

# Auditing Yelp’s Business Ranking and Review Recommendation Through the Lens of Fairness

Mohit Singhal

The University of Texas at Arlington  
mohit.singhal@uta.edu

Javier Pacheco

The University of Texas at Arlington  
jxp6862@mavs.uta.edu

Tanushree Debi

The University of Texas at Arlington  
txd8957@mavs.uta.edu

Seyyed Mohammad Sadegh

Moosavi Khorzooghi  
The University of Texas at Arlington  
sadegh.moosavi@uta.edu

Abolfazl Asudeh

University of Illinois Chicago  
asudeh@uic.edu

Gautam Das

The University of Texas at Arlington  
gdas@cse.uta.edu

Shirin Nilizadeh

The University of Texas at Arlington  
shirin.nilizadeh@uta.edu

## ABSTRACT

Web 2.0 recommendation systems, such as Yelp, connect users and businesses so that users can identify new businesses and simultaneously express their experiences in the form of reviews. Yelp recommendation software moderates user-provided content by categorizing them into recommended and not-recommended sections. The recommended reviews, among other attributes, are used by Yelp’s ranking algorithm to rank businesses in a neighborhood. Due to Yelp’s substantial popularity and its high impact on local businesses’ success, understanding the fairness of its algorithms is crucial. However, with no access to the training data and the algorithms used by such black-box systems, studying their fairness is not trivial, requiring a tremendous effort to minimize bias in data collection and consider the confounding factors in the analysis.

This large-scale data-driven study, for the first time, investigates Yelp’s business ranking and review recommendation system through the lens of fairness. We define and examine 4 hypotheses to examine if Yelp’s recommendation software shows bias against reviews of a specific gender, e.g., females, or specific users, e.g., less established users with a lower number of friends and reviews, and if Yelp’s business ranking algorithm shows bias against restaurants located in specific neighborhoods, e.g., hotspot regions, with specific demographic compositions. Our findings show that reviews of female and less-established users are disproportionately categorized as recommended. We also find a positive association between restaurants being located in hotspot regions and their average exposure. Furthermore, we observed some cases of severe disparity bias in cities where the hotspots are in neighborhoods with less demographic diversity or areas with higher affluence and education levels. Indeed, biases introduced by data-driven systems, including our findings in this paper, are (almost) always implicit and through proxy attributes. Still, the authors believe such implicit biases should be detected and resolved as those can create cycles of discrimination that keep increasing the social gaps between different groups even further.

## PVLDB Reference Format:

Mohit Singhal, Javier Pacheco, Tanushree Debi, Seyyed Mohammad Sadegh Moosavi Khorzooghi, Abolfazl Asudeh, Gautam Das, and Shirin Nilizadeh.

Auditing Yelp’s Business Ranking and Review Recommendation Through the Lens of Fairness. PVLDB, 17(1): XXX-XXX, 2024.  
doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

## PVLDB Artifact Availability:

The source code, data, and/or other artifacts have been made available at <https://github.com/msinghal10/Yelp-Unfairness.git>.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

With the advent of Web 2.0, physical barriers between people have been removed, and it has profoundly reshaped human life and society. Innumerable web-based applications such as online shopping portals (e.g., Amazon), online streaming services (e.g., Netflix, Hulu) [28, 48], social media websites (e.g., Facebook, Twitter), dating websites (e.g., Tinder, Hinge), trip planners (e.g., Tripadvisor), hotel booking (e.g., Hotels.com, Expedia, etc.), and online business recommendation services such as Yelp [64, 83], etc., have remarkably improved connectivity, convenience, and cost-effectiveness in people’s lives. However, despite their widespread influence on various aspects of human life and society, these systems can exhibit various shades of biases that may deteriorate the recommendation’s effectiveness. Machine Learning (ML) algorithms are shown to have a bias against African Americans in predicting recidivism [8, 31, 43], in granting loans [41], bias against women in job screen and online advertisements [29, 101], etc.

For the first time, this paper studies the fairness of Yelp as a popular example of a web 2.0 application that connects local businesses with users [54]. In Yelp, users identify businesses in a local city or neighborhood, connect to other users, and share their experiences about the businesses with other Yelp users through their reviews and ratings. Prior works have found that fake reviews are common

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International License. Visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> to view a copy of this license. For any use beyond those covered by this license, obtain permission by emailing [info@vldb.org](mailto:info@vldb.org). Copyright is held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to the VLDB Endowment.

Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment, Vol. 17, No. 1 ISSN 2150-8097.  
doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

on Yelp and can impact the popularity of businesses and their revenues [32, 52, 71, 88]. To detect these fake reviews, Yelp uses an automated content moderation tool called Yelp recommendation software [56]. This software filters out certain reviews based on four key considerations: conflicts of interest, solicited reviews, reliability, and usefulness [56]. Reviews marked as “Not Recommended” do not influence metrics like a business’s average star rating [56–58]. While certain details of the Yelp recommendation software [56] are publicly disclosed, there still remains uncertainty regarding whether sensitive attributes, such as the *users’ gender, number of friends or number of reviews* are directly or indirectly taken into account when determining whether a review should be placed in *not-recommended* section.

Yelp uses a black-box ranked-retrieval model [11] to rank businesses per users’ query, which usually provides some criteria for the desired outcome, e.g., asking for a specific type of business, location, services, etc. Studies have shown that this ranking highly affects businesses because the higher visibility and exposure [98] means higher foot traffic and increased revenue [78]. The Yelp user’s reviews, among other attributes, are used by the ranking algorithm to rank businesses. Therefore, several sources of bias can impact the outcome of Yelp and, as a result, the success of businesses. For example, algorithmic bias can stem from the use of certain sensitive attributes, such as race and gender of Yelp users who provide ratings and reviews such that reviews by a specific group are categorized as not-recommended with higher probability, or bias might be more implicit and arise from users’ inputs who have preferences towards certain neighborhoods and tend to provide more and better reviews for some businesses, probably influenced by factors such as racial composition or neighborhood wealth [5, 67, 94].

This work, for the first time, audits the fairness of Yelp’s business ranking and review recommendation systems. We formulated four hypotheses to audit fairness using the knowledge and theories from prior work. To examine fairness, we not only relied on popular definitions of fairness, such as *demographic parity* and *exposure*, but also used statistical tests, such as quantile linear and logistic regression, to identify associations and relationships between Yelp’s outcomes and the sensitive groups. Since the inherent black-box structure and the lack of access to training data and algorithms make it challenging to audit Yelp, we designed two data collection frameworks focusing on minimizing bias in the process.

The first hypothesis audits the fairness of Yelp’s recommendation system against a specific gender, e.g., females, while the second hypothesis defines and investigates the fairness for a new type of sensitive group, specific to Web 2.0 applications, i.e., the notion of *less-established users* in contrast to *well-established users*. We found some interesting results. For example, we found that reviews posted by *female, unknown, and ambiguous* users are more likely to be categorized as *not recommended* than those posted by *male* users. This bias is most likely implicit, through proxy attributes such as number of reviews as, for example, female users may be less confident [73] to write reviews. Through the statistical analysis, we found that reviews written by users with a higher number of friends and reviews are more likely to be categorized as *recommended*, hence showing a disparate impact for new or less-active users ( $p < 0.001$ ).

The third and fourth hypotheses investigate the fairness of Yelp’s business ranking system. In particular, a ranking algorithm that puts a high weight on factors such as popularity and number of reviews, can give further exposure to the restaurants that are located in popular regions. The increased exposure causes an even higher popularity, fame, and revenue for those restaurants, further increasing the popularity gap between (similar) restaurants in different regions, which in turn will cause even higher exposure for popular regions. The result will be a discriminatory cycle against less popular neighborhoods. In order to evaluate this, we introduced the notion of *hotspot* (popular) regions and examined whether restaurants in these regions receive higher exposure on Yelp’s ranking outcome and whether these hotspots are associated with various sensitive attributes, such as racial composition, education percentage, neighborhood wealth, and percentage of unemployed people. Our second data collection framework obtained the rankings of 2.8K businesses for nine cities in the US over 15 days, twice a day. Our quantile analysis showed a statistically significant positive correlation between a restaurant’s presence in a hotspot and its average exposure ( $p < 0.001$ ). This finding was observed across all nine cities, indicating that the Yelp algorithm disproportionately accords higher exposure to those restaurants that are in the city’s hotspots. Furthermore, we noted more severe cases of disparity bias in cities where these hotspots are placed in neighborhoods with less demographic diversity or areas with higher affluence and education levels. For example, in the city of Chicago, we found that hotspot regions are usually white-dominated, highly educated, and wealthy neighborhoods. Hence, we can conclude that there would be bias against the restaurants in neighborhoods with lower wealth and less educated people. The association between hotspots and demographic composition can also be due to existing deep underlying societal biases.

Our results highlight the importance of *responsible data science practices* in data-driven systems such as Yelp. Irresponsible ranking and recommendation models and algorithms not only can create unfair results but can also create discriminatory feedback loops that keep segregating the cities and marginalizing people. Fairness audits with open access to these proprietary systems are needed to further explain the fairness draw backs of these systems.

## 2 RELATED WORK

**Fairness in Recommendation.** Prior works have found that the recommendation systems incur biases [5, 7, 45, 74, 76, 93, 119], some against a gender or race group [19, 53, 65, 75, 120] leading to under-representation of some social groups and denial of economic opportunities for others [4, 14, 22, 53, 66, 108]. For example, Chen et al. [26] found that female job seekers resumes are ranked lower than those of male job seekers, and Kay et al. [65] found that gender bias presents in image search results for a variety of occupations. To counteract these biases, scholarships have proposed a dozen of methods to make these ML systems fair [17, 45, 74, 75, 118]. Zhang et al. [118] proposed a system for supporting group fairness in machine learning applications. Bobadilla et al. [17] proposed an algorithm that provides recommendations with an optimum balance between fairness and accuracy.

