

FORML: Learning to Reweight Data for Fairness

BOBBY YAN^{*†}, Stanford University, USA

SKYLER SETO^{†‡}, Apple, USA

NICHOLAS APOSTOLOFF, Apple, USA

Deployed machine learning models are evaluated by multiple metrics beyond accuracy, such as fairness and robustness. However, such models are typically trained to minimize the average loss for a single metric, which is typically a proxy for accuracy. Training to optimize a single metric leaves these models prone to fairness violations, especially when the population of sub-groups in the training data are imbalanced. This work addresses the challenge of jointly optimizing fairness and predictive performance in the multi-class classification setting by introducing **Fairness Optimized Reweighting via Meta-Learning (FORML)**, a training algorithm that balances fairness constraints and accuracy by jointly optimizing training sample weights and a neural network’s parameters. The approach increases fairness by learning to weight each training datum’s contribution to the loss according to its impact on reducing fairness violations, balancing the contributions from both over- and under-represented sub-groups. We empirically validate FORML on a range of benchmark and real-world classification datasets and show that our approach improves equality of opportunity fairness criteria over existing state-of-the-art re-weighting methods by $\approx 1\%$ on image classification tasks and by $\approx 5\%$ on a face attribute prediction task. This improvement is achieved without pre-processing data or post-processing model outputs, without learning an additional weighting function, and while maintaining accuracy on the original predictive metric.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: fairness, neural networks, equal opportunity, data re-weighting, meta-learning

ACM Reference Format:

Bobby Yan, Skyler Seto, and Nicholas Apostoloff. 2022. FORML: Learning to Reweight Data for Fairness. In *Proceedings of Under Review*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 21 pages.

1 INTRODUCTION

Deep neural networks (DNNs) are widely used for machine learning applications, including image classification [34], speech recognition [25], natural language understanding [13], and healthcare [17]. Despite the strong predictive performance of modern DNN architectures, when the distribution of the evaluation data differs from that of the training data, or the evaluation metrics differ on the test set, models inherit biases and fail to generalize by exploiting spurious correlations in the dataset and overfitting to the training metric. Importantly, models that have not been trained with robustness and generalization considerations can have fairness violations for certain groups in the training set [23]. This issue is further exacerbated as notions of fairness and accuracy may be inherently opposed to one another. In particular, it has been stated that demanding fairness of models comes at the cost of reduced predictive accuracy [5, 31].

^{*}Work done while an intern at Apple.

[†]Authors contributed equally.

[‡]Corresponding author

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2022 Association for Computing Machinery.

Manuscript submitted to ACM




Fig. 1. The gradient update rules for fairness optimized reweighting meta-learning algorithm (FORML) which optimizes model parameters θ for fairness and performance by jointly learning training sample weights w on a held-out validation set yielding model learning with a fairly reweighted training objective.

A common paradigm in fairness and robustness for approaching data distribution shift and class imbalance is through data reweighting. Classical approaches to data reweighting involve resampling data [30], estimating weights based on data difficulty [38, 41], and computing weights based on the training loss [29]. Recent works have extended classical approaches by learning a (typically parameterized) function mapping the inputs to weights [36, 65], or by optimizing for the weights by treating them as directly learnable parameters [51]. Prior reweighting approaches typically aim to further improve the original metric of interest by improving generalization and robustness to noisy labels [51, 54, 56, 61] or improve training time and convergence by learning a curriculum over instances [35, 54], but none of these works aim to reweight data to directly optimize an additional (fairness) metric.

In this work, we propose **Fairness Optimized Reweighting via Meta-Learning (FORML)**, an algorithm that directly optimizes both fairness and predictive performance. We follow the learning-to-learn (meta-learning) paradigm [2, 20, 37, 51, 58] and jointly learn both a unique weight per sample in the training set and the model parameters by optimizing for the given test metric and a fairness criteria. At a high-level, our algorithm (1) optimizes model parameters via a weighted loss objective, and (2) optimizes sample weights using a given fairness metric over a clean, balanced validation set. Learning sample weights over a validation set helps adapt the model to the fairness metric similar to how the model may be evaluated at test time. This leads the model to better balance the performance of the different metric across sub-groups which can lead to improvements in the discrepancy between train and test performance when the sub-group distributions differ. An overview of the gradient rules of the algorithm are given in Figure 1. Our algorithm resembles the model-agnostic meta-learning (MAML) framework [20, 51] as FORML learns model parameters by optimizing the original training metric \mathcal{L}_c and performs a gradient update over the validation set with a meta-objective (fairness metric \mathcal{L}_f) to learn sample weights, and finally adapts the model parameters with the new fairly reweighted objective.

FORML extends existing meta-learning and fairness reweighting approaches including [20, 29, 51, 65] as (1) the learned weights are global for each datum rather than local to a batch, (2) weights are directly optimized based on a fairness metric evaluated on a with-held validation set, and (3) the approach does not require learning a parameterized

weighting function as it treats the training sample weights as optimizable parameters avoiding specification of a complex weighting function. We experiment with benchmark fairness and image recognition datasets and demonstrate that our approach is able to reduce fairness violations (measured by equality of opportunity) by improving the worst group performance, even in scenarios where the number of samples are uniform across groups, which shows that our approach does not simply learn to reweight based on the number of samples, but based on the inherent difficulty and variability of each datum. Further, FORML improves performance in noisy label settings and can be used to remove data samples leading to improved fairness and higher efficiency.

2 RELATED WORK

Our proposed approach is inspired by a long history of reweighting approaches for solving issues in robustness, class-imbalance, and curricula learning. We briefly review methods for data reweighting, and related approaches.

2.1 Reweighting Data with Fixed Weights and Iterative Updates

Reweighting data is a classic idea that covers data resampling and instance weighting methods. Early resampling techniques date back to importance sampling [7, 30, 41], and early instances of reweighting were based on computing weights with known constraints or domain-specific knowledge [63]. More recent variants have used class-count information to determine the weights [12, 53]. Other data-dependent variants compute weights by reweighting iteratively based on the training loss [19, 45, 62], which typically leads to imposing a higher weight to higher loss samples, encouraging models to learn more difficult samples that might be ignored. Recent work also proposed an iterative reweighting approach for fairness applications where label bias may be a direct result of sensitive groups [29]. A limitation of traditional reweighting approaches is that they typically make assumptions about the issue leading to imbalanced predictive performance or fairness violations and aim to incorporate that directly through reweighting. However, in many scenarios the origins of the observed bias may not be known *a priori* to model training. In an analogous problem setting, data reweighting performs well for class-imbalance problems [14, 35, 38], and in other works, reweighting and learning to reweight data can be seen as a form of curriculum learning [35, 54], or boosting [21, 28], where these approaches typically encourage learning easier examples first with benefits for faster learning, better generalization, and robustness to noisy labels.

2.2 Meta-Learning to Reweight Data

In contrast to reweighting approaches that use pre-computed weights or iterative training updates, our approach follows the meta-learning paradigm¹, which is the process of learning-to-learn [2, 20, 37, 58]. Prior work developed meta-learning frameworks for learning to reweight by learning a meta-network that learns to generate a weight for each sample. Learning meta-networks have been used for teaching and distilling networks [19, 62] and for class-imbalance problems [56]. The approach is costly, however, as a meta-network must be designed and learned for the specific task. Metric optimized example weights (MOEW) also learns a “meta-network” for learning to reweight for fairness, however they learn the parameters of the meta-network using a Gaussian process upper confidence bound technique from the bandits literature rather than learning with traditional meta-learning optimization algorithms [65]. MOEW is also costly due to needing multiple evaluations to find the correct weights for the meta-network while also still maintaining

¹A variety of meta-learning approaches exist including learning the learning algorithm via another model, adapting networks for new tasks, or metric based learning of samples. While our approach and those listed broadly follow the second class of approaches, differing from these approaches, we do not evaluate our models in a typical few shot setup or with unknown tasks at test time. Rather we are generally interested in meta-learning approaches as a way to better learn to fine-tune models to adapt to new tasks as in [42]

a meta-network. A closely related approach called “learning to reweight” learns weights explicitly for each sample in a batch without the need of a weighting function [51]. However, learning to reweight does not learn a global weight for each training sample and the weight for a particular sample in one batch may be different from the weight of the same sample in a different batch. As the weights may differ greatly depending on batch differences, weights learned from this approach may be unstable and unable to generalize [56]. To the best of our knowledge, all prior meta-learning reweighting methods optimize for a single training metric, and do not consider multi-objective optimization with both the performance and fairness metrics as in this work.

