

# Data Debiasing with Datamodels (D3M): Improving Subgroup Robustness via Data Selection

Saachi Jain\*, Kimia Hamidieh\*, Kristian Georgiev\*,  
Andrew Ilyas, Marzyeh Ghassemi, Aleksander Madry  
MIT

{saachij,hamidieh,krisgrg,ailyas,mghassem,madry}@mit.edu

## Abstract

Machine learning models can fail on subgroups that are underrepresented during training. While techniques such as dataset balancing can improve performance on underperforming groups, they require access to training group annotations and can end up removing large portions of the dataset. In this paper, we introduce *Data Debiasing with Datamodels* (D3M), a debiasing approach which isolates and removes specific training examples that drive the model’s failures on minority groups. Our approach enables us to efficiently train debiased classifiers while removing only a small number of examples, and does not require training group annotations or additional hyperparameter tuning.

## 1 Introduction

The advent of large datasets such as OpenImages [KRA+18] and The Pile [GBB+20] has led to machine learning models being trained on explicit [BP21] and illegal [Thi23] content, or on data that encode negative societal biases [BG18; Fer23; ALM+22; CP21] and other spurious correlations [ODC+20; NAB+23]. Indeed, there is increasing evidence that models reflect the biases in these datasets, and the enormous scale of these datasets makes manually curating them infeasible.

In this paper, we propose an approach that aims to remove data responsible for biased model predictions. In particular, we focus on a specific way of quantifying model bias—called *worst-group error*—which captures the extent to which model performance degrades on pre-defined subpopulations of the data. We aim to identify (and remove) the points in the training dataset that contribute most to this metric to improve the model’s group robustness.

The challenge inherent in this approach is that it requires an understanding of how training data affect machine learning model predictions. To overcome this challenge, we first approximate predictions as simple, direct functions of the training dataset, using a framework called *datamodeling* [IPE+22; PGI+23]. We can then write our quantitative notion of model bias (which is a function of predictions) as a function of the dataset. Finally, by studying this function, we identify the training data points that contribute most to this measure of model bias. With the resulting method, which we call *Data Debiasing with Datamodels* (D3M), we show that, across a variety of datasets, there are often a small number of examples that disproportionately drive worst-group error. Removing these examples, in turn, greatly improves models’ worst-group error while maintaining dataset size.

---

\*Equal contribution.




Figure 1: Our method (D3M) improves worst group accuracy by identifying and removing the training samples which most negatively impact worst-group accuracy. Specifically, we use TRAK [PGI+23] to identify examples that exacerbate the discrepancy in group performance. We then remove and re-train a model on the remaining data.

**Our contributions.** In the rest of this paper, we present and demonstrate the effectiveness of our Data Debiasing with Datamodels (D3M). Concretely, we show that D3M enables us to:

- **Pinpoint examples that harm worst-group accuracy.** We show that there are often a small number of examples that disproportionately drive models’ worst-group error on validation data. For example, on CelebA-Age, our method improves worst group error over a natural baseline (data balancing) while removing  $2.4 \times$  fewer examples. Furthermore, these offending examples often form coherent subpopulations within the data.
- **Achieve competitive debiasing performance.** Our approach outperforms standard approaches (both model-based and data-based) to improving worst-group accuracy [LHC+21; KIW22; IAP+22], and is able to match the performance of methods which use ground-truth training group annotations [SKH+20].
- **Discover unlabeled biases.** When validation group labels are unavailable, we show how to extract hidden biases (i.e., unlabeled subgroups) directly from the data. As a result, we can perform end-to-end debiasing without *any* group annotations.

We present our method in Section 4, and demonstrate these capabilities in Section 5. In Section 6, we leverage our framework to discover and mitigate biases within the ImageNet dataset, where D3M surfaces coherent color and co-occurrence biases. We then debias the model according to these failures, and improve accuracy on the identified populations.

## 2 The group robustness problem

We consider an (unobserved) data distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over triplets  $(x_i, y_i, g_i)$ , each comprising an input  $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ , a label  $y_i \in \mathcal{Y}$ , and a *subgroup label*  $g_i \in \mathcal{G}$ , where  $\mathcal{G}$  is the set of distinct subpopulations in the data. As a running example, consider the CelebA age classification task—here, we take the inputs  $x_i$  to be images of faces, the labels  $y_i$  to be either “old” or “young,” and the possible group labels to be “old man”, “old woman”, “young man”, and “young woman” (see Figure 1).

Given a training dataset  $S_{\text{train}}$  and a (small) validation dataset  $S_{\text{val}}$ , the goal of the group robustness problem is to produce a classifier  $f$  that minimizes the worst-case loss over groups, i.e.,

$$\max_{g' \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y,g) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\ell(f(x), y) | g = g'], \quad (1)$$

where  $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$  is a loss function. When  $\ell$  is the 0-1 loss, Equation (1) is (one minus) the *worst-group accuracy* (WGA) of the classifier  $f$ , which we use to quantify success in the remainder of this work.

Standard loss minimization can yield models that perform poorly with respect to (1). For instance, returning to our example of CelebA age classification, suppose there was a spurious correlation between age and gender in the training set  $S_{\text{train}}$ , such that old men and young women are overrepresented. A predictor that minimizes loss on  $S_{\text{train}}$  might leverage this correlation, and thus perform poorly on the underrepresented subgroups of old women or young men.

In practice, subgroup labels  $g_i$  can be expensive to collect. Thus, approaches to the subgroup robustness problem vary in terms of whether we observe the group label  $g_i$  in the training set  $S_{\text{train}}$  and in the validation set  $S_{\text{val}}$ . In particular, there are three settings of interest:

- **Full-information (Train ✓ / Val ✓):** We observe the group labels for both the training dataset  $S_{\text{train}}$  and validation dataset set  $S_{\text{val}}$ .
- **Partial-information (Train ✗ / Val ✓):** We observe the group labels for the validation set  $S_{\text{val}}$ , but not for the (much larger) training set  $S_{\text{train}}$ .
- **No-information (Train ✗ / Val ✗):** We do not have group information for either  $S_{\text{train}}$  or  $S_{\text{val}}$ . Note that theoretically this setting is unsolvable, since for any non-perfect classifier  $f$ , there exists an assignment of group labels so that the worst-group accuracy is zero. Nevertheless, subgroups of relevant practical interest typically have structure that allows for non-trivial results even with no information.

