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To act safely and ethically in the real world, agents must be able to reason about harm and avoid harmful actions. In this paper we develop the first statistical definition of harm and a framework for factoring harm into algorithmic decisions. We argue that harm is fundamentally a counterfactual quantity, and show that standard machine learning algorithms are guaranteed to pursue harmful policies in certain environments. To resolve this, we derive a family of counterfactual objective functions that robustly mitigate for harm. We demonstrate our approach with a statistical model for identifying optimal drug doses. While identifying optimal doses using the causal treatment effect results in harmful treatment decisions, our counterfactual algorithm identifies doses that are far less harmful without sacrificing efficacy. Our results show that counterfactual reasoning is a key ingredient for safe and ethical AI.
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1. Introduction

Machine learning algorithms are increasingly used for making highly consequential decisions in areas such as medicine (De Fauw et al., 2018; Obermeyer et al., 2019; Topol, 2019), criminal justice (Angwin et al., 2016; Kehl and Kessler, 2017; Završnik, 2021), finance (Addo et al., 2018; Belanche et al., 2019; Johnson et al., 2019), and autonomous vehicles (Schwarting et al., 2018). These algorithms optimize for outcomes such as survival time, recidivism rate, and financial cost. However, these are purely factual objectives, depending only on what outcome occurs. On the other hand, human decision making incorporates preferences that depend not only on the outcome, but why it occurred.

For example, consider two treatments for a disease which, when left untreated, has a 50% mortality rate. Treatment 1 has a 60% chance of curing a patient, and a 40% chance of having no effect, with the disease progressing as if untreated. Treatment 2 has an 80% chance of curing a patient and a 20% chance of killing them. Treatments 1 and 2 have identical recovery rates, hence any agent that selects actions based solely on the outcome statistics (e.g. the effect of treatment on the treated (Heckman, 1992) will not be able to distinguish between these two treatments. However, doctors systematically favour treatment 1 as it achieves the same recovery rate but never harms the patient—there are no patients that would have survived had they not been treated. On the other hand, doctors who administer treatment 2 risk harming their patients—there are patients who die following treatment who would have lived had they not been treated. While treatments 1 and 2 have the same mortality rates, the resulting deaths have different causes (the doctor or the disease) which have different ethical implications.

Determining what would have happened to a patient if the doctor hadn’t treated them is a counterfactual inference, which cannot be identified from outcome statistics alone but requires knowledge of the functional causal relation between actions and outcomes (Balke and Pearl, 1994). However, standard machine learning algorithms are limited to making factual inferences—e.g. learning correlations between actions and outcomes. How then can we express these ethical preferences as objective functions and ultimately incorporate them into machine learning algorithms? This question has some urgency, given that machine learning algorithms currently under development or in deployment will be unable to reason about harm and factor it into their decisions.
The concept of harm is foundational to many ethical codes and principles; from the Hippocratic oath (Sokol, 2013) to environmental policy (Lin, 2006), and from the foundations of classical liberalism (Mill, 2006), to Asimov’s laws of robotics (Asimov, 2004). Despite this ubiquity, there is no formal statistical definition of harm. We address this by translating the predominant account of harm (Feinberg, 1987; Klocksiem, 2012) into a statistical measure—counterfactual harm. Our definition of harm enables us for the first time to precisely answer the following basic questions,

**Question 1** Did the actions of an agent cause harm, and if so, how much?

**Question 2** How much harm can we expect an action to cause prior to taking it?

**Question 3** How can we identify actions that balance the expected harms and benefits?

In section 2 we introduce concepts from causality, ethics, and expected utility theory used to derive our results. In section 3 we present our definitions of harm and benefit, and in section 4 we describe how harm-aversion can be factored into algorithmic decisions. In section 5 we prove that algorithms based on standard statistical learning theory are incapable of reasoning about harm and are guaranteed to pursue harmful policies following certain distributional shifts, while our approach using counterfactual objective functions overcomes these problems. Finally, in section 6 we apply our methods to an interpretable machine learning model for determining optimal drug doses, and compare this to standard algorithms based on standard statistical learning.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we introduce some basic principles from causal modelling, expected utility theory and ethics that we use to derive our results.

2.1. Structural causal models

We provide a brief overview of structural causal models (SCMs) (see Chapter 7 of Pearl (2009) and Bareinboim et al. (2020) for reviews). SCMs represent observable variables \(X^i\) as vertices of a directed acyclic graph (DAG), with directed edges representing causal relations between \(X^i\) and their direct causes (parents), which includes observable (endogenous) parents \(p_a\), and a single exogenous noise variable \(E^i\). The value of each variable is assigned by a deterministic function \(f_i\) of these parents.

**Definition 1** (Structural Causal Model (SCM)). A structural causal model \(M = (G, E, X, F, P)\) specifies:

1. a set of observable (endogenous) random variables \(X = \{X^1, \ldots, X^N\}\),
2. a set of mutually independent noise (exogenous) variables \(E = \{E^1, \ldots, E^K\}\) with joint distribution \(P(E = e) = \prod_{i=1}^{K} P(E^i = e^i)\)
3. a directed acyclic graph \(G\), whose nodes are the variables \(E \cup X\) with directed edges from \(p_{a_i}\) to \(X^i\), where \(p_{a_i} \subseteq X\) denotes the endogenous parents of \(X^i\).
4. a set of functions (mechanisms) \(F = \{f_1, \ldots, f_N\}\), where the collection \(F\) forms a mapping from \(E\) to \(X\),

\[
x^i := f_i(p_{a_i}, e), \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, N,
\]

By recursively applying condition 4 every observable variable can be expressed as a function of the noise variables alone, \(X'(e) = x\) where \(E = e\) is the joint state of the noise variables, and the distribution over unobserved noise variables induces a distribution over the observable variables,

\[
P(X = x) = \int_{e: X(e) = x} P(E = e)
\]

where \(X = x\) is the joint state over \(X\).

The power of SCMs is that they specify not only the joint distribution \(P(X = x)\) but also the distribution of \(X\) under all interventions, including incompatible interventions (counterfactuals). Interventions describe an external agent changing the underlying causal mechanisms \(F\). For example, \(do(X^1 = x)\) denotes intervening to force \(X^1 = x\) regardless of the state of its parents, replacing \(x^i := f_i(p_{a_i}, e^i)\) to \(x\). The variables in this post-intervention SCM are denoted \(X^i_x\) or \(X^i_{X^i = x}\) and their interventional distribution is given by (1) under the updated mechanisms. The trivial
intervention (no intervention) is denoted do(∅) and leaves the SCM unchanged.

These interventional distributions quantify the effects of actions and are used to inform decisions. For example, the conditional average treatment effect (CATE) (Shpitser and Pearl, 2012b),

$$\text{CATE}(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y_{T=1}|x] - \mathbb{E}[Y_{T=0}|x]$$ (2)

measures the expected value of outcome $Y$ for treatment $T = 1$ compared to no treatment (control) $T = 0$ conditional on $X$, and is used in decision making from precision medicine to economics (Abrevaya et al., 2015; Shalit et al., 2017).

Counterfactual distributions are used to ascribe causal explanations for data by determining the probability that other outcomes would have occurred had some precondition been different. For example, for $X, Y \in \{T, F\}$, the causal effect $P(Y_{X=T} = T)$ is insufficient to determine if do$(X = T)$ was a necessary cause of $Y = T$ (Halpern, 2016). Instead this is captured by the counterfactual probability of necessity (Tian and Pearl, 2000),

$$\text{PN} = P(Y_{X=F} = F|X = T, Y = T)$$ (3)

which is the probability that $Y$ would be false if $X$ had been false (the counterfactual proposition), given that $X$ and $Y$ were both true (the factual data). For example, if PN $= 0$ then $Y = T$ would have occurred regardless of $X = T$, whereas if PN $= 1$ then $Y = T$ could not have occurred without $X = T$. Equation (3) involves the joint distribution over incompatible states of $Y$ under different interventions, $Y = T$ and $Y_{X=F} = F$, which cannot be jointly measured and hence (3) cannot be identified from data alone. However, (3) can be calculated from the SCM using (1) for the combined factual and counterfactual propositions,

$$P(Y_{X=F} = F, X = T, Y = T) = \int_{Y_{X=F}(e)=F} P(E = e) \quad \text{if } Y(e)=T, X(e)=T$$ (4)

This ability to generate quantitative causal explanations for data has made SCMs and counterfactual inference a key ingredient in statistical definitions of blame, intent and responsibility (Halpern and Kleiman-Weiner, 2018; Kleiman-Weiner et al., 2015; Lagnado et al., 2013), and has seen applications in AI research ranging from explainability (Madumal et al., 2020; Wachter et al., 2017), safety (Everitt et al., 2019, 2021), and fairness (Kusner et al., 2017), to reinforcement learning (Buesing et al., 2018; Forney et al., 2017) and medical diagnosis (Richens et al., 2020).

2.2. The counterfactual comparative account of harm

The concept of harm is deeply embedded in ethical principles, codes and law. One famous example is the bioethical principle “first, do no harm” (Smith, 2005), asserting that the moral responsibility for doctors to benefit patients is superseded by their responsibility not to harm them (Ross, 2011). Another example is John Stuart Mill’s harm principle which forms the basis of classical liberalism (Mill, 2006) and inspired the “zeroth law” of Asimov’s fictional robot governed society, which states that “A robot may not harm humanity or, by inaction, allow humanity to come to harm” (Asimov, 2004).

Despite these attempts to codify harm into rules for governing human and AI behaviour, it is not immediately clear what we mean when we talk about harm. This can lead to confusion—for example, does “allow humanity to come to harm” refer to an agent causing harm by inaction (e.g. Bradley, 2012), or failing to benefit? The meaning and measure of harm also has important practical ramifications. For example, establishing negligence in tort law requires establishing that significant harm has occurred (Wright, 1985), and liability for damages due to algorithmic negligence is expected to fall on the vendors of these algorithms (Kingston, 2016).

This has motivated work in philosophy, ethics and law to rigorously define harm, with the most widely accepted definition being the counterfactual comparative account (CCA) (Feinberg, 1986; Hanser, 2008; Klocksiem, 2012),

**Definition 2 (CCA).** The counterfactual comparative account of harm and benefit states,

“An event $e$ or action $a$ harms (benefits) a person overall if and only if $a$ would
have been on balance better (worse) off if e had not occurred, or a had not been performed.”

Simply stated, the CCA defines harm as causing someone to be worse off (Purves, 2019). The CCA establishes causation with a but-for counterfactual (Halpern, 2016) similar to the probability of necessity (3), comparing the factual outcome where the agent acted to the counterfactual outcome that would have occurred had the agent not acted. The second aspect of the CCA is determining if the person would be “better (worse) off”, which we will address using expected utility theory (Morgenstern and Von Neumann, 1953).

