

An experimental study on fairness-aware machine learning for credit scoring problem

Huyen Giang Thi Thu^{1,3}, Thang Viet Doan^{2,4} and Tai Le Quy^{5*}

¹Information Technology and Digital Economics, Banking Academy of Vietnam, Vietnam.

²Faculty of Finance, Banking Academy of Vietnam, Vietnam.

³Graduate University of Science and Technology, Vietnam Academy of Science and Technology, Vietnam.

⁴Florida International University, USA.

^{5*}Institute for Web Science & Technologies, University of Koblenz, Germany.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): tailequy@uni-koblenz.de;

Contributing authors: huyengtt@hvnh.edu.vn;

24a4013133@hvnh.edu.vn;

Abstract

Digitalization of credit scoring is an essential requirement for financial organizations and commercial banks, especially in the context of digital transformation. Machine learning techniques are commonly used to evaluate customers' creditworthiness. However, the predicted outcomes of machine learning models can be biased toward protected attributes, such as race or gender. Numerous fairness-aware machine learning models and fairness measures have been proposed. Nevertheless, their performance in the context of credit scoring has not been thoroughly investigated. In this paper, we present a comprehensive experimental study of fairness-aware machine learning in credit scoring. The study explores key aspects of credit scoring, including financial datasets, predictive models, and fairness measures. We also provide a detailed evaluation of fairness-aware predictive models and fairness measures on widely used financial datasets.

Keywords: fairness, machine learning, credit scoring, fairness measures, financial dataset, predictive model

1 Introduction

The traditional banking system consumes considerable time, requires plenty of human resources, and is tedious to execute. There is a risk that traditional banks will become obsolete due to technological advancements. Therefore, a digital transformation in the banking systems is needed to fasten and ease banking tasks. We have seen the new technologies in the banking sector as vivid examples of digital transformation, such as Robotic Process Automation (RPA), Big Data, Cloud computing, and Blockchain¹. In the digital transformation process, the automation of banking procedures is an essential requirement of banks. Hence, the digitalization of credit scoring is also apparent because credit scoring is a crucial phase in the risk management process of financial organizations and commercial banks. In order to perform customer credit scoring automatically, a variety of machine learning (ML) methods have been effectively applied [1–4]. The experimental results are calculated based on existing customers' financial and non-financial data at the time of credit scoring and customer rating.

However, apart from the advantages of ML techniques on credit scoring, there is a brunch of evidence regarding the discriminative impact of ML-based decision-making on individuals and groups of people on the basis of protected attributes such as race or gender [5, 6]. Therefore, ensuring fairness with respect to the protected attributes of ML models is an important requirement. It is crucial for ML models to be highly accurate while minimizing discrimination against individuals or groups of people with regard to protected attributes.

In the ML research community, fairness-aware ML has been investigated in many domains, such as finance, healthcare, and education [6]. However, there are a few studies of fairness-aware ML in the banking sector, especially credit scoring problem. The pioneering work of Bono et al. [7] was the first empirical study of the accuracy and statistical fairness of different credit scoring technologies in the UK context. The experiments were conducted on only a dataset collected in the UK. Then, Kozodoi et al. [8] provided an evaluation of different fairness-aware classifiers on credit scoring datasets. However, they reported the experimental results on only three fairness measures. The literature review by [9] offered a thorough analysis of the fairness of credit scoring models in relation to mortgage accessibility for underserved populations. The current work of [10] focuses on analyzing the trade-off between performance and fairness of several fairness-aware ML techniques. However, they reported the results on only two fairness measures (demographic parity and equalized odds). Recently, Hurlin et al. [11] presented a framework aimed at formally testing the null hypothesis of fairness and helping lenders and regulatory bodies identify the factors driving unfair outcomes. But the experimental results were reported on only the German credit dataset.

¹<https://boostylabs.com/blog/digital-transformation-in-banking>

Furthermore, the choice of the fairness criterion has severe consequences for the social impact of lending decisions with credit scoring [12]. Without constraints, a scoring model leverages all available (including sensitive) information, potentially discriminating against protected groups if doing so improves predictive performance. The goal of incorporating fairness is to modify decision-making (*i.e.*, scoring) practices to achieve equitable, non-discriminatory outcomes. Indeed, more than 20 fairness measures have been introduced in the domain of fairness-aware ML [13]. Therefore, choosing a suitable fairness measure for the credit scoring problem is not a straightforward circumstance since no metric is universal and fits all circumstances [13, 14]. Hence, a comprehensive review and evaluation of fairness-aware ML models and fairness notions on the credit scoring problem is needed.

In this work, we summarize the prevalent notions of fairness and evaluate the well-known fairness-aware classification models on diverse public credit scoring datasets. Our work makes the following key contributions:

- We provide an overview of fairness-aware ML and prevalent fairness measures applicable to the credit scoring problem.
- We analyze popular credit scoring datasets using Bayesian networks and data analytics.
- We present a comprehensive evaluation of traditional and fairness-aware classification models on credit scoring datasets.

This paper is structured as follows: Section 2 provides an introduction to fairness-aware ML techniques and the fairness-aware ML models that can be used for credit scoring problem. Section 3 describes the most popular fairness measures used in fairness-aware ML models. The following section 4 demonstrates an overview of the datasets used for credit scoring. Next, section 5 evaluates fairness-aware ML models with fairness notions and credit scoring results from the predictive models. Finally, we offer our conclusions and present some possible future directions for research in Section 6.

2 Fairness-aware machine learning (for credit scoring)

In this section, we provide an overview of fairness-aware predictive models designed for classification tasks in the financial domain, with a particular focus on models potentially applicable to credit scoring problem. We review three main categories of fairness-aware predictive models: pre-processing, in-processing, and post-processing.

2.1 Formulation of the credit scoring problem

In this paper, we consider the credit scoring problem as a binary classification problem [2].

We denote D as a dataset with class attribute $Y = \{+, -\}$; e.g., $Y = \{\textit{good credit}, \textit{bad credit}\}$ or $Y = \{\textit{accepted}, \textit{rejected}\}$, etc. A binary protected attribute is denoted by S , $S \in \{s, \bar{s}\}$ where s is the protected group and \bar{s} is the non-protected group; e.g., $S = \textit{Sex}$ and $S \in \{\textit{female}, \textit{male}\}$. $\hat{Y} = \{+, -\}$ is the predicted class. Hence, the protected and non-protected groups with respect to positive (negative, respectively) classes are s_+ (s_-), \bar{s}_+ (\bar{s}_-). We refer to the positive class as the target class, e.g., *good credit*.

The goal of the fairness-aware classification model in the credit scoring problem is to find a map function $f : D \mapsto Y$ that minimizes the loss and mitigates the discriminatory outcomes simultaneously.

