

Cherry on the Cake: Fairness is NOT an Optimization Problem

Marco Favier^{1*} and Toon Calders¹

¹University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): marco.favier@uantwerpen.be;

Abstract

Fair cake-cutting is a mathematical subfield that studies the problem of fairly dividing a resource among a number of participants. The so-called “cake,” as an object, represents any resource that can be distributed among players. This concept is connected to supervised multi-label classification: any dataset can be thought of as a cake that needs to be distributed, where each label is a player that receives its share of the dataset. In particular, any efficient cake-cutting solution for the dataset is equivalent to an optimal decision function. Although we are not the first to demonstrate this connection, the important ramifications of this parallel seem to have been partially forgotten. We revisit these classical results and demonstrate how this connection can be prolifically used for fairness in machine learning problems. Understanding the set of achievable fair decisions is a fundamental step in finding optimal fair solutions and satisfying fairness requirements. By employing the tools of cake-cutting theory, we have been able to describe the behavior of optimal fair decisions, which, counterintuitively, often exhibit quite unfair properties. Specifically, in order to satisfy fairness constraints, it is sometimes preferable, in the name of optimality, to purposefully make mistakes and deny giving the positive label to deserving individuals in a community in favor of less worthy individuals within the same community. This practice is known in the literature as *cherry-picking* and has been described as “*blatantly unfair*.”

Keywords: Classification, Fairness, Cake-Cutting, Impossibility Results, Cherry-Picking

1 Introduction

In various social and economic contexts, the challenge of fairly allocating a divisible resource among multiple participants has been of paramount importance. In particular, when the resource is heterogeneous in nature, the players involved may disagree on the value of a piece of it, further complicating how to distribute the resource in a suitable way for all participants.

For instance, consider the problem of dividing land for agricultural purposes. The yield of different crops depends on various factors, including the chemical components in the soil, access to sunlight and water, and the overall geography of the land. For this reason, different plots of land may be more effective for some crops than for others. Efficiently allocating the land is imperative to maximize the total yield. In this example, the different crops can be thought of as players demanding a certain amount of land, each disagreeing about the value of a particular plot.

How to divide and distribute a heterogeneous resource (the land) among different participants (the crops) is the kind of question that cake-cutting theory aims to solve. After a cake has been partitioned, there are multiple ways to categorize the quality of the distribution. A partition is called *envy-free* if no player would prefer to receive another person’s piece, ensuring that no one is envious. In contrast, a partition is called *Pareto optimal* if, to give a player a better piece, we would be forced to give a worse piece to another player. Our work focuses solely on the latter.

In multi-label supervised learning, researchers must address a similar problem: learning a decision function capable of predicting a label for each data point in a dataset. This decision function essentially partitions the dataset, where each partition corresponds to a possible label. From a cake-cutting perspective, each label acts as a player: the more data points assigned to a specific label, the higher the prediction rate for that label becomes.

For example, in binary classification, assigning the positive label to data points previously labeled as negative results in an equal or increased true positive rate. Furthermore, the dataset, or more precisely, the underlying distribution, behaves as a heterogeneous resource: the likelihood of each label varies from data point to data point. Hence, every label *prefers* some data points more than others.

Under some reasonable assumptions, not only are the two problems related, but they are actually equivalent: every cake-cutting problem can be expressed as a multi-label classification problem, and vice versa. Because of this connection, a number of results from cake-cutting theory can be restated using multi-label classification terminology. This translation sheds light on the space of possible decisions and feasible model performances, generalizing concepts such as ROC curves and confusion matrices.

These results find an important application in *Fair ML* [1]. In this field, researchers focus on developing algorithms and models that minimize bias and discrimination, ensuring equitable outcomes for all individuals, regardless of their demographic characteristics. In order to measure discrimination, various mathematical metrics have been developed to evaluate how unfair a classifier is. For *group fairness* especially, where a decision is considered fair when different demographic groups are treated similarly, the fairness criterion is often connected to the performance of the classifier in question.

Fairness metrics are often used as additional objectives in optimization problems, but the approach has been criticized for its naivety [2–4]. Moreover, it remains unclear how the fairness term affects the learning process or the final model [5–7], and whether these models can even be considered fair. We shed light on this issue: by employing cake-cutting theory, we mathematically prove that group fairness metrics can frequently exhibit problematic behaviors, wherein the optimal solution inherently possesses unfair properties. If fairness is framed as an optimization problem, it is often optimal to deliberately introduce errors or randomly assign labels. These errors occur not between different communities, which would make them acceptable for the sake of fairness, but within the same community. Accepting this implies that, in the name of optimality, we should misrepresent a community by assigning the positive label to less deserving candidates, even when better candidates from the *same* community are available. This is not only inherently unfair, as it marginalizes worthy individuals from minorities, but also because it can perpetuate stereotypes and biases, as less-capable individuals are more likely to be assigned the positive label.

For example, a supposedly fair optimal model might prefer to hire a young person even if a stronger candidate of the same age is available. People who mistakenly believe that newer generations are lazy would then be more likely to have their beliefs validated by the model’s selections. Confirmation bias would reinforce the stereotype in a self-fulfilling prophecy.

The careless, if not malicious, selection of individuals solely to meet group fairness constraints is often referred to in the literature as *cherry-picking* [8–10]. Generally, cherry-picking is portrayed as a mischievous and absurd method to be avoided, capable of meeting fairness constraints while still being unfair.

What is often overlooked in the literature, however, is that cherry-picking can be a phenomenon that inevitably emerges from the optimization process itself. Unaware practitioners might thus obtain a cherry-picking model without even realizing it. Our results indicate that blindly optimizing fairness metrics will, in many cases, result in counterintuitive and unfair outcomes, as optimal decisions may be forced to cherry-pick. We strongly believe that these findings highlight why discussing fairness purely as a mathematical optimization problem is disingenuous and potentially dangerous. On the other hand, for a few fairness metrics, the optimal solution does not exhibit these problematic behaviors. We demonstrate under which conditions this can or cannot occur.

2 Notation & Definitions

2.1 Cake-Cutting Theory

Cake-Cutting Theory formalizes problems where a divisible resource needs to be distributed among different players in an optimal way. Each player exhibits preferences on what portion of the resource they prefer to receive. It has applications in Game Theory and Statistics. We suggest [11] as a reference.

Definition 1 (Cake-cutting). A *cake-cutting instance* is a triple (X, Σ, μ) where

- X is a set called the “*cake*”, and each player wants a metaphorical slice of it.

- Σ is a σ -algebra on X , representing all the possible slices of the cake.
- $\boldsymbol{\mu} := (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$ is a vector of n atomless¹ finite measures on the measurable space (X, Σ) . Each measure represents a player who wants a piece of the cake, μ_i is how much player i likes a particular slice.

Definition 2 (Slicing). Given a cake-cutting instance $(X, \Sigma, \boldsymbol{\mu})$, we call an ordered partition $\mathbf{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_n)$ of X into n measurable subsets a *slicing*. Each player μ_i receives slice S_i and likes it $\mu_i(S_i)$.

Obviously, players can also evaluate pieces received by other players. This concept plays an important role in cake-cutting theory, so we need to keep track of the opinions of all the players for all the possible pieces.

Definition 3 ($\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{S})$ and IPS). Given a cake-cutting instance $(X, \Sigma, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ and a slicing \mathbf{S} , we indicate with $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{S})$ the matrix defined as

$$[\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{S})]_{i,j} := \mu_i(S_j) \quad \forall i, j \in [n]$$

The *Individual Pieces Set* (IPS) of X is the set of possible diagonals of $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{S})$, that is:

$$\text{IPS}(X) := \{\text{diag } \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{S}) : \mathbf{S} \text{ is a slicing of } X\}$$

So the matrix $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{S})$ considers how players evaluate all the pieces in a given slicing, while the IPS tracks how much each player likes their own piece, but does so for all possible slicings. Since we want to split and distribute our cake so that every participant appreciates their slice, formally, it means that we would like to maximize $\mu_i(S_i)$. This naturally gives rise to the following definition:

Definition 4 (Pareto pre-order). Let $(X, \Sigma, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ be a cake-cutting instance. Given two slicings \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{S}' , we say that \mathbf{S}' is *Pareto non-inferior* to \mathbf{S} (and similarly \mathbf{S} is *non-superior* to \mathbf{S}'), and write $\mathbf{S} \preceq \mathbf{S}'$, if for all $i \in [n]$ it holds $\mu_i(S_i) \leq \mu_i(S'_i)$, or equivalently

$$\text{diag } \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{S}) \leq \text{diag } \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{S}')$$

A slicing \mathbf{S}' is said to be *Pareto-maximal* (and similarly *minimal*) if for any slicing \mathbf{S} such that $\mathbf{S}' \preceq \mathbf{S}$, it also holds $\mathbf{S} \preceq \mathbf{S}'$.

2.2 Supervised Multi-label Classification

In supervised multi-label classification, we have a population of individuals X and a set of possible labels Y . Each individual is associated with a probability distribution over the labels, and our task is to find a probabilistic classifier that can predict the labels of new individuals.

Definition 5. We define a *supervised multi-label classification problem* as a probability space $X \times Y$, where

- X is a set, called the *feature space*, with probability measure μ_X and σ -algebra Σ_X .

¹A measure μ is said to be *atomless* if for each positive measurable set A there exists $B \subset A$ such that $0 < \mu(B) < \mu(A)$.

- $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ is the set of labels, with a conditional probability density function $p_X(\mathbf{y}|x): X \rightarrow \Delta^n$, where Δ^n is the n -dimensional simplex:

$$\Delta^n := \{\mathbf{t} \in [0, 1]^n : t_1 + \dots + t_n = 1\}$$

Our objective is to find a measurable probabilistic classifier (or decision function) $\mathbf{d}: X \rightarrow \Delta^n$ that we can use to make predictions \hat{Y} , where $\hat{Y} = y \sim \mathbf{d}(x) \in \Delta^n$. We can understand how well a classifier performs by looking at the *confusion matrix* $M_X(\mathbf{d})$, which is defined as follows:

$$M_X(\mathbf{d}) := \left[\int_X d_j(x) p_X(y_i|x) \mu_X(dx) \right]_{i,j \in [n]} = \left[P(\hat{Y} = y_j, Y = y_i) \right]_{i,j \in [n]}$$

Our objective is to maximize the *prediction probabilities*, which correspond to the diagonal entries of the confusion matrix, by minimizing the *error probabilities*, which are the entries that are not on the diagonal. A decision \mathbf{d} is said to be *deterministic* if for almost all $x \in X$, there exists an $i \in [n]$ such that $d_i(x) = 1$.

3 The Connection

The connection between cake-cutting and supervised learning is intuitive: if we limit ourselves to deterministic decisions, then for any decision \mathbf{d} , we can simply define a slicing \mathbf{S} so that

$$S_j = \{x \in X : d_j(x) = 1\}$$

and then define probability measures μ_i by considering the entries of the confusion matrix, that is:

$$\mu_i(S_j) = P(\hat{Y} = y_j, Y = y_i) = \int_X d_j(x) p_X(y_i|x) \mu_X(dx)$$

But two problems need to be addressed to formalize this line of reasoning. First, it is unclear how we can define a proper slicing when the decision used is not deterministic. Secondly, a more technical problem may arise: the newly defined measures might not be atomless, as the cake-cutting definition requires. When μ_X is atomless itself, it is possible to prove that it doesn't really matter whether a decision is deterministic or not: any confusion matrix obtained by a probabilistic decision can also be obtained by a deterministic one. This has been proven by [12]. But when μ_X is not atomless, we can still circumvent the issue by simply considering an extra dimension: any probabilistic decision on X can be seen as a deterministic decision on $X \times [0, 1)$, and hence a cake-cutting problem on $X \times [0, 1)$. Formally:

Theorem 1. Consider a multi-label classification problem on $X \times Y$. There exists a cake-cutting instance $(X \times [0, 1), \Sigma, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ such that for any matrix M , it holds:

$$M = M_X(\mathbf{d}) \text{ for a decision } \mathbf{d} \iff M = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{S}) \text{ for some slicing } \mathbf{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_n)$$

Proof. First, let's formalize the cake-cutting instance $(X \times [0, 1], \Sigma, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ that we need. We already know that the cake is $X \times [0, 1]$, so a natural choice for the σ -algebra Σ is the product algebra $\Sigma_X \otimes \mathcal{B}([0, 1])$, where Σ_X is the original σ -algebra on X and $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ is the Borel σ -algebra on $[0, 1]$.

Similarly, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$ is defined as the vector of the product measures μ_i such that

$$\mu_i(Q \times [a, b]) := \lambda([a, b]) \cdot \int_Q p_X(y_i|x) \mu_X(dx) = (b-a) \cdot P(Q, Y = y_i)$$

The use of the Lebesgue measure λ in the product guarantees that μ_i is an atomless measure. We can now prove that such a cake-cutting instance satisfies the claim of the proposition.

