k) = \frac{m_i}{m_{\text{total}}} \nabla \hat{L}_i(\theta^k) + (\lambda_{a_i}^k - \lambda_{b_i}^k) \nabla \hat{D}_i(\theta^k)$, and replacing Equations (12) and (13), respectively, by $\lambda_{a_i}^{k+1} = \max \left((1 - \gamma\beta)\lambda_{a_i}^k + \beta \hat{D}_i(\theta^k) - \beta\epsilon, 0 \right)$ and $\lambda_{b_i}^{k+1} = \max \left((1 - \gamma\beta)\lambda_{b_i}^k - \beta \hat{D}_i(\theta^k) - \beta\epsilon, 0 \right)$.

Since both Algorithm 1 and its extension for the LCO problem implement the AGP algorithm, they have the same convergence behaviour as AGP [4]. The hyper-parameters are set as $\alpha = 0.05$, $\beta = 0.05$ and $\gamma = 0.001$. To prevent divergence in training, we reduce the value of α by $\alpha \leftarrow 0.1 \times \alpha$ per 20,000 gradient descent steps.

Does Algorithm 1 protect the privacy of the private data owned by each client? Yes, it protects the data privacy of the clients in a similar way as [5], [29], [46]. Because, in each iteration, there is no communication between the clients, and the information sent from a client to the cloud server only contains $\hat{D}_i(\theta^k)$, $\nabla \hat{D}_i(\theta^k)$ and $\nabla \hat{L}_i(\theta^k)$, which do not expose the private data sets of clients or any information about the distribution of the private datasets.

VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, we conduct a series of experiments to evaluate the performance of our proposed methods for federated fair model training, and compare with the state-of-the-art

baselines. We first describe the experiment settings and then present the experimental results.

A. Experiment Settings

In our experiments, we evaluate the performance of a series of seven methods. First of all, FedFair is our proposed method solving the FedFair Problem in Equation (6). Second, LCO is the method solving the LCO problem in Equation (4). Third, we use the state-of-the-art federated fair model training method AgnosticFair (AF) [3] as a baseline.

As the fourth and the fifth methods in our experiments, we compare with a separate training (ST) method and the classical federated learning method FedAvg [5]. We also extend FedAvg by two post-processing fairness enhancing methods, equalized odds (EO) [15] and calibrated equalized odds (CEO) [22], to obtain the sixth and the seventh methods in our experiments.

The ST method simply asks each client U_i to use its own private training data set B_i to train a fair model by solving the following constrained optimization problem.

$$\min_{\theta} \hat{L}_i(\theta) \quad (14a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \left| \hat{L}_i^{a,c}(\theta) - \hat{L}_i^{b,c}(\theta) \right| \leq \epsilon \quad (14b)$$

The post-processing methods, such as EO and CEO, are used to separately post-process the model trained by FedAvg for each client based on its private training data set. This will produce N fairness enhanced models for N clients. We report the average performance and the variance of those N models.

For all the methods except AF, we use two types of models for f_θ . One is logistic regression, the other one is a fully connected neural network with two hidden layers, where the first and the second hidden layers contain eight and four ReLU units, respectively.

We do not report the performance of AF for the neural network model because the source code of AF is not applicable to training neural networks.

The source codes of all the baseline methods are provided by the authors of [3], [5], [15], [22]. FedFair and LCO are implemented in PyTorch 1.4, the source code is available at: <https://bit.ly/fedfair>. All the experiments are conducted on Dell Alienware with Intel(R) Core(TM) i9-9980XE CPU, 128G memory, NVIDIA 1080Ti, and Ubuntu 16.04.

B. Data Sets

We adopt the following three benchmark data sets that have been widely used in literature to evaluate the performances of fair model training methods [25], [47].

The ADULT data set [48] contains 45,222 data instances. Each data instance consists of 14 features of a person. The binary class label of a data instance indicates whether a person's annual income is above 50,000 dollars or not. Following the settings of Hardt et al. [15], we use 'female' and 'male' as the pair of protected groups, and use "above 50,000 dollars" as the protected class. We uniformly sample 40,000 data instances as the training data, and use the remaining 5,222 data instances as the testing data. The training data is uniformly partitioned into 50 private training data sets, each owned by a client.

