
Online Algorithmic Recourse by Collective Action

Elliot Creager^{1,2} Richard Zemel^{1,2}

Abstract

Research on algorithmic recourse typically considers how an individual can reasonably change an unfavorable automated decision when interacting with a fixed decision-making system. This paper focuses instead on the online setting, where system parameters are updated dynamically according to interactions with data subjects. Beyond the typical individual-level recourse, the online setting opens up new ways for groups to shape system decisions by leveraging the parameter update rule. We show empirically that recourse can be improved when users coordinate by jointly computing their feature perturbations, underscoring the importance of collective action in mitigating adverse automated decisions.

1. Introduction

Pressing legal and ethical considerations have motivated a recent flurry of research on algorithmic recourse. Generally, the technical framing of recourse computation involves a solving a constrained optimization problem that, given a fixed classifier f_θ , finds the minimal amount of (plausible or actionable) effort required by individual i to reverse an undesirable model prediction $\hat{Y}_i = f_\theta(X_i)$ given their features X_i (Ustun et al., 2019; Karimi et al., 2020). In some applications, however, the model parameters θ may update upon deployment after new data are collected. This opens up new avenues for realizing recourse, as the model behavior can be influenced indirectly through the parameter update rule. Because training and test inputs are typically distinct, we will consider new types of recourse where (1) an individual seeks additional recourse assistance from *others* whose data is used to train the model; and (2) those providing this additional recourse act *collectively* towards this goal.

Consider a machine learning system that determines (or partially determines) high school assignment for an amal-

gamated school district comprising two neighborhoods $\{\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2\}$ and two high schools $\{\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2\}$. The school district’s model f_θ is trained to assign 8th graders to high schools based on a labeled dataset of input features X_i (covariates collected about students prior to starting high school) and a label Y_i indicating academic success after a period of time, such as graduation or GPA. In principle, the model seeks to assign students to the school where their chances for success will be maximized. In practice, it may learn a policy that (mostly) segregates students from \mathcal{N}_1 into \mathcal{H}_1 , and from \mathcal{N}_2 into \mathcal{H}_2 . This could arise due to seemingly innocuous proxies in the training data, such as number of extracurricular activities, perhaps higher in \mathcal{N}_1 where more sports facilities are available, correlating with academic success in \mathcal{H}_1 .

Now suppose that \mathcal{H}_1 offers more Advanced Placement (AP) courses than \mathcal{H}_2 . Consider a subset of high-achieving students $S \subset \mathcal{N}_2$ that want to take AP classes, but were assigned $f_\theta(X_i) = \mathcal{H}_2 \forall X_i \in S$. While the ambition of these students suggests they would be well equipped to succeed in \mathcal{H}_1 , they are nevertheless assigned to \mathcal{H}_2 due to their low number of extracurricular activities. What recourse is available to them to change their school assignment?

One way to compute (individualized) recourse for $i \in S$ is to assume a fixed f_θ , then determine an actionable feature perturbation δ (e.g. increasing extracurricular activities) such that $f_\theta(X_i + \delta_i) = \mathcal{H}_1$. While this may prove useful the specific $i \in S$ in question, we focus on a different avenue for recourse that takes a longer-term perspective by leveraging the learning rule for the model parameters θ . If we assume that θ is updated each year using the graduating classes from $\{\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2\}$ as a new training set, then all current students from \mathcal{H}_1 can collectively help prospective students from S by under-reporting their extracurricular activity, causing f_θ to ignore this proxy variable when predicting next year’s admissions cohort.

This method of *collective recourse* is actionable, coordinated, and arguably provides a better long-term fix to the neighborhood diversity problem across both schools, all without relying on the district officials who deploy f_θ (who may or may not care about the long-term fairness of their system). Crucially, this type of recourse requires that f_θ updates *online* as new data becomes available. To further

¹University of Toronto ²Vector Institute. Correspondence to: Elliot Creager <creager@cs.toronto.edu>.

investigate this issue, we present a technical framework for Online Algorithmic Recourse (OAR), and present preliminary evidence that collective action can be an effective way to shape model behavior in the online setting. Our approach is inspired by recent advances in adversarial machine learning that also exploit knowledge of a learning rule to find small train-time perturbations that change test-time predictions.