Let's start by proving that, given a probabilistic decision $\mathbf{d}(x) \in \Delta^n$, we can construct a slicing \mathbf{S} for the cake-cutting instance such that $\mu_i(S_j) = P(\widehat{Y} = y_j, Y = y_i)$ for all $i, j \in [n]$. We define S_j as follows:

$$S_j = \left\{ (x, t) \in X \times [0, 1] : \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} d_k(x) \leq t < \sum_{k=1}^j d_k(x) \right\}$$

Since $\sum_{k=1}^n d_k(x) = 1$, we have that the slicing $\mathbf{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_n)$ forms a partition of $X \times [0, 1]$. They are also measurable, since the sub-graphs of measurable functions are measurable sets in $X \times [0, 1]$. Therefore, every S_j is measurable, as it can be expressed as the difference of measurable sets. Consequently,

$$\mu_i(S_j) = \int_{S_j} p_X(y_i|x) \mu_X(dx) \otimes dt$$

By Fubini-Tonelli's theorem, the integral can be rewritten as

$$\int_X \left(\int_{\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} d_k(x)}^{\sum_{k=1}^j d_k(x)} dt \right) p_X(y_i|x) \mu_X(dx) = \int_X d_j(x) p_X(y_i|x) \mu_X(dx)$$

since the inner integral is just $\sum_{k=1}^j d_k(x) - \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} d_k(x) = d_j(x)$. Finally,

$$\int_X d_j(x) p_X(y_i|x) \mu_X(dx) = P(\widehat{Y} = y_j, Y = y_i)$$

On the other hand, if we start with a slicing $\mathbf{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_n)$ of $X \times [0, 1]$, we can consider the probabilistic decision function $\mathbf{d}(x) = (d_1(x), \dots, d_n(x))$ defined as follows:

$$d_j(x) = \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}_{S_j}(x, t) dt$$

where $\mathbb{1}_{S_j}$ is the characteristic function of the set S_j . Since S_j is measurable, its characteristic function is also measurable. Then, again by Fubini-Tonelli's theorem, we have that $d_j(x)$ is a measurable function in X , and it holds

$$\int_X d_j(x) p_X(y_i|x) \mu_X(dx) = \int_X \left(\int_0^1 \mathbb{1}_{S_j}(x, t) dt \right) p_X(y_i|x) \mu_X(dx) = \mu_i(S_j)$$

Finally, $\mathbf{d}(x) \in \Delta^n$ because

$$\sum_{j=1}^n d_j(x) = \sum_{j=1}^n \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}_{S_j}(x, t) dt = \int_0^1 \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{S_j}(x, t) dt = \int_0^1 dt = 1$$

since $\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{S_j}(x, t) = 1$, given that \mathbf{S} is a partition of $X \times [0, 1)$. \square

The theorem proves that for each classification problem, there exists an equivalent cake-cutting instance. But the converse is also true: every cake-cutting problem can be stated as a classification problem, up to a reparametrization. This is a classical result [13], which involves the use of the Radon-Nikodym theorem. Consider a cake-cutting instance $(X, \Sigma, \boldsymbol{\mu})$. Since $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is a vector of finite measures, we can define a new probability measure μ_X such that

$$\mu_X(Q) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i(Q)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i(X)} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mu_i(Q)}{\|\boldsymbol{\mu}(X)\|_1}$$

Every normalized measure $\mu_i/\|\boldsymbol{\mu}(X)\|_1$ is clearly absolutely continuous with respect to μ_X ; hence, by the Radon-Nikodym theorem, there must be functions $p_X(y_i|x): X \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ such that

$$\frac{\mu_i(Q)}{\|\boldsymbol{\mu}(X)\|_1} = \int_Q p_X(y_i|x) \mu_X(dx)$$

In particular, it's possible to choose them such that $\sum_{i=1}^n p_X(y_i|x) = 1$. Moreover, μ_X is an atomless probability measure, since the measures μ_i are atomless as well. So, as proven in [12], we have that any slicing of X is equivalent to a decision function $\mathbf{d}: X \rightarrow \Delta^n$ and vice versa, without the need of extra dimensions as in Proposition 1.

3.1 The Simplex as the One Cake

Being able to derive probabilities $p_X(\mathbf{y}|x)$ for any cake-cutting problem provides a different point of view on how to approach the problem: $p_X(\mathbf{y}|x)$ can not only be seen as a conditional probability but also as a measurable function $p_X(\mathbf{y}|x): X \rightarrow \Delta^n$.

This means that we can enrich the simplex Δ^n with the pushforward measure defined by $\mu_\Delta := \mu_X \circ p_X(\mathbf{y}|)^{-1}$. Moreover, we can also define new conditional probability distributions $p_\Delta(\mathbf{y}| -)$ on Δ^n such that

$$p_\Delta(y_i|\mathbf{t}) := t_i \text{ for all } \mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \Delta^n$$

meaning that the conditional distributions on Δ^n correspond to the identity function.

The probability measure μ_Δ , together with the conditional distributions $p_\Delta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{t})$, allows us to discuss probabilistic decisions and, by extension, cake-cutting on Δ^n .

In particular, if we consider a probabilistic decision function $\mathbf{d}: \Delta^n \rightarrow \Delta^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\widehat{Y}_\Delta = y_j, Y = y_i) &= \int_{\Delta^n} d_j(\mathbf{t}) p_\Delta(y_i|\mathbf{t}) \mu_\Delta(d\mathbf{t}) = \\ &= \int_{\Delta^n} d_j(\mathbf{t}) t_i \mu_\Delta(d\mathbf{t}) = \\ &= \int_X d_j(p_X(\mathbf{y}|x)) p_X(y_i|x) \mu_X(dx) = P(\widehat{Y}_X = y_j, Y = y_i) \end{aligned}$$

where \widehat{Y}_Δ is sampled according to \mathbf{d} and \widehat{Y}_X according to $\mathbf{d} \circ p_X(\mathbf{y}|-)$.

So, the confusion matrix of any decision on X that only depends on the conditional probabilities can be seen as the matrix for a decision on Δ^n , and vice versa. But more importantly, as a consequence of Weller's theorem [14] stated in the next subsection, *any* decision \mathbf{d} on X is equivalent to a decision $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}$ that only depends on $p_X(\mathbf{y}|x)$. Which means that Δ^n , together with conditional probability $p_\Delta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{t}) := \mathbf{t}$, provides a universal space where the only variable that changes is the underlying probability μ_Δ . Critically, we must be aware that some of the choices of μ_Δ may lead to measures that are not atomless, hence by Proposition 1, the space $\Delta^n \times [0, 1)$ provides a universal cake where the players μ_i are defined by

$$\mu_i(Q \times [a, b]) := (b - a) \cdot \int_Q t_i \cdot \mu_\Delta(d\mathbf{t})$$

for some probability measure μ_Δ on Δ^n .

3.2 Cake-Cutting for Classification

Let's now return for a moment to the definition of Pareto maximality and discuss in more detail some important differences. Since we now know that cake-cutting and classification are two sides of the same coin, it seems natural to apply the Pareto pre-order defined on slicings as a pre-order on decisions as well. This is indeed how we will approach the problem, yet it is not the most general way to define an order on decisions.

What we consider a "good decision" in classification is one that minimizes errors. Hence, in full generality, given two decisions \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d}' , we can say that one is better ($\mathbf{d} \preceq_e \mathbf{d}'$) than the other according to errors by defining \preceq_e such that

$$(\mathbf{d} \preceq_e \mathbf{d}') \iff P(\widehat{Y} = y_j, Y = y_i) \geq P(\widehat{Y}' = y_j, Y = y_i) \text{ for all } i \neq j$$

However, the Pareto pre-order on decision \preceq is defined as

$$(\mathbf{d} \preceq \mathbf{d}') \iff P(\widehat{Y} = y_i, Y = y_i) \leq P(\widehat{Y}' = y_i, Y = y_i) \text{ for all } i \in [n]$$

where \widehat{Y} is sampled from \mathbf{d} and \widehat{Y}' from \mathbf{d}' .

If $n > 2$, these two definitions are *not* equivalent. In particular, it does hold that $\mathbf{d} \lesssim_e \mathbf{d}' \Rightarrow \mathbf{d} \lesssim \mathbf{d}'$, but unless we are discussing binary classification, the converse $\mathbf{d} \lesssim \mathbf{d}' \Rightarrow \mathbf{d} \lesssim_e \mathbf{d}'$ is *false*.

Example. You have been tasked with building an AI model to predict blood pressure without the need for direct measurements. There are three possible labels, $Y = \{low, even, high\}$, and you have developed two algorithms, $\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d}' : X \rightarrow \Delta^3$, with the following confusion matrices

$$\begin{array}{c|ccc}
 M_X(\mathbf{d}) & \widehat{Y} = & & \\
 & low & even & high \\
 \hline
 Y = low & 12\% & 15\% & 3\% \\
 Y = even & 15\% & 15\% & 0\% \\
 Y = high & 0 & 0 & 40\%
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{c|ccc}
 M_X(\mathbf{d}') & \widehat{Y} = & & \\
 & low & even & high \\
 \hline
 Y = low & 15\% & 5\% & 10\% \\
 Y = even & 15\% & 15\% & 0\% \\
 Y = high & 0 & 0 & 40\%
 \end{array}$$

Looking at the diagonals, we can tell that $\mathbf{d} \prec \mathbf{d}'$, but the error rates cannot be compared directly. This means we cannot claim that $\mathbf{d} \lesssim_e \mathbf{d}'$, nor $\mathbf{d} \lesssim \mathbf{d}'$. In particular, it's debatable whether \mathbf{d} is better than \mathbf{d}' , since predicting high blood pressure in people with low blood pressure can be more serious than predicting even blood pressure instead.

That said, by limiting ourselves to the use of \lesssim only, we naturally inherit a lot of useful properties and results from cake cutting.

Similarly to what we have done for the Pareto pre-order, we can redefine concepts from cake-cutting as concepts for classification. For instance, $\text{IPS}(X)$ can be considered as the set of diagonals of all possible confusion matrices for a classification problem on X .

First of all, we can now properly state one of the major results from [12] using machine learning terminology:

Theorem 2 (Dvoretzky, Wald, and Wolfowitz's Theorem). Consider a classification problem on X . The set of achievable confusion matrices

$$\{M_X(\mathbf{d}) : \mathbf{d} \text{ is a decision on } X\}$$

is closed and convex. In particular, so is $\text{IPS}(X)$.

This finds an important use in the following theorem, which states that unless there exist data points where certain labels can be excluded with absolute certainty, suboptimal decisions can always be improved in any direction.

Theorem 3. Consider a classification problem on X such that

$$\mu_X(\{x \in X : p_X(y_i|x) = 0 \text{ for some } i \in [n]\}) = 0$$

If $\mathbf{d} : X \rightarrow \Delta^n$ is *not* a Pareto maximal decision then, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\{\text{diag } M_X(\mathbf{d})\} + [0, \varepsilon]^n \subseteq \text{IPS}(X)$$

Proof. If $\mathbf{d}: X \rightarrow \Delta^n$ is not Pareto maximal, then by the definition of Pareto maximality, there exists $\mathbf{d}' \succ \mathbf{d}$ such that $[M_X(\mathbf{d})]_{i,i} < [M_X(\mathbf{d}')]_{i,i}$ for some $i \in [n]$. Because of Theorem 1, we can then find slicings \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{S}' of $X \times [0, 1)$ equivalent to \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d}' , respectively. Let $Q \subseteq S'_i$ be a set such that $\mu_i(Q) = \mu_i(S'_i) - \mu_i(S_i)$. Such a set must exist because μ_i is an atomless measure. In particular, $\mu_j(Q) > 0$ for all $j \in [n]$, since almost everywhere $p_X(y_j|x) > 0$. Because of this, we can construct slicings $\mathbf{S}^{(j)} = (S_1^{(j)}, \dots, S_n^{(j)})$ for all $j \in [n]$ defined as:

$$S_k^{(j)} := \begin{cases} S'_k \setminus Q & \text{if } k \neq j \\ S'_k \cup Q & \text{if } k = j \end{cases}$$

Notice that $\mathbf{S} \prec \mathbf{S}^{(j)}$ and $\mu_j(S_j) < \mu_j(S_j^{(j)})$ for all $j \in [n]$. Due to Theorem 2, this means that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\{\text{diag } \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{S})\} + [0, \varepsilon]^n \subseteq \text{IPS}(X \times [0, 1))$$

Hence, once again, we have the thesis by applying Theorem 1. \square

Another important result comes from the aforementioned Weller's Theorem [14], which provides a sufficient and necessary condition to construct Pareto maximal decisions.

Theorem 4 (Weller's Theorem [14]). A decision $\mathbf{d}: X \rightarrow \Delta^n$ is Pareto maximal if and only if there exists a sequence $(\boldsymbol{\omega}^{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\Delta^n \cap (0, 1)^n$ such that

- for all $i, j \in [n]$, the limit $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \omega_i^{(k)} / \omega_j^{(k)}$ converges in $[0, \infty]$.
- for all $i \in [n]$, almost everywhere on X ,

$$d_i(x) > 0 \Rightarrow \exists \bar{k} \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } \frac{p_X(y_i|x)}{p_X(y_j|x)} \geq \sup_{k \geq \bar{k}} \left(\frac{\omega_i^{(k)}}{\omega_j^{(k)}} \right) \quad \forall j \in [n]$$

Such a sequence $(\boldsymbol{\omega}^{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is said to be w -associated with $\mathbf{d}(x)$.

For the binary case this theorem can be restated as follows:

Corollary 1. Consider a binary classification problem with labels $Y = \{0, 1\}$. A binary decision $\mathbf{d}(x) = (d_0(x), d_1(x))$ is Pareto maximal if and only if there exists $t \in [0, 1]$ such that almost everywhere on X , it holds

$$d_1(x) = 1 - d_0(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p_X(y_0|x) = 0 \text{ or } p_X(y_1|x) > t \\ 0 & \text{if } p_X(y_1|x) = 0 \text{ or } p_X(y_0|x) < t \\ q(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for some measurable function $q: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

Proof. \mathbf{d} is Pareto maximal if and only if there exists a sequence $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{(k)} = (\omega_0^{(k)}, \omega_1^{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ associated with the decision. Thus, we need to show that the decisions described by the theorem are exactly those associated with such a sequence.




Fig. 1: Optimal decisions according to Weller's Theorem on the Δ^3 simplex with labels $Y = \{\text{red, green, blue}\}$. The RGB decomposition of a color represents the conditional distribution $p_X(\mathbf{y}|x)$.

Since $p_X(y_0|x) + p_X(y_1|x) = 1$ and similarly $\omega_0^{(k)} + \omega_1^{(k)} = 1$, for any sequence in $\Delta^2 \cap (0, 1)^2$ we have

$$\frac{p_X(y_1|x)}{p_X(y_0|x)} \geq \frac{\omega_1^{(k)}}{\omega_0^{(k)}} \iff p_X(y_1|x) \geq \omega_1^{(k)} \iff p_X(y_0|x) \leq \omega_0^{(k)}$$

For the same reason, the limit $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \omega_0^{(k)}/\omega_1^{(k)}$ converges in $[0, \infty]$ if and only if $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \omega_1^{(k)}$ converges in $[0, 1]$.

