
Multiaccuracy: Black-Box Post-Processing for Fairness in Classification

Michael P. Kim*
Stanford University
mpk@cs.stanford.edu

Amirata Ghorbani
Stanford University
amiratag@stanford.edu

James Zou
Stanford University
jamesz@stanford.edu

Abstract

Machine learning predictors are successfully deployed in applications ranging from disease diagnosis, to predicting credit scores, to image recognition. Even when the overall accuracy is high, the predictions often have systematic biases that harm specific subgroups, especially for subgroups that are minorities in the training data. We develop a rigorous framework of *multiaccuracy* auditing and post-processing to improve predictor accuracies across *identifiable subgroups*. Our algorithm, MULTIACCURACY BOOST, works in any setting where we have black-box access to a predictor and a relatively small set of labeled data for auditing. We prove guarantees on the convergence rate of the algorithm and show that it improves overall accuracy at each step. Importantly, if the initial model is accurate on an identifiable subgroup, then the post-processed model will be also. We demonstrate the effectiveness of this approach on diverse applications in image classification, finance, and population health. MULTIACCURACY BOOST can improve subpopulation accuracy (e.g. for “black women”) even when the sensitive features (e.g. “race”, “gender”) are not known to the algorithm.

1 Introduction

Despite the successes of machine learning at complex tasks that involve making predictions about people, there is growing evidence that “state-of-the-art” models can perform significantly less accurately on minority populations than the majority population. Indeed, a notable study of three commercial face recognition systems known as the “Gender Shades” project [4], demonstrated significant performance gaps across different populations at classification tasks. While all systems achieved roughly 90% accuracy at gender detection on a popular benchmark, a closer investigation revealed that the system was significantly less accurate on female subjects compared to the male subjects and on dark-skinned individuals compared to light-skinned. Worse yet, this discrepancy in accuracy compounded when comparing dark-skinned females to light-skinned males; classification accuracy differed between these groups by as much as 34%! This study confirmed empirically the intuition that machine-learned classifiers may optimize predictions to perform well on the majority population, inadvertently hurting performance on the minority population in significant ways.

A first approach to address this serious problem would be to update the training distribution to reflect the distribution of people, making sure historically-underrepresented populations are well-represented in the training data. While this approach may be viewed as an eventual goal, often for historical and social reasons, data from certain minority populations is less available than from the majority population. In particular, we may not have enough data from these underrepresented subpopulations to train a complex model. Additionally, even when adequate representative data is available, this process necessitates retraining the underlying prediction model. In the common setting where the learned model is provided as a service, like a commercial image recognition system,

*Supported by a Google Faculty Research Award and NSF Grant CCF-1763299.

there may not be sufficient incentive (financial, social, etc.) for the service provider to retrain the model. Still, the clients of the model may want to improve the fairness of the resulting predictions.

Many different notions of fairness has been proposed in literature on learning and classification [9, 10, 13, 14, 18, 21, 27, 36]. Many of these works encode some notion of parity, e.g. different subgroups should have similar false positive rates, as an explicit objective/constraint in the training of the original classifier. The fairness properties are viewed as constraints on the classifier that ultimately *limit the model’s utility*. A common belief is that in order to achieve equitable treatment for protected subpopulations, the performance on other subpopulations necessarily can degrade.

Our contributions. A notable exception to this pattern is the work of Hébert-Johnson *et al.* [14], which introduced a framework for achieving fairness notions that aim to provide accurate predictions for many important subpopulations. Our work focuses on a setting, studied in [14], that is common in practice but distinct from much of the other fairness literature: we have black-box access to a classifier, f_0 , and a relatively small set of labeled samples – an audit set – which could be drawn from the same or different distribution as the training data for f_0 .

We develop a new algorithm, MULTIACCURACY BOOST, where a simple classifier – the auditor – learns to identify subgroups in the audit set where f_0 is systematically making more mistakes. This information is then used to iteratively post-process f_0 until the multiaccuracy condition – unbiased predictions in each identifiable subgroup – is satisfied. The notion of multiaccuracy differs from parity constraints, and it is reasonable in settings such as gender detection where we would like to boost the classifier’s accuracy across many subgroups. We prove convergence guarantees for MULTIACCURACY BOOST and show that post-processing for multiaccuracy also improves the overall classification accuracy.

Empirically, we validate MULTIACCURACY BOOST in three case studies: adult income prediction, gender detection from images, and a semi-synthetic medical diagnosis task. In all three cases, the initial models exhibit biases against significant subpopulations. After post-processing, the accuracy improves across these minority groups, even when minority-status is not explicitly given to post-processing algorithm as a feature. As suggested by the theory, MULTIACCURACY BOOST improves the *overall* accuracy and does not significantly affect groups where accuracy was already high. MULTIACCURACY BOOST does not require explicit subgroup categories (e.g. “race”) to audit; the subgroups identified during auditing may not perfectly align with simple human categories (e.g. “black females”). Our experiments demonstrate that as long as there are features in the audit set correlated with the (unobserved) human categories, then MULTIACCURACY BOOST is effective in improving the multiaccuracy across these categories.

In an ideal world, one might wish to train a separate classifier for *every* subpopulation of interest, as proposed in [10]. In many settings though, this approach is untenable for a number of reasons. First, it requires that we have race, age, and other attributes of interest in the dataset; this information is often not available. Second, training many different models may be computationally expensive; further, in the case where data about the minority populations is scarce, the approach may be information-theoretically limited. In many applications, the number of subpopulations we wish to protect may be very large. For instance, if we defined subpopulations by the conjunction of attributes, the number of classifiers to learn grows exponentially with the number of attributes (and the available data for each subpopulation decreases correspondingly). Moreover, while we might be judicious in selecting which subpopulations to protect, *a priori*, it may not be obvious which subpopulations require special attention. For instance, in medical diagnosis, we may want to ensure fair treatment for individuals with certain genetic factors that we may not fully understand until learning the model. Finally, even if training separate models for different populations of people is feasible, in some cases, providing differential treatment on the basis of sensitive features, like race or gender, may be considered illegal.

Our experiments demonstrate that MULTIACCURACY BOOST performs comparably and often even better than white-box baseline setting, which includes retraining separate classifiers for each subgroup and transfer learning. Importantly, MULTIACCURACY BOOST does not require the addition of sensitive categorical features and is more data efficient than these white-box approaches.

Related works. Recently, two independent works of Hébert-Johnson *et al.* [14] and Kearns *et al.* [18] have investigated how to achieve statistical fairness guarantees, not just for traditionally-protected groups, but on rich families of *subpopulations*.

Hébert-Johnson *et al.* [14] introduced the notion of *multiaccuracy*² and a stronger notion, dubbed *multiprecalibration* in the context of regression tasks. Multiprecalibration guarantees (approximately) calibrated predictions, not just overall, but on each identifiable subpopulation. [14] provides algorithms for achieving multiaccuracy and multiprecalibration, and shows how to post-process a model to achieve multiprecalibration in a way that *improves* the regression objective across all subpopulations (in terms of squared-error). Our work directly extends the approach of [14], adapting their work to the binary classification setting. Our post-processing algorithm, MULTIACCURACY BOOST, builds on the algorithm given in [14], providing an additional “do-no-harm” property; MULTIACCURACY BOOST guarantees that if the initial predictor f_0 has small classification error on some identifiable group, then the resulting post-processed model will also have small classification error on this group.

Kearns *et al.* [18] study fairness in the context of classification and proposes a framework for *auditing* and learning models to achieve fairness notions like statistical parity and equal false positive rates. Both works [14, 18] connect the task of learning a model that satisfies the notion of fairness to the task of agnostic learning [11, 16, 17, 19]. Our approach to post-processing, which uses a learning algorithm as a fairness auditor, is similar in spirit to the approach of [18], but differs technically in important ways. In particular, in the framework of [18], the auditor is used to *constrain* the hypothesis selected from a pre-specified hypothesis class; ultimately, this constrains the accuracy of the predictions. In our setting (as in [14]), we do not restrict ourselves to an explicitly-defined hypothesis class, so we can augment the current model using the auditor; these augmentations *improve* the accuracy of the model.