**Fairness in Ranking.** Ranking fairness implies that comparable items or groups of items receive similar visibility, i.e., that

they occupy comparable positions in the ranking. Prior works have extensively studied fairness in ranking [14, 15, 23, 46, 89, 100, 105, 106, 114, 115, 121]. Scholarships have examined probability-based fairness notions in ranking [9, 23, 46, 112] and also provided mechanisms to design fair ranking schemes and models. For example, Asudeh et al. [9] developed a system that assists individuals in choosing criterion weights that lead to significant fairness. Singh et al. [98] proposed a framework for formulating fairness constraints on rankings. In fair ranking tasks, a frequently studied problem is how to distribute the exposure opportunity to candidates fairly [30, 46, 82, 98, 113]. Our work builds on these works by investigating the fairness of Yelp’s recommendation and ranking systems.

**Yelp Recommendation System:** Mukherjee et al. [83] investigated the factors that the Yelp review filtering algorithm uses, reporting that Yelp might filter reviews based on various behavioral features than linguistic ones. In our work, we examine the sensitive user-level features, such as gender and no. of friends and reviews. Kamerer [64] established that Yelp users who are prolific reviewers and are known and trusted by the community have their reviews in the recommended section. This finding inspired us to formulate our second hypothesis (H2). Yao et al. [109] found that reviews were most likely to be in the recommended section when conveying an overall positive message. Some works studied the opinions and reactions of users whose reviews were being removed [16, 34, 60]. For example, Eslami et al. [38] found that users echoed that the system suppresses their voices. One relevant work to our study [92] empirically studied Yelp’s review recommendation and found that reviews of businesses in lower-density and low-middle-income areas are most likely to be labeled as not recommended. Our study, however, investigates fairness toward various gender groups.

**Fairness in Content Moderation.** Scholarships have investigated fairness in content moderation and how it affects the users [16, 34, 38, 60, 96, 99], mostly focusing on the harm of moderation on marginalized communities via user studies [16, 33, 47, 49, 51, 63, 84, 96, 97, 103]. These studies found that Users echo that these moderation systems censor their point of view [16, 34, 60], while Eslami et al. [38] found that elite users on Yelp defend the Yelp review recommendation algorithm because their reviews are rarely filtered. We motivate our H1 and H2 based on the findings of [38, 64]. However, our approach is a large-scale data-driven method where we understand if perceived gender and user characteristics have a role in the review being placed in the not recommended section.

### 3 AUDITING FAIRNESS OF YELP’S REVIEW RECOMMENDATION SYSTEM

Researchers have proposed dozens of definitions of fairness for ML models [37, 68, 72, 85, 89, 121]. However, not all definitions of fairness can satisfy a specific use case. In this particular use case, we have two key stakeholders, i.e., Yelp and Yelp users, each having their own fairness perspective: **Yelp:** Yelp would want to ensure their review recommendation software has near-perfect accuracy, correctly identifying and highlighting honest and useful reviews. Therefore, fairness to Yelp is to use any features or ML models that can provide such high performance, enhancing the experiences of both people and businesses who use the platform, and maintaining Yelp’s popularity in the highly competitive market

over other recommendation applications. **Yelp Review Writers:** Review writers spend time and effort to create and maintain an account on Yelp and participate in the platform by connecting to other Yelp users and sharing their personal experiences with everyone. Therefore, fairness for these users can be acknowledging their opinions, making them available on the platform, and using them for rating the businesses. In contrast, if their reviews are placed in the not recommended section, they echo frustrations and call the system biased [38].

These two perspectives can be in contrast to each other. For example, to achieve high accuracy, the system might use sensitive attributes, such as gender, resulting in the disproportional removal of reviews by female users, affecting honest female users. However, due to the base rate fallacy [12], this disparate effect can be even more severe if the platform receives more reviews from females than others, which can be true as at least 53% of users on Yelp are females [42], and in our dataset, we found 47% of users are perceived as females in recommended, and 48% of not recommended reviews are posted by perceived female users.

**Hypotheses:** We audit fairness from the perspective of users and hypothesize that Yelp’s recommendation software tends to remove reviews posted by perceived female users compared to others, suppressing their voices more than others.

**H1.** *Reviews written by female users are more likely to be categorized as not recommended than other users.*

Scholars [64] have shown that, unsurprisingly, users who are prolific reviewers and are known and trusted by the community have their reviews in the recommended section. However, using these attributes to classify reviews can disadvantage users who are not yet well-established in the platform, either being new or less-active users. Other works have also studied the negative impact of unjust content moderation on the disengagement of users [38]. Hence, we hypothesize that:

**H2.** *Reviews written by users with fewer friends and reviews are more likely to be categorized as not recommended.*

### 3.1 Methodology

At a high level, fairness definitions fall into two categories of *individual* fairness and *group* fairness. To examine H1, we employed the *demographic parity* fairness, which falls under the group fairness narrative, where the model, independent of the demographic information of the user, should give similar predictions or acceptance to various groups [25, 35, 62, 69, 77, 104, 111, 117]. The intuition behind using demographic parity is that the model should not favor representing one demographic group over another. For our purpose, given a set of reviews written by two people from group  $a$  and group  $b$ ,

$$\frac{P(C=1|A=a)}{P(C=1|A=b)} \leq 1 - \epsilon \quad (1)$$

where  $C=1$  denotes the review to be recommended,  $A$  represents group status,  $\epsilon$  is a slack value, and  $P(C=1|A=a)$  is the conditional probability that reviews of users with gender  $a$  to be recommended and  $P(C=1|A=b)$  is the conditional probability that reviews of users with gender  $b$  to be recommended.


Prior works such as [13, 66] have used statistical association between the systems’ outcomes and the sensitive attributes to indicate

**Table 1: Descriptive statistics of dataset**

Variable	Recommended Users (n=707,658)				Not-Recommended Users (n=178,747)			
	Min	Max	Mean	Med.	Min	Max	Mean	Med.
# Friends	1	19,679	157.89	21	0	4,995	23.79	0
# Reviews	0	17,473	121.76	24	0	7,738	7.73	2

**Table 2: Gender statistics**

	Recommended Users	Not-Recommended Users
Male	238,354 (33.6%)	65,269 (36.5%)
Female	332,997 (47%)	81,845 (45.7%)
Ambiguous	70,725 (9.9%)	16,641 (9.3%)
Unknown	65,582 (9.2%)	14,992 (8.3%)



**Figure 1: CDF of Reviews and Friends for Recommended and Not Recommended Users**

bias. For example, Becerril [13] used regression analysis to explain product prices and price differences as functions of consumer demographics. To test **H2**, we used linear regression to statistically investigate the relationship between the users’ number of friends and reviews and their reviews being categorized as not recommended. Since the distribution of these variables is not normal but rather skewed, running the test on all the data cannot provide a full picture. Hence, we used quartile regression analysis [110], which organizes data into three points—a lower quartile, median, and upper quartile—to form four groups of the dataset, each representing 20% of the observations. To the best of our knowledge, no other work has used this method to study fairness and bias in the datasets.

### 3.2 Data collection

We developed a framework for collecting the datasets. First, we used the dataset provided by Yelp as part of their Yelp Dataset Challenge [59] to identify and collect 707,658 *recommended* reviews of about 144K businesses spanning over about 11 metropolitan cities in the USA. The Yelp Dataset Challenge does not provide the *not recommended* reviews, and therefore, we deployed a custom-built crawler to collect them. However, collecting such large-scale data is time-consuming and could generate a lot of traffic. Therefore, instead, we sampled 15K (10%) of the businesses and obtained their not recommended reviews. We were able to obtain 178,747 not-recommended reviews. We did not obtain non-recommended reviews for 1,761 businesses. We randomly selected 100 of these businesses and found that they do not have any non-recommended reviews. We were able to obtain the full review text, review date, friend and review count, username, location, and the user profile image URL. We found that only 69,167 (38%) of all users in our not-recommended dataset had a profile image.


**Dataset Characterization:** Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of the dataset. We could not find the unique users in the not recommended dataset, as Yelp does not provide unique user ids for the users, and this is a limitation we encountered. Figures 1b and 1a show the CDF of the number of friends and reviews, respectively. They show that these variables do not follow the normal distribution and on average, users in the recommended dataset have more friends and reviews than those in the non-recommended dataset.

**Extraction of users’ gender:** We extracted the gender of Yelp users in our recommended and not-recommended datasets by using the methodology employed by Mislove et al. [81]. This gender detection algorithm computes the probability of usernames being a specific gender by using the names obtained from Census data from the years 1900 to 2013. Since in our fairness analysis, precision is more important than recall, we used a threshold of 0.95 or greater to classify a name as a *male* and a threshold of 0.05 or lower to classify a name as a *female* and names with probabilities between 0.05 and 0.95 were classified as *ambiguous* and if there was no value then we labeled that as *unknown*. Note that, using the above method, we are only capturing the perceived gender of the accounts, and this however might not match with the gender of the person who is controlling the account. Further, we did not use popular gender detection APIs offered by Microsoft, IBM, and Face++ because the recommended dataset obtained from Yelp Data Challenge does not provide users’ profile images. Moreover, these face recognition tools are known to be biased and inaccurate in their predictions [19, 95].

Table 2 shows the count and percentage of the gender of Yelp users in our recommended and not-recommended datasets. We could identify the gender of 80.6% and 82.2% users in recommended and not recommended datasets, respectively. Only the gender of about 9.5% of users could not be identified and was labeled as *ambiguous*, and the rest were labeled as *unknown*. Two authors randomly sampled 100 users, and manually labeled them as male, female, and ambiguous, by visiting their Yelp profiles and checking their usernames, images, reviews, etc. The authors resolved their disagreements and the Cohen Kappa score was 0.87. The accuracy of the labels was computed by how many labels were matched from the model to that of the authors’ final label. We obtained an accuracy of 87%, with an accuracy of Females at 96%, Males at 84%, and Ambiguous at 28%. Most of the incorrect labels belong to the ambiguous category. We admit that inaccurate labeling, even in low percentages, can affect our results. However, we argue that this effect is not enough to change the overall findings, especially when comparing female and male users as their accuracy is high. As one can see, in both datasets, a majority of Yelp users as *Females*. This finding is in line with prior works where the majority of users on Yelp are females [87, 107].