2. Method

Preliminaries Denote by $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ an observation of d features from the i -th “data subject” (i.e. individual), and by $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^k$ its associated target, which could be a one-hot encoded class label for k -way classification, or real-valued vector for k -dimensional regression. In some cases Y_i may correspond to a real-world outcome, as in the school admissions case mentioned above; other times they may be assigned by a labeler (often a crowd worker). When observations from N individuals are collected at once, they make a “batch” of labeled data (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) with $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$ and $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times k}$, i.e. $\mathbf{X} = [X_1 \dots X_N]^T$. The model is specified by a prediction function $f_\theta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ with parameters θ , along with a scalar loss function $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that scores a model prediction $\hat{y} = f_\theta(x)$ w.r.t its target y . Crucially, the designers of the model assume the individuals within \mathbf{X} to be *distributed i.i.d.*, $p(\mathbf{X}) = \prod_i p(X_i)$, which justifies learning the parameters by minimizing the empirical risk $R(\theta, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ as follows:

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \underbrace{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{L}(f_\theta(X_i), Y_i)}_{R(\theta, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})}. \quad (1)$$

Any suitable regularizer(s), e.g. weight decay, can be added onto the empirical risk $R(\theta, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ as needed, but we omit them here for ease of exposition.

This paper is concerned with measuring and improving a particular type of recourse, where the data subjects comprising the “batch” \mathbf{X} seek to change the model’s behavior when making predictions or decisions about some *other* individual(s), the *query subject(s)*. In general, there may be multiple query subjects, and the data subject and query subject groups may be overlapping, but for simplicity of exposition, we consider only one such *query subject*, and denote its features and (true) target as (X_\dagger, Y_\dagger) . Regardless of the true value of the query target Y_\dagger , the query subject seeks to have the model predict a particular *goal target* \tilde{Y}_\dagger on the query subjects features, i.e. recourse is successful if $f_\theta(X_\dagger) = \tilde{Y}_\dagger$. As we discuss next, this can be accomplished by the query subject perturbing their features (individual recourse), or by a coordinated effort of the data subjects on

behalf of the query subject (collective recourse).

Individual recourse Given the query subject’s desire to set their model prediction to \tilde{Y}_\dagger , the most immediate avenue for recourse is for the query subject to directly perturb their inputs. Assuming that such a perturbation must have a small p -norm¹ of $\epsilon \geq 0$, this means of *individual recourse* can be summarized by the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^*(X_\dagger) &= \arg \min_{\delta} \mathcal{L}(f(X_\dagger + \delta), \tilde{Y}_\dagger) \\ \text{s.t. } & \|\delta\|_p \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

By encouraging the model assign low loss for the perturbed input when $Y = \tilde{Y}_\dagger$, the query subject maximizes the chances that the model will predict $\hat{Y} = \tilde{Y}_\dagger$ on the perturbed X_\dagger .

Online algorithmic recourse We now examine the leverage that data subjects have on the query subject’s model prediction. If f_θ is fixed and learned ahead of time (i.e. the data subjects are not part of the training data), then its predictions will be rendered independently, and the data subjects have no influence on the fate of the query subject.² However, if the model updates its parameters *online*, the data subjects can realize leverage over model behavior through its update rule.

Assuming an online regime, we allow each data subject X_i to make a small perturbation δ_i on its features, where $\|\delta_i\|_p \leq \epsilon$. The data subjects will assert recourse on behalf of the query subject by affecting the model predictions via the model parameter updates from Eq. (1); specifically, they try to encourage the model to have low loss on $(X_\dagger, \tilde{Y}_\dagger)$, i.e. $f_\theta(X_\dagger) \approx \tilde{Y}_\dagger$. Letting $\Delta = [\delta_1 \dots \delta_N]^T$ denote the batched perturbations for all data subjects and $\text{rows}(\Delta)$ the set of its unique row vectors, this implies the following bi-level optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^* &= \arg \min_{\Delta} \mathcal{L}(f_{\theta^*(\Delta)}(X_\dagger), \tilde{Y}_\dagger) \\ \text{s.t. } & \theta^*(\Delta) = \arg \min_{\theta} R(\theta, \mathbf{X} + \Delta, \mathbf{Y}) \\ & \|\delta_i\|_p \leq \epsilon \forall \delta_i \in \text{rows}(\Delta). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Because the data subjects exercise recourse through the model’s online parameter updates, we dub this Online Algo-