A different approach to subgroup fairness is studied by Dwork *et al.* [10]. This work investigates the question of how to learn a “decoupled” classifier, where separate classifiers are learned for each subgroup and then combined to achieve a desired notion of fairness. This work differs from our setting in that [10] assumes that the sensitive groups partition the input space. Further, they assume there is enough data to learn a classifier on each subpopulation, or that effective transfer learning is possible. In particular, the multiaccuracy approach allows us to protect a rich class of overlapping subpopulations; further, our experiments show that MULTIACCURACY BOOST improves accuracy across subgroups even when the generative process for y conditioned on x is different across different subgroups (i.e. in a setting where the transfer learning approach of [10] will not be effective).

The present work, along with [14, 18, 21], can be viewed as studying information-fairness tradeoffs in prediction tasks (i.e. strengthening the notion of fairness that can be guaranteed using a small sample). These works fit into the larger literature on fairness in learning and prediction tasks [4, 9, 10, 13, 21, 27, 36], discussions of the utility-fairness tradeoffs in fair classification [1, 5–7, 22, 26].

2 Setting and multiaccuracy

High-level setting. We study the question of how to post-process a model for fairness in a black-box fashion. In our formal model, the post-processing algorithm receives as input a small sample of labeled validation data and black-box access to an initial model f_0 . The goal is to output a new model (using calls to f_0) that satisfies the multiaccuracy conditions (described below).

Notation. Let $\mathcal{X}$ denote the input space; we denote by $y : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ the function that maps inputs to their label. Let $\mathcal{D}$ represent the validation data distribution supported on $\mathcal{X}$; for a subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, we use $x \sim S$ to denote a sample from $\mathcal{D}$ conditioned on membership in S . We take the characteristic function of S to be $\chi_S(x) = 1$ if $x \in S$ and 0 otherwise. For a hypothesis $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, 1)$, we denote the classification error of f with respect to a subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ as $\text{er}_S(f; y) = \Pr_{x \sim S}[\tilde{f}(x) \neq y(x)]$, where $\tilde{f}(x)$ rounds $f(x)$ to $\{0, 1\}$. For a function $z : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ and a subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, let z_S be the restriction to S where $z_S(x) = z(x)$ if $x \in S$ and $z_S(x) = 0$ otherwise. We use $\ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f; y) = \mathbf{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[\ell_x(f; y)]$ to denote the expected cross-entropy loss of f on $x \in \mathcal{X}$ where $\ell_x(f; y) = -y(x) \cdot \log(f(x)) - (1 - y(x)) \cdot \log(1 - f(x))$.

² [14] refers to this notion as “multi-accuracy-in-expectation”.

Auditing subpopulations for multiaccuracy. The goal of multiaccuracy is to achieve low classification error, not just on $\mathcal{X}$ overall, but also on subpopulations of $\mathcal{X}$. This goal is formalized in the following definition adapted from [14].

Definition (Multiaccuracy). *Let $\alpha \geq 0$ and let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq [-1, 1]^{\mathcal{X}}$ be a class of functions on $\mathcal{X}$. A hypothesis $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ is $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)$ -multiaccurate if for all $c \in \mathcal{C}$:*

$$\mathbf{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}} [c(x) \cdot (f(x) - y(x))] \leq \alpha. \quad (1)$$

$(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)$ -multiaccuracy guarantees that a hypothesis appears unbiased according to a class of statistical tests defined by $\mathcal{C}$. As an example, we could define the class in terms of a collection of subsets $S \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, taking $\mathcal{C}$ to be χ_S (and its negation) for each subset in the collection; in this case, $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)$ -multiaccuracy guarantees that for each S , the predictions of f are at most α -biased.

Ideally, we would hope to take $\mathcal{C}$ to be the class of *all* statistical tests. Requiring multiaccuracy with respect to such a $\mathcal{C}$, however, requires learning the function exactly, which is information-theoretically impossible from a small sample. Thus, by analogy to cryptography – where security is proved against a computationally-bounded adversary – we relax this information-theoretic ideal to a complexity-theoretic analogue, and take $\mathcal{C}$ to be a class of *learnable* functions. In this case, $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)$ -multiaccuracy guarantees accuracy on all *efficiently-identifiable* subpopulations.

We use a learning algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ to audit a classifier f for multiaccuracy. The algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ receives a small sample from $\mathcal{D}$ and aims to learn a function h that correlates with the *residual* function $f - y$. The connection between subpopulation fairness and learning is also made in [14, 18], albeit for different tasks.

Definition (Multiaccuracy auditing). *Let $\alpha > 0, m \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{X}^m \rightarrow [-1, 1]^{\mathcal{X}}$ be a learning algorithm. Suppose $D \sim \mathcal{D}^m$ is a set of independent random samples. A hypothesis $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ passes $(\mathcal{A}, \alpha)$ -multiaccuracy auditing if for $h = \mathcal{A}(D)$:*

$$\mathbf{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}} [h(x) \cdot (f(x) - y(x))] \leq \alpha. \quad (2)$$

A special case of $(\mathcal{A}, \alpha)$ -multiaccuracy auditing uses a naive learning algorithm that iterates over statistical tests $c \in \mathcal{C}$. More generally, if the auditing algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ *provably* agnostic learns a class of functions $\mathcal{C}$ (in the sense of [11, 16]), then the notions of $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)$ -multiaccuracy and auditing with $\mathcal{A}$ coincide; this observation follows from the arguments in [14]. If, however, $\mathcal{A}$ is a heuristic method, it is not necessarily possible to translate this guarantee into a class of functions that will be protected. Still, many popular heuristics for learning rich classes of functions work very well in practice. Concretely, in our experiments, we audit with ridge regression and decision tree regression; both auditors are effective at identifying subpopulations on which the model is under-performing.

Intuitively, as we take $\mathcal{C}$ to define a richer class of tests, the guarantees of multiaccuracy become stronger. This intuition is formalized in the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *Let $\hat{y} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ as $\hat{y}(x) = 1 - 2y(x)$. Suppose that for $S \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ with $\Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[x \in S] \geq \gamma$, there is some $c \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\mathbf{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[|c(x) - \hat{y}_S(x)|] \leq \tau$. Then if f is $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)$ -multiaccurate, $\text{er}_S(f; y) \leq 2 \cdot (\alpha + \tau)/\gamma$.*

That is, if there is a function in $\mathcal{C}$ that correlates well with the label function on a significant subpopulation S , then this statistical guarantee translates into a guarantee on the *classification error* on this subpopulation.

Remark on data distribution. Note that in our definition of multiaccuracy, we take an expectation over the distribution $\mathcal{D}$ of validation data. Ideally, $\mathcal{D}$ should reflect the true population distribution or could be aspirational, increasing the representation of populations who have experienced historical discrimination; nevertheless, if we take α small enough, then we may still hope to improve the accuracy on less-represented subpopulations. In Section 4, we show empirically that multiaccuracy can improve the accuracy on minority populations, even when our validation data is drawn from the original (biased) training distribution.