### 3.3 Results

**Reviews by female users are more likely to be categorized as not recommended.** We performed the demographic parity analysis across six subgroups, i.e., Female-Male, Female-Ambiguous, and Female-Unknown using equation (1). We also performed the demographic parity analysis for Male vs. Ambiguous and Unknown users, i.e., Male-Ambiguous and Male-Unknown. Figure 2 shows the results of our demographic parity analysis. For each of the six subgroups, we report the probability that the first group is favored. Note that the red line at 0.8 shows the tolerance and if it falls below 0.8, then there is a *disparate impact* and if it is above this threshold,



**Figure 2: The results obtained from Eq. 1. We can observe that female, ambiguous, and unknown users have a higher probability to have their reviews placed in the not recommended section than male users**

then the decision is fair. This is provided in the guidelines by the US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) [40, 91]. We observe that the Yelp recommendation system has strong gender favoritism for reviews written by Males over Female, Ambiguous, and Unknown users when classifying them as recommended. In particular, we see that female users are at a 73% disadvantage than male counterparts to have their reviews in the recommended section. A similar result is seen for ambiguous users and unknown users, where their disadvantage is just 70% of males, and 69% of males, respectively. Interestingly, when comparing Females-Unknown and Females-Ambiguous users, we found no disparate impact. Hence we found partial support for H1, that reviews written by *female* users are more likely to be labeled as not-recommended, compared to that of *male* users. However, we did not find the same impact for *female* users compared to *ambiguous* and *unknown* users.

**Implications.** Our observation on the gender bias of Yelp’s review recommendation is most likely implicit and through proxy attributes. For example, it is known that women are on average less confident than men [73]. As a result, they may be less confident to write reviews, and when do, may write less confident reviews. As a result, the number of reviews by authors can play a role as a proxy for gender. Subsequently, if a recommendation filtering algorithm puts a high weight on the number of reviews by authors, it filters female reviews more often, which will cause unfairness. In order to further evaluate this, next we evaluate the algorithm to see if factors such as the number of reviews have an impact on the algorithm’s behavior.

**Reviews written by new users with fewer friends and reviews are categorized as not recommended.** We ran a logistic regression model on all the data, with *recommended* as the dependent variable and the number of *friends* and *reviews* as the independent variables, and found that the reviews of users with more friends and reviews are more likely to be recommended. However, these findings obtained from the whole dataset might be misleading because the distributions of the number of friends and reviews variables are skewed. Therefore, we also ran two quartile logistic regressions, one for the *friends* and the other for *reviews*, where we could investigate the relationships in each quartile. Table 3 shows the results. The results on the whole data, without quartile analysis (in the second column) but using one variable as an independent variable, still show a statistically significant positive association between the number of friends and reviews and the reviews being categorized as *recommended*. Quartile regression on users’ number of friends (in Table 3) reveals that a strong positive association exists between

the users’ number of friends and their reviews being categorized as recommended ( $IRR = 3.7149e+10$ ), in the first quartile, where users have less number of friends. However, for users who have a higher number of friends, i.e., the third and fourth quartiles, even though the relationship is positive, the impact is not high ( $IRR_{Q_3} = 1.002$ ,  $p < 0.001$  and  $IRR_{Q_4} = 1.001$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

Quartile regression on users’ number of reviews (in Table 3) reveals a positive association between the users’ number of reviews and their reviews being categorized as recommended ( $IRR = 1.912$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), in the first quartile, where users have less number of reviews. However, we found that when users’ review count starts to increase, i.e., from the second to the third quartile, even though there is still a positive association, the impact decreases ( $IRR_{Q_2} = 1.164$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $IRR_{Q_3} = 1.019$ ,  $p < 0.001$  and  $IRR_{Q_4} = 1.001$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

**Summary and Implications:** In summary, we found support for our H2 that users with a lower number of friends and reviews, i.e., new or less-active users, are less likely to have their reviews in the recommended section. In addition, as explained before, properties such as the number of friends and the number of reviews usually have a high correlation with sensitive attributes such as gender. Hence, the dependence of the algorithm’s behavior on these attributes can also cause gender bias.

## 4 AUDITING FAIRNESS OF YELP’S RANKING SYSTEM

In this particular use case, we have two key stakeholders, i.e., Yelp, & Businesses on Yelp, where each has a different fairness perspective. **Yelp** would want to ensure that its business ranking algorithm provides an accurate ranking for businesses so that users, as well as businesses, can efficiently use the platform and benefit from the platform. **Businesses on Yelp** would want that Yelp removes fake reviews from their platform and be ranked fairly compared to their competitors.

These two perspectives have very similar goals, as both Yelp and the businesses would want to have a fair ranking so that the businesses can benefit from the platform. However, the main contrast comes when Yelp uses additional features such as demographic composition or other attributes that define that area into consideration when ranking. This can harm businesses that are in areas of low income or education or are in diverse neighbourhoods [80, 112].

**Hypotheses:** A fair ranking is essential for a business, as it directly correlates to foot traffic and the revenue that the business is able to generate. Prior works have extensively studied how to design fair ranking schemes in order to satisfy various fairness goals [9, 15, 23, 98, 100, 106, 112, 121]. While algorithmic bias can affect the ranking disparities in society, such as neighborhoods’ economic status and racial composition, can also have an impact on the ranking. For example, restaurants in poor neighborhoods may have lower foot traffic, simply because the marginalized people cannot afford to go to restaurants frequently. In addition, such restaurants may receive bad reviews more often simply due to various review writing behaviors, which could incur a popularity bias, which in turn can lead to bad reviews and affect the ranking of business [6, 36, 79, 80, 112]. Because of all these factors, the ranking of the business might get affected and in turn their exposure.

It is common for ranking algorithms to use factors such as ratings and popularity in order to find more appealing results as their

**Table 3: Results of the quartile regression**

	Dependent variable: <i>recommended</i>				
	Logistic	0.25 Qnt.	0.50 Qnt.	0.75 Qnt.	1.00 Qnt.
No. of Friends	0.007 (0.000)***	24.34 (0.768)	-0.372 (0.000)***	0.002(0.000)***	0.001 (0.000)***
No. of Friends (IRR)	1.007	3.719e+10	0.689	1.002	1.001
Observations	886,405	221,602	221,601	221,601	221,601
No. of Reviews	0.053 (0.000)***	0.648 (0.000)***	0.152(0.000)***	0.019 (0.000)***	0.001 (0.000)***
No. of Reviews (IRR)	1.054	1.912	1.164	1.019	1.001
Observations	886,405	221,602	221,601	221,601	221,601

Note: \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001

search results. This, however, can cause an *ill negative cycle of discrimination* against restaurants with less exposure. To see why, let us consider a toy example with two identical restaurants at different locations, where restaurant A is in a popular touristy region while restaurant B is in a local neighborhood with less exposure. Apparently having a higher exposure, restaurant A is already more popular than restaurant B, receiving more of the (wealthy) tourist customers who not only pay more but are more likely to write positive reviews and leave positive ratings. A ranking algorithm, with a high weight on ratings and popularity, ranks restaurant A much higher than restaurant B *giving even more exposure to it*. The higher exposure in turn drags even more customers to restaurant A giving it a further boost in fame and popularity, despite the fact that it did not provide a better service or a higher quality food than restaurant B. This cycle of discrimination keeps continuously increasing the popularity and revenue gap between the two restaurants. As a result, it causes *“the rich to get richer and the poor to get poorer”*. Besides, depending on where the popular restaurants are located, this can cause unfairness against different demographic groups such as racial minorities. To test Yelp’s ranking algorithm against this hypothesis, we define a notion of *hotspot* regions. We define a location as a hotspot with plenty of foot traffic and people visiting that location often. Hence we hypothesize that:

**H3.** *In Yelp’s ranking of businesses in a city, businesses located in hotspots tend to have higher exposure.*

**H4.** *Hotspots in a city are associated with more diverse but less educated, less unemployed, and highly wealthy areas.*

## 4.1 Methodology

**Data Collection:** Since the Yelp Dataset Challenge does not provide the ranking of businesses, we developed a second data collection framework to collect business rankings in a given city. We limited our analysis to some cities, obtaining a sample of them that are known for their demographic and social compositions. We first collated a list of cities based on the following criteria: *tourism, wealth, education, diversity, and crime*. For each criterion, we collated the top 10 cities using a variety of resources such as HGTV, CNBC, Forbes, USA Today, WalletHub, etc. Using this approach, we were able to obtain 127 unique cities. To condense this list and find representatives, we found *The Skyline* among these cities [10, 18, 90]. We created a 127 by 5 matrix, with each row representing the cities and the column representing the criteria. When multiple cities were satisfying various criteria and were all part of the skyline, we chose the cities with the highest population count. For example, Chicago, Los Angeles, Louisville, and New York City all satisfy tourism and diversity criteria, however, Louisville is less populated

**Table 4: List of Cities with the criteria. Note that X denotes that the city fulfilled the requirement**

City	Tourism	Wealth	Education	Diversity	Crime Rate
Corpus Christi			X	X	X
Detroit	X		X	X	
Seattle	X	X			
San Jose	X	X	X	X	
San Francisco	X	X	X		
New Orleans	X				X
Anchorage	X	X			X
Chicago	X			X	
Los Angeles	X			X	
New York City	X			X	


**Table 5: Number of Restaurants per City**

City	# Rests.	City	# Rests.
Anchorage	291	Chicago	329
Corpus Christi	271	Los Angeles	344
New Orleans	281	New York City	348
San Francisco	353	San Jose	346
Seattle	305		

than the other three cities, so we removed it from our list. Using this approach, we were able to obtain ten cities shown in Table 4.