2.3 Differentiable Fairness Metrics

Various fairness definitions and measures have been proposed and studied in the literature, such as demographic parity (group fairness, statistical parity [15]), equalized odds (disparate mistreatment), equal opportunity [23], and predictive parity [6, 60]. Due to the non-differentiability of these fairness metrics, a large body of work has focused on optimizing surrogates for these metrics include directly approximating AUCPR or pairwise AUCROC loss [16], and learning the parameters of a general structured loss function [3]. These methods assume that the metric has a closed-form structure. Recent works extend this by learning approximations to any loss function [26, 27, 36, 65]. Methods for approximating general black-box functions are able to learn general metrics including those that are non-differentiable or have no closed-form expression, however they often require deriving a complex function by learning over a validation set. This function is typically learned through some type of search procedure to estimate the parameters of a surrogate value function. While some of these approaches follow the learning-to-learn paradigm [26, 27], these approaches are orthogonal to ours as we can replace our surrogate loss function with one of these, and the approaches can be easily combined. For our surrogate loss, we use a variant of the loss in [52, 53] which aims to achieve equalized loss per group.

2.4 Data Subsampling

A related body of work looks at subsampling data by identifying erroneous, or redundant samples [49, 57, 59]. These approaches can be seen as learning hard weights that set the loss during training to zero, effectively ignoring these samples. While this is not the main focus of this work, we show how weights learned through FORML can be leveraged to remove samples for the purpose of building smaller, and fairer datasets.

3 FORML: FAIRNESS AND LEARNING DATASET REWEIGHTING

In this section, we provide background on fairness metrics and constrained optimization. Through mathematically defining fairness as a constrained optimization procedure, our approach, named **Fairness Optimized Reweighting via Meta-learning** (FORML), is naturally developed. We give a practical algorithm for FORML in modern neural network architectures and discuss benefits of our approach over existing approaches.

3.1 Mathematical Definitions of Fairness

Many popular algorithmic fairness criteria are a form of classification parity [9]. In this section, we define some common mathematical notions of fairness before explaining our choice of *equality of opportunity* as a fairness criteria.

In binary classification, there are three well-established statistical notions of fairness. One such notion is *demographic parity*, also known as *statistical parity* and *group fairness*. Given a classifier’s prediction $\hat{Y} \in \{0, 1\}$ and sensitive attributes $A \in \mathcal{A}$, demographic parity measures *independence* between the prediction, \hat{Y} , and the sensitive attributes, A and is satisfied when $\hat{Y} \perp A$ or, $P(\hat{Y} = 1 | A = a) = P(\hat{Y} = 1 | A = b), \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}$.

A second common notion of fairness is *calibration*. Calibration for fairness can only be applied when the classifier’s raw output is a score $s \in \mathbb{R}$ that approximates the probability of the true label being 1, i.e., $P(Y = 1 | X)$. Formally, a classifier h is *calibrated* when the proportion of samples labelled as positive is equal to s : $P(Y = 1 | h(X) = s) = s$.

Calibration alone does not enforce any notion of fairness, but when conditioned on the sensitive attribute, we get *calibration within groups* [32]: $P(Y = 1 | h(X) = s, A = a) = s, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$. Note that *calibration within groups* implies *sufficiency*, another fairness criterion that requires the true label Y to be independent of sensitive attributes A given the score $S : Y \perp A | S$. For a binary predictor, *sufficiency* is defined as

$$P(Y = 1 | S = s, A = a) = P(Y = 1 | S = s, A = b), \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Further note that *sufficiency* of the score S also implies *calibration by group* as the function $c(s) = P(Y = 1 | S = s, A = a)$ implies calibration. Thus, *calibration by group* and *sufficiency* are equivalent.

The third notion of group fairness is *equalized odds*, also known as *disparate mistreatment* [64]. Formally, *equalized odds* requires that a classifier have equal true positive and false positive rates across sensitive attributes:

$$P(\hat{Y} = 1 | Y = y, A = a) = P(\hat{Y} = 1 | Y = y, A = b), \forall y \in \{0, 1\}, \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}. \quad (1)$$

Equalized odds is equivalent to the notion of *separation*, which is satisfied when the classifier’s predictions are independent of the sensitive attributes, given the true label $Y : \hat{Y} \perp A | Y$.

Equalized odds can be relaxed into two other notions of fairness by conditioning only on the labelled positives ($Y = 1$) and the labelled negatives ($Y = 0$) respectively:

- *Equal opportunity* requires equal true positive rate across groups:

$$P(\hat{Y} = 1 | Y = 1, A = a) = P(\hat{Y} = 1 | Y = 1, A = b), \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}. \quad (2)$$

- *Predictive equality* requires equal false negative rate across groups:

$$P(\hat{Y} = 1 | Y = 0, A = a) = P(\hat{Y} = 1 | Y = 0, A = b), \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}. \quad (3)$$

The equalized odds fairness criteria can be generalized to a family of fairness notions—often known as *error parity* or *classification parity* [9]—which seek the equality of some error metric or measure of predictive performance, such as accuracy, true positive rate, false positive rate, and precision, across groups.

From a statistical perspective, these fairness criteria establish independence, or conditional independence, relationships between three random variables: the classifier’s predictions, \hat{Y} , the true labels, Y , and the sensitive attributes, A . Therefore, these statistical definitions of algorithmic fairness can be naturally extended to the multi-class classification setting, by allowing Y and \hat{Y} to take on values in $\{0, \dots, k - 1\}$, where k is the number of classes.

However, ignoring the statistical limitations inherent to all group fairness notions—ones that arise as a result of assessing the fairness of algorithms by their impacts on different groups identified by sensitive attributes rather than, for instance, individuals [9]—not all of these definitions make sense when generalizing to the multi-class classification setting. For example, demographic parity is impossible to satisfy by any classifier that does better than a random predictor when the sensitive attribute is perfectly correlated with the label itself. Some of the fairness definitions are also easier to satisfy than others; for example, sufficiency, and thus calibration by group, is an implicit byproduct of unconstrained learning [39] and many methods exist for performing post-hoc calibration [22, 43, 46]. Moreover, there is often mutual incompatibility between various group fairness notions, such as that between calibration and any error-rate parity constraints [8, 32, 48]. Therefore, we focus on the class of fairness definition most suited for measuring

the amount of "unfairness" or fairness violations, and the setup for our proposed approach follows the framework of *equalized odds*, or a relaxation, *equal opportunity* [23]. For our algorithm, FORML, we use the max loss discrepancy, which is the difference between the loss of the maximum and minimum sub-groups. This choice of loss serves as a differentiable proxy for the equality of opportunity criteria and is similar to the metric used in [52]. More generally, any differentiable loss function can be applied for FORML.

3.2 Learning to Reweight Data for Optimizing Fairness via Meta-learning

Our FORML approach is inspired by a number of prior modeling and optimization techniques, most notably example reweighting [51] and fairness constrained optimization [10, 29], where the loss value associated with each data sample is up-weighted or down-weighted to address problems such as class imbalance, or noisy and corrupted labels.

Formally, we consider a dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i, a_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq N\}$, where $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ is the input (e.g. images, texts), $y_i \in \mathcal{Y}$ is the target variable, and $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ is the sensitive attribute. Let $D_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $D_{\mathcal{V}}$ denote the train and validation sets formed from \mathcal{D} . Let $h(x; \theta) \in \mathcal{H}$ be our neural network classifier parameterized by model parameters θ . In traditional learning, the task is to learn a model h that minimizes the expected loss over the training data $D_{\mathcal{T}}$:

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \sum_{(x_i, y_i, a_i) \sim D_{\mathcal{T}}} \mathcal{L}_c(h(x_i; \theta), y_i), \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_c(h(x; \theta), y)$ is a given loss function between the label predicted by the model h , and the ground-truth label y (in our experiments cross entropy or hinge loss). Improving fairness with minimal impact on predictive accuracy can be formulated as a constrained optimization problem, where the goal is to find the solution to Equation 4 subject to an additional fairness constraint \mathcal{L}_f

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \quad & \sum_{(x_i, y_i, a_i) \sim D_{\mathcal{T}}} \mathcal{L}_c(h(x_i; \theta), y_i) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{(x_i, y_i, a_i) \sim D_{\mathcal{T}}} \mathcal{L}_f(h(x_i; \theta), y_i; a_i) \leq \epsilon_i \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

for some ϵ_i indicating the amount of acceptable constraint violation.

A method for solving such constrained optimization problems is the penalty method, and in particular the method of Lagrange multipliers, which defines Equation 5 as optimization of both the model parameters and Lagrange multiplier w in a penalized loss objective.