2.2 Fairness-aware ML models

There are three approaches to mitigate bias in the ML models and achieve fairness: 1) pre-processing methods, 2) in-processing methods, and 3) post-processing methods [5, 14].

In the pre-processing approach, researchers focus on the data, which are the primary source of bias. The goal is to generate a “balanced” dataset and then apply any ML algorithms to that. For example, the class labels are altered, different weights are assigned to instances, or the protected and unprotected groups are balanced in the training set. Techniques such as learning fair representations aim to encode data effectively while obscuring protected attributes [15]. Similarly, the disparate impact remover adjusts feature values to enhance group fairness while preserving rank-ordering within groups [16].

In-processing approaches reformulate the classification problem by explicitly incorporating the model’s discrimination behavior in the objective function through regularization or constraints or by training on latent target labels. Besides, an in-processing approach involves incorporating a model’s discrimination behavior into the objective function by regularizing or constraining it. According to Agarwal’s method, a fair classification can be reduced to a series of cost-sensitive classification problems with the lowest (empirical) error under the desired constraints [17]. AdaFair [18], a sequential fair ensemble, extends AdaBoost’s weighted distribution approach by taking into account the cumulative fairness of the learner up until the current boosting round and moreover, accounts for class imbalance by optimizing for balanced error instead of an overall error.

Unlike the above two approaches, the post-processing method post-process the classification models once they have been learned from data. It involves altering the model’s internals (white-box approaches) or its predictions (black-box approaches). White-box post-processing methods adjust the internal decision-making criteria of a model [19]. For example, decision thresholds might be altered to balance outcomes across sensitive groups. This requires direct access to the model’s decision rules, making it most suitable for scenarios where model transparency is available. Black-box post-processing methods, by contrast, operate solely on the model’s outputs [20]. This makes them model-agnostic and widely applicable. For instance, calibrated equalized odds

post-processing optimizes calibrated classifier score outputs to determine the probabilities of altering output labels to achieve equalized odds [21]. Similarly, equalized odds post-processing uses linear programming to find probabilities for modifying output labels, ensuring equalized odds objectives are met [22].

In this work, we demonstrate the performance of the three above approaches with 6 well-known models: 1) Pre-processing approach: Learning fair representations (LFR), Disparate impact remover (DIR); 2) In-processing approach: Agarwal’s, AdaFair; 3) Post-processing approach: Equalized odds post-processing (EOP), Calibrated equalized odds post-processing (CEP).

3 Fairness measures

We perform the evaluation on the most popular group fairness notions which are used to determine how fair the model’s results are. The fairness notion may be turned into measures by taking a difference or a ratio of the equation components [23]. Therefore, in this paper, we use the terms “fairness notion” and “fairness measure” interchangeably. The fairness measures are chosen based on the number of citations². In all fairness measures, a higher value indicates a larger difference in predictions between the two groups, so the model is less fair, i.e., 0 stands for no discrimination. Table 1 provides an overview of fairness measures. The fairness measures are defined as below using the notations described in Section 2.1.

Table 1: An overview of fairness measures

Fairness measures	Proposed by	#Citations	Value range
Statistical parity (SP)	Dwork et al. [24]	4398	$[-1, 1]$
Equal opportunity (EO)	Hardt et al. [22]	4935	$[0, 1]$
Equalized odds (EOd)	Hardt et al. [22]	2748	$[0, 1]$
Predictive parity (PP)	Chouldechova [25]	2461	$[0, 1]$
Predictive equality (PE)	Corbett-Davies et al. [26]	1545	$[0, 1]$
Treatment equality (TE)	Berk et al. [27]	1170	$(-\infty, \infty)$
ABROCA	Gardner et al. [28]	191	$[0, 1]$

Statistical parity (SP)

$$SP = P(\hat{Y} = + | S = \bar{s}) - P(\hat{Y} = + | S = s) \quad (1)$$

Equal opportunity (EO)

$$EO = | P(\hat{Y} = - | Y = +, S = \bar{s}) - P(\hat{Y} = - | Y = +, S = s) | \quad (2)$$

Equalized odds (EOd)

$$EOd = \sum_{y \in \{+, -\}} | P(\hat{Y} = + | S = s, Y = y) - P(\hat{Y} = + | S = \bar{s}, Y = y) | \quad (3)$$

²Reported by Google Scholar on 21st October 2024

Predictive parity (PP)

$$PP = | P(Y = + | \hat{Y} = +, S = s) - P(Y = + | \hat{Y} = +, S = \bar{s}) | \quad (4)$$

Predictive equality (PE)

$$PE = | P(\hat{Y} = + | Y = -, S = s) - P(\hat{Y} = + | Y = -, S = \bar{s}) | \quad (5)$$

Treatment equality (TE) Treatment equality is computed based on False Negative (FN) and False Positive (FP) of the protected group (prot.) and non-protected (non-prot.) groups.

$$\frac{FN_{prot.}}{FP_{prot.}} = \frac{FN_{non-prot.}}{FP_{non-prot.}} \quad (6)$$

Absolute Between-ROC³ Area (ABROCA) It measures the divergence between the protected (ROC_s) and non-protected group ($ROC_{\bar{s}}$) curves across all possible thresholds $t \in [0, 1]$ of false positive rates (FPR) and true positive rates (TPR). The absolute difference between the two curves is calculated to account for cases where the curves intersect.

$$\int_0^1 | ROC_s(t) - ROC_{\bar{s}}(t) | dt \quad (7)$$

4 Datasets for credit scoring

This section provides a systematic view of financial datasets used for credit scoring problem. We perform fundamental analysis to discover bias in the dataset itself by analyzing the association of protected attributes with class attributes.

To identify the relevant datasets, we use several research databases such as Google Scholar⁴, Paper With Code⁵, ResearchGate⁶, ScienceDirect⁷ with “datasets for credit scoring” as the primary query term to narrow down the search. We take into account the resulting papers from 2010 to 2021 because this was the post-global recession period [29, 30], and credit lending became a challenging issue due to the emergence of various inequalities and a lack of transparency in credit activities. Fig. 1 illustrates the use of found datasets in scientific works. We select datasets for our experiments based on several criteria: 1) The dataset must contain the protected attributes, such as gender, race, etc.; 2) The dataset must have the “target/class” attribute which is used

³ROC: Receiver operating characteristic

⁴<https://scholar.google.com/>

⁵<https://paperswithcode.com/>

⁶<https://www.researchgate.net/>

⁷<https://www.sciencedirect.com/>




Fig. 1: The use of credit scoring datasets

for classification operation; 3) The dataset must have more than 500 instances. To this end, we employ 6 datasets for our evaluation⁸, described in Table 2.