While the CCA is the predominant definition of harm and forms the basis of our results, alternative definitions have been proposed (Harman, 2009; Norcross, 2005), motivated by scenarios where the CCA appears to give counterintuitive results (Bradley, 2012). Surprisingly, we find these problematic cases are identical to those raised in the study of actual causality (Halpern, 2016), and can be resolved with a formal causal analysis. To our knowledge, this connection with actual causality has not been noted before, and we present a detailed account of the arguments against CCA and how they can be addressed in Supplementary Note A in the hope this will stimulate discussion between these two fields.

2.3. Decision theoretic setup

In this section we present our setup for calculating the CCA (Definition 2). The CCA describes a person (referred to as the user) being made better or worse off due to the actions of an agent. We focus on the simplest case involving single agent’s performing single actions, though ultimately our definitions could be extended to multi-agent or sequential decision problems. For causal modelling in these scenarios we refer the reader to (Dawid, 2002; Everitt et al., 2019; Heckerman and Shachter, 1994).

We describe the environment with a structural causal model $M$ which specifies the distribution over environment states $W$ as endogenous variables, $P(w; M)$. For single actions the environment variables can be divided into three disjoint sets $W = A \cup X \cup Y$ (Figure 1 a)); action variables $A$ whose state can be intervened on by the agent, outcome variables $Y$ that are descendants of $A$ and so can be influenced by the agent’s action, and context variables $X$ that are non-descendants of nor in $A$.

The CCA (Definition 2) is comparative, and in our setup the harm caused by the agent’s actions is measured in comparison to a default policy $P(a|x)$. For example, in a randomised control trial the harm caused by a treatment is typically measured in comparison to a placebo treatment, whereas in a malpractice lawsuit the defendants actions are compared to some default policy that follows guidelines. Choosing and interpreting the default policy $P(a|x)$ is discussed further in Supplementary Note B.

In the following, $M$ denotes our SCM model for the environment when the distribution of the action variables is the default policy $P(a|x)$. We represent that agent’s actions as interventions on $M$ that fix the state of the action variables, do($A = a$). This allows us to represent the agent’s actions and the default policy in a single model, with the trivial intervention do($\emptyset$) resulting in the default policy. The user’s preferences over environment states are specified by their utility function $U(a,x,y)$, and following an intervention the user’s expected utility is given by,

$$E[U_a|x] = \int_y P(y|a,x)U(a,x,y)$$  

(5)

In sections 3-4 we focus on the case where the agent acts to maximize the user’s expected utility, with optimal actions $a_{\text{max}} = \arg\max_a E[U_a|x]$. 

Figure 1 | SCM $M$ depicting causal relations between the agent’s action $A$, context variables $X$, outcomes $Y$ and the user’s utility function $U$. 
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While this is similar to the standard setup in expected utility theory (Fishburn, 2013; Morgenstern and Von Neumann, 1953; Savage, 1972), note that $U$ describes the preferences of the user, and in general the agent can pursue any objective and could be entirely unaware of the user's preferences. In section 5 we extend our analysis to agent's pursuing arbitrary objectives.

**Example 1: conditional average treatment effects.** Returning to our example from section 1, consider an agent trialling the two treatments. The agent can choose from a placebo do$(A = 0)$, or treatments 1 and 2 (do$(A = 1)$ and do$(A = 2)$ respectively). Outcome $Y = 1$ indicates recovery and $Y = 0$ mortality. In the trial, harm is measured by comparison to the placebo treatment hence the default policy is $P(A = 0|x) = 1$. Here $X = x$ describes any variables that can potentially influence the agent's choice of intervention and $Y$, e.g. the patient's medical history.

Consider patients (users) whose preferences are fully determined by survival, e.g. $U(a, x, y) = y$. The expected utility is $\mathbb{E}[U_a|x] = \sum_y P(y_a|x)U(a, x, y) = \sum_y yP(y_a|x) = \mathbb{E}[Y_a|x]$. The agent's policy is therefore to maximize the treatment effect $a_{\text{max}} = \arg \max_y \mathbb{E}[Y_a|x]$, which is equivalent to $a_{\text{max}} = \arg \max_y \{\mathbb{E}[Y_a|x] - \mathbb{E}[Y_0|x]\}$ i.e. maximizing the CATE (2)—a standard objective for identifying optimal treatments (Bica et al., 2021; Prosperi et al., 2020). In Supplementary Note D we derive an SCM model for the treatments described in the introduction, and show that $\mathbb{E}[Y_{a=1}] = \mathbb{E}[Y_{a=2}] = 0.8$, i.e. the expected utility and CATE is the same for 1 and 2.

### 3. Counterfactual harm

We now present our definitions for harm and benefit based on Definition 2. We use $y_a$ to denote the state of post-intervention outcome $Y_a$, noting that $Y_0 = Y$. Counterfactual states are identified with an $*$, e.g. $Z = z^*$. First we consider the harm caused by an action given we observe the outcome (Question 1 in Section 1).

**Definition 3** (Counterfactual harm). The harm caused by action do$(A = a)$ given context $X = x$ and outcome $Y = y$ compared to the default policy $P(a|x)$ is,

$$h(a, x, y; M) = \int P(y^*, a^*|x, y_a; M) h(a, a^*, x, y, y^*)_{y^*, a^*}$$

(6)

where $M$ is the SCM describing the environment under the default policy $P(a|x)$,

$$h(a, a^*, x, y, y^*) = \max \{0, U(a^*, x, y^*) - U(a, x, y)\}$$

(7)

and $U$ is the user's utility function.

The counterfactual harm is the expected positive increase in utility had the agent not intervened, given they took action do$(A = a)$ in context $X = x$ resulting in outcome $Y = y$. Taking the max in (7) ensures that we only include counterfactual outcomes where harm occurred, i.e. where the utility is higher in the counterfactual world. Note that $X_a = X$ as $X$ is not a descendant of $A$, so the factual and counterfactual contexts are identical (Shpitser and Pearl, 2012a). Next we define the counterfactual benefit,

**Definition 4** (Counterfactual benefit). The benefit caused by action do$(A = a)$ given context $X = x$ and outcome $Y = y$ compared to the default policy $P(a|x)$ is,

$$b(a, x, y; M) = \int P(y^*, a^*|x, y_a; M) b(a, a^*, x, y, y^*)_{a^*, y^*}$$

(8)

where $M$ is the SCM describing the environment under the default policy $P(a|x)$,

$$b(a, a^*, x, y, y^*) = \max \{0, U(a^*, x, y^*) - U(a, x, y)\}$$

(9)

and $U$ is the user’s utility function.

The only difference from (6) is we now calculate the expected decrease in utility in the counterfactual world.

Now that we have defined the counterfactual harm and benefit we can calculate the expected harm and benefit that will be caused by an action (Question 2 in section 1),

$$\mathbb{E}[h|a, x; M] = \int_y P(y_a|x; M) h(a, x, y; M)$$

(10)

$$\mathbb{E}[b|a, x; M] = \int_y P(y_a|x; M) b(a, x, y; M)$$

(11)
While the expected counterfactual harm and benefit are counterfactual expectations, we note that they form a decomposition of the (factual) expected utility.

**Theorem 1** (harm-benefit trade-off). The difference in expected utility for action do(\(A = a\)) and for the default policy is given by,

\[
\mathbb{E}[U_a|x] - \mathbb{E}[U|x] = \mathbb{E}[b|a, x; M] - \mathbb{E}[h|a, x; M]
\]

where \(\mathbb{E}[U|x] = \int a \, p(a, y|x; M)u(a, x, y), U\) is the user’s utility function, and \(M\) is the SCM describing the environment under the default policy \(P(a|x)\).

**Proof.** See Supplementary Note C \(\square\)

**Example 2:** Returning to Example 1, the expected counterfactual harm is,

\[
\mathbb{E}[h|a; M] = \sum_{y^*, a, y} P(y^*, a^*, y_0; M)h(a, a^*, y, y^*) = \sum_{y^*, a} P(y^*, a^*, y_0; M) \max\{0, y^* - y_0\} = P(Y_0 = 1, Y_0 = 0; M)
\]

where we have used \(U(a, y) = y\), \(P(A = 1) = 1\), and the fact that there are no latent confounders to give \(P(y^*|a') = P(y^*|a)\). This is the probability that a patient dies given the agent administers treatment \(A = a\), and would have recovered had they received the placebo. In Supplementary Note D we show that \(P(Y_0 = 1, Y_0 = 0) = 0\) (treatment 1 causes zero harm) and \(P(Y_0 = 1, Y_2 = 0) = 0.1\) (treatment 2 causes non-zero harm), reflecting our intuition that treatment 2 is more harmful than treatment 1, despite having the same causal effect / CATE. Hence, the counterfactual harm allows us to differentiate between these two treatments.

**4. Harm in decision making**

Now we have expressions for the expected harm and benefit, how can we incorporate these into the agent’s decisions? Consider two actions \(a, a'\) such that \(\mathbb{E}[b|a', x; M] = \mathbb{E}[b|a, x; M] + K\) and \(\mathbb{E}[h|a', x; M] = \mathbb{E}[h|a, x; M] + K\) where \(K\) is an arbitrary constant. By Theorem 1 they must have the same expected utility, as \(\mathbb{E}[U_a'|x] = \mathbb{E}[b|a', x; M] - \mathbb{E}[h|a', x; M] + \mathbb{E}[U|x] = \mathbb{E}[b|a, x; M] + K - \mathbb{E}[h|a, x; M] - K + \mathbb{E}[U|x] = \mathbb{E}[U_a|x].\) Therefore agent’s that maximize the expected utility are indifferent to harm, i.e. they are willing to trade an increase in harm for an equal increase in benefit.

We say that an agent is harm averse if they are willing to risk causing harm only if they expect a comparatively greater benefit. Theorem 1 suggests a simple way to overcome harm indifference in the expected utility by assigning a higher weight to the harm component of the decomposition (12). If instead we maximize an adjusted expected utility \(\mathbb{E}[V|a, x; M] = \mathbb{E}[U|x] + \mathbb{E}[b|a, x; M] - (1 + \lambda)\mathbb{E}[h|a, x; M]\) where \(\lambda \in \mathbb{R}\), then if \(\mathbb{E}[V|a, x; M]\) and \(\mathbb{E}[h|a, x; M]\) are fits and harms (Question 2 section 1). Note that unlike the utility, the HPU is a model-dependent quantity and cannot be evaluated without both \(U\) and \(M\). We refer to the expected HPU (14) as a

\[
V(a, x, y; M) = U(a, x, y) - \lambda h(a, x, y; M)
\]
counterfactual objective function as $V(a, x, y; M)$ is itself a counterfactual expectation that cannot be evaluated without knowledge of $M$. Conversely, we refer to the expected utility as a factual objective function, as it can be evaluated on data alone without knowledge of the data generating process. As we show in the following example, harm-aversion can lead to qualitatively very different policies compared to other factual approaches to safety such as risk aversion (Howard and Matheson, 1972).