Classical algorithms for solving the penalized objective are based on the basic differential multiplier method [47], which defines a gradient update rule for both model parameters and the weight parameters. Gradient-based approaches to hyperparameter optimization have also been proposed in [4], where the implicit function theorem can be used to compute the gradient and update the hyperparameters using same training criterion.

Constrained optimization with Lagrangians has been studied in prior work for fairness [10, 11]. Recent work studied the fairness constrained objective in the context of label bias and demonstrated that assuming a biased classifier that satisfies Equation 5 up to some error on the constraints, the true, fair classifier can be computed by reweighting the biased classifier [29]. They further develop an algorithm for computing the true classifier, which iteratively computes the weights according to the fairness constraints followed by optimizing the model parameters. This approach used a fixed coordinate descent update rule for computing the weights based on the fairness constraint before performing standard training on the weighted loss. Other work also demonstrated in the context of fairness that optimizing model parameters over a given evaluation metric is equivalent to optimizing over a particular example weighted loss [65].

An alternative view for the two-step procedure is that rather than independently optimizing a fairness constraint as part of the same objective over the dataset, the model is adapted by the training sample weights (learned through the constraint) to handle new tasks where the constraint is enforced, such that the model predictions generalize for solving both tasks - that is, we view \mathcal{L}_c as the standard training objective, and the weighted loss as the loss which adapts the model for a new task, thereby jointly optimizing the model parameters and sample weights. From this perspective, the model learns to optimize for the fairness violation by directly optimizing the metric over the validation set. Such an approach is typically handled well by meta-learning optimization algorithms [18, 20]. We follow a similar procedure to that of the model-agnostic meta-learning adaptation algorithms [20, 51] and extend the two-step procedure of [29] to a three-step procedure for iteratively optimizing a jointly learned weighted training objective. We propose an iterative optimization procedure where at a particular time step of the algorithm t , the model parameters θ_{t+1} and sample weights w_{t+1} are jointly optimized according to the learned weighted training objective:

$$\tilde{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y,a) \sim D_{\mathcal{T}}} \langle w_t, \mathcal{L}_c(h(x; \theta), y) \rangle, \quad (6)$$

given a set of weights $\{w^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R} \mid 1 \leq i \leq N\}$. The training sample weights, w_t , are then updated according to the loss term \mathcal{L}_f :

$$w_{t+1} = \arg \min_w \mathbb{E}_{(x,y,a) \sim D_{\mathcal{V}}} \left[\mathcal{L}_f(h(x; \tilde{\theta}), y; a) \right], \quad (7)$$

and finally the model parameters are updated to minimize a training loss \mathcal{L}_c that has now been adapted to the fairness criteria of interest:

$$\theta_{t+1} = \arg \min_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim D_{\mathcal{T}}} \langle w_{t+1}, \mathcal{L}_c(h(x; \theta), y) \rangle, \quad (8)$$

The proposed procedure is named Fairness Optimized Reweighting via Meta-Learning (FORML) and can be distinguished from prior approaches as the sample weights can be efficiently optimized via meta-learning by taking a gradient step over a clean held-out set with the fairness metric (meta-objective). An overview of the meta-learning optimization procedure is given in Figure 2. First, the model performs a gradient step on the predictive loss. Second, the weight parameters are updated through evaluation over the validation set. Finally, the model parameters undergo a meta-update according to the training sample weights learned over the validation set effectively adapting the loss that balances fairness and predictive performance similar to the algorithm of [51].

An advantage of the meta-learned procedure over a fixed or independent update rule is that (1) it will incorporate gradient information from the fairness metric to the gradient updates of the model parameters thus adapting the model parameters towards fairness directly, and (2) allows for learning over a balanced validation set where the fairness metric better generalizes to the test set compared to leveraging the fairness metric on the training set when the training loss goes to zero. FORML does so efficiently using only a small number of stochastic gradient steps to yield both a fair and predictive model. In contrast to model-agnostic meta-learning frameworks like learning to reweight [20, 51], FORML can be seen as an extension where the task is specified by a different loss function rather than solely a different dataset. In the next section, we give an efficient algorithm for computing FORML for standard deep neural networks.

3.3 Implementation of FORML

Training a model with FORML involves two additional gradient updates over the standard stochastic optimization pipeline. Given training and validation sets $D_{\mathcal{T}}$, and $D_{\mathcal{V}}$, model parameters θ , training sample weights w , and losses \mathcal{L}_c and \mathcal{L}_f , pseudocode for computation of FORML is given by Algorithm 1 and an overview is given in Figure 2. The




Fig. 2. Illustration of the forward and backward passes for the model parameters and training sample weights. (1)-(2) Model parameters are first updated using the gradient on the predictive loss, (3)-(4) Sample weights are updated using the updated parameters and the fair metric, (5)-(6) Model parameters are updated again using the sample weights.

algorithm is as follows: (1) the model parameters are updated using standard optimization (Steps 5-7) by computing the gradient of the weighted loss over the training metric with respect to the model parameters, (2) the training example weights are updated based on the gradient of the fairness metric on the validation dataset using the updated model parameters from the previous step (Steps 8-10), which serves to up-weight training examples that are helpful for improving fairness, and (3) model parameters are updated using the updated sample weights over the original training metric (Steps 11-12) resulting in a model which has been adapted to handle both the training metric and fairness metric. Note that in [Algorithm 1](#), we perform only one gradient update for the computation of the updated model parameters and training sample weights for efficiency, however using multiple gradient updates or running to convergence is a straightforward extension. For deep neural networks trained with gradient-based optimization algorithms, FORML’s update rules require the computation of a gradient from a prior gradient update as in Finn et al. [20]. These gradient updates can be easily implemented using automatic differentiation techniques, implemented in popular software packages such as PyTorch and TensorFlow [1, 44].

4 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We present results to demonstrate the use of FORML as an algorithm for reweighting to learn fair neural networks. To do so, we perform experiments on image recognition datasets and answer the questions:

- (1) Does FORML learn training sample weights that improve fairness between known classes in the dataset?

Section 4.2 – Yes: We compare FORML with several other methods on image classification tasks and find that FORML reduces the true positive rate disparity (TPRD) and maximum false negative rate (FNR) across classes. FORML reduces the fairness gap by 1% between the best and worst performing groups by improving the worst-group fairness performance, as shown by the reduction in maximum false negative rates in nearly all of our experiments, instead of sacrificing the performance of the best-performing groups.

- (2) Does FORML learn training sample weights that improve fairness between groups of sensitive attributes in the dataset?

Section 4.3 – We demonstrate that FORML reduces the fairness violation (TPRD) by 5% and maximum FNR by 11% on a Celeb-A face attribute prediction task with gender (denoted as the binary attribute “Male” in the dataset) as

Algorithm 1 FORML: Fairness-Optimized Reweighting via Meta-Learning

```

1: Input: Training set  $\mathcal{D}_T$ , validation set  $\mathcal{D}_V$ , model parameters  $\theta$ , sample weights  $w \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{D}_T|}$ , training loss  $\mathcal{L}_c$ , meta
   loss  $\mathcal{L}_f$ , learning rates  $\eta_c, \eta_f$ 
2: for  $t = 0$  to  $T - 1$  do
3:   for  $b = 0$  to  $B - 1$  do
4:      $X_{\mathcal{T}}, y_{\mathcal{T}}, X_{\mathcal{V}}, y_{\mathcal{V}} \leftarrow \text{sample\_minibatch}(\mathcal{D}_T, \mathcal{D}_V, b)$ 
5:      $\hat{y}_{\mathcal{T}} \leftarrow h(X_{\mathcal{T}}; \theta_t)$ 
6:      $\delta_c = \nabla_{\theta_t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\exp(w_t^{(i)})}{\sum_j \exp(w_t^{(j)})} \mathcal{L}_c \left( y_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)}, \hat{y}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)} \right) \right]$ 
7:      $\tilde{\theta}_t \leftarrow \theta_t - \eta_c \delta_c$ 
8:      $\hat{y}_{\mathcal{V}} \leftarrow h(X_{\mathcal{V}}; \tilde{\theta}_t)$ 
9:      $\delta_f = \nabla_{w_t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{L}_f \left( y_{\mathcal{V}}^{(i)}, \hat{y}_{\mathcal{V}}^{(i)} \right) \right]$ 
10:     $w_{t+1} \leftarrow w_t - \eta_f \delta_f$ 
11:     $\tilde{\delta}_c = \nabla_{\theta_t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\exp(w_{t+1}^{(i)})}{\sum_j \exp(w_{t+1}^{(j)})} \mathcal{L}_c \left( y_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)}, \hat{y}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)} \right) \right]$ 
12:     $\theta_{t+1} \leftarrow \theta_t - \eta_f \tilde{\delta}_c$ 
13:   end for
14: end for

```

the sensitive attribute, as well as reducing the FPRD by 1.5% in predicting crime rates on tabular data with race percentages as the sensitive attribute.