Table 2: An overview of credit scoring datasets

Datasets	#Instances	#Instances (cleaned)	#Attributes	Protected attribute(s)	Class label (positive)	IR (+:-)
Credit approval	690	678	15	Sex, Age	Approved	1:1.23
Credit card clients	30,000	30,000	23	Sex, Education, Marital status	Default payment	1:3.52
Credit scoring	8,755	8,755	17	Age, Sex, Marital status	Good credit	11.58:1
German credit	1,000	1,000	21	Age, Sex	Good credit	2.33:1
Home Credit	307,511	8,602	123	Sex, Marital status	Payment difficulty	1:15.35
PAKDD credit	50,000	38,896	47	Age, Sex, Marital status	Bad credit	2.83:1

In the next step, inspired by the work of [6], we perform the fundamental data analysis to investigate bias in the dataset by using the Bayesian network (BN) [31]. The BN is used to discover the relationship between protected attributes and class label. If the generated BN reveals any direct or indirect connection between a protected attribute and the class attribute, we can infer that the dataset may be biased with respect to that specific protected attribute. We also transform the numerical attributes into categorical attributes in order to reduce the computation complexity of the BN generator [32]. Regarding the generated BN of the *Credit card clients* and *German credit* datasets, we refer to [6].

4.1 Credit approval dataset

The credit approval dataset⁹ (another name: Australian credit approval dataset) contains information of 690 credit card applications. The classification task is to predict whether an application is approved or not (class

⁸We use the term “Sex” to refer to “Gender”, “Marital status” to refer to “Marriage”, “Family status”. Abbreviation: IR: Imbalance ratio.

⁹<http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/credit+approval>




Fig. 2: Credit approval: Bayesian network (class label: *Class*, protected attributes: *Age*, *Sex*).

attribute: *Approved*). The positive class is approved (value +). To generate the BN, we discretize $age = \{< 25, \geq 25\}$; the continuous variables *Debt*, *YearsEmployed*, *CreditScore* and *Income* are encoded based on their median value: $Debt = \{\leq 2.875, > 2.875\}$, $YearsEmployed = \{\leq 1, > 1\}$, $Income = \{\leq 5, > 5\}$. Fig. 2 depicts the BN of the credit approval dataset where the class label is highlighted in yellow, while the protected attributes are colored in blue. In the BN, there is a strong relationship between *Class* and *Bank account* attributes. The analysis shows that 79.55% of people with bank accounts ($Bank\ account = "Yes"$) are approved for credit, while the rate among people without bank accounts is only 5.86% (Fig.3).

4.2 Credit card clients dataset

The credit card clients dataset¹⁰ consists of information about 30,000 customers in Taiwan in October 2005 [33]. The prediction task is to forecast if

¹⁰<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/350/default+of+credit+card+clients>




Fig. 3: Credit approval: Relationship between class label and *Bank account* attribute.

a customer will face the default situation in the next month or not (class attribute: Y). The positive class is default payment (value 0).

4.3 Credit scoring dataset

The credit scoring dataset¹¹ has 8,755 records of customers collected by a FinTech company in Central Asia. The dataset was published on Kaggle in 2021 by Davronov. Predicting whether a customer has good credit (value 1) is the main goal (class attribute: *label*). We categorize two numerical attributes based on their median value: $INPS_mln_sum = \{ \leq 1.7, > 1.7 \}$ and $Score_point = \{ \leq 0, > 0 \}$. Fig. 4 demonstrates the BN of the Credit scoring dataset. There is an indirect relationship between the class *label* and *Sex* attribute which might imply a bias in the dataset.

4.4 German credit dataset

The German credit dataset¹² contains observations for 1000 applicants for credit. It was published on the UCI repository website by Prof. Dr. Hans Hofmann [34]. The goal is to predict whether a customer has good (value 1) or bad credit (value 2) (class attribute: *class-label*). The positive class is good (value 1).

4.5 Home Credit dataset

The Home Credit dataset¹³ belongs to the Home Credit Default Risk competition organized by Kaggle in 2017, with over 7,000 participating teams. Home Credit is a credit institution established in 1997 in the Czech Republic, with its headquarters in the Netherlands, and operates in 10 countries. The target attribute is *TARGET* intending to predict whether the customer faces

¹¹ <https://www.kaggle.com/code/islombekdavronov/credit-scoring>

¹² <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/144/statlog+german+credit+data>

¹³ <https://www.kaggle.com/competitions/home-credit-default-risk/data>




Fig. 4: Credit scoring: Bayesian network (class label: *Label*, protected attributes: *Age*, *Marital*, *Sex*).

payment difficulty or not (value 1). We encode the numerical attributes as below based on their median value: $Amt_income_total = \{\leq 193500, > 193500\}$, $Amt_credit = \{\leq 585000, > 585000\}$, $Amt_annuity = \{\leq 29209.5, > 29209.5\}$, $Amt_goods_price = \{\leq 495000, > 495000\}$, $Own_car_age = \{\leq 8, > 8\}$, $Region_population_relative = \{\leq 0.020246, > 0.020246\}$, $Days_employed = \{\leq -1680.5, > -1680.5\}$.

The BN of this dataset is visualized in Fig. 5. The attribute *Name_contract_type* has many relationships with others such as income (*Amt_income_total*) and gender. Fig. 6 reveals that the female's income is lower than the male's income because the percentage of males with high income reaches 57.3%, while for females, this rate is only 43.7%. In addition, customers rated as having good credit often have a higher borrowing demand than those with bad credit ratings. Up to 55.32% opt for cash loans, and 97.03% choose revolving credit options (Fig. 7). Credit rating agencies currently view cash




Fig. 5: Home Credit: Bayesian network (class label: *TARGET*, protected attributes: *CODE_GENDER*, *NAME_FAMILY_STATUS*).




Fig. 6: Home Credit: Relationship between income and gender.

loans as less risky than revolving loans because cash loans often require fixed assets as collateral, providing lenders with greater security [35].

4.6 PAKDD 2009 credit risk assessment dataset

The PAKDD credit risk assessment dataset¹⁴ was provided by the PAKDD data mining competition in 2009 with 50,000 instances. The class label is *TARGET_LABEL_BAD*, intending to predict if a customer has bad credit. Therefore, the positive class in this dataset is set based on the value *TARGET_LABEL_BAD* = 1 (bad credit). To generate the BN, we remote attributes with too many distinct values, such as *Id_client*, *Professional_code*, *Residential_phone_area_code*. Moreover, we discrete continues attributes based on their median: *Quant_dependants* = { ≤ 0 , > 0 }; *Months_in_residence* = { ≤ 5 , > 5 }; *Personal_monthly_income* = { ≤ 500 , > 500 }. Fig. 8 depicts the BN

¹⁴<https://github.com/JLZml/Credit-Scoring-Data-Sets>




Fig. 7: Home Credit: Relationship between income and type of contract.