Let's now consider a decision \mathbf{d} associated with a sequence $\omega^{(k)}$. Now, Weller's theorem, even in the non-binary case, ties our hands for points where $p_X(y_i|x) = 0$ for some i . In that case, almost everywhere, $d_i(x) = 0$; otherwise, $d_i(x) > 0$ would imply that

$$0 = \frac{p_X(y_i|x)}{p_X(y_j|x)} \geq \frac{\omega_i^{(k)}}{\omega_j^{(k)}} > 0$$


which, independently of the sequence $\omega^{(k)}$, always results in a contradiction.

The other points instead depend on the sequence, so let's call $t := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \omega_1^{(k)}$. If $p_X(y_1|x) < t$, then for the same reasoning as above, $d_1(x) = 0$. Similarly, if $p_X(y_1|x) > t$, then $d_1(x) = 0$.

The only points where $\mathbf{d}(x)$ is not predetermined by Weller's theorem are exactly those where $p_X(y_1|x) = t$, and they can be freely assigned using a function $q(x)$. Hence, we have that

$$d_1(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p_X(y_0|x) = 0 \text{ or } p_X(y_1|x) > t \\ 0 & \text{if } p_X(y_1|x) = 0 \text{ or } p_X(y_1|x) < t \\ q(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

To see that any function written in this way is Pareto maximal, we can simply take a sequence $\omega^{(k)}$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \omega_1^{(k)} = t$ and apply Weller's theorem similarly as before. \square



(a) IPS and Pareto maximal decisions. (b) The ROC curve for the same problem.

Fig. 2: IPS and ROC curve for a binary classification problem where half the population has $p_X(y_1|x) = 0.9$ and the other half $p_X(y_1|x) = 0.3$.

The corollary shows that, for the binary case, optimal solutions are achieved by selecting a threshold for the probability distribution. The only cases where the decision is not determined in this way are those where the probability distribution coincides with the threshold. For non-binary classification, a sequence $\omega^{(k)}$ can be seen as the generalization of what a threshold represents in the binary case.

Moreover, this shows that there is a connection between the ROC curve and the IPS. The ROC is the curve traced by $(P(\hat{Y} = 1|Y = 0), P(\hat{Y} = 1|Y = 1)) \in [0, 1]^2$ as the decision threshold changes. Thanks to Weller's theorem, we know this corresponds to the Pareto maximal decisions for the problem. It's easy to observe that the ROC curve and the optimal points of the IPS are identical, merely mirrored and rescaled.

4 Fairness

We will use the theory developed in the previous sections to discuss fairness in machine learning. Cake-cutting provides a useful framework to discuss how and when fair decisions might exist. Let's start with an illustrative scenario:

You have developed a new ML model for college applications able to predict if a given applicant would be a good student and not drop out. Despite your best efforts, the model seems to perform differently depending on the demographic group considered.

In particular, the precision of the model $P(Y = 1|\hat{Y} = 1)$ appears conveniently low for men. This has raised concerns about the fairness of the model, as the difference in precision suggests that the model is very strict when selecting which female candidates to admit to college, while being more lenient on male candidates. You know that by law, unfair treatment of different communities based on gender is not allowed, and that the precision needs to be similar for all groups.

Nonetheless, your model has been recently adopted by a conservative institution which is aware that the performance needs to change to abide by the law. You have been contacted to discuss how to proceed on the matter.

The university does not want to increase the precision for men: higher precision would mean denying education to multiple candidates, possibly excluding many potentially good students. You agree that denying education to anyone is not an option you want to pursue.

You then propose to lower the precision for women, so to admit more of them. But to your surprise, the university staff is against this idea: they claim they are already overworked and that admitting more students would be a burden they cannot afford. It's pretty clear that the university doesn't really care about the fairness of the model nor about gender equality. To the point that they propose you a murky deal instead. You have two options:

1. You do the ethical thing and lower the decision threshold for female applicants, so that women who were previously at the verge of being selected are now admitted. This group still likely contains a lot of suitable candidates. Consequently, you would have to admit a larger number of them before achieving an equal precision rate as that of males.
2. You accept the university's proposal: they suggest tweaking the model to admit only a few female students who would clearly drop out, purposefully making mistakes. The number of additional students admitted would be kept to a minimum, all of whom would drop out soon anyway. This approach would indeed be sufficient to balance the errors and provide the same precision for both groups. This option is highly unethical, but the university doesn't care. They only care to show that they are abiding by the law and that the precision is now 'fair'. They completely wash their hands of the matter: according to them, they are still giving women an opportunity, it's not their fault if they fail.

In the field of fairness in ML, researchers deal with the problem of creating predictive models $d: X \rightarrow Y$ which have the extra requirement of 'being fair' to different subgroups of the population. The elusive notion of fairness is often defined within the problem and evaluated using a fairness metric.

In the context of our example, the definition of fairness was that the model's performance needed to be the same for men and women. Fairness constraints that depend on how a classifier behaves on different subgroups of the population are often called *group fairness constraints* to emphasize that it is possible to understand if a classifier can be considered fair only by looking at how it performs on the full population.

The two possible solutions proposed in the example are two different ways to satisfy the fairness constraint. The first solution is, in our view, the correct ethical solution where different thresholds are used for different groups to guarantee a fair outcome. The second solution, instead, is an unethical way to circumvent fairness constraints by intentionally making mistakes, a practice referred to as *cherry-picking* in fairness literature.

This example, albeit unrealistic, illustrates the conceptual questions that fair ML practitioners have to face: balancing performance and fairness, and choosing the fairest solution among different options.

In this paper, we specifically focus on unethical decisions similar to the second one in our example. Specifically, we investigate instances where cherry-picking solutions may arise naturally from the definition of the fairness problem, despite being unethical. In other words, when optimal solutions to fairness problems are not fair at all.

4.1 Fairness Definitions

To avoid the shortcomings presented at the start of Section 3.2, from now on we will only work with the binary case where $Y = \{0, 1\}$, and we will also assume that any pushforward measure $\mu_\Delta = \mu_X \circ p_X(\mathbf{y}|-)^{-1}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on Δ^2 . This guarantees that the main hypothesis for Theorem 3 holds and that Pareto maximal solutions are deterministic. Furthermore, it avoids trivial situations where, for instance, all people on X have the same conditional probability $p_X(\mathbf{y}|x)$. As a consequence, this also ensures that $\text{IPS}(X)$ always has a non-empty interior. We will denote by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}) &:= P(\widehat{Y} = 0, Y = 0) \\ \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}) &:= P(\widehat{Y} = 1, Y = 1) \end{aligned}$$

the *probability of a true negative* pTN and the *probability of a true positive* pTP, which correspond to the diagonal elements of a binary confusion matrix.

As mentioned in Section 4, fairness definitions depend on subgroups of the population X . To identify these subgroups, referred to as *sensitive groups*, a finite partition $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ of the space X into measurable sets is assumed. To simplify the discussion, we assume the existence of only two groups: $\mathcal{A} := \{\varphi, \sigma\}$. All the results can be easily generalized to more groups and are independent of this assumption. Moreover, the use of “ σ ” and “ φ ” is only meant as an indication for the sensitive groups, it does not have semantic meaning. Their use is simply syntactic sugar for the reader, reminding them of the sensitive connotation. With a bit of notation abuse, we often write “ $A = \varphi$ ” to indicate the set φ , and similarly with σ .

Definition 6 (Evaluation Metric). A real-valued function $\Phi(\mathbf{d}, X)$ is said to be an *evaluation metric* if:

- for all decisions \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d}' on X , it holds

$$\mathbf{d} \succsim \mathbf{d}' \Rightarrow \Phi(\mathbf{d}, X) \leq \Phi(\mathbf{d}', X)$$

- for all decisions \mathbf{d} on Δ^2 , it holds

$$\Phi(\mathbf{d} \circ p_X(\mathbf{y}|-), X) = \Phi(\mathbf{d}, \Delta_X)$$

where Δ_X is the classification problem on Δ^2 with the pushforward measure obtained by X .

We say that Φ is *strict* on X if the first property holds with strict inequalities.

Definition 7 (Fairness Measure). Given sensitive groups $\{\varphi, \sigma\}$ of X , a (*group*) *fairness measure* $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}_\varphi, \mathbf{d}_\sigma, \varphi, \sigma)$ is a positive-valued function such that

- for all decisions $\mathbf{d}_\varphi, \mathbf{d}'_\varphi$ on φ and $\mathbf{d}_\sigma, \mathbf{d}'_\sigma$ on σ , it holds

$$M_\varphi(\mathbf{d}_\varphi) = M_\varphi(\mathbf{d}'_\varphi) \wedge M_\sigma(\mathbf{d}_\sigma) = M_\sigma(\mathbf{d}'_\sigma) \Rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}_\varphi, \mathbf{d}_\sigma, \varphi, \sigma) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}'_\varphi, \mathbf{d}'_\sigma, \varphi, \sigma)$$

- for all decisions $\mathbf{d}_\varphi, \mathbf{d}_\sigma$ on Δ^2 , it holds

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}_\varphi \circ p_\varphi(\mathbf{y}|-), \mathbf{d}_\sigma \circ p_\sigma(\mathbf{y}|-), \varphi, \sigma) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}_\varphi, \mathbf{d}_\sigma, \Delta_\varphi, \Delta_\sigma)$$

where Δ_φ and Δ_σ are the classification problems on Δ^2 with the pushforward measures obtained by φ and σ , respectively.

Definition 8 (Fairness Problem). A (*group*) *fairness problem* on X is an instance of the following problem:

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{d}: X \rightarrow \Delta^2} \Phi(\mathbf{d}, X) - \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}|_\varphi, \mathbf{d}|_\sigma, \varphi, \sigma)$$

where Φ is an evaluation metric and \mathcal{F} a fairness measure.

The definition of an evaluation metric is quite natural: essentially, it states that an evaluation metric is a function that outputs a higher value when a decision improves. Instead, fairness measures are generally *not* evaluation metrics. What we require is that a fairness measure depends solely on the quality of decisions within each sensitive group, which is assessed by examining the confusion matrices.

Notice that this has two important implications. First, two decisions that appear equivalent on X may have different fairness measurements because they could perform differently across each sensitive group. The other implication is that this definition of fairness only concerns what is called ‘group fairness,’ since the fairness metric doesn’t change unless the decision for some sensitive group as a whole changes.

Moreover, it’s reasonable to expect that an evaluation of a decision might depend on how difficult the problem is: for some problems, blindly assigning a label might be close to the best decision, while for others, it might be far from it. An evaluation metric should be able to capture this property, which is why we require an evaluation metric to also depend on the classification problem. The second condition instead ensures that the evaluation is invariant under the permutation of the conditional distributions. More formally, if we consider a decision \mathbf{d} that depends only on the conditional distribution $p_X(\mathbf{y}|x)$, then the evaluation of \mathbf{d} should not change if we permute individuals who have the same conditional distribution. This is also important for fairness measures, as it ensures that no person in a sensitive group counts more than another.

On the other hand, without specifying some form of continuity, we could end up with ill-behaved evaluation metrics that change abruptly when we slightly change the classification problem on X . So we would like to consider only evaluation metrics and fairness measures that behave as expected. In order to introduce these concepts, we first need the following lemmas:

Lemma 1. For any evaluation metric Φ , there exists a real-valued function $\widehat{\Phi}(t, t', E): [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{B}([0, 1]^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\widehat{\Phi}(\text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}), \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}), \text{IPS}(X)) = \Phi(\mathbf{d}, X)$$

for all decisions \mathbf{d} on X .

Proof. In the appendix. \square

Lemma 2. For any fairness measure \mathcal{F} , there exists a real-valued function $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(t_\varphi, t'_\varphi, E_\varphi, t_\sigma, t'_\sigma, E_\sigma): [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{B}([0, 1]^2) \times [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{B}([0, 1]^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(\text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}_\varphi), \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}_\varphi), \text{IPS}(\varphi), \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}_\sigma), \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}_\sigma), \text{IPS}(\sigma)) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}_\varphi, \mathbf{d}_\sigma, \varphi, \sigma)$$

for all decisions \mathbf{d}_φ on φ and \mathbf{d}_σ on σ .

Proof. Similar proof as before. \square

The fact that we can translate fairness measures and evaluation metrics into functions with real numbers as variables allows us to discuss differentiability.

Definition 9. An evaluation metric Φ is said to be *continuous* if $\widehat{\Phi}$ is continuous in all its variables, where continuity for $\text{IPS}(X)$ is understood with respect to the Fréchet-Nikodym metric. Φ is said to be *smooth* if it is also continuously differentiable in $(t, t') \in [0, 1]^2$.

Similarly, we say that a fairness measure \mathcal{F} is *continuous* if $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ is continuous in all its variables and *smooth* if it is also continuously differentiable in $(t_\varphi, t'_\varphi, t_\sigma, t'_\sigma) \in [0, 1]^4$.

Let's take a moment to understand some details about the previous definitions. First, let's formally introduce what the *Fréchet-Nikodym* metric is. Given two measurable sets of a measure space, the Fréchet-Nikodym metric is defined as the measure of their symmetric difference.

In our case, if we have two classification problems on X and X' respectively, we can consider the symmetric difference $\text{IPS}(X) \Delta \text{IPS}(X')$ of their IPSs, which is defined as:

$$\lambda(\text{IPS}(X) \Delta \text{IPS}(X')) := \lambda(\text{IPS}(X') \setminus \text{IPS}(X)) + \lambda(\text{IPS}(X) \setminus \text{IPS}(X'))$$

where λ is the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]^2$. In general, this is a pseudo-metric, but for IPSs specifically, the symmetric difference is actually a well-defined distance. By extensions, it is possible to talk about the distance between two classification problems, by considering the distance between their IPSs. This means that we can properly define what continuity means for functions that depend on a classification problem, as we did for evaluation metrics and fairness measures.

The symmetric difference of the IPSs is a measure of how different two classification problems are, because the larger the IPS, the easier the problem. So, requiring continuity in X according to the symmetric difference is a way to ensure that evaluation metrics work as intended. For similar reasons, we require fairness measures to be continuous as well, this time with respect to the classification problem on each sensitive group.

Example (Precision). Precision is a smooth evaluation metric, since it can be rewritten as:

$$P(Y = 1 | \hat{Y} = 1) = \frac{\text{pTP}(\mathbf{d})}{\text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}) + P(Y = 0) - \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d})}$$

The values $P(Y = 0)$ depends on the classification problem on X , and it is continuous with respect to the measure of $\text{IPS}(X)$.

