

# One Fits All: Learning Fair Graph Neural Networks for Various Sensitive Attributes

Yuchang Zhu  
Sun Yat-sen University  
Guangzhou, China  
zhuych27@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

Jintang Li  
Sun Yat-sen University  
Guangzhou, China  
lijt55@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

Yatao Bian  
Tencent AI Lab  
Shenzhen, China  
yatao.bian@gmail.com

Zibin Zheng  
Sun Yat-sen University  
Guangzhou, China  
zhzibin@mail.sysu.edu.cn

Liang Chen\*  
Sun Yat-sen University  
Guangzhou, China  
chenliang6@mail.sysu.edu.cn

## ABSTRACT

Recent studies have highlighted fairness issues in Graph Neural Networks (GNNs), where they produce discriminatory predictions against specific protected groups categorized by sensitive attributes such as race and age. While various efforts to enhance GNN fairness have made significant progress, these approaches are often tailored to specific sensitive attributes. Consequently, they necessitate retraining the model from scratch to accommodate changes in the sensitive attribute requirement, resulting in high computational costs. To gain deeper insights into this issue, we approach the graph fairness problem from a causal modeling perspective, where we identify the confounding effect induced by the sensitive attribute as the underlying reason. Motivated by this observation, we formulate the fairness problem in graphs from an invariant learning perspective, which aims to learn invariant representations across environments. Accordingly, we propose a graph fairness framework based on invariant learning, namely **FairINV**, which enables the training of fair GNNs to accommodate various sensitive attributes within a single training session. Specifically, FairINV incorporates sensitive attribute partition and trains fair GNNs by eliminating spurious correlations between the label and various sensitive attributes. Experimental results on several real-world datasets demonstrate that FairINV significantly outperforms state-of-the-art fairness approaches, underscoring its effectiveness.<sup>1</sup>

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Computing methodologies** → **Knowledge representation and reasoning.**

## KEYWORDS

Fairness, Graph Neural Networks, Invariant Learning

\*Corresponding author.

<sup>1</sup>Our code is available via: <https://github.com/ZzoomD/FairINV/>.

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

*KDD '24, August 25–29, 2024, Barcelona, Spain*

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3637528.3672029>

## ACM Reference Format:


Yuchang Zhu, Jintang Li, Yatao Bian, Zibin Zheng, and Liang Chen. 2024. One Fits All: Learning Fair Graph Neural Networks for Various Sensitive Attributes. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD '24)*, August 25–29, 2024, Barcelona, Spain. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 12 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3637528.3672029>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Graph neural networks (GNNs) have achieved tremendous success in processing graph-structured data, such as citation networks [38, 42] and social networks [28, 40]. Consequently, this advancement has led to their application across diverse domains, including fraud detection [16], recommender systems [45], and drug discovery [6]. However, recent studies [13, 39] have unveiled a concerning trend that GNNs make discriminatory decisions toward the specific protected groups defined by sensitive attributes, e.g., race, and age. This phenomenon, termed the group fairness problem of GNNs, hinders the application of GNNs in high-stake scenarios.

To improve the fairness of GNNs, considerable efforts have been devoted to debiasing the training data [15, 32] or learning fair GNNs directly [7, 13], referred to as the pre-process and in-process approaches, respectively. Within these two methodological categories, common implementations encompass adversarial learning [32, 43], distribution alignment among various protected groups [15, 19], graph-structured data modification [15, 32, 39], and edge reweighting [30]. Despite significant progress, these approaches are often tailored to specific sensitive attributes, as shown in Figure 1(a). Consequently, training GNN models from scratch becomes imperative when faced with fairness requirement alterations in sensitive attributes, such as transitioning from age-based considerations to gender-related factors. Take loan approvals in a credit card network as an example, according to fairness policies, initially trained GNNs are designed to make fair decisions toward the protected groups divided by age, e.g., age  $\leq 25$  and age  $> 25$ . However, when policies change to focus on gender, necessitating fair treatment between male and female groups, the previously tailored model optimized for age fairness becomes inadequate. Hence, this mandates retraining the GNN model to ensure fairness regarding gender, which is a laborious and computationally intensive process.

In summary, there is a significant demand for a universal graph fairness approach that trains fair GNNs across various sensitive attributes in a single training session. Achieving such an approach entails addressing the following challenges: (1) **Generalization**



**Figure 1: An illustration of comparison between prior works and our work (FairINV). (a) Prior works (pre-process and in-process) achieve fairness toward the specific sensitive attribute; (b) Our work trains fair GNNs toward various sensitive attributes in a single training session without accessing the sensitive attribute.**

**to various sensitive attributes.** Previous studies aim to achieve fairness tailored for the specific sensitive attribute. Additionally, these approaches always require accessing the sensitive attributes in the training process, which is impractical in real-world scenarios due to legal limitations [8, 27]. Correspondingly, our first challenge is to design a fairness framework that achieves fairness w.r.t. various sensitive attributes in a single training session without accessing the sensitive attribute, as shown in Figure 1(b). (2) **Full fairness.** According to Section 3.2, two causal pathways ( $S \rightarrow Y$  and  $S \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \rightarrow Y$ ) demonstrate how the sensitive attribute  $S$  influences the labels  $Y$ , misleading the trained GNNs to capture the sensitive attribute information for predictions. In this regard,  $S$  is a confounder. To achieve full fairness, blocking these two causal effects appears to be a straightforward solution. However, it is challenging due to the presence of underlying spurious correlations between unobservable variables  $S$  and  $Y$ . As discussed in Section 3.2, prior works failed to eliminate both causal effects concurrently. Inspired by INV-REG [34], backdoor adjustment implemented by data partition presents a promising approach to tackle this challenge.

In this work, we first formulate the graph fairness issue from an invariant learning [10, 29, 44] perspective, where sensitive attributes as environments. Building upon this formulation, we propose a universal graph fairness framework named **FairINV**. To overcome the first challenge, FairINV jointly optimizes a fair GNN for multiple sensitive attributes inferred automatically via sensitive attribute partition. To overcome the second challenge, FairINV incorporates invariant learning optimization objectives building upon sensitive attribute partition to remove confounding effects induced by  $S$ . Specifically, the optimization objective of FairINV gives rise to equal predictions of trained GNNs across environments (sensitive attributes). In summary, FairINV mitigates spurious correlations between various sensitive attributes and the label. Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We study the fairness issue on graphs from an invariant learning perspective. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt to explore graph fairness from this particular perspective.
- We introduce FairINV, a universal graph fairness framework that inherits the spirit of graph invariant learning. An unsupervised sensitive attributes partition of FairINV facilitates fairness improvement in terms of various sensitive attributes.

- We conduct experiments on several real-world datasets to validate the effectiveness of FairINV. Experimental results show that FairINV can train a fair GNN toward various sensitive attributes in a single training session.

## 2 RELATED WORK

### 2.1 Fairness in Graph Neural Networks

The fairness of GNNs includes group fairness [2, 13] and individual fairness [14, 24]. Our study focuses on the group fairness aspect, emphasizing equitable model decisions for each protected group partitioned by the sensitive attribute. Recent studies improving group fairness in GNNs typically segregate into pre-process [15, 32] and in-process [7, 43] approaches. Pre-process approaches aim to mitigate biases in training data before training downstream tasks. To mitigate biases, techniques like adversarial learning [32], and distribution alignment [12, 15, 47] serve as optimization objectives for debiasing training data. Additionally, some heuristic approaches modify the training graph [31, 39] or reweight edge [25, 30] by either enhancing connections between diverse groups or reducing connections within the same groups. In-process approaches aim to train fair GNNs through the fairness-aware framework. Similar to pre-process approaches, in-process approaches also incorporate adversarial learning [7, 13] and distribution alignment [18, 19] to learn GNNs. Despite significant progress, these approaches are tailored to the specific sensitive attribute, lacking considerations for various sensitive attributes.

Despite Bose et al.’s [7] work of a compositional adversarial framework using a set of sensitive-invariant filters, it necessitates prior knowledge of considered sensitive attributes and their specific values for each individual. In contrast, our work learns fair GNNs toward various sensitive attributes in a single training session without accessing sensitive attributes, which remains under-explored for prior works.

### 2.2 Invariant Learning for Fairness

Guided by the independent causal mechanism assumption [35, 36], invariant learning, capable of capturing invariances across various environments, stands as a significant approach facilitating out-of-distribution (OOD) generalization [3, 4, 11, 41]. The core idea behind invariant learning is to learn causal information that stays invariant

across different environments while disregarding spurious correlations that exhibit variability [9]. However, there is limited research exploring the application of invariance learning in fairness. Adragna et al. [1] empirically illustrate how invariant risk minimization in invariant learning can contribute to building fair machine learning models. Ma et al. [34] point out the fairness-related bias in face recognition stemming from confounding demographic attributes. Then, they iteratively partition data to annotate confounders and learn invariant features to remove the confounding effect. Yet, these explorations of invariant learning in fairness predominantly focus on Euclidean data. Conversely, significant efforts [10, 29, 33] have addressed the out-of-distribution problem within graph structures from an invariant learning perspective. However, the effectiveness of invariant learning in ensuring graph fairness remains an under-explored area. To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first to explore the graph fairness problem utilizing graph invariant learning.