The COMPAS data set [49] contains 5,278 data instances. Every data instance consists of 16 features of a person. The binary class label of a data instance indicates whether the person is a recidivist or not. Following the settings of Hardt et al. [15], we use 'African-American' and 'Caucasian' as the

TABLE I

THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL THE METHODS USING LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODELS. THE ACCURACY, FAIRNESS, AND HARMONIC MEAN ARE DENOTED BY AC, FR AND HM, RESPECTIVELY. THE COLUMN OPT REPORTS THE OPTIMAL HYPER PARAMETER τ FOR AF, AND THE OPTIMAL HYPER PARAMETER ϵ FOR ST, LCO AND FEDFAIR, TO ACHIEVE THE BEST HARMONIC MEAN PERFORMANCE.

Method	DRUG				COMPASS				ADULT			
	OPT	AC	FR	HM	OPT	AC	FR	HM	OPT	AC	FR	HM
FedAvg	n/a	0.73±0.02	0.88±0.05	0.79±0.02	n/a	0.68±0.02	0.79±0.05	0.73±0.04	n/a	0.83±0.01	0.83±0.04	0.83±0.02
EO	n/a	0.70±0.04	0.92±0.06	0.80±0.04	n/a	0.59±0.02	0.93±0.03	0.72±0.01	n/a	0.78±0.01	0.93±0.03	0.85±0.01
CEO	n/a	0.66±0.04	0.87±0.02	0.75±0.03	n/a	0.65±0.01	0.77±0.01	0.70±0.01	n/a	0.80±0.00	0.96±0.01	0.87±0.00
ST	0.01	0.70±0.02	0.88±0.02	0.78±0.01	0.10	0.66±0.01	0.88±0.03	0.75±0.02	10 ⁻⁴	0.82±0.00	0.93±0.02	0.87±0.01
AF	0.05	0.73±0.02	0.88±0.06	0.80±0.04	0.05	0.68±0.02	0.88±0.08	0.76±0.04	0.05	0.72±0.06	0.83±0.08	0.77±0.03
LCO	0.40	0.72±0.02	0.90±0.05	0.80±0.02	0.48	0.69±0.02	0.79±0.02	0.74±0.02	0.80	0.84±0.00	0.86±0.04	0.85±0.02
FedFair	0.07	0.72±0.02	0.93±0.04	0.81±0.02	10 ⁻⁴	0.67±0.03	0.95±0.02	0.79±0.02	0.10	0.83±0.00	0.97±0.02	0.90±0.01

TABLE II

THE PERFORMANCES OF ALL THE METHODS USING NEURAL NETWORK MODELS. THE ACCURACY, FAIRNESS, AND HARMONIC MEAN ARE DENOTED BY AC, FR AND HM, RESPECTIVELY. THE COLUMN OPT REPORTS THE OPTIMAL HYPER PARAMETER ϵ FOR ST, LCO AND FEDFAIR TO ACHIEVE THE BEST HARMONIC MEAN PERFORMANCE.

Method	DRUG				COMPASS				ADULT			
	OPT	AC	FR	HM	OPT	AC	FR	HM	OPT	AC	FR	HM
FedAvg	n/a	0.72±0.02	0.85±0.07	0.78±0.04	n/a	0.68±0.02	0.81±0.05	0.74±0.03	n/a	0.84±0.00	0.87±0.04	0.85±0.02
EO	n/a	0.66±0.07	0.94±0.05	0.77±0.05	n/a	0.61±0.02	0.91±0.04	0.73±0.01	n/a	0.79±0.01	0.91±0.03	0.85±0.01
CEO	n/a	0.61±0.04	0.89±0.06	0.72±0.04	n/a	0.66±0.00	0.78±0.01	0.72±0.00	n/a	0.82±0.00	0.93±0.01	0.87±0.00
ST	0.07	0.63±0.01	0.85±0.04	0.72±0.02	0.20	0.60±0.01	0.86±0.02	0.71±0.01	0.40	0.79±0.00	0.88±0.02	0.83±0.01
LCO	0.45	0.72±0.02	0.87±0.09	0.78±0.04	0.60	0.68±0.02	0.81±0.03	0.74±0.02	0.80	0.85±0.00	0.92±0.04	0.89±0.02
FedFair	0.005	0.70±0.02	0.87±0.06	0.78±0.04	0.01	0.68±0.02	0.94±0.04	0.79±0.02	0.10	0.85±0.00	0.98±0.02	0.91±0.01