Example (0-1 Loss). Consider the 0-1 loss function $\mathcal{L}(\hat{y}, y) := \mathbb{1}_{\hat{y} \neq y}$. The expected loss is

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \sim \mu_X \\ y \sim p_X(\mathbf{y}|x) \\ \hat{y} \sim \mathbf{d}(x)}} (\mathcal{L}(\hat{y}, y)) = 1 - (\text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}) + \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}))$$

which is one minus a smooth evaluation metric. This pattern generalizes to margin-based loss functions when sampling \hat{y} from the distribution $\mathbf{d}(x)$ instead of using a score function.

5 Relationship with Fairness Literature

The initial example of section 4 illustrates that determining an optimal model under fairness constraints can be far from straightforward. To address such questions, Corbett-Davis et al. [15] have considered how to find optimal decisions when utilizing the following fairness constraints:

- (Conditional) Statistical Parity: $P(\hat{Y} = 1 | A = \sigma) = P(\hat{Y} = 1 | A = \varphi)$
Which means that individuals from different sensitive groups should have the same access to the positive label (for the “conditional” case, subgroups that satisfy the same requirements are used).
- Equal Opportunity: $P(\hat{Y} = 1 | Y = 1, A = \sigma) = P(\hat{Y} = 1 | Y = 1, A = \varphi)$
Which means that the model’s errors on individuals who deserve the positive label should be independent of the sensitive group to which they belong.

and proved that, if the evaluation function is “Immediate Utility”, an optimal fair decision can be attained by employing distinct thresholds on the probability distribution for each sensitive group. Immediate utility is defined as follows:

$$U_t(\mathbf{d}) := P(\hat{Y} = 1, Y = 1) - tP(\hat{Y} = 1)$$

where t is a constant within the range $[0, 1]$. They limit their results for the case where fairness is a constraint to satisfy, rather than the more general case of a measure to minimize.

Menon et al. [16] further improved on these results by showing that even when the same fairness requirements are implemented as part of the maximization problem, the optimal classifier is still a threshold of the probability distribution. However, their work, like Corbett-Davis et al., is limited to Immediate Utility. Our contribution generalizes these findings to encompass any evaluation metric. The importance of these results is twofold: first, they demonstrate that some of the earliest methods

for achieving fairness are not only still relevant but also theoretically optimal [17, 18]. This means that irrespective of the methodology used, the optimal solution to a fairness problem can always be found by thresholding the probability distributions of the different sensitive groups.

This is significant since it shows that the best way to achieve fairness is to train a well calibrated classifier, able to correctly assign probability distributions to different individuals, instead of using a more complex, and often less interpretable, model.

Secondly, these results can be used to measure the so-called “fairness-accuracy trade-off”. The fairness-accuracy trade-off suggests that an unconstrained model will outperform one that satisfies a fairness constraint [15, 16, 19]. The intuition behind why this phenomenon occurs can be easily understood: the set of constrained models is a subset of all possible models, hence there is a high probability that the best model exists outside the constrained set. However, this point of view has also been challenged [4, 5]. Researchers have shown that fair models are better suited to predict unbiased data after introducing errors in the dataset through a biasing procedure.

5.1 The Cherry-Picking Problem

One important overlooked consequence of what Corbett-Davis et al. and Menon et al. have proved is that, for some specific fairness problems, it’s not necessary to cherry-pick to find optimal solutions. As mentioned in the introduction, in fairness literature, cherry-picking refers to the practice of careless or malicious selection of individuals to make a model appear fair, since it still satisfies the group fairness constraints.

Cherry-picking is often discussed to underline that group fairness constraints are not enough to ensure the fairness of a model. In mathematical terms, we would say that satisfying a group fairness constraint is a *necessary but not sufficient* condition for a model to be fair. Cherry-picking is a clear counterexample that shows why it’s not sufficient, since it has been described as “blatantly unfair” and yet able to satisfy group fairness constraints [8, 9].

What is often overlooked is that cherry-picking can emerge as a consequence of the choice of the fairness constraint and the evaluation used. In particular, optimal “fair” decisions may be forced to cherry-pick. Before continuing with our discussion, let’s formally define what we mean by cherry-picking.

Definition 10 (Cherry-picking). We say that a binary decision \mathbf{d} doesn’t *cherry-pick* if for almost all $x, x' \in A$, it holds

$$\text{If } p_X(y_1|x) \leq p_X(y_1|x') \text{ then } P\left(\widehat{Y}(x') = 0 \mid \widehat{Y}(x) = 1\right) = 0$$

for any $A \in \{\varnothing, \sigma\}$. If this doesn’t happen, we say that \mathbf{d} *cherry-picks*.

Let’s unpack why a decision that doesn’t satisfy the previous definition can be considered cherry-picking and deemed unfair. If a decision \mathbf{d} cherry-picks, it means that we are able to find individuals x, x' from the same sensitive group A such that, even if x' better deserves to receive the positive label than x , the decision \mathbf{d} will still assign the positive label to x and not to x' .

This means that the decision is selecting individuals not based on their merits, but solely to satisfy certain fairness constraints.

It's important to notice that this is different from the case where x and x' belong to different sensitive groups. In that case, the difference in outcomes can be more easily justified. For instance, the distribution of the two groups be skewed due to societal biases. Therefore, it's acceptable if the decision for the privileged group is negative, while the one for the unprivileged group is positive, in order to compensate the bias. Or affirmative action policies may require the use of different criteria when assigning the positive label to the two groups.

Cherry-picking can be characterized using Pareto optimality, as it follows from the following lemma:

Lemma 3. A decision $\mathbf{d}: X \rightarrow \Delta^2$ doesn't cherry-pick if and only if for all sensitive groups $A \in \varphi, \sigma$, the restricted decision $\mathbf{d}|_A: A \rightarrow \Delta^2$ is Pareto maximal.

Proof. Direct consequence of Weller's Theorem and Corollary 1. \square

Hardt et al. [18] were the first to show that there exist cases where cherry-picking is necessary to satisfy group fairness constraints. They have shown that, for the case of Equal Odds, unless the ROC curves of the two sensitive groups intersect, it's impossible to find a fair decision that doesn't cherry-pick. It's also interesting to note that in their work, they had to prove properties about the space of possible decisions, which would be automatically granted by cake-cutting theory, showing how much the two fields are intertwined.

We greatly expand on their results by showing that, for a wide range of fairness constraints, cherry-picking may be an unavoidable consequence of the optimization process.

6 Results

What we are going to show is that the results from [15, 16] can be generalized to any possible evaluation metric Φ . First of all, let's demonstrate why Immediate Utility U_t can be considered an evaluation metric:

Lemma 4. For all $t \in [0, 1]$, U_t is a smooth evaluation metric.

Proof. We can simply rewrite it as

$$U_t(\mathbf{d}) = (1 - t) \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}) + t(\text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}) - P(Y = 0))$$

which is clearly a non-decreasing function for pTN and pTP. \square

The first result we are going to prove is the following, which, together with the previous lemma, generalizes the results of [15, 16] as claimed:

Theorem 5. Let \mathcal{F} be one of the following group fairness measures:

- (Conditional) Demographic Parity Difference:
 $|P(\widehat{Y} = 1|A = \sigma) - P(\widehat{Y} = 1|A = \varphi)|$

- (Conditional) Equal Opportunity Difference:
 $|P(\widehat{Y} = 1|Y = 1, A = \sigma) - P(\widehat{Y} = 1|Y = 1, A = \varphi)|$
- (Conditional) Equal Risk Difference:
 $|P(\widehat{Y} = 0|Y = 0, A = \sigma) - P(\widehat{Y} = 0|Y = 0, A = \varphi)|$

Then, for any evaluation metric Φ , there exists a deterministic binary decision $\bar{\mathbf{d}}$ such that

$$\bar{\mathbf{d}} \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{d}: X \rightarrow \Delta^2} \Phi(\mathbf{d}, X) - \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}|_{\varphi}, \mathbf{d}|_{\sigma}, \varphi, \sigma)$$

that doesn't cherry-pick.

In order to prove the theorem we will first need a couple of definitions and properties to then derive the result.

Definition 11 (First-Quadrant Minimum). Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set and $f: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a function. We say that a point \mathbf{x} is a *first-quadrant minimum* if for all $\mathbf{y} \in U$, it holds

$$\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{y} \Rightarrow f(\mathbf{x}) < f(\mathbf{y})$$

We say that the point \mathbf{x} is a local first-quadrant minimum if there exists an open neighborhood $U' \subseteq U$ of \mathbf{x} such that \mathbf{x} is a first-quadrant minimum for $f|_{U'}$.

The name ‘‘first-quadrant minimum’’ comes from the fact that $\mathbf{x} = 0$ is a first-quadrant minimum for a function $f: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ if it is a strict minimum for all the points in the first-quadrant. As is often the case in calculus, this is tied to properties of the partial derivatives.

Theorem 6. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set and $f: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a C^1 function. If \mathbf{x} is a first-quadrant minimum, then there exists a point $\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{x}$ such that

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(\mathbf{y}) > 0 \quad \forall i \in [n]$$

Proof. The full proof can be found in the appendix. □

This purely mathematical result will provide an important tool. Informally, what we are going to prove is that for all the fairness measures in Theorem 5, $\mathbf{d}|_A$ is never a local first-quadrant minimum for \mathcal{F} . Therefore, we can simultaneously improve \mathcal{F} and Φ until we converge to a Pareto maximal \mathbf{d} . When formalized, this line of reasoning provides a proof for the following theorem, of which Theorem 5 is a corollary.

Theorem 7. Let \mathcal{F} be a smooth fairness measure. If for all sensitive groups $A \in \{\varphi, \sigma\}$, it holds

$$\min \left(\frac{\partial \widehat{\mathcal{F}}}{\partial t_A}, \frac{\partial \widehat{\mathcal{F}}}{\partial t'_A} \right) \leq 0$$

then, if \mathbf{d} is not Pareto maximal when restricted on A , there exists $\widehat{\mathbf{d}} \succ \mathbf{d}$ satisfying $\mathcal{F}(\widehat{\mathbf{d}}|_{\varphi}, \widehat{\mathbf{d}}|_{\sigma}, \varphi, \sigma) \leq \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}|_{\varphi}, \mathbf{d}|_{\sigma}, \varphi, \sigma)$.

In particular, for any continuous evaluation metric Φ , there exists a decision $\bar{\mathbf{d}}$ satisfying

$$\bar{\mathbf{d}} \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{d}: X \rightarrow \Delta^2} \Phi(\mathbf{d}, X) - \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}|_{\varphi}, \mathbf{d}|_{\sigma}, \varphi, \sigma)$$

that doesn't cherry-pick.

Proof. Consider a decision \mathbf{d} such that $\mathbf{d}|_A$ is not Pareto maximal for a given sensitive group, WLOG we can assume it to be $A = \varphi$, and consider the function

$$f(t_{\varphi}, t'_{\varphi}) := \widehat{\mathcal{F}}(t_{\varphi}, t'_{\varphi}, \text{IPS}(\varphi), \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}|_{\sigma}), \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}|_{\sigma}), \text{IPS}(\sigma))$$

By hypothesis, we have

$$\min \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial t_{\varphi}}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial t'_{\varphi}} \right) \leq 0$$

since

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t_{\varphi}}(t_{\varphi}, t'_{\varphi}) = \frac{\partial \widehat{\mathcal{F}}}{\partial t_{\varphi}}(t_{\varphi}, t'_{\varphi}, \text{IPS}(\varphi), \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}|_{\sigma}), \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}|_{\sigma}), \text{IPS}(\sigma))$$

As a consequence, by Theorem 6, no point $(t_{\varphi}, t'_{\varphi})$ can be a local first-quadrant minimum for f . Now since $\mathbf{d}|_{\varphi}$ is not Pareto maximal, and we assume μ_{Δ} to be absolutely continuous with regard to the Lebesgue measure, we can apply Theorem 3, and find $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\{\text{diag } M_{\varphi}(\mathbf{d})\} + [0, \varepsilon]^2 \subseteq \text{IPS}(\varphi)$$

In particular, we know that there exists a point $(\widehat{t}_{\varphi}, \widehat{t}'_{\varphi})$ in the above set such that $f(\widehat{t}_{\varphi}, \widehat{t}'_{\varphi}) \leq f(\text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}|_{\varphi}), \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}|_{\varphi}))$. But since $(\widehat{t}_{\varphi}, \widehat{t}'_{\varphi})$ is in the IPS, then we can find a decision $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{\varphi}$ on φ such that $(\widehat{t}_{\varphi}, \widehat{t}'_{\varphi}) = (\text{pTN}(\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{\varphi}), \text{pTP}(\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{\varphi}))$. We can now extend the decision $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{\varphi}$ to a decision $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}$ on the full space X in the following way:

$$\widehat{\mathbf{d}}(x) = \begin{cases} \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{\varphi}(x) & \text{if } x \in \varphi \\ \mathbf{d}(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We then get $\mathbf{d} \prec \widehat{\mathbf{d}}$, and more importantly $\mathcal{F}(\widehat{\mathbf{d}}|_{\varphi}, \widehat{\mathbf{d}}|_{\sigma}, \varphi, \sigma) \leq \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}|_{\varphi}, \mathbf{d}|_{\sigma}, \varphi, \sigma)$ which proves the first half of the theorem.