### 3 PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we first introduce the detailed notations used in this work. Then, we give a causal analysis for our study problem, followed by the problem formulation of this work.

#### 3.1 Notations

Let  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathbf{X})$  denote an undirected and unweighted attributed graph, where  $\mathcal{V}$  is a set of nodes and  $\mathcal{E}$  is a set of edges. Meanwhile,  $|\mathcal{V}| = n$  and  $|\mathcal{E}| = m$  represent the number of nodes and edges, respectively.  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  represents the node attribute matrix without the sensitive attribute  $S$  where  $d$  is the node attribute dimension.  $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$  is the adjacency matrix where  $\mathbf{A}_{uv} = 1$  indicates the edge connection  $e_{uv} \in \mathcal{E}$  between the node  $u$  and the node  $v$ , and  $\mathbf{A}_{uv} = 0$  otherwise. Nodes with the same sensitive attribute value belong to the same protected group. Most GNNs follow the message-passing mechanism, which aggregates messages from their neighbors, and can be summarized as follows:


$$\mathbf{h}_u^{(l)} = \text{UPD}^{(l)}(\{\mathbf{h}_v^{(l-1)}, \text{AGG}^{(l)}(\{\mathbf{h}_v^{(l-1)} : v \in \mathcal{N}(u)\})\}), \quad (1)$$

where  $l$  is the layer number,  $\text{AGG}^{(l)}(\cdot)$  and  $\text{UPD}^{(l)}(\cdot)$  denote aggregation function and update function in  $l$ -th layer, respectively.  $\mathcal{N}(u)$  denote the set of nodes adjacent to node  $u$ .

While our approach is applicable to various downstream tasks, in this paper, we exemplify its application using the node classification downstream task to illustrate the proposed methodology. A GNN model  $f$ , consisting of an encoder  $f_g$  and a linear classifier  $f_c$ , takes a graph  $\mathcal{G}$  as input and outputs the node predicted label  $\hat{Y} = f_c(f_g(\mathcal{G}))$ . The goal of  $f$  is to predict  $\hat{Y}$  such that it is as close as possible to the ground truth labels  $Y$ .

#### 3.2 Causal Analysis

To broaden insights, we construct a structural causal model [36] (SCM) to analyze the group fairness issue in graph-structured data. Figure 2(a) illustrates the causal relationship among the graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , the sensitive attribute  $S$ , and the node label  $Y$ . In the SCM, there are two causal pathways by which the sensitive attribute  $S$  affects the node label  $Y$ , leading to issues of group fairness in GNNs. A detailed description of these two causal pathways is provided below.



**Figure 2: Structural causal model for GNNs prediction. (a) The fairness issue on graphs can be caused by two causal pathways, i.e.,  $S \rightarrow Y$  and  $S \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \rightarrow Y$ ; (b) Prior works either exclusively eliminate the causal pathway  $S \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$  or exclusively eradicate the causal pathway  $S \rightarrow Y$ ; (c) FairINV tackles the fairness issue through blocking both two causal pathways.**

- $S \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \rightarrow Y$ . This causal pathway describes the influence of  $S$  on the formation of graph-structured data  $\mathcal{G}$ , which subsequently impacts the predictions of node labels  $Y$  by the trained GNN. Specifically, the path  $S \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$  represents the impact of  $S$  on the generation process of graph-structured data. In this context, the data exhibit two primary phenomena: (1) the graph topology exhibits sensitive homophily [22], where connected nodes are more likely to share the same sensitive attribute  $S$ . (2) Non-sensitive node attributes may implicitly convey information about  $S$ . For instance, if  $S$  represents gender, certain attributes like height, while not directly sensitive, become relevant in inferring an individual’s gender. The path  $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow Y$  encapsulates the training process of GNNs, wherein the network may inherit and subsequently propagate biases (information related to  $S$ ) present in the training data.
- $S \rightarrow Y$ . This causal pathway illustrates the underlying correlation between the node label and the sensitive attribute. This correlation often originates from societal discrimination against protected groups, leading to biased predictions in the trained GNN. For instance, given a social network dataset, the task is to predict the user’s occupational field. The dataset predominantly comprises occupations of females as nurses and males as engineers. Consequently, the GNN trained on this dataset tends to predict engineering as the occupational field for males and nursing for females, thus revealing a gender bias in its predictions. This phenomenon can be attributed to the  $S \rightarrow Y$  causal pathway inherent in the dataset.

In summary, discriminatory decisions in GNNs stem from the two causal pathways discussed above. In this regard, the pathway  $Y \leftarrow S \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$  is a backdoor path, with  $S$  acting as a confounder. This pathway may mislead the trained GNN to utilize the sensitive attribute for predictions, known as the spurious confounding effect. To remove this effect, a straightforward yet challenging solution involves eliminating  $S \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \rightarrow Y$  and  $S \rightarrow Y$ . However, prior works have not successfully removed both pathways simultaneously. As

shown in Figure 2(b), pre-process methods primarily focus on reducing the information related to the sensitive attribute in the training data, effectively removing the path  $S \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ . Conversely, in-process methods strive to develop a fair GNN that makes decisions independently of  $S$ , akin to removing the path  $S \rightarrow Y$ . Another approach to mitigate confounding effects is the backdoor adjustment, achieved by partitioning the training data into different splits. In our scenarios, we partition nodes into distinct demographic groups and learn GNNs invariant across these groups. Drawing inspiration from a fairness study in face recognition [34], we attempt to formulate the graph fairness issue from an invariant learning perspective. Leveraging the environment inference capabilities of invariant learning, we can unsupervisedly infer the sensitive attribute of nodes, facilitating group partitioning.

### 3.3 Problem Formulation

In this subsection, we formulate the graph fairness problem from an invariant learning perspective. Our work focuses on the node-level task. Following the setting of EERM [44], we investigate the impact of the node’s ego-graph on the centered node. Specifically, given a single graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathbf{X})$ , we have a set of ego-graph  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^e$  from various environment  $\mathcal{E}_{all}$ , where  $\mathcal{D}^e = \{\mathcal{G}_v^e, y_v^e\}$  is graphs from environment  $e$ .  $\mathcal{G}_v^e$  and  $y_v^e$  are the ego-graph and the node label of node  $v$ . The invariant learning aims to learn GNNs to generalize to all unseen environments. Denote  $f$  as a GNN model consisting of an encoder and a classifier,  $\hat{y}_v = f(\mathcal{G}_v)$  as the predicted label of node  $v$ , and  $\mathcal{R}^e(\cdot)$  as the empirical risk under environment  $e$ . Formally, the invariant learning on the node level is to minimize:

$$\min_f \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}_{all}} \mathcal{R}^e(f) \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{R}^e(f) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{G}_v, y_v}^e [l(f(\mathcal{G}_v), y_v)]$ ,  $l(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the loss function.

Based on the above minimization objective, the trained GNN performs equally across all environments. Similarly, the goal of fairness on the graph is to have the model equally treat different demographic groups divided by the sensitive attribute  $S$ . In this regard, the centered node (the ego-graph) with different sensitive attribute values or under different sensitive attributes can be regarded as a graph under different environments. Naturally, a fairness problem on graphs can be formulated as a form of invariant learning.

In this work, we aim to learn fair GNNs toward various sensitive attributes in a single training session. With the formulation of invariant learning, our goal is transformed into learning GNNs invariant across different sensitive attributes and sensitive attribute values. Formally, our goal is to minimize:

$$\min_f \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{all}} \mathcal{R}^S(f) \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathcal{R}^S(f) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{G}_v, y_v}^S [l(f(\mathcal{G}_v), y_v)]$  is the empirical risk under sensitive attribute  $S$ .  $\mathcal{S}_{all}$  is a set of  $S$ . For instance, assume that gender and race are sensitive attributes,  $\mathcal{S}_{all}$  includes male, female, white, black, and yellow people environments.

## 4 PRESENT WORK: FAIRINV

In this section, we discuss how to learn a GNN towards fairness w.r.t. various sensitive attributes in a single training session through our proposed method FairINV. Specifically, we first give a brief overview

of FairINV and then make a detailed description of the components of FairINV. Furthermore, we provide the training algorithm to shed insights into the process of FairINV.


### 4.1 Overview

FairINV focuses on the node-level task, aiming to learn GNNs invariant across various sensitive attributes within a single training session, thereby achieving fairness on graph-structured data. As shown in Figure 3, our proposed method FairINV comprises two modules, i.e., sensitive attribute partition (SAP) and sensitive invariant learning (SIL). The SAP module partitions nodes into different subsets by inferring variant ego-subgraphs for each centered node. It should be noted that the sampling of ego-subgraphs can be disregarded due to the message-passing mechanism, which effectively aggregates the representations of neighboring nodes to update its own representation. To optimize this module, we employ the Invariant Risk Minimization (IRM) objective [4], maximizing it to guide the SAP module in capturing the worst-case environment. This process can be seen as inferring the sensitive attribute value of nodes. Since the maximization of the IRM objective is executed in an unsupervised manner, we can iteratively predict sensitive attributes multiple times. This iterative process enables FairINV to achieve fairness with respect to various sensitive attributes in a single training session. Due to the formulation of the fairness problem from an invariant learning perspective in Section 3.3, we can naturally tackle this problem through invariant learning. Specifically, based on the partition results of SAP, the SIL module learns a GNN invariant across different sensitive attribute partitions through a variance-based loss. The objective of being invariant across different sensitive attribute partitions implies the equitable treatment of different demographic groups, thereby achieving fair decision-making. Overall, the SAP module is akin to data augmentation, facilitating the process of the SIL module. Due to such a training paradigm, FairINV follows the same inference process as vanilla GNNs.