Example 3: assistant paradox. Alice invests $80 in the stock market, and expects a normally distributed return $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ with $\mu = \sigma = 100$. She asks her new AI assistant to manage her investment, and after a lengthy analysis the AI identifies three possible actions,

1. Multiply the investment by $0 < K \leq 20$, resulting in a return $Y \rightarrow K \cdot Y$.
2. Perform a clever trade that Alice was unaware of, increasing her return by $+$10 with certainty, $Y \rightarrow Y + 10$
3. Cancel Alice’s investment, returning $80$

Consider 3 agent’s,

1. Agent 1 maximizes expected return, choosing $a = \arg \max_a \mathbb{E}[Y_a]$
2. Agent 2 is risk-averse, in the sense of (Howard and Matheson, 1972), choosing $a = \arg \max_a \mathbb{E}[Y_a] - \lambda \text{Var}(Y_a)$
3. Agent 3 is harm-averse, choosing $a = \arg \max_a \{\mathbb{E}[Y_a] - \lambda \mathbb{E}[h|a; M]\}$

In Supplementary Note E we derive the optimal policies for Agents 1-3. Agent 1 chooses action 1 and $K = 20$, maximising Alice’s return but also maximising the expected harm—e.g. if Alice would have lost $100 she will now lose $2000. The standard approach in portfolio theory (Markowitz, 1968) is to use agent 2 with an appropriate risk aversion $\lambda$. However, agent 2 never chooses action 2 for any $\lambda$, despite the fact that action 2 is guaranteed to benefit Alice (increasing her expected return and causing zero harm). Agent 2 will reduce or even cancel Alice’s investment (for $\lambda > 0.0032$) rather than take action 2. This is because the risk-averse objective is factual, and cannot differentiate between losses caused by the agent’s actions versus those caused by exogenous fluctuations in return. Consequently, agent 2 treats all variance as being caused by its actions, and is willing to harm Alice by reducing or even cancelling her investment in order to minimizes her risk. On the other hand agent 3 never reduces Alice’s expected return, choosing either action 1 or action 2 depending on the degree of harm aversion.

The surprising behaviour of agent 2 demonstrates that non-causal preferences such as risk aversion aren’t always sufficient to capture a user’s preferences for the actions of other agent’s. For example, if the assistant’s actions cause Alice to lose money this could be worse from Alice’s perspective than if the money was lost due to her own actions or due to exogenous influences such as market fluctuations, and she may prefer the agent to take action 2 over actions 1 or 3. Understanding these preferences is necessary for training agent’s that have a duty of care to the user, and we expect harm aversion to be relevant for designing AI assistants and for alignment schemes based on assistance games (Hadfield-Menell et al., 2016). While Alice can overcome these issues by training the agent on a different objective to the expected utility (i.e. one that favours action 2 a priori, assuming Alice is aware of this action), we show in the following section that this approach fails to generalize to new environments and ultimately leads to harmful policies.

5. Counterfactual reasoning is necessary for harm aversion

In the previous sections we presented examples where maximizing the expected utility harms the user. However, these examples use specific utility functions and outcome distributions. They also assume the agent is an expected utility maximizer, rather than optimizing for some other (potentially less harmful) objective. In this section we extend our analysis to users with arbitrary utility functions and agents with arbitrary objectives to answer; when is maximizing the expected utility harmful? And is this problem unique to expected utility maximizers, or does it extend to (factual) objective functions in general?
Machine learning algorithms typically optimize factual objective functions, which can be expressed as the expected value of some real-valued function of the data \( J \). Examples include the expected utility function \( J = U \), cost functions in statistical learning theory (Berger, 2013), and the cumulative discounted reward in reinforcement learning (Sutton and Barto, 2018). Once \( J \) is specified the optimal actions in environment \( M \) are given by,

\[
a_{\max} = \arg \max_a E[J|a, x] = \arg \max_a \sum_y P(y_a|x; M)J(a, x, y) \tag{15}
\]

Note that while \( M \) appears in (15) the expected value of \( J \) can be estimated from data alone (i.e. from samples of the joint distribution of \( X \) and \( Y_a \)) without knowledge of \( M \). In the following we relax our requirement that agent's have some fixed harm aversion \( \lambda \), requiring only that they don’t take needlessly harmful actions.

**Definition 6** (Harmful actions & policies). An action \( do(A = a) \) is needlessly harmful in context \( X = x \) and environment \( M \) if there is \( a' \neq a \) such that \( E[U_{a'}|x] \geq E[U_a|x] \) and \( E[h|a', x; M] < E[h|a, x; M] \). A policy is harmful if it assigns a non-zero probability to at least one needlessly harmful action.

**Definition 7** (Harmful objectives). An objective \( E[J|a, x] \) is harmful in environment \( M \) if there is a policy that maximizes the expected value of \( J \) and is harmful.

Note that needlessly harmful actions violate any degree of harm aversion \( \lambda > 0 \), as the agent is willing to choose actions that are strictly more harmful for no additional benefit. In examples 1 and 2, treatment 2 is a needlessly harmful action and the CATE is a harmful objective as treatment 2 maximizes the CATE. First, we show that maximizing the expected HPU is never a harmful objective in any environment,

**Theorem 2.** For any utility functions \( U \), environment \( M \) and default policy \( P(a|x) \) the expected HPU is never a harmful objective for \( \lambda > 0 \).

**Proof.** See Supplementary Note H

It is vital that agent’s continue to pursue safe objectives following changes to the environment (distributional shifts). At the very least, agent’s should be able to re-train in the shifted environment without needing to tweak their objective functions. In structural causal models, distributional shifts are represented as interventions that change the exogenous noise distribution and/or the underlying causal mechanisms (Peters et al., 2017; Schölkopf et al., 2021). We focus on distributional shifts that change the outcome distribution \( P(y|a, x; M) \) alone, i.e. the default policy \( P(a|x) \) and utility function \( U(a, x, y) \) remain fixed.

**Definition 8** (Outcome distributional shift). For an environment described by SCM \( M \), \( M \rightarrow M' \) is a shift in the outcome distribution if the exogenous noise distribution for \( Y \) changes \( P(e' \mid M') \neq P(e' \mid M) \) and/or the causal mechanism changes \( f'_r(a, x, e') \neq f_r(a, x, e' \).

By Theorem 2 the expected HPU is not harmful following any distributional shifts. On the other hand, we find that maximizing almost any factual utility function will result in harmful policies under distributional shifts. In the following we assume some degree of outcome dependence in the user’s utility function.

**Definition 9** (Outcome dependence). \( U(a, x, y) \) is outcome dependent for a set of actions \( C = \{a_1, \ldots, a_N\} \) in context \( X = x \) if \( \forall a_i, a_j \in C \), \( i \neq j \), \( \max_y U(a_i, x, y) > \min_y U(a_j, x, y) \).

If there is no outcome dependence then the optimal action is independent of the outcome distribution \( P(y_a|x) \), and no learning is required to determine the optimal policy. Typically we are interested in tasks that require some degree of learning and hence outcome dependence.

**Theorem 3.** For any deterministic default policy \( P(a|x) = \delta(a - a_0(x)) \), if there is a context \( X = x \) where the user’s utility function is outcome dependent for \( a_0(x) \) and another action \( a \neq a_0(x) \), then there is an outcome distributional shift such that \( U \) is harmful in the shifted environment.

**Proof.** See Supplementary Note H.
To understand the implications of Theorem 3 we can return to examples 1 & 2 and no longer assume a specific utility function or outcome statistics. Theorem 3 implies that for any agent whose objective is to maximize the user’s utility, there is always a a distributional shift such that the agent will cause unnecessary harm to patient in the shifted environment, compared to not treating them \( P(A = 0|X) = 1 \) or any other deterministic default policy. Unlike in examples 1 & 2 we allow the patient utility function to depend on the treatment choice, and for treatments to vary in effectiveness. The only assumption we make is that whatever the user’s utility function is, it is not true that \( U(A = a, x, Y = 0) > U(A = 0, x, Y = 1) \) \( \forall a, x \). If this were true then the patient’s preferences are dominated by the agents action choice alone, i.e. the user would always prefer to die so long as they are treated, rather than not being treated and surviving.

While robust harm aversion is not possible for expected utility maximizers in general, it seems likely at first that we can train robustly harm-averse agents using other learning objectives. One possibility would be to use human interactions and demonstrations (Christiano et al., 2017; Leike et al., 2018; Nair et al., 2018) that implicitly encode harm aversion, with \( J(a, x, y) \) representing the user’s feedback or some learned (factual) reward model. In examples 1 & 2 users with utility \( U(a, x, y) = y \) could assign a higher cost to deaths following treatment 2 compared to treatment 1, \( J(A = 2, Y = 0) < J(A = 1, Y = 0) \), with the resulting \( J \) implicitly encoding the harm caused by treatment 2. If we can identify harm-averse factual objective functions we can train robustly harm averse agents using standard machine learning techniques, without needing to learn \( M \) or perform counterfactual inference. However, we now show this is not possible in general.

**Theorem 4.** For any deterministic default policy \( P(a|x) = \delta(a - a_0(x)) \), if there is a context \( X = x \) where the user’s utility function is outcome dependent for \( a_0(x) \) and two other actions \( a_1, a_2 \neq a_0(x) \), then for any factual objective function \( J \) there is an outcome distributional shift such that \( J \) is harmful in the shifted environment.

**Proof.** See supplementary Note H

Theorem 4 implies that agent’s optimizing factual objective functions may appear safe in their training environments but are guaranteed to pursue harmful policies following certain distributional shifts, even if they are allowed to re-train. This is true regardless of the (factual) objective function of the agent, and applies to any user whose utility function has some basic degree of outcome dependence. This is particularly concerning as all standard machine learning algorithms use factual objective functions. In section 6 we give a concrete example of a reasonable factual objective function and a distributional shift that renders it harmful.

**Example 4:** Alice trains an AI assistant to manage her health, with action variables including medical treatments, clinical testing and lifestyle interventions. These actions have a causal effect on Alice’s health outcomes—e.g. disease progression, severity of symptoms, and medical costs, and Alice’s preferences depend on these outcomes and not just on the action chosen by the agent (outcome dependence). The agent maximizes a reward function over these health states and actions (factual objective), including feedback from Alice and clinicians in-the-loop which penalize harmful actions by comparing to standardised treatment rules (deterministic default policy). The agent appears to be safe and is deployed at scale. However, some of these deployment environments are distributionally shifted such that the agent actively pursues a harmful policy, choosing treatments that needlessly harm patients in spite of retraining.

**6. Illustration: Dose-response models**

How does harm aversion affect behaviour and performance in real-world tasks? And how can reasonable objective functions result in harmful policies following distributional shifts? In this section we apply the methods developed in section 4 to the task of determining optimal treatments. This problem has received much attention in recent years following advances in causal machine learning techniques (Yao et al., 2018) and
increasing commercial interests including in recommendation (Liang et al., 2016), personalized medicine (Bica et al., 2021), epidemiology and econometrics (Imbens and Rubin, 2015) to name a few.