Fig. 1. The fairness and accuracies of the models trained by all the methods. Some methods do not show 5 points in a figure because some points coincide with each other.

pair of protected groups, and use “not a recidivist” as the protected class. We uniformly sample 4,800 data instances as the training data, and use the remaining 478 data instances as

the testing data. The training data is uniformly partitioned into 20 private training data sets, each owned by a client.

The DRUG data set [50] contains 1,885 data instances. Each data instance represents a person characterized by 12 features. The binary class label of a data instance indicates whether the person abuses volatile substance or not. We use ‘white’ and ‘non-white’ as the pair of protected groups, and use “not abuse volatile substance” as the protected class. We uniformly sample 1,600 data instances for training, and use the remaining 285 data instances for testing. The training data is uniformly partitioned into 10 private training data sets, each owned by a client.

For all the data sets, every categorical feature is converted into a set of binary features using one-hot encoding¹.

The private training data sets owned by the clients are used to train models. The testing data sets are used to evaluate the prediction accuracies and the fairness of the models produced by all the methods.

C. Fairness Measurement

In our experiments, the **fairness** of a trained model f_θ is evaluated by $\text{fairness} = 1 - \text{DEO}(f_\theta)$, where $\text{DEO}(f_\theta)$ [25] is extended from the notion of equal opportunity [15] to measure how unfair a model f_θ is. According to Donini et al. [25], a small DGEO usually indicates a small $\text{DEO}(f_\theta)$, which means good fairness. The range of fairness is between 0 and 1. A larger value of fairness means the model f_θ is fairer.

We also evaluate the overall performance of f_θ by the harmonic mean of its fairness and accuracy, which is simply referred to as **harmonic mean** when the context is clear.

For ST, EO and CEO that produce N different models for N clients, respectively, we report the average accuracy, the average fairness and the average of the harmonic means of the N models on the testing data sets.

D. Fairness and Accuracy of Trained Models

For each of ST, LCO, AF and FedFair, we conduct a grid search on the hyper parameter that controls the trade-off

¹<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/One-hot>

between fairness and accuracy. This produces multiple trained models for every method, where each model is trained using a unique value of the hyper parameter. For every method, we report the performance of the models that achieve the top-5 largest harmonic means.

The fairness and the accuracy of each of the top-5 models is plotted as a point in Figure 1. Some methods show less than five points in a figure because some points may overlap with each other.

FedAvg, EO and CEO do not provide a hyper parameter to control the trade-off between fairness and accuracy, thus we can only use their default settings to run each of them once on every data set. As a result, there is only one point for each of FedAvg, EO and CEO in every figure of Figure 1.

As it is shown in Figure 1, the models trained by ST do not perform well in either fairness or accuracy due to the lack of collaboration among clients during training. The model trained by FedAvg cannot achieve a good fairness due to the ignorance of fairness during training. The models post-processed by EO and CEO cannot achieve a good fairness and a good accuracy at the same time, because the improvements on their fairness are usually gained at the cost of sacrificing accuracy [1].

The in-processing methods, such as LCO, AF and FedFair, achieve better results, because they can explicitly impose the required trade-off between accuracy and fairness in the objective functions to find a good balance during training [19].

The accuracies of the models trained by LCO, AF and FedFair are mostly comparable, but FedFair always achieves the best fairness performance. This demonstrates the outstanding performance of FedFair in training fair models with high accuracies.

The accuracies of the logistic regression models in Figure 1(a) are slightly better than the accuracies of the corresponding neural network models in Figure 1(b) because the neural network models tend to overfit the small training data of DRUG.