- (3) Does FORML learn training sample weights that improve model learning in a noisy/corrupt label setting?

Section 4.4 – Yes: We demonstrate that learning with FORML when 20% of the labels in the training set are incorrect, FORML improves classification performance by 1% and reduces fairness violations by 5% over prior reweighting methods.

- (4) Can we use the FORML sample weights to improve datasets and model training?

Section 4.5 – We show that the weights learned by FORML can be used to distill a smaller dataset that improves fairness while maintaining the same level of accuracy. This suggests that the datasets may contain potentially erroneous samples that are harmful for fairness.

Note that for some experiments there is no pre-defined sensitive attribute to evaluate for fairness violations. However, in the case with no sensitive attribute, it is still possible to have a large discrepancy in performance across classification labels. Another difference from the standard fairness setup is that we do not only consider the class-imbalance in the number of samples as many of classic image recognition benchmarks such as the CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets [33] have a high fairness violation but equal number of samples across classes. In all experiments, the goal of FORML is to reduce fairness violations while maintaining accuracy. Thus, while it is possible to further reduce the fairness violations, and prior works have reduced fairness violations to nearly 0 [29], doing so typically results in a decrease in accuracy and is outside the scope of this work.

4.1 Experimental Setup

In our experiments, we evaluate the performance of several different weighting schemes which have previously been applied for improving fairness, including static weighting strategies (1) - (3) and learned weighting strategies (4) - (6):

- (1) **Uniform**: All examples are weighted equally. This is equivalent to training without any data reweighting.
- (2) **Random**: Each example is randomly assigned a weight sampled from a standard normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.
- (3) **Class-Balanced** [12]: Each example is assigned a weight depending on the effective number of samples in each protected attribute (or label if the dataset has no sensitive attributed) using $\beta = 0.9999$.
- (4) **Label Bias (LB)** [29]: A dynamic weighting scheme that computes sample weights using constraints corresponding to the fairness metric of interest. Updates to the weights are non-gradient-based and are applied based on the loss on the training set, not a held-out validation set. For equal comparison, we take H in Jiang and Nachum [29, Algorithm 1] to be a model update after 1 epoch of training, and update the sample weights after each epoch. For datasets with a sensitive attribute, we use equality of opportunity constraints, and for datasets with no sensitive attribute, we apply a demographic parity constraint such that the number of predictions for the worst performing class is uniform following Jiang and Nachum [29, Section 8]. Our implementation is modified from the author code².
- (5) **Metric Optimized Example Weights (MOEW)** [65]: A dynamic weighting scheme is learned from the black-box metric values observed during training, based on Gaussian process regression. For comparison, we use the implementation provided by the authors³ and only modify the dataset.
- (6) **FORML**: Our proposed approach learns weights by optimizing directly over a validation set and bypasses the need for a learnable function. When constructing batches for the validation set, we ensure each batch contains a minimum number of samples per group, which is dependent on the dataset and number of sub-groups. Maintaining a minimum number of samples per group guarantees evaluation of the fairness criteria over all groups of the dataset.

Unless otherwise stated, the error metric during training is the standard cross entropy loss, the fairness metric is the maximum false negative rate (*maxFNR*), and the fairness violation is the *True Positive Rate Disparity (TPRD)* also known as *equality of opportunity*, which is defined as the difference between the maximum and minimum TPR across groups. We approximate the fairness violation by the max loss discrepancy.

4.2 Image Classification: Class-based Fairness

In this section, we evaluate the empirical performance of FORML on three standard benchmarks for image classification: MNIST, CIFAR-10, and CIFAR-100. For these experiments, there is no pre-defined sensitive attribute, therefore we denote the sensitive attribute as the class label (e.g. for MNIST the sensitive attribute is the digit value and the objective is to achieve equal classification performance across digit values reported as TPRD).

4.2.1 MNIST Experiments with Model Capacity. We use a train/validation/test split of sizes 55k/5k/10k. We train models on MNIST using the ADAM optimizer with a batch size of 100 and learning rate 0.001 for 50 epochs. For the classifier, we use a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) with sigmoid activation and one hidden layer mapping from $784 \rightarrow d \rightarrow 10$ dimensions. To learn the training sample weights in FORML, we use SGD and the same learning rate as the model parameter learning rate and minimize the max loss discrepancy between samples from the best and worst performing

²https://github.com/google-research/google-research/tree/master/label_bias

³<https://github.com/google-research/google-research/tree/master/moew>




Fig. 3. Accuracy and fairness violations on the MNIST dataset comparing FORML and other reweighting methods. The x-axis indicates varying model capacity, as measured by the number of hidden units d , and the y-axis is the metric of interest. The mean of each metric is reported over five runs.

groups in the validation set. We examine the performance of FORML and competing methods as we vary the model capacity via the hidden dimension $d \in \{10, 20, 30, 40, 50\}$. Results are summarized in Figure 3.

First, we note that all methods attain relatively similar accuracy ranging from 93% to 97%. As the accuracy is high, and there is minimal variety in the digits, we also note the fairness violation is low, especially when $d \geq 40$ in Figure 3b and Figure 3c. This experiment evaluates the behavior of each method in the presence of minimal fairness violation. In this setting, since accuracy is already high, reweighting may be unnecessary as indicated by the uniform (baseline) and random reweighting approaches performing comparably or better than other methods. Based on the results, we see that FORML manages to remain competitive with uniform weighting with FORML performing slightly better for a few different values of d . By contrast, proportion weightings actually perform worse, and while MOEW attains competitive fairness, it falls below FORML and baseline approaches in accuracy for a few values of d .

4.2.2 CIFAR Experiments. For CIFAR-10/100, we train a ResNet-18 architecture [24] using SGD with Nesterov momentum $\gamma = 0.9$ and batch size of 128. We set the initial learning rate to $\eta_c = 0.1$ and decay by 0.1 at the 60th, 120th, and 160th epochs and train for a total of 200 epochs. We also penalize the model parameters with weight decay at $5e - 4$. For both CIFAR-10/100, we use standard data augmentations (normalization, random horizontal flip, translation by up to 4 pixels). To learn the training sample weights in FORML, we use SGD with the same learning rate as the model parameter learning rate and minimize the max loss discrepancy. For MOEW on CIFAR-10 we used twenty batches for learning the weight function parameters and fifty batches on CIFAR-100. Both MOEW and FORML use a held-out validation set of 5000 samples for learning weights and maintains a minimum of 3 samples per class per batch.

Method	CIFAR-10			CIFAR-100		
	TPRD (%) ↓	maxFNR (%) ↓	Accuracy (%) ↑	TPRD (%) ↓	maxFNR (%) ↓	Accuracy (%) ↑
Uniform / Proportion	8.79 ± 0.14	10.80 ± 0.14	95.25 ± 0.03	46.27 ± 0.46	49.29 ± 0.43	77.80 ± 0.06
Random	11.22 ± 0.15	13.84 ± 0.85	93.77 ± 0.04	50.56 ± 0.43	55.56 ± 0.38	72.54 ± 0.08
MOEW	23.08 ± 0.26	30.88 ± 0.23	83.072 ± 0.03	67.2 ± 0.72	80.6 ± 0.68	53.94 ± 0.03
LB	8.68 ± 0.15	10.73 ± 0.14	95.21 ± 0.03	45.87 ± 0.52	49.17 ± 0.46	77.73 ± 0.05
FORML	7.97 ± 0.12	10.36 ± 0.17	95.20 ± 0.03	45.17 ± 0.35	48.80 ± 0.32	77.51 ± 0.08

Table 1. True Positive Rate Disparity (TPRD), Maximum False Negative Rate (maxFNR), and test accuracy on CIFAR-10/100. The means and standard errors are from 30 runs. ↓ denotes lower values are better. ↑ denotes higher values are better.

For CIFAR-10/100, the task is harder than MNIST and as such accuracy is lower, because the classes have more variety compared with digits. In this setting, we expect methods that learn a proper reweighting scheme will improve

classification performance and reduce fairness violations. Also note, the number of samples per class is equal, therefore while there is still a fairness violation, weightings based on the number of samples (class-imbalance) will not resolve this.