In order to prove the ‘‘in particular’’ section, we consider the set Q of decisions that maximize the fairness problem, that is

$$Q := \arg \max_{\mathbf{d}: X \rightarrow \Delta^2} \Phi(\mathbf{d}, X) - \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}|_{\varphi}, \mathbf{d}|_{\sigma}, \varphi, \sigma)$$

We can show that if \mathbf{d} was in Q , then we also get $\widehat{\mathbf{d}} \in Q$ since

$$\Phi(\widehat{\mathbf{d}}, X) - \mathcal{F}(\widehat{\mathbf{d}}|_{\varphi}, \widehat{\mathbf{d}}|_{\sigma}, \varphi, \sigma) \geq \Phi(\mathbf{d}, X) - \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}|_{\varphi}, \mathbf{d}|_{\sigma}, \varphi, \sigma)$$

Since we assume that \mathbf{d} was already a maximum of the problem, it means that $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}$ is still a maximum and the above inequality is an equality. This doesn't prove yet that $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{\varphi}$ is Pareto maximal for φ , but it proves that $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}$ is Pareto superior to \mathbf{d} . As a consequence,

we have that any maximal element in Q according to the Pareto order must also be Pareto maximal for each $A \in \{\varphi, \sigma\}$, otherwise there is a strict upper bound in Q . The question then becomes: “Does Q have elements that are maximal in Q according to the Pareto order ?” and we can positively answer it by applying Zorn’s lemma. This means that if we take a sequence $\{\mathbf{d}^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of decisions in Q such that

$$\mathbf{d}^{(0)} \preceq \mathbf{d}^{(1)} \preceq \dots \preceq \mathbf{d}^{(k)} \preceq \dots$$

we need to be able to find an upper bound in Q . Consider a new decision $\mathbf{d}^{(\infty)}$ such that

$$\text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}^{(\infty)}) = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}^{(k)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}^{(\infty)}) = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}^{(k)})$$

Such decision must exist since the sequences

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}^{(0)}) &\leq \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}^{(1)}) \leq \dots \leq \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}^{(k)}) \leq \dots \\ \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}^{(0)}) &\leq \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}^{(1)}) \leq \dots \leq \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}^{(k)}) \leq \dots \end{aligned}$$

are monotonic and the IPS is compact. Also $\mathbf{d}^{(\infty)}$ must still be a maximum for the fairness problem due to the continuity of Φ and \mathcal{F} . This means that $\mathbf{d}^{(\infty)}$ is an upper bound for the sequence. The only other property we need to prove is that Q is not empty, which follows from the fact that the IPS is a compact set and the fairness problem is a continuous one. So Q has maximal elements, which again means that there exists $\bar{\mathbf{d}}$ that satisfies the claim. The fact that $\bar{\mathbf{d}}$ is deterministic follows from Corollary 1 and once again our assumptions on μ_{Δ} . \square

It’s now easy to show that the fairness measures considered in Theorem 5 satisfy the theorem’s claim, as we only need to check the behavior of their derivatives.

proof of Theorem 5. First of all, let’s formally define $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(t_{\varphi}, t'_{\varphi}, E_{\varphi}, t_{\sigma}, t'_{\sigma}, E_{\sigma})$ for all the measures considered:

- Demographic Parity Difference:

$$|t'_{\sigma} - t_{\sigma} + P(Y = 0|A = \sigma) - t'_{\varphi} + t_{\varphi} - P(Y = 0|A = \varphi)|$$

- Equal Opportunity Difference:

$$\left| \frac{t'_{\sigma}}{P(Y = 1|A = \sigma)} - \frac{t'_{\varphi}}{P(Y = 1|A = \varphi)} \right|$$

- Equal Risk Difference:

$$\left| \frac{t_{\sigma}}{P(Y = 0|A = \sigma)} - \frac{t_{\varphi}}{P(Y = 0|A = \varphi)} \right|$$

All these fairness measures are not continuously differentiable, but their square is. So, instead of applying Theorem 7 to $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$, we apply it to $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}^2$, removing the absolute value.

In that case we have $\partial \widehat{\mathcal{F}}^2 / \partial t_\varphi = 0 = \partial \widehat{\mathcal{F}}^2 / \partial t_\sigma$ when \mathcal{F} is Equal Opportunity and $\partial \widehat{\mathcal{F}}^2 / \partial t'_\varphi = 0 = \partial \widehat{\mathcal{F}}^2 / \partial t'_\sigma$ for Equal Risk. When \mathcal{F} is Demographic Parity instead we have

$$\frac{\partial \widehat{\mathcal{F}}^2}{\partial t_\varphi} = -\frac{\partial \widehat{\mathcal{F}}^2}{\partial t'_\varphi} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \widehat{\mathcal{F}}^2}{\partial t_\sigma} = -\frac{\partial \widehat{\mathcal{F}}^2}{\partial t'_\sigma}$$

In particular, regardless of which measure \mathcal{F} is, we can apply Theorem 7 and claim that if the restriction of \mathbf{d} on some sensitive group A is not Pareto maximal, then there exists $\widehat{\mathbf{d}} \succ \mathbf{d}$ with $\mathcal{F}^2(\widehat{\mathbf{d}}|_\varphi, \widehat{\mathbf{d}}|_\sigma, \varphi, \sigma) \leq \mathcal{F}^2(\mathbf{d}|_\varphi, \mathbf{d}|_\sigma, \varphi, \sigma)$, which implies $\mathcal{F}(\widehat{\mathbf{d}}|_\varphi, \widehat{\mathbf{d}}|_\sigma, \varphi, \sigma) \leq \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}|_\varphi, \mathbf{d}|_\sigma, \varphi, \sigma)$. Hence, the ‘‘In particular’’ section of Theorem 7 holds which proves Theorem 5. \square

This result has three major consequences:

1. As already mentioned previously, this shows that the results from [15, 16] can be generalized to any evaluation metric and not only apply to immediate utility. Therefore, the result can be seen as an improvement of the theoretical state-of-the-art.
2. The result has practical consequences on how to find fair solutions for the three proposed measures. Since the optimal solutions are Pareto maximal for each sensitive group, to find an optimal solution, one only needs to identify suitable thresholds of the ROC curves for each sensitive group. This approach is not new and it has been used since the beginnings of the field of fairness [17, 18, 20]. Now, however, we also know that these methods not only discover fair solutions but can identify the best overall solution when the conditional probability for a data point is correctly modeled.
3. As a consequence, we also find that for these specific fairness measures, there isn’t an inherent conflict between fairness and cherry-picking. Moreover, Theorem 7 extends this result to any fairness measure that satisfies its hypothesis.

That said, these results for Demographic Parity, Equal Opportunity and Equal Risk are far from being general. The condition proposed in Theorem 7, albeit general, is also somewhat counterintuitive since it requires that, regardless of the decision we are considering, if we can find a better decision for a sensitive group, then we can find one that is equally fair if not more.

But, depending on the context, this does not always follow our intuition for fairness: if a decision is already extremely good for one sensitive group and not for another, it’s sometimes reasonable to expect that a decision that is even better for the first group should be considered less fair.

To capture this intuition, we define the following class of fairness measures.

Definition 12. We will say that a fairness measure \mathcal{F} is an *error-based (fairness) measure* if there exists a smooth evaluation metric F such that

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}_\varphi, \mathbf{d}_\sigma, \varphi, \sigma) = |F(\mathbf{d}_\varphi, \varphi) - F(\mathbf{d}_\sigma, \sigma)|$$

We say that \mathcal{F} is *strict* on a set X if F is.

Essentially, an error-based measure uses an evaluation metric to compare the quality of the decision for the two communities. A decision is considered unfair if the quality differs between the two groups. Equal Opportunity and Equal Risk are two examples of error-based measures, as one compares the true positive rate and the other the false positive rate between the communities. Another well-know error-based measure is Predictive Parity (often called Calibration), which confronts the precision of the classifier between groups and and is the focus of our initial example in Section 4. In contrast, Demographic Parity is not an error-based measure.

We are going to show that, for error-based measures, the result of Theorem 7 generally does not hold. More precisely, if the fairness measure is strict, then there exists a sensitive partition and a evaluation metric such that *all* optimal decision must cherry-pick. Equal Opportunity and Equal Risk are not strict, which is why they manage to avoid this pitfall. But in general, evaluations tend to be strict for error-based measures. More formally:

Theorem 8. Consider an error-based measure \mathcal{F} . If \mathcal{F} is strict on X then one of the following must be true:

- There exists a partition $\{\varphi, \sigma\}$ of X and an evaluation Φ such that any solution \bar{d} to the fairness problem

$$\bar{d} \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{d}: X \rightarrow \Delta^2} \Phi(\mathbf{d}, X) - \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}|_{\varphi}, \mathbf{d}|_{\sigma}, \varphi, \sigma)$$

must cherry-pick.

- $F(\mathbf{d}, X)$ is constant for all Pareto maximal decisions on X .

Proof. The idea is to show that if the second point doesn't hold, then the first one must. So, let's suppose $F(\mathbf{d}, X)$ is not constant for all Pareto maximal decisions. As a consequence, if we consider the closed interval I defined as

$$I := \{z \in \mathbb{R} \mid F(\mathbf{d}, X) = z \text{ for a Pareto maximal decision } \mathbf{d}\}$$

we know it cannot be a singleton. Since F is continuous and the set of Pareto maximal decision generate a compact boundary on the IPS, it follows I must indeed be an interval $I = [a, b]$ with $a < b$.

As a consequence, we have an open set $Q \subseteq \text{IPS}(X)$ of decisions \mathbf{d} such that $F(\mathbf{d}, X) \in (a, b)$. In particular, there must be a point $(\hat{t}, \hat{t}') \in Q$ where

$$\frac{\partial \hat{F}}{\partial t}(\hat{t}, \hat{t}', \text{IPS}(X)) > 0 \text{ and } \frac{\partial \hat{F}}{\partial t'}(\hat{t}, \hat{t}', \text{IPS}(X)) > 0$$

otherwise this would mean for all $(t, t') \in Q$

$$\frac{\partial \hat{F}}{\partial t}(\hat{t}, \hat{t}', \text{IPS}(X)) = 0 \text{ or } \frac{\partial \hat{F}}{\partial t'}(\hat{t}, \hat{t}', \text{IPS}(X)) = 0$$




Fig. 3: A visualization of the proof for Theorem 8. After finding (\hat{t}, \hat{t}') for a specific level set of F , the set X is splitted into φ and σ and a new decision is constructed based on the new level set F on σ .

since \hat{F} is an increasing differentiable function. We can prove that one of the two must always be equal to zero on Q , which is done in the appendix in Theorem 9.

As a consequence, we have that \hat{F} is a constant in one direction on Q which conflicts with the fact that F is strict. Hence, the point (\hat{t}, \hat{t}') must exist.

Fix constants $0 < \varepsilon, \varepsilon' < 1$ and consider now a partition $\{\varphi, \sigma\}$ of X constructed in the following way:

- $\partial \text{IPS}(\sigma) \cap \partial \text{IPS}(\varphi) = \{(0, P(Y = 1)), (P(Y = 0), 0)\}$.
- $0 < \lambda(\text{IPS}(\sigma) \setminus \text{IPS}(\varphi)) < \varepsilon$
- $\mu_X(\varphi) = \varepsilon'$

where ∂IPS represents the boundary of an IPS and λ is the Lebesgue measure.

It's sufficiently intuitive that such a partition always exists, but a formal proof of this statement can be found in Corollary 3 in the appendix.

Moreover, if we set ε small enough we get that the point (\hat{t}, \hat{t}') is in the interior of $\text{IPS}(\varphi)$, that the partial derivatives of \hat{F} are still strictly positive in a neighborhood of (\hat{t}, \hat{t}') , and that $\hat{F}(\hat{t}, \hat{t}', \text{IPS}(\varphi))$ can be found in the set of optimal values of $\hat{F}(-, -, \text{IPS}(\sigma))$, since all of these depends on the continuity of F .

This means there is a decision $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_\sigma$ that is Pareto maximal for σ and a decision $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_\varphi$ in the interior of $\text{IPS}(\varphi)$ such that

$$F(\hat{\mathbf{d}}_\sigma, \sigma) = \hat{F}(\hat{t}, \hat{t}', \text{IPS}(\varphi)) = F(\hat{\mathbf{d}}_\varphi, \varphi)$$

We can further suppose that $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_\sigma$ is not a trivial decision (otherwise it is easy to pick a new (\hat{t}, \hat{t}') with the same properties).

We are now ready to find an evaluation metric that forces cherry-picking. Consider an evaluation metric Φ , independent from the distribution, with the following properties:

- Φ has a global maximum in $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_\sigma$ for φ
- Φ has a global maximum in $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_\varphi$ for $\varphi \cap \{\mathbf{d}: \varphi \rightarrow \Delta^2: F(\mathbf{d}, \varphi) = F(\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_\varphi, \sigma)\}$.

Notice that the second global maximum is taken on a specific level set of F , which doesn't conflict with the first global maximum requirement.

The existence of an evaluation metric with this property is a consequence of Theorem 10 proven in the appendix.

Since φ and σ are a partition of X , we can rewrite the distribution on X , so $\mu_X = (1 - \varepsilon')\mu_\sigma + \varepsilon'\mu_\varphi$. We can now prove that there exists constants ε', c such that the following fairness problem

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{d}: X \rightarrow \Delta^2} c \cdot \Phi(\mathbf{d}, X) - \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d}|_\varphi, \mathbf{d}|_\sigma, \varphi, \sigma)$$

has only cherry-picking solutions: if we take ε' and c indefinitely small we can notice that any solution $\bar{\mathbf{d}}$ that maximizes the problem must satisfy

$$\mathcal{F}(\bar{\mathbf{d}}|_\varphi, \bar{\mathbf{d}}|_\sigma, \varphi, \sigma) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_c(\bar{\mathbf{d}}, X) = \max_{\sigma \rightarrow \Delta^2} \Phi(\mathbf{d}, \sigma)$$

which means that $\bar{\mathbf{d}}|_\varphi$ cannot be Pareto maximal since by the properties of Φ we know that $\bar{\mathbf{d}}|_\varphi = \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_\varphi$ which is not Pareto maximal. Since the solution to the problem is continuous in ε' and c , and all the properties shown hold true for a suitable neighborhood of $\bar{\mathbf{d}}$, we can conclude that there exists also a ε' and c such that the problem has only cherry-picking solutions. \square

7 Conclusions, Future Work and Limitations

The results we have shown in this paper are quite formal and precise, so before continuing with the conclusions we would like to specify what they are *not* claiming.

First of all, we are not claiming that all optimal solutions of every fairness problem must cherry-pick. This is formally false, since we have shown that for some common fairness measures there are always non-cherry-picking solutions. Also, for the other fairness measure, this statement doesn't hold true in general, and it very much depends on the specific details of the problem at hand. For instance, if in our fairness problem we use a constant evaluation metric, we shouldn't expect any cherry-picking.