In this work, we focus on the partial-information and no-information settings, since acquiring group labels for the entire training set is often prohibitively expensive. Still, in Section 5, we show that our proposed methods (D3M for the partial-information setting, and AUTO-D3M for the no-information setting) perform comparably to full-information approaches.

## 3 Related work

Before introducing our method (Section 4), we discuss a few related lines of work.

**Approaches to subgroup robustness.** The *group robustness* problem (Section 2) has attracted a wide variety of solutions (see, e.g., [ABG+19; KXR+19; SKH+20; LHC+21; KIW22; QPI+23]). Broadly, these solutions fall into one of two categories—model interventions and data interventions. *Model interventions* target either model weights [STE+21; SIM24] or the training procedure [SKH+20; KIW22]. *Data interventions*, on the other hand, seek to improve worst-group accuracy by modifying

the training dataset. For example, data balancing removes or subsamples examples so that all subgroups are equally represented. Idrissi et al. [IAP+22] find that this simple approach can perform on par with much more intricate model intervention methods.

In this work, we focus on data interventions, for two reasons. First, it is often training data that drives models’ disparate performance across groups [MMS+21], e.g., via spurious correlations [ODC+20] or underrepresentation [BG18]. Second, data interventions do not require any control over the model training procedure, which can make them a more practical solution (e.g., when using ML-as-a-service). Indeed, since data intervention approaches only manipulate the dataset, they are also easy to combine with model intervention techniques.

Compared to our work, the main drawback of existing data interventions is that they often (a) require subgroup labels for the training data (which might not be available), and (b) hurt the models’ natural accuracy on skewed datasets [CZP+23; SS22]. In this work we circumvent these limitations, by proposing a data-based approach to debiasing that can preserve natural accuracy without access to subgroup information.

**Bias discovery.** Another related line of work identifies biases in machine learning datasets and algorithms. For the former, previous works have shown that large, uncurated datasets used for training machine learning models often contain problematic or biased data [BP21; BPK21; Thi23]. Raji et al. [RKH+22] show that data bias can be a hurdle towards deploying functional machine learning models. Nadeem et al. [NBR20] curate a dataset to estimate bias in NLP models. Adebayo et al. [AHY+23] show that label errors can disproportionately affect disparity metrics.

On the learning algorithm side, Shah et al. [STR+20] and Puli et al. [PZW+23] show that the inductive bias of neural networks may encourage reliance on spurious correlations. Pezeshki et al. [PBI+23] leverage two networks trained on random splits of data while imitating confident held-out mistakes made by its sibling to identify the bias. Shah et al. [SPI+22] show that algorithmic design choices (e.g., the choice of data augmentation) can significantly impact models’ reliance on spurious correlations. Finally, there has been a variety of work on “slice discovery” [JLM+22; EVS+22], where the goal is to discover systematic errors made by machine learning models.

**Data selection for machine learning.** Our work uses data selection to improve the subgroup robustness of machine learning models. In this way, we build on a recent line of work that has explored data selection for improving various measures of model performance. For example, Engstrom et al. [EFM24] and Xie et al. [XSM+23] select pretraining data for LLMs. Similarly, Xia et al. [XMG+24] and Nguyen and Wong [NW23] select data for finetuning and in-context learning, respectively. In another related work, Wang et al. [WWH24] propose a method to reweight training data in order to improve models’ fairness.

Many of these works leverage *data attribution* methods to select data that improves model performance. One line of work aims to approximate the influence function [HRR+11]—a closed-form approximation of the effect of dropping out a single sample—through either Hessian approximation [KL17; SZV+22; HL22; BNL+22] or similarity-based heuristics [PLS+20]. Another related line of work takes a game-theoretic approach, and estimates the Shapley contribution [GZ19; LZL+22] of each datapoint to model performance. Finally, here we rely on a line of work taking a prediction-based approach, where the goal is to predict model behavior directly as a function of the training data [IPE+22; PGI+23].

## 4 Debiasing datasets with datamodeling (D3M)

In this section, we present our *data-based* approach to training debiased classifiers. The main idea behind our approach is to identify (and remove) the training samples that negatively contribute to the model’s worst-group accuracy, by writing model predictions as a function of the training data.

**Preliminaries.** Let  $S = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)\}$  be a dataset of input-label pairs. For any subset of the dataset—as represented by indices  $D \subset [n]$ —let  $\theta(D) \in \mathbb{R}^p$  be the parameters of a classifier trained on  $D$ . Given an example  $z = (x, y)$ , let  $f(z; \theta)$  be the correct-class margin on  $z$  of a classifier with parameters  $\theta$  (defined as  $\log(\frac{p}{1-p})$ , where  $p$  is the confidence assigned to class  $y$  for input  $x$ ).

A *datamodel* [IPE+22] for the example  $z$  is a simple function that predicts  $f(z; \theta(D))$  directly as a function of  $D$ , i.e., a function  $\hat{f}_z : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that

$$\hat{f}_z(D) \approx f(z; \theta(D)) \quad \text{for } D \subset [n].$$

Recent works (e.g., [IPE+22; LZL+22; PGI+23]) demonstrate the existence of accurate *linear* datamodels—functions  $\hat{p}$  that decompose *additively* in terms of their inputs  $D$ . In other words, these works show that one can compute example-specific vectors  $\tau(z) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$\hat{f}_z(D) := \sum_{i \in D} \tau(z)_i \approx f(z; \theta(D)). \quad (2)$$

The coefficients  $\tau(z)_i$  have a convenient interpretation as quantifying the “importance” of the  $i$ -th training sample to model performance on example  $z$  (i.e., as a *data attribution* score [HL22; WSM+23]). In what follows, we will assume access to coefficients  $\tau(z)$  for any example  $z$ —at the end of this section, we will show how to actually estimate the coefficient vectors  $\tau(z)$  efficiently.