We can also conclude from Figure 1 that the fairness of the models trained by LCO is weaker than that of FedFair on most of the data sets, because the LCO problem quickly becomes infeasible when ϵ gets small, which makes it impossible to improve the fairness of the models trained by LCO.

To the contrary, the FedFair problem stays feasible for small values of ϵ , thus it is able to train models with a much higher fairness than LCO with only slight overhead in accuracy.

Tables I and II summarize the performance of all the compared methods. To analyze the variance of the performance, we repeat the random data set construction process introduced in Section VI-B to construct four additional data sets for each of DRUG, COMPASS and ADULT. Every additional data set is randomly constructed by using a unique random seed to generate the N private training data sets and the testing data set. Including the first data set we constructed at the beginning, in total we have a collection of five random data sets for each of DRUG, COMPASS and ADULT.

For FedAvg, AF, LCO and FedFair, we train five models on the five random data sets in the same collection. Then, we evaluate the mean and standard deviation of the accuracies, fairness and harmonic means of the five models. For EO, CEO and ST, we train one model per client on each of the five random data sets in the same collection. This produces $5N$ models for each collection of random data sets, where N is the number of clients. Then, we evaluate the mean and standard




Fig. 2. The effect of parameter ϵ on the logistic regression models trained by FedFair. The AFE is for the absolute value of the federated estimation in Equation (5). The set of ϵ we use is $\{10^{-4}, 10^{-3}, 0.01, 0.07, 0.13, 0.19\}$ for DRUG, and $\{10^{-4}, 10^{-3}, 0.01, 0.1, 0.2, 0.4\}$ for COMPASS and ADULT.

deviation of the accuracies, fairness and harmonic means of the $5N$ models. For ST, AF, LCO and FedFair, we use the optimal hyper parameter that achieves the best harmonic mean performance. FedAvg, EO and CEO are evaluated with default settings because they do not provide a hyper parameter to control the trade-off between accuracy and fairness.

As shown in Tables I and II, in most cases, the accuracies of the models trained by FedFair are comparable with the other methods, but FedFair achieves the best fairness most of the cases, and always achieves the best harmonic mean. This demonstrates the outstanding performance of FedFair in training fair models with high accuracies.

E. Effect of Parameter ϵ

We first analyze how ϵ affects the fairness and accuracy of the logistic regression models trained by FedFair. As shown in Figure 2, for each data set, we use FedFair to train a logistic regression model f_θ with every value of ϵ , and report the performance of f_θ , including the absolute value of the federated estimation (see Equation (5)) on the training data, the DGEO on the testing data, fairness, and accuracy. Please note that the absolute value of the federated estimation (AFE for short in this section) is the lefthand side of the federated DGEO constraint in Equation (6b).

In Figures 2(a), 2(c) and 2(e), AFE (the solid line) is always not larger than ϵ . When ϵ is small, AFE reaches the value of ϵ . In other words, the federated DGEO constraint is activated to constrain model fairness during training. When ϵ is large, AFE is substantially lower than ϵ , and FedFair can satisfy the fairness requirement without sacrificing accuracy.

In Figures 2(a), 2(c) and 2(e), the DGEO curve (the dashed line) on the testing data closely follows the trend of the corresponding AFE curve. This shows that the federated DGEO constraint applied on the training data generalizes well in constraining the DGEO on the testing data, which makes FedFair highly effective in training fair models.




Fig. 3. The effect of parameter ϵ on the neural network models trained by FedFair. The AFE in (a), (c) and (e) is for the absolute value of the federated estimation in Equation (5). The sets of ϵ we used are $\{10^{-4}, 10^{-3}, 0.005, 0.01, 0.02, 0.07, 0.13, 0.19, 0.22, 0.25\}$ for DRUG, and $\{10^{-4}, 10^{-3}, 0.01, 0.1, 0.2, 0.4\}$ for COMPASS and ADULT.