Based on the results in Table 1, we find that neither random nor MOEW are able to perform competitively with other methods, and FORML achieves $\approx 1\%$ improvement (a relative performance gain of $\approx 10\%$) over uniform and label bias. MOEW does not perform well due to the autoencoder and weighting function likely being too simple to capture the variability in the CIFAR dataset and is unable to learn proper sample weights. Needing to build a new architecture for each dataset is one cost to MOEW and similar methods, since constructing an architecture for the autoencoder and weighting function may require domain expertise relative to the task. For CIFAR-100, we see a similar trend as in the CIFAR-10 dataset in Table 1 where only FORML is able to outperform the uniform training method while simultaneously maintaining accuracy. We also perform additional experiments demonstrating that FORML outperforms meta-weight-net [56], a state of the art meta-learned reweighting approach that does not incorporate fairness information in Section 7. On average, the performance for all methods is much lower and the fairness violation is much higher due to the larger number of classes, higher variability and specificity of the class labels for all methods.

4.3 Fairness with Sensitive Attributes

We evaluate the empirical performance of FORML on two benchmarks for fairness in sensitive attributes, namely racial categories in the Crimes and Communities dataset [50] and gender categories in Celeb-A dataset [40].

4.3.1 Communities and Crime. For the crimes and communities dataset, we train a linear model using the Adam optimizer and a batch size of 100. We set the initial learning rate to $\eta_c = 0.001$, train for a total of 10000 steps, and optimize the hinge loss over the training data following [65]. We use the same set of features as in [65]. The input is a 94 dimensional feature vector, the binary target attribute is the “amount of violent crime above 0.28 per 100k population”, and the sensitive attribute is the “percentage of white population” grouped between the thresholds: 0%, 63%, 84%, 94%, and 100%.

Method	FPRD (%) ↓	maxFPR (%) ↓	Accuracy (%) ↑
Uniform	50.54 ± 2.83	50.83 ± 2.83	85.08 ± 0.41
Random	50.21 ± 3.39	50.51 ± 3.35	84.56 ± 0.37
Proportion	49.40 ± 2.61	49.61 ± 2.61	85.20 ± 0.44
MOEW	48.72 ± 3.05	48.94 ± 3.05	85.36 ± 0.3835
LB ($\eta = 10^{-5}$)	48.38 ± 2.73	48.53 ± 2.73	85.16 ± 0.37
FORML	46.73 ± 2.03	46.80 ± 2.01	85.10 ± 0.42

Table 2. False Positive Rate Disparity (FPRD), maxFPR, and test accuracy on the Crimes and Communities attribute prediction task, where the target attribute is a binary predictor for whether or not the violent crime rate for a particular community is above 0.28, and the sensitive attribute is the percentage of white population (thresholded at 63%, 84%, and 94%) as in Zhao et al. [65]. The means and standard errors are reported over 10 runs. ↓ denotes lower values are better. ↑ denotes higher values are better.

For the label bias (LB) baseline, we evaluated using both the proposed step size ($\eta = 1$ in [29, Algorithm 1]), however this dropped accuracy significantly compared with other approaches for reweighting. Instead, we evaluate using $\eta = 10^{-5}$ which was the largest step size value that achieved equivalent accuracy (within 0.1% of the baseline). To learn the training sample weights in FORML, we use SGD with the same learning rate as the model parameter learning rate and minimize the mean loss discrepancy between the best and worst groups as in [52]. The validation set maintains a minimum of 15 samples per class per batch. For the proportion weighting, we take the number of samples according

to the sensitive attribute. For consistency with the results in Zhao et al. [65] for all methods except MOEW and FORML, cross-validation over 50 learned models is done to select the best model based on accuracy on a held-out validation set. The dataset train-val-test splits are unique between runs and results are evaluated over 10 runs. Results are summarized in Table 2. FORML improves performance over all competing methods by reducing the fairness violation by 1.5 – 4% while retaining competitive accuracy.

Method	TPRD (%) ↓	maxFNR (%) ↓	Accuracy (%) ↑
Uniform	24.91 ± 1.67	36.51 ± 1.78	81.72 ± 0.04
Random	24.52 ± 1.40	34.59 ± 1.68	80.63 ± 0.14
Proportion	23.44 ± 1.71	34.68 ± 1.79	81.71 ± 0.10
LB ($\eta = 1$)	24.63 ± 1.62	36.94 ± 2.63	81.91 ± 0.07
FORML	18.70 ± 2.73	25.78 ± 3.87	80.07 ± 1.06

Table 3. True Positive Rate Disparity (TPRD), Maximum False Negative Rate (maxFNR), and test accuracy on the Celeb-A attribute prediction task, where the target attribute is “Attractive” and the protected attribute is gender. The means and standard errors are from 5 runs. ↓ denotes lower values are better. ↑ denotes higher values are better.

4.3.2 *Celeb-A*. For Celeb-A, we train a ResNet-18 architecture [24] to predict the binary attribute “Attractive” given images of faces. The sensitive attribute is gender denoted by “Male” in the dataset. We also experiment with an alternative binary predictor and sensitive attribute in Section 7. The model is trained using Adam optimizer and batch size of 256. We set the initial learning rate to $\eta_c = 0.001$ and train for a total of 10 epochs. For pre-processing the images, we center-crop and resize to size 128×128 and normalize. To learn the training sample weights in FORML, we use SGD with the same learning rate as the model parameter learning rate and minimize the mean loss discrepancy. The validation set maintains a minimum of 20 samples per class per batch. For the proportion weighting, we take the number of samples according to the sensitive attribute because the number of samples in each group for the target attribute “Attractive” are nearly identical at 51.4% in the training set and we seek to reduce fairness violations in the sensitive attribute “Male” in the dataset. For this dataset, we use the pre-defined train, val, test split and select results with the highest validation accuracy during training for all approaches except FORML where we take accuracy at the last epoch, because FORML optimizes over the validation set. Metrics are reported over the test set in Table 3. In Section 7, we also report results comparing FORML with uniform weighting on a different task within the Celeb-A dataset demonstrating FORML improvements extend to multiple attributes and predictive tasks.

For the Celeb-A tasks, we dropped the comparison with MOEW as their weighting function is unable to give good weights and learn good representations for the images. While it may be possible to learn better representations to improve their learned weightings, it is outside the scope of this work. Unlike in prior datasets, both proportional reweighting based on sensitive attribute balance and random weightings perform better when examining maxFNR, however overall perform similarly on the fairness violation. Both approaches achieve similar performance on the fairness violation (TPRD) because they decrease accuracy by around 1.5%. In contrast, FORML improves in fairness metrics achieving a reduction of $\approx 6\%$ (relative reduction over the baseline of $\approx 25\%$) on the fairness violation (TPRD), and a reduction of $\approx 10\%$ (relative reduction in the maxFNR by $\approx 30\%$), while dropping accuracy slightly. It is clear that FORML and learning to reweight has clear advantages over static weighting approaches and the label bias approach which slightly improves accuracy but only marginally over the baseline, and does not reduce fairness violations.

4.4 Mislabeled Data in MNIST

We investigate the performance of FORML in robustness settings when the training data has incorrect labels. To simulate this setup, we take the MNIST dataset under the standard train/test split and then randomly select 20% of the training data points and change their label to 2, yielding a biased set of train labels, as in [29]. The objective is to learn data weights that ignore wrongly labeled data and improve performance over training with a non-weighted loss. For this experiment, a two hidden layer network with ReLU activations and embedding dimensions $784 \rightarrow 512 \rightarrow 512 \rightarrow 512 \rightarrow 10$ is trained. We compare FORML with the label bias reweighting approach with a demographic parity constraint enforcing the model to predict 10% of the data as a 2, as in [29], and baseline training with and without corrupted labels. For FORML we randomly select 5k samples from the training set for validation and take test accuracy at the highest validation accuracy⁴. Based on the results in Table 4, FORML achieves higher accuracy and reduces fairness violation over training with uniform weighting and label bias weightings. When using FORML with a clean validation set (validation set that does not have any flipped labels but the training set still has 20% flipped labels), the fairness violation is further decreased by an additional 1%. Although FORML improves performance by $\approx 4\text{--}7\%$ over label bias and uniform training on noisy data, it performs worse than training with clean data by $\approx 2\%$.