**Debiasing approach.** How can we leverage datamodeling to debias a dataset? Recall that our goal is to remove the samples in  $S$  that lead to high worst-group error. Stated differently, given a dataset  $S$  of size  $n$ , we want to maximize the worst-group performance of a classifier  $\theta(D)$  with respect to the indices  $D \subset [n]$  that we train on.

Our main idea will be to approximate the predictions of  $\theta(D)$  using the corresponding datamodels  $\hat{f}_z(D)$ . To illustrate this idea, suppose that our goal was to maximize performance on a *single* test example  $z$ , i.e.,  $\arg \max_D f(z; \theta(D))$ . We can approximate this goal as finding  $\arg \max_D \hat{f}_z(\theta(D))$ : then, due to the linearity of the datamodel  $\hat{f}_z$ , the training samples that hurt performance on  $z$  are simply the bottom indices of the vector  $\tau(z)$ .

Now, this analysis applies not only to a single example  $z$ , but to any *linear combination* of test examples. In particular, if we wish to maximize performance on a linear combination of validation examples, we simply take the linear combination of their coefficients, and remove the training examples corresponding to the smallest coordinates of the averaged vector.

**Debiasing with group-annotated validation data.** Given a set of validation samples for which the group labels  $g_i$  are observable, our last observation gives rise to the following simple procedure:

1. **Compute group coefficients  $\tau(G)$  for each  $G$ .** Since we have group annotations for each validation sample, we can define a vector  $\tau(G)$  for each group  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  as simply the average  $\tau(z)$  within each group.

2. **Compute group alignment.** Next, we compute a *group alignment score*  $A_i$  for each training sample  $i \in [n]$ , which captures the the impact of the sample on worst-group performance. Since there may be many low-performing groups, we use a “smooth maximum” function to weight each group according to its average loss. Thus, for a training example  $i$ ,

$$A_i = \frac{\sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \exp(\beta \ell_g) \cdot \tau(g)_i}{\sum_{g' \in \mathcal{G}} \exp(\beta \ell_{g'})}, \text{ where we set hyperparameter } \beta = 1. \quad (3)$$

Here,  $\ell_g$  is the loss of a base classifier  $\theta(S)$  on group  $g$  (evaluated on the given validation set).

3. **Remove drivers of bias.** Finally, we construct a new training set  $S_{\text{new}}$  by keeping only the examples with the highest group alignment scores, i.e., removing the examples that most degrade worst-group accuracy:

$$S_{\text{new}} = \arg \text{top-k}(\{A_i : z_i \in S_{\text{train}}\}).$$

We make two brief observations about hyperparameters before continuing. When computing the group alignment score in Step 2, the hyperparameter  $\beta$  controls the temperature of the soft maximum function in (3). When  $\beta \rightarrow 0$ , the group alignment  $A_i$  measures the impact of the  $i$ -th training example on the “balanced” performance (treating all groups equally). As  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $A_i$  collapses to the training example’s importance to *only the worst group*, which is suboptimal if models perform poorly on more than one group. For simplicity, we take  $\beta = 1$  and refrain from tuning it.

Another hyperparameter in the algorithm above is the number of examples to remove,  $k$ . We consider two different ways of setting this hyperparameter. One approach is to search for the value of  $k$  that maximizes worst-group accuracy on the validation set  $S_{\text{val}}$ . Alternatively, we find that the simple (and much more efficient) heuristic of removing all examples with a negative group alignment score (i.e., examples for which  $A_i < 0$ ) tends to only slightly over-estimate the best number of examples to remove (see, e.g., Figure 2). Thus, unless otherwise stated, we use this heuristic when reporting our results.

**Debiasing *without* group annotations.** Our procedure above relies on group annotations for a validation set  $S_{\text{val}}$  to compute the “per-group coefficients”  $\tau(G)$ . In many real-world settings, however, models might exhibit disparate performance along *unannotated* subpopulations—in this case, we might not have a validation set on which we can observe group annotations  $g_i$ . Can we still fix disparate model performance in this setting?

In general, of course, the answer to this question is no: one can imagine a case where each individual example is its own subpopulation, in which case worst-group accuracy will be zero unless the classifier is perfect. In practical settings, however, we typically care about the model’s disparate performance on coherent groups of test examples. The question, then, becomes how to find such coherent groups.

We posit that a unifying feature of these subpopulations is that they are *data-isolated*, i.e., that models’ predictions on these coherent groups rely on a different set of training examples than models’ predictions on the rest of the test data. Conveniently, prior works [IPE+22; SPI+22] show that to find data-isolated subpopulations, one can leverage the *datamodel matrix*—a matrix constructed by stacking the datamodel vectors  $\tau(z)$  for each test example. Intuitively, the top principal component of this matrix encodes the direction of maximum variability among the vectors  $\tau(z)$ . Thus, by projecting the datamodel vectors  $\tau(z)$  of our validation examples onto this top principal component, we can identify the examples that are, in a sense, “maximally different”



from the rest of the test examples in terms of how they rely on the training set. These maximally different examples correspond to an isolated subpopulation, to which we can apply D3M directly.

This approach (which we call AUTO-D3M), enables us to perform end-to-end debiasing without *any* group annotations. This method proceeds in four steps. For each class:

1. Construct a matrix  $\mathbf{T}$  of stacked attribution vectors, where  $\mathbf{T}_{ij} = \tau(z_i)_j$ .
2. Let  $\mathbf{v}$  be the top principal component of  $\mathbf{T}$ .
3. Project the attribution vector  $\tau(z)$  onto  $\mathbf{v}$  and construct “group pseudo-labels”

$$g_i = \mathbf{1}\{\tau(z_i)^\top \mathbf{v} \geq \lambda\}.$$

where  $\lambda$  is a hyperparameter <sup>1</sup>

4. Apply D3M with the group pseudo-labels to train a debiased classifier.

A depiction of AUTO-D3M can be found in Appendix Figure 7.