However, we found that many restaurants from Canada appear when searching for restaurants in Detroit. Thus, we removed Detroit from our list of cities. We also limited our analysis to *restaurants* as the category as it is one of the most searched categories on Yelp [42, 55]. Using our custom-built crawler, we obtained the list of all the restaurants with their corresponding ranks and address. We noticed that the ranking of a restaurant is dynamic and changes at different times, even on a specific day. Therefore, we need more data points on the ranking of businesses. Based on Central Limit Theorem, we decided to collect 30 data points (i.e., rankings for a specific city) so that their means be approximately normally distributed [1, 70]. Therefore, we extracted the rankings twice a day, once in the morning at 11:00 AM and once in the evening at 7:00 PM, for 15 days, from March 4th to March 19th, 2023. Table 5 shows the total number of restaurants obtained for each of the nine cities. We obtained the most number of restaurants for the city of San Francisco (353) and the least for New Orleans (281).

During the data collection, for each restaurant, we also obtained the zip code, where the restaurant is located, as well as their star rating. We could not obtain the address or the latitude and longitude of these restaurants from Yelp; hence we used the Google Places API [50] to extract this information. For each city, we provided the name of the restaurant as well as the latitude and longitude of the city. Google Places provided us with the restaurant’s address and its latitude and longitude. Moreover, using the zip code, we extracted the *demographic, educational, income, and employment* data from the US Census website of 2020 [21].



**Figure 3: Histogram of clusters.** The x-axis shows the cluster size and Y-axis shows the frequency.

**Businesses’ exposure by ranking:** To identify the disparate impact in the ranking of businesses, we computed the average exposure of each restaurant. We employed the exposure-based fairness metric proposed in [98]. Exposure-based fairness is defined by quantifying the expected attention received by a candidate, or a group of candidates, typically by comparing their average *position bias* to that of the other candidates or groups [61, 116]. The standard exposure drop-off, i.e., the position bias, is given by

$$\frac{1}{\log(1+j)} \quad (2)$$

where  $j$  is the position in the ranking.

We identified some restaurants being present only for one or a few days and not throughout the whole 15 days. Therefore, we assigned 0 exposure on those days and averaged all their data points.

**Hotspot Identification:** Using the latitude and longitude information obtained using the Google Places API, we generated various maps using the Folium library in Python [44]. We used the DBSCAN algorithm to perform clustering [39] on spatial data to identify hotspots of the city. The model’s parameters were set as an epsilon value of 200 meters divided by the radians in 1 kilometer. We tried multiple epsilon values, including 100 m, 200 m, 500 m, 1000 m, etc., manually cross-checked with their corresponding plot, and found that 200 m was better than others in the number of distinct clusters obtained. When increasing the epsilon, we only were obtaining one or two clusters with large cluster sizes. Hence we decided to use 200 m as it was optimal.

We then obtained various clusters for each city that contained the latitude and longitude information. While in all the cities, many clusters have a size of one, we could obtain hotspots where several restaurants are located close to each other. Figure 3 shows the histogram for Chicago and New Orleans (histograms for the rest of the cities can be found in our artifacts). We found that there were many clusters that were of size 1 or 2 and are not hotspots. We decided to choose a size of 6 or more to be referred to as a hotspot as if there are more than 6 restaurants in the vicinity then there would be considerably large foot traffic. We also chose 6 because we found that not all the cities (8) had clusters of size 7 and while only one city did not have a cluster of size 5, we found that including that would marginally increase the number of clusters for each city hence, we decided to choose 6 as the threshold. Hence, for each city, we created a binary variable, where we labeled a restaurant to be in a hotspot as ‘1’ if they were in a cluster of size six or more, else we labeled that as ‘0’. Table 6 shows the number of clusters per city. We obtained the highest number of clusters for San Francisco (13) and the lowest for New Orleans (3).

**Table 6: Number of Clusters per City**

City	# Clusters	City	# Rests.
Anchorage	8	Chicago	12
Corpus Christi	7	Los Angeles	8
New Orleans	3	New York City	9
San Francisco	13	San Jose	10
Seattle	11		

**Table 7: Regression analysis of average exposure with hotspot**

<i>Dependent variable: average exposure</i>	
Hotspot	0.027 (0.000)***
Stars	0.103 (0.004)**
Observations	2,868
Adjusted R-squared	0.02215
<i>Note: *p&lt;0.05; **p&lt;0.01; ***p&lt;0.001</i>	

## 4.2 Results of the overall data

We statistically investigated *H3*, by using linear regression. We used this method because our dependent variable i.e., *average exposure* follows a normal distribution. We also used the *star* rating of the business as our control variable, as the star rating as prior work has shown that a one-point increase in star rating increases the ranking of the business and consequently their revenue [78].

**Businesses located in hotspots have higher exposure.** Table 7 shows the result of our regression analysis for hotspots and average exposure. We see that there is a statistically significant positive association between restaurants’ exposure, their location in hotspots, and high star ratings, hence supporting our hypothesis *H3*. We also ran the same statistical test per city for all nine cities to investigate if the same pattern is seen everywhere. Interestingly, we observed the same results, where the restaurants located in hotspots have a higher probability of having higher exposures. Hence, for each city, we could support our hypothesis *H3*. A complete overview of the results can be found in our artifacts.

## 4.3 Results for Select Cities

We used logistic regression models to examine *H4* and if any relationship exists between the hotspots and demographic composition. Since every city has a unique structure and composition, we run the model for each city separately. While we did the analysis for all the cities, due to brevity we only present the results of Chicago and San Jose as they provided us with very different findings<sup>1</sup>.


**Chicago:** We obtained 12 hotspots for Chicago. We investigated if hotspots are associated with neighborhoods’ demographic features. To run our logistic regression model, we created binary variables, namely White neighborhood (WN), Black neighborhood (BN), American-Indian neighborhood (AIN), Asian neighborhood (AN), high educated neighborhood (HED), high unemployment neighborhood (HUne), and high wealth neighborhood (HWe). To obtain the binary value, we used the official U.S. Census dataset quickfacts website [24]. We labeled ‘1’ if the percentage of the variable is above what is given on the quickfacts website and ‘0’ if it is not. For example, WN was labeled as ‘1’ if the percentage of the white population in the zip code was greater than or equal to 45.3%

<sup>1</sup>The results for all the cities can be found in our artifact <https://github.com/msinghal10/Yelp-Unfairness>.

**Table 8: Results of the regression analysis of hotspot with other sensitive attributes for Chicago**

Dependent variable: Hotspot	
WN	-16.485 (0.000)***
BN	-16.287 (0.000)***
AIN	-0.142 (0.820)
AN	-0.457 (0.446)
HED	14.957 (0.000)***
HU <sub>ne</sub>	-0.600 (0.407)
HWe	15.706 (0.000)***

Note: \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001




**Figure 4: Heatmap for Chicago.**

etc. We removed Native Hawaiian (NHN) variable from the models because the sum of all of them would be 100%, making the variables not independent.

Table 8 shows the result of our logistic regression which is obtained when we clustered the zip code. We did this so that one zip code does not influence the overall results. Interestingly we see that white and black neighborhoods are negatively correlated to hotspots. This could be because of how racially divided the city is and how the south side of Chicago, which has a large black population and also it is very poor and less educated [27]. We find that the restaurants that are in hotspots are more likely to be in wealthier and higher-educated neighborhoods, hence we find support *H4*. Our statistical results can also visually be seen in Figure 4. We can see that major hotspots are in highly educated (shown in Fig. 4a) and wealthy neighborhoods (shown in Fig. 4b). Putting all the findings together, we can conclude that businesses located in the city of Chicago’s hotspots are more likely to have higher average exposure, and these hotspots are in wealthy and highly educated neighborhoods. This has an important implication for businesses that are already in less wealthy and less educated neighborhoods as firstly, they are not in a hotspot and have less exposure. Hence, the businesses in these neighborhoods lose revenue.

**San Jose:** We obtained 10 hotspots in the city of San Jose. Interestingly, we did not see a statistically significant relationship between any of the sensitive and demographic attributes and the hotspots for the city of San Jose. Figure 5 shows the heatmap for San Jose. We can see visually that major hotspots are all scattered in highly educated and highly wealthy neighborhoods throughout the city (shown in Figure 5a and Figure. 5b) and high-wealthy neighborhoods. While we can support our *H3* that businesses in hotspots have higher exposure, the results do not support *H4*. While this



**Figure 5: Heatmap for San Jose**

might not be because of the algorithmic bias, it can be due to the fact that the city has some pre-existing societal bias and that has an impact on the position of the hotspot [2, 3].

**Implications:** Each city has unique demographic characteristics. Hot spots appear in different regions of cities with different demographic distributions. Depending on the associations between groups and hot spots, ranking algorithm may behave differently for those groups, which explains the implicit bias of the algorithm for different sensitive attributes within each city.

## 5 ETHICS AND LIMITATION

We only gathered reviews from businesses, and public restaurants, and did not attempt to access or find any accounts on Yelp. We also made no attempts to maliciously gather this data, instead, we used the same backend APIs that a user browser would request data from. To not overwhelm the website with numerous requests, we time delayed the requests for about 5 seconds.

**Limitations** Firstly, we could not obtain the list of unique users. Secondly, we only considered users’ gender and not other demographics, such as age, because to infer race, we need to obtain users’ full names, and since Yelp does not provide the full names (e.g., John D. or Jane D.), we cannot effectively compute their race. Additionally, Yelp Dataset Challenge did not provide the user images; hence we could not compute race based on images. Furthermore, we were not able to obtain the gender of about 8% of the users in the not-recommended dataset and 9% in the recommended dataset.

## 6 CONCLUSION

In this work, using a large-scale data-driven approach, we audit Yelp’s business ranking and review recommendation software. We defined and examined 4 hypotheses to audit both systems. Using statistical and empirical analysis, we found that Yelp’s review recommendation system disproportionately filters reviews by females and less-established users into the not recommended section. We also discovered that there was a linear association between a restaurant being in a hotspot and having a higher exposure, hence its ranking was higher than those restaurants that were not in a hotspot. This can create a discriminatory feedback loop against businesses with less exposure.