Figures 2(b), 2(d) and 2(f) show how ϵ affects the accuracy and the fairness of f_θ . On all the data sets, the accuracy of f_θ drops when ϵ becomes smaller, because reducing ϵ induces a tighter federated DGEO constraint, shrinks the feasible region of the FedFair problem, and makes it harder to find a good solution. Figures 2(b) and 2(d) show that reducing ϵ significantly improves the fairness of f_θ , since a smaller ϵ requires f_θ to have a smaller DGEO, that is, to be fairer.

However, a smaller DGEO does not always induce a higher fairness. The reason is that fairness is defined based on the notion of $\text{DEO}(f_\theta)$, which is equivalent to DGEO only if a hard loss function $\ell(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y) = \mathbb{1}_{y * f_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0}$ is used [25]. The hard loss function cannot be used to train the logistic regression model f_θ , thus DGEO is not equivalent to $\text{DEO}(f_\theta)$ in our case. As a result, when ϵ gets smaller than 0.10, the DGEO in Figure 2(e) decreases, but the corresponding fairness in Figure 2(f) drops as well. However, this does not affect the practical performance of FedFair much. As discussed in Section VI-D, FedFair always achieves the best performance on all data sets.

Next, we analyze the effect of ϵ on the performance of the neural network models trained by FedFair in Figure 3, where the curves are drawn in the same way as Figure 2.

In Figures 3(c) and 3(e), the DGEO represented by the dashed curves are closely following the trends of the corresponding solid curves of absolute federated estimations (AFE). This demonstrates that the federated DGEO constraint applied on the training data generalizes well in constraining the DGEO on the testing data, which further means FedFair is highly effective in training fair neural network models.

However, the federated DGEO constraint may not generalize well when the training data set is too small. As shown in Figure 3(a), the DGEO curve on the small DRUG data set first drops with the decrease of ϵ , but then becomes large again when ϵ becomes smaller than 0.075. This is because a small




Fig. 4. The influence of dropping clients on FedFair and LCO.

ϵ forces the neural network model to overfit the federated DGEO constraint on the small training data set of DRUG, which reduces the effectiveness of the constraint in controlling the DGEO on the testing data.

The logistic regression model in Figure 2(a) does not overfit the federated constraint on the training data set of DRUG because it has a much lower model complexity than the neural network model.

Now, let's discuss the accuracy and fairness performances in Figures 3(b), 3(d) and 3(f). Different from the accuracies of the logistic regression models in Figures 2(b), 2(d) and 2(f), the accuracies of the neural network models do not always drop with the decrease of ϵ . This is largely due to the high model complexity and high non-linearity of the neural network models, where a tighter federated DGEO constraint induced by a smaller ϵ may act as a regularization term to improve the testing accuracies of the neural network models.

We can also observe in Figure 3 that a smaller DGEO does not always induce a larger fairness for the neural network models. This is because the notion of $\text{DEO}(f_\theta)$, from which we develop fairness, is not equivalent to DGEO when we use cross-entropy loss to train neural network models [25].

However, this does not affect the practical performance of FedFair very much. As demonstrated in Subsection VI-D, the neural network models trained by FedFair always achieve the best harmonic mean performance.

VII. INFLUENCE OF DROPPING CLIENTS

Following the standard experiments of classical federated learning methods [5], [26]–[29], we randomly drop a proportion of clients offline in each iteration of the training processes of FedFair and LCO, and evaluate how dropping clients affects the harmonic mean of a trained model. For each of LCO and FedFair, we report the best performance in Figure 4 using the optimal value of ϵ that corresponds to the model with the largest harmonic mean. The performances of the other methods

are always inferior to FedFair, thus we skip the discussions on them due to limit of space.

The proportion of dropped clients is called **drop rate**. Figure 4 shows the harmonic means of FedFair and LCO for the drop rates of 0.0, 0.1, 0.3 and 0.5. Here, a drop rate 0.0 means no client is dropped.

In most cases, the harmonic mean of the model trained by LCO decreases when the drop rate increases from 0.0 to 0.1. Because dropping a client drops the corresponding local DGEO constraint of the LCO problem, and the fairness of the model trained by LCO will be reduced if some dominating active local DGEO constraints are dropped during training.