While harm is an important determinant for decision making in many of these areas, existing approaches based on causal inference reduce the problem to identifying treatment effects—e.g. the CATE (2)—which is indifferent to harm as shown in sections 3 and 5. This could result in needlessly harmful treatment decisions being made, perhaps overlooking equally effective treatments that are far less harmful.

To demonstrate this, we consider an existing model for determining the effectiveness of the antipsychotic drug Aripiprazole (Crippa and Orsini, 2016). This dose-response model predicts the reduction in symptom severity \( Y \) (measured on the Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) (Kay et al., 1992)) following treatment with a dose \( A \) (mg/day) of Aripiprazole. The response of \( Y \) is estimated using generalized additive model (GAM) (Hastie and Tibshirani, 2017)—an interpretable machine learning model commonly used for dose-response analysis (Desquilbet and Mariotti, 2010),

\[
y = f(a, \theta_1, \theta_2, \epsilon) = \theta_1 a + \theta_2 f(a) + \epsilon \tag{16}
\]

where \( \theta_i \sim N(\bar{\theta}_i, V_i) \) are random effects parameters, \( \epsilon \sim N(0, V_\epsilon) \) is a noise parameter, and \( f(a) \) is a cubic spline function (for further details including parameter values see Supplementary Note G). We assume \( U(a, y) = y \) (patients have no intrinsic preference for different doses) and measure harm in comparison to the zero dose \( P(A = 0) = 1 \).

To calculate the expected counterfactual harm we derive a solution for a broad class of SCMs, heteroskedastic additive noise models, which includes our GAM (16),

**Definition 10** (Heteroskedastic additive noise models). For \( Y, Pa(Y) = A \cup X \), the mechanism \( y = f_Y(a, x) \) is a heteroskedastic additive noise model if \( Y \) is normally distributed with a mean and variance that are functions of \( a, x \),

\[
y = \mu(a, x) + \epsilon^Y \sigma(a, x) \tag{17}
\]

where \( \epsilon^Y \sim N(0, 1) \).

In Supplementary Note G we show that the dose response model (16) can be parameterised as a heteroskedastic additive noise model and calculate the expected counterfactual harm using the following theorem,

**Theorem 5** (Expected harm for heteroskedastic additive noise model). For \( Y = f_Y(a, x, \epsilon^Y) \) where \( f_Y \) is a heteroskedastic additive noise model (Definition 10) and default policy \( P(a|x) = \delta(a - a_0) \), the expected harm is

\[
\mathbb{E}[h|a, x] = \frac{|\Delta \sigma|}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{\Delta U}{2\sigma^2}} + \frac{\Delta U}{2} \left( \text{erf} \left( \frac{\Delta U}{\sqrt{2} \Delta \sigma} \right) - 1 \right)
\]

(18)

where \( \text{erf}(\cdot) \) is the error function, \( \Delta U = \mathbb{E}[U_\epsilon|x] - \mathbb{E}[U_{a_0}|x] \), \( \Delta \sigma = \sigma(a, x) - \sigma(a_0, x) \).

**Proof.** See Supplementary Note F.

First we note that \( \mathbb{E}[h|a, x] \) can vary by orders of magnitude for doses that achieve very similar outcome statistics (actions with similar \( \Delta U \), \( \Delta \sigma \), which fully determine \( \mu(a, x), \sigma(a, x) \) in (18)). We also note that (30) is non-analytic and flat (Glaister, 1991) at \( \Delta \sigma = 0 \), and declines rapidly (with \( H \ll \Delta U \)) for \( |\Delta \sigma| < \Delta U/4 \). These properties imply i) the existence of interventions that can achieve significant expected utility but are essentially harm-free, and ii) the expected harm can vary by orders of magnitude between similar doses—for example, between optimal and nearly-optimal doses.

Next we calculate the expected HPU (5) for \( \lambda = 0, 10, 100 \) (Figure 2a). In this context a relatively large \( \lambda \) is appropriate to ensure a high ratio of expected benefit to harm typically required for medical interventions (FDA, 2018). We find that the optimal dose is highly sensitive to \( \lambda \), for example reducing from 19.3 mg/day to 17.3 mg/day for \( \lambda = 100 \). On the other hand, these lower-harm doses achieve a similar improvement in symptom severity compared to the optimal dose. Figure 2b) shows the trade-off between expected utility and harm relative to the optimal dosage \( a_{\text{CATE}} = \arg \max_x \mathbb{E}[Y_x] \). For almost-optimal doses we observe a steep harm gradient, with small improvements in symptom severity requiring large increases in harm. For example, it is possible to
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(a) Expected HPU (Def 5) for the dose-response model (16) v.s. dosage of \( \lambda = 0 \), \( \lambda = 10 \) and \( \lambda = 100 \). Dotted lines show the dose maximizing expected HPU for each \( \lambda \). 

(b) \( \mathbb{E} \text{max} h_j(a) \) v.s. \( \mathbb{E} \text{max} U_j(a) \) for \( a \leq a_{\text{max}} \). Dotted lines show reduction in harm by 50% and 90%, reducing expected utility by 0.2% and 2.0% respectively.

Figure 2 | Harm aversion in dose-response model

reduce expected harm by 90% compared to \( a_{\text{CATE}} \) and only reduce the treatment effect by 2%. This demonstrates that maximizing expected utility without taking harm into account will often result in extreme harm values (an example of Goodhart’s law Zhuang and Hadfield-Menell (2021)).

Finally, we consider identifying safe doses using a reasonable factual objective function (risk-averse) and describe how this can result in harmful actions following distributional shifts. Consider the risk-averse objective function \( \mathbb{E}[J(a) = \mathbb{E}[Y_a] - \beta \text{Var}[Y_a]] \). As higher doses have a higher variance in \( Y \), this objective will select lower doses which are also the harm-averse doses in our example. However, consider a distributional shift where (16) gains an additional exogenous noise term, \( Y = f(a, \theta_1, \theta_2, \epsilon, \eta) = \theta_1 a + \theta_2 f(a) + \epsilon + \eta^Y(10 - 0.5a) \) where \( \eta^Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \), describing a population where untreated patients \( A = 0 \) have a high variation in outcome \( Y \) which decreases as the dose increases. It is simple to check that in this shifted model \( \arg \max_{a} \mathbb{E}[U_a] = \arg \max_{a} \mathbb{E}[V|a, x; M] \forall \lambda > 0 \) (i.e. harm averse agent’s maximize expected utility), whereas for any risk averse agent \( (\beta > 0) \) the optimal dose is strictly larger than \( a_{\text{max}} \). Hence, all risk averse agent’s achieve a lower expected utility and higher expected harm than the optimal dose, and risk aversion is harmful in this shifted environment (Definition 7).

7. Conclusion

One of the core assumptions of statistical learning theory is that human preferences can be expressed solely in terms of states of the world, while the underlying causal relations between these states can be ignored. This assumption allows goals to be expressed as factual objective functions and optimized on data without needing to perform counterfactual reasoning. According to this view, all behaviours we care about can be achieved using the first two levels of Pearl’s hierarchy (Pearl, 2019).

In this article we have argued against this view. We proposed the first statistical definition of harm, and showed that agent’s that optimize factual objective functions are incapable of avoiding harmful actions in general. Arguably the ability to avoid causing harm is a key requirement for deploying safe and ethical AI (Bostrom and Yudkowsky, 2014), and our results add weight to arguments that advanced AI systems will be severely limited if they are unable to perform causal and counterfactual reasoning (Pearl, 2018). That said, it is an open question as to how counterfactual reasoning can be achieved with current implementations. While our approach uses structural causal models, there is growing interest in counterfactual reasoning with deep learning models (Dasgupta et al., 2019; Khe-
makhem et al., 2021; Pawlowski et al., 2020; Vlontzos et al., 2021).
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Supplementary Notes

A.

In this supplementary note we discuss the omission problem and pre-emption problem (Bradley, 2012), and propose a resolution using causal modelling. For other arguments see (Klocksiem, 2012).

Omission Problem: Alice decides not to give Bob a set of golf clubs. Bob’s would be happy if Alice had given him the golf clubs. Therefore, according to the CCA, Alice’s decision not to give Bob the clubs causes Bob harm. However, intuitively Alice has not harmed Bob, but merely failed to benefit him (Bradley, 2012).

Solution: The omission problem relies on the judgement that Alice does not have a moral obligation to provide Bob with golf clubs, therefore her choice not to do so does not constitute harm to Bob. In our formulation of the CCA, this judgement is encoded in the model $M$ comprising of two variables; Alice’s action $A \in \{0, 1\}$ where $A = 0$ indicates ‘Bob not given clubs’ and $A = 1$ ‘Bob given clubs’, and outcome $Y \in \{0, 1\}$ where $Y = 0$ indicates ‘Bob has clubs’ and $Y = 1$ indicates ‘Bob does not have clubs’. By default, Alice is not expected to give Bob clubs, which is encoded in the default policy $P(A = 0) = 1$. The causal mechanism for $Y$ is $y = a$, i.e. Bob only receives the golf clubs if he is given them, deterministically. Whatever utility function we choose for Bob, the action $\text{do}(A = 0)$ causes no harm in this model (Lemma 3 Supplementary Note H).

Note there are other reasonable scenarios where Alice’s actions would constitute harm. For example, if Alice was a clerk in a golf shop and Bob had pre-paid for a set of golf clubs. In this case, we would expect Alice to give Bob the clubs by default $P(A = 1)$, and her choosing not to—do$(A = 0)$—would cause harm to Bob.

Preemption Problem: Alice shoots Bob. A moment later, a fireball would have hit Bob, killing him with certainty. Therefore, Alice’s action does not cause bob to be worse off as he would have died regardless of her actions, and by the CCA Alice does not harm bob by shooting him. However, intuitively Alice harms Bob if she shoots him, regardless of what occurs later (Bradley, 2012).

The preemption problem has a long history in the field of causality, and proposed solutions in actual causality (there referred to as the rock throwing problem) use causal modeling to avoid this apparent contradiction when using counterfactual contrastive methods for causal attribution (Halpern, 2016). However, there are some issues with this approach—namely, the fact that one has to select certain contingencies that fix causal mechanisms in the counterfactual world, and it is not always clear which contingencies should be selected. While we note that the preemption problem as posed in (Bradley, 2012) can be resolved using the analysis in (Halpern, 2016), our main argument is to point out that the preemption problem for harm can be resolved far more easily than the preemption problem for attribution (i.e. establishing actual cause). In fact, the mistake is to conflate establishing harm as establishing actual cause, the latter being a necessary but insufficient condition for the former.