## 7 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Award NSF III Medium 2107296.



## REFERENCES

- [1] 2016. Central Limit Theorem. [https://sphweb.bumc.bu.edu/otlt/mph-modules/bs/bs704\\_probability/BS704\\_Probability12.html](https://sphweb.bumc.bu.edu/otlt/mph-modules/bs/bs704_probability/BS704_Probability12.html).
- [2] 2021. How progressive is Silicon Valley? The answer might surprise you. <https://sanjosespotlight.com/how-progressive-is-silicon-valley-the-answer-might-surprise-you/>.
- [3] 2023. San Jose Cinco de Mayo traffic diversions called biased. <https://www.cbsnews.com/sanfrancisco/news/san-jose-cinco-de-mayo-traffic-diversions-bias/>.
- [4] Himan Abdollahpour and Robin Burke. 2019. Multi-stakeholder Recommendation and its Connection to Multi-sided Fairness. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Recommendation in Multi-stakeholder Environments co-located with the 13th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys 2019)*, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 20, 2019 (CEUR Workshop Proceedings), Vol. 2440. CEUR-WS.org. <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-2440/paper3.pdf>
- [5] Himan Abdollahpour, Masoud Mansoury, Robin Burke, and Bamshad Mobasher. 2019. The Unfairness of Popularity Bias in Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Recommendation in Multi-stakeholder Environments co-located with the 13th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys 2019)*, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 20, 2019 (CEUR Workshop Proceedings), Robin Burke, Himan Abdollahpour, Edward C. Malthouse, K. P. Thai, and Yongfeng Zhang (Eds.), Vol. 2440. CEUR-WS.org. <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-2440/paper4.pdf>
- [6] Himan Abdollahpour, Masoud Mansoury, Robin Burke, and Bamshad Mobasher. 2020. The connection between popularity bias, calibration, and fairness in recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 726–731.
- [7] Muhammad Ali, Piotr Sapiezynski, Miranda Bogen, Aleksandra Korolova, Alan Mislove, and Aaron Rieke. 2019. Discrimination through optimization: How Facebook’s Ad delivery can lead to biased outcomes. *Proceedings of the ACM on human-computer interaction* 3, CSCW (2019), 1–30.
- [8] Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu, and Lauren Kirchner. 2016. Machine Bias. <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing>.
- [9] Abolfazl Asudeh, HV Jagadish, Julia Stoyanovich, and Gautam Das. 2019. Designing fair ranking schemes. In *Proceedings of the 2019 international conference on management of data*. 1259–1276.
- [10] Abolfazl Asudeh, Saravanan Thirumuruganathan, Nan Zhang, and Gautam Das. 2016. Discovering the Skyline of Web Databases. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 9, 7 (2016), 600–611.
- [11] Abolfazl Asudeh, Nan Zhang, and Gautam Das. 2016. Query Reranking As A Service. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 9, 11 (2016), 888–899. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2983200.2983205>
- [12] Maya Bar-Hillel. 1980. The base-rate fallacy in probability judgments. *Acta Psychologica* 44, 3 (1980), 211–233.
- [13] Rafael Becerril-Arreola. 2023. A Method to Assess and Explain Disparate Impact in Online Retailing. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*. 3670–3679.
- [14] Alex Beutel, Jilin Chen, Tulsee Doshi, Hai Qian, Li Wei, Yi Wu, Lukasz Heldt, Zhe Zhao, Lichan Hong, Ed H Chi, et al. 2019. Fairness in recommendation ranking through pairwise comparisons. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 2212–2220.
- [15] Asia J Biega, Krishna P Gummedi, and Gerhard Weikum. 2018. Equity of attention: Amortizing individual fairness in rankings. In *The 41st international acm sigir conference on research & development in information retrieval*. 405–414.
- [16] Danielle Blunt, Ariel Wolf, Emily Coombes, and Shanelle Mullin. 2020. Posting into the void: Studying the impact of shadowbanning on sex workers and activists. Retrieved September 6 (2020), 2021.
- [17] Jesús Bobadilla, Raúl Lara-Cabrera, Ángel González-Prieto, and Fernando Ortega. 2021. DeepFair: Deep Learning for Improving Fairness in Recommender Systems. *Int. J. Interact. Multim. Artif. Intell.* 6, 6 (2021), 86–94. <https://doi.org/10.9781/ijimai.2020.11.001>
- [18] Stephan Borzsony, Donald Kossmann, and Konrad Stocker. 2001. The skyline operator. In *Proceedings 17th international conference on data engineering*. IEEE, 421–430.
- [19] Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru. 2018. Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. In *Conference on fairness, accountability and transparency*. PMLR, 77–91.
- [20] U.S. Census Bureau. 2023. QuickFacts. [https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/newyorkcitynewyork\\_US/EDU685221](https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/newyorkcitynewyork_US/EDU685221).
- [21] United States Census Bureau. 2023. Census Data. <https://data.census.gov/>.
- [22] Robin Burke. 2017. Multisided fairness for recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.00093* (2017).
- [23] L Elisa Celis, Damian Straszak, and Nisheeth K Vishnoi. 2017. Ranking with fairness constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.06840* (2017).
- [24] US Census. 2023. QuickFacts. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/RHI225222>.
- [25] Jiawei Chen, Hande Dong, Xiang Wang, Fuli Feng, Meng Wang, and Xiangnan He. 2023. Bias and debias in recommender system: A survey and future directions. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 41, 3 (2023), 1–39.
- [26] Le Chen, Ruijun Ma, Anikó Hannák, and Christo Wilson. 2018. Investigating the impact of gender on rank in resume search engines. In *Proceedings of the 2018 chi conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–14.
- [27] Heather Cheron. 2023. How Did Chicago Become So Segregated? By Inventing Modern Segregation. <https://interactive.wttw.com/firsthand/segregation/how-did-chicago-become-so-segregated-by-inventing-modern-segregation>.
- [28] Paul Covington, Jay Adams, and Emre Sargin. 2016. Deep neural networks for youtube recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM conference on recommender systems*. 191–198.
- [29] Jeffrey Dastin. 2018. Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women. In *Ethics of data and analytics*. Auerbach Publications, 296–299.
- [30] Fernando Diaz, Bhaskar Mitra, Michael D Ekstrand, Asia J Biega, and Ben Carterette. 2020. Evaluating stochastic rankings with expected exposure. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*. 275–284.
- [31] Julia Dressel and Hany Farid. 2018. The accuracy, fairness, and limits of predicting recidivism. *Science advances* 4, 1 (2018), eaao5580.
- [32] Wenjing Duan, Bin Gu, and Andrew B Whinston. 2008. Do online reviews matter?—An empirical investigation of panel data. *Decision support systems* 45, 4 (2008), 1007–1016.
- [33] Brooke Erin Duffy and Colten Meisner. 2022. Platform governance at the margins: Social media creators’ experiences with algorithmic (in) visibility. *Media, Culture & Society* (2022), 01634437221111923.
- [34] Brooke Erin Duffy and Colten Meisner. 2023. Platform governance at the margins: Social media creators’ experiences with algorithmic (in) visibility. *Media, Culture & Society* 45, 2 (2023), 285–304.
- [35] Cynthia Dwork, Moritz Hardt, Toniann Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Richard Zemel. 2012. Fairness through awareness. In *Proceedings of the 3rd innovations in theoretical computer science conference*. 214–226.
- [36] Bora Edizel, Francesco Bonchi, Sara Hajian, André Panisson, and Tamir Tassa. 2020. FaiRecSys: mitigating algorithmic bias in recommender systems. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics* 9 (2020), 197–213.
- [37] Michael D Ekstrand, Anubrata Das, Robin Burke, Fernando Diaz, et al. 2022. Fairness in information access systems. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval* 16, 1-2 (2022), 1–177.
- [38] Motahhare Eslami, Kristen Vaccaro, Min Kyung Lee, Amit Elazari Bar On, Eric Gilbert, and Karrie Karahalios. 2019. User attitudes towards algorithmic opacity and transparency in online reviewing platforms. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–14.
- [39] Martin Ester, Hans-Peter Kriegel, Jörg Sander, Xiaowei Xu, et al. 1996. A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise. In *kdd*, Vol. 96. 226–231.
- [40] Michael Feldman, Sorelle A Friedler, John Moeller, Carlos Scheidegger, and Suresh Venkatasubramanian. 2015. Certifying and removing disparate impact. In *proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*. 259–268.
- [41] Manny Fernandez. 2007. Study finds disparities in mortgages by race. *New York Times* 15 (2007).
- [42] FinancesOnline. 2023. 78 Yelp Statistics You Must Know: 2023 Market Share & User Profile Analysis. <https://financesonline.com/yelp-statistics/>.
- [43] Anthony W Flores, Kristin Bechtel, and Christopher T Lowenkamp. 2016. False positives, false negatives, and false analyses: A rejoinder to machine bias: There’s software used across the country to predict future criminals. and it’s biased against blacks. *Fed. Probation* 80 (2016), 38.
- [44] Folium. 2023. Folium. <https://python-visualization.github.io/folium/>.
- [45] Zuohui Fu, Yikun Xian, Ruoyuan Gao, Jieyu Zhao, Qiaoying Huang, Yingqiang Ge, Shuyuan Xu, Shijie Geng, Chirag Shah, Yongfeng Zhang, et al. 2020. Fairness-aware explainable recommendation over knowledge graphs. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 69–78.
- [46] Sahin Cem Geyik, Stuart Ambler, and Krishnamurthy Kenthapadi. 2019. Fairness-aware ranking in search & recommendation systems with application to linkedin talent search. In *Proceedings of the 25th acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 2221–2231.
- [47] Tarleton Gillespie. 2018. Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media. (2018).
- [48] Carlos A Gomez-Urbe and Neil Hunt. 2015. The netflix recommender system: Algorithms, business value, and innovation. *ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems (TMIS)* 6, 4 (2015), 1–19.
- [49] João Gonçalves, Ina Weber, Gina M Masullo, Marisa Torres da Silva, and Joep Hofhuis. 2021. Common sense or censorship: How algorithmic moderators and message type influence perceptions of online content deletion. *new media & society* (2021), 1461448211032310.
- [50] Google. 2023. Google Places API. <https://developers.google.com/maps/documentation/places/web-service/overview>.
- [51] Oliver L Haimson, Daniel Delmonaco, Peipei Nie, and Andrea Wegner. 2021. Disproportionate Removals and Differing Content Moderation Experiences