The harmonic mean of the model trained by LCO stays stable for the drop rates 0.1, 0.3 and 0.5, which means dropping more local DGEO constraints does not affect the performance of the model if the dominating active constraints are already dropped.

Comparing to LCO, FedFair achieves a much better robustness to dropping clients. As shown in Figures 4(a), 4(c) and 4(e), the harmonic means of the logistic regression models trained by FedFair stay unchanged at very high values for all the drop rates. This outstanding robustness of FedFair to dropping clients is inherited from the robustness of the federated estimation, because the federated estimation is the average of the local estimations, which is very robust to dropped clients.

When training neural network models, the robustness of FedFair to dropping clients is a little bit different from training linear models. In Figures 4(b) and 4(d), on the small data sets of DRUG and COMPASS, the harmonic mean of the neural network model trained by FedFair decreases when the drop rate increases. Because training neural network models requires a lot of data, but dropping clients reduces the amount of available private data sets, which limits the collaboration effectiveness among clients. However, FedFair is still very robust to dropping clients on the large ADULT data set. As shown in Figure 4(f), dropping clients does not affect the harmonic means of the neural network models trained by FedFair.

In summary, FedFair is highly robust to dropping clients, and the models trained by FedFair achieve the best harmonic mean performance on all the data sets.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we tackle the novel task of training fair models in cross-silo federated learning. We first propose an effective federated estimation method to accurately estimate the fairness of a model, and we also analyze why it achieves a smaller estimation variance than locally estimating the fairness of a model on every client. Based on the federated estimation, we develop a fairness constraint that can be smoothly incorporated into an effective federated learning framework to train high-performance fair models without infringing the data privacy of any client.