**Estimating the coefficients  $\tau(z)$ .** In order to operationalize D3M and AUTO-D3M, it remains to show that we can actually estimate coefficients  $\tau(z)$  satisfying (2). To accomplish this, we use a method called TRAK [PGI+23]. Leveraging differentiability of the model output  $f(z; \theta)$  with respect to the model parameters  $\theta$ , TRAK computes the coefficient vector  $\tau(z)$  for an example  $z$  as follows:

- (a) Train a model  $\theta^* := \theta(S)$  on the entire training dataset  $S = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ .
- (b) Sample a random Gaussian matrix  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times k}$  where  $p$  is the dimensionality of  $\theta^*$  (i.e., the number of model parameters) and  $k$  is a hyperparameter;
- (c) For an example  $z$ , define  $g(z) := \mathbf{P}^\top \nabla_\theta f(z; \theta^*)$  as the randomly-projected model output gradient (with respect to the model parameters) evaluated at  $z$ .
- (d) Compute the coefficient vector

$$\underbrace{\tau(z)_i}_{i\text{-th coefficient for example } z} = g(z)^\top \left( \sum_{z_j \in S} g(z_j) \cdot g(z_j)^\top \right)^{-1} g(z_i) \cdot (1 - \sigma(f(z; \theta^*)))$$

- (e) Repeat steps (a)-(d) for  $T$  trials, and average the results to get a final coefficient vector  $\tau(z)$ . The trials are identical save for the randomness involved in step (a).

**Remark 1** (A note on scalability.). *In terms of computational cost, TRAK involves taking a single backward pass (i.e., gradient computation) on each training and validation example. The (projected) gradients are then saved to compute TRAK scores. Typically, TRAK is computed over an ensemble of  $M$  models (following the original paper, we use  $M = 100$  models each trained with 50% of the training data). However, our approach is general and can be used with any datamodeling technique (i.e., any method for approximating  $\tau(z)$ ).*

<sup>1</sup>For our experiments we choose  $\lambda$  so that the lower performing group consists of 35% of the validation examples of that class.

Group Info Train / Val	Method	Worst Group Accuracy (%)			
		CelebA-Age	CelebA-Blond	Waterbirds	MultiNLI
$\times / \times$	ERM	56.7	45.9	57.9	67.2
	<b>AUTO-D3M (ours)</b>	<b>76.0</b>	<b>83.8</b>	<b>81.0</b>	<b>75.0</b>
$\times / \checkmark$	JTT [LHC+21]	61.0	81.6	63.6	72.6
	DFR* [KIW22]	70.4	88.4	<b>89.0</b>	74.7
	<b>D3M (ours)</b>	<b>75.6</b>	<b>90.0</b>	87.2	<b>76.0</b>
$\checkmark / \checkmark$	RWG [IAP+22]	<b>75.6</b>	88.4	81.2	68.4
	SUBG [IAP+22]	68.5	88.3	<b>85.5</b>	67.8
	GroupDRO [SKH+20]	74.8	<b>90.6</b>	72.5	<b>77.7</b>

Table 1: Worst-group accuracies on four group robustness datasets. A \* denotes methods that use validation group labels for both finetuning and hyperparameter tuning.

## 5 Results

In Section 4, we presented D3M—an approach for debiasing a classifier by identifying examples which contribute to a targeted bias. In this section, we validate this framework by assessing its performance on tasks with known biases.

We consider four classification tasks where there is a spurious correlation between the target label and a group label in the training dataset: CelebA-Age [LLW+15; JLM+22], CelebA-Blond [LLW+15], Waterbirds [SRK+20], and MultiNLI [WNB17]. We provide more information about the datasets in Appendix B.1, and other experimental details in Appendix B.2.

### 5.1 Quantitative results

We first evaluate D3M and AUTO-D3M quantitatively, by measuring the worst-group accuracy of models trained on the selected subsets of the biased datasets above.

**D3M: Debiasing the model in the presence of validation group labels.** In Table 1, we compare D3M against several baselines, each of which requires either only validation group labels ( $\times / \checkmark$ ) or both training and validation group labels ( $\checkmark / \checkmark$ ). We find that D3M outperforms all other methods that use the same group information (i.e., only validation group labels) on all datasets except Waterbirds<sup>2</sup>. Moreover, D3M performs on par with methods that have full access to both training and validation group labels.

**AUTO-D3M: Discovering biases with TRAK.** We now consider the case where validation group labels are not accessible. Using AUTO-D3M, we debias our model using pseudo-annotations derived from the top principal component of the TRAK matrix (AUTO-D3M in Table 1)<sup>3</sup>. Note that AUTO-D3M is the only method other than ERM that does not require either train or validation group labels. Despite this, AUTO-D3M achieves competitive worst-group accuracy in our experiments. We emphasize that AUTO-D3M does not require group labels at all—in particular, we *do not* use group labels to do hyperparameter selection or model selection when we retrain.

<sup>2</sup>Note that WaterBirds has more worst-group examples in the val split (133) than the train split (56). Since DFR directly fine-tunes on the validation set, it has an advantage here over other methods.

<sup>3</sup>For MultiNLI, we chose the PCA component by inspection that captures examples with/without negation.






Figure 2: Worst group accuracy on CelebA-Age as a function of the number of examples  $k$  removed from the training set, using various removal methods. In green, D3M removes the  $k$  training examples with the most negative alignment scores  $A_i$ . The green star marks the value of  $k$  selected by our heuristic ( $A_i < 0$ ). In blue is the performance of a baseline that removes  $k$  random examples from the training set, and in orange is dataset balancing, which removes examples randomly from the majority group. Compared to baselines, D3M efficiently improves worst group accuracy.

**The effect of the number of removed examples  $k$ .** How well does D3M isolate the training examples that drive disparate performance? To answer this question, we re-run the method on CelebA-Age while varying the hyperparameter  $k$ . That is, we iteratively remove training examples from CelebA-Age starting with the most negative  $A_i$  and measure the worst-group and balanced accuracy (See Figure 2). CelebA-Age has 40K “majority” examples and 10K “minority” examples; thus, naive balancing requires removing 30K training examples. In contrast, by isolating *which* specific majority examples contribute to the bias, our method is able to debias the classifier by removing only 10 thousand examples.