¹We measure size of the perturbation using a p -norm here for convenience, but this could easily be replaced with another suitable metric, e.g. indicating a cost or feasibility of recourse per feature (Ustun et al., 2019).

²One subtle exception is when f_θ is a deep neural net trained with batch norm, where it is somewhat common for the batch norm parameters to be updated at test time by computing activations statistics over the test inputs (test labels are not required for this). Thus it is possible that data subjects could affect the query subject prediction by adversarially attacking the batch norm parameters at test time.




Figure 1. Online algorithmic recourse under a nearest-centroid classifier. **Left:** A nearest-centroid classifier with parameters $\theta = \{\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3\}$ is fit to 20 data subjects, with features \mathbf{X} (circles) and class labels \mathbf{Y} (circle colors). A query subject X_{\dagger} seeks to change their prediction under this model to $\hat{Y}_{\dagger} = 1$. The query subject can exercise *individual recourse* by applying the best perturbation δ with $\|\delta\| \leq \epsilon$ towards this end, moving $X_{\dagger} + \delta$ towards the decision boundary separating $\hat{Y} = 1$ from $\hat{Y} = 2$. **Right:** Another means of recourse is to have *all* data subjects coordinate by applying perturbations $\Delta = [\delta_1 \dots \delta_N]^T$ with $\|\delta_i\| \leq \epsilon \forall i$ in order to help the query subject. Note that this changes the model’s decision boundary, as the centroids $\{\mu_k\}$ are fit to the perturbed data $(\mathbf{X} + \Delta, \mathbf{Y})$. This *collective recourse* is more effective in this instance, as we see that once the model fits new centroids to the perturbed training data, X_{\dagger} lies on the desired side of the model decision boundary. Data in this example come from first two features of the UCI-Iris dataset.

rithmic Recourse (OAR). We note that this framework can be extended to handle multiple timesteps of model updates, which we leave for future work.

Collective action A solution to Eq. (3) can be seen as a sort of *collective recourse*, where the data subjects act to change the model behavior on behalf of the query subject. We verify in the experiments below that, in a simple setting where good solutions to Eq. (3) can be readily computed, this collective action can actually be *more effective* than if the query subject directly perturbs their features as in Eq. (2). Recall the key assumption underpinning the model design: that training and test points are drawn i.i.d. from the same distribution. By coordinating their actions on behalf of the query subject, the data subjects *violate the i.i.d. assumption by collective action*, thus realizing considerable leverage over model behavior. OAR provides a simple and intuitive framework in which to explore this theme. Fig. 1 illustrates the difference between collective and individual recourse.

3. Related work

A key inspiration for the OAR framework is the recent work on computing adversarial training examples, often referred to as Data Poisoning (DP) (Koh & Liang, 2017; Shafahi et al., 2018; Shan et al., 2020; Geiping et al., 2021; Cherepanova et al., 2021). Generally, DP seeks to degrade test-time predictive performance via imperceptible pertur-

bations to (some of) the training set. For example, Geiping et al. (2021) used bi-level constrained optimization (similar to OAR) to poison a subset of training data using a gradient alignment procedure on an auxiliary classifier trained from public data. In some instances OAR and DP may be strongly aligned, e.g. when a nefarious online surveillance tool is deployed and the data subjects seek recourse by reducing overall model accuracy with imperceptible input perturbations (Albert et al., 2020). In other instances, OAR may differ by seeking perceptible (but actionable) perturbations that change model behavior in more targeted way, i.e. for a specific query subject rather than the global population.