- for Conservative, Transgender, and Black Social Media Users: Marginalization and Moderation Gray Areas. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 5, CSCW2 (2021), 1–35.
- [52] Lisa Hankin. 2007. The effects of user reviews on online purchasing behavior across multiple product categories. *Master’s final project report, UC Berkeley School of Information*, [http://www.ischool.berkeley.edu/files/lhankin\\_report.pdf](http://www.ischool.berkeley.edu/files/lhankin_report.pdf) (2007).
- [53] Anikó Hannák, Claudia Wagner, David Garcia, Alan Mislove, Markus Strohmaier, and Christo Wilson. 2017. Bias in online freelance marketplaces: Evidence from taskrabit and fiverr. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM conference on computer supported cooperative work and social computing*. 1914–1933.
- [54] Yelp Inc. [n.d.]. About Yelp. <https://www.yelp.com/about>.
- [55] Yelp Inc. 2019. Yelp’s 15th Anniversary. <https://www.yelp15.com/>.
- [56] Yelp Inc. 2022. Recommendation software. <https://trust.yelp.com/recommendation-software/>.
- [57] Yelp Inc. 2023. Do reviews that aren’t currently recommended impact the business’s star rating? <https://www.yelp-support.com/article/Do-reviews-that-arent-currently-recommended-impact-the-business-star-rating>.
- [58] Yelp Inc. 2023. Why would a review not be recommended? <https://www.yelp-support.com/article/Why-would-a-review-not-be-recommended>.
- [59] Yelp Inc. 2023. Yelp Open Dataset. <https://www.yelp.com/dataset>.
- [60] Shagun Jhaver, Darren Scott Appling, Eric Gilbert, and Amy Bruckman. 2019. "Did you suspect the post would be removed?" Understanding user reactions to content removals on Reddit. *Proceedings of the ACM on human-computer interaction* 3, CSCW (2019), 1–33.
- [61] Thorsten Joachims, Laura Granka, Bing Pan, Helene Hembrooke, and Geri Gay. 2017. Accurately interpreting clickthrough data as implicit feedback. In *Acm Sigir Forum*, Vol. 51. Acm New York, NY, USA, 4–11.
- [62] Matthew Joseph, Michael Kearns, Jamie Morgenstern, Seth Neel, and Aaron Roth. 2016. Rawlsian fairness for machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.09559* 1, 2 (2016), 19.
- [63] Prerna Juneja, Deepika Rama Subramanian, and Tanushree Mitra. 2020. Through the looking glass: Study of transparency in Reddit’s moderation practices. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 4, GROUP (2020), 1–35.
- [64] David Kamerer. 2014. Understanding the Yelp review filter: An exploratory study. *First Monday* (2014).
- [65] Matthew Kay, Cynthia Matuszek, and Sean A Munson. 2015. Unequal representation and gender stereotypes in image search results for occupations. In *Proceedings of the 33rd annual acm conference on human factors in computing systems*. 3819–3828.
- [66] Allison Koenecke, Eric Giannella, Robb Willer, and Sharad Goel. 2023. Popular Support for Balancing Equity and Efficiency in Resource Allocation: A Case Study in Online Advertising to Increase Welfare Program Awareness. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, Vol. 17. 494–506.
- [67] Marios Kokkodis and Theodoros Lappas. 2020. Your hometown matters: Popularity-difference bias in online reputation platforms. *Information Systems Research* 31, 2 (2020), 412–430.
- [68] Caitlin Kuhlman, Walter Gerych, and Elke Rundensteiner. 2021. Measuring group advantage: A comparative study of fair ranking metrics. In *Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*. 674–682.
- [69] Matt J Kusner, Joshua Loftus, Chris Russell, and Ricardo Silva. 2017. Counterfactual fairness. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [70] Sang Gyu Kwak and Jong Hae Kim. 2017. Central limit theorem: the cornerstone of modern statistics. *Korean journal of anesthesiology* 70, 2 (2017), 144–156.
- [71] Theodoros Lappas, Gaurav Sabnis, and Georgios Valkanias. 2016. The impact of fake reviews on online visibility: A vulnerability assessment of the hotel industry. *Information Systems Research* 27, 4 (2016), 940–961.
- [72] Tomo Lazovich, Luca Belli, Aaron Gonzales, Amanda Bower, Uthaiapon Tantipongpipat, Kristian Lum, Ferenc Huszar, and Rumman Chowdhury. 2022. Measuring disparate outcomes of content recommendation algorithms with distributional inequality metrics. *Patterns* 3, 8 (2022), 100568.
- [73] Ellen Lenney. 1977. Women’s self-confidence in achievement settings. *Psychological bulletin* 84, 1 (1977), 1.
- [74] Yunqi Li, Hanxiong Chen, Zuohui Fu, Yingqiang Ge, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2021. User-oriented fairness in recommendation. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*. 624–632.
- [75] Yunqi Li, Hanxiong Chen, Shuyuan Xu, Yingqiang Ge, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2021. Towards personalized fairness based on causal notion. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1054–1063.
- [76] Yunqi Li, Yingqiang Ge, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2021. Tutorial on fairness of machine learning in recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 44th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 2654–2657.
- [77] Christos Louizos, Kevin Swersky, Yujia Li, Max Welling, and Richard S. Zemel. 2016. The Variational Fair Autoencoder. In *4th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2016, San Juan, Puerto Rico, May 2-4, 2016, Conference Track Proceedings*, Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun (Eds.). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.00830>
- [78] Michael Luca. 2016. Reviews, reputation, and revenue: The case of Yelp. *com. Com (March 15, 2016). Harvard Business School NOM Unit Working Paper* 12-016 (2016).
- [79] Masoud Mansoury, Himan Abdollahpouri, Jessie Smith, Arman Dehpanah, Mykola Pechenizkiy, and Bamshad Mobasher. 2020. Investigating Potential Factors Associated with Gender Discrimination in Collaborative Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Florida Artificial Intelligence Research Society Conference, FLAIRS 2020*, Eric Bell and Roman Bartak (Eds.). 193–196.
- [80] Rishabh Mehrotra, James McInerney, Hugues Bouchard, Mounia Lalmas, and Fernando Diaz. 2018. Towards a fair marketplace: Counterfactual evaluation of the trade-off between relevance, fairness & satisfaction in recommendation systems. In *Proceedings of the 27th acm international conference on information and knowledge management*. 2243–2251.
- [81] Alan Mislove, Sune Lehmann, Yong-Yeol Ahn, Jukka-Pekka Onnela, and James Rosenquist. 2011. Understanding the demographics of Twitter users. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media*, Vol. 5. 554–557.
- [82] Marco Morik, Ashudeep Singh, Jessica Hong, and Thorsten Joachims. 2020. Controlling fairness and bias in dynamic learning-to-rank. In *Proceedings of the 43rd international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 429–438.
- [83] Arjun Mukherjee, Vivek Venkataraman, Bing Liu, and Natalie Glance. 2013. What yelp fake review filter might be doing?. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media*, Vol. 7. 409–418.
- [84] Tyler Musgrave, Alia Cummings, and Sarita Schoenebeck. 2022. Experiences of Harm, Healing, and Joy among Black Women and Femmes on Social Media. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–17.
- [85] Arvind Narayanan. 2018. Tutorial: 21 fairness definitions and their politics.(2018). URL <https://www.youtube.com/watch> (2018).
- [86] U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2019. New Orleans had the highest unemployment rate among large metro areas in June 2019. <https://www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2019/new-orleans-had-highest-unemployment-rate-among-large-metro-areas-in-june-2019.htm>.
- [87] Finances Online. 2023. 78 Yelp Statistics You Must Know: 2023 Market Share & User Profile Analysis. <https://financesonline.com/yelp-statistics/>.
- [88] Do-Hyung Park, Jumin Lee, and Ingoo Han. 2007. The effect of on-line consumer reviews on consumer purchasing intention: The moderating role of involvement. *International journal of electronic commerce* 11, 4 (2007), 125–148.
- [89] Gourab K Patro, Lorenzo Porcaro, Laura Mitchell, Qiuyue Zhang, Meike Zehlike, and Nikhil Garg. 2022. Fair ranking: a critical review, challenges, and future directions. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 1929–1942.
- [90] Md Farhadur Rahman, Abolfazl Asudeh, Nick Koudas, and Gautam Das. 2017. Efficient computation of subspace skyline over categorical domains. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 407–416.
- [91] OSHA Regulations and Regulatory Guidance. 1910. Code of Federal Regulations. *Respiratory Protection* (1910).
- [92] Roland Maio Ryan Amos and Prateek Mittal. 2022. Reviews in motion: a large scale, longitudinal study of review recommendations on Yelp. *The 6th Workshop on Technology and Consumer Protection (ConPro ’22)*(2022). <https://www.ieee-security.org/TC/SPW2022/ConPro/papers/amos-conpro22.pdf>
- [93] Javier Sánchez-Monedero, Lina Dencik, and Lilian Edwards. 2020. What does it mean to ‘solve’ the problem of discrimination in hiring? Social, technical and legal perspectives from the UK on automated hiring systems. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 458–468.
- [94] Diego Sánchez-Moreno, Vivian López Batista, M Dolores Muñoz Vicente, Ángel Luis Sánchez Lázaro, and María N Moreno-García. 2020. Exploiting the user social context to address neighborhood bias in collaborative filtering music recommender systems. *Information* 11, 9 (2020), 439.
- [95] Morgan Klaus Scheuerman, Jacob M Paul, and Jed R Brubaker. 2019. How computers see gender: An evaluation of gender classification in commercial facial analysis services. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 3, CSCW (2019), 1–33.
- [96] Sarita Schoenebeck, Carol F Scott, Emma Grace Hurley, Tammy Chang, and Ellen Selkie. 2021. Youth Trust in Social Media Companies and Expectations of Justice: Accountability and Repair after Online Harassment. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 5, CSCW1 (2021), 1–18.
- [97] Joseph Seering, Tony Wang, Jina Yoon, and Geoff Kaufman. 2019. Moderator engagement and community development in the age of algorithms. *New Media & Society* 21, 7 (2019), 1417–1443.
- [98] Ashudeep Singh and Thorsten Joachims. 2018. Fairness of exposure in rankings. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 2219–2228.