First, we will show that when modelling this scenario as a Markov decision process there is no preemption problem (i.e. Alice’s action is not assigned zero harm). The MDP that describes the preemption problem is depicted below. Bobs state at time step $t$ is $B^{(t)} \in \{0, 1\}$ with $B^{(t)} = 0$ (dead), $B^{(t)} = 1$ (alive). Alice’s can choose to shoot $A = 1$ or not shoot $A = 0$ Bobs at time $t = 1$, and at time $t = 2$ the fireball is either fired $F = 1$ or not fired $F = 0$. $B^{(0)} = 1$, and $B^{(1)} = b^{(0)} \land (1 - a)$ (Bob is alive at $t = 1$ if he is alive at the previous time step, and Alice doesn’t shoot him), and $B^{(2)} = b^{(1)} \land (1 - f)$ (Bob is alive at $t = 2$ if he is alive at $t = 1$ and the fireball is not fired at him). We choose the default policy for Alice to be $P(A = 0) = 1$, and $P(F = 1) = 1$. At each time step, Bob has a utility function $U^{(t)}$ which for simplicity we choose to be $U^{(t)} = b^{(t)}$, i.e. Bob has a utility of 1 if he is alive, and a utility of 0 if he is dead.
When Alice intervenes to shoot Bob, this causes $B^{(1)} = 0$ and subsequently $B^{(2)} = 0$. Clearly, the cause of $B^{(2)} = 0$ (Bob = dead) at $t = 2$ is that Alice shot him at time $t = 1$. However, as noted in Halpern (2016) a simple but-for counterfactual is insufficient to identify this, as $F = 1$ and so $P(B_{A=0}^{(2)} = 1|B^{(2)} = 0, A = 1) = 0$, Bob will always die at $t = 2$ regardless of what Alice does. To recover the correct causal attribution (Alice shooting Bob is indeed the cause of him being dead at $t = 2$) we would have to fix $do(F = 0)$ in the counterfactual world, which is a contingency that allows us to identify $A = 1$ as a cause of $B^{(2)} = 0$.

However, if we calculate the counterfactual harm caused by $do(A = 1)$ we see there is no pre-emption problem. Consider the cumulative utility $U^{(T)} = U^{(0)} + U^{(1)} + U^{(2)}$. When Alice doesn’t intervene, the expected total utility is $\mathbb{E}[U^{(T)}] = 2$—Bob is Alive for two time steps and then killed with certainty at $t = 2$. When Alice intervenes the expected utility is $\mathbb{E}[U^{(T)}_{A=1}] = 1$. Finally, note that the expected harm caused by Alice is $\mathbb{E}[H|A = 1] = \sum_{a,b^{(1)},b^{(2)}} P(a,b^{(1)},b^{(2)}|B_{A=0}^{(1)} = 0, B_{A=0}^{(2)} = 0) \max \{0,U^{(T)}(b^{(1)},b^{(2)}) - U^{(T)}(0,0)\} = 1$, and so when we model the problem as a causal MDP there is no preemption problem (Alices action causes non-zero harm).

What remains is to answer—as $A = 1$ is the actual cause of $B^{(2)} = 0$, why do we count the harm as 1 and not 2 (i.e. why do we not include the lost utility at time $t = 2$)? Consider the identical case where $F = 1$ indicates Bob dying of old age—i.e. an inevitable future event beyond which Alice’s action can have no causal effect on Bob’s utility. Should we account for lost utility following an event $F = 1$ that removes any causal effect of $A$ on the outcome? $A = 1$ is the actual cause of any $B^{(1)} = 0$ for $t \geq 1$ (i.e. we apply the contingency $do(F = 0)$ in the counterfactual world). Consider a model where $t$ runs from 0 to 100. If Alice is the actual cause for Bob not being Alive up to and including $t = 100$, should we also include this lost utility in the harm? If there was no event $F = 1$ then yes. But including lost utility after the event $F = 1$ is akin to assigning harm to Alice’s action for the years Bob would have lived after inevitably dying of old age. Whilst Alice is responsible for $B^{(1)} = 0$ for $t \rightarrow \infty$, we do not want to include this fictitious lost utility in our calculation because it would never have been received, regardless of Alice’s actions.

In summary, our approach is akin to demanding that harm does not occur for outcomes where the causal effect of the agent’s actions is zero. The preemption problem is resolved by restricting our attention to Markov process models and noting that Alice’s actions being an actual cause of Bob losing utility is a necessary but insufficient condition for harm.

**B.**

In this supplementary note we discuss selecting and interpreting default policies. The CCA (Definition 2) is comparative, and the agent’s action is measured against a default policy. To calculate harm as a statistical measure, we need to incorporate the default policy $P(a|x)$ into $M$, so that when the agent does not act ($do(\emptyset)$) the counterfactual outcome distribution is generated under $P(a|x)$. Note that
does not act' should not be confused with ‘do nothing’, as doing nothing is often a valid action choice and should be included as an element of \( A \).

When determining harm, \( P(a|x) \) should be seen as part of the query and chosen to reflect our normative assumptions. For example, ‘the doctor harmed the patient by not treating them’ may be true whereas ‘the bystander harmed the patient by not treating them’ may be false (failure to benefit instead of harm Feit (2019)). Both involve the same action and outcome—i.e. the same \( P(y|a, x) \) and \( U(a, x, y) \)—but in the first the default policy treats the patient \( P(A = 1) = 1 \) (doctors have a duty of care to the patient), whereas in the second it does not treat the patient \( P(A = 0) = 1 \) (bystanders are not expected to treat the patient). In both of these cases the query is of the form ‘A harms the user compared to B’, but the comparison B is tacitly assumed rather than explicitly stated, and the reader is expected to infer it from norms (i.e. knowledge of doctors v.s bystanders). Other examples include statements like ‘treatments are more beneficial than harmful’, which can be understood as comparing treatment \( A = 1 \) to an untreated or control group \( A = 0 \), and hence \( P(A = 0) = 1 \). While some have argued against comparative accounts on the grounds that it is not always clear which comparison is needed Hanser (2008), in the scenarios we consider this problem arises due to the ambiguity of statements about harm (note, we do not consider scenarios where the agent’s action alters the user’s utility function). Clearly, there is not a single universal comparison for all actions and outcomes (this assumption leads to the omission problem, described in Supplementary Note A), and the ability to explicitly choose the comparison is a feature rather than a fault with the CCA.

Interpreting \( P(a|x) \) as an integral part of the query also explains why in section 5 we restrict our attention to distributional shifts where the default policy remains the same. Changing the default policy amounts to changing the harm query, and changing normative assumptions that frame what we define as harm in a given scenario. For example, we could train an agent to solve a task that is independent of the user, and under a ‘prime directive’ where we believe it has no obligation to help the user (though they should avoid harming them). If we then re-train the agent in an environment where the statistics are identical, but we now demand that they do help the user by default, this would be an unfair test of the agent akin to testing the bystander as if they were a doctor with a duty of care relation as described in the previous examples.

C.

In this supplementary note we prove Theorem 1. Noting that \( b(a^*, x, y, y^*) - h(a, x, y, y^*) = U(a, x, y) - U(a^*, x, y^*) \), subtracting the expected harm (Definition 3) from the expected benefit (Def 4) gives,

\[
\mathbb{E}[b|a, x; M] - \mathbb{E}[h|a, x; M] = \int_{y, y^*} P(y_a|y^*, a^*|x; M)(U(a, x, y) - U(a^*, x, y^*))
\]

\[
= \int_{y} P(y_a|x)U(a, x, y) - \int_{y^*} P(y^*, a^*|x)U(a^*, x, y^*)
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}[U_a|x] - \mathbb{E}[U|x]
\]

D.

In this supplementary note we derive the SCM model for the treatment decision task in examples 1 and 2, and calculate the average treatment effect and counterfactual harm.

Patients who receive the default ‘no treatment’ \( T = 0 \) have a 50% survival rate. \( T = 1 \) has a 60%
chance of curing a patient, and a 40% chance of having no effect, with the disease progressing as if \( T = 0 \), whereas \( T = 2 \) has a 80% chance of curing a patient as a 20% chance of killing them, due to some unforeseeable allergic reaction to the treatment.

Next we evaluate this expression for our two treatment by constructing an SCM for the decision task. The patient’s response to treatment is described by three independent latent factors (for example genetic factors) that we model as exogenous variables. Firstly, half of the patients exhibit a robustness to the disease which means they will recover if not treated, which we encode as \( E^1 \in \{0, 1\} \) where \( e^1 = 1 \) implies robustness with \( P(e^1 = 1) = 0.5 \). Secondly, the patients may exhibit a resistance to treatment 1 indicated by variable \( E^2 \), with \( e^2 = 1 \) implying resistance with \( P(e^2 = 1) = 0.4 \). Finally, the patients can be allergic to treatment 2, indicated by variable \( E^3 \) with \( e^3 = 1 \) and \( P(e^3 = 1) = 0.2 \). Given knowledge of these three factors the response of any patient is fully determined, and so we define the exogenous noise variable as \( E^v = E^1 \times E^2 \times E^3 \) with \( P(E^v) = P(e^1)P(e^2)P(e^3) \).

Next we characterise the mechanism \( y = f(t, e^v) = f(t, e^1, e^2, e^3) \) where \( f(0, e^v) = [e^1 = 1] \) (untreated patients recover if they are robust), \( f(1, e^v) = [e^1 = 1] \lor [e^2 = 0] \) (patients with \( T = 1 \) recover if they are robust or non-resistant) and \( f(2, e^v) = [e^3 = 0] \) (patients with \( T = 2 \) recover if they are non-allergic), where \( [X = x] \) are Iverson brackets which return 1 if \( X = x \) and 0 otherwise, and \( \lor \) is the Boolean OR.

The recovery rate for \( T = 1 \) and \( T = 2 \) can be calculated with (1) to give \( P(Y_1 = 1) = P(e^1 = 1 \lor e^2 = 0) = 1 - P(e^1 = 0)P(e^2 = 1) = 0.8 \), and likewise \( P(Y_2 = 1) = P(e^3 = 0) = 0.8 \). Hence the two treatments have identical outcome statistics (recovery/mortality rates), and all observational and interventional statistical measures are identical, such as risk, expected utility and the effect of treatment on the treated. Note as there are no unobserved confounders the recovery rate for action \( A = a \) is equal to \( E[E^v] \).

We compute the counterfactual expected harm by evaluating (4), noting that \( Y^*_o(e) = 1 \) if \( e^1 = 1 \), \( Y^*_1(e) = 0 \) if \( e^1 = 0 \) and \( e^2 = 1 \), and \( Y^*_2(e) = 0 \) if \( e^3 = 1 \). This gives \( P(Y_1 = 0, Y^*_o = 1) = 0 \), i.e. there are no values of \( e^v \) that satisfy both \( Y_1(e) = 0 \) and \( Y^*_o(e) = 1 \), and therefore \( \text{do}(T_1 = 1) \) causes zero harm. However, \( P(Y_2 = 0, Y^*_o = 1) = P(e^1 = 1)P(e^3 = 1) = 0.1 \), and so \( \text{do}(T_2 = 2) \) causes non-zero harm. This is due to the existence of allergic patients who are also robust, and will die if treated with \( T = 2 \) but would have lived had \( T = 0 \).