Method	TPRD (%) ↓	maxFNR (%) ↓	Accuracy (%) ↑
Uniform (clean data)	3.26 ± 0.27	4.06 ± 0.27	97.85 ± 0.07
Uniform	13.84 ± 0.58	15.18 ± 0.59	92.51 ± 0.26
Label Bias ($\eta = 1$)	10.78 ± 0.76	11.87 ± 0.77	94.54 ± 0.21
FORML	6.93 ± 0.79	8.22 ± 0.83	95.90 ± 0.21
FORML (clean validation)	5.56 ± 0.16	6.73 ± 0.43	96.27 ± 0.16

Table 4. True Positive Rate Disparity (TPRD), Maximum False Negative Rate (maxFNR), and test accuracy on the MNIST dataset with 20% of the labels flipped to a 2. The means and standard errors are reported over 10 runs.

4.5 Using Data Weights for Building Better Datasets

To understand the impact FORML has for uncovering erroneous or unfair samples, we perform dataset condensation using the FORML weights and remove samples according to the normalized weighted loss during training. Specifically, we train a model with FORML using a validation set of 1000 samples corresponding to those with the lowest number of forgetting events [59]. This validation set contains “easy” samples which will not be removed based on the train sample weights, and allows for the removal of samples primarily based on their contribution to fairness. Note that performance using this validation set produces similar but slightly worse results to the FORML algorithm in Table 1, but yields good results when subsampling. We then remove 5000 samples from the training set that have the lowest average normalized weighted loss which is computed using an exponential moving average (EMA) over training epochs. A moving average is done over epochs in order to incorporate the impact that the weights have over all of training rather than only considering the weights at the end of training.

To demonstrate performance with the subsampled dataset, we re-train the model using standard training with the subsampled dataset; results are summarized in Table 5 and they indicate that on CIFAR-100, removing samples based on the weighted EMA of the weighted losses performs similarly and reduces fairness violation over training with the full dataset. Training on the subsampled dataset also leads to better results than the model trained with FORML, and

⁴We do not use a validation set for the baseline and label bias as the baselines do not use one in Jiang and Nachum [29] and reserving the validation set dropped overall test performance at the end of training on MNIST.

Method	TPRD (%) ↓	maxFNR (%) ↓	Accuracy (%) ↑
Uniform Full Data	46.0 ± 0.85	49.6 ± 0.92	77.74 ± 0.18
Uniform Random 45k Data	46.8 ± 0.33	50.0 ± 0.49	76.7 ± 0.09
FORML	46.4 ± 0.5367	49.6 ± 1.0431	77.54 ± 0.13
FORML 45k EMA Data	43.8 ± 0.52	47.6 ± 0.36	77.50 ± 0.04

Table 5. True Positive Rate Disparity (TPRD), Maximum False Negative Rate (maxFNR), and test accuracy on CIFAR-100 comparing data removal using FORML, baseline FORML, and baseline training. The means and standard errors are reported over 5 runs.

performs better than a model that has been trained on a random subset of the same size. This suggests that the weights learned by FORML are useful in filtering examples that may be harmful to fairness.

5 DISCUSSION

FORML consistently improves fairness metrics over state of the art reweighting methods for fairness on a variety of fairness, robustness, and image classification tasks. While prior dynamic reweighting approaches like MOEW and LB offer improvements in some benchmarks, the improvement is inconsistent, and in some cases did not reduce fairness violations compared to static or trivial weightings. The FORML algorithm which optimizes over a balanced validation set yields consistent improvements motivating the importance of the meta-update and meta-loss in FORML. Performance over MOEW indicates the advantage of learning the sample weights directly versus a function that is unique to a dataset. FORML also improves performance under a noisy label scenario, and for data condensation over baseline approaches as shown in [Section 4.4](#) and [Section 4.5](#).

Further analysis of the weighted loss demonstrated in [Section 4.4](#) that FORML improves performance under a corrupt label scenario in MNIST by $\approx 4\%$. Expanding on this analysis, we analyzed the ratio of the normalized loss for digits with the label 2 and without the label 2 in the training set, and identified that FORML reduced this ratio in [Section 7](#). From that analysis, we can conclude it is likely that the weights learned by FORML are reducing the model’s ability to overfit to the incorrect labels leading to better performance on the test set. Further, we find in [Table 5](#) that performing dataset condensation based on the EMA of the normalized loss over epochs leads to reductions in fairness violations and competitive accuracy while using less data. Both results motivate that the global weighting scheme of FORML learns the importance of individual data points.

Finally, in [Section 7](#) we examine some important choices that can be made when evaluating FORML including the use of reverse gradient updates consistent with the literature on Lagrange multipliers [47], different weight weight functions, and different meta-losses. These results further motivate optimizing fairness for reweighting and the improvements FORML makes over prior reweighting methods for fairness. Future work will study other benefits of training with the FORML algorithm and applications for the sample weights.

6 CONCLUSION

Fairness violations are a critical challenge limiting the use of deep neural networks. In this work, we presented FORML, a method for reducing fairness violations in classification problems. FORML is an algorithm that learns to dynamically reweight data to promote training networks that are fairer and maintain accuracy compared with networks trained without fairness constraints.

Our approach has several benefits: it is simple to implement by making small modifications to the training scheme, and it requires neither pre-processing of the data nor post-processing of the model outputs.

While the approach learns additional sample weight parameters, the additional parameters are only needed during training to align the losses according to the fairness metric of interest but not during inference. Further, our approach is agnostic to the model, fairness metric, and data, extending beyond classification setting described here. We believe this work is one step towards creating fairer models without sacrificing accuracy. Further research in this area can lead to fairness gains and towards a better understanding of building datasets with fairness in mind.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Carlos Guestrin, Katherine Metcalf, Barry-John Theobald, and Russ Webb for their helpful discussions, and valuable comments on the ideas presented in this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] Martin Abadi, Paul Barham, Jianmin Chen, Zhifeng Chen, Andy Davis, Jeffrey Dean, Matthieu Devin, Sanjay Ghemawat, Geoffrey Irving, Michael Isard, et al. TensorFlow: A system for large-scale machine learning. In *12th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, OSDI*, pages 265–283. USENIX Association, 2016.
- [2] Marcin Andrychowicz, Misha Denil, Sergio Gomez, Matthew W Hoffman, David Pfau, Tom Schaul, Brendan Shillingford, and Nando De Freitas. Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3981–3989, 2016.
- [3] Jonathan T Barron. A general and adaptive robust loss function. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4331–4339, 2019.
- [4] Yoshua Bengio. Gradient-based optimization of hyperparameters. *Neural Comput.*, 12(8):1889–1900, 2000.
- [5] Richard Berk, Hoda Heidari, Shahin Jabbari, Matthew Joseph, Michael Kearns, Jamie Morgenstern, Seth Neel, and Aaron Roth. A convex framework for fair regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.02409*, 2017.
- [6] Alessandro Castelnovo, Riccardo Crupi, Greta Greco, and Daniele Regoli. The zoo of fairness metrics in machine learning. *CoRR*, abs/2106.00467, 2021.
- [7] Nitesh V Chawla, Kevin W Bowyer, Lawrence O Hall, and W Philip Kegelmeyer. Smote: synthetic minority over-sampling technique. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 16:321–357, 2002.
- [8] Alexandra Chouldechova. Fair prediction with disparate impact: A study of bias in recidivism prediction instruments. *Big data*, 5(2):153–163, 2017.
- [9] Sam Corbett-Davies and Sharad Goel. The measure and mismeasure of fairness: A critical review of fair machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.00023*, 2018.
- [10] Andrew Cotter, Heinrich Jiang, Maya R Gupta, Serena Wang, Taman Narayan, Seungil You, and Karthik Sridharan. Optimization with non-differentiable constraints with applications to fairness, recall, churn, and other goals. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 20(172):1–59, 2019.
- [11] Andrew Cotter, Heinrich Jiang, and Karthik Sridharan. Two-player games for efficient non-convex constrained optimization. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 300–332. PMLR, 2019.
- [12] Yin Cui, Menglin Jia, Tsung-Yi Lin, Yang Song, and Serge Belongie. Class-balanced loss based on effective number of samples. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR*, pages 9268–9277, 2019.
- [13] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT*, pages 4171–4186. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019.
- [14] Qi Dong, Shaogang Gong, and Xiatian Zhu. Class rectification hard mining for imbalanced deep learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1851–1860, 2017.
- [15] Cynthia Dwork, Moritz Hardt, Toniann Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Richard Zemel. Fairness through awareness. In *Proceedings of the 3rd innovations in theoretical computer science conference*, pages 214–226. ACM, 2012.
- [16] Elad Eban, Mariano Schain, Alan Mackey, Ariel Gordon, Ryan Rifkin, and Gal Elidan. Scalable learning of non-decomposable objectives. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS*, pages 832–840. PMLR, 2017.
- [17] Andre Esteva, Alexandre Robicquet, Bharath Ramsundar, Volodymyr Kuleshov, Mark DePristo, Katherine Chou, Claire Cui, Greg Corrado, Sebastian Thrun, and Jeff Dean. A guide to deep learning in healthcare. *Nature Medicine*, 25(1):24–29, 2019.
- [18] Alireza Fallah, Aryan Mokhtari, and Asuman Ozdaglar. Generalization of model-agnostic meta-learning algorithms: Recurring and unseen tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.03832*, 2021.
- [19] Yang Fan, Fei Tian, Tao Qin, Xiang-Yang Li, and Tie-Yan Liu. Learning to teach. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.