### 4.2 Sensitive Attributes Partition

Existing methods are designed for the specific sensitive attribute while assuming accessible sensitive attributes. However, these methods are impractical in real-world scenarios due to legal restrictions. To overcome this challenge, there is a need to infer the sensitive attribute value for each node in an unsupervised manner. Inferring the sensitive attribute value multiple times can be regarded as obtaining multiple sensitive attribute values, e.g., gender, and race, facilitating the achievement of fairness w.r.t. various sensitive attributes. Unfortunately, learning a sensitive attribute inference model without access to the sensitive attribute ground truth is a non-trivial task.

Inspired by the unsupervised environment inference in invariant learning [11], we aim to maximize variability across environments to achieve the sensitive attribute partition. Based on our formulation of the fairness problem from an invariant learning perspective, the sensitive attributes can be seen as environments in invariant learning. Nodes with different sensitive attribute values can be considered as being in different environments. Thus, maximizing variability across environments indicates inferring a worst-case



**Figure 3: The overview of FairINV. FairINV includes two stages: Sensitive Attributes Partition (SAP) and Sensitive Invariant Learning (SIL).**

sensitive attribute partition, where GNNs exhibit the worst fairness performance towards the demographic group divided by the sensitive attribute. However, directly inferring sensitive attributes partition through the aforementioned maximization objective is impractical due to the interactive nature of graph-structured data. Following the inspiration from GIL [29], identifying variant subgraphs as auxiliary information for sensitive attribute partition may provide a desirable solution.

Following the above idea, we construct the SAP module to infer the sensitive attribute value of each node. Specifically, the SAP module consists of a pre-trained GNN backbone  $\phi$ , a variant inference model  $\psi$ , and a sensitive attribute inference model  $q$ . With an expected structure identical to the GNN model to be trained,  $\phi$  serves as an Empirical Risk Minimization-trained (ERM-trained) reference model. In other words, it is trained on the node classification task in a semi-supervised manner to capture spurious correlations between variant patterns and node labels. Given an attributed graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathbf{X})$  with unknown sensitive attribute values, we sample an ego-graph set  $\{\mathcal{G}_v\}_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$ , where  $\mathcal{G}_v$  is the ego-graph of the centered node  $v$ .  $\phi$  takes  $\mathcal{G}_v$  as input and outputs the node representation  $\mathbf{h}_v = \phi(\mathcal{G}_v)$ . Due to the similar process between ego-graphs sampling and the message-passing mechanism of GNN, the sampling of ego-graphs can be disregarded. For two connected nodes  $u$  and  $v$  in  $\mathcal{G}$ ,  $\psi$  takes the concatenation of node representations  $\mathbf{h}_u$  and  $\mathbf{h}_v$  as input to measure the variant score of edge  $e_{uv}$ . Assuming inferring the sensitive attribute  $k$  times, the variant score in the  $i$ -th inferring can be formulated as:

$$w_{uv}^i = \sigma(\psi([\mathbf{h}_u, \mathbf{h}_v])), \quad (4)$$

where  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  denotes the concatenation operation, and  $\sigma(\cdot)$  is a sigmoid function. In this context,  $\psi$  can be implemented as a linear layer, measuring the probability that edge  $e_{uv}$  belongs to the variant pattern.

According to Eq. (4), we can obtain a variant score vector  $\mathbf{w}^i \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}|}$ , which includes variant scores for all edges.  $\mathbf{w}^i$  represents variant patterns, i.e., variant subgraphs, capturing the variant correlation between the graph structure and node labels under different sensitive attribute groups. After inferring  $k$  times, we have a variant score vector set  $\{\mathbf{w}^i\}_{i=1}^k$ , representing the variant correlation for various sensitive attributes. Accordingly, we can use these variant

patterns to infer sensitive attributes. Specifically, we employ a GNN classifier as the sensitive attribute inference model  $q$  to generate the sensitive attribute partition. Given the  $i$ -th variant score vector  $\mathbf{w}^i$ , the  $i$ -th sensitive attribute partition  $\mathcal{P}_i$  can be formulated as:

$$\mathcal{P}_i = q(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{w}^i, Y), \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times t}$ , and  $t$  is the number of sensitive attribute groups. For instance, in the case of a sensitive attribute like gender,  $t = 2$ .

To achieve accurate partitioning of sensitive attributes, optimizing  $\psi$  and  $q$  with well-defined objectives is crucial. Our goal is to capture variant patterns that result in significant performance differences across different sensitive attribute groups. Consequently, aligning with the approach of EIL [11], we employ the IRM objective as the optimization objective of  $\psi$  and  $q$ . Formally, the optimization objective of SAP can be formulated as follows:

$$\max_{\theta_\psi, \theta_q} \|\nabla_{\bar{\mathbf{w}}} \mathcal{R}^S(\bar{\mathbf{w}} \circ \phi, q)\|, \quad (6)$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}$  denotes a constant scalar multiplier of 1 for each output dimension, and the empirical risk  $\mathcal{R}^S(\phi, q)$  can be formulated as:

$$\mathcal{R}^S(\phi, q) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \mathbf{q}_v(S) \mathcal{L}(\phi(\mathcal{G}_v), y_v), \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{q}_v(S) : q_v(S|\mathcal{G}_v, \mathbf{w}^i, y_v)$  denotes a soft per-partition risk and is a node-level implementation of Eq. (5).

Notably, the application of the IRM objective enables inferring sensitive attributes in an unsupervised manner. The inferred sensitive attributes correspond to the demographic group partition with the worst-case fairness performance. In such an unsupervised manner, we can partition sensitive attributes  $k$  times to identify the top  $k$  worst-case partitions, denoted by  $\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ .

### 4.3 Towards Fairness via Invariant Learning

In the SIL module, we aim to learn a fair GNN model  $f$  including a GNN backbone  $\Phi$  and a classifier  $g$  from an invariant learning perspective. Prior works have revealed that training model  $f$  in an ERM paradigm inevitably results in the capturing of spurious correlations. In our scenarios, such spurious correlations are the correlation between the sensitive attribute and node labels, being uncovered as

**Table 1: Datasets statistics.**

Dataset	German	Bail	Pocec-z	Pocec-n	NBA
#Nodes	1,000	18,876	67,796	66,569	403
#Edges	22,242	321,308	617,958	583,616	21,242
#Attr.	27	18	277	266	95
Sens.	Gender	Race	Region	Region	Nationality

variant patterns through the SAP module. Naturally, based on  $\mathcal{P}_i$ , we guarantee the variance across the sensitive attribute groups to optimize  $f$ , which is motivated by the objective of EERM [44]. In other words, this objective guides the model to leverage the invariant patterns to yield equal performance on different sensitive attribute groups  $S$ . Given an attributed graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathbf{X})$ , we can obtain variant score vector set  $\{\mathbf{w}^i\}_{i=1}^k$  and sensitive attributes partition set  $\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ . In the forward of the training pipeline,  $f$  takes  $\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{w}^i$  as input to predict node labels  $\hat{Y} = f(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{w}^i), i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ . Thus, optimization objectives of  $f$  can be formulated as follows:

$$\min_{\theta_f} \text{Var}(\{\mathcal{L}_{cls}^S(\hat{Y}, Y)\}_{S \in S_{all}}) + \alpha \text{Mean}(\{\mathcal{L}_{cls}^S(\hat{Y}, Y)\}_{S \in S_{all}}), \quad (8)$$

where  $\text{Var}(\cdot)$  and  $\text{Mean}(\cdot)$  are variance and mean functions, respectively. The sensitive attribute group  $S$  is derived from  $\mathcal{P}$ .  $\mathcal{L}_{cls}^S(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the classification loss function under  $S$  and we employ a binary cross-entropy function as  $\mathcal{L}_{cls}$  in all experiments.  $\alpha$  is a hyperparameter to balance two loss terms.

In Eq.(8), the variance loss term aims to minimize the performance difference between various sensitive attribute groups while the mean loss term ensures the predicted accuracy across all sensitive attribute groups.

#### 4.4 Training Algorithm

To further help understand our proposed framework FairINV, we summarize the detailed training algorithm of FairINV, as shown in Algorithm 1.

### 5 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we conduct node classification experiments on several commonly used fairness datasets, including German, Bail, Pocec-z, Pocec-n, and NBA. Table 1 presents the statistical information of these datasets. In our experiments, we aim to answer the following three questions: **RQ1**: Can FairINV improve fairness while maintaining utility performance? **RQ2**: How does FairINV achieve fairness across various sensitive attributes in a single training session? **RQ3**: How do relevant hyperparameters and components impact FairINV?