Fig. 8: PAKDD credit: Bayesian network (class label: *TARGET_LABEL_BAD*, protected attributes: *AGE*, *SEX*, *MARITAL_STATUS*).

of the PAKDD credit dataset. *Sex* attribute has an indirect connection with the class label. We observe that up to 53.16% of female customers have bad credit ratings when their monthly income is low (below 500). Nevertheless, even among female customers with good credit ratings, the proportion in the higher income group (above 500) remains not high (Fig. 9).



Fig. 9: PAKDD credit: Relationship between *Sex*, *Personal_monthly_income* and class label.

5 Evaluation

We experiment with selected fairness-aware predictive models using prevalent fairness measures and various financial datasets to evaluate the performance of a wide range of predictive models (traditional models, pre-processing, in-processing, and post-processing fairness-aware predictive models). The preliminary results are the primary means of selecting the appropriate fairness-aware predictive models and fairness measures for credit scoring problem.

5.1 Experimental setups

5.1.1 Predictive models

Traditional predictive models. We perform experiments on four well-known traditional classification models, namely 1) Decision Tree (DT); 2) Naive Bayes (NB); 3) Multi-layer Perceptron (MLP); and 4) k-nearest neighbors (kNN).

Fairness-aware ML models. Three groups of fairness-aware ML models are chosen: 1) Pre-processing approach: Learning fair representations (LFR) [15], Disparate impact remover (DIR) [16]; 2) In-processing approach: Agarwal's [17], Adafair [18]; 3) Post-processing approach: Calibrated equalized odds post-processing (CEP) [21], Equalized odds post-processing (EOP) [22].

5.1.2 Training and test sets

We use 70% of the data for training and 30% for testing with a single split. All traditional predicted models are implemented and executed with default

parameters provided by the Scikit-learn toolkit¹⁵. Regarding fairness-aware ML models, we use the implementation of [18] and the AI Fairness 360 toolkit¹⁶ to execute Agarwal’s, LFR, DIR, EOP and CEP methods. In addition, we combine the use of pre-processing and post-processing models with the traditional approaches. In detail, the resulting datasets of pre-processing models, i.e., fair dataset, will be the input of traditional models. Similarly, the outcome of traditional models will be processed by the post-processing fairness-aware models in order to mitigate bias and achieve fairness in the final output. *Sex* is selected as the protected attribute for all datasets due to its popularity.

We report the prediction performance of classification models for each dataset in the accuracy (Acc.) and balanced accuracy (BA) measures because most datasets are imbalanced, as demonstrated in the imbalance ratio (IR) column of Table 2.

5.2 Experimental results

5.2.1 Credit approval dataset

The experimental results on the Credit approval dataset are presented in Table 3 and Fig. 10. The dashed lines are used to separate the group of predictive models (traditional, pre-processing, in-processing, and post-processing approaches). The best results are in **bold**.

It is obvious that (fair) classification models cannot satisfy multiple fairness measures simultaneously. Among fairness-aware models, AdaFair is the best model in terms of accuracy (0.8431) and balanced accuracy (0.8538). Besides, LFR-kNN is a notable model with the best performance on SP, EO, EOd, PE and ABROCA measures. However, its accuracy and balanced accuracy are very low with values 0.5588 and 0.5, respectively. In addition, most pre-processing models prioritize fairness at the cost of significant reductions in accuracy and balanced accuracy. For the TE measures, as defined in Eq. 6, the result may be “NaN” if the denominator equals zero. In addition, ne limitation of the post-processing models is the inability to obtain ABROCA values, as calculating ABROCA requires model probabilities across multiple thresholds. This is reflected as “NaN” values in Table 3. Overall, the in-processing approach outperforms pre-processing and post-processing approaches in terms of trade-off between predictive performance and fairness constraints.

5.2.2 Credit card clients dataset

Table 4 and Fig. 11 present the experimental results of predictive models on the dataset of credit card clients. AdaFair once again demonstrates its ability to make accurate predictions while maintaining fairness, standing out as a fair classification model with the best accuracy and balanced accuracy, at 0.82 and 0.6392, respectively. The pre-processing models show locally good results,

¹⁵<https://scikit-learn.org/>

¹⁶<https://github.com/Trusted-AI/AIF360>

Table 3: Credit approval: performance of predictive models

Model	BA	Acc.	SP	EO	EOd	PP	PE	TE	ABROCA
DT	0.7646	0.7696	0.0840	0.0962	0.1167	0.0536	0.0205	0.2190	0.0378
NB	0.7629	0.7794	0.0530	0.0637	0.0729	0.0647	0.0092	-0.5357	0.0483
MLP	0.7038	0.7107	0.0922	0.0950	0.1432	0.0414	0.0482	0.2697	0.1005
kNN	0.6494	0.6617	-0.1051	0.0084	0.0638	0.1131	0.0554	-0.6150	0.0664
DIR-DT	0.5421	0.5196	0.0137	0.1117	0.1774	0.1241	0.0656	0.0142	0.0887
DIR-NB	0.8263	0.8333	-0.0423	0.1659	0.1874	0.0304	0.0215	-1.6500	0.0471
DIR-MLP	0.7360	0.7402	0.0081	0.0649	0.1469	0.1469	0.0820	-0.3818	0.0630
DIR-kNN	0.6570	0.6715	0.0058	0.0468	0.1032	0.1348	0.0564	-0.6333	0.0668
LFR-DT	0.5055	0.5637	-0.0154	0.0384	0.0384	0.0	0.0	NaN	0.0897
LFR-NB	0.5356	0.5882	-0.0184	0.0913	0.1180	0.3333	0.0267	NaN	0.0487
LFR-MLP	0.5523	0.6030	-0.0419	0.1526	0.1793	0.2857	0.0266	NaN	0.0410
LFR-kNN	0.5	0.5588	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NaN	0.0036
AdaFair	0.8538	0.8431	0.0607	0.0240	0.0722	0.0020	0.0482	-0.0855	0.0361
Agarwal's	0.7851	0.7990	0.0366	0.0180	0.0272	0.0504	0.0092	-0.7500	0.0268
EOP-DT	0.7646	0.7696	0.0840	0.0962	0.1167	0.0536	0.0205	0.2190	NaN
EOP-NB	0.7628	0.7794	0.0530	0.0637	0.0729	0.0647	0.0092	-0.5357	NaN
EOP-MLP	0.6938	0.7010	0.1373	0.1334	0.2339	0.0052	0.1005	0.7143	NaN
EOP-kNN	0.628	0.6421	0.0203	0.1238	0.2048	0.1948	0.0810	-0.4559	NaN
CEP-DT	0.7646	0.7696	0.0840	0.0961	0.1166	0.0536	0.0205	0.2190	NaN
CEP-NB	0.7573	0.7745	0.0458	0.0481	0.0573	0.0616	0.0092	-0.6786	NaN
CEP-MLP	0.6982	0.7059	0.1075	0.1334	0.1816	0.0572	0.0482	0.3947	NaN
CEP-kNN	0.6304	0.6471	0.0972	0.2007	0.2048	0.1731	0.0041	0.1830	NaN

such as LFR-kNN, which achieves the best performance on EOd and TE; DIR-DT, which excels in PP; and LFR-DT, which has the best performance on the ABROCA measure. However, all of them have lower accuracy and balanced accuracy compared to traditional classification models.