Our heuristic of removing examples with negative  $A_i$  (the star in Figure 2) slightly over-estimates the best number of examples to remove. Thus, while this heuristic gives a decent starting point for  $k$ , actually searching for the best  $k$  might further improve performance.

## 5.2 Qualitative results

What type of data does our method flag? Do the examples we identify as driving worst-group error share some common characteristics? To answer these questions, in this section we inspect the data removed by our method and identify subpopulations (using auxiliary annotations) that contribute disproportionately to worst-group error. We then retrain the model after excluding *all* training examples from the identified subpopulations and show that this is a viable strategy for improving worst-group accuracy, performing competitively with D3M while offering more insight into the examples being removed.

## 5.3 Qualitative results

What type of data does our method flag? In particular, do the examples we identify as driving the targeted bias share some common characteristics? To test this hypothesis, we inspect the data removed by our method and identify subpopulations within the majority groups that are



Figure 3: Randomly sampled examples from the subpopulations with the most negative group alignment scores. We find that many of these examples have labeling errors (e.g., platinum blond instead of gray hair.)




Figure 4: The average group alignment score of the training examples in each subpopulation of CelebA-Age. Subpopulations such as “old” with “bushy eyebrows” or “young” with “gray hair” have particularly negative scores.

disproportionately responsible for the bias. We then retrain the model after excluding *all* training examples from the identified subpopulations and show that this is a viable strategy for mitigating the underlying bias.

**Finding subpopulations responsible for model bias.** Consider a running example where we train a model on the CelebA-Age dataset to predict whether a person is “young” or “old,” with gender (only “male” or “female” are represented in CelebA-Age) being a spurious feature (i.e., young women and old men are overrepresented). CelebA-Age has a variety of annotations beyond age and gender, such as whether the person is wearing eyeglasses. In this section, we use these extra annotations to identify coherent subpopulations that are flagged by our methods.

In particular, we consider subpopulations formed by taking the Cartesian product of labels and annotations (e.g., subpopulations of the form {“young”, “wearing eyeglasses”}). For each of these subpopulations, we calculate the average group alignment score  $A_i$  of the training examples within that subpopulation (see Figure 4). We find that subpopulations such as {“young”, “gray hair”}, {“old”, “5 o’clock shadow”} or {“old”, “bushy eyebrows”} have particularly negative group alignment scores. In Figure 3, we show examples from the subpopulations with the most negative group alignment scores, and observe that many of them contain labeling errors.

**Retraining without identified subpopulations.** Once we have identified subpopulations with negative average alignment scores, a natural strategy for mitigating the underlying bias is to exclude the entire subpopulations from the training set. (This is in contrast to ordinary D3M, which only removes the training examples for which  $A_i < 0$ .) To explore this approach, we exclude the five subpopulations with the most negative average alignment from the CelebA-Age dataset—these are



Figure 5: For four ImageNet classes, the most extreme (positive or negative) examples according to the top PCA direction of the TRAK matrix. Our method identifies color and co-occurrence biases.

{“young”, “gray hair”}, {“old,” “5 o’clock shadow”}, {“old,” “bushy eyebrows”}, {“young,” “blond hair”}, and {“old,” “sideburns”}. After removing these subpopulations and retraining the model on this modified training set, we get a worst-group accuracy (WGA) of 68.4%—an improvement of ~12% over the WGA of the original model (56.7%).

## 6 Case study: Finding and mitigating biases on ImageNet

In Section 5 we evaluated D3M and AUTO-D3M on datasets where a spurious correlation (or *bias*) leading to poor worst-group accuracy was already known. In this section, we deploy AUTO-D3M to discover and mitigate biases within the ImageNet dataset, which does not have pre-labelled biases or available group annotations.

**Identifying ImageNet biases.** We use TRAK to compute a coefficient matrix  $T$  (see Step 1 of AUTO-D3M in Section 4) for a held out validation split (10% of the training set). Focusing on seven ImageNet classes, we use the first principal component of the matrix  $T$  to identify potential biases. In Figure 5, we display the most extreme training examples according to the top principal component for four of these classes. PCA identifies semantically color and co-occurrence biases (e.g., tench fishes with or without humans or yellow/white cauliflowers that are either cooked or uncooked.) In fact, our identified biases match the challenging subpopulations in Jain et al. [JLM+22] and Moayeri et al. [MSF22].




Figure 6: Worst-group accuracy for the ImageNet classes studied in Section 6 after intervening with either D3M or AUTO-D3M.

**Mitigating ImageNet biases with AUTO-D3M.** For each of the four targeted ImageNet classes, we seek to mitigate the identified failure modes with AUTO-D3M. We consider two settings based on the level of human intervention. In the first, we manually assign each of the validation images

to a group according to a human description of identified bias (e.g., an image of a tench is in group 1 if a human is present and group 2 otherwise), and then use those group labels with D3M.<sup>4</sup> In the second setting, we debias in a purely automatic fashion, using AUTO-D3M to derive pseudo-group labels from the top principal component. In Figure 6, we display worst group accuracy on the test images of the targeted class (evaluated using manual group assignments of the 50 test examples). Both D3M and AUTO-D3M improve worst group accuracy over ERM without significantly impacting the overall ImageNet accuracy (see Appendix C.2).

## 7 Conclusion

We propose Data Debiasing with Datamodels (D3M), a simple method for debiasing classifiers by isolating training data that disproportionately contributes to model performance on underperforming groups. Unlike approaches such as balancing, our method only removes a small number of examples and does not require training group annotations or additional hyperparameter tuning. More generally, our work takes a first step towards *data-centric* model debiasing.

## Acknowledgements

Work supported in part by the NSF grant DMS-2134108. This material is based upon work supported by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) under Contract No. HR001120C0015.

---

<sup>4</sup>Here, we only consider the target class when computing the loss weighting. As a result, the heuristic overestimates the number of examples  $k$  to remove, and so we instead search for the optimal  $k$  using our held out validation set.