3 Post-processing for multiaccuracy

Here, we describe an algorithm, MULTIACCURACY BOOST, for post-processing a pre-trained model to achieve multiaccuracy. The algorithm is given black-box access to an initial hypothesis f_0 :

Algorithm 1: MULTIACCURACY BOOST

Given: initial hypothesis $f_0 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, 1)$; auditing algorithm $\mathcal{A}$; accuracy parameter $\alpha > 0$; validation data $D = D_0, \dots, D_T \sim \mathcal{D}^m$:

$\mathcal{X}_0 \leftarrow \{x \in \mathcal{X} : f_0(x) \leq 1/2\}$
 $\mathcal{X}_1 \leftarrow \{x \in \mathcal{X} : f_0(x) > 1/2\}$ Partition $\mathcal{X}$ according to f_0
 $S \leftarrow \{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{X}_1\}$

Repeat: from $t = 0, 1, \dots$

- For $S \in \mathcal{S}$:
 $h_{t,S} \leftarrow \mathcal{A}^{f_t}(D_t)$ // audit current hypothesis f_t on $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{X}_0$, and $\mathcal{X}_1$
- $S^* \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{E}_{x \sim D_t}[h_{t,S}(x) \cdot (f_t(x) - y(x))]$ // take largest residual
- if $\mathbf{E}_{x \sim D_t}[h_{t,S^*}(x) \cdot (f_t(x) - y(x))] \leq \alpha$: // terminate when at most alpha
return f_t
- $f_{t+1}(x) \propto e^{-\eta h_{t,S^*}(x)} f_t(x) \quad \forall x \in S^*$ // multiplicative weights update

$\mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ and a learning algorithm $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{X}^m \rightarrow [-1, 1]^{\mathcal{X}}$, and for any accuracy parameter $\alpha > 0$, outputs a hypothesis $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ that passes $(\mathcal{A}, \alpha)$ -multiaccuracy auditing. The post-processing algorithm is an iterative procedure similar to boosting [12, 29], that uses the multiplicative weights framework to improve suboptimal predictions identified by the auditor. This approach is similar to the algorithm given in [14] in the context of fairness and [34] in the context of pseudorandomness. Importantly, we adapt these algorithms so that MULTIACCURACY BOOST exhibits what we call the “do-no-harm” guarantee; informally, if f_0 has low classification error on some subpopulation $S \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ identified by $\mathcal{A}$, then the resulting classification error on S cannot increase significantly. In this sense, achieving our notion of fairness need not adversely affect the utility of the classifier. Here, we give an overview of the algorithm, and state its formal guarantees in Section 3.1.

At a high level, MULTIACCURACY BOOST starts by partitioning the input space $\mathcal{X}$ based on the initial classifier f_0 into $\mathcal{X}_0 = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : f_0(x) \leq 1/2\}$ and $\mathcal{X}_1 = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : f_0(x) > 1/2\}$; note that we can partition $\mathcal{X}$ implicitly, by testing set membership with calls to f_0 . Partitioning the search space $\mathcal{X}$ based on the predictions of f_0 helps to ensure that the f we output maintains the initial accuracy of f_0 ; in particular, it allows us to search over just the positive-labeled examples (negative, resp.) for a way to improve the classifier. In turn, the updates can improve the false positives without hurting the true positives. Additionally, the initial hypothesis may make false positive predictions and false negative predictions for very different reasons, even if in both cases the reason is simple.

After partitioning the input space, the procedure iteratively uses the learning algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ to search over $\mathcal{X}$ (and within the partitions $\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{X}_1$) to find any function which correlates significantly with the current residual in prediction $f - y$. If $\mathcal{A}$ successfully returns some function $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ that identifies a significant subpopulation where the current hypothesis is inaccurate, the algorithm updates the predictions multiplicatively according to h . In order to update the predictions simultaneously for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, at the t th iteration, we build f_{t+1} by incorporating h_t into the previous model f_t . This approach of augmenting the model at each iteration is similar to boosting. To guarantee good generalization of h , we assume that $\mathcal{A}$ uses a fresh sample $D_t \sim \mathcal{D}^m$ per iteration. In practice, when we have few samples, we can put all of our samples in one batch and use noise-addition techniques to reduce overfitting [8, 28]; this connection to adaptive data analysis was studied formally in [14].

From the stopping condition, it is clear that if the algorithm terminates after T updates, then f_T passes $(\mathcal{A}, \alpha)$ -multiaccuracy auditing. Thus, there are two important questions: (1) does MULTIACCURACY BOOST terminate? and (2) how do we evaluate the magnitude of $\mathbf{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[h(x) \cdot (f(x) - y(x))]$, which depends on $y(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$? Theorem 2 provides formal guarantees on the convergence rate and the sample complexity from $\mathcal{D}$ needed to estimate the expectations sufficiently-accurately.

Do no harm. The distinction between our approach and most prior works on fairness (especially [18]) is made clear from the “do-no-harm” property that MULTIACCURACY BOOST exhibits, stated formally as Theorem 3. In a nutshell, the property guarantees that on any subpopulation

$S \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ that $\mathcal{A}$ audits, the classification error cannot increase significantly from f_0 to the post-processed classifier. For instance, when we audit with decision trees, this property will hold on all of the partitions the auditor learns. Further, the bound we prove is very pessimistic. Both in theory and in practice, we do not expect any increase to occur. In particular, the convergence analysis of MULTIACCURACY BOOST follows by showing that at every update, the average cross-entropy loss on the population we update must drop significantly. Termination is guaranteed because after too many iterations of auditing, the post-processing will have learned y perfectly. Thus, if we use Algorithm 1 to post-process a model that already achieves high accuracy overall the resulting model's accuracy should not deteriorate in significant ways; empirically, we observe that classification accuracy improves with multiaccuracy.

3.1 Formal guarantees of MULTIACCURACY BOOST

For clarity of presentation, we describe the formal guarantees of our algorithm assuming that $\mathcal{A}$ provably agnostic learns a class of tests $\mathcal{C}$, in order to describe the sample complexity appropriately. The guarantees on the rate of convergence do not rely on such an assumption. We show that, indeed, Algorithm 1 must converge in a bounded number of iterations. The proof follows by showing that choosing η appropriately (on the order of α), each update improves the cross-entropy loss over the updated set S , so the bound depends on the initial cross-entropy loss.

To estimate the statistics used in MULTIACCURACY BOOST, we need to bound the sample complexity required for the auditor to generalize. Informally, we say the *dimension* $d(\mathcal{C})$ of an agnostically learnable class $\mathcal{C}$ is the minimum value such that $m \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d(\mathcal{C}) + \log(1/\delta)}{\alpha^2}\right)$ random samples from $\mathcal{D}$ guarantee uniform convergence over $\mathcal{C}$ with accuracy α with failure probability at most δ . Examples of dimension include $\log(|\mathcal{C}|)$ for a finite class of tests, the VC-dimension [20] for boolean tests, and the metric entropy [2] of real-valued tests. We state the formal guarantees as Theorem 2.

Theorem 2. *Let $\alpha, \delta > 0$; suppose $\mathcal{A}$ agnostic learns a class $\mathcal{C} \subseteq [-1, 1]^{\mathcal{X}}$ of dimension $d(\mathcal{C})$. Then, using $\eta = O(\alpha)$, Algorithm 1 converges to a $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)$ -multiaccurate hypothesis f_T in $T = O\left(\frac{\ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f_0; y)}{\alpha^2}\right)$ iterations from $m = \tilde{O}\left(T \cdot \frac{d(\mathcal{C}) + \log(1/\delta)}{\alpha^2}\right)$ random samples with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$.*

Roughly speaking, for constant α, δ , the sample complexity scales with the dimension of the class $\mathcal{C}$. For many relevant classes $\mathcal{C}$ for which we would want to enforce $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)$ -multiaccuracy, this dimension will be significantly smaller than the amount of data required to train an accurate initial f_0 . Note also that our sample complexity is completely generic and we make no effort to optimize the exact bound. In particular, for structured $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{A}$, better uniform convergence bounds can be proved. Further, appealing to a recent line of work on adaptive data analysis initiated by [8, 28], we can avoid resampling at each iteration as in [14].