- [99] M. Singhal, C. Ling, P. Paudel, P. Thota, N. Kumarswamy, G. Stringhini, and S. Nilizadeh. 2023. SoK: Content Moderation in Social Media, from Guidelines to Enforcement, and Research to Practice. In *2023 IEEE 8th European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*. IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 868–895. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EuroSP57164.2023.00056>
- [100] Julia Stoyanovich, Ke Yang, and HV Jagadish. 2018. Online set selection with fairness and diversity constraints. In *Proceedings of the EDBT Conference*.
- [101] Latanya Sweeney. 2013. Discrimination in online ad delivery. *Commun. ACM* 56, 5 (2013), 44–54.
- [102] Los Angeles Times. 2023. Four-year Degrees. <https://maps.latimes.com/neighborhoods/education/four-year-degree/neighborhood/list/index.html>.
- [103] Kristen Vaccaro, Christian Sandvig, and Karrie Karahalios. 2020. " At the End of the Day Facebook Does What ItWants" How Users Experience Contesting Algorithmic Content Moderation. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 4, CSCW2 (2020), 1–22.
- [104] Sahil Verma and Julia Rubin. 2018. Fairness definitions explained. In *Proceedings of the international workshop on software fairness*. 1–7.
- [105] Ke Yang, Vasilis Gkatzelis, and Julia Stoyanovich. 2019. Balanced Ranking with Diversity Constraints. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-19*. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 6035–6042. <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2019/836>
- [106] Ke Yang and Julia Stoyanovich. 2017. Measuring fairness in ranked outputs. In *Proceedings of the 29th international conference on scientific and statistical database management*. 1–6.
- [107] Qingjiang Yao. 2023. When in Rome, Do as the Romans Do: Differences of Interactive Behaviors Across Social Media Networks. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Interactive Marketing*. Springer, 451–473.
- [108] Sirui Yao and Bert Huang. 2017. Beyond parity: Fairness objectives for collaborative filtering. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [109] Yao Yao, Ivelin Angelov, Jack Rasmus-Vorrath, Mooyoung Lee, and Daniel W Engels. 2018. Yelp’s Review Filtering Algorithm. *SMU Data Science Review* 1, 3 (2018), 3.
- [110] Keming Yu, Zudi Lu, and Julian Stander. 2003. Quantile regression: applications and current research areas. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series D: The Statistician* 52, 3 (2003), 331–350.
- [111] Muhammad Bilal Zafar, Isabel Valera, Manuel Gomez Rogriguez, and Krishna P Gummadi. 2017. Fairness constraints: Mechanisms for fair classification. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 962–970.
- [112] Meike Zehlike, Francesco Bonchi, Carlos Castillo, Sara Hajian, Mohamed Megahed, and Ricardo Baeza-Yates. 2017. Fa\* ir: A fair top-k ranking algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 1569–1578.
- [113] Meike Zehlike and Carlos Castillo. 2020. Reducing disparate exposure in ranking: A learning to rank approach. In *Proceedings of the web conference 2020*. 2849–2855.
- [114] Meike Zehlike, Ke Yang, and Julia Stoyanovich. 2022. Fairness in Ranking, Part I: Score-Based Ranking. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 55, 6, Article 118 (dec 2022), 36 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3533379>
- [115] Meike Zehlike, Ke Yang, and Julia Stoyanovich. 2022. Fairness in Ranking, Part II: Learning-to-Rank and Recommender Systems. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 55, 6, Article 117 (dec 2022), 41 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3533380>
- [116] Meike Zehlike, Ke Yang, and Julia Stoyanovich. 2022. Fairness in ranking, part ii: Learning-to-rank and recommender systems. *Comput. Surveys* 55, 6 (2022), 1–41.
- [117] Rich Zemel, Yu Wu, Kevin Swersky, Toni Pitassi, and Cynthia Dwork. 2013. Learning fair representations. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 325–333.
- [118] Hantian Zhang, Xu Chu, Abolfazl Asudeh, and Shamkant B Navathe. 2021. Omnifair: A declarative system for model-agnostic group fairness in machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 international conference on management of data*. 2076–2088.
- [119] Xueru Zhang and Mingyan Liu. 2021. Fairness in learning-based sequential decision algorithms: A survey. In *Handbook of Reinforcement Learning and Control*. Springer, 525–555.
- [120] Jieyu Zhao, Tianlu Wang, Mark Yatskar, Vicente Ordonez, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2017. Men Also Like Shopping: Reducing Gender Bias Amplification using Corpus-level Constraints. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 2979–2989.
- [121] Indrė Žliobaitė. 2017. Measuring discrimination in algorithmic decision making. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 31, 4 (2017), 1060–1089.

## APPENDIX

### A COMPLIMENTARY EXPERIMENT RESULTS

The following report presents the remaining results from the paper.

#### A.1 Exposure of each city

Figure 6 shows the exposure of restaurants per city. The circles shown in the figure show the exposure of each restaurant. The bigger the size, more is the exposure of that restaurant.

**Anchorage:** Figure 6c shows the exposure of restaurants in the city of Anchorage. By employing the DBSCAN algorithm, we obtained a total of 111 clusters. We found that there were 64 clusters of size 1. We obtained a total of 8 hotspots for the city of Anchorage. We then performed a linear regression to see if statistically there is a correlation between average exposure and hotspots.

**Table 9: Results of the regression analysis of average exposure with hotspot for Anchorage**

Dependent variable:	
Average Exposure	
Hotspot	0.033 (0.001)**
Observations	291
Adjusted R-squared	0.03078
Note:	*p<0.05;
	**p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table 9 shows the results. We observed a consistent result with that of the analysis carried out on the whole dataset, where is a positive correlation between average exposure and the restaurant being in a hotspot, hence we find support for *H3*. We then investigated if a restaurant that is in a hotspot has any relation with demographic features such as racial composition, percentage of educated people, percentage of unemployed people, and percentage of wealthy people i.e., *H4*. To run our logistic regression model, we created some new binary variables, namely white neighborhood (WN), black neighborhood (BN), American-Indian neighborhood (AIN), Asian neighborhood (AN), high educated neighborhood (HED), high unemployment neighborhood (HUne), and high wealth neighborhood (HWe). Table 10 shows the results from our regression model. We performed the analysis, by clustering them based on zip codes. We can see that restaurants that are in hotspots have a higher Black and American Indian population, they are also in highly educated and wealthy neighborhoods and hence we find partial support for *H4*

Figure 7 shows the map for educated and white neighborhoods in Anchorage. Visually looking at the map, it confirms our statistical analysis, as restaurants that are in hotspots have higher education (shown in Fig. 7b) and restaurants that are in predominantly white neighborhoods are not in hotspots (shown in Fig. 7a). Therefore, we can draw a conclusion about Yelp in the city of Anchorage, businesses that are in the hotspots, have higher average exposure, and businesses that are in the zip codes with a hotspot, have a

**Table 10: Results of the regression analysis of hotspot with other sensitive attributes for Anchorage**

Dependent variable:	
Hotspot	
WN	-0.658 (0.003)***
BN	0.512 (0.000)***
AIN	0.972 (0.000)***
AN	-0.514 (0.000)***
HED	0.830 (0.001)***
HUne	-1.720 (0.000)***
HWe	0.170 (0.595)
Note:	*p<0.05;
	**p<0.01; ***p<0.001

higher black and American Indian population, they are also in highly educated and wealthy neighborhoods.

**Chicago:** Figure 6b shows the exposure of restaurants in the city of Chicago. We obtained 12 hotspots of size 6 or more. Table 11 shows the results of our linear regression model.

**Table 11: Results of the regression analysis of average exposure with hotspot for Chicago**

Dependent variable:	
average exposure	
Linear	
Hotspot	0.037 (0.000)***
Observations	329
Adjusted R-squared	0.0401
Note:	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

We again see a very similar result, where there is a positive correlation between average exposure and hotspot, hence we find support for *H3*.

**Corpus Christi:** Figure 6c shows the exposure of restaurants in the city of Corpus Christi. Using the DBSCAN algorithm, we were able to identify 132 clusters. Using our threshold, we found 7 hotspots that were of size six or more. Table 12 shows the results of our linear regression model. We can see that average exposure and

**Table 12: Results of the regression analysis of average exposure with hotspot for Corpus Christi**


Dependent variable:	
average exposure	
Linear	
Hotspot	0.027 (0.024)*
Observations	271
Adjusted R-squared	0.01502
Note:	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

**Table 13: Results of the regression analysis of hotspot with other sensitive attributes for Corpus Christi**


Dependent variable:	
Hotspot	
Logistic	
WN	0.854 (0.457)
BN	0.730 (0.444)
AIN	-15.037 (0.000)***
AN	-13.889 (0.000)***
HED	13.668 (0.000)***
HUne	-0.241 (0.810)
HWe	-0.504 (0.601)
Note:	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

hotspots have a positive correlation. Table 13 shows the results of our logistic regression model. We see that restaurants in zip codes that are in a hotspot are in highly educated neighborhoods and have less number of American Indians and Asian populations. This is because Corpus Christi has a high Hispanic population. We can see the results in Figure. 8. We can visually see that hotspots are in areas that are highly educated neighborhoods. Therefore, we can draw a conclusion about Yelp in the city of Corpus Christi, businesses that are in the hotspots, have higher average exposure, and businesses that are in zip codes that are in hotspots, are in highly educated neighborhoods and have less number of American Indians and Asian population, hence, while we find support for *H3*, we rejected our *H4*.