Table 4: Credit card clients: performance of predictive models

Model	BA	Acc.	SP	EO	EOd	PP	PE	TE	ABROCA
DT	0.6131	0.7277	0.0308	0.0263	0.0656	0.0275	0.0393	0.0071	0.0324
NB	0.5599	0.3778	-0.0034	0.0308	0.0311	0.0226	0.0002	-0.0184	0.0238
MLP	0.6111	0.5782	0.0523	0.0403	0.0883	0.0231	0.0481	0.0148	0.0193
kNN	0.5435	0.7530	0.0153	0.0089	0.0230	0.0105	0.0142	0.0454	0.0115
DIR-DT	0.6099	0.7187	0.029	0.0034	0.0342	0.0011	0.0308	-0.0079	0.0174
DIR-NB	0.5674	0.4104	0.0121	0.0174	0.0333	0.0215	0.0158	-0.0152	0.0240
DIR-MLP	0.5301	0.7814	0.0245	0.0258	0.0479	0.1022	0.0220	7.9436	0.0129
DIR-kNN	0.5471	0.7511	0.0053	0.0106	0.0111	0.0482	0.0005	-0.3479	0.0101
LFR-DT	0.5798	0.5897	0.0476	0.0039	0.0586	0.0061	0.0546	-0.0043	0.0062
LFR-NB	0.4831	0.7103	-0.0053	0.0081	0.0161	0.0457	0.0079	-0.5013	0.0063
LFR-MLP	0.4514	0.6406	0.0117	0.0264	0.0373	0.0384	0.0109	-0.8892	0.0074
LFR-kNN	0.4967	0.2270	-0.0044	0.0051	0.0091	0.0267	0.0040	-0.0026	0.0106
AdaFair	0.6392	0.8200	0.0045	0.0342	0.0402	0.0207	0.0059	-0.2942	0.0202
Agarwal's	0.5025	0.5270	0.0045	0.0228	0.0238	0.0362	0.0009	-0.0392	0.0098
EOP-DT	0.6132	0.7278	0.0305	0.0263	0.0652	0.0271	0.0389	0.0056	NaN
EOP-NB	0.5548	0.3714	0.0090	0.0379	0.0566	0.0165	0.0187	-0.0199	NaN
EOP-MLP	0.6073	0.5812	0.0138	0.0026	0.0137	0.0267	0.0110	-0.0311	NaN
EOP-kNN	0.5416	0.7534	0.0062	0.0053	0.0119	0.0107	0.0066	-0.2388	NaN
CEP-DT	0.6131	0.7277	0.0308	0.0263	0.0656	0.0275	0.0393	0.0071	NaN
CEP-NB	0.5599	0.3778	-0.0035	0.0308	0.0311	0.0226	0.0002	-0.0184	NaN
CEP-MLP	0.6111	0.5782	0.0522	0.0403	0.0883	0.0231	0.0481	0.0148	NaN
CEP-kNN	0.5407	0.7561	0.0302	0.0322	0.0590	0.0051	0.0268	0.6475	NaN

5.2.3 Credit scoring dataset

The results are described in Table 5 and Fig. 12. With regard to predictive performance, AdaFair once again outperforms others models with very high

accuracy (0.9939) and balanced accuracy (0.9927). Besides, the pre-processing model LFR-MLP shows a perfect result on multiple fairness measures, such as SP, EO, EOd, PE and TE. Nevertheless, the balanced accuracy on this model is low. The traditional MLP model stands out with the best performance on the ABROCA notion (0.0005). The pre-processing LFR model is disappointing due to its very low balanced accuracy (below 0.5), whereas the DIR model performs better by achieving both accurate classification results and high-quality fairness measures.

Table 5: Credit scoring: performance of predictive models

Model	BA	Acc.	SP	EO	EOd	PP	PE	TE	ABROCA
DT	0.9761	0.9924	0.0345	0.0032	0.0269	0.0003	0.0238	0.8333	0.0132
NB	0.8785	0.9585	0.0448	0.0149	0.1126	0.0003	0.0976	0.7148	0.0088
MLP	0.9923	0.9931	0.0299	0.0001	0.0124	0.0013	0.0122	NaN	0.0005
kNN	0.8447	0.9581	0.0460	0.0236	0.0596	0.0082	0.0359	0.7267	0.0238
DIR-DT	0.9713	0.9908	0.0361	0.0009	0.0764	0.0043	0.0754	1.0286	0.0377
DIR-NB	0.9612	0.9292	0.0934	0.0702	0.0702	0.0	0.0	NaN	0.0064
DIR-MLP	0.9820	0.9924	0.0284	0.0001	0.0218	0.0029	0.0217	-3.6667	0.0006
DIR-kNN	0.8378	0.9562	0.0503	0.0267	0.0868	0.0068	0.0601	0.8279	0.0222
LFR-DT	0.4674	0.7632	0.0143	0.0191	0.0360	0.0365	0.0169	-0.7024	0.0057
LFR-NB	0.4683	0.8549	-0.0611	0.0642	0.0642	0.0276	0.0	-1.0684	0.0235
LFR-MLP	0.5	0.9128	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0312	0.0	0.0	0.0644
LFR-kNN	0.4674	0.7632	0.0143	0.0191	0.0360	0.0365	0.0169	-0.7024	0.0232
AdaFair	0.9927	0.9939	0.0319	0.0023	0.0146	0.0014	0.0123	NaN	0.0073
Agarwal's	0.9077	0.9649	0.0421	0.0157	0.0442	0.0038	0.0284	0.7200	0.0405
EOP-DT	0.9761	0.9924	0.0345	0.0032	0.0269	0.0030	0.0238	0.8333	NaN
EOP-NB	0.8598	0.9532	0.0273	0.0012	0.0498	0.0053	0.0486	-0.2118	NaN
EOP-MLP	0.9901	0.9928	0.0293	0.0001	0.0185	0.0020	0.0184	NaN	NaN
EOP-kNN	0.8317	0.9524	0.0311	0.0126	0.0286	0.0129	0.0160	0.1192	NaN
CEP-DT	0.9761	0.9924	0.0345	0.0032	0.0270	0.0034	0.0238	0.8333	NaN
CEP-NB	0.8617	0.9566	0.0561	0.0182	0.2371	0.0081	0.2189	1.0442	NaN
CEP-MLP	0.9901	0.9928	0.0309	0.0001	0.0030	0.0002	0.0029	-1.000	NaN
CEP-kNN	0.8229	0.9543	0.0563	0.0236	0.2111	0.0022	0.1875	0.7728	NaN