E.

In this supplementary note we derive the policies of agent’s 1-3 in Example 3. We note that outcome \( Y \) is described by a heteroskedastic additive noise model with \( a_0 \) (no action) corresponding to \( A = 1, K = 1 \). The expected harm is given by Theorem 5 with \( \sigma(a_0) = 100 \), \( \sigma(A = 2) = 100 \), \( \sigma(A = 3) = 0 \) and \( \sigma(A = 1, K) = 100K \). \( E[U] = 100E[U_1] = 110, E[U_2] = 80 \) and \( E[U_1] = 100K \), where we have used \( \text{Var}(KY) = K^2\text{Var}(Y) \) and \( \text{Var}(Y + 10) = \text{Var}(Y) \)

Agent 1 takes action 1 and the maximum value \( K = 20 \) as this extremizes \( E[U_a] \).

Agent 2 chooses \( a = \arg \max_a \{E[Y_a] - \text{Var}(Y_a)\} \) which for each action is given by,

\[
E[Y_1] - \lambda \text{Var}(Y_1) = 100K - 100^2K^2\lambda \tag{23}
\]
\[
E[Y_2] - \lambda \text{Var}(Y_2) = 110 - 100^2\lambda \tag{24}
\]
\[
E[Y_3] - \lambda \text{Var}(Y_3) = 80 \tag{25}
\]
For action 1 the optimal $K = 1/200\lambda$, which gives $E[Y_1] - \text{Var}(Y_1) = 1/4\lambda$. Note that $1/4\lambda > 110 - 100^2\lambda$ for $\lambda < 0.0032$, which $80 > 1/4\lambda$ for $\lambda > 0.003125$. Therefore there is no value of $\lambda$ for which agent 2 selects action 2, choosing action 1 for $\lambda > 0.003125$ and action 3 otherwise.

For agent 3 applying Theorem 5 gives,

$$
E[Y_1] - \lambda E[h|A = 1, K] = 100K - \lambda \left[ \frac{100(K - 1)}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{100(K - 1)}{2} \left( \text{erf}\left(\frac{\text{sign}(K - 1)}{\sqrt{2}}\right) - 1\right) \right] \quad (26)
$$

$$
= \begin{cases} 
100K - 8.332(K - 1)\lambda, & K \geq 1 \\
100K - 59.937(1 - K)\lambda, & K < 1 
\end{cases} \quad (27)
$$

$$
E[Y_2] - \lambda E[h|A = 2] = 110 \quad (28)
$$

$$
E[Y_3] - \lambda E[h|A = 3] = 80 - \lambda \left[ 100 \frac{e^{-\frac{20^2}{2 \times 100}}} {\sqrt{2\pi}} + \frac{20}{2} \left( \text{erf}\left(\frac{20}{\sqrt{2} \times 100}\right) - 1\right) \right] \quad (29)
$$

Clearly, the agent will never take action 3 as its expected HPU is smaller than that for action 2 for all $\lambda$. For action 1, for $K < 1$ the expected HPU is also smaller that that for action 2, for all $\lambda$. For action 1 with $K > 1$, if $\lambda < 12.002$ the optimal $K = 20$, otherwise it is 0. As a result, for $\lambda < 11.93$ the agent chooses action 1 with $K = 20$, and otherwise chooses action 2.

F.

In this Supplementary Note we present the proof of Theorem 5.

Theorem 4 (Expected harm for heteroskedastic additive noise model). For $Y = f_Y(a, x)$ where $f_Y(a, x)$ is a heteroskedastic additive noise model with normally distributed noise, for $A = a$ the expected harm is

$$
E[h|a, x] = \frac{|\Delta\sigma|}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{|\Delta\sigma|^2}{2\Delta\sigma^2}} + \frac{\Delta U}{2} \left( \text{erf}\left(\frac{\Delta U}{\sqrt{2}|\Delta\sigma|}\right) - 1\right) \quad (30)
$$

where $\text{erf}(\cdot)$ is the error function, $\Delta U = E[U_a|x] - E[U_{a_0}|x]$, $\Delta\sigma = \sigma(a, x) - \sigma(a_0, x)$.

Proof. Note that if $e^Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \nu)$ we can replace $e^Y \rightarrow e^{\delta Y} = e^Y / \sqrt{\nu} - \mu$ and absorb these terms into $f(a, x)$ and $\sigma(a, x)$. Hence we need only consider zero-mean univariate noise. In the following we use $e^Y = \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ to denote the fact the the exogenous noise term is univariate normally distributed. Calculating the expected counterfactual harm using $P(a|x) = \delta(a - a_0)$ gives
\[
\mathbb{E}[h|a, x] = \int_{y_a} dy_a \int_{y^*, a^*} dy^* da^* P(y_a, y^*, a^*|x) \max(0, U(a^*, x, y^*) - U(a, x, y_a)) \\
= \int_{y_a} dy_a \int_{y^*} dy^* da^* P(y_a, y^*|x) \max(0, U(a_0, x, y_{a_0}) - U(a, x, y_a)) \\
= \int_{y_a} P(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon \int_{y_a} dy_a \int_{y^*} dy^* da^* P(y_a, y^*|\varepsilon, a, x) \max(0, U(a_0, x, y_{a_0}) - U(a, x, y_a)) \\
= \int_{\varepsilon} P(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon \int_{y_a} dy_a \int_{y_{a_0}} dy_{a_0} P(y_{a_0}|\varepsilon, a, x) P(y_{a_0}, y_{a_0}|\varepsilon, a, x) \max(0, U(a_0, x, y_{a_0}) - U(a, x, y_a))
\]

Substituting in \(U(a, x, y) = y\) and \(P(y|\varepsilon, a, x) = \delta(y - f(a, x) - \varepsilon \sigma(a, x))\) gives,

\[
\mathbb{E}[h|a, x] = \int_{\varepsilon} d\varepsilon P(\varepsilon) \max\{0, f(a_0, x) - f(a, x) + \varepsilon (\sigma(a_0, x) - \sigma(a, x))\} \\
= \int_{\varepsilon} d\varepsilon P(\varepsilon) \max\{0, -[\mathbb{E}[U_a|x] - \mathbb{E}[U_{a_0}|x]] - \varepsilon (\sigma(a, x) - \sigma(a_0, x))\}
\]

where we have used the fact that \(\mathbb{E}[U_a|x] = \int \varepsilon d\varepsilon P(\varepsilon) (f(a, x) + \varepsilon \sigma(a, x)) = f(a, x)\). For ease of notation we use \(\Delta U = \mathbb{E}[U_a|x] - \mathbb{E}[U_{a_0}|x]\), \(\Delta \sigma = \sigma(a, x) - \sigma(a_0, x)\). Next, we remove the \(\max()\) by incorporating it into the bounds for the integral. If \(\Delta U > 0\) and \(\Delta \sigma > 0\), this is equivalent to \(\varepsilon < -\Delta U / \Delta \sigma\) and hence,

\[
\mathbb{E}[h|a, x] = \int_{\varepsilon < -\Delta U / \Delta \sigma} d\varepsilon P(\varepsilon) (-\Delta U - \varepsilon \Delta \sigma) \\
= -\Delta U \int_{-\infty}^{-\Delta U / \Delta \sigma} P(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon - \Delta \sigma \int_{-\Delta U / \Delta \sigma}^{\infty} \varepsilon P(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon
\]

Using the standard Gaussian integrals

\[
\int_a^b P(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \text{erf}\left( \frac{b}{\sqrt{2}} \right) - \text{erf}\left( \frac{a}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \right] \\
\int_a^b \varepsilon P(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon = P(a) - P(b)
\]

where \(P(\varepsilon) = e^{-\varepsilon^2 / 2} / \sqrt{2\pi}\) and \(\text{erf}(z)\) is the error function, we recover

\[
\mathbb{E}[h|a, x] = \frac{-\Delta U}{2} \left[ \text{erf}\left( \frac{-\Delta U}{\sqrt{2} \Delta \sigma} \right) - \text{erf}(\infty) \right] - \Delta \sigma \left[ P(\infty) - P(-\Delta U / \Delta \sigma) \right] \\
= \frac{\Delta U}{2} \left[ \text{erf}\left( \frac{\Delta U}{\sqrt{2} \Delta \sigma} \right) - 1 \right] + \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sqrt{2} \pi} e^{-\Delta U^2 / 2 \Delta \sigma^2}
\]
where we have used \( \text{erf}(-z) = -\text{erf}(z) \) and \( P(-z) = P(z) \). Similarly, if \( \Delta U > 0, \Delta \sigma < 0 \) then the max() in (36) can be replaced with a definite integral over \( \varepsilon > \Delta U/\Delta \sigma \) giving,

\[
\mathbb{E}[h[a,x]] = \int_{\varepsilon > \Delta U/\Delta \sigma} d\varepsilon P(\varepsilon) (-\Delta U - \varepsilon \Delta \sigma)
\]

(44)

\[
= -\Delta U \int_{-\Delta U/\Delta \sigma}^{\infty} P(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon - \Delta \sigma \int_{-\Delta U/\Delta \sigma}^{\infty} \varepsilon P(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon
\]

(45)

\[
= -\frac{\Delta U}{2} \left[ \text{erf}(\infty) - \text{erf} \left( \frac{-\Delta U}{\sqrt{2} \Delta \sigma} \right) \right] - \Delta \sigma \left[ P \left( \frac{-\Delta U}{\sqrt{2} \Delta \sigma} \right) - P(\infty) \right]
\]

(46)

\[
= \frac{\Delta U}{2} \left[ \text{erf} \left( \frac{\Delta U}{\sqrt{2} |\Delta \sigma|} \right) - 1 \right] + \frac{|\Delta \sigma|}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{\Delta \sigma^2}{2}}
\]

(47)

Next, if \( \Delta U < 0 \) and \( \Delta \sigma > 0 \) we recover the same integral as (38), and if \( \Delta U < 0 \) and \( \Delta \sigma < 0 \) we recover the same integral as (44). Hence the general solution for all \( \Delta \sigma \) is (47).

\( \square \)

**G.**

In this supplementary note we present the GAM dose response model including parameter values, and show that it corresponds to a heteroskedastic additive noise model and calculate the expected harm for a given dose.