Similarly, we are not claiming that for any sensitive partition of the population the cherry-picking phenomenon happens. We have shown that for some partitions, cherry-picking could be unavoidable if we simply optimize the decision.

What we *are* claiming is that for a number of fairness measures and fairness problems, there is no guarantee that cherry-picking can be avoided. The problem is that a priori it is often not clear if a fairness problem can guarantee at least a non-cherry-picking solution, which means that practitioners should be extremely careful before optimizing a fairness measure, since they could end up with cherry-picking solutions.

That said, we believe it would be interesting to investigate how often cherry-picking occurs in practice and if there are some fairness measures that are more prone to it. This is not an easy task in practice, as it would require almost perfect knowledge of

the underlying distribution and is very dependent on the quality of the data. This is indeed an interesting topic for future research.

That being said, we do expect this phenomenon to arise naturally sufficiently often: the reasoning behind the proof of Theorem 8 requires finding a minority where the quality of decisions is strictly worse than the majority. This is a common situation in many real-world problems, where data collected from marginalized groups are often of lower quality due to bias and discrimination.

Moreover, once again, our results show how people with malicious intentions can exploit the fairness problem to appear fair on one hand, while unfairly treating some groups on the other hand. They could even justify their choices as being “theoretically optimal”.

Furthermore, the cherry-picking problem probably extends to scores as well. If we manually set thresholds for each sensitive group to avoid cherry-picking, based on scores optimized for fairness, we could still inadvertently cherry-pick. A model could potentially unfairly distribute scores, ranking less-deserving individuals higher than more-deserving ones, all while adhering to the fairness constraint. Consequently, any decision based on these scores might seem non-cherry-picking solely because the true scores are obscured by the model.

In light of these results, what we advocate is to stop viewing fairness as something to optimize for. Instead, practitioners should prioritize building reliable classifiers capable of providing well-calibrated scores. This ensures that all the information contained in the data, even if biased, can be collected, and that the type and extent of bias in the distribution can be measured to the best of our abilities.

Then, fairness policies should be considered as a post-processing step, where the goal is either to correct the biases in the data to achieve the most equitable outcome possible, or implementing affirmative action policies to guarantee a more equitable world for future generations. This is transparent, easier to apply, and, most importantly, it doesn’t hide any unfairness behind a veil of optimality.

Declarations

Acknowledgments: We thank the AXA joint research initiative for their support. We thank MSc Daphne Lenders for providing feedback and the example in Section 4.

- Funding: First author is supported by the AXA joint research initiative (CS15893).
- Conflict of interest: No conflict of interest outside authors’ institution.
- Ethics approval: Not applicable
- Consent to participate: Not applicable
- Consent for publication: Not applicable
- Availability of data and materials: Not applicable
- Code availability: Not applicable
- Authors’ contributions: All authors contributed to the study conception and design. Formal proofs were originally discovered by the first author and double-checked by the second. First draft of the manuscript written by the first author while second author provided feedback on the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

References

- [1] Barocas, S., Hardt, M., Narayanan, A.: *Fairness and Machine Learning: Limitations and Opportunities*. Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning series. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts (2023)
- [2] Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., Russell, C.: Why fairness cannot be automated: Bridging the gap between eu non-discrimination law and ai. *Computer Law & Security Review* **41**, 105567 (2021)
- [3] Binns, R., Kleek, M.V., Veale, M., Lyngs, U., Zhao, J., Shadbolt, N.: 'it's reducing a human being to a percentage': Perceptions of justice in algorithmic decisions. *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (2018)
- [4] Favier, M., Calders, T., Pinxteren, S., Meyer, J.: How to be fair? a study of label and selection bias. *Machine Learning* **112**(12), 5081–5104 (2023)
- [5] Wick, M., Tristan, J.-B., et al.: Unlocking fairness: a trade-off revisited. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **32** (2019)
- [6] Haas, C.: The price of fairness—a framework to explore trade-offs in algorithmic fairness. *ICIS 2019 Proceedings*. 19. (2019)
- [7] Kearns, M., Neel, S., Roth, A., Wu, Z.S.: Preventing fairness gerrymandering: Auditing and learning for subgroup fairness. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 2564–2572 (2018). PMLR
- [8] Fleisher, W.: What's fair about individual fairness? In: *Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pp. 480–490 (2021)
- [9] Dwork, C., Hardt, M., Pitassi, T., Reingold, O., Zemel, R.: Fairness through awareness. In: *Proceedings of the 3rd Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference*, pp. 214–226 (2012)
- [10] Goethals, S., Martens, D., Calders, T.: Precof: counterfactual explanations for fairness. *Machine Learning*, 1–32 (2023)
- [11] Barbanel, J.B., Taylor, A.D.: *The Geometry of Efficient Fair Division*, pp. 1–451. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511546679>
- [12] Dvoretzky, A., Wald, A., Wolfowitz, J.: Relations among certain ranges of vector measures. (1951)
- [13] Akin, E.: Vilfredo pareto cuts the cake. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **24**(1), 23–44 (1995)

- [14] Weller, D.: Fair division of a measurable space. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **14**(1), 5–17 (1985)
- [15] Corbett-Davies, S., Pierson, E., Feller, A., Goel, S., Huq, A.: Algorithmic decision making and the cost of fairness. In: *Proceedings of the 23rd Acm Sigkdd International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pp. 797–806 (2017)
- [16] Menon, A.K., Williamson, R.C.: The cost of fairness in binary classification. In: *Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*, pp. 107–118 (2018). PMLR
- [17] Kamiran, F., Calders, T.: Data preprocessing techniques for classification without discrimination. *Knowledge and information systems* **33**(1), 1–33 (2012)
- [18] Hardt, M., Price, E., Srebro, N.: Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **29** (2016)
- [19] Pleiss, G., Raghavan, M., Wu, F., Kleinberg, J., Weinberger, K.Q.: On fairness and calibration. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **30** (2017)
- [20] Kamiran, F., Calders, T.: Classifying without discriminating. *2009 2nd International Conference on Computer, Control and Communication*, 1–6 (2009)
- [21] Rudin, W.: *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. International series in pure and applied mathematics, pp. 235–236. McGraw-Hill, New York (1976)

Appendix

In order to first prove proposition 6 we first need the following:

Theorem. Let $f: [0, 1]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^1 function. If

$$\forall \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n \quad \exists i \in [n] \text{ such that } \partial_{x_i} f(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$$

then

$$\exists \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n \setminus [0, 1]^n \text{ such that } f(\mathbf{0}) \leq f(\mathbf{x})$$

Proof. We are going to prove this via induction on the dimension n .

Case $n = 1$

In this case the theorem simply states that the function $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has non-negative derivative and so it's non-decreasing. Then clearly $f(1) \geq f(0)$.

Case $n - 1 \rightarrow n$

Let's now consider the set Q of points of $[0, 1]^n$ where f has a first-quadrant maximum, formally

$$Q := \{ \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n : f(\mathbf{x}) > f(\mathbf{y}) \forall \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^n \text{ such that } \mathbf{y} > \mathbf{x} \}$$

Q exhibits the following curious property that we can exploit:

Claim.

$$\mathbf{q} \in Q \Rightarrow \nabla f(\mathbf{q}) = 0$$

Proof of the claim. Via contradiction, let's assume the claim to be false. Then, there exists $i \in [n]$ such that $\partial_{x_i} f(\mathbf{q}) \neq 0$. We can safely assume that $i = 1$.

If $\partial_{x_1} f(\mathbf{q}) > 0$ we can find a $\varepsilon > 0$ so that the point $\bar{\mathbf{q}} := (q_1 + \varepsilon, q_2, \dots, q_n)$ is such that $f(\bar{\mathbf{q}}) > f(\mathbf{q})$. Since $\mathbf{q} \in [0, 1]^n$ we can choose an ε small enough such that $\bar{\mathbf{q}} \in [0, 1]^n$, but then by definition we have $\mathbf{q} \notin Q$ which is a contradiction.

Otherwise if $\partial_{x_1} f(\mathbf{q}) < 0$, since all partial derivatives are continuous, we can find an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{x} \in [q_1, q_1 + \varepsilon] \times \dots \times [q_n, q_n + \varepsilon] \Rightarrow \partial_{x_1} f(\mathbf{x}) < 0$$

Consider the function

$$\begin{aligned} g: [0, 1]^{n-1} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (x_2, \dots, x_n) &\mapsto f(q_1, q_2 + \varepsilon x_2, \dots, q_n + \varepsilon x_n) \end{aligned}$$

Now, g must satisfy all the hypothesis of the proposition, in particular there always is $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ such that $\partial_{x_i} g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ in $[0, 1]^{n-1}$, otherwise we would have a point where $\partial_{x_i} f < 0$ for all $i \in [n]$. By induction we can find a point $\mathbf{q}' := (q'_2, \dots, q'_n) \in [0, 1]^{n-1} \setminus [0, 1]^{n-1}$ such that $g(\mathbf{0}) \leq g(\mathbf{q}')$.

In particular if we now consider the point $\bar{\mathbf{q}} := (q_1, q_2 + \varepsilon q'_2, \dots, q_n + \varepsilon q'_n)$, it is such that $f(\bar{\mathbf{q}}) > f(\mathbf{q})$. But this is a contradiction, since it would imply $\mathbf{q} \notin Q$. \square

The claim says that Q is a subset of the set of stationary points of f . This is important because the set of stationary points $\{\nabla f = \mathbf{0}\}$ in $[0, 1]^n$ is a compact set since ∇f is a continuous function and $\{\mathbf{0}\}$ is a closed set.

Because of this we can build a finite covering $\mathcal{F}_\delta := \{H^{(t)}\}_{t \in I}$ of $\{\nabla f = \mathbf{0}\}$, depending on a value $\delta > 0$, made of hypercubes $H^{(t)} := H(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)}, r^{(t)})$ such that $r^{(t)} < \delta$ for all $H^{(t)} \in \mathcal{F}_\delta$, where an hypercube is

$$H(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, r) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}\|_\infty < r\} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x_i - \alpha_i| < r \quad \forall i \in [n]\}$$

The idea now is that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ we will find a sequence $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, 1]^n$ starting at $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} := \mathbf{0}$ and converging to a point $\mathbf{x}' \in [0, 1]^n \setminus [0, 1)^n$ such that $f(\mathbf{0}) - f(\mathbf{x}') < \varepsilon$. Therefore, since ε is arbitrary and $[0, 1]^n \setminus [0, 1)^n$ is closed, this also implies that there exists $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in [0, 1]^n \setminus [0, 1)^n$ such that $f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \geq f(\mathbf{0})$.

We build our sequence using the following rules (and the axiom of choice): for every element $\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)}$ there are three possible situations, namely:

- $\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \in [0, 1]^n \setminus [0, 1)^n$,
- $\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \in [0, 1)^n \setminus Q$,
- $\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \in Q$.

If $\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \in [0, 1]^n \setminus [0, 1)^n$ we have already arrived to the set we want to converge to, so we simply pick $\mathbf{x}^{(k)} := \mathbf{x}^{(k-1)}$

If $\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \in [0, 1)^n \setminus Q$ we know that the set

$$\{\mathbf{y} \in [x_1^{(k-1)}, 1] \times \cdots \times [x_n^{(k-1)}, 1] : \mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \text{ and } f(\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)}) \leq f(\mathbf{y})\}$$

is non-empty, so we can pick any element from that set as $\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$

If $\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \in Q$ then $\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \in H$ for some $H \in \mathcal{F}_\delta$. Since H is a n -dimensional open interval as is $(0, 1)^n$ there exist $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$H \cap (0, 1)^n = (a_1, b_1) \times \cdots \times (a_n, b_n)$$

In this case our choice for the next point in the sequence will be $\mathbf{x}^{(k)} := \mathbf{b}$. If there are multiple elements of \mathcal{F}_δ we can choose from, any of them will work. Notice that any sequence $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ built in such a way is non-decreasing in any direction, that is

$$x_i^{(k)} \leq x_i^{(k+1)} \quad \forall i \in [n], k \in \mathbb{N}$$

Also, only a finite amount of elements lie in Q . We can assume that the sequence $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to the set $[0, 1]^n \setminus [0, 1)^n$: suppose it doesn't, then, since the sequence is non-decreasing and bounded by $[0, 1]^n$, it must converge to a point $\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1)^n$. Now, since \mathcal{F}_δ is a finite set, we can be certain that in a neighborhood of \mathbf{p} the points of the sequence are all outside Q , so there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$f(\mathbf{x}^{(m)}) \leq f(\mathbf{x}^{(m+1)}) \leq \cdots \leq f(\mathbf{x}^{(m+i)}) \leq \cdots \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}$$

Since f is continuous we also have $f(\mathbf{x}^{(m)}) \leq f(\mathbf{p})$. We can then redefine the sequence removing all the points after $\mathbf{x}^{(m)}$ and redefining $\mathbf{x}^{(m+1)} := \mathbf{p}$, notice that this choice of $\mathbf{x}^{(m+1)}$ still follows the same rules previously stated. Continuing this new sequence we get a sequence that converges to a point strictly closer to $[0, 1]^n \setminus [0, 1]^n$; it follows that the supremum of the possible point reachable in such a way is in $[0, 1]^n \setminus [0, 1]^n$. So now we have a sequence $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to $\mathbf{x}' \in [0, 1]^n \setminus [0, 1]^n$. Also, by the same reasoning, the sequence can be chosen such that it is finite, so $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})_{k \leq m}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \in [0, 1]^n$ if and only if $k < m$. The only thing that remains to be proven is that we can choose this sequence in a way such that $f(\mathbf{0}) - f(\mathbf{x}') < \varepsilon$. We have

$$f(\mathbf{0}) - f(\mathbf{x}') = f(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - f(\mathbf{x}^{(m)}) = \sum_{k \in [m]} f(\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)}) - f(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})$$

We can split the sum according to the rules we have followed to build the sequence, since only $\mathbf{x}^{(m)} \in [0, 1]^n \setminus [0, 1]^n$ one of the rules does not appear:

$$\sum_{k \in [m]} f(\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)}) - f(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) = \sum_{\substack{k \in [m] \\ \mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \notin Q}} f(\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)}) - f(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) + \sum_{\substack{k \in [m] \\ \mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \in Q}} f(\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)}) - f(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})$$

