Fairness with Adaptive Weights

Junyi Chai chai28@purdue.edu Xiaoqian Wang joywang@purdue.edu

July 12, 2022



Introduction

As automated decision making systems are widely applied in social fields, fairness has become an arising concern in machine learning society.





Much of literature on fairness focuses on specified fairness metrics.

However, relaxations of fairness metrics could be too relaxed to achieve expected improvement.

Our goal:group balance to mitigate representation bias and error-prone reweighing



Method

Equal reweighing:





Figure: Demonstration of our method.



Problem formulation

Error-prone reweighing:

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{w} \sum_{i=1}^{n'} w_i L_{\theta}(y_i, \hat{y}_i) \quad s.t. \quad w^T 1 = c, w \ge 0.$$



Problem formulation

$$\max_{w} \sum_{i=1}^{n'} w_i L(y_i, \hat{y}_i) - \alpha \|w\|_2^2 \quad s.t. \quad w^T 1 = c, w \ge 0.$$
 (1)



Theoretical analysis

Closed-form solution of 1:

$$w_i^* = \max(\frac{l_i - \lambda}{2\alpha}, 0), \ \ i = 1, 2, ..., d',$$

where λ is the Lagrange multiplier.



Theoretical analysis

Theorem

Consider a classifier f_{θ} with parameter θ such that $\hat{y}_i = f_{\theta}(x_i)$. Given the adaptive weight w^* by optimizing Problem (1), under the L_1 -norm loss or the cross-entropy loss for $L(y_i, \hat{y}_i)$, the following fairness metrics

Disparate mistreatment:

$$\sum_{s} (|p(\hat{y} \neq y|y = 1, s) - p(\hat{y} \neq y|y = 1)| + |p(\hat{y} \neq y|y = 0, s) - p(\hat{y} \neq y|y = 0)|)$$

Equal opportunity:

$$\sum_{s} (|p(\hat{y} \neq y | y = 1, s) - p(\hat{y} \neq y | y = 1)|)$$

are upper bounded by our weighted loss up to a multiplicative constant.



Method	Baseline	Reweighing	Undersampling	Oversampling	ASR	Postprocessing	Covariance	Ours
Accuracy	65.23±1.39	62.24±2.47	$63.34{\pm}2.41$	63.50 ± 2.42	63.75 ± 1.27	63.42 ± 1.14	64.11 ± 1.46	63.41±1.35
Disparate Impact	22.29±4.76	9.13±3.16	8.45±2.68	8.55±2.83	2.31±0.25	2.33±0.10	7.36±1.03	1.82±0.11
Disparate TPR	21.14±7.14	6.46±2.14	9.32±3.86	7.02±3.44	1.07±0.33	1.06 ± 0.16	3.38±0.71	1.02±0.09
Disparate TNR	17.41±3.72	19.11±3.22	5.77±1.73	5.25±1.40	1.14±0.21	1.20 ± 0.21	10.28±2.33	0.24±0.17

Table 3. Experimental results on COMPAS dataset.

Table 6. Experimental results of nonlinear classifier on COMPAS dataset.

Method	Baseline	Reweighing	Undersampling	Oversampling	ASR	Postprocessing	Covariance	Ours
Accuracy	64.17 ± 1.13	61.18 ± 1.78	62.76 ± 2.26	62.35±2.13	63.17 ± 1.21	63.14±1.16	63.64±1.31	63.23 ± 1.64
Disparate Impact	21.37±5.24	10.17±2.27	8.83±2.69	8.67±3.12	2.41±0.31	3.24±0.11	7.43±1.22	2.23±0.87
Disparate TPR	22.21±8.17	6.85±2.13	8.86±3.11	7.44±2.57	1.82 ± 0.46	1.31 ± 0.17	3.13±0.76	$1.16{\pm}0.08$
Disparate TNR	17.64±3.46	18.85±4.41	5.41±1.68	6.13±1.25	1.71±0.43	1.24±0.23	11.47±2.63	0.69±0.34



Method	MSE	SP
Baseline	$0.114{\pm}0.003$	15.20±4.34%
Oversampling	$0.152{\pm}0.004$	9.62±3.17%
Undersampling	$0.163{\pm}0.002$	8.57±4.52%
FWB	$0.141 {\pm} 0.004$	2.13±0.13%
Our method	$0.135{\pm}0.004$	$2.16{\pm}0.19\%$

Table: Experimental results on Law school dataset.

Table: Experimental results on CRIME dataset.

Method	MSE	SP
Baseline	$0.037{\pm}0.003$	50.63±6.75%
Oversampling	$0.052{\pm}0.004$	21.37±7.73%
Undersampling	$0.047{\pm}0.006$	$19.42{\pm}6.63\%$
FWB	$0.042{\pm}0.004$	$12.10{\pm}1.19\%$
Our method	$0.043{\pm}0.004$	11.47±1.63%



Elmore Family School of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Fairness-accuracy trade-off:



Figure: Pareto frontier on COMPAS, German credit and Adult datasets.



Robustness:



Figure: Change of accuracy and fairness under different noise ratio on COMPAS, German credit and Adult datasets.



Summary

- Balance between different groups
- Sample-level reweighing method
- Close-form solution for weight assignment
- Theoretical property in terms of convergence
- Fairness guarantee



Thank you