Do no harm. The do-no-harm property guarantees that the classification error on any subpopulation that $\mathcal{A}$ audits cannot increase significantly. As we assume $\mathcal{A}$ can identify a very rich class of overlapping sets, in aggregate, this property gives a strong guarantee on the utility of the resulting predictor. Further, the proof of Theorem 3 reveals that this worst-case bound is very pessimistic and can be improved with stronger assumptions.

Theorem 3 (Do-no-harm). *Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$ and $S \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a subpopulation where $\Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[x \in S] \geq \gamma$. Suppose $\mathcal{A}$ audits the characteristic function $\chi_S(x)$ and its negation. Let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ be the output of Algorithm 1 when given $f_0 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, 1)$, $\mathcal{A}$, and $\alpha \leq \beta\gamma$ as input. Then the classification error of f on the subset S is bounded as*

$$\text{er}_S(f; y) \leq 3 \cdot \text{er}_S(f_0; y) + 4\beta. \quad (3)$$

Derivative learning for faster convergence Here, we propose auditing with an algorithm $\mathcal{A}_\ell$, described formally in Algorithm 2 in the Appendix, that aims to learn a smoothed version of the partial derivative function of the cross-entropy loss with respect to the predictions $\frac{\partial \ell(f; y)}{\partial f(x)} = \frac{1}{1 - f(x) - y(x)}$, which grows in magnitude as $|f(x) - y(x)|$ grows. This approach to updating the model is similar in spirit to the line of work that interprets boosting algorithms as running gradient descent on an appropriate cost-functional [25]. In particular, we show that running MULTIACCURACY BOOST with $\mathcal{A}_\ell$ converges in a number of iterations that grows with $\log(1/\alpha)$, instead of polynomially, as we would expect for a smooth, strongly convex objective [3, 31]. This sort of gradient method does not

typically make sense when we don't have information about $y(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$; nevertheless, if there is a "simple" way to improve f , we might hope to *learn* the partial derivative as a function of $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and use this learned "derivative" to update f .

In principle, if the magnitude of the residual $|f(x) - y(x)|$ is not too close to 1 for most $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then the learned partial derivative function should correlate well with the true gradient. Empirically, we observe that $\mathcal{A}_\ell$ is effective at finding ways to improve the model quite rapidly. Formally, we show the following linear convergence guarantee.

Proposition 4. *Let $\alpha, B, L > 0$ and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq [-B, B]^\mathcal{X}$. Suppose we run Algorithm 1 with $\eta = O(1/L)$ on initial model f_0 with auditor $\mathcal{A}_\ell$ defined in Algorithm 2. Then, Algorithm 1 converges in $T = O(L \cdot \log(\ell_\mathcal{X}(f_0; y)/\alpha))$ iterations.*

4 Experiments

We evaluate the empirical performance of MULTIACCURACY BOOST in three case studies. In each case, we observe that overall and subpopulation accuracy improves. Depending on the setting, we choose one of two auditing strategies. First, we use $\mathcal{A}_{\text{dt}}$ that performs decision tree regression (max depth 5) to fit the residual $f(x) - y(x)$. Second, we use a variant of $\mathcal{A}_\ell$ (Algorithm 2) that performs ridge regression to fit $\frac{\partial \ell_x(f; y)}{\partial f(x)} = \frac{1}{1 - f(x) - y(x)}$.³

We describe the results next, documenting our choices of auditor $\mathcal{A}$. For each experiment, we report for various subpopulations, the population percentage and accuracies of the initial model, our black-box post-processed model, and white-box benchmarks. Specifically, we report the accuracy of (1) the initial model; (2) the post-processed multiaccurate model; (3) a model trained on data exclusively from the subpopulation; and if the test distribution differs from the train distribution, (4) a model that retrains the last layer of the initial model on the entire test distribution.

Adult Income Prediction We utilize the adult income prediction data set [23] with 45,222 samples and 14 attributes (after removing subjects with unknown attributes) for the task of binary prediction of income more than \$50k. We remove the sensitive features of gender – female (**F**) and male (**M**) and race – black (**B**) and white (**W**) (two major groups) – from the data, to simulate settings where sensitive features are not used in the algorithm training. We trained a base algorithm, f_0 , which is a 2-layer neural network on 27,145 randomly selected individuals. The test set consists of an independent set of 15,060 persons. We report the overall test accuracy of f_0 as well as its test accuracy on different subpopulations – e.g. **BF** indicates black female – in Table 1

We audit using a decision tree regression model for $\mathcal{A}_{\text{dt}}$ given validation data drawn from the same distribution as training. The auditor has access to 3,017 individuals sampled from the same adult income dataset (disjoint from the training set of f_0). The auditor does not know the gender or race of any individual. We evaluate the post-processed classifier on the same independent test set.

MULTIACCURACY BOOST converges in 50 iterations with $\eta = 1$. As a baseline, we trained four separate models for each of the four subgroups. As shown in Table 1, MULTIACCURACY BOOST post-processing achieves better accuracy both in aggregate and for each of the subgroups. Importantly, the post-processing algorithm is "blind" – it has no access to the sensitive features of gender and race, while the subgroup-specific model requires these features. This example illustrates the strength of MULTIACCURACY BOOST. Training a classifier for each subgroup, or explicitly adding subgroup accuracy into the training objective, assumes that the subgroup is already identified in the data. This is not feasible in the many applications where, say, race or more granular categories are not given. Even when the subgroups are identified ("Subgroup-Specific"), we often do not have enough samples to train accurate classifiers on each subgroup separately, especially if the subgroups are granular.

Gender detection Our f_0 is an inception-resnet-v1 [33] gender classification model trained on the CelebA data set with more than 200,000 face images [24]. The resulting test accuracy for binary gender classification is 98.4%. The original CelebA data contains gender but no race information. Therefore we tested f_0 on a random subset of the LFW+a data containing 6,880 face images, each of which is labeled with both gender and race – black (**B**) and non-black (**N**) [15, 35].

³To help avoid outliers, we smooth the loss and use a quadratic approximation for $\left| \frac{\partial \ell_x(f; y)}{\partial f(x)} \right| > 10$.

Stage	All	F	M	B	W	BF	BM	WF	WM
Population Percentage (%)	100.0	32.3	67.7	86.1	9.2	4.6	4.7	26.2	59.9
Initial Model (%)	19.3	9.3	24.2	10.5	20.3	4.8	15.8	9.8	24.9
MULTIACCURACY BOOST (%)	14.7	7.2	18.3	9.4	15.0	4.5	13.9	7.3	18.3
Subgroup-Specific (%)	19.7	9.5	24.6	10.5	19.9	5.5	15.3	10.2	25.3

Table 1: Test error rates for Adult Income Data Set

For gender classification on LFW+a, f_0 achieves 94.4% accuracy. Even though the overall accuracy is high, the error rate is much worse for females (23.1%) compared to males (0.7%) and worse for blacks (10.2%) compared to non-blacks (5.1 %). We applied MULTIACCURACY BOOST to this f_0 giving the auditor access to 6,263 samples. Again, the auditor is blind and does not see the race or gender of any individual. The auditor uses the learner $\mathcal{A}_\ell$. Instead of training the auditor on raw input pixels, we use the low dimensional representation of the input images derived by a Variational Auto Encoder trained on CelebA dataset using Facenet [30] library. MULTIACCURACY BOOST converged in 7 iterations and achieves substantial reduction in errors rates.

As a baseline method (“Subgroup-Specific”), we retrain the last layer of the network separately on samples of the two subgroups of Black and non-Black to have subgroup-specific classifiers. As a second baseline (“Retraining”), we also retrain the last layer of f_0 on the audit set. Note that both baselines require white-box access to f_0 in order to do the retraining and subgroup-specific classifiers require access to race data. MULTIACCURACY BOOST does not use either information and achieves comparable and, for several subgroups, lower error rates (Table 2).