We follow the set-up described in (Crippa and Orsini, 2016), where outcome \( Y \) denotes the level of improvement in the symptoms of schizoaffective patients following treatment and compared to pre-treatment levels, measured in terms of the Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) (Kay et al., 1992). The response of \( Y \) w.r.t dose \( A \) (Aripiprazole mg/day) is determined using a generalized additive model fit with a cubic splines regression and random effects,

\[
y = \theta_1 a + \theta_2 f(a) + \varepsilon_0
\]

(48)

where the parameters \( \theta_i \) are random variables \( \theta_i \sim N(\hat{\theta}_i, V_i), \varepsilon_0 \sim N(0, V_0) \) is the sample noise, and the spline function \( f(a) \) is given by,

\[
f(a) = \frac{(a - k_1)^3 - k_3 k_2 (a - k_2)^2 + k_2 k_1 (a - k_3)^2}{(k_3 - k_1)^2}
\]

(49)

where \( k_1, k_2, k_3 \) are the knots at \( a = 0, 10 \) and 30 respectively, with \( (u)_+ = \max\{0, u\} \). In the following we assume for simplicity that \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \) are independent. This hierarchical model can be expressed as an SCM with the mechanism for \( Y \) given by,

\[
y = \left( \hat{\theta}_1 a + \hat{\theta}_2 f(a) \right) + \varepsilon_1 a + \varepsilon_2 f(a) + \varepsilon_0
\]

(50)

where \( \varepsilon_i \sim N(0, V_i) \). We will now reparameterise this as an equivalent SCM that is an additive heteroskedastic noise model. Using the identifies \( Z = kY, Y \sim N(0, 1) \Rightarrow Z \sim N(0, k^2) \), and \( Z = X+Y \),
where we have used $U(a, x, y) = U(a, y) = y$ and the fact that $\epsilon, \epsilon_0$ are mean zero to give $E[U|a] = \theta_1 a + \theta_2 f(a)$.

Finally, we note that the sample noise term $\epsilon_0$ cancels in the expression for the harm,

$$E[h|a] = \frac{\Delta U}{2} \left| \text{erf} \left( \frac{\Delta U}{\sqrt{2} \Delta \sigma} \right) - 1 \right| + \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sqrt{2 \pi}} e^{-\Delta \sigma^2 / 2 \Delta \sigma^2}$$

where $\Delta U = E[U_a] - E[U_{a_0}]$, $\Delta \sigma = g(a) - g(a_0)$ and $g(a) = \sqrt{a^2 V_1 + f(a)^2 V_2}$.
Table 1 | Parameters for the hierarchical generalized additive dose-response model reported in (Crippa and Orsini, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_1$</td>
<td>0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_2$</td>
<td>1.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_1$</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_2$</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H.

In this supplementary note we present proofs of Theorems 2, 3 and 4. First, we prove Theorem 2.

**Theorem 2:** For any utility functions $U$, environment $M$ and default policy $P(a|x)$ the expected HPU is never a harmful objective for $\lambda > 0$.

**Proof.** Let $a_{\text{max}} = \text{arg max}_a \{E[U_a|x] - \lambda E[h|a,x; M]\}$. If $\exists a' \neq a_{\text{max}}$ such that $E[U_{a'}|x] \geq E[U_{a_{\text{max}}}|x]$ and $E[h|a', x; M] < E[h|a_{\text{max}}, x; M]$, then $E[U_{a_{\text{max}}}|x] + \lambda E[h|a_{\text{max}}, x; M] < E[U_{a'}|x] + \lambda E[h|a', x; M] \forall \lambda > 0$ and so $a_{\text{max}} \neq \text{arg max}_a \{E[U_a|x] - \lambda E[h|a,x; M]\}$. \hfill $\square$

Next, we prove theorems 3 and 4 by example, constructing distributional shifts that reveal if an objective function is harmful. To do this we make use of a specific family of structural causal models—counterfactually independent models.

**Definition 11** (counterfactual independence (CFI)). $Y$ is counterfactually independent in with respect to $A$ in $M$ if,

$$P(y_{a^*}, y_a|x) = \begin{cases} P(y_a|x)\delta(y_a - y_{a^*}) & a = a^* \\ P(y_{a^*}|x)P(y_a|x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (60)$$

Counterfactually independent models (CFI models) are those for which the outcome $Y_a$ is independent to any counterfactual outcome $Y_{a'}$. Next we show that there is always a CFI model that can induce any factual outcome statistics.

**Lemma 1.** For any desired outcome distribution $P(y_a|x)$ there is a choice of exogenous noise distribution $P(e^\gamma)$ and causal mechanism $f_{\gamma}(a,x,e^\gamma)$ such that $Y$ is counterfactually independent with respect to $A$.

**Proof.** Consider the causal mechanism $y = f_{\gamma}(a,x,e^\gamma)$ for some fixed $X = x$, and exogenous noise distribution $P(E^\gamma = e^\gamma)$. Let the noise term by described by the random field $E^\gamma = \{E^\gamma(a,x) : a \in A, x \in X\}$, with $P(E^\gamma = e^\gamma) = \times_{a \in A,x \in X} P(E^\gamma(a,x) = e^\gamma(a,x))$ and with $\text{dom}(E^\gamma(a,x)) = \text{dom}(Y) \forall A = a, X = x$. i.e. we choose the noise distribution to be joint state over mutually independent noise variables, one for every action $A = a$ and context $X = x$, and where each of these variables has the same domain as $Y$. Next, we choose the causal mechanism,

$$f_{\gamma}(a,x,e^\gamma) = e^\gamma(a,x) \quad (61)$$

i.e. the value of $Y$ for action $A = a$ and context $X = x$ is the state of the independent noise variable $E^\gamma(a,x)$. By construction this is a valid SCM, and we note that the factual distributions (calculated with (4)) are given simply by,

$$P(y_a|x) = P(E^\gamma(a,x) = y) \quad (62)$$
Likewise applying our choice of mechanism and noise distribution to (4) gives (for \(a \neq a'\)) the counterfactual distribution,

\[
P(Y_a = y, Y_{a'} = y'|x) = P(E^z(a, x) = y)P(E^z(a', x) = y') = P(Y_a = y|x)P(Y_{a'} = y'|x)
\]

and likewise gives \(P(y_a|x)\delta(y_a - y'_a)\) for \(a = a'\). Finally, we note that we can choose any \(P(y_a|x) = P(E^z(a, x) = y)\), hence there is a CFI model that induces any factual outcome distribution we desire. □

Next, we show that in counterfactually independent models there are outcome distributional shifts that only change the expected harm of individual actions, without changing any other factual or counterfactual statistics. In the following, we restrict our attention to deterministic default policies \(P(a|x) = \delta(a - a_0(x))\).

**Lemma 2.** For \(M\) with deterministic default policy \(P(a|x) = \delta(a - a_0(x))\), if \(U\) is outcome dependent for the default action \(a_0(x)\) and some other action \(a \neq a_0(x)\), then there are three outcome distributionally shifted environments \(M_0, M_+\) and \(M_-\) such that;

1. \(H(a, x; M_-) < H(a, x; M_0) < H(a, x; M_+)\)
2. \(H(b, x; M_0) = H(b, x; M_+)\) \(\forall b \neq a\)
3. \(P(y_{a'}|x; M_0) = P(y_{a'}|x; M_+) = P(y_{a'}|x; M_-)\) \(\forall a' \in A\), including \(a, a_0\)

**Proof.** To construct the environment \(M_0\) we restrict to a binary outcome distribution for each action such that \(P(y_a|x)\) is completely concentrated on the highest and lowest utility outcomes,

\[
\begin{align*}
Y_a = 1 & \implies Y_a = \arg\max_y U(a, x, y) \\
Y_a = 0 & \implies Y_a = \arg\min_y U(a, x, y)
\end{align*}
\]

\[
1 = P(Y_a = 1|x; M_0) + P(Y_a = 0|x; M_0)
\]

Note that we abuse notation as the variables \(Y_a = 1\) and \(Y_b = 1\) will not be in the same state in general, and the states 1, 0 denote the max/min utility states under any given action, rather than a fixed state of \(Y\). By Lemma 1 we can choose \(Y_a\) to be counterfactually independent with respect to \(A\). Recalling our parameterization of CFI models in Lemma 1, with noise distribution \(P(E^z = e^z) = \delta(a \in A, e^z)\) \(\forall a \neq a_0\), \(P(E^z(a, x) = e^z(a, x)), \dom(E^z(a, x)) = \dom(Y)\), and causal mechanism \(f_r(a, x, e^z) = e^z(a, x)\), therefore \(E^z(a, x) \in \{0, 1\} \forall a, x\). The expected harm for action \(\text{do}(A = a)\) is,

\[
E[h|a, x; M_0] = \sum_{y_a = 0}^{1} \sum_{y_{a_0} = 0}^{1} P(y_{a_0}|x)P(y_a|x) \max \{0, U(a_0, x, y_{a_0}) - U(a, x, y_a)\}
\]

where we have used the fact that for deterministic default policy \(P(a^*, y^*, y_{a_0}) = P(y_{a^*}, y_a|x)\) and use counterfactual independence. \(U(a, x, 0) < U(a_0, x, 1)\) and so if we choose non-deterministic outcome distributions for \(P(y_a|x)\) and \(P(y_{a_0}|x)\) then (68) is strictly greater than 0.
We can construct the desired $M_x$ by keeping the causal mechanism but changing the factorized exogenous noise distribution in $M$ to be,

$$
P'(\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}; M_x) = P(\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}; M_0) + (-1)^{\gamma(x, a_0) - \gamma(x, a)} \phi_+ + (\gamma(x, a_0) - \gamma(x, a)) \phi_-
$$

where $\phi_+ \in \mathbb{R}$ are constants that satisfy the bounds $\max \{ -P(Y_{a_0} = 1|x)P(Y_a = 1|x), -P(Y_{a_0} = 0|x)P(Y_a = 0|x) \} \leq \phi_+ \leq \min \{ P(Y_{a_0} = 1|x)P(Y_a = 0|x), P(Y_{a_0} = 0|x)P(Y_a = 1|x) \}$. It is simple to check that for any $\phi$ that satisfies these bounds we recover $\sum_{y} P'(\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}) = 1$, $P'(\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}) \geq 0 \forall \mathcal{X}$, and therefore $P'$ is a valid noise distribution. Keeping the same causal mechanism $f_Y$ is $M_x$ as in $M_0$ gives

$$
P(y_a|x; M_0) = P(y_a|x; M_x) = P(y_a|x; M_-) \text{ as,}
$$

and likewise for $i = a_0$. This implies that for any desired outcome statistics $P(y_a|x)$ there is a model where $Y_a \perp Y_{a'} \forall (a, a')$ where $a \neq a'$ except for the pair $a, a_0$, so long as $P(y_{a_0}|x)$ and $P(y_a|x)$ are non-deterministic (if they are deterministic, $\phi_+ = 0$ and $M_0 = M_x$). Because $Y_{a'} \perp Y_{a_0} \forall a' \neq a$, then $H(a', x; M_0) = H(a', x; M_x) \forall a' \neq a$. Also note that $H(a_0, x; M) = 0$ for any $U$ or $M$ if $P(a|x) = \delta(a - a_0)$, as $P(Y_{a_0} = i, Y_{a_0} = k) = 0$ if $i \neq k$ and if $i = k$ (factual and counterfactual outcomes are identical) then the expected harm is zero. The only difference between $M_0$ and $M_x$ is $P(y_{a_0}, y_a|x; M_x) \neq P(y_{a_0}, y_a|x; M_-) \neq P(y_{a_0}, y_a|x; M_0)$, which differ for $\phi_+ \neq 0, \phi_- \neq 0$ and $\phi_+ \neq \phi_-$. Substituting (69) and (70) into our expression for the expected harm as using the notation $\Delta_{y,y'} = \max\{0, U(a_0, x, y) - U(a, x, y')\}$ gives,