## References

- [ABG+19] Martin Arjovsky, Léon Bottou, Ishaan Gulrajani, and David Lopez-Paz. “Invariant risk minimization”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02893* (2019).
- [AHY+23] Julius Adebayo, Melissa Hall, Bowen Yu, and Bobbie Chern. “Quantifying and mitigating the impact of label errors on model disparity metrics”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02533* (2023).
- [ALM+22] Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu, and Lauren Kirchner. “Machine Bias \*”. In: *Ethics of Data and Analytics*. 1st Edition. Auerbach Publications, May 2022, pp. 254–264.
- [BG18] Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru. “Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification”. In: *Conference on fairness, accountability and transparency (FAccT)*. 2018.
- [BNL+22] Juhan Bae, Nathan Ng, Alston Lo, Marzyeh Ghassemi, and Roger Grosse. “If Influence Functions are the Answer, Then What is the Question?”. In: *ArXiv preprint arXiv:2209.05364*. 2022.
- [BP21] Abeba Birhane and Vinay Uday Prabhu. “Large image datasets: A pyrrhic win for computer vision?”. In: *2021 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*. IEEE, Jan. 2021, pp. 1536–1546.
- [BPK21] Abeba Birhane, Vinay Uday Prabhu, and Emmanuel Kahembwe. “Multimodal datasets: misogyny, pornography, and malignant stereotypes”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.01963* (2021).
- [CP21] Kate Crawford and Trevor Paglen. “Excavating AI: the politics of images in machine learning training sets”. In: *AI & society* 36.4 (Dec. 2021), pp. 1105–1116.
- [CZP+23] Rhys Compton, Lily Zhang, Aahlad Puli, and Rajesh Ranganath. “When More is Less: Incorporating Additional Datasets Can Hurt Performance By Introducing Spurious Correlations”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.04431* (2023).
- [EFM24] Logan Engstrom, Axel Feldmann, and Aleksander Madry. “DsDm: Model-Aware Dataset Selection with Datamodels”. In: 2024.
- [EVS+22] Sabri Eyuboglu, Maya Varma, Khaled Saab, Jean-Benoit Delbrouck, Christopher Lee-Messer, Jared Dunnmon, James Zou, and Christopher Ré. “Domino: Discovering systematic errors with cross-modal embeddings”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.14960* (2022).
- [Fer23] Emilio Ferrara. “Fairness and Bias in Artificial Intelligence: A Brief Survey of Sources, Impacts, and Mitigation Strategies”. en. In: *Sci* 6.1 (Dec. 2023), p. 3.
- [GBB+20] Leo Gao, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Laurence Golding, Travis Hoppe, Charles Foster, Jason Phang, Horace He, Anish Thite, Noa Nabeshima, et al. “The pile: An 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00027* (2020).
- [GZ19] Amirata Ghorbani and James Zou. “Data shapley: Equitable valuation of data for machine learning”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*. 2019.
- [HL22] Zayd Hammoudeh and Daniel Lowd. “Training Data Influence Analysis and Estimation: A Survey”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.04612*. 2022.

- [HRR+11] Frank R Hampel, Elvezio M Ronchetti, Peter J Rousseeuw, and Werner A Stahel. *Robust statistics: the approach based on influence functions*. Vol. 196. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- [HZR+15] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. *Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition*. 2015.
- [IAP+22] Badr Youbi Idrissi, Martin Arjovsky, Mohammad Pezeshki, and David Lopez-Paz. “Simple data balancing achieves competitive worst-group-accuracy”. In: *Conference on Causal Learning and Reasoning*. PMLR. 2022, pp. 336–351.
- [IPE+22] Andrew Ilyas, Sung Min Park, Logan Engstrom, Guillaume Leclerc, and Aleksander Madry. “Datamodels: Predicting Predictions from Training Data”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*. 2022.
- [JLM+22] Saachi Jain, Hannah Lawrence, Ankur Moitra, and Aleksander Madry. “Distilling Model Failures as Directions in Latent Space”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.14754* (2022).
- [KIW22] Polina Kirichenko, Pavel Izmailov, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. “Last layer re-training is sufficient for robustness to spurious correlations”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02937* (2022).
- [KL17] Pang Wei Koh and Percy Liang. “Understanding Black-box Predictions via Influence Functions”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 2017.
- [KRA+18] Alina Kuznetsova, Hassan Rom, Neil Alldrin, Jasper Uijlings, Ivan Krasin, Jordi Pont-Tuset, Shahab Kamali, Stefan Popov, Matteo Mallocci, Tom Duerig, et al. “The open images dataset v4: Unified image classification, object detection, and visual relationship detection at scale”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.00982* (2018).
- [KXR+19] Bingyi Kang, Saining Xie, Marcus Rohrbach, Zhicheng Yan, Albert Gordo, Jiashi Feng, and Yannis Kalantidis. “Decoupling representation and classifier for long-tailed recognition”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.09217* (2019).
- [LHC+21] Evan Z Liu, Behzad Haghgoo, Annie S Chen, Aditi Raghunathan, Pang Wei Koh, Shiori Sagawa, Percy Liang, and Chelsea Finn. “Just Train Twice: Improving Group Robustness without Training Group Information”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 2021.
- [LLW+15] Ziwei Liu, Ping Luo, Xiaogang Wang, and Xiaoou Tang. “Deep Learning Face Attributes in the Wild”. In: *International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. 2015.
- [LZL+22] Jinkun Lin, Anqi Zhang, Mathias Lecuyer, Jinyang Li, Aurojit Panda, and Siddhartha Sen. “Measuring the Effect of Training Data on Deep Learning Predictions via Randomized Experiments”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.10013* (2022).
- [MMS+21] Ninareh Mehrabi, Fred Morstatter, Nripsuta Saxena, Kristina Lerman, and Aram Galstyan. “A Survey on Bias and Fairness in Machine Learning”. In: (2021).
- [MSF22] Mazda Moayeri, Sahil Singla, and Soheil Feizi. “Hard imagenet: Segmentations for objects with strong spurious cues”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), pp. 10068–10077.
- [NAB+23] Yannic Neuhaus, Maximilian Augustin, Valentyn Boreiko, and Matthias Hein. “Spurious features everywhere-large-scale detection of harmful spurious features in imagenet”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2023, pp. 20235–20246.