We tested f_0 on a second face dataset, PPB, which is much smaller in order to stress test the auditor. The test set has 415 individuals and the audit set has size 855. PPB annotates each face as dark (D) or light-skinned (L). As with LFW+a, we evaluated the test accuracy of the original f_0 , the MULTIACCURACY BOOST returned classifier, subgroup specific, and retrained classifiers on each subgroup. MULTIACCURACY BOOST converged in 5 iterations and is able to substantially reduce error despite a small audit set and the lack of annotation about race or skin color (Table 3).

Stage	All	F	M	B	N	BF	BM	NF	NM
Population Percentage (%)	100	21.0	79.0	4.9	95.1	2.1	18.8	2.7	76.3
Initial Model (%)	5.4	23.1	0.7	10.2	5.1	20.4	2.1	23.4	0.6
MULTIACCURACY BOOST (%)	4.1	11.3	3.2	6.0	4.9	8.2	4.3	11.7	3.2
Subgroup-Specific (%)	4.5	14.0	2.0	8.1	4.4	14.3	3.2	14.0	2.0
Retraining (%)	4.5	13.5	2.1	6.0	4.4	8.8	3.7	14.0	2.1

Table 2: Test error rates for LFW+a gender classification data set.

Stage	All	F	M	D	L	DF	DM	LF	LM
Population Percentage (%)	100	44.6	55.4	46.4	53.6	21.4	25.0	23.2	30.4
Initial Model (%)	9.9	21.6	0.4	18.8	2.2	39.8	1.0	5.2	0.0
MULTIACCURACY BOOST (%)	3.9	6.5	1.8	7.3	0.9	12.5	2.9	1.0	0.8
Subgroup-Specific (%)	4.1	7.0	1.7	7.3	1.3	11.4	3.8	3.1	0.0
Retraining (%)	4.3	7.6	1.7	7.8	1.3	13.6	2.9	2.1	0.8

Table 3: Test error rates for the PPB gender classification data set.

Semi-Synthetic Disease Prediction We design a disease prediction task based on real individuals, where the phenotype to disease relation is designed to be different for different subgroups, in order to simulate a challenging setting. We used 40,000 individuals sampled from the UK Biobank [32]. Each individual contains 60 phenotype features. To generate a synthetic disease outcome for each subgroup, we divided the data set into four groups based on gender – male (M) and female (F) – and age – young (Y) and old (O). For each subgroup, we create synthetic binary labels using a different polynomial function of the input features with different levels of difficulty.

For f_0 , we trained a 2-layer neural network on 32,000 individuals, without using the gender and age features. MULTIACCURACY BOOST used auditor $\mathcal{A}_{dt}$ with 4,000 individuals, without using the

gender and age features. As a baseline, we trained a separate classifier for each of the subgroups using the same audit data. MULTIACCURACY BOOST achieved significantly lower error rates across all the subgroups compared to f_0 and to the baseline. Results are in Table 4.

Stage	All	F	M	O	Y	OF	OM	YF	YM
Population Percentage (%)	100	39.6	60.4	34.6	65.4	15.0	19.7	24.6	40.7
Initial Model (%)	36.5	43.4	32	33.4	38.3	36.4	31	48	32.5
MULTIACCURACY BOOST (%)	21.6	27.0	18.1	9.7	28.2	13.5	6.7	35.7	23.7
Subgroup-Specific (%)	26.5	33.2	22.2	17.3	31.4	26.2	10.5	37.5	27.7

Table 4: **Test error rates for UK Biobank semi-synthetic data set.**

5 Discussion

Standard supervised learning optimizes for overall performance. This can lead to settings where certain subpopulations incur substantially worse error rates. Multiaccuracy provides a framework for fairness in classification by improving the accuracy in identifiable subgroups. We show that improving subgroup multiaccuracy actually improves the overall accuracy, demonstrating that there is no tradeoff between multiaccuracy and utility. We demonstrate – both theoretically and empirically – that post-processing with MULTIACCURACY BOOST serves as an effective tool for improving the accuracy across important subpopulations, and does not harm the populations that are already classified well.

Our experiments reveal some surprising strengths of the multiaccuracy framework. In particular, we observe that accuracy can improve across underrepresented groups even when (1) the sensitive attributes defining these groups are not explicitly given to the auditor, and (2) the minority groups remain underrepresented in the validation data. While our experiments represent initial proofs of concept, the results suggest a pathway to improving the fairness of modern classification systems in a way that is feasible information-theoretically and computationally.

Multiaccuracy works to the extent that the auditor can effectively identify specific subgroups where the original classifier f_0 tends to make mistakes. The power of multiaccuracy lies in the fact that in many settings, we can identify issues with f_0 using a relatively small amount of audit data. Thus, multiaccuracy auditing is limited: if the mistakes appear overly-complicated to the bounded auditor (for information- or complexity-theoretic reasons), then MULTIACCURACY BOOST will not be able to identify these mistakes. Our empirical results suggest, however, that in many realistic settings, the subpopulations on which a classifier errs are efficiently-identifiable. This observation may be of interest beyond the context of fairness. In particular, our experiments improving the accuracy of a model trained on CelebA on the LFW+a and PPB test sets suggests a lightweight black-box alternative to more sophisticated transfer learning techniques, which warrants further investigation.

Acknowledgements. The authors thank Omer Reingold and Guy N. Rothblum for their advice and helpful discussions throughout the development of this work; we thank Weihao Kong, Aditi Raghunathan, and Vatsal Sharan for feedback on early drafts of this work.

References

- [1] Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu, and Lauren Kirchner. Machine bias: There’s software used across the country to predict future criminals. and it’s biased against blacks. *ProPublica*, 2016.
- [2] Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. *Concentration inequalities: A nonasymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford university press, 2013.
- [3] Sébastien Bubeck et al. Convex optimization: Algorithms and complexity. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 8(3-4):231–357, 2015.
- [4] Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru. Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. In *Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*, pages 77–91, 2018.
- [5] Alexandra Chouldechova. Fair prediction with disparate impact: A study of bias in recidivism prediction instruments. *Big Data*, 2017.
- [6] Alexandra Chouldechova and Max G’Sell. Fairer and more accurate, but for whom? *FATML*, 2016.
- [7] Sam Corbett-Davies, Emma Pierson, Avi Feller, Sharad Goel, and Aziz Huq. Algorithmic decision making and the cost of fairness. *KDD*, 2017.
- [8] Cynthia Dwork, Vitaly Feldman, Moritz Hardt, Toniann Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Aaron Roth. The reusable holdout: Preserving validity in adaptive data analysis. *Science*, 349(6248):636–638, 2015.
- [9] Cynthia Dwork, Moritz Hardt, Toniann Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Richard S. Zemel. Fairness through awareness. In *Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science (ITCS)*, pages 214–226, 2012.
- [10] Cynthia Dwork, Nicole Immorlica, Adam Tauman Kalai, and Max Leiserson. Decoupled classifiers for fair and efficient machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06613*, 2017.
- [11] Vitaly Feldman. Distribution-specific agnostic boosting. In *Proceedings of the First Symposium on Innovations in Computer Science’10*, 2010.
- [12] Yoav Freund and Robert E. Schapire. A desicion-theoretic generalization of on-line learning and an application to boosting. In *European conference on computational learning theory*, pages 23–37. Springer, 1995.
- [13] Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nathan Srebro. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3315–3323, 2016.
- [14] Úrsula Hébert-Johnson, Michael P. Kim, Omer Reingold, and Guy N. Rothblum. Calibration for the (computationally-identifiable) masses. *arXiv Preprint*, 1711.08513, 2017.
- [15] Gary B. Huang, Manu Ramesh, Tamara Berg, and Erik Learned-Miller. Labeled faces in the wild: A database for studying face recognition in unconstrained environments. Technical Report 07-49, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, October 2007.
- [16] Adam Tauman Kalai, Yishay Mansour, and Elad Verbin. On agnostic boosting and parity learning. In *Proceedings of the fortieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 629–638. ACM, 2008.
- [17] Michael Kearns. Efficient noise-tolerant learning from statistical queries. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 45(6):983–1006, 1998.
- [18] Michael Kearns, Seth Neel, Aaron Roth, and Zhiwei Steven Wu. Preventing fairness gerrymandering: Auditing and learning for subgroup fairness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05144v3*, 2017.
- [19] Michael J. Kearns, Robert E. Schapire, and Linda M. Sellie. Toward efficient agnostic learning. *Machine Learning*, 17(2-3):115–141, 1994.
- [20] Michael J. Kearns and Umesh Virkumar Vazirani. *An introduction to computational learning theory*. MIT press, 1994.
- [21] Michael P. Kim, Omer Reingold, and Guy N. Rothblum. Fairness through computationally-bounded awareness. *arXiv Preprint*, 1803.03239, 2018.