$$
E[h|a, x; M_x] = E[h|a, x; M_0] + \phi_+ [\Delta_{00} + \Delta_{11} - \Delta_{10} - \Delta_{01}],
$$

$$
E[h|a', x; M_x] = E[h|a', x; M_0], \quad a' \neq a
$$

Now, as $\max_y U(a, x, y) > \min_y U(a_0, x, y)$ then $\Delta_{01} = 0$. For the coefficient of $\phi_+$ in (74) to be zero, we would therefore require that $\Delta_{00} + \Delta_{11} = \Delta_{10}$. We know $\Delta_{00} > 0$ because otherwise $\min_y U(a, x, y) > \max_y U(a_0, x, y)$, therefore the minimal value of $\Delta_{10}$ is $\max_y U(a_0, x, 1) - \min_y U(a, x, y)$. If $\Delta_{00} \neq 0$ and $\Delta_{11} \neq 0$ then $\Delta_{00} + \Delta_{11} \geq \Delta_{10}$ implies $\min_y U(a_0, x, y) \geq \max_y U(a, x, y)$ which violates our assumptions, therefore $\Delta_{00} + \Delta_{11} < \Delta_{10}$. If $\Delta_{00} = 0$ clearly we cannot have $\Delta_{11} = \Delta_{10}$ as $\min_y U(a, x, y) < \max_y U(a_0, x, y)$ by our assumptions, and likewise if $\Delta_{11} = 0$ we cannot have $\Delta_{00} = \Delta_{10}$ as this would imply $\min_y U(a_0, x, y) = \max_y U(a_0, x, y)$ which violates our assumptions. Therefore we can conclude that the coefficient in (74) is greater than zero.

Therefore if we choose any $0 < \phi_- < \min\{P(Y_{a_0} = 1|x)P(Y_a = 0|x), P(Y_{a_0} = 0|x)P(Y_a = 1|x)\}$ we get $E[h|a, x; M_x] > E[h|a, x; M_0]$, and any $\max\{P(Y_{a_0} = 1|x)P(Y_a = 1|x), P(Y_{a_0} = 0|x)P(Y_a = 0|x)\} < \phi_- < 0$, we get $E[h|a, x; M_-] < E[h|a, x; M_0]$. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 3.** For deterministic default policy $P(a|x) = \delta(a - a_0(x))$, $E[h|a_0(x), x; M] = 0 \forall M$
where the user’s utility function is outcome dependent for

For the expected utility to not be harmful by Definition 7, it must be that

\[ E[h|a_0(x), x; M] = \int P(y^*, a^*, y_{a_0(x)}|x; M) h(a, a^*, x, y, y^*) \]  \hspace{1cm} (76)

\[ = \int P(y^*_{a_0(x)}, y_{a_0(x)}|x; M) h(a_0(x), a^*_0(x), x, y_{a_0(x)}, y^*_{a_0(x)}) \]  \hspace{1cm} (77)

\[ = \int P(y_{a_0(x)}|x; M) \delta(y^* - y_{a_0(x)}) h(a_0(x), a^*_0(x), x, y_{a_0(x)}, y^*_{a_0(x)}) \]  \hspace{1cm} (78)

\[ = \int P(y_{a_0(x)}|x; M) h(a_0(x), a^*_0(x), x, y_{a_0(x)}, y_{a_0(x)}) \]  \hspace{1cm} (79)

\[ = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (80)

where we have used the fact that for deterministic \( P(a|x) \), \( P(y, a|x) = P(y_a|x) \), and we have used the

Theorem 3: For any deterministic default policy \( P(a|x) = \delta(a - a_0(x)) \), if there is a context \( X = x \)
where the user’s utility function is outcome dependent for \( a_0(x) \) some other action \( a \neq a_0(x) \), then
there is an outcome distributional shift such that \( U \) is harmful in the shifted environment.

Proof. For the expected utility to not be harmful by Definition 7, it must be that \( E[h|a, x] > E[h|b, x] \)
\[ \implies E[U_a|x] < E[U_b|x]. \]

Given our assumption of outcome dependence, we know there is a context \( X = x \) such that the utility functions for \( a_0(x) \) and \( a \neq a_0(x) \) overlap, that is \( \min_y U(a, x, y) < \max_y U(a_0(x), x, y) \) and \( \max_y U(a, x, y) > \min_y U(a_0(x), x, y) \). In the following we drop the notation \( a_0(x) = a_0 \). We can restrict our agent to choose between these two actions and construct an outcome distributional shift such that; i) The outcomes \( Y_a \) and \( Y_{a_0} \) are binary with one outcome maximizing the utility for that action and the other minimizing the utility, i.e. \( Y_a \in \{ \max_y U(a, x, y), \min_y U(a, x, y) \} \) and \( Y_{a_0} \in \{ \max_y U(a_0, x, y), \min_y U(a_0, x, y) \} \), ii) \( E[U_a|x] = E[U_{a_0}|x] \), iii) \( P(y_a|x) \) and \( P(y_{a_0}|x) \) are non-deterministic. This follows from the fact that the set of possible expected utility values for an action \( a \) is the set of mixtures over \( U(a, x, y) \) with respect to \( y \), and as \( Y_a = 0, 1 \) are the extremal points of this convex set, the expected utility for action \( a \) in context \( x \) can be written as \( P(Y_a = 0|x) U(a, x, 0) + P(Y_a = 1|x) U(a, x, 1) \). Then, as the utility functions for \( a \) and \( a_0 \) overlap there is point in the intersection of these convex sets that is non-extremal (and hence, a non-deterministic mixture).

By Lemma 3 the default action causes zero expected harm. By Lemma 2 we can construct a shifted environment \( M_0 \) where the non-default action \( a \neq a_0 \) has non-zero harm for any non-deterministic \( P(y_a|x) \). We can therefore construct \( M_0 \) such that i) \( E[Y_a|x] = E[Y_{a_0}|x] \), and ii) \( E[h|a, x] > E[h|a_0, x] \), violating our requirement that \( E[h|a, x] > E[h|b, x] \implies E[U_a|x] < E[U_b|x] \).

Theorem 4: For any deterministic default policy \( P(a|x) = \delta(a - a_0(x)) \), if there is a context \( X = x \)
where the user’s utility function is outcome dependent for \( a_0(x) \) and two other actions \( a_1, a_2 \neq a_0(x) \),
then for any factual objective function \( J \) there is an outcome distributional shift such that maximizing the \( J \) is harmful in the shifted environment.
Proof. By assumption there is a context $X = x$ for which the utility functions for $a_1, a_2$ and $a_0(x)$ overlap. In the following we drop the notation $a_0(x) = a_0$. There is a choice of non-deterministic outcome distributions $P(y_a|x), P(y_a|x)$ such that all three actions have the same expected utility. By Lemma 2 for any non-deterministic outcome distribution we can choose $M_0$ such that $E[h|a_1,x;M_0] > 0$, and $E[h|a_2,x;M_0] > 0$, and by Lemma 3 $E[h|a_0,x;M] = 0 \forall M$. Therefore $\exists M_0$ that is an outcome distributional shift of the original environment $M$ such that $a_0, a_1, a_2$ have the same expected utility, $a_0$ has zero expected harm and $a_1, a_2$ have non-zero expected harm.

If $E[h|a_1,x;M_0] = E[h|a_2,x;M_0]$ then by Lemma 2 there are outcome-shifted environments $M_\pm$ such that $a_0, a_1$ and $a_2$ have the same factual statistics as in $M_0$ and $E[h|a_2,x;M_0] = E[h|a_2,x;M_\pm]$, but the harm caused by $a_1$ is increased (decreased) by some non-zero amount. Therefore in $M_+$ $a_1$ and $a_2$ have the same expected utility but $a_1$ has a strictly higher expected harm, and in order to be non-harmful it must be that $E[J|a_1,x;M_+] < E[J|a_2,x;M_+]$. Likewise in $M_- a_1$ and $a_2$ have the same expected utility but the expected harm for $a_1$ is strictly lower than for $a_2$, therefore in order to be non-harmful it must be that $E[J|a_1,x;M_-] > E[J|a_2,x;M_-]$. Finally we note that $E[J|a,x;M_+] = E[J|a,x;M_-] = E[J|a,x;M_0] \forall a \in A$ as the factual statistics are identical in $M_0, M_\pm$, i.e., $P(y_a|x; M_+) = P(y_a|x; M_-) = P(y_a|x; M_0)$. Therefore any $J$ must be harmful in either $M_+$ and $M_-$, and therefore there is an outcome distributional shift $M \rightarrow M_+$ or $M \rightarrow M_-$ such that $J$ is harmful in the shifted environment.

If $E[h|a_1,x;M_0] \neq E[h|a_2,x;M_0]$, assume without loss of generality that $E[h|a_1,x;M_0] > E[h|a_2,x;M_0]$. As $a_0, a_1$ and $a_2$ have the equal expected utilities then so does any mixture of these actions, in $M_0$ and $M_\pm$. Restrict the agent to choose between action $a_2$ and a mixture of actions $a_0$ and $a_1$—i.e. a stochastic or ‘soft’ intervention Correa and Bareinboim (2020); Pearl (2009), which involves replacing the causal mechanism for $A$ with a mixture $\tau := q[A = a_1] + (1 - q)[A = a_0]$ where $q$ is an independent binary noise term. By linearity the expected utility for this mixed action is $E[U_\tau|x] = qE[U_a|x] + (1 - q)E[U_{a_0}|x] = E[U_{a_1}|x]$ as all three actions have the same expected utility, and has an expected harm $E[h|\tau,x;M_0] = qE[h|a_1,x;M] + (1 - q)E[h|a_2,x;M] = qE[h|a_1,x;M] + (1 - q)E[h|a_2,x;M]$ as $E[h|a_0,x;M] = 0 \forall M$. Therefore as $E[h|a_1,x;M] > 0$ and $E[h|a_2,x;M] > 0$ we can choose $p > 0$ such that $E[h|\tau,x;M_0] = E[h|a_2,x;M_0]$. Therefore in $M_0$, $a_2$ and $\tau$ have the same expected harm and utility, and in $M_\pm$ they have the same expected utility but $\tau$ is more harmful than $a_2$ as $E[h|a_1,x;M_+] > E[h|a_1,x;M_0]$ and $p > 0$, and in $M_-$ they have the same expected utility but $a_2$ is more harmful than $\tau$. As the factual statistics $P(y_a|x)$ are identical for $M_0$ and $M_\pm$, so is the value of any factual objective function across all three environments. Hence, any factual objective function must be harmful in either $M_+$ or $M_-$. □