Since $f(\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)}) - f(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \leq 0$ if $\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \notin Q$, the first term of the right-hand-side of the equation is always non-negative; it follows

$$f(\mathbf{0}) - f(\mathbf{x}') \leq \sum_{\substack{k \in [m] \\ \mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \in Q}} f(\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)}) - f(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})$$

So if we find a suitable bound for the sequence of points in Q we can prove the theorem. First we notice that

$$\sum_{k \in [m]} \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)} \right\|_{\infty} \leq n$$

because

$$\sum_{k \in [m]} \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \sum_{k \in [m]} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left| x_i^{(k-1)} - x_i^{(k)} \right| \leq \sum_{i \in [n]} \left| x_i^{(0)} - x_i^{(m)} \right| \leq n$$

so obviously the same bound holds for points in Q

$$\sum_{\substack{k \in [m] \\ \mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \in Q}} \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)} \right\|_{\infty} \leq n$$

Now, for all $i \in [n]$ we know that $\partial_{x_i} f$ is a continuous function. But since $[0, 1]^n$ is compact, $\partial_{x_i} f$ is also uniformly continuous. As a consequence there exists $\delta > 0$ such

that for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^n$

$$\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_\infty < \delta \Rightarrow \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{y})\|_\infty < \varepsilon/n^{1.5}$$

If we use such a δ to define our family \mathcal{F}_δ then we have the following property: if $\mathbf{x} \in H \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\delta$ then $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x})\|_\infty < \varepsilon/n$. This is because by the definition of \mathcal{F}_δ there exists $\mathbf{y} \in Q$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_\infty < \delta \Rightarrow \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x})\|_\infty = \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{y})\|_\infty < \varepsilon/n^{1.5}$$

That mean that if we consider any $H \in \mathcal{F}_\delta$ we have that the gradient is everywhere bounded in H . Since H is also convex, the function f is Lipschitz in \bar{H} with constant ε/n according to the ∞ -norm. In fact if $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \bar{H}$ then if we consider the curve $\gamma(t) := t\mathbf{b} + (1-t)\mathbf{a}$

$$|f(\mathbf{a}) - f(\mathbf{b})| = \left| \int_0^1 \nabla f(\gamma(t)) \cdot \gamma'(t) dt \right| \leq \int_0^1 |\nabla f(\gamma(t)) \cdot \gamma'(t)| dt$$

by Cauchy-Schwartz $|\nabla f(\gamma(t)) \cdot \gamma'(t)| \leq \|\nabla f(\gamma(t))\| \cdot \|\gamma'(t)\|$ so

$$\int_0^1 |\nabla f(\gamma(t)) \cdot \gamma'(t)| dt < \varepsilon/n^{1.5} \cdot \int_0^1 \|\gamma'(t)\| dt = \varepsilon/n^{1.5} \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}\| \leq \varepsilon/n \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}\|_\infty$$

since $\|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}\| \leq \sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}\|_\infty$. Putting everything together, since if $\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \in Q$ then there exists $H \in \mathcal{F}_\delta$ such that $\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)} \in \bar{H}$, we have

$$f(\mathbf{0}) - f(\mathbf{x}') \leq \sum_{\substack{k \in [m] \\ \mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \in Q}} f(\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)}) - f(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) < \sum_{\substack{k \in [m] \\ \mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} \in Q}} \varepsilon/n \|\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)}\| \leq \varepsilon$$

proving the theorem. □

Theorem (6). Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set and $f: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a C^1 function. If \mathbf{x} is a first-quadrant minimum, then there exists a point $\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{x}$ such that

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(\mathbf{y}) > 0 \quad \forall i \in [n]$$

Proof. Since U is open we can find an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $[x_1, x_1 + \varepsilon] \times \dots \times [x_n, x_n + \varepsilon] \subseteq U$. Consider the function

$$g: [0, 1]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \mathbf{t} \mapsto -f(\mathbf{x} + \varepsilon \mathbf{t})$$

If, by contradiction, for all $\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{x}$ such that $y_i \geq x_i$ for all $i \in [n]$, we have $\partial_{x_j} f(\mathbf{y}) \leq 0$ for some $j \in [n]$, then g satisfies the hypothesis of the previous proposition. So there

exists $\mathbf{q} \in [0, 1]^n \setminus [0, 1)^n$ such that $g(\mathbf{0}) \leq g(\mathbf{q})$, but then $f(\mathbf{x} + \varepsilon\mathbf{q}) \leq f(\mathbf{x})$. So \mathbf{x} cannot be an first-quadrant minimum, which is a contradiction. \square

Theorem 9. Let $f: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^1 function on an open convex set $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ such that

$$\partial_x f(x, y) \cdot \partial_y f(x, y) = 0$$

If f is never locally constant, that is, there is no open subset $V \subseteq U$ such that $f|_V$ is constant, then

$$\partial_x f(x, y) = 0 \text{ or } \partial_y f(x, y) = 0$$

Proof. Since f cannot be constant it means that there exists a point (x_0, y_0) where the two partial derivative are not both zero at the same time. So let's assume WLOG $\partial_x f(x_0, y_0) > 0$ and $\partial_y f(x_0, y_0) = 0$ (the case with $<$ is equivalent). Since f is a C^1 function, by the continuity of $\partial_x f$, we know that there exists a neighborhood U_0 of (x_0, y_0) where $\partial_x f > 0$, which means by hypothesis that also $\partial_y f = 0$ in U_0 . This also means that $f(x_0, y) = f(x_0, y_0)$ for all y such that $(x_0, y) \in U$. It's pretty obvious that this holds in U_0 but we can also show it for the full set U : to do so consider the value

$$\bar{y} := \inf\{y > y_0 \mid \partial_y f(x_0, y) \neq 0\}$$

If we now focus on $\partial_x f$, we can show $\partial_x f(x_0, \bar{y}) = 0$, to do so consider a sequence $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to \bar{y} such that

$$y_k \in \{y > y_0 \mid \partial_y f(x_0, y) \neq 0\} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$$

such sequence must exist otherwise \bar{y} wouldn't be the infimum of that set. We already know $\partial_x f(x_0, y_k) = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ which then means by continuity

$$\partial_x f(x_0, \bar{y}) = \lim_{y \rightarrow \bar{y}} \partial_x f(x_0, y) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \partial_y f(x_0, y_k) = 0$$

But then, since U is convex, the set $\{x_0\} \times [y_0, \bar{y}]$ belongs in U and so we have $\partial_x f(x_0, y_0) = \partial_x f(x_0, \bar{y})$ since

$$\partial_y (\partial_x f(x_0, y)) = \partial_x (\partial_y f(x_0, y)) = 0 \quad \forall y \in [y_0, \bar{y}]$$

Notice that the two partial derivatives always commute since one is constant as proven in [21]. But that's a contradiction since it would imply $\partial_x f(x_0, y_0) = \partial_x f(x_0, \bar{y}) = 0$ which means \bar{y} doesn't exist. A similar reasoning with the value $\sup\{y < y_0 \mid \partial_y f(x_0, y) \neq 0\}$ proves that $f(x_0, y) = f(x_0, y_0)$ for all y such that $(x_0, y) \in U$.

In particular it holds that $\partial_x f(x, y) = \partial_x f_0(x)$ and $\partial_y f(x, y) = \partial_y f_1(y)$ for some function f_0, f_1 . So $f(x, y)$ is of the form $f_0(x) + f_1(y)$. Which means that we can extend the function $f(x, y)$ to a set $I_0 \times I_1 \supseteq U$ where I_0, I_1 are open interval, moreover there exist open intervals $I'_0 \subseteq I_0$ and $I'_1 \subseteq I_1$ having $\partial_x f_0 = 0$ on I'_0 and $\partial_y f_1 = 0$ on I'_1 such

that $U \subseteq I'_0 \times I_1 \cup I_0 \times I'_1$. Since f is never locally constant we know $U \cap (I'_0 \times I'_1) = \emptyset$, so since U is also open it must be

$$U \subseteq I'_0 \times (I_1 \setminus \overline{I'_1}) \cup I'_1 \times (I_0 \setminus \overline{I'_0})$$

But U is connected so $U \subseteq I'_0 \times (I_1 \setminus \overline{I'_1})$ or $U \subseteq I'_1 \times (I_0 \setminus \overline{I'_0})$ which is equivalent to the thesis. \square

Corollary 2. Theorem 9 works also if U is connected instead of convex.

Proof. We can cover U with convex open sets. For every convex set Theorem 9 holds, which means that every set has either $\partial_x f = 0$ or $\partial_y f = 0$. Let U_0 be the union of the sets where $\partial_x f = 0$ and similarly U_1 with $\partial_y f = 0$. The intersection $U_0 \cap U_1$ must be empty since f is never locally constant; but since U is connected it means $U_0 = \emptyset$ or $U_1 = \emptyset$. \square

Theorem 10. Let $F(x, y)$ be a monotonically increasing function in x and y . Consider a C^1 function $G(x, y)$ such that for any point (x, y) satisfying $F(x, y) = 0$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x F(x, y) = 0 &\Rightarrow \partial_x G(x, y) \geq 0 \text{ in a neighborhood of } (x, y) \\ \partial_y F(x, y) = 0 &\Rightarrow \partial_y G(x, y) \geq 0 \text{ in a neighborhood of } (x, y) \end{aligned}$$

then there exists a function $\widehat{G}(x, y)$ monotonically increasing such that $\widehat{G}(x, y) = G(x, y)$ on the set $F(x, y) = 0$.

Proof. Consider the function $\widehat{G}(x, y) := G(x, y) + \alpha \cdot F(x, y)$. Clearly $\widehat{G}(x, y)$ has the same value of $G(x, y)$ on the set $F(x, y) = 0$. We can now choose α such that $\widehat{G}(x, y)$ is monotonically increasing. We can do this by imposing that the gradient of $\widehat{G}(x, y)$ is always positive. This means

$$\nabla \widehat{G}(x, y) = \nabla G(x, y) + \alpha \nabla F(x, y) \geq 0$$

and so

$$\alpha \geq \max_{F(x, y)=0} \max \left(-\frac{\partial_x G(x, y)}{\partial_x F(x, y)}, -\frac{\partial_y G(x, y)}{\partial_y F(x, y)} \right)$$

A positive α exists since the hypothesis implies that the right-hand side is always bounded from above. \square

Lemma 5. Consider a binary classification problem $X \times Y$. There exists a partition $\{\varphi, \sigma\}$ of X having measure $\mu_X(\varphi) = 1/2 = \mu_X(\sigma)$ such that $\forall \varepsilon > 0$

$$\partial \text{IPS}(\varphi) \cap \partial \text{IPS}(\sigma) = \{(0, P(Y = 1)), (P(Y = 0), 0)\} \text{ and } \lambda(\text{IPS}(\sigma) \Delta \text{IPS}(\varphi)) < \varepsilon$$

where λ is the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]^2$.

Proof. Let's first forget about the ε part and prove that we can find a partition $\{\varphi, \sigma\}$ that satisfies the other conditions.

As mentioned in Section 3.1 we can assume $X = [0, 1] = \Delta^2$ and $p_\Delta(y_1|x) = x$ by using

the pushforward measure. Let $a_1 := \sup\{a \in [0, 1] : \mu_X([a, 1]) = 1/2\}$ and consider the function $b_a := b(a) : [0, a_1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ defined as

$$b(a) = \inf\{x \in [0, 1] : \mu_X([a, x]) = 1/2\}$$

Then the value $P(Y = 1|x \in [a, b_a])$ is a continuous non-decreasing function as a varies, in particular, it's easy to see that

$$P(Y = 1|x \in [0, b_0]) < P(Y = 1) < P(Y = 1|x \in [a_1, 1])$$

which means there exists an interval $[a_\varphi, b_\varphi]$ such that $P(Y = 1|x \in [a_\varphi, b_\varphi]) = P(Y = 1)$. We can then define φ as this newly found interval $\varphi := [a_\varphi, b_\varphi]$ and $\sigma := X \setminus \varphi$. Since $P(Y = 1|A = \varphi) = P(Y = 1)$ and $\mu_X(\varphi) = 1/2 = \mu_X(\sigma)$ we have the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y = 1|A = \sigma) &= \frac{P(Y = 1) - P(Y = 1|A = \varphi)\mu_X(\varphi)}{\mu_X(\sigma)} = P(Y = 1) \\ P(Y = 0|A = \varphi) &= 1 - P(Y = 1|A = \varphi) = 1 - P(Y = 1) = P(Y = 0) \\ P(Y = 0|A = \sigma) &= 1 - P(Y = 1|A = \sigma) = 1 - P(Y = 1) = P(Y = 0) \end{aligned}$$

Take now a non-trivial Pareto optimal decision \mathbf{d}_φ on φ , we need to exhibit a decision \mathbf{d}_σ on σ such that $\text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}_\varphi) < \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}_\sigma)$ and $\text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}_\varphi) < \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}_\sigma)$. This suffices to show that $\text{IPS}(\varphi) \cap \text{IPS}(\sigma) = \{(0, P(Y = 1)), (P(Y = 0), 0)\}$.