5.2.4 German credit dataset

The experimental results of predictive models on German credit dataset are reported in Table 6 and Fig. 13. Concerning classification performance, the traditional NB model delivers the best results with an accuracy of 0.73 and a balanced accuracy of 0.6604. Regarding fairness constraint, AdaFair and LFR-MLP share the top rank with the perfect results on multiple fairness measures, including SP, EO, EOd, PE and TE. However, their balanced accuracy score is low with 0.5. The pre-processing technique DIR is quite effective in achieving a better trade-off between model accuracy and fairness. While post-processing models have relatively fair classification quality, they do not excel in terms of fairness constraints.

5.2.5 Home Credit dataset

The evaluation results are depicted in Table 7 and Fig. 14. In terms of performance, all predictive models show very low results in balanced accuracy, despite having very high accuracy (approximately 90%). This result can be

Table 6: German credit: performance of predictive models

Model	BA	Acc.	SP	EO	EOd	PP	PE	TE	ABROCA
DT	0.5954	0.6567	0.0485	0.0160	0.1807	0.0292	0.1646	0.0769	0.0903
NB	0.6604	0.7300	0.0019	0.0614	0.1615	0.0166	0.1001	-0.2557	0.1012
MLP	0.6095	0.6634	-0.0669	0.0936	0.1292	0.0214	0.0356	-0.6250	0.0697
kNN	0.5348	0.6500	0.0641	0.0670	0.1171	0.0391	0.0501	0.1399	0.0458
DIR-DT	0.6221	0.6767	-0.0736	0.0972	0.1489	0.0263	0.0517	-0.6653	0.0227
DIR-NB	0.6392	0.7133	-0.0094	0.0511	0.0983	0.0043	0.0473	-0.2667	0.0970
DIR-MLP	0.5676	0.7000	-0.0326	0.0625	0.0781	0.0169	0.0156	-0.2178	0.1114
DIR-kNN	0.5118	0.6267	-0.0144	0.0608	0.1431	0.0018	0.0823	-0.2114	0.1223
LFR-DT	0.5686	0.5933	-0.0174	0.0646	0.1325	0.0128	0.0679	-0.3510	0.0032
LFR-NB	0.4861	0.5433	-0.0592	0.0410	0.1361	0.0546	0.095	-0.5092	0.0342
LFR-MLP	0.5	0.6967	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0371	0.0	0.0	0.0545
LFR-kNN	0.5467	0.6667	-0.0570	0.0649	0.1161	0.0336	0.0512	-0.2826	0.0434
AdaFair	0.5	0.6967	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0371	0.0	0.0	0.0534
Agarwal's	0.6289	0.7033	-0.0945	0.1116	0.2001	0.0350	0.0884	-0.6364	0.0384
EOP-DT	0.5954	0.6567	0.0485	0.0160	0.1807	0.0292	0.1646	0.0769	NaN
EOP-NB	0.6286	0.6900	-0.0935	0.1347	0.1703	0.0131	0.0356	-0.7500	NaN
EOP-MLP	0.5990	0.6533	-0.0877	0.1069	0.1770	0.0297	0.0701	-0.7279	NaN
EOP-kNN	0.5309	0.6533	0.0877	0.0870	0.1693	0.0357	0.0823	0.2190	NaN
CEP-DT	0.5954	0.6567	0.0485	0.0160	0.1807	0.0292	0.1646	0.0769	NaN
CEP-NB	0.6153	0.7233	0.1151	0.0120	0.3218	0.0597	0.3098	0.1980	NaN
CEP-MLP	0.5667	0.6600	0.0510	0.0136	0.1877	0.0227	0.1741	0.0208	NaN
CEP-kNN	0.5257	0.6633	0.1396	0.1337	0.2805	0.0307	0.1468	0.3783	NaN

partly explained by the high IR of 1:15.35 (see Table 2). Regarding fairness constraints, all in-processing methods show the perfect results on all fairness measures, especially Agarwal's method. Besides, pre-processing and post-processing methods perform well when combined with traditional classification models such as NB and MLP.

Table 7: Home Credit: performance of predictive models

Model	BA	Acc.	SP	EO	EOd	PP	PE	TE	ABROCA
DT	0.5370	0.8795	0.0273	0.0138	0.0430	0.0358	0.0292	0.1812	0.0215
NB	0.5	0.9396	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NaN	0.0795
MLP	0.5	0.9396	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NaN	0.0004
kNN	0.5013	0.9365	-0.0017	0.0118	0.0143	0.2500	0.0026	-16.1667	0.0369
DIR-DT	0.5654	0.8935	0.0090	0.0169	0.0242	0.0167	0.0073	-0.0094	0.0051
DIR-NB	0.5	0.9396	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NaN	0.0750
DIR-MLP	0.4988	0.9372	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-70.8000	0.0014
DIR-kNN	0.4988	0.9372	-8.830	0.0	7.1436	0.0	7.1436	-4.6667	0.0297
LFR-DT	0.5187	0.3491	0.0224	0.0910	0.1086	0.0150	0.0177	0.0052	0.0367
LFR-NB	0.5	0.9396	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NaN	NaN
LFR-MLP	0.5	0.0604	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0086	0.0	0.0	0.0055
LFR-kNN	0.5	0.9396	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NaN	NaN
AdaFair	0.5	0.9396	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NaN	0.0359
Agarwal's	0.5	0.9396	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NaN	0.0
EOP-DT	0.5370	0.8795	0.0273	0.0138	0.0430	0.0358	0.0292	0.1812	NaN
EOP-NB	0.5	0.9396	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NaN	NaN
EOP-MLP	0.5	0.9396	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NaN	NaN
EOP-kNN	0.5135	0.9365	-0.0017	0.0118	0.0143	0.2500	0.0026	-16.1667	NaN
CEP-DT	0.5370	0.8795	0.0273	0.0138	0.0430	0.0358	0.0292	0.1812	NaN
CEP-NB	0.5	0.9396	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NaN	NaN
CEP-MLP	0.5	0.9396	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NaN	NaN
CEP-kNN	0.5016	0.9368	-0.0009	0.0118	0.0135	0.2500	0.0017	-13.8000	NaN

5.2.6 PAKDD credit dataset

In the PAKDD credit risk assessment dataset, all methods exhibit low performance in balanced accuracy, as presented in Table 8 and Fig. 15. The in-processing approach, AdaFair, achieves superior performance with the best values on 6 out of 9 measures, including accuracy and 5 fairness measures. Besides, in the group of pre-processing approach, although LFR-NB achieves fairness in classification results (with respect to TE and ABROCA measures), its accuracy is significantly reduced. The post-processing approach outperform other models in terms of balanced accuracy.