Our work is also inspired by Protective Optimization Technologies (POTs) (Kulynych et al., 2020), a broad framework that discusses the countermeasures available to data subjects facing automated decisions rendered by an untrustworthy party. For example Kulynych et al. (2020) present a greedy algorithm for selectively curating a training set to ensure particular fairness criteria in f_{θ} are realized; by contrast, our empirical approach focuses on additive perturbations on the features, which are optimized jointly via gradient-based methods.

OAR also bears a resemblance to strategic classification (Hardt et al., 2016; Milli et al., 2019), since data subjects change their features to encourage certain model behaviors. One difference is that whereas strategic classifiers seek equilibrium in a Stackelberg game where the model leads and

the data subjects follow, in our setup the roles are reversed. Perdomo et al. (2020) proposed Performative Prediction (PP), whereby the data distribution changes as a function of the model parameters $p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = \mathcal{D}(\theta)$, and a model stability w.r.t. this dynamic is sought. Whereas PP assumes a fixed mapping \mathcal{D} , OAR can be phrased as computing an optimal mapping \mathcal{D} from the perspective of maximizing recourse.

The Algorithmic Recourse literature has recently taken steps towards moving “beyond individualized recourse” (Rawal & Lakkaraju, 2020; Karimi et al., 2020), by computing population-level recommendations (Rawal & Lakkaraju, 2020), or examining situations where one data subject seeks actionable recourse on behalf of another (Venkatasubramanian & Alfano, 2020). Our approach is distinct in its focus on the online setting, specifically examining recourse that data subjects have through the update to θ .

4. Experiments

In this section we present a simple proof-of-concept experiment showing that recourse can be improved by viewing the problem through an online lens, then solving for the optimal collective (rather than individual) action.

Setup We use the following simple classification datasets:

- UCI-Iris:³ we use (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) as the $N = 150$ examples of $d = 4$ attributes are collected from each of $k = 3$ flower types;
- MNIST:⁴ we use (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) as the $N = 60,000$ handwritten digits stored as 28×28 -pixel greyscale images, with $k = 10$ classes corresponding digits 0–9. Prior to computing recourse we embed the images in a pre-trained VAE embedding space with $d = 10$ dimensions.

For each dataset, we compute individual recourse by solving Eq. (2) and collective recourse by solving Eq. (3), using $p = 2$ to compute p -norms in the constraint. We choose a synthetic query point X_{\dagger} that lies soundly within the model’s decision boundary for $\hat{Y} = f_{\theta}(X_{\dagger}) = 2$, then specify $\tilde{Y}_{\dagger} = 1$, meaning that the query prediction should be flipped. For lack of space, we defer details to Appendix A.

Results While the data subjects have only an indirect influence on the model through its parameter update, we find that this influence is substantial in practice. In fact, across all ϵ budgets, we find that collective recourse is more effective than individual recourse, as we see that for a given ϵ , the loss $\mathcal{L}(X_{\dagger}, \tilde{Y}_{\dagger})$ is lower (as desired) for the collective




Figure 2. Measuring success of recourse according to model loss for query goal class \tilde{Y}_{\dagger} evaluated at query input X_{\dagger} (the lower the better). The model is a nearest centroid classifier. We find that on UCI-Iris (left), and MNIST (right), collective recourse is more effective than individual recourse at a given ϵ budget.

perturbations than the individual perturbations (Fig. 2). In other words, the perturbations on the data subjects’ inputs \mathbf{X} , which were computed by phrasing recourse as an *online* problem, change the model behavior for the query subject more than if the query subject acts on their own behalf to directly perturb their inputs X_{\dagger} .