REFERENCES

- [1] Pessach et al., “Algorithmic fairness,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.09784*, 2020.
- [2] Kairouz et al., “Advances and open problems in federated learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.04977*, 2019.
- [3] Du et al., “Fairness-aware agnostic federated learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.05057*, 2020.
- [4] Xu et al., “A unified single-loop alternating gradient projection algorithm for nonconvex-concave and convex-nonconcave minimax problems,” in *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2006.02032*, 2020.
- [5] McMahan et al., “Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data,” in *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2017, pp. 1273–1282.
- [6] Kamiran et al., “Data preprocessing techniques for classification without discrimination,” *KAIS*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 1–33, 2012.
- [7] Luong et al., “k-nn as an implementation of situation testing for discrimination discovery and prevention,” in *ACM SIGKDD*, 2011, pp. 502–510.
- [8] Calmon et al., “Optimized pre-processing for discrimination prevention,” in *NeurIPS*, 2017, pp. 3995–4004.
- [9] Feldman et al., “Certifying and removing disparate impact,” in *ACM SIGKDD*, 2015, pp. 259–268.
- [10] Louizos et al., “The variational fair autoencoder,” in *ICLR*, 2016.
- [11] Quadrianto et al., “Recycling privileged learning and distribution matching for fairness,” in *NeurIPS*, 2017, pp. 10976–10987.
- [12] Zemel et al., “Learning fair representations,” in *ICML*, 2013, pp. 325–333.
- [13] Corbett-Davies et al., “Algorithmic decision making and the cost of fairness,” in *ACM SIGKDD*, 2017, pp. 797–806.
- [14] Dwork et al., “Decoupled classifiers for group-fair and efficient machine learning,” in *Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*, 2018, pp. 119–133.
- [15] Hardt et al., “Equality of opportunity in supervised learning,” in *NeurIPS*, 2016, pp. 3315–3323.
- [16] Menon et al., “The cost of fairness in binary classification,” in *Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*, 2018, pp. 107–118.
- [17] Zafar et al., “Fairness beyond disparate treatment & disparate impact: Learning classification without disparate mistreatment,” in *WWW*, 2017, pp. 1171–1180.
- [18] Kamishima et al., “Fairness-aware classifier with prejudice remover regularizer,” in *ECML-PKDD*, 2012, pp. 35–50.
- [19] Woodworth et al., “Learning non-discriminatory predictors,” in *Conference on Learning Theory*, 2017, pp. 1920–1953.
- [20] Kamiran et al., “Discrimination aware decision tree learning,” in *ICDM*, 2010, pp. 869–874.
- [21] Quadrianto et al., “Discovering fair representations in the data domain,” in *CVPR*, 2019, pp. 8227–8236.
- [22] Pleiss et al., “On fairness and calibration,” in *NeurIPS*, vol. 30, 2017, pp. 5680–5689.
- [23] Agarwal et al., “A reductions approach to fair classification,” in *ICML*, 2018, pp. 60–69.
- [24] —, “Fair regression: Quantitative definitions and reduction-based algorithms,” in *ICML*, 2019, pp. 120–129.
- [25] Donini et al., “Empirical risk minimization under fairness constraints,” in *NeurIPS*, 2018, pp. 2791–2801.
- [26] Yang et al., “Federated machine learning: Concept and applications,” *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 1–19, 2019.
- [27] Chen et al., “Distributed statistical machine learning in adversarial settings: Byzantine gradient descent,” *ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 1–25, 2017.
- [28] Wang et al., “Federated learning with matched averaging,” in *ICLR*, 2020.
- [29] Huang et al., “Personalized cross-silo federated learning on non-iid data,” *AAAI*, 2021.
- [30] Mohri et al., “Agnostic federated learning,” in *ICML*, 2019, pp. 4615–4625.
- [31] Yang et al., “On designing data quality-aware truth estimation and surplus sharing method for mobile crowdsensing,” *IEEE JSAC*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 832–847, 2017.
- [32] Gollapudi et al., “Profit sharing and efficiency in utility games,” in *ESA*, 2017.
- [33] Yu et al., “A fairness-aware incentive scheme for federated learning,” in *AAAI*, 2020, pp. 393–399.
- [34] Li et al., “Fair resource allocation in federated learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10497*, 2019.
- [35] Lyu et al., “Towards fair and privacy-preserving federated deep models,” *IEEE TPDS*, vol. 31, no. 11, pp. 2524–2541, 2020.
- [36] Sim et al., “Collaborative machine learning with incentive-aware model rewards,” in *ICML*, 2020, pp. 8927–8936.
- [37] Dwork et al., “Fairness through awareness,” in *Theoretical Computer Science Conference*, 2012, pp. 214–226.
- [38] Joseph et al., “Fairness in learning: Classic and contextual bandits,” in *NeurIPS*, vol. 29, 2016, pp. 325–333.
- [39] Calders et al., “Building classifiers with independency constraints,” in *ICDM Workshops*, 2009, pp. 13–18.
- [40] —, “Three naive bayes approaches for discrimination-free classification,” *DMKD*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 277–292, 2010.
- [41] Xu et al., “Algorithmic decision making with conditional fairness,” in *ACM SIGKDD*, 2020, pp. 2125–2135.
- [42] Wu et al., “On convexity and bounds of fairness-aware classification,” in *WWW*, 2019, pp. 3356–3362.

- [43] Cotter et al., "Optimization with non-differentiable constraints with applications to fairness, recall, churn, and other goals." *JMLR*, vol. 20, no. 172, pp. 1–59, 2019.
- [44] Hashimoto et al., "Fairness without demographics in repeated loss minimization," in *ICML*, 2018, pp. 1929–1938.
- [45] Baharlouei et al., "Rényi fair inference," in *ICLR*, 2019.
- [46] Li et al., "Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks," *Machine Learning and Systems*, vol. 2, pp. 429–450, 2020.
- [47] Mehrabi et al., "A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.09635*, 2019.
- [48] Kohavi et al., "Scaling up the accuracy of naive-bayes classifiers: A decision-tree hybrid," in *ACM SIGKDD*, vol. 96, 1996, pp. 202–207.
- [49] Larson et al., "Compass analysis," in *Github*: <https://github.com/propublica/compass-analysis/>, 2016.
- [50] Fehrman et al., "The five factor model of personality and evaluation of drug consumption risk," in *Data science*. Springer, 2017, pp. 231–242.