- [20] Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1126–1135. PMLR, 2017.
- [21] Yoav Freund and Robert E Schapire. A decision-theoretic generalization of on-line learning and an application to boosting. *Journal of computer and system sciences*, 55(1):119–139, 1997.
- [22] Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1321–1330. PMLR, 2017.
- [23] Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nati Srebro. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*, pages 3315–3323, 2016.
- [24] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [25] Geoffrey Hinton, Li Deng, Dong Yu, George E Dahl, Abdel-rahman Mohamed, Navdeep Jaitly, Andrew Senior, Vincent Vanhoucke, Patrick Nguyen, Tara N Sainath, et al. Deep neural networks for acoustic modeling in speech recognition: The shared views of four research groups. *IEEE Signal processing magazine*, 29(6):82–97, 2012.
- [26] Chen Huang, Shuangfei Zhai, Walter Talbott, Miguel Bautista Martin, Shih-Yu Sun, Carlos Guestrin, and Josh Susskind. Addressing the loss-metric mismatch with adaptive loss alignment. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML*, pages 2891–2900. PMLR, 2019.
- [27] Chen Huang, Shuangfei Zhai, Pengsheng Guo, and Josh Susskind. MetricOpt: Learning to optimize black-box evaluation metrics. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 174–183, 2021.
- [28] Vasileios Iosifidis and Eirini Ntousi. Adafair: Cumulative fairness adaptive boosting. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM*, pages 781–790, 2019.
- [29] Heinrich Jiang and Ofir Nachum. Identifying and correcting label bias in machine learning. In *The 23rd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS*, pages 702–712. PMLR, 2020.
- [30] Herman Kahn and Andy W Marshall. Methods of reducing sample size in monte carlo computations. *Journal of the Operations Research Society of America*, 1(5):263–278, 1953.
- [31] Michael Kearns and Aaron Roth. *The ethical algorithm: The science of socially aware algorithm design*. Oxford University Press, 2019.
- [32] Jon Kleinberg, Sendhil Mullainathan, and Manish Raghavan. Inherent trade-offs in the fair determination of risk scores. *Proceedings of Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science (ITCS)*, 2017.
- [33] Alex Krizhevsky. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. Technical report, University of Toronto, 2009.
- [34] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1106–1114, 2012.
- [35] M Kumar, Benjamin Packer, and Daphne Koller. Self-paced learning for latent variable models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 23:1189–1197, 2010.
- [36] Preethi Lahoti, Alex Beutel, Jilin Chen, Kang Lee, Flavien Prost, Nithum Thain, Xuezhi Wang, and Ed H Chi. Fairness without demographics through adversarially reweighted learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33*, 2020.
- [37] Brenden M Lake, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Joshua B Tenenbaum. Human-level concept learning through probabilistic program induction. *Science*, 350(6266):1332–1338, 2015.
- [38] Tsung-Yi Lin, Priya Goyal, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Dollár. Focal loss for dense object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV*, pages 2980–2988, 2017.
- [39] Lydia T Liu, Max Simchowitz, and Moritz Hardt. The implicit fairness criterion of unconstrained learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4051–4060. PMLR, 2019.
- [40] Ziwei Liu, Ping Luo, Xiaogang Wang, and Xiaoou Tang. Deep learning face attributes in the wild. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, December 2015.
- [41] Tomasz Malisiewicz, Abhinav Gupta, and Alexei A Efros. Ensemble of exemplar-svms for object detection and beyond. In *2011 International conference on computer vision*, pages 89–96. IEEE, 2011.
- [42] Alex Nichol, Joshua Achiam, and John Schulman. On first-order meta-learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02999*, 2018.
- [43] Alexandru Niculescu-Mizil and Rich Caruana. Predicting good probabilities with supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning*, pages 625–632, 2005.
- [44] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. PyTorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 8024–8035. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- [45] Andrija Petrović, Mladen Nikolić, Sandro Radovanović, Boris Delibašić, and Miloš Jovanović. Fair: Fair adversarial instance re-weighting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.07495*, 2020.
- [46] John Platt et al. Probabilistic outputs for support vector machines and comparisons to regularized likelihood methods. *Advances in large margin classifiers*, 10(3):61–74, 1999.
- [47] John C Platt and Alan H Barr. Constrained differential optimization. In *Proceedings of the 1987 International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 612–621, 1987.

- [48] Geoff Pleiss, Manish Raghavan, Felix Wu, Jon Kleinberg, and Kilian Q Weinberger. On Fairness and Calibration. In I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- [49] Geoff Pleiss, Tianyi Zhang, Ethan Elenberg, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Identifying mislabeled data using the area under the margin ranking. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 17044–17056. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- [50] Michael Redmond and Alok Baveja. A data-driven software tool for enabling cooperative information sharing among police departments. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 141(3):660–678, 2002.
- [51] Mengye Ren, Wenyuan Zeng, Bin Yang, and Raquel Urtasun. Learning to reweight examples for robust deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML*, pages 4334–4343. PMLR, 2018.
- [52] Yuji Roh, Kangwook Lee, Steven Euijong Whang, and Changho Suh. Fairbatch: Batch selection for model fairness. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [53] Yuji Roh, Kangwook Lee, Steven Euijong Whang, and Changho Suh. Sample selection for fair and robust training. In *Thirty-Fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [54] Shreyas Saxena, Oncel Tuzel, and Dennis DeCoste. Data parameters: A new family of parameters for learning a differentiable curriculum. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 11093–11103, 2019.
- [55] Skyler Seto, Martin T Wells, and Wenyu Zhang. Halo: Learning to prune neural networks with shrinkage. In *Proceedings of the 2021 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)*, pages 558–566. SIAM, 2021.
- [56] Jun Shu, Qi Xie, Lixuan Yi, Qian Zhao, Sanping Zhou, Zongben Xu, and Deyu Meng. Meta-weight-net: Learning an explicit mapping for sample weighting. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32:1919–1930, 2019.
- [57] Swabha Swayamdipta, Roy Schwartz, Nicholas Lourie, Yizhong Wang, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Noah A Smith, and Yejin Choi. Dataset cartography: Mapping and diagnosing datasets with training dynamics. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9275–9293, 2020.
- [58] Sebastian Thrun and Lorien Pratt. *Learning to learn*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [59] Mariya Toneva, Alessandro Sordani, Remi Tachet des Combes, Adam Trischler, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey J Gordon. An empirical study of example forgetting during deep neural network learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [60] Sahil Verma and Julia Rubin. Fairness definitions explained. In *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Software Fairness, FairWare@ICSE 2018, Gothenburg, Sweden, May 29, 2018*, pages 1–7. ACM, 2018.
- [61] Nidhi Vyas, Shreyas Saxena, and Thomas Voice. Learning soft labels via meta learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.09496*, 2020.
- [62] Lijun Wu, Fei Tian, Yingce Xia, Yang Fan, Tao Qin, Jian-Huang Lai, and Tie-Yan Liu. Learning to teach with dynamic loss functions. In *NeurIPS*, 2018.
- [63] Bianca Zadrozny. Learning and evaluating classifiers under sample selection bias. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first international conference on Machine learning*, page 114, 2004.
- [64] Muhammad Bilal Zafar, Isabel Valera, Manuel Gomez Rodriguez, and Krishna P Gummadi. Fairness beyond disparate treatment & disparate impact: Learning classification without disparate mistreatment. In *Proceedings of the 26th international conference on world wide web*, pages 1171–1180, 2017.
- [65] Sen Zhao, Mahdi Milani Fard, Harikrishna Narasimhan, and Maya R. Gupta. Metric-optimized example weights. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 7533–7542. PMLR, 2019.