5. Discussion

In this paper we drew inspiration from the adversarial machine learning literature to present the framework of Online Algorithmic Recourse (OAR), and presented preliminary evidence that there may be power in numbers when it comes to achieving recourse in this setting. That is, data subjects can coordinate to mitigate undesirable prediction on separate query subject(s) because their data determines the model’s update rule. However there remains much to be done in this area. For example, while we constrained the perturbations by their p -norm for convenience, alternative constraints that represent actionability, feasibility, or diversity of recourse could enable the adoption of techniques from the counterfactual explanation literature (Ustun et al., 2019; Poyiadzi et al., 2020; Dandl et al., 2020) to the computation of collective recourse. Also, our experiments assumed the data subjects have access to the model’s loss function (analogous to white-box adversarial attacks). In the future we would like to relax this assumption, noting that adversarial attacks often generalize across architectures (Demontis et al., 2019), so that black-box attacks can be realized by training auxiliary models using public data (Geiping et al., 2021). Finally, we have thusfar ignored the role of the labeling process. When labels are acquired using crowd workers, the labelers themselves have plenty of leverage over model behavior that could be used for algorithmic recourse, and are already known to work collaboratively (Irani & Silberman, 2013).

³<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/iris>

⁴<http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>

References

- Albert, K., Penney, J., Schneier, B., and Siva Kumar, R. S. Politics of adversarial machine learning. In *Towards Trustworthy ML: Rethinking Security and Privacy for ML Workshop, Eighth International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2020.
- Cherepanova, V., Goldblum, M., Foley, H., Duan, S., Dickerson, J., Taylor, G., and Goldstein, T. Lowkey: leveraging adversarial attacks to protect social media users from facial recognition. 2021.
- Dandl, S., Molnar, C., Binder, M., and Bischl, B. Multi-objective counterfactual explanations. In *International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature*, pp. 448–469. Springer, 2020.
- Demontis, A., Melis, M., Pintor, M., Jagielski, M., Biggio, B., Oprea, A., Nita-Rotaru, C., and Roli, F. Why do adversarial attacks transfer? explaining transferability of evasion and poisoning attacks. In *Proceedings of the 28th USENIX Conference on Security Symposium, SEC’19*, pp. 321–338, USA, 2019. USENIX Association. ISBN 9781939133069.
- Geiping, J., Fowl, L., Huang, W. R., Czaja, W., Taylor, G., Moeller, M., and Goldstein, T. Witches’ brew: Industrial scale data poisoning via gradient matching. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Goodfellow, I., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., Xu, B., Warde-Farley, D., Ozair, S., Courville, A., and Bengio, Y. Generative adversarial nets. In Ghahramani, Z., Welling, M., Cortes, C., Lawrence, N., and Weinberger, K. Q. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27. Curran Associates, Inc., 2014. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2014/file/5ca3e9b122f61f8f06494c97b1afccf3-Paper.pdf>.
- Hardt, M., Megiddo, N., Papadimitriou, C., and Wootters, M. Strategic classification. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM conference on innovations in theoretical computer science*, pp. 111–122, 2016.
- Irani, L. C. and Silberman, M. S. Turkocticon: Interrupting worker invisibility in amazon mechanical turk. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pp. 611–620, 2013.
- Karimi, A.-H., Barthe, G., Schölkopf, B., and Valera, I. A survey of algorithmic recourse: definitions, formulations, solutions, and prospects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.04050*, 2020.
- Koh, P. W. and Liang, P. Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1885–1894. PMLR, 2017.
- Kulynych, B., Overdorf, R., Troncoso, C., and Gürses, S. Pots: protective optimization technologies. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 177–188, 2020.
- Lorraine, J. and Duvenaud, D. Stochastic hyperparameter optimization through hypernetworks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.09419*, 2018.
- Maclaurin, D., Duvenaud, D., and Adams, R. Gradient-based hyperparameter optimization through reversible learning. In Bach, F. and Blei, D. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 37 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 2113–2122, Lille, France, 07–09 Jul 2015. PMLR. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v37/maclaurin15.html>.
- Milli, S., Miller, J., Dragan, A. D., and Hardt, M. The social cost of strategic classification. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAT* ’19*, pp. 230–239, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450361255. doi: 10.1145/3287560.3287576. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287576>.
- Perdomo, J., Zrnic, T., Mendler-Dünner, C., and Hardt, M. Performative prediction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 7599–7609. PMLR, 2020.
- Poyiadzi, R., Sokol, K., Santos-Rodriguez, R., De Bie, T., and Flach, P. Face: Feasible and actionable counterfactual explanations. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pp. 344–350, 2020.
- Rawal, K. and Lakkaraju, H. Beyond individualized recourse: Interpretable and interactive summaries of actionable recourses. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.
- Shafahi, A., Huang, W. R., Najibi, M., Suci, O., Studer, C., Dumitras, T., and Goldstein, T. Poison frogs! targeted clean-label poisoning attacks on neural networks. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018.
- Shan, S., Wenger, E., Zhang, J., Li, H., Zheng, H., and Zhao, B. Y. Fawkes: Protecting privacy against unauthorized deep learning models. In *29th {USENIX} Security Symposium ({USENIX} Security 20)*, pp. 1589–1604, 2020.
- Snell, J., Swersky, K., and Zemel, R. S. Prototypical networks for few-shot learning. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.