- [NBR20] Moin Nadeem, Anna Bethke, and Siva Reddy. “StereoSet: Measuring stereotypical bias in pretrained language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.09456* (2020).
- [NW23] Tai Nguyen and Eric Wong. “In-context example selection with influences”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11042* (2023).
- [ODC+20] Lauren Oakden-Rayner, Jared Dunnmon, Gustavo Carneiro, and Christopher Ré. “Hidden stratification causes clinically meaningful failures in machine learning for medical imaging”. In: *Proceedings of the ACM conference on health, inference, and learning*. 2020.
- [PBI+23] Mohammad Pezeshki, Diane Bouchacourt, Mark Ibrahim, Nicolas Ballas, Pascal Vincent, and David Lopez-Paz. “Discovering environments with XRM”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16748* (2023).
- [PGI+23] Sung Min Park, Kristian Georgiev, Andrew Ilyas, Guillaume Leclerc, and Aleksander Madry. “TRAK: Attributing Model Behavior at Scale”. In: *Arxiv preprint arXiv:2303.14186*. 2023.
- [PLS+20] Garima Pruthi, Frederick Liu, Mukund Sundararajan, and Satyen Kale. “Estimating Training Data Influence by Tracing Gradient Descent”. In: *Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 2020.
- [PZW+23] Aahlad Puli, Lily Zhang, Yoav Wald, and Rajesh Ranganath. “Don’t blame dataset shift! Shortcut learning due to gradients and cross entropy”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12553* (2023).
- [QPI+23] Shikai Qiu, Andres Potapczynski, Pavel Izmailov, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. “Simple and Fast Group Robustness by Automatic Feature Reweighting”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11074* (2023).
- [RKH+22] Inioluwa Deborah Raji, I Elizabeth Kumar, Aaron Horowitz, and Andrew Selbst. “The fallacy of AI functionality”. In: *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 2022, pp. 959–972.
- [SIM24] Harshay Shah, Andrew Ilyas, and Aleksander Madry. “Decomposing and Editing Model Predictions”. In: *arXiv preprint*. 2024.
- [SKH+20] Shiori Sagawa, Pang Wei Koh, Tatsunori B. Hashimoto, and Percy Liang. “Distributionally Robust Neural Networks for Group Shifts: On the Importance of Regularization for Worst-Case Generalization”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2020.
- [SPI+22] Harshay Shah, Sung Min Park, Andrew Ilyas, and Aleksander Madry. “ModelDiff: A Framework for Comparing Learning Algorithms”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12491*. 2022.
- [SRK+20] Shiori Sagawa, Aditi Raghunathan, Pang Wei Koh, and Percy Liang. “An investigation of why overparameterization exacerbates spurious correlations”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2020, pp. 8346–8356.
- [SS22] Roy Schwartz and Gabriel Stanovsky. “On the limitations of dataset balancing: The lost battle against spurious correlations”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.12708* (2022).
- [STE+21] Shibani Santurkar, Dimitris Tsipras, Mahalaxmi Elango, David Bau, Antonio Torralba, and Aleksander Madry. “Editing a classifier by rewriting its prediction rules”. In: *Preprint*. 2021.

- [STR+20] Harshay Shah, Kaustav Tamuly, Aditi Raghunathan, Prateek Jain, and Praneeth Netrapalli. “The pitfalls of simplicity bias in neural networks”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), pp. 9573–9585.
- [SZV+22] Andrea Schioppa, Polina Zablotskaia, David Vilar, and Artem Sokolov. “Scaling up influence functions”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Vol. 36. 8. 2022, pp. 8179–8186.
- [Thi23] David Thiel. *Identifying and eliminating CSAM in generative ML training data and models*. Tech. rep. 2023.
- [WNB17] Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel R Bowman. “A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.05426* (2017).
- [WSM+23] Theodora Worledge, Judy Hanwen Shen, Nicole Meister, Caleb Winston, and Carlos Guestrin. “Unifying corroborative and contributive attributions in large language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12233* (2023).
- [WWH24] Haonan Wang, Ziwei Wu, and Jingrui He. “FairIF: Boosting Fairness in Deep Learning via Influence Functions with Validation Set Sensitive Attributes”. In: *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 2024, pp. 721–730.
- [XMG+24] Mengzhou Xia, Sadhika Malladi, Suchin Gururangan, Sanjeev Arora, and Danqi Chen. “Less: Selecting influential data for targeted instruction tuning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04333* (2024).
- [XSM+23] Sang Michael Xie, Shibani Santurkar, Tengyu Ma, and Percy Liang. “Data selection for language models via importance resampling”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.03169* (2023).

## A Omitted Figures




Figure 7: Procedure for discovering spurious attributes. To discover spurious attributes, we first compute the TRAK matrix for the validation set. We then split the validation examples into two groups based on the top principal components of the TRAK matrix. Finally, we use these groups to create pseudo-annotations for the validation set.

## B Details of Experiments

### B.1 Experimental Setup

In this section, we describe the datasets, models and evaluation procedure that we use throughout the paper.

**Datasets.** In order to cover a broad range of practical scenarios, we consider the following image classification and text classification problems.

- Waterbirds [SKH+20] is a binary image classification problem, where the class corresponds to the type of the bird (landbird or waterbird), and the background is spuriously correlated with the class. Namely, most landbirds are shown on land, and most waterbirds are shown over water.
- CelebA-Blond [LLW+15] is a binary image classification problem, where the goal is to predict whether a person shown in the image is blond; the gender of the person serves as a spurious feature, as 94% of the images with the “blond” label depict females.
- CelebA-Age [LLW+15; JLM+22] is a binary image classification problem, where the goal is to predict whether a person shown in the image is young; the gender of the person serves as a spurious feature. For this task, we specifically subsample the training set such that the ratio of samples in the majority vs. minority groups is 4:1.
- MultiNLI [WNB17; SKH+20] is a classification problem where given a pair of sentences, the task is to classify whether the second sentence is entailed by, neutral with, or contradicts the first sentence. The spurious attribute from Sagawa et al. [SKH+20] describes the presence of negation words, which appear more frequently in the examples from the negation class.