Since \mathbf{d}_φ is maximal and non-trivial, by Corollary 1, we know that there exists a threshold $a_\varphi < \theta_\varphi < b_\varphi$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}_\varphi) &= \int_{a_\varphi}^{\theta_\varphi} p_X(y = 0|x)\mu_X(dx) > 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}_\varphi) &= \int_{\theta_\varphi}^{b_\varphi} p_X(y = 1|x)\mu_X(dx) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

Consider now a new threshold θ_σ such that

$$\mu_X([0, \min(a_\varphi, \theta_\sigma)]) + \mu_X([b_\varphi, \max(b_\varphi, \theta_\sigma)]) = \mu_X([a_\varphi, \theta_\varphi])$$

which must exist since the dimension of φ and σ is the same. We can now define a decision $\mathbf{d}_\sigma(x) := \mathbb{1}_{[\theta_\sigma, 1]}(p_X(y = 1|x))$ on σ . We have now two cases:

Case 1: $\theta_\sigma \leq a_\varphi$. In this case we have $\mu_X([0, \theta_\sigma]) = \mu_X([a_\varphi, \theta_\varphi]) > 0$ so

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}_\sigma) &= \int_0^{\theta_\sigma} p_X(y = 0|x)\mu_X(dx) = \\ &= \int_0^{\theta_\sigma} (1 - x)\mu_X(dx) > \int_0^{\theta_\sigma} (1 - a_\varphi)\mu_X(dx) = \end{aligned}$$

$$\int_{a_{\varphi}}^{\theta_{\varphi}} (1 - a_{\varphi}) \mu_X(dx) > \int_{a_{\varphi}}^{\theta_{\varphi}} (1 - x) \mu_X(dx) = \int_{a_{\varphi}}^{\theta_{\varphi}} p_X(y = 0|x) \mu_X(dx) = \frac{1}{2} \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}_{\varphi})$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}_{\sigma}) &= \int_{\theta_{\sigma}}^{a_{\varphi}} p_X(y = 1|x) \mu_X(dx) + \int_{b_{\varphi}}^1 p_X(y = 1|x) \mu_X(dx) = \\ P(Y = 1) - \int_0^{\theta_{\sigma}} p_X(y = 1|x) \mu_X(dx) &> P(Y = 1) - \int_{a_{\varphi}}^{\theta_{\varphi}} p_X(y = 1|x) \mu_X(dx) = \\ &= \int_{\theta_{\varphi}}^{b_{\varphi}} p_X(y = 1|x) \mu_X(dx) = \frac{1}{2} \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}_{\varphi}) \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $\theta_{\sigma} > a_{\varphi}$. In this other case we have $\mu_X([\theta_{\sigma}, 1]) = \mu_X([\theta_{\varphi}, b_{\varphi}]) > 0$, and the same reasoning as before holds by swapping the label.

This proves that $\text{IPS}(\varphi) \subset \text{IPS}(\sigma)$ with only trivial intersection. We now need to prove that we can arbitrarily limit how bigger the difference between the two is. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, and consider a finite collection of points $\{x_i\}_{i=0\dots k} \subseteq X$, satisfying

$$0 = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_k = 1$$

such that $0 < \mu_X([x_i, x_{i+1}]) < \varepsilon/2$ for all $i \in [k-1]$.

On every $X_i := [x_i, x_{i+1}]$, by conditioning on the interval, we can apply the same reasoning as before and get a subpartition $\{\varphi_i, \sigma_i\}$ satisfying the previous conditions. We can then take the union of all the φ_i and σ_i and define $\varphi := \bigcup_i \varphi_i$ and $\sigma := \bigcup_i \sigma_i$. Let's prove that φ and σ work as intended: first we need to show that they respect the condition for $\partial \text{IPS}(\varphi) \cap \partial \text{IPS}(\sigma)$. This follows easily because it's satisfied on every X_i which are almost everywhere disjoint, so for every non-trivial decision on φ we can find a Pareto superior decision on σ by carefully selecting how it behaves on all the σ_i . Moreover we still have $\mu_X(\varphi) = \mu_X(\sigma)$ and $P(Y|A) = P(Y)$.

Now we need to show that the difference between the two is less than ε and strictly positive. If \mathbf{d}_{φ} is Pareto optimal on φ , then as before we have a threshold θ_{φ} that characterises \mathbf{d}_{φ} . In particular there exists j such that $\theta_{\varphi} \in [x_j, x_{j+1}] = X_j$. We then know that $\text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}_{\varphi_i}) = P(Y = 0)$ for all $i < j$ and $\text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}_{\varphi_i}) = P(Y = 1)$ for all $i > j$. Let's take now any optimal decision \mathbf{d}_{σ} on σ such that $\text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}_{\sigma}) = \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}_{\varphi})$ and again consider the threshold θ_{σ} that characterises it. We will prove that $\theta_{\sigma} \in [x_j, x_{j+1}]$ as well. Suppose they are not in the same interval, and WLOG $\theta_{\varphi} < \theta_{\sigma}$. Then we would have

$$\int_{\theta_{\varphi}}^1 p_X(y = 1|x) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\varphi}(x) \mu_X(dx) \geq \int_{x_{j+1}}^1 p_X(y = 1|x) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\varphi}(x) \mu_X(dx) =$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i=j+1}^{k-1} \int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} p_X(y=1|x) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\varphi_i}(x) \mu_X(dx) = \sum_{i=j+1}^{k-1} \int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} p_X(y=1|x) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\sigma_i}(x) \mu_X(dx) = \\
&= \int_{x_{j+1}}^1 p_X(y=1|x) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\sigma}(x) \mu_X(dx) > \int_{\theta_{\sigma}}^1 p_X(y=1|x) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\sigma}(x) \mu_X(dx)
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction since it would imply $\text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}|_{\varphi}) > \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}|_{\sigma})$. The same reasoning holds if $\theta_{\varphi} > \theta_{\sigma}$ by considering the probability of a true negative. As a consequence θ_{φ} and θ_{σ} are in the same interval X_j , then by splitting the integral as we just did, we can see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}(\text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}|_{\sigma}) - \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}|_{\varphi})) = \\
&= \int_{\theta_{\sigma}}^{x_{j+1}} p_X(y=1|x) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\sigma_j}(x) \mu_X(dx) - \int_{\theta_{\varphi}}^{x_{j+1}} p_X(y=1|x) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\varphi_j}(x) \mu_X(dx)
\end{aligned}$$

we already know that this quantity is strictly positive, but we can also bound it since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\theta_{\sigma}}^{x_{j+1}} p_X(y=1|x) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\sigma_j}(x) \mu_X(dx) - \int_{\theta_{\varphi}}^{x_{j+1}} p_X(y=1|x) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\varphi_j}(x) \mu_X(dx) \leq \\
&\leq \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} p_X(y=1|x) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\sigma_j}(x) \mu_X(dx) - 0 \leq \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma_j}(x) \mu_X(dx) = \\
&= \mu_X(X_j)/2 < \varepsilon/4
\end{aligned}$$

which implies $\text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}|_{\sigma}) - \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}|_{\varphi}) < \varepsilon/2$.

We know that there are two monotonically decreasing functions $f_{\varphi}, f_{\sigma} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that for all $t \in [0, 1]$ there exist Pareto maximal decisions $\mathbf{d}_{\varphi}, \mathbf{d}_{\sigma}$ such that $(\text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}_{\varphi}), \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}_{\varphi})) = (t, f_{\varphi}(t))$ and $(\text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}_{\sigma}), \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}_{\sigma})) = (t, f_{\sigma}(t))$. Hence, because of the symmetry of the IPS and since $\text{IPS}(\varphi) \subset \text{IPS}(\sigma)$ we have

$$\lambda(\text{IPS}(\sigma) \triangle \text{IPS}(\varphi)) = \lambda(\text{IPS}(\sigma)) - \lambda(\text{IPS}(\varphi)) = 2 \int_0^1 f_{\sigma}(t) - f_{\varphi}(t) dt$$

but the difference between f_{σ} and f_{φ} is exactly the difference of the probability of a true positive between the two optimal decisions on σ and φ sharing the same probability of a true negative. So

$$0 < 2 \int_0^1 f_{\sigma}(t) - f_{\varphi}(t) dt < 2 \int_0^1 \frac{\varepsilon}{2} dt = \varepsilon$$

□

Corollary 3. Consider a binary classification problem $X \times Y$. For all $(\varepsilon, \varepsilon') \in (0, 1)^2$ there exists a partition $\{\varphi, \sigma\}$ of X having measure $\mu_X(\sigma) = \varepsilon'$ and $\mu_X(\varphi) = 1 - \varepsilon'$

such that

$$\partial \text{IPS}(\varphi) \cap \partial \text{IPS}(\sigma) = \{(0, P(Y = 1)), (P(Y = 0), 0)\} \text{ and } \lambda(\text{IPS}(\sigma) \Delta \text{IPS}(\varphi)) < \varepsilon$$

where λ is the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]^2$.

Proof. It is easy to see that if ε' is a power of $1/2$ then we can simply apply the previous lemma multiple times in a row. If ε' is not a power of $1/2$ then we can simply consider its binary expansion and apply the previous lemma on each digit. \square

Lemma 6. There exists a bijection between distributions μ_Δ on Δ^2 and the set of all the possible IPSs.

Proof. We just need to prove that the set of maximal points in $\text{IPS}(\Delta^2)$ uniquely identify the distribution μ_Δ . We prove it only for the case of μ_Δ being absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, but the result holds in general.

Let $\varphi(x): [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the convex function describing the set of maximal points in $\text{IPS}(\Delta^2)$, we want to reconstruct the cumulative densitive function

$$F(T) = \int_0^T f(t) dt$$

for some density $f(x)$. Moreover, by Weller's theorem, we know that the set of maximal points in $\text{IPS}(\Delta^2)$ is described by the curve $(X(T), Y(T))$ where

$$X(T) = \int_0^T (1-t)f(t) dt \quad Y(T) = \int_T^1 t \cdot f(t) dt$$

First we prove that the non-singleton intervals $[\underline{T}_x, \overline{T}_x]$ satisfying

$$[\underline{T}_x, \overline{T}_x] = X^{-1}(\{x\})$$

for some $x \in [0, 1]$ are at most countable. This is because at the point x the function $\varphi'(x)$ is discontinuous or undefined, we can remove the cases where either $\underline{T}_x = 0$ or $\overline{T}_x = 1$ since they don't affect the countability claim. For all $\varepsilon > 0$, we know that in $(\underline{T}_x - \varepsilon, \underline{T}_x)$ the density $f(x)$ is not almost everywhere zero, otherwise $[\underline{T}_x, \overline{T}_x]$ wouldn't be maximal. Moreover, by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, we know that almost everywhere we have

$$X'(T) = (1-T) \cdot f(T) \quad Y'(T) = -T \cdot f(T)$$

which means that we can find a $\underline{T}_\varepsilon \in (\underline{T}_x - \varepsilon, \underline{T}_x)$ such that $f(\underline{T}_\varepsilon) > 0$ and

$$\varphi'(\underline{x}_\varepsilon) = \frac{-\underline{T}_\varepsilon \cdot f(\underline{T}_\varepsilon)}{(1-\underline{T}_\varepsilon) \cdot f(\underline{T}_\varepsilon)} = \frac{-\underline{T}_\varepsilon}{1-\underline{T}_\varepsilon}$$

for some $\underline{x}_\varepsilon$. Similarly we can find a $\overline{T}_\varepsilon \in (\overline{T}_x, \overline{T}_x + \varepsilon)$ such that $f(\overline{T}_\varepsilon) > 0$ and

$$\varphi'(\underline{x}_\varepsilon) = \frac{-\overline{T}_\varepsilon \cdot f(\overline{T}_\varepsilon)}{(1 - \overline{T}_\varepsilon) \cdot f(\overline{T}_\varepsilon)} = \frac{-\overline{T}_\varepsilon}{1 - \overline{T}_\varepsilon}$$

But then

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varphi'(\underline{x}_\varepsilon) = \frac{-\underline{T}_\varepsilon}{(1 - \underline{T}_\varepsilon)} \neq \frac{-\overline{T}_\varepsilon}{(1 - \overline{T}_\varepsilon)} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varphi'(\overline{x}_\varepsilon)$$

which shows that $\varphi'(x)$ is discontinuous at x . Since $\varphi(x)$ is convex, the set of discontinuous points for the derivative is at most countable, which proves the countability of the intervals.

We now know that, if for a point x the derivative $\varphi'(x)$ is continuous and defined, then there exists a unique T_x such that $Y(T_x) = x$. Moreover in every neighborhood of T_x the density $f(x)$ is not almost everywhere zero. Using a similar argument as before, we can find points $x_\varepsilon \rightarrow x$ such that $f(x_\varepsilon) > 0$ and

$$\varphi'(x) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varphi'(x_\varepsilon) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{-T_{x_\varepsilon}}{1 - T_{x_\varepsilon}}$$

so given $\varphi'(x)$ we can find T_x by solving

$$T_x = \frac{\varphi'(x)}{\varphi'(x) - 1}$$

Moreover, given the point $(x, \varphi(x))$, we have

$$F(T_x) = x - \varphi(x) - P(Y = 1)$$

since

$$x - \varphi(x) = \int_0^{T_x} (1-t)f(t)dt - \int_0^1 t \cdot f(t)dt + \int_0^{T_x} t \cdot f(t)dt = F(T_x) + P(Y = 1)$$

So given a point $(x, \varphi(x))$, if $\varphi'(x)$ is continuous in x , we know

$$F\left(\frac{\varphi'(x)}{\varphi'(x) - 1}\right) = x - \varphi(x) - P(Y = 1)$$

which defines F uniquely. □

Lemma (1). For any evaluation metric Φ , there exists a real-valued function $\widehat{\Phi}(t, t', E): [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{B}([0, 1]^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\widehat{\Phi}(\text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}), \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}), \text{IPS}(X)) = \Phi(\mathbf{d}, X)$$

for all decisions \mathbf{d} on X .

Proof. We need to show that if we take a decision \mathbf{d} on X and a decision \mathbf{d}' on X' such that $\text{IPS}(X) = \text{IPS}(X')$, $\text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}) = \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}')$ and $\text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}) = \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}')$ then $\Phi(\mathbf{d}, X) = \Phi(\mathbf{d}', X')$.

First notice that equivalent decisions on a set have the same evaluation since the evaluation is monotonic in \succsim . This mean we can also suppose that \mathbf{d} and \mathbf{d}' only depend on the value of $p_X(y = 1|x)$ and $p_{X'}(y = 1|x)$, otherwise we can always find equivalent decisions satisfying it. Which then means that we can suppose that \mathbf{d} and \mathbf{d}' are function of the simplex Δ^2 .

If $\text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}) = \text{pTN}(\mathbf{d}')$ and $\text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}) = \text{pTP}(\mathbf{d}')$ and $\Delta_X = \Delta_{X'}$ then the two decisions are equivalent on Δ^2 , which would imply $\Phi(\mathbf{d}, X) = \Phi(\mathbf{d}', X')$. But we proved in Lemma 6 that if $\text{IPS}(X) = \text{IPS}(X')$ then $\Delta_X = \Delta_{X'}$. So we have the thesis. \square