#### 5.1 Experimental Settings

**5.1.1 Datasets.** Five real-world fairness datasets, namely German, Bail [2], Pocec-z, Pocec-n, and NBA [13], are employed in our experiments. We give a brief overview of these datasets as follows:

- **German** [5] is constructed by [2]. Specifically, German includes clients' data in a German bank, e.g., gender, and loan amount. Nodes represent clients in the German bank. The edges in the German dataset are constructed according to individual similarity. Regarding "gender" as the sensitive

---

#### Algorithm 1 Training Algorithm of FairINV

---

**Input:**  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathbf{X})$  without the sensitive attribute  $S$ , node labels  $\mathbf{Y}$ , the pre-trained GNN backbone  $\varphi$ , the variant inference model  $\psi$ , the sensitive attribute inference model  $q$ , GNN model  $f = \{\Phi, g\}$ , partition time  $k$ , and hyperparameters  $\alpha$ .

**Output:** Trained inference GNN model  $f$ .

```

1: // SAP module
2: for  $i = 1$  to  $k$  do
3:    $\mathbf{H} \leftarrow \varphi(\mathcal{G})$ ;
4:   for  $t = 1$  to  $epoch_{SAP}$  do
5:      $\mathbf{w}_{uv}^i \leftarrow \sigma(\psi([\mathbf{h}_u, \mathbf{h}_v]))$ ,  $\mathbf{h}_u, \mathbf{h}_v \in \mathbf{H}, e_{uv} \in \mathcal{E}$ ;
6:     // Sensitive attribute partition
7:      $\mathcal{P}_i \leftarrow q(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{w}^i, Y)$ ,  $\mathbf{w}^i = \{\mathbf{w}_{uv}^i | u, v \in \mathcal{V}, e_{uv} \in \mathcal{E}\}$ ;
8:     Calculate loss function according to Eq.(6);
9:     Update parameters of  $\psi$  and  $q$  by gradient descent;
10:  end for
11:   $\mathbf{w}_{uv}^i \leftarrow \sigma(\psi([\mathbf{h}_u, \mathbf{h}_v]))$ ,  $\mathbf{h}_u, \mathbf{h}_v \in \mathbf{H}, e_{uv} \in \mathcal{E}$ ;
12:   $\mathcal{P}_i \leftarrow q(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{w}^i, Y)$ ,  $\mathbf{w}^i = \{\mathbf{w}_{uv}^i | u, v \in \mathcal{V}, e_{uv} \in \mathcal{E}\}$ ;
13: end for
14: Obtain  $\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i=1}^k, \{\mathbf{w}^i\}_{i=1}^k$ ;
15: // SIL module
16: for  $t = 1$  to  $epoch$  do
17:   for  $i = 1$  to  $k$  do
18:      $\hat{Y} \leftarrow f(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{w}^i)$ ;
19:     Calculate loss function according to Eq.(8) and  $\mathcal{P}_i$ ;
20:     Accumulated loss;
21:   end for
22:   Update parameters of  $f$  by gradient descent;
23: end for
24: return  $f$ ;

```

---

attribute, the goal of German is to classify clients into two credit risks (high or low).

- **Bail** [2] is a defendants dataset, where defendants in this dataset are released on bail during 1990-2009 in U.S states [23]. We regard nodes as defendants and edges are decided by the similarity of past criminal records and demographics. Considering "race" as the sensitive attribute, the task is to predict whether defendants will commit a crime after release (bail vs. no bail).
- **Pocec-z/n** [13, 40] is derived from a popular social network application in Slovakia, where Pocec-z and Pocec-n are social network data in two different provinces. Nodes denote users with features such as gender, age, interest, etc. Edge represents the friendship between users. Considering "region" as the sensitive attribute, the task is to predict the working field of the users.
- **NBA** [13] is derived from a Kaggle dataset comprising approximately 400 NBA basketball players from the 2016-2017 season. Nodes denote NBA basketball players with features such as performance statistics, age, etc. Edge represents the relationship between these players on Twitter. Considering "nationality (U.S. and overseas players)" as the sensitive attribute, the goal is to predict whether the salary of the player is over the median.



**5.1.2 Baselines.** We compare FairSAD with four state-of-the-art fairness methods, including EDITS, NIFTY, FairGNN, and FairVGNN. Among these four methods, EDITS can be summarized as the pre-processing fairness method, while the remaining baselines represent the in-processing approach. A brief overview of these methods is shown as follows:

- **EDITS** [15] modify graph-structured data by minimizing the Wasserstein distance between two demographics.
- **NIFTY** [2] is a fair and stable graph representation learning method. The core idea behind NIFTY is learning GNNs to keep stable w.r.t. the sensitive attribute counterfactual.
- **FairGNN** [13] aims to learn fair GNNs with limited sensitive attribute information. To achieve this goal, FairGNN employs the sensitive attribute estimator to predict the sensitive attribute while improving fairness via adversarial learning.
- **FairVGNN** [43] learns a fair GNN by mitigating the sensitive attribute leakage using adversarial learning and weight clamping technologies.

**5.1.3 Evaluation Metrics.** To evaluate the utility performance, we use AUC and F1 scores. Additionally, we employ two commonly used fairness metrics, i.e.,  $\Delta_{DP} = |P(\hat{y} = 1|s = 0) - P(\hat{y} = 1|s = 1)|$  [17] and  $\Delta_{EO} = |P(\hat{y} = 1|y = 1, s = 0) - P(\hat{y} = 1|y = 1, s = 1)|$  [21], to evaluate the fairness performance.

**5.1.4 Implementation Details.** For all methods, including FairINV, we use a multi-layer GNN model consisting of a GNN backbone  $\Phi$  and a 1-layer linear classifier  $g$ . To validate the generalizability of FairINV on various backbones, we employ the following GNN backbones: a 1-layer GCN [26], a 1-layer GIN [46], and a 2-layer GraphSAGE [20]. Here, the hidden dimension of all GNN backbones is set to 16 for all datasets. Hyperparameter settings for all baseline methods adhere to the guidelines provided by the respective authors. We conduct all experiments 5 times and reported average results.

For FairINV, we utilize the Adam optimizer with the learning rate  $lr = 1 \times 10^{-2}$ , epochs=1000, and the weight decay  $= 1 \times 10^{-5}$ . Using the same optimizer, the learning rate  $lr_{sp}$  for training the SAP modules are set to  $\{0.1, 0.1, 0.01, 0.5, 0.1\}$  for German, Bail, Pokec-z, Pokec-n, and NBA datasets, respectively. Meanwhile, we set the balanced parameter  $\alpha$  to  $\{10, 10, 10, 1, 1\}$  for German, Bail, Pokec-z, Pokec-n, and NBA datasets, respectively. The partition times  $k$  and the number of sensitive attribute groups  $t$  are fixed at 3 and 2 for all datasets. In the SAP module, a 1-layer linear layer is used as the variant inference model  $\psi$ . We employ a model with the same structure as the GNN model ( $\Phi$  and  $g$ ) as a sensitive attribute inference model  $q$ . Meanwhile,  $\varphi$  has the same structure as the GNN model ( $\Phi$  and  $g$ ) and is trained by minimizing the cross-entropy loss function. For  $\varphi$  and the SAP module, we set the training epoch to 500. Due to all baselines using the sensitive attribute, FairINV incorporates the sensitive attribute into the original node features for fair comparison. Moreover, all evaluations of FairINV are conducted on a single NVIDIA RTX 4090 GPU with 24GB memory. All models are implemented with PyTorch and PyTorch-Geometric.

## 5.2 Comparison Study

To answer **RQ1**, we conduct a comparison study between FairINV and four baseline methods for the node classification task across

five datasets. Specifically, we verify the effectiveness of FairINV on three GNN backbones, i.e., GIN, and GraphSAGE. Limited by the space, we only present the comparison results on the GCN backbone and provide more results in Appendix A. As shown in Table 2, the following observations can be seen: (1) FairINV outperforms all baseline methods in terms of both utility and fairness in most cases. (2) In instances where FairINV exhibits relatively lower performance, the best-performing baseline method surpasses FairINV by a slight margin. (3) FairINV improves fairness while maintaining utility performance, as evidenced by the performance improvement compared with vanilla GCN.

The first two observations verify the effectiveness of FairINV on fairness performance, simultaneously showcasing the state-of-the-art performance achieved by FairINV. As for the last observation, the potential explanation lies in FairINV’s adherence to the invariance principle [10, 29, 37], i.e., (1) sufficiency property and (2) invariance property. The sufficiency property emphasizes the necessity of adequate predictive abilities for the downstream task, which explains the preservation of the utility performance of FairINV. Meanwhile, the invariance property assumes consistency across different environments, signifying the invariance across the sensitive attribute groups in FairINV. Consequently, this property serves as the underlying reason for FairINV’s superior fairness performance. Overall, leveraging invariant learning, FairINV captures invariant subgraphs with sufficient information for the downstream task while learning to be invariant across different sensitive attribute groups. Thus, FairINV improves fairness while preserving utility performance. In addition, as shown in Appendix A, similar results can be observed from the experiments on GIN and GraphSAGE backbones.


## 5.3 Generalizing to Various Sensitive Attributes

To answer **RQ2**, we generalize FairINV to various sensitive attribute scenarios. Specifically, we employ FairINV once to train a GNN model and then evaluate the fairness performance of this GNN model toward various sensitive attributes. Table 3 presents the results of various sensitive attributes and inferior results compared to vanilla GCN are marked with a gray background. We only present results on four datasets except for the NBA dataset due to the lack of suitable node features as the sensitive attribute. When the sensitive attribute is “Age”, we set the median of age as the threshold to obtain binary values for the sensitive attribute. Furthermore, we provide the comparison results of FairINV and baseline methods in multi-sensitive attribute scenarios, as detailed in the Appendix B.