- [22] Jon Kleinberg, Sendhil Mullainathan, and Manish Raghavan. Inherent trade-offs in the fair determination of risk scores. *ITCS*, 2017.
- [23] Ron Kohavi. Scaling up the accuracy of naive-bayes classifiers: a decision-tree hybrid. In *KDD*, volume 96, pages 202–207. Citeseer, 1996.
- [24] Ziwei Liu, Ping Luo, Xiaogang Wang, and Xiaoou Tang. Deep learning face attributes in the wild. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2015.
- [25] Llew Mason, Jonathan Baxter, Peter L Bartlett, and Marcus R Frean. Boosting algorithms as gradient descent. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 512–518, 2000.
- [26] Geoff Pleiss, Manish Raghavan, Felix Wu, Jon Kleinberg, and Kilian Q. Weinberger. On fairness and calibration. *NIPS*, 2017.
- [27] Guy N. Rothblum and Gal Yona. Probably approximately metric-fair learning. *arXiv Preprint*, 1803.03242, 2018.
- [28] Daniel Russo and James Zou. How much does your data exploration overfit? controlling bias via information usage. *AISTATS*, 2016.
- [29] Robert E Schapire and Yoav Freund. *Boosting: Foundations and algorithms*. MIT press, 2012.
- [30] Florian Schroff, Dmitry Kalenichenko, and James Philbin. Facenet: A unified embedding for face recognition and clustering. *CoRR*, abs/1503.03832, 2015.
- [31] Shai Shalev-Shwartz et al. Online learning and online convex optimization. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 4(2):107–194, 2012.
- [32] Cathie Sudlow, John Gallacher, Naomi Allen, Valerie Beral, Paul Burton, John Danesh, Paul Downey, Paul Elliott, Jane Green, Martin Landray, et al. Uk biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes of a wide range of complex diseases of middle and old age. *PLoS medicine*, 12(3):e1001779, 2015.
- [33] Christian Szegedy, Sergey Ioffe, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Alexander A Alemi. Inception-v4, inception-resnet and the impact of residual connections on learning. In *AAAI*, volume 4, page 12, 2017.
- [34] Luca Trevisan, Madhur Tulsiani, and Salil Vadhan. Regularity, boosting, and efficiently simulating every high-entropy distribution. In *Computational Complexity, 2009. CCC'09. 24th Annual IEEE Conference on*, pages 126–136. IEEE, 2009.
- [35] Lior Wolf, Tal Hassner, and Yaniv Taigman. Effective unconstrained face recognition by combining multiple descriptors and learned background statistics. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 33(10):1978–1990, 2011.
- [36] Rich Zemel, Yu Wu, Kevin Swersky, Toni Pitassi, and Cynthia Dwork. Learning fair representations. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-13)*, pages 325–333, 2013.

Additional notation. We use the inner product $\langle h, g \rangle = \mathbf{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[h(x) \cdot g(x)]$ and the p -norms $\|h\|_p = (\mathbf{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[|h(x)|^p])^{1/p}$.

A Multiaccuracy and classification error

Here, we prove Proposition 1.

Proposition (Restatement of Propostion 1). *Let $\hat{y} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ as $\hat{y}(x) = 1 - 2y(x)$. Suppose that for $S \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ with $\mathbf{Pr}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[x \in S] \geq \gamma$, there is some $c \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\|c - \hat{y}_S\|_1 \leq \tau$. Then if f is $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)$ -multiaccurate, $\text{er}_S(f; y) \leq 2 \cdot (\alpha + \tau)/\gamma$.*

Proof. For $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$, let $S_{ij} = \{x \in S : y(x) = i \wedge \bar{f}(x) = j\}$. Further denote $\beta_{ij} = \mathbf{Pr}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[x \in S_{ij}]$. Note that the classification error on a set S is $\text{er}_S(f; y) \leq (\beta_{01} + \beta_{10})/\gamma$.

Let $\hat{y}(x) = 1 - 2y(x)$ and suppose $c(x) = \hat{y}(x)_S + z(x)$ where $\|\delta\|_1 \leq \tau$. Then, we derive the following inequality.

$$\mathbf{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[c(x) \cdot (f(x) - y(x))] = \mathbf{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[\hat{y}(x)_S \cdot (f(x) - y(x))] + \mathbf{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[z(x) \cdot (f(x) - y(x))] \quad (4)$$

$$\geq \beta_{01} \cdot \mathbf{E}_{x \sim S_{01}}[f(x) - y(x)] + \beta_{10} \cdot \mathbf{E}_{x \sim S_{10}}[y(x) - f(x)] - \tau \quad (5)$$

where (5) follows by Hölder's inequality, from the fact that the contribution to the expectation of $(1 - 2y(x)) \cdot (f(x) - y(x))$ from S_{00} and S_{11} is lower bounded by 0, and by the definition $\hat{y}_S(x) = 0$ for $x \notin S$. Further, because we know any $x \in S_{01} \cup S_{10}$ is misclassified, we can lower bound the contribution by $1/2$. Thus, if $\mathbf{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[c(x) \cdot (f(x) - y(x))] \leq \alpha$, then by rearranging we conclude

$$\text{er}_S(f; y) = (\beta_{01} + \beta_{10})/\gamma \leq 2 \cdot (\alpha + \tau)/\gamma. \quad (6)$$

□

Theorem 3 follows by a similar argument.

Theorem (Restatement of Theorem 3). *Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$ and $S \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a subpopulation where $\mathbf{Pr}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[x \in S] \geq \gamma$. Suppose for $\mathcal{A}$ audits the characteristic function $\chi_S(x)$ and its negation. Let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ be the output of Algorithm 1 when given $f_0 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, 1)$, $\mathcal{A}$, and $0 < \alpha \leq \beta\gamma$ as input. Then the classification error of f on the subset S is bounded as*

$$\text{er}_S(f; y) \leq 3 \cdot \text{er}_S(f_0; y) + 4\beta. \quad (7)$$

Proof. Suppose that $\text{er}_S(f_0; y) \leq \tau$. Consider $S_1 = \{x \in S : f_0(x) > 1/2\}$; suppose $\text{er}_{S_1}(f_0; y) = \tau_1$. By assumption, $-\chi_S(x)$ is audited on $\mathcal{X}_1$. Consider $\mathbf{E}_{x \sim S_1}[-\chi_S(x) \cdot (f(x) - y(x))]$.