Ustun, B., Spangher, A., and Liu, Y. Actionable recourse in linear classification. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 10–19, 2019.

Venkatasubramanian, S. and Alfano, M. The philosophical basis of algorithmic recourse. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAT* '20, pp. 284–293, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450369367. doi: 10.1145/3351095.3372876. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372876>.

A. Experimental details

For each dataset, we fit a nearest centroid classifier to (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) . This is a distance-based classifier that assigns predictive probability of X belonging to class $Y = y$ as

$$p(Y = y|X) = \frac{\exp(-\|X - \mu_y\|)}{\sum_{y'=1}^k \exp(-\|X - \mu_{y'}\|)}.$$

The model parameters are the per-class centroid vectors $\theta = \{\mu_y\} \forall y \in 1..k$, which are fit by maximum likelihood (equivalent to computing per-class averages in the data space).

We note that, despite their simplicity, distance-based classifiers such as nearest centroid are fairly common in deep learning (applied within a learned embedding space), especially in few-shot learning (Snell et al., 2017). The base model achieves training accuracies of 96% and 83% on UCI-Iris and MNIST, respectively.

For the MNIST dataset, rather than fitting centroids to the pixels directly, we first embedded the images into a learned 10-dimensional VAE embedding space. For the VAE encoder and decoder, we used two-hidden-layer MLPs with 512 hidden neurons per layer, which were trained for 500 epochs using SGD with learning rate 0.001 and momentum 0.9. Following training, we embed the images by directly using the encoder mean for each image, rather than sampling from a Gaussian with the encoder mean and variance as parameters.

We choose f_θ to be a nearest-centroid classifier because the optimal post-update model parameters under perturbation, i.e. $\theta^*(\Delta)$ from Eq. (3), can be computed in closed form. Thus substituting this solution into Eq. (3) gives a single-level constrained optimization problem, instead of the bilevel problem required for generic f_θ . We note that several approaches to solving the generic bilevel optimization problem—e.g. unrolling or approximating the lower-level solution as in hyperparameter optimization (Maclaurin et al., 2015; Lorraine & Duvenaud, 2018) or alternating updates

as in GANs (Goodfellow et al., 2014)—could be employed here to tackle generic (twice) differentiable models f_θ , but we leave this for future work.

We specify a query point as $X_{\dagger} = \alpha\mu_1 + (1 - \alpha)\mu_2$ (we use $\alpha = 0.25$ in our experiments), with corresponding query goal target $\tilde{Y}_{\dagger} = 1$. The query input X_{\dagger} thus lies close to the $Y = 2$ centroid, but its model prediction must be flipped so that $\tilde{Y}_{\dagger} = 1$.

We compute individual and collective recourse by approximately solving Eq. (2) and Eq. (3), respectively. For ease of implementation, we use a heuristic projected-gradient attack to solve each optimization problem. Noting that, as mentioned above, the choice of nearest centroid model makes both Eq. (2) and Eq. (3) constrained optimization problems, we compute a gradient w.r.t the perturbation of the objective, then normalize the perturbation to have the desired norm of ϵ .