**Los Angeles:** Figure 6d shows the exposure of restaurants in the city of Los Angeles. Using the DBSCAN algorithm, we were able to identify 172 clusters. Using our threshold, we obtained 8 hotspots. Table 14 shows the results of our linear regression model. We can see similar results, that were obtained in the previous cities, where average exposure is positively correlated to hotspots of the city. Table 15 shows the results of our logistic regression model. We




(a) Anchorage




(b) Chicago



(c) Corpus Christi




(d) Los Angeles




(e) New Orleans




(f) New York City



(g) San Francisco



(h) San Jose



(i) Seattle

Figure 6: Exposure of restaurants in each city. Note that the red marker in the figure shows the popular attraction in each city




Figure 9: Heatmap for Los Angeles




Figure 7: Heatmap for Anchorage




Figure 8: Education heatmap for Corpus Christi

Table 14: Results of the regression analysis of average exposure with hotspot for Los Angeles

Dependent variable:	
average exposure	
Linear	
Hotspot	0.027 (0.009)**
Observations	344
Adjusted R-squared	0.01676
Note:	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table 15: Results of the regression analysis of hotspot with other sensitive attributes for Los Angeles

Dependent variable:	
Hotspot	
Logistic	
WN	- 0.387 (0.648)
BN	0.088 (0.924)
AIN	1.181 (0.186)
AN	0.505 (0.408)
HED	16.627 (0.000)***
HUne	-2.087 (0.007)
HWe	0.680 (0.541)
Note:	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

see that restaurants in zip codes that are in a hotspot are in highly educated neighborhoods. Interestingly none of the demographic features were significant with hotspot. Figure 9 shows the heatmap for Los Angeles. We can see visually that major hotspots are in highly educated (shown in Figure 9a) and restaurants with higher

exposure are more in less white neighborhoods, hence confirming the validity of our regression analysis (shown in Figure 9b). It should also be noted that the areas which are highly educated are Beverly Crest and Westwood where they have about 67.6% and 66.5% adults who have earned a four-year degree or higher respectively [102]. Therefore, we can draw a conclusion about Yelp in the city of Los Angeles, businesses that are in the hotspots, have higher average exposure, supporting our  $H3$ , and businesses that are in the zip codes that are in a hotspot, are in highly educated neighborhoods, hence we can reject  $H4$ .

**New Orleans:** Figure 6e shows the exposure of restaurants in the city of New Orleans. Using the DBSCAN algorithm, we were able to identify 87 clusters. Using our threshold, we obtained 3 hotspots. Table 16 shows the results of our linear regression model. We can see similar results, that were obtained in the previous cities,

Table 16: Results of the regression analysis of average exposure with hotspot for New Orleans

Dependent variable:	
average exposure	
Linear	
Hotspot	0.039 (0.000)***
Observations	281
Adjusted R-squared	0.04479
Note:	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table 17: Results of the regression analysis of hotspot with other sensitive attributes for New Orleans

Dependent variable:	
Hotspot	
Logistic	
WN	7.261 (0.000)***
BN	8.379 (0.000)***
AIN	-4.217 (0.000)***
AN	0.754 (0.329)
HED	4.067 (0.000)***
HUne	3.296 (0.000)***
HWe	1.217 (0.140)
Note:	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

where average exposure is positively correlated to the hotspots of the city. Table 17 shows the results of our logistic regression model. We see that restaurants in zip codes that are in a hotspot are in highly white, black neighborhoods, they are also in highly educated and highly unemployed areas. This is interesting, however, New Orleans had the highest unemployment rate among large metro areas according to U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics [86]. Figure 10




Figure 10: Heatmap for New Orleans

shows the heatmap for New Orleans. We can see visually that major hotspots are in highly educated (shown in Figure 10a) and highly unemployed neighborhoods, (shown in Figure 10b). Therefore, we can draw a conclusion about Yelp in the city of New Orleans, businesses that are in hotspots, have higher average exposure, hence finding support for  $H3$ , and businesses in zip codes where there is

a hotspot, are in highly educated and highly unemployed neighborhoods and diverse neighbourhoods, hence we find a partial support for  $H4$ .

**New York City:** Figure 6f shows the exposure of restaurants in the city of New York City. Using the DBSCAN algorithm, we were able to identify 131 clusters. Using our threshold, we obtained 9 hotspots in the city of New York. Table 18 shows the results of our linear regression model.


**Table 18: Results of the regression analysis of average exposure with hotspot for New York City**

Dependent variable:	
average exposure	
Linear	
Hotspot	0.031 (0.001)**
Observations	348
Adjusted R-squared	0.02542
Note:	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

**Table 19: Results of the regression analysis of hotspot with other sensitive attributes for New York**

Dependent variable:	
Hotspot	
Logistic	
WN	-2.077 (0.018)*
BN	-2.046 (0.027)*
AIN	0.597 (0.359)
AN	1.218 (0.031)*
HED	N/A
HUne	0.186 (0.749)
HWe	2.197 (0.018)*
Note:	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

We can see similar results, that were obtained in the previous cities, where average exposure is positively correlated to hotspots of the city. Table 19 shows the results of our logistic regression model. We see that restaurants in zip codes that are in a hotspot are highly Asian and highly wealthy neighborhoods. We also observed that restaurants in zip codes that are in a hotspot have lower numbers of white and black populations. Interestingly, we didn't find any results for education. Upon further examination we found that the percentage of people with bachelor's degrees for all the zip codes was higher than that of the whole city average i.e., 39.6% based on Census [20]. Figure 11 shows the heatmap for New York City.



**Figure 11: Heatmap for New York City**

We can visually see that major hotspots are all scattered in highly educated neighborhoods (shown in Figure 11a), hence confirming why we did not obtain any result from our regression model and highly wealthy neighborhoods, (shown in Figure 11b). Therefore, we can draw a conclusion about Yelp in the city of New York,

businesses that are in the hotspots, have higher average exposure, hence finding support for  $H3$ , and businesses that are in zip codes that are in a hotspot, are in highly wealthy and Asian neighborhoods and they are also in the neighborhoods that have lower white and black populations, hence we partially find support for  $H4$ .

**San Francisco:** Figure 6g shows the exposure of restaurants in the city of San Francisco. Using the DBSCAN algorithm, we were able to identify 120 clusters. Using our threshold, we obtained 13 hotspots in the city of San Francisco. Table 20 shows the results of our linear regression model. We can see similar results, that were


**Table 20: Results of the regression analysis of average exposure with hotspot for San Francisco**

Dependent variable:	
average exposure	
Linear	
Hotspot	0.021 (0.020)*
Observations	353
Adjusted R-squared	0.01239
Note:	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

**Table 21: Results of the regression analysis of hotspot with other sensitive attributes for San Francisco**

Dependent variable:	
Hotspot	
Logistic	
WN	-1.457 (0.144)
BN	0.027 (0.963)
AIN	-0.786 (0.303)
AN	-1.812 (0.225)
HED	13.214 (0.000)***
HUne	0.826 (0.368)
HWe	1.491 (0.049)*
Note:	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

obtained in the previous cities, where average exposure is positively correlated to the hotspots of the city. Table 21 shows the results of our logistic regression model. We see that restaurants in zip codes that are in a hotspot are in highly educated and are in highly wealth neighbourhoods. Interestingly none of the demographic groups have any correlation with hotspots.



**Figure 12: Heatmap for San Francisco**

Figure 12 shows the heatmap for San Francisco. We can visually see that major hotspots are all scattered in highly educated (shown in Figure 12a) and highly wealthy neighborhoods, (shown in Figure 12b). Therefore, we can draw a conclusion about Yelp in the city of San Francisco, businesses that are in the hotspots, have higher average exposure, and businesses that are in zip codes that are in a hotspot, are in highly wealthy and highly educated neighborhoods. While we do find support for  $H3$ , we were only able to partially find support for  $H4$ .

**San Jose:** Figure 6h shows the exposure of restaurants in the city of San Jose. Using the DBSCAN algorithm, we were able to identify 151 clusters. Using our threshold, we obtained 10 hotspots




Figure 13: Wealth heatmap for Seattle

Table 22: Results of the regression analysis of average exposure with hotspot for San Jose

<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
<i>average exposure</i>	
<i>Linear</i>	
Hotspot	0.027 (0.005)**
Observations	346
Adjusted R-squared	0.01239
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

in the city of San Jose. Table 22 shows the results of our linear regression model. We can see similar results, that were obtained in the previous cities, where average exposure is positively correlated to hotspots of the city, hence we cannot reject our  $H3$ .

**Seattle:** Figure 6i shows the exposure of restaurants in the city of Seattle. Using the DBSCAN algorithm, we were able to identify 103 clusters. Using our threshold, we obtained 11 hotspots in the city of San Jose. Table 23 shows the results of our linear regression model. We can see similar results, that were obtained in the previous

Table 23: Results of the regression analysis of average exposure with hotspot for Seattle

<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
<i>average exposure</i>	
<i>Linear</i>	
Hotspot	0.023 (0.025)*
Observations	305
Adjusted R-squared	0.01312
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table 24: Results of the regression analysis of hotspot with other sensitive attributes for Seattle

<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
<i>Hotspot</i>	
<i>Logistic</i>	
WN	-3.145 (0.092)
BN	-0.122 (0.933)
AIN	-2.629 (0.016)*
AN	-0.709 (0.659)
HED	-0.441 (0.795)
HU <sub>ne</sub>	0.059 (0.965)
HWe	-2.066 (0.000)**
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

cities, where average exposure is positively correlated to hotspots of the city. Table 24 shows the results of our logistic regression model. We find that restaurants in zip codes that are in a hotspot have a smaller American Indian population and are in less wealthy neighborhoods.

Figure 13 shows the heatmap of wealth for the city of Seattle. We can clearly see that the hotspots are in areas where the wealth is less, hence our analysis stands true. Therefore, we can draw a conclusion about Yelp in the city of Seattle, businesses that are in the hotspots, have higher average exposure, and businesses that are in zip codes that are in a hotspot, are in less wealthy neighborhoods and have less number of American Indian population. While we find support for  $H3$ , we reject our  $H4$ .