Table 8: PAKDD credit: performance of predictive models

Model	BA	Acc.	SP	EO	EOd	PP	PE	TE	ABROCA
DT	0.5241	0.6244	0.0124	0.0325	0.0358	0.0476	0.0033	-0.0707	0.0146
NB	0.5088	0.7256	0.0022	0.0087	0.0143	0.0523	0.0056	0.3997	0.0110
MLP	0.5119	0.6925	0.0655	0.0715	0.1340	0.0224	0.0624	1.5546	0.0144
kNN	0.5057	0.6822	-0.0056	0.0192	0.0201	0.0013	0.0010	-0.4404	0.0094
DIR-DT	0.5174	0.6189	0.0253	0.0116	0.0493	0.0090	0.0377	-0.0109	0.0247
DIR-NB	0.5130	0.7210	0.0251	0.0155	0.0432	0.0556	0.0277	3.4949	0.0112
DIR-MLP	0.5003	0.7351	0.0	0.0018	0.0024	5.8833	0.0006	-909.4	0.0128
DIR-kNN	0.5027	0.6810	-0.0028	0.0044	0.0101	0.0437	0.0056	-0.4816	0.0134
LFR-DT	0.4949	0.7200	0.0069	0.0013	0.0106	0.0189	0.0093	2.6914	0.0040
LFR-NB	0.5034	0.2771	-0.0088	0.0064	0.0163	0.0271	0.0100	-0.0033	0.0017
LFR-MLP	0.4986	0.7180	0.0034	0.0070	0.0145	0.0543	0.0074	0.6436	0.0072
LFR-kNN	0.5075	0.4736	0.0212	0.0024	0.0319	0.0155	0.0294	-0.0239	0.0159
AdaFair	0.5	0.7353	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NaN	0.0141
Agarwal's	0.5093	0.7263	-0.0017	0.0140	0.0162	0.0549	0.0021	-0.9031	0.0081
EOP-DT	0.5241	0.6244	0.0124	0.0325	0.0358	0.0476	0.0033	-0.0707	NaN
EOP-NB	0.5083	0.7258	-0.0009	0.0134	0.0165	0.0613	0.0031	-0.5122	NaN
EOP-MLP	0.5132	0.6854	0.0120	0.0123	0.0233	0.0270	0.0110	-0.0755	NaN
EOP-kNN	0.5057	0.6817	-0.0076	0.0214	0.0242	0.0013	0.0029	-0.4848	NaN
CEP-DT	0.5241	0.6244	0.0124	0.0325	0.0358	0.0476	0.0033	-0.0707	NaN
CEP-NB	0.5088	0.7269	0.0068	0.0037	0.0138	0.0696	0.0101	2.6232	NaN
CEP-MLP	0.5127	0.7029	0.0096	0.1051	0.2018	0.0069	0.0967	4.6288	NaN
CEP-kNN	0.5060	0.6860	0.0069	0.0070	0.0186	0.0053	0.0116	-0.1113	NaN

In summary, fairness-aware models have achieved good results by balancing model accuracy and fairness in the outcomes. As expected, fairness-aware models achieve the best values with respect to fairness measures. Among these, LFR-MLP and AdaFair are notable methods that outperform others across multiple datasets. Interestingly, AdaFair demonstrates outstanding capability by not only improving accuracy but also achieving fairness in the outcomes. This performance is evidenced in 5 out of 6 datasets (Credit Approval, Credit Card Clients, Credit Scoring, Home Credit, and PAKDD Credit). Furthermore, the difference in accuracy and balanced accuracy between traditional classification models and fairness-aware methods is not significant.

6 Conclusions and outlook

In this work, we investigated the prevalent credit scoring datasets used in ML for the finance domain. Data analysis using a Bayesian network reveals that bias naturally exists in all the selected datasets, indicating a

potential bias in the outcomes of predictive models. Furthermore, we evaluated traditional classifiers in comparison with various fairness-aware models across three approaches: pre-processing, in-processing, and post-processing. The experimental results show that the application of fairness-aware methods demonstrates an improvement in meeting both fairness and accuracy criteria compared to traditional models.

In the future, we plan to expand the evaluation of fairness to simultaneously address multiple protected attributes, such as gender and race, while further exploring the correlations between different fairness measures. Additionally, understanding commonly used datasets motivates us to research and develop fair synthetic data generation models for finance domain, as finding a perfect dataset in the real world has never been a straightforward task. Furthermore, we aim to develop fair and explainable classification algorithms to understand the root causes of bias within the algorithms themselves as well as in the datasets.

Declarations

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Competing Interests: The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Funding Information: The authors did not receive support from any organization for the submitted work.

Author Contribution: All authors contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, data collection and analysis were performed by Huyen Giang Thi Thu, Thang Viet Doan and Tai Le Quy. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Huyen Giang Thi Thu and Tai Le Quy and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Data Availability: The authors confirm that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article.

Research Involving Human and/or Animals: Not Applicable

Informed Consent: Not Applicable

Ethical Approval: Not applicable.

Consent to Participate: Not applicable.

Consent for Publication: Not applicable.

References


- [1] Bhatore, S., Mohan, L., Reddy, Y.R.: Machine learning techniques for credit risk evaluation: a systematic literature review. *Journal of Banking and Financial Technology* **4**(1), 111–138 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42786-020-00020-3>