$$\mathbf{E}_{x \sim S_1}[-\chi_S(x) \cdot (f(x) - y(x))] = \mathbf{E}_{x \sim S_1}[y(x) - f(x)] \quad (8)$$

$$= \mathbf{Pr}_{x \sim S_1}[y(x) = 1] \cdot \mathbf{E}_{\substack{x \sim S_1 \\ y(x)=1}}[1 - f(x)] - \mathbf{Pr}_{x \sim S_1}[y(x) = 0] \cdot \mathbf{E}_{\substack{x \sim S_1 \\ y(x)=0}}[f(x)] \quad (9)$$

$$\geq \mathbf{Pr}_{x \sim S_1}[y(x) = 1 \wedge \bar{f}(x) = 0] \cdot \mathbf{E}_{\substack{x \sim S_1 \\ y(x)=1 \\ f(x)=0}}[1 - f(x)] - \tau_1 \quad (10)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{Pr}_{x \sim S_1}[y(x) = 1 \wedge \bar{f}(x) = 0] - \tau_1 \quad (11)$$

where (10) follows from applying Hölder's inequality and the assumption that $\text{er}_{S_1}(f_0; y) = \tau_1$; and (11) follows from lower bounding the contribution to the expectation based on the true label and the predicted label. Note that $\mathbf{Pr}_{x \sim S}[x \in S_1] \cdot \mathbf{E}_{x \sim S_1}[y(x) - f(x)] \leq \alpha/\gamma = \beta$ by the fact that f passes multiaccuracy auditing by $\mathcal{A}$ and the assumption that $\mathbf{Pr}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[x \in S] \geq \gamma$. Rearranging gives the following inequality

$$\text{er}_{S_1}(f; y) \leq \frac{2\beta}{\mathbf{Pr}_{x \sim S}[x \in S_1]} + 3\tau_1 \quad (12)$$

where the additional τ_1 comes from accounting for the false positives.

A similar argument holds for S_0 with $\text{er}_{S_0}(f_0; y) = \tau_0$, using $\chi_S(x)$. We can expand $\text{er}_S(f; y)$ as a convex combination of the classification error over S_0 and S_1 .

$$\text{er}_S(f; y) = \Pr_{x \sim S}[x \in S_0] \cdot \text{er}_{S_0}(f; y) + \Pr_{x \sim S}[x \in S_1] \cdot \text{er}_{S_1}(f; y) \quad (13)$$

$$\leq \Pr_{x \sim S}[x \in S_0] \cdot \Pr_{x \sim S_0}[y(x) \neq \bar{f}(x)] + \Pr_{x \sim S}[x \in S_1] \cdot \Pr_{x \sim S_1}[y(x) \neq \bar{f}(x)] \quad (14)$$

$$\leq \Pr_{x \sim S}[x \in S_0] \cdot \left(3\tau_0 + \frac{2\beta}{\Pr_{x \sim S}[x \in S_0]}\right) + \Pr_{x \sim S}[x \in S_1] \cdot \left(3\tau_1 + \frac{2\beta}{\Pr_{x \sim S}[x \in S_1]}\right) \quad (15)$$

$$= 3 \cdot \left(\Pr_{x \sim S}[x \in S_0] \cdot \tau_0 + \Pr_{x \sim S}[x \in S_1] \cdot \tau_1\right) + 4\beta \quad (16)$$

$$\leq 3\tau + 4\beta \quad (17)$$

by the fact that S is partitioned into S_0 and S_1 and τ is a corresponding convex combination of τ_0 and τ_1 . $\square$

B Analysis of Algorithm 1

Here, we analyze the sample complexity and running time of Algorithm 1.

Theorem (Restatement of Theorem 2). *Let $\alpha, \delta > 0$ and suppose $\mathcal{A}$ agnostic learns a class $\mathcal{C} \subseteq [-1, 1]^{\mathcal{X}}$ of dimension $d(\mathcal{C})$. Then, using $\eta = O(\alpha)$, Algorithm 1 converges to a $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)$ -multiaccurate hypothesis f_T in $T = O\left(\frac{\ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f_0; y)}{\alpha^2}\right)$ iterations from $m = \tilde{O}\left(T \cdot \frac{d(\mathcal{C}) + \log(1/\delta)}{\alpha^2}\right)$ samples with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the random samples.*

B.1 Sample complexity

We essentially assume the sample complexity issues away by working with the notion of dimension. We give an example proof outline of a standard uniform convergence argument using metric entropy as in [2].

Lemma 5. *Suppose $\mathcal{C} \subseteq [-1, 1]^{\mathcal{X}}$ has ε -covering number $N_\varepsilon = \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{C}, \|\cdot\|_1)$. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (c(x_i)y(x_i)) - \mathbf{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[c(x)y(x)] \right| \leq O(\alpha) \quad (18)$$

provided $m \geq \tilde{\Omega}\left(\frac{\log(N_{\Theta(\alpha)}/\delta)}{\alpha^2}\right)$.

Proof. The lemma follows from a standard uniform convergence argument. First, observe that because every $c : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ and $y \in \{0, 1\}$ that the empirical estimate using m samples has sensitivity $1/m$. Thus, we can apply McDiarmid's inequality to show concentration of the following statistic.

$$\sup_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (c(x_i)y(x_i)) - \mathbf{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{X}}[c(x)y(x)] \right| \quad (19)$$

Then, using a standard covering argument, for $N = \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{C}, \|\cdot\|_1)$ the ε -covering number, we can bound the deviation with high probability. Specifically, taking $O\left(\frac{\log(N/\delta)}{\alpha^2}\right)$ samples guarantees that the empirical estimate for each $c \in \mathcal{C}$ will be within $O(\alpha)$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Taking δ small enough to union bound against every iteration and adjusting constants shows gives the lemma. $\square$

Note that this analysis is completely generic, and more sophisticated arguments may improve the resulting bounds that leverage structure in the specific $\mathcal{C}$ of interest.

B.2 Convergence analysis

We will track progress of Algorithm 1 by tracking the expected cross-entropy loss. We show that every update makes the expected cross-entropy loss decrease significantly. As the loss is bounded below by 0, then positive progress at each iteration combined with an upper bound on the initial loss gives the convergence result.

Note that when we estimate the statistical queries from data, we only have access to approximate answers. Thus, per the sample complexity argument above, we assume that each statistical query is $\alpha/4$ -accurate. Further, we will update f_t if we find an update c_t where $\langle c_t, f - y \rangle \geq 3\alpha/4$. Thus, at convergence, it should be clear that the resulting hypothesis will be $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)$ -multiaccurate. The goal is to show that this way, MULTIACCURACY BOOST converges quickly.

Lemma 6. *Let $\alpha > 0$ and suppose $\mathcal{C} \subseteq [-1, 1]^{\mathcal{X}}$. Given access to statistical queries that are $\alpha/4$ -accurate, Algorithm 1 converges to a $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha)$ -multiaccurate hypothesis in $T = O\left(\frac{\ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f_0; y)}{\alpha^2}\right)$ iterations.*

We state this lemma in terms of a class $\mathcal{C}$ but the proof reveals that any nontrivial update that $\mathcal{A}$ returns suffices to make progress.