We make the following observations from this table: (1) FairINV achieves superior performance compared with vanilla GCN in terms of both fairness and utility. This observation demonstrates that FairINV improves the fairness of GNNs towards various sensitive attributes in a single training session. (2) In some instances, FairINV exhibits slightly inferior fairness performance compared to vanilla GCN. We attribute this to the fact that the sensitive attribute groups partitioned by the SAP module are unrelated to the sensitive attributes we have selected. This is primarily due to the model itself making fairly equitable decisions concerning the sensitive attributes we have chosen. In other words, when grouped according to the selected sensitive attributes, the variability values are relatively small. Consequently, the sensitive attribute groups partitioned by

**Table 2: Comparison results of FairINV and baseline fairness methods on GCN backbone. In each row, the best result is indicated in bold, while the runner-up result is marked with an underline. OOM: out-of-memory on a GPU with 24GB memory.**

Datasets	Metrics	Vanilla GCN	EDITS	NIFTY	FairGNN	FairVGNN	FairINV
German	AUC	65.90 ± 0.83	69.89 ± 3.23	67.77 ± 4.30	67.35 ± 2.13	<b>72.38 ± 1.09</b>	69.11 ± 1.80
	F1	77.32 ± 1.20	<u>82.01 ± 0.91</u>	81.43 ± 0.54	<u>82.01 ± 0.26</u>	81.94 ± 0.26	<b>82.36 ± 0.35</b>
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	36.29 ± 4.64	2.38 ± 1.36	2.64 ± 2.25	3.49 ± 2.15	<u>1.44 ± 2.04</u>	<b>0.76 ± 1.24</b>
	$\Delta_{Eo}(\downarrow)$	31.35 ± 4.39	3.03 ± 1.77	2.52 ± 2.88	3.40 ± 2.15	<u>1.51 ± 2.11</u>	<b>0.15 ± 0.29</b>
Bail	AUC	87.13 ± 0.31	87.92 ± 1.83	79.62 ± 1.80	87.27 ± 0.76	87.05 ± 0.39	<b>88.53 ± 1.83</b>
	F1	78.98 ± 0.67	<u>79.45 ± 1.48</u>	67.19 ± 2.63	77.67 ± 1.33	<b>79.56 ± 0.29</b>	78.80 ± 3.71
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	9.18 ± 0.59	8.03 ± 0.97	<b>3.52 ± 0.72</b>	6.72 ± 0.60	6.31 ± 0.77	3.58 ± 1.61
	$\Delta_{Eo}(\downarrow)$	4.43 ± 0.37	5.80 ± 0.73	2.82 ± 0.82	4.49 ± 1.00	5.12 ± 1.40	<b>2.15 ± 1.24</b>
Pokec-z	AUC	<b>76.42 ± 0.13</b>		71.59 ± 0.17	76.02 ± 0.15	75.52 ± 0.06	75.79 ± 0.08
	F1	70.32 ± 0.20	OOM	67.13 ± 1.66	<u>68.84 ± 3.46</u>	<u>70.45 ± 0.57</u>	<b>70.78 ± 0.50</b>
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	3.91 ± 0.35	OOM	3.06 ± 1.85	2.93 ± 2.83	<u>3.30 ± 0.87</u>	<b>2.70 ± 0.96</b>
	$\Delta_{Eo}(\downarrow)$	4.59 ± 0.34	OOM	3.86 ± 1.65	<b>2.04 ± 2.27</b>	3.19 ± 1.00	<u>2.23 ± 0.66</u>
Pokec-n	AUC	<b>73.87 ± 0.08</b>		69.43 ± 0.31	73.49 ± 0.28	72.72 ± 0.93	<u>73.55 ± 0.16</u>
	F1	<b>65.55 ± 0.13</b>	OOM	61.55 ± 1.05	64.80 ± 0.89	62.35 ± 1.14	<u>65.19 ± 0.62</u>
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	2.83 ± 0.46	OOM	5.96 ± 1.80	<u>2.26 ± 1.19</u>	4.38 ± 1.73	<b>1.24 ± 0.64</b>
	$\Delta_{Eo}(\downarrow)$	3.66 ± 0.43	OOM	7.75 ± 1.53	<u>3.21 ± 2.28</u>	6.74 ± 1.87	<b>2.80 ± 0.78</b>
NBA	AUC	66.09 ± 0.98	65.91 ± 5.19	68.88 ± 0.93	<b>72.53 ± 0.96</b>	64.73 ± 2.34	66.18 ± 2.84
	F1	61.32 ± 2.53	61.42 ± 8.26	<u>67.41 ± 2.92</u>	60.18 ± 20.18	60.32 ± 5.79	<b>67.56 ± 1.30</b>
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	28.80 ± 4.17	6.09 ± 5.1	5.41 ± 2.78	6.44 ± 6.74	<u>3.48 ± 3.62</u>	<b>1.98 ± 3.15</b>
	$\Delta_{Eo}(\downarrow)$	20.00 ± 9.43	6.0 ± 5.33	3.43 ± 1.78	<b>2.64 ± 2.61</b>	<u>3.33 ± 3.65</u>	<u>2.67 ± 3.89</u>

**Figure 4: The results of ablation study on all datasets.**

SAP when maximizing variability are unrelated to the groups corresponding to such low variability. For the results with “Age” as the sensitive attribute on the Pokec-n dataset, despite decisions of the model being extremely unfair with respect to the sensitive attribute, FairINV still does not improve fairness. We attribute this to the aggressive partitioning of age into binary-sensitive attributes.

#### 5.4 Ablation Study

To answer RQ3, we conduct an ablation study to investigate the impact of each component of FairINV on improving fairness and maintaining utility. Specifically, we investigate the effect of three components including the variant inference model  $\psi$ , the SAP module, and the SIL module, denoted by *FairINV-VI*, *FairINV-SAP*, and *FairINV-SIL*. *FairINV-VI* removes  $\psi$ , replacing  $w$  predicted by  $\psi$  with random numbers. *FairINV-SAP* removes the SAP module, replacing  $\mathcal{P}$  predicted by  $q$  with the sensitive attribute ground truth. *FairINV-SIL* removes the SIL module, replacing the objective shown in Eq. (8) with minimizing the IRM objective shown in Eq. (6). Figure 4 presents the ablation results on five datasets.

From this figure, we observe that the removal of the SIL module leads to a decline in both utility and fairness, implying the significant impact of SIL on FairINV. Furthermore, from the results of *FairINV-SAP*, even when using the ground truth of sensitive attributes to replace the predicted sensitive attribute partition  $\mathcal{P}$  by SAP, the performance of FairINV is still affected. This experimental phenomenon is consistent with previous research results on invariant learning without environmental labels. Finally, we find that removing the variant inference model affects the fairness performance of FairINV, indicating the importance of the variant inference model in capturing variant patterns.

#### 5.5 Hyperparameters Sensitivity

To further answer RQ3, we investigate the parameter sensitivity of FairINV w.r.t. two hyperparameters, i.e., the balanced parameter  $\alpha$  and the learning rate  $lr_{sp}$  of SAP. Notably, the setting of  $lr_{sp}$  benefits from the independent training of SAP. We vary  $\alpha$  and  $lr_{sp}$  within the range of  $\{0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 0.5, 1, 10, 100\}$ . We only illustrate results on the Bail and Pokec-z datasets due to similar observations on other datasets. We observe that, with a wide range of variations in two parameters, the performance of FairINV remains stable. However, a sharp decline in both utility and fairness performance is noted when the value of  $\alpha$  is less than 0.01.


#### 5.6 Training Time Comparison

To further investigate the computational cost of FairINV compared to baseline methods, we conduct a training time comparison experiment across all datasets. Specifically, we repeat each method five times and record the total training time. We set  $k$  to 1 and 3 to implement two variants of FairINV, namely FairINV-1, and FairINV-3, representing FairINV trained for the single sensitive attribute and three-sensitive attribute scenarios, respectively. As shown in Table 4, FairINV exhibits lower computational costs on




**Table 3: Results of various sensitive attributes. The results in which FairINV exhibits inferior performance compared to vanilla GCN are highlighted with a gray background. Sens.Attr.: Sensitive Attribute**