**Methods.** We benchmark our approach against the following methods:

- **ERM** is simple empirical risk minimization on the full training set.
- **RWG** [IAP+22] is ERM applied to random batches of the data where the groups are equally represented with a combination of upsampling and downsampling such that the size of the dataset does not change.
- **SUBG** [IAP+22] is ERM applied to a random subset of the data where we subsample all groups such that they have the same number of examples.
- **GroupDRO** [SKH+20] trains that minimizes the worst-case performance over pre-defined groups in the test dataset.
- **Just Train Twice (JTT)** [LHC+21] trains an ERM model with upsampling initially misclassified training examples by an initial ERM model.
- **DFR** [KIW22] trains an ensemble of linear models on a balanced validation set, given ERM features.

## B.2 Training Details

In this section, we detail the model architectures and hyperparameters used by each approach. We used the same model architecture across all approaches: Randomly initialized ResNet-18 [HZR+15] for CelebA and ImageNet-pretrained ResNet-18s for Waterbirds. We use the GroupDRO implementation by Sagawa et al. [SKH+20] and DFR implementation by Kirichenko et al. [KIW22].

For all approaches, we tune hyperparameters for ERM-based methods (ERM, DFR, and D3M) and re-weighting based methods (RWG, SUBG, GroupDRO and JTT) separately. For RWG, SUBG, GroupDRO and JTT, we early stop based on highest worst-group accuracy on the validation set as well. We optimize all approaches with Adam optimizer.

For the CelebA dataset, we all methods with learning rate  $1e - 3$ , weight decay  $1e - 4$ , and batch size 512. We train RWG, SUBG, GroupDRO and JTT with learning rate  $1e - 3$ , weight decay  $1e - 4$ , and batch size 512. We train all models for the CelebA-Age task to up to 5 epochs and all models for CelebA-Blond task up to 10 epochs.

For the Waterbirds dataset, we train the approaches that use the ERM objective (including D3M) with learning rate  $1e - 4$ , weight decay  $1e - 4$ , and batch size 32. We train RWG, SUBG, GroupDRO and JTT with learning rate  $1e - 5$ , weight decay 0.1, and batch size 32. We train all models to up to 20 epochs.

For all other hyperparameters, we use the same hyperparameters as Kirichenko et al. [KIW22] for DFR and the same hyperparameters as Liu et al. [LHC+21] for JTT.

We report the performance of the models via Worst-group Accuracy, or Balanced Accuracy in Table 2, which is the average of accuracies of all groups. If all groups in the test set have the same number of examples, balanced accuracy will be equivalent to average accuracy.

Our model was trained on a machine with 8 A100 GPUs.

## C Omitted Results

### C.1 Balanced Accuracies

Below we include the balanced accuracies for the experiments in Table 2.

Method	Group Info Train / Val	CelebA-Age		CelebA-Blond		Waterbirds		MultiNLI	
		Balanced Accuracy	Worst Group Accuracy	Balanced Accuracy	Worst Group Accuracy	Balanced Accuracy	Worst Group Accuracy	Balanced Accuracy	Worst Group Accuracy
ERM	✗/✗	77.96	56.65	82.59	45.86	83.40	57.85	80.92	67.19
Auto-TRAK (ours)	✗/✗	80.05	<b>75.97</b>	91.01	83.77	90.36	81.04		
RWG [IAP+22]	✓/✓	80.66	<b>75.64</b>	90.42	88.40	86.51	81.21	78.61	68.41
SUBG [IAP+22]	✓/✓	77.57	68.49	91.30	88.26	86.97	85.46	73.64	67.76
GroupDRO [SKH+20]	✓/✓	80.88	74.80	91.83	<b>90.61</b>	86.51	72.47	81.4	77.7
JTT [LHC+21]	✗/✓	68.06	60.95	92.01	81.61	85.24	63.61	78.6	72.6
DFR [KIW22]	✗/✓✓	80.69	70.37	91.93	88.40	90.89	<b>88.96</b>	82.1	74.7
TRAK (ours)	✗/✓	81.05	<b>75.55</b>	91.08	<b>90.03</b>	91.46	87.15	81.54	75.46

Table 2: Balanced accuracy and worst-group accuracy on CelebA-Age, CelebA-Blond, and Waterbirds. A double checkmark (✓✓) indicates that the method uses validation group labels for model finetuning, in addition to hyperparameter tuning.

## C.2 ImageNet Accuracies

Below we included the detailed accuracies for the ImageNet experiment.

Class ( <i>bias</i> )	Method	Class-Level		ImageNet-Level
		Balanced Accuracy	Worst Group Accuracy	Overall Accuracy
Red Wolf ( <i>Red Coat</i> )	ERM	46.87	22.62	63.97
	D3M	65.63	<b>52.38</b>	63.71
	AUTO-D3M	59.94	39.29	63.87
Tench ( <i>Presence of human</i> )	ERM	85.10	78.12	63.97
	D3M	90.73	<b>86.88</b>	63.84
	AUTO-D3M	86.67	80.00	63.97
Cauliflower ( <i>Not Cooked</i> )	ERM	77.81	63.64	63.97
	D3M	85.77	<b>79.55</b>	63.70
	AUTO-D3M	86.73	79.40	63.75
Strawberry ( <i>Not on a plate</i> )	ERM	58.93	35.58	63.97
	D3M	70.49	<b>51.92</b>	63.88
	AUTO-D3M	68.99	50.48	63.79

Table 3: AUTO-D3M identifies and mitigates biases in ImageNet. For four ImageNet classes, a bias was identified from inspecting the TRAK PCA directions. Then AUTO-D3M is applied in order to mitigate the bias for that class. AUTO-D3M is able to improve the worst group accuracy for the targeted class without significantly changing the overall ImageNet accuracy.