7 APPENDIX

7.1 FORML Hyperparameter Sensitivity and Variations

We conduct ablation studies on the Celeb-A dataset to determine the impact of different hyperparameters and settings in FORML. In the main paper, we use the best performing hyperparameters that also reduce the number of hyperparameters needed to tune (i.e. maintaining the same learning rate, and only reported results with two meta-loss functions, although there are many others that are compatible with FORML).

Reverse and Adversarial comparisons: Our algorithm shares many similarities with the Lagrange multipliers and basic differentiable multipliers method (BDMM) algorithms [47], which have been applied for constrained optimization problems and in recent work for fairness [10, 29]. In the BDMM algorithm, it is argued that standard gradient descent for the constraint in Lagrange multipliers does not work and instead the reverse sign should be applied [47]. We experiment with both a reverse sign in the update for the model parameters in the first update, as well as for the weights of the model and report results in Table 6 and Table 7. Results indicate that FORML performs better when using the reverse update on the model parameters, but the reverse update on the sample weights has little effect. While results are slightly higher for the test accuracy, TPRD on the validation set was on average 1% lower for the reverse update on the sample weights. Thus our algorithm in the main paper uses a reverse update for the model parameters, and not for the sample weights indicating some differences from the BDMM algorithm.

Method	TPRD (%) ↓	maxFNR (%) ↓	Accuracy (%) ↑
No Reverse	22.80 ± 3.88	37.35 ± 7.55	79.99 ± 1.11
Reverse	20.41 ± 3.34	33.89 ± 8.34	79.48 ± 0.82

Table 6. Testing the model with a reverse update for the model parameters by comparing the True Positive Rate Disparity (TPRD), Maximum False Negative Rate (maxFNR), and test accuracy on Celeb-A. The means and standard errors are from 5 runs. ↓ denotes lower values are better. ↑ denotes higher values are better.

Method	TPRD (%) ↓	maxFNR (%) ↓	Accuracy (%) ↑
No Reverse	20.41 ± 3.34	33.89 ± 8.34	79.48 ± 0.82
Reverse	20.45 ± 2.44	33.32 ± 6.48	80.37 ± 0.57

Table 7. Testing the model with a reverse update for the model parameters by comparing the True Positive Rate Disparity (TPRD), Maximum False Negative Rate (maxFNR), and test accuracy on Celeb-A. The means and standard errors are from 5 runs. ↓ denotes lower values are better. ↑ denotes higher values are better.

Meta Loss Variations: In Section 4, the meta-loss optimized over the validation set is either the MaxLossD or the MeanLossD which generally perform similarly. We demonstrate the advantage of using a loss oriented for fairness in Table 8 by comparing with the cross entropy loss. We find that using MaxLossD and MeanLossD lower the fairness violation, but marginally lowers accuracy; whereas using cross entropy increases accuracy slightly but does not lower the fairness violation with respect to baseline performance from Table 3.

Sample Weight Variations: In Section 4, the weights are directly multiplied to balance the loss. However, other variations of weights could be applied to balance the loss such as weights on the logits, or a different function of the weight parameters to enforce different behavior. Here, we explore a reweighting based on the logits, and a weighting based on the L_1 penalty that encourages sparsity of the weights by forcing weights that are too large to zero; we denote this weighting as the inverse square L_1 [55]. Both are compared with the baseline of directly multiplying the learned

Method	TPRD (%) ↓	maxFNR (%) ↓	Accuracy (%) ↑
MaxLossD	20.85 ± 2.88	37.66 ± 7.96	79.41 ± 0.59
MeanLossD	20.41 ± 3.34	33.89 ± 8.34	79.48 ± 0.82
Cross Entropy	24.70 ± 2.74	38.87 ± 4.76	81.08 ± 0.48

Table 8. Testing the model with cross entropy as the meta-loss by comparing the True Positive Rate Disparity (TPRD), Maximum False Negative Rate (maxFNR), and test accuracy on Celeb-A. The means and standard errors are from 5 runs. ↓ denotes lower values are better. ↑ denotes higher values are better.

sample weights with the sample loss, and results reported in Table 9 indicate that the baseline reweighting performs best across all metrics.

Method	TPRD (%) ↓	maxFNR (%) ↓	Accuracy (%) ↑
Baseline	18.91 ± 1.16	28.57 ± 2.27	80.91 ± 0.30
Logits	25.32 ± 2.36	43.81 ± 5.96	80.65 ± 0.58
Inverse Sq. L_1	24.52 ± 3.67	44.08 ± 9.50	78.90 ± 1.02

Table 9. Testing the model with different methods for applying weights by comparing the True Positive Rate Disparity (TPRD), Maximum False Negative Rate (maxFNR), and test accuracy on Celeb-A. The means and standard errors are from 5 runs. ↓ denotes lower values are better. ↑ denotes higher values are better.

Alternative CelebA Fairness Tasks: In addition to the task of predicting the “Attractive” attribute with gender (denoted “Male”) as the sensitive attribute, we also experiment with different tasks and sensitive attributes to test robustness of FORML to different tasks. We change the sensitive attribute to the “Pale Skin” attribute (color), and the prediction task to the “Young” attribute. Accuracy on this task is higher than for the “Attractive” attribute, and as such the fairness violation is lower. Nonetheless, we report in Table 10 that FORML is able to reduce fairness violations over uniform weighting.

Method	TPRD (%) ↓	maxFNR (%) ↓	Accuracy (%) ↑
Uniform	2.64 ± 0.46	5.36 ± 0.25	87.62 ± 0.09
FORML	2.51 ± 0.43	4.64 ± 0.84	87.07 ± 0.22

Table 10. Evaluating FORML for predicting “Young” subject to the sensitive attribute color (“Pale Skin”) according to the metrics: True Positive Rate Disparity (TPRD), Maximum False Negative Rate (maxFNR), and test accuracy on Celeb-A. The means and standard errors are from 5 runs. ↓ denotes lower values are better. ↑ denotes higher values are better.

Comparison with Meta-learning Reweighting Approach: We present additional results to compare FORML with a meta-learning algorithm for reweighting that does not incorporate fairness into the meta-loss. We compare with the meta-weight-net approach⁵ [56] on the CIFAR-10/100 datasets and demonstrate that their approach does not offer any reduction in fairness violations compared with FORML. We use the standard training hyperparameters and network described in Section 4.2, and take a validation set of size 1000. The meta-network is an MLP with one hidden layer with hidden dimension 100. Results are summarized in Table 11 and indicate that the meta-weight-net approach offers no advantage over uniform weighting on CIFAR-10, and only marginal improvement on CIFAR-100, but still performs worse than FORML in reducing the fairness violation.

⁵https://github.com/ShiYunyi/Meta-Weight-Net_Code-Optimization

Method	CIFAR-10			CIFAR-100		
	TPRD (%) ↓	maxFNR (%) ↓	Accuracy (%) ↑	TPRD (%) ↓	maxFNR (%) ↓	Accuracy (%) ↑
Uniform / Proportion	8.79 ± 0.14	10.80 ± 0.14	95.25 ± 0.03	46.27 ± 0.46	49.29 ± 0.43	77.80 ± 0.06
Meta-Weight-Net	9.0 ± 0.15	11.17 ± 0.14	95.10 ± 0.03	45.83 ± 0.46	49.13 ± 0.45	77.62 ± 0.05
FORML	7.97 ± 0.12	10.36 ± 0.17	95.20 ± 0.03	45.17 ± 0.35	48.80 ± 0.32	77.51 ± 0.08

Table 11. True Positive Rate Disparity (TPRD), Maximum False Negative Rate (maxFNR), and test accuracy on CIFAR-10/100. The means and standard errors are from 30 runs. ↓ denotes lower values are better. ↑ denotes higher values are better.

7.2 Normalized Loss for Reducing Overfitting to Corrupt Labels

In Section 4.4, FORML is tested in the robustness setting with incorrect labels. We further explore how training with FORML improves performance by examining the loss for each sample over epochs during training. The objective of this analysis is to investigate how the loss differs for the model trained with FORML, and how this leads to improvement on the test set.

We compute an exponential moving average (EMA) on the loss and compare the average EMA loss for samples with label “2” to samples with another label. As expected, since many of the samples have an incorrect label “2”, the loss for samples with label “2” is higher in both a model trained with uniform weights and the model trained with FORML. For a model with uniform weights, the ratio of the losses for label “2” samples to other samples is 2.9. In comparison, the model trained with FORML has a ratio of 2.61, a relative decrease of 10%. As the accuracy for both models in predicting samples with label “2” are relatively similar, we can conclude it is likely that the weights learned by FORML are reducing the model’s ability to overfit to the incorrect labels leading to better performance on the test set.