Datasets		Vanilla GCN	FairINV	Vanilla GCN	FairINV	Vanilla GCN	FairINV	Vanilla GCN	FairINV
German	Sens.Attr.	Age		Gender		ForeignWorker		Single	
	AUC	65.90 ± 0.83	69.11 ± 1.80	65.90 ± 0.83	69.11 ± 1.80	65.90 ± 0.83	69.11 ± 1.80	65.90 ± 0.83	69.11 ± 1.80
	F1	77.32 ± 1.20	82.36 ± 0.35	77.32 ± 1.20	82.36 ± 0.35	77.32 ± 1.20	82.36 ± 0.35	77.32 ± 1.20	82.36 ± 0.35
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	20.18 ± 5.17	0.48 ± 0.38	36.29 ± 4.64	0.76 ± 1.24	8.45 ± 7.05	2.31 ± 3.81	34.13 ± 3.29	2.64 ± 4.15
	$\Delta_{EO}(\downarrow)$	15.83 ± 3.47	0.46 ± 0.52	31.35 ± 4.39	0.15 ± 0.29	5.66 ± 2.61	2.34 ± 4.09	27.26 ± 4.96	1.48 ± 2.96
Bail	Sens.Attr.	Race		Gender		MARRIED		WORKREL	
	AUC	87.13 ± 0.31	88.53 ± 1.83	87.13 ± 0.32	88.53 ± 1.83	87.13 ± 0.33	88.53 ± 1.83	87.13 ± 0.34	88.53 ± 1.83
	F1	78.98 ± 0.67	78.80 ± 3.71	78.98 ± 0.68	78.80 ± 3.71	78.98 ± 0.69	78.80 ± 3.71	78.98 ± 0.70	78.80 ± 3.71
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	9.18 ± 0.59	3.58 ± 1.61	11.51 ± 0.22	12.09 ± 5.58	2.36 ± 0.54	3.40 ± 1.23	0.34 ± 0.09	0.55 ± 0.47
	$\Delta_{EO}(\downarrow)$	4.43 ± 0.37	2.15 ± 1.24	1.95 ± 0.22	3.53 ± 2.12	3.13 ± 0.52	4.81 ± 2.34	1.25 ± 0.28	1.18 ± 0.67
Pokec-z	Sens.Attr.	Gender		Region		Age		Hair color indicator	
	AUC	76.42 ± 0.13	75.79 ± 0.08	76.42 ± 0.13	75.79 ± 0.08	76.42 ± 0.13	75.79 ± 0.08	76.42 ± 0.13	75.79 ± 0.08
	F1	70.32 ± 0.20	70.78 ± 0.50	70.32 ± 0.20	70.78 ± 0.50	70.32 ± 0.20	70.78 ± 0.5	70.32 ± 0.20	70.78 ± 0.50
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	3.15 ± 0.24	2.38 ± 1.03	3.91 ± 0.35	2.70 ± 0.96	33.09 ± 0.57	27.49 ± 3.29	18.70 ± 0.9	15.63 ± 1.09
	$\Delta_{EO}(\downarrow)$	5.25 ± 0.48	5.08 ± 0.98	4.59 ± 0.34	2.23 ± 0.66	36.32 ± 0.7	29.19 ± 3.68	18.73 ± 0.8	14.31 ± 1.76
Pokec-n	Sens.Attr.	Gender		Region		Age		Hair color indicator	
	AUC	73.87 ± 0.08	73.55 ± 0.16	73.87 ± 0.08	73.55 ± 0.16	73.87 ± 0.08	73.55 ± 0.16	73.87 ± 0.08	73.55 ± 0.16
	F1	65.55 ± 0.13	65.19 ± 0.62	65.55 ± 0.13	65.19 ± 0.62	65.55 ± 0.13	65.19 ± 0.62	65.55 ± 0.13	65.19 ± 0.62
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	6.36 ± 0.20	6.44 ± 0.70	2.83 ± 0.46	1.24 ± 0.64	40.05 ± 0.73	40.11 ± 0.83	14.96 ± 0.68	12.8 ± 1.90
	$\Delta_{EO}(\downarrow)$	13.18 ± 0.41	13.13 ± 1.26	3.66 ± 0.43	2.80 ± 0.78	42.82 ± 0.60	43.53 ± 0.50	12.49 ± 0.51	12.3 ± 1.65



**Figure 5: Parameters sensitivity analysis on Bail.**



**Figure 6: Parameters sensitivity analysis on Pokec-z.**

larger datasets compared to baseline methods. Although FairINV-3 requires more training time, it trains fair GNN models toward three sensitive attributes, which are unreachable for baseline methods. Furthermore, we also observe that the training time of FairINV-3 is significantly longer than that of FairINV-1. A possible explanation for this phenomenon is the high computational cost associated with

**Table 4: Comparison of training time for both baseline methods and FairINV.**

Datasets	EDITS	NIFTY	FairGNN	FairVGNN	FairINV-1	FairINV-3
German	82.88 s	94.91 s	<b>50.42 s</b>	539.54 s	56.20 s	114.97 s
Bail	338.28 s	106.22 s	373.54 s	988.19 s	<b>92.60 s</b>	200.71 s
Pokec-z	OOM	139.83 s	302.11 s	963.39 s	<b>113.38 s</b>	210.29 s
Pokec-n	OOM	132.03 s	261.73 s	1072.48 s	<b>102.33 s</b>	191.87 s
NBA	81.50 s	92.08 s	<b>46.65 s</b>	534.02 s	57.64 s	112.75 s

the SAP module. Overall, the experimental results demonstrate that FairINV has lower computational costs than the baseline methods.

## 6 CONCLUSION

In this work, we investigate the universal fairness problem, i.e., training a fair GNN toward various sensitive attributes in a single training session. To address this problem, we first formulate such a problem from a graph invariant learning point of view. Then, we propose a universal graph fairness approach, namely, FairINV. The core idea behind FairINV is to eliminate spurious correlations between the sensitive attributes and labels in a graph variant learning way. Experiments on several real-world datasets validate the effectiveness of FairINV in both fairness and utility performance. We leave validation on other downstream tasks, e.g., edge-level, as future works. In addition, due to FairINV only focusing on group fairness, future works will focus on considering fine-grained fairness, e.g., individual fairness.

## 7 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research is supported by the National Key R&D Program of China under grant No. 2022YFF0902500, the Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation, China (No. 2023A1515011050), Shenzhen Science and Technology Program (KJZD20231023094501003), and Tencent AI Lab (RBFR2024004).