- [2] Dastile, X., Celik, T., Potsane, M.: Statistical and machine learning models in credit scoring: A systematic literature survey. *Applied Soft Computing* **91**, 106263 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2020.106263>
- [3] Dumitrescu, E., Hué, S., Hurlin, C., Tokpavi, S.: Machine learning for credit scoring: Improving logistic regression with non-linear decision-tree effects. *European Journal of Operational Research* **297**(3), 1178–1192 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2021.06.053>
- [4] Trivedi, S.K.: A study on credit scoring modeling with different feature selection and machine learning approaches. *Technology in Society* **63**, 101413 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101413>
- [5] Ntoutsis, E., Fafalios, P., Gadiraju, U., Iosifidis, V., Nejdil, W., Vidal, M.-E., Ruggieri, S., Turini, F., Papadopoulos, S., Krasanakis, E., *et al.*: Bias in data-driven artificial intelligence systems - an introductory survey. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* **10**(3), 1356 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1002/widm.1356>
- [6] Le Quy, T., Roy, A., Iosifidis, V., Zhang, W., Ntoutsis, E.: A survey on datasets for fairness-aware machine learning. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* **12**(3), 1452 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1002/widm.1452>
- [7] Bono, T., Croxson, K., Giles, A.: Algorithmic fairness in credit scoring. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* **37**(3), 585–617 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/grab020>
- [8] Kozodoi, N., Jacob, J., Lessmann, S.: Fairness in credit scoring: Assessment, implementation and profit implications. *European Journal of Operational Research* **297**(3), 1083–1094 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2021.06.023>
- [9] Adegoke, T.I., Ofodile, O.C., Ochuba, N.A., Akinrinol, O.: Evaluating the fairness of credit scoring models: A literature review on mortgage accessibility for under-reserved populations. *GSC Advanced Research and Reviews* **18**(3), 189–199 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.30574/gscarr.2024.18.3.0104>
- [10] Mariscal, C., Yustiawan, Y., Rochim, F.C., Tanuar, E.: Implementing and analyzing fairness in banking credit scoring. *Procedia Computer Science* **234**, 1492–1499 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2024.03.150>
- [11] Hurlin, C., Pérignon, C., Saurin, S.: The fairness of credit scoring models. *Management Science* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2022.03888>

- [12] Liu, L.T., Dean, S., Rolf, E., Simchowitz, M., Hardt, M.: Delayed impact of fair machine learning. In: International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 3150–3158 (2018). PMLR
- [13] Verma, S., Rubin, J.: Fairness definitions explained. In: Proceedings of the International Workshop on Software Fairness, pp. 1–7 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3194770.3194776>
- [14] Mehrabi, N., Morstatter, F., Saxena, N., Lerman, K., Galstyan, A.: A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)* **54**(6), 1–35 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3457607>
- [15] Zemel, R., Wu, Y., Swersky, K., Pitassi, T., Dwork, C.: Learning fair representations. In: International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 325–333 (2013). PMLR
- [16] Feldman, M., Friedler, S.A., Moeller, J., Scheidegger, C., Venkatasubramanian, S.: Certifying and removing disparate impact. In: Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, pp. 259–268 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2783258.2783311>
- [17] Agarwal, A., Beygelzimer, A., Dudík, M., Langford, J., Wallach, H.: A reductions approach to fair classification. In: International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 60–69 (2018). PMLR
- [18] Iosifidis, V., Ntoutsis, E.: Adafair: Cumulative fairness adaptive boosting. In: Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, pp. 781–790 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3357384.3357974>
- [19] Kamiran, F., Calders, T.: Data preprocessing techniques for classification without discrimination. *Knowledge and information systems* **33**(1), 1–33 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10115-011-0463-8>
- [20] Kim, M.P., Ghorbani, A., Zou, J.: Multiaccuracy: Black-box post-processing for fairness in classification. In: Proceedings of the 2019 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society (AIES'19), pp. 247–254 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3306618.3314287>
- [21] Pleiss, G., Raghavan, M., Wu, F., Kleinberg, J., Weinberger, K.Q.: On fairness and calibration. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **30** (2017)
- [22] Hardt, M., Price, E., Srebro, N.: Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **29** (2016)

- [23] Žliobaitė, I.: Measuring discrimination in algorithmic decision making. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* **31**(4), 1060–1089 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10618-017-0506-1>
- [24] Dwork, C., Hardt, M., Pitassi, T., Reingold, O., Zemel, R.: Fairness through awareness. In: *Proceedings of the 3rd Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference*, pp. 214–226 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2090236.2090255>
- [25] Chouldechova, A.: Fair prediction with disparate impact: A study of bias in recidivism prediction instruments. *Big data* **5**(2), 153–163 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1089/big.2016.0047>
- [26] Corbett-Davies, S., Pierson, E., Feller, A., Goel, S., Huq, A.: Algorithmic decision making and the cost of fairness. In: *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pp. 797–806 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3097983.3098095>
- [27] Berk, R., Heidari, H., Jabbari, S., Kearns, M., Roth, A.: Fairness in criminal justice risk assessments: The state of the art. *Sociological Methods & Research* **50**(1), 3–44 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124118782533>
- [28] Gardner, J., Brooks, C., Baker, R.: Evaluating the fairness of predictive student models through slicing analysis. In: *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge*, pp. 225–234 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3303772.3303791>
- [29] McDonald, I.M.: The global financial crisis and behavioural economics. *Economic Papers: A journal of applied economics and policy* **28**(3), 249–254 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-3441.2009.00026.x>
- [30] Kose, M.A., Sugawara, N., Terrones, M.E.: *Global recessions. Prospects* (2020)
- [31] Holmes, D.E.: *Innovations in Bayesian Networks: Theory and Applications* vol. 156. Springer, ??? (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-85066-3>
- [32] Chen, Y.-C., Wheeler, T.A., Kochenderfer, M.J.: Learning discrete bayesian networks from continuous data. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* **59**, 103–132 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.5371>
- [33] Yeh, I.-C., Lien, C.-h.: The comparisons of data mining techniques for the predictive accuracy of probability of default of credit card clients. *Expert systems with applications* **36**(2), 2473–2480 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2007.12.020>


- [34] Hofmann, H.: Statlog (German Credit Data). UCI Machine Learning Repository (1994). <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5NC77>
- [35] Berger, A.N., Udell, G.F.: Collateral, loan quality and bank risk. *Journal of Monetary Economics* **25**(1), 21–42 (1990). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3932\(90\)90042-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3932(90)90042-3)



(a) DT

(b) NB


(c) MLP



(d) kNN

(e) AdaFair


(f) Agarwal's



(g) DIR-DT

(h) DIR-NB


(i) DIR-MLP



(j) DIR-kNN

(k) LFR-DT

(l) LFR-NB



(m) LFR-MLP

(n) LFR-kNN

Fig. 10: Credit approval: ABROCA slice plots




Fig. 11: Credit card: ABROCA slice plots










Fig. 12: Credit scoring: ABROCA slice plots




(a) DT

(b) NB


(c) MLP




(d) kNN




(e) AdaFair




(f) Agarwal's




(g) DIR-DT




(h) DIR-NB




(i) DIR-MLP




(j) DIR-kNN




(k) LFR-DT



(l) LFR-NB



(m) LFR-MLP



(n) LFR-kNN

Fig. 13: German credit: ABROCA slice plots






Fig. 14: Home Credit: ABROCA slice plots



(a) DT

(b) NB


(c) MLP



(d) kNN

(e) AdaFair


(f) Agarwal's



(g) DIR-DT

(h) DIR-NB


(i) DIR-MLP



(j) DIR-kNN

(k) LFR-DT

(l) LFR-NB



(m) LFR-MLP

(n) LFR-kNN

Fig. 15: PAKDD credit: ABROCA slice plots