Proof. We begin by considering the effect of the multiplicative weights update as a univariate update rule. Suppose we use the multiplicative weights update rule to compute $f_{t+1}(x)$ to be proportional to $f_t(x) \cdot e^{-\eta c_t(x)}$ for some $c_t(x)$. We can track how $\ell_x(f; y)$ changes based on the choice of $c_t(x)$.

$$\ell_x(f_t; y) - \ell_x(f_{t+1}; y) = y(x) \cdot \log\left(\frac{f_{t+1}(x)}{f_t(x)}\right) + (1 - y(x)) \cdot \log\left(\frac{1 - f_{t+1}(x)}{1 - f_t(x)}\right) \quad (20)$$

Recall $f_t(x) = \frac{q_t(x)}{1 + q_t(x)}$, so $1 - f_t(x) = \frac{1}{1 + q_t(x)}$. Thus, we can rewrite (20) as follows.

$$(20) = y(x) \cdot \log\left(\frac{q_{t+1}(x)}{q_t(x)}\right) + (1 - y(x)) \cdot \log\left(\frac{1}{1}\right) - \log\left(\frac{1 + q_{t+1}(x)}{1 + q_t(x)}\right) \quad (21)$$

$$= -\eta c_t(x) y(x) + 0 - \log\left(\frac{1 + q_{t+1}(x)}{1 + q_t(x)}\right) \quad (22)$$

where (22) follows by the multiplicative weights update rule implies $q_{t+1}(x) = e^{-\eta c_t(x)} q_t(x)$ for $x \in S_t$. Next, we expand the final logarithmic term.

$$-\log\left(\frac{1 + q_{t+1}(x)}{1 + q_t(x)}\right) = -\log\left(\frac{1 + q_t(x)e^{-\eta c_t(x)}}{1 + q_t(x)}\right) \quad (23)$$

$$\geq -\log\left(\frac{1 + q_t(x)(1 - \eta c_t(x) + \eta^2 c_t(x)^2)}{1 + q_t(x)}\right) \quad (24)$$

$$\geq -\log\left(1 - \frac{q_t(x)}{1 + q_t(x)}(\eta c_t(x) - \eta^2 c_t(x)^2)\right) \quad (25)$$

$$\geq \eta c_t(x) f_t(x) - \eta^2 c_t(x)^2 \quad (26)$$

where (24) follows by upper bounding the Taylor series approximation for e^z for $z \geq -1$; and (26) follows by the fact that $f_t(x) \in (0, 1)$. Combining the expressions, we can simplify as follows.

$$(22) \geq -\eta c_t(x) y(x) + \eta c_t(x) f_t(x) - \eta^2 c_t(x)^2 \quad (27)$$

$$= \eta c_t(x) \cdot (f_t(x) - y(x)) - \eta^2 c_t(x)^2 \quad (28)$$

Thus, we can express the change in $\ell_x(f_t; y) - \ell_x(f_{t+1}; y)$ after an update based on $c_t(x)$ in terms of the inner product between c_t and $f - y$. In this sense, we can express the local progress during the update at time t in terms of some global progress in the objective.

When we update $x \in \mathcal{X}$ simultaneously according to c , we can express the change in expected cross-entropy as follows.

$$\ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f_t; y) - \ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f_{t+1}; y) \geq \eta \cdot \mathbf{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{X}}[c_t(x) \cdot (f_t(x) - y(x))] - \eta^2 \cdot \mathbf{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{X}}[c_t(x)^2] \quad (29)$$

$$\geq \eta \langle c_t, f_t - y \rangle - \eta^2 \quad (30)$$

$$\geq \eta(\alpha/2 - \eta) \quad (31)$$

where (31) follows from the fact that we assumed that our estimates of the statistical queries were $\alpha/4$ -accurate and that we update based on c_t if $\langle c_t, f - y \rangle$ is at least $3\alpha/4$ according to our estimates. Thus, taking $\eta = \alpha/4$, then we see the change in expected cross-entropy over $\mathcal{X}$ is at least $\alpha^2/16$, which shows the lemma. $\square$

C Linear convergence from gradient learning

Here we show that given an auditing algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ that learns the cross-entropy gradients accurately, Algorithm 1 converges linearly. Consider the following auditor $\mathcal{A}_\ell$. We assume the norms and inner products are estimated accurately using $D \sim \mathcal{D}^m$.

Algorithm 2: $\mathcal{A}_\ell$ – smooth cross-entropy auditor

Given: hypothesis $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, 1)$; class of functions $\mathcal{C} \subseteq [-B, B]^\mathcal{X}$; accuracy parameter $\alpha > 0$; smoothing parameter L ; validation data $D \sim \mathcal{D}^m$:

```

 $\varepsilon \leftarrow \frac{\langle \nabla_f \ell, f - y \rangle^2}{\|\nabla_f \ell\|^2 \|f - y\|^2}$  // approx factor based on angle between grad and f-y
 $\mathcal{H} \leftarrow \{h \in \mathcal{C} : \|h\|^2 \leq L \cdot \ell(f; y)\}$  // audit over l2-bounded version of C
 $h_f \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \|h - \nabla_f \ell(f; y)\|^2$ 
if  $\ell(f; y) \leq \alpha$  or  $\|h_f - \nabla_f \ell(f; y)\|^2 > \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot \|\nabla_f \ell(f; y)\|^2$ :
    return  $h(x) = 0$  // cross-entropy small or hf bad approx to derivative
else:
    return  $h_f$ 

```

We claim that this auditor learns the partial derivative function in a way that guarantees linear convergence.

Proposition (Restatement of Proposition4). *Let $\alpha, B, L > 0$ and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq [-B, B]^\mathcal{X}$. Suppose we run Algorithm 1 on initial model f_0 with auditor $\mathcal{A}_\ell$ defined in Algorithm 2. Then, Algorithm 1 converges in $T = O(L \cdot \log(\ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f_0; y)/\alpha))$ iterations.*

Proof. Note that when $\mathcal{A}_\ell$ returns $h(x) = 0$, then Algorithm 1 terminates. Thus, we will bound the number of iterations until $\ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f; y)$ at most than α . For notational convenience, we denote $\nabla_f \ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f; y)$ as $\nabla_f \ell$.

By the definition of ε and the termination condition, we know that if $\mathcal{A}_\ell$ returns $h_f(x) \neq 0$ then h_f satisfies the following inequality.

$$\|h_f - \nabla_f \ell\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\langle \nabla_f \ell, f - y \rangle^2}{\|f - y\|^2} \quad (32)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\langle \nabla_f \ell, f - y \rangle^2}{\|f - y\|^2} + \frac{1}{16} \|\nabla_f \ell\|^2 \quad (33)$$

$$= \left\| \frac{\langle \nabla_f \ell, f - y \rangle}{\|f - y\|^2} (f - y) - \frac{\nabla_f \ell}{4} \right\|^2 \quad (34)$$

Using this inequality, we can bound the inner product between h_f and $f - y$.

$$\langle h_f, f - y \rangle = \langle \nabla_f \ell, f - y \rangle + \langle h_f - \nabla_f \ell, f - y \rangle \quad (35)$$

$$\geq \langle \nabla_f \ell, f - y \rangle - \left\| \frac{\langle \nabla_f \ell, f - y \rangle}{\|f - y\|^2} (f - y) - \frac{\nabla_f \ell}{4} \right\| \cdot \|f - y\| \quad (36)$$

$$\geq \langle \nabla_f \ell, f - y \rangle - \langle \nabla_f \ell, f - y \rangle \cdot \frac{\|f - y\|^2}{\|f - y\|^2} + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \langle \nabla_f \ell, f - y \rangle \quad (37)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{4} \cdot \ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f; y) \quad (38)$$

where (37) follows from the fact that $\nabla_f \ell$ and $f - y$ are positively correlated; and (38) follows by convexity of $\ell_{\mathcal{X}}$.

Thus, using the analysis of the multiplicative weights update from Section B, we can see that the progress in cross-entropy can be bounded as

$$\ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f_t; y) - \ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f_{t+1}; y) \geq \frac{\eta}{4} \cdot \ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f_t; y) - \eta^2 \cdot \|h_{f_t}(x)\|^2 \quad (39)$$

$$\geq \left(\frac{\eta}{4} - \eta^2 L\right) \cdot \ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f_t; y) \quad (40)$$

where (40) follows from the fact that h_f is drawn from a class with Euclidean norm bounded as $\|h_f\|^2 \leq L \cdot \ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f; y)$.

Rearranging and taking $\eta = \frac{1}{8L}$, we arrive at the following inequality that implies linear convergence.

$$\ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f_{t+1}; y) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{4} + \eta^2 L\right) \ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f_t; y) \quad (41)$$

$$\leq e^{-1/64L} \ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f_t; y) \quad (42)$$

Thus, after $O(L \cdot \log(\ell_{\mathcal{X}}(f_0; y)/\alpha))$, then the cross-entropy will drop below α . $\square$