## REFERENCES

- [1] Robert Adragna, Elliot Creager, David Madras, and Richard Zemel. 2020. Fairness and robustness in invariant learning: A case study in toxicity classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.06485* (2020).
- [2] Chirag Agarwal, Himabindu Lakkaraju, and Marinka Zitnik. 2021. Towards a unified framework for fair and stable graph representation learning. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*. PMLR, 2114–2124.
- [3] Kartik Ahuja, Karthikeyan Shanmugam, Kush Varshney, and Amit Dhurandhar. 2020. Invariant risk minimization games. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 145–155.
- [4] Martin Arjovsky, Léon Bottou, Ishaan Gulrajani, and David Lopez-Paz. 2019. Invariant risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02893* (2019).
- [5] Arthur Asuncion and David Newman. 2007. UCI machine learning repository.
- [6] Pietro Bongini, Monica Bianchini, and Franco Scarselli. 2021. Molecular generative graph neural networks for drug discovery. *Neurocomputing* 450 (2021), 242–252.
- [7] Avishek Bose and William Hamilton. 2019. Compositional fairness constraints for graph embeddings. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 715–724.
- [8] Junyi Chai, Taeuk Jang, and Xiaoqian Wang. 2022. Fairness without demographics through knowledge distillation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 19152–19164.
- [9] Yimeng Chen, Ruibin Xiong, Zhi-Ming Ma, and Yanyan Lan. 2022. When Does Group Invariant Learning Survive Spurious Correlations? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 7038–7051.
- [10] Yongqiang Chen, Yonggang Zhang, Yatao Bian, Han Yang, MA Kaili, Binghui Xie, Tongliang Liu, Bo Han, and James Cheng. 2022. Learning causally invariant representations for out-of-distribution generalization on graphs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 22131–22148.
- [11] Elliot Creager, Jörn-Henrik Jacobsen, and Richard Zemel. 2021. Environment inference for invariant learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2189–2200.
- [12] Sean Current, Yuntian He, Saket Gurukur, and Srinivasan Parthasarathy. 2022. Fairmod: Fair link prediction and recommendation via graph modification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11596* (2022).
- [13] Anyan Dai and Suhang Wang. 2021. Say no to the discrimination: Learning fair graph neural networks with limited sensitive attribute information. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 680–688.
- [14] Yushun Dong, Jian Kang, Hanghang Tong, and Jundong Li. 2021. Individual fairness for graph neural networks: A ranking based approach. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 300–310.
- [15] Yushun Dong, Ninghao Liu, Brian Jalaian, and Jundong Li. 2022. Edits: Modeling and mitigating data bias for graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. 1259–1269.
- [16] Yingdong Dou, Zhiwei Liu, Li Sun, Yutong Deng, Hao Peng, and Philip S Yu. 2020. Enhancing graph neural network-based fraud detectors against camouflaged fraudsters. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*. 315–324.
- [17] 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.
- [18] Wei Fan, Kunpeng Liu, Rui Xie, Hao Liu, Hui Xiong, and Yanjie Fu. 2021. Fair graph auto-encoder for unbiased graph representations with wasserstein distance. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 1054–1059.
- [19] Dandan Guo, Chaojie Wang, Baoxiang Wang, and Hongyuan Zha. 2022. Learning Fair Representations via Distance Correlation Minimization. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* (2022).
- [20] Will Hamilton, Zhitao Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2017. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [21] Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nati Srebro. 2016. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).
- [22] Zhimeng Jiang, Xiaotian Han, Chao Fan, Zirui Liu, Na Zou, Ali Mostafavi, and Xia Hu. 2023. Chasing Fairness in Graphs: A GNN Architecture Perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12369* (2023).
- [23] Kareem L Jordan and Tina L Freiburger. 2015. The effect of race/ethnicity on sentencing: Examining sentence type, jail length, and prison length. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice* 13, 3 (2015), 179–196.
- [24] Jian Kang, Jingrui He, Ross Maciejewski, and Hanghang Tong. 2020. Inform: Individual fairness on graph mining. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 379–389.
- [25] Ahmad Khajehnejad, Moein Khajehnejad, Mahmoudreza Babaei, Krishna P Gummadi, Adrian Weller, and Baharan Mirzasoleiman. 2022. Crosswalk: Fairness-enhanced node representation learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 36. 11963–11970.
- [26] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2016. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907* (2016).
- [27] Preethi Lahoti, Alex Beutel, Jilin Chen, Kang Lee, Flavien Prost, Nithum Thain, Xuezhong Wang, and Ed Chi. 2020. Fairness without demographics through adversarially reweighted learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 728–740.
- [28] Jure Leskovec and Julian McAuley. 2012. Learning to discover social circles in ego networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 25 (2012).
- [29] Haoyang Li, Ziwei Zhang, Xin Wang, and Wenwu Zhu. 2022. Learning invariant graph representations for out-of-distribution generalization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 11828–11841.
- [30] Peizhao Li, Yifei Wang, Han Zhao, Pengyu Hong, and Hongfu Liu. 2021. On dyadic fairness: Exploring and mitigating bias in graph connections. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [31] Yanying Li, Xiuling Wang, Yue Ning, and Hui Wang. 2022. Fairlp: Towards fair link prediction on social network graphs. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, Vol. 16. 628–639.
- [32] Hongyi Ling, Zhimeng Jiang, Youzhi Luo, Shuiwang Ji, and Na Zou. 2022. Learning fair graph representations via automated data augmentations. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [33] Yang Liu, Xiang Ao, Fuli Feng, Yunshan Ma, Kuan Li, Tat-Seng Chua, and Qing He. 2023. FLOOD: A flexible invariant learning framework for out-of-distribution generalization on graphs. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 1548–1558.
- [34] Jiali Ma, Zhongqi Yue, Kagaya Tomoyuki, Suzuki Tomoki, Karlekar Jayashree, Sugiri Pranata, and Hanwang Zhang. 2023. Invariant Feature Regularization for Fair Face Recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 20861–20870.
- [35] Jonas Peters, Peter Bühlmann, and Nicolai Meinshausen. 2016. Causal inference by using invariant prediction: identification and confidence intervals. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 78, 5 (2016), 947–1012.
- [36] Jonas Peters, Dominik Janzing, and Bernhard Schölkopf. 2017. *Elements of causal inference: foundations and learning algorithms*. The MIT Press.
- [37] Mateo Rojas-Carulla, Bernhard Schölkopf, Richard Turner, and Jonas Peters. 2018. Invariant models for causal transfer learning. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 19, 1 (2018), 1309–1342.
- [38] Oleksandr Shchur, Maximilian Mummé, Aleksandar Bojchevski, and Stephan Günnemann. 2018. Pitfalls of graph neural network evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.05868* (2018).
- [39] Indro Spinelli, Simone Scardapane, Amir Hussain, and Aurelio Uncini. 2021. Fairdrop: Biased edge dropout for enhancing fairness in graph representation learning. *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence* 3, 3 (2021), 344–354.
- [40] Lubos Takac and Michal Zabovsky. 2012. Data analysis in public social networks. In *International scientific conference and international workshop present day trends of innovations*, Vol. 1.
- [41] Xiaoyu Tan, LIN Yong, Shengyu Zhu, Chao Qu, Xihe Qiu, Xu Yinghui, Peng Cui, and Yuan Qi. 2023. Provably invariant learning without domain information. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 33563–33580.
- [42] Jie Tang, Jing Zhang, Limin Yao, Juanzi Li, Li Zhang, and Zhong Su. 2008. Ar-netminer: extraction and mining of academic social networks. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 990–998.
- [43] Yu Wang, Yuying Zhao, Yushun Dong, Huiyuan Chen, Jundong Li, and Tyler Derr. 2022. Improving fairness in graph neural networks via mitigating sensitive attribute leakage. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 1938–1948.
- [44] Qitian Wu, Hengrui Zhang, Junchi Yan, and David Wipf. 2022. Handling distribution shifts on graphs: An invariance perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.02466* (2022).
- [45] Shiwen Wu, Fei Sun, Wentao Zhang, Xu Xie, and Bin Cui. 2022. Graph neural networks in recommender systems: a survey. *Comput. Surveys* 55, 5 (2022), 1–37.
- [46] Keyulu Xu, Weihua Hu, Jure Leskovec, and Stefanie Jegelka. 2018. How powerful are graph neural networks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00826* (2018).
- [47] Moyi Yang, Junjie Sheng, Wenyang Liu, Bo Jin, Xiaoling Wang, and Xiangfeng Wang. 2022. Obtaining Dyadic Fairness by Optimal Transport. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. IEEE, 4726–4732.

## A COMPARISON FOR VARIOUS GNN BACKBONES

To further investigate the generalizability of FairINV across various GNN backbones, we conduct comparative experiments using GIN [46] and GraphSAGE [20] backbones. As shown in Tables 5 and 6, we compare FairINV with three fairness baseline methods, including NIFTY [2], FairGNN [13], and FairVGNN [43]. From these two tables, we can observe that FairINV consistently outperforms the three fairness baseline methods in most cases. Furthermore, upon summarizing the comparison results across the three backbones, we find that most fairness methods, including FairINV, consistently enhance both utility and fairness performance on the Bail dataset. This observation suggests an underlying relationship between fairness and utility in the Bail dataset, providing a promising avenue for future research.

## B COMPARISON FOR MULTI-SENSITIVE ATTRIBUTES

We further present a comparison of FairINV and two baseline methods in various sensitive attribute scenarios, as shown in Table 7. Due to the single sensitive attribute setting of these two methods, it is necessary to extend them by modifying the optimization objectives. For NIFTY [2], we simultaneously flip various sensitive attributes to construct the counterfactual graph. For FairGNN [13], we train multiple sensitive attribute estimators and discriminators simultaneously. Although existing methods can be extended to multi-sensitive attribute scenarios, their performance might be negatively affected since they are not explicitly designed for multiple sensitive attributes. From Table 7, we can observe that FairINV is the only method that can achieve fairness and maintain utility. In most cases, FairINV's fairness performance is better than baseline methods.

**Table 5: Comparison results of FairINV and baseline fairness methods on GIN backbone. In each row, the best result is indicated in bold, while the runner-up result is marked with an underline.**

Datasets	Metrics	Vanilla GIN	NIFTY	FairGNN	FairVGNN	FairINV
German	AUC	$71.86 \pm 1.55$	$66.70 \pm 4.91$	<b><math>72.78 \pm 1.19</math></b>	$69.23 \pm 3.08$	$70.08 \pm 2.17$
	F1	$82.35 \pm 0.55$	$80.33 \pm 3.76$	$81.48 \pm 1.55$	<u><math>82.41 \pm 0.62</math></u>	<b><math>82.57 \pm 0.22</math></b>
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	$14.92 \pm 5.52$	$5.28 \pm 6.67$	$15.63 \pm 5.2$	<u><math>2.71 \pm 3.16</math></u>	<b><math>1.02 \pm 1.17</math></b>
	$\Delta_{EO}(\downarrow)$	$8.24 \pm 6.31$	$7.39 \pm 8.49$	$10.0 \pm 5.51$	<u><math>0.91 \pm 1.41</math></u>	<b><math>0.17 \pm 0.34</math></b>
Bail	AUC	$75.69 \pm 7.75$	$79.49 \pm 6.65$	$83.96 \pm 0.61$	<b><math>86.33 \pm 1.05</math></b>	$86.05 \pm 0.81$
	F1	$64.26 \pm 8.73$	$65.20 \pm 11.22$	$73.10 \pm 1.28$	<b><math>87.47 \pm 0.50</math></b>	<u><math>75.66 \pm 3.01</math></u>
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	$8.44 \pm 2.94$	<b><math>5.38 \pm 1.16</math></b>	$8.93 \pm 1.63$	<u><math>6.95 \pm 0.41</math></u>	$7.35 \pm 1.71$
	$\Delta_{EO}(\downarrow)$	$6.57 \pm 1.36$	<b><math>4.00 \pm 2.21</math></b>	$6.65 \pm 1.77$	<u><math>6.97 \pm 1.18</math></u>	<u><math>4.80 \pm 1.21</math></u>
Pokey-z	AUC	<b><math>75.04 \pm 0.39</math></b>	$72.52 \pm 2.66$	$74.70 \pm 1.21$	$74.51 \pm 0.12$	<u><math>74.90 \pm 1.28</math></u>
	F1	<u><math>68.45 \pm 1.23</math></u>	$67.93 \pm 1.26$	$67.30 \pm 0.77$	<b><math>69.70 \pm 0.57</math></b>	<u><math>67.47 \pm 1.98</math></u>
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	<u><math>3.24 \pm 2.09</math></u>	$3.56 \pm 2.95$	$3.96 \pm 1.47$	<u><math>1.93 \pm 1.23</math></u>	<b><math>1.66 \pm 1.16</math></b>
	$\Delta_{EO}(\downarrow)$	$4.26 \pm 2.27$	$3.51 \pm 2.20$	$5.22 \pm 1.51$	<u><math>2.71 \pm 1.20</math></u>	<b><math>2.06 \pm 0.89</math></b>
Pokey-n	AUC	<u><math>74.06 \pm 0.62</math></u>	$72.12 \pm 1.65$	$73.25 \pm 1.04$	$72.71 \pm 0.48$	<b><math>74.39 \pm 0.48</math></b>
	F1	<u><math>62.39 \pm 0.51</math></u>	$60.25 \pm 4.53$	$60.88 \pm 2.99$	<b><math>65.56 \pm 1.03</math></b>	$62.09 \pm 2.37$
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	<u><math>2.64 \pm 1.28</math></u>	$3.34 \pm 1.78$	<u><math>2.25 \pm 1.33</math></u>	$6.13 \pm 1.59$	<b><math>1.37 \pm 0.91</math></b>
	$\Delta_{EO}(\downarrow)$	$6.77 \pm 2.36$	$6.88 \pm 2.11$	<u><math>2.68 \pm 1.59</math></u>	$7.00 \pm 1.80$	<b><math>2.03 \pm 2.04</math></b>

**Table 6: Comparison results of FairINV and baseline fairness methods on GraphSAGE backbone. In each row, the best result is indicated in bold, while the runner-up result is marked with an underline.**

Datasets	Metrics	Vanilla GraphSAGE	NIFTY	FairGNN	FairVGNN	FairINV
German	AUC	<u><math>74.41 \pm 0.80</math></u>	$68.45 \pm 3.8$	<b><math>75.25 \pm 0.9</math></b>	$73.79 \pm 1.67$	$73.64 \pm 2.88$
	F1	$80.74 \pm 1.81$	$77.35 \pm 0.69$	$79.45 \pm 2.69$	<u><math>82.20 \pm 0.48</math></u>	<b><math>82.49 \pm 0.23</math></b>
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	$26.89 \pm 6.23$	$5.93 \pm 7.03$	$27.45 \pm 4.59$	<u><math>2.98 \pm 2.75</math></u>	<b><math>0.34 \pm 0.58</math></b>
	$\Delta_{EO}(\downarrow)$	$18.36 \pm 6.91$	$5.27 \pm 4.02$	$20.21 \pm 4.48$	<u><math>1.38 \pm 0.89</math></u>	<b><math>0.17 \pm 0.34</math></b>
Bail	AUC	$90.79 \pm 1.14$	$91.18 \pm 1.32$	$91.48 \pm 0.28$	<b><math>92.01 \pm 0.68</math></b>	<u><math>91.85 \pm 0.43</math></u>
	F1	$80.82 \pm 1.81$	$80.54 \pm 1.52$	$81.41 \pm 0.54$	<b><math>83.85 \pm 1.15</math></b>	<u><math>81.59 \pm 1.66</math></u>
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	$2.45 \pm 1.31$	<b><math>6.19 \pm 1.64</math></b>	<u><math>1.52 \pm 0.85</math></u>	<u><math>3.00 \pm 1.55</math></u>	<b><math>0.49 \pm 0.43</math></b>
	$\Delta_{EO}(\downarrow)$	$1.77 \pm 0.68$	<b><math>4.75 \pm 1.62</math></b>	<u><math>1.44 \pm 0.84</math></u>	<u><math>1.48 \pm 1.34</math></u>	<b><math>0.66 \pm 0.49</math></b>
Pokey-z	AUC	<b><math>78.69 \pm 0.44</math></b>	$77.05 \pm 0.53$	$77.86 \pm 0.93$	<u><math>78.67 \pm 0.57</math></u>	<u><math>78.22 \pm 0.68</math></u>
	F1	<u><math>70.54 \pm 1.26</math></u>	$65.19 \pm 3.18$	$68.83 \pm 3.88$	<b><math>72.78 \pm 0.73</math></b>	<u><math>70.48 \pm 2.32</math></u>
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	<u><math>4.99 \pm 1.41</math></u>	$3.65 \pm 0.94$	$5.48 \pm 1.15$	<b><math>3.08 \pm 1.73</math></b>	<b><math>3.76 \pm 1.29</math></b>
	$\Delta_{EO}(\downarrow)$	$5.17 \pm 1.68$	$3.87 \pm 1.21$	$5.61 \pm 1.48$	<u><math>3.85 \pm 1.90</math></u>	<b><math>3.46 \pm 0.99</math></b>
Pokey-n	AUC	<u><math>75.99 \pm 0.39</math></u>	$72.31 \pm 1.67$	$75.12 \pm 1.03$	$75.22 \pm 0.63$	<b><math>76.08 \pm 0.31</math></b>
	F1	<u><math>63.03 \pm 1.49</math></u>	$61.73 \pm 1.4$	$64.84 \pm 1.86$	<b><math>65.91 \pm 1.43</math></b>	<b><math>66.22 \pm 1.61</math></b>
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	<u><math>1.02 \pm 0.67</math></u>	$6.66 \pm 1.40$	<u><math>1.93 \pm 1.14</math></u>	$4.94 \pm 1.91$	<b><math>0.99 \pm 0.90</math></b>
	$\Delta_{EO}(\downarrow)$	$2.65 \pm 1.20$	$9.16 \pm 1.86$	<u><math>2.6 \pm 2.19</math></u>	$6.26 \pm 2.71$	<b><math>1.49 \pm 1.11</math></b>

**Table 7: Comparison of FairINV and baseline methods in various sensitive attributes scenarios. Sens.Attr.: Sensitive Attribute.**

Datasets		Vanilla GCN	NIFTY	FairGNN	FairINV	Vanilla GCN	NIFTY	FairGNN	FairINV	Vanilla GCN	NIFTY	FairGNN	FairINV
German	Sens.Attr.	Age				Gender				Single			
	AUC	$65.90 \pm 0.83$	$49.26 \pm 6.68$	$75.13 \pm 0.84$	$69.11 \pm 1.80$	$65.90 \pm 0.83$	$55.87 \pm 8.19$	$75.69 \pm 0.60$	$69.11 \pm 1.80$	$65.90 \pm 0.83$	$56.08 \pm 8.46$	$75.69 \pm 0.60$	$69.11 \pm 1.80$
	F1	$77.32 \pm 1.20$	$82.0 \pm 0.71$	$76.83 \pm 3.09$	$82.36 \pm 0.35$	$77.32 \pm 1.20$	$81.88 \pm 0.39$	$77.91 \pm 5.16$	$82.36 \pm 0.35$	$77.32 \pm 1.20$	$82.03 \pm 0.37$	$78.17 \pm 5.15$	$82.36 \pm 0.35$
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	$20.18 \pm 5.17$	$0.13 \pm 0.25$	$20.67 \pm 3.40$	$0.48 \pm 0.38$	$36.29 \pm 4.64$	$1.75 \pm 1.82$	$36.07 \pm 5.75$	$0.76 \pm 1.24$	$34.13 \pm 3.29$	$1.19 \pm 1.71$	$33.37 \pm 7.83$	$2.64 \pm 4.15$
	$\Delta_{EO}(\downarrow)$	$15.83 \pm 3.47$	$0.34 \pm 0.67$	$18.24 \pm 3.95$	$0.46 \pm 0.52$	$31.35 \pm 4.39$	$1.53 \pm 0.93$	$27.84 \pm 5.71$	$0.15 \pm 0.29$	$27.26 \pm 4.96$	$0.61 \pm 0.69$	$25.91 \pm 7.93$	$1.48 \pm 2.96$
Pokey-z	Sens.Attr.	Hair color indicator				Region				AGE			
	AUC	$76.42 \pm 0.13$	$74.04 \pm 0.46$	$70.39 \pm 1.07$	$75.79 \pm 0.08$	$76.42 \pm 0.13$	$74.04 \pm 0.46$	$70.25 \pm 0.89$	$75.79 \pm 0.08$	$76.42 \pm 0.13$	$74.04 \pm 0.46$	$70.31 \pm 1.07$	$75.79 \pm 0.08$
	F1	$70.32 \pm 0.20$	$69.90 \pm 0.34$	$43.73 \pm 24.28$	$70.78 \pm 0.50$	$70.32 \pm 0.20$	$69.9 \pm 0.34$	$41.98 \pm 23.68$	$70.78 \pm 0.5$	$70.32 \pm 0.20$	$69.90 \pm 0.34$	$41.34 \pm 28.04$	$70.78 \pm 0.50$
	$\Delta_{DP}(\downarrow)$	$18.7 \pm 0.90$	$17.29 \pm 7.62$	$10.80 \pm 7.58$	$15.63 \pm 1.09$	$3.91 \pm 0.35$	$8.15 \pm 3.28$	$2.80 \pm 1.11$	$2.70 \pm 0.96$	$33.09 \pm 0.57$	$35.71 \pm 13.32$	$22.08 \pm 18.8$	$27.49 \pm 3.29$
	$\Delta_{EO}(\downarrow)$	$18.73 \pm 0.80$	$14.81 \pm 6.47$	$10.19 \pm 7.21$	$14.31 \pm 1.76$	$4.59 \pm 0.34$	$7.57 \pm 2.93$	$3.45 \pm 1.38$	$2.23 \pm 0.66$	$36.32 \pm 0.70$	$33.68 \pm 13.4$	$23.42 \pm 19.31$	$29.19 \pm 3.68$