

---

# DATA ACQUISITION FOR IMPROVING MODEL FAIRNESS USING REINFORCEMENT LEARNING

---

**Jahid Hasan, Romila Pradhan**  
Purdue University  
West Lafayette, USA  
{hasan89, rpradhan}@purdue.edu

## ABSTRACT

Machine learning systems are increasingly being used in critical decision making such as healthcare, finance, and criminal justice. Concerns around their fairness have resulted in several bias mitigation techniques that emphasize the need for high-quality data to ensure fairer decisions. However, the role of earlier stages of machine learning pipelines in mitigating model bias has not been explored well. In this paper, we focus on the task of acquiring additional labeled data points for training the downstream machine learning model to rapidly improve its fairness. Since not all data points in a data pool are equally beneficial to the task of fairness, we generate an ordering in which data points should be acquired. We present DATASIFT, a data acquisition framework based on the idea of data valuation that relies on partitioning and multi-armed bandits to determine the most valuable data points to acquire. Over several iterations, DATASIFT selects a partition and randomly samples a batch of data points from the selected partition, evaluates the benefit of acquiring the batch on model fairness, and updates the utility of partitions depending on the benefit. To further improve the effectiveness and efficiency of evaluating batches, we leverage influence functions that estimate the effect of acquiring a batch without retraining the model. We empirically evaluate DATASIFT on several real-world and synthetic datasets and show that the fairness of a machine learning model can be significantly improved even while acquiring a few data points.

**Keywords** Data Acquisition · Algorithmic Fairness · Multi-Armed Bandits · Data Valuation

## 1 Introduction

With the increasingly widespread use of machine learning (ML) in consequential decision-making domains, such as criminal justice, healthcare, and housing, there is an ever-growing need to ensure that ML-based systems do not have adverse implications on society. Designed carefully, these systems can potentially eliminate the unwanted aspects of human decision-making (e.g., biased decisions). However, irresponsible uses of artificial intelligence (AI) can lead to and reinforce systemic biases, discrimination and other abuses often reflected in the underlying training data [2, 10, 29]. A number of fairness metrics have been introduced over the past decade to quantify the discrimination exhibited by the ML-based systems [56, 40]. Simultaneously, the need to debias these systems has given rise to several bias mitigation techniques (see [14, 40] for recent surveys on fairness and bias in machine learning).

The focus on data-centric AI has spotlighted the importance of *data quality* in improving machine learning performance [61, 47, 60, 62]. In a recent survey, data science practitioners have reported feeling the most control over their data during earlier stages in the data science pipeline such as data collection and curation [31]. Several recent works have particularly recognized the significance of acquiring additional data, termed as *data acquisition*, for improving machine learning models [37, 38, 15]. In the field of machine learning fairness too, recent research has highlighted the importance of different stages of data science pipelines in combating fairness violations [9, 8]. However, most of the existing works on data acquisition to enhance machine learning models focus on traditional performance metrics (e.g., model accuracy, loss) [15, 37] or model confidence [38]. None of these works is directly applicable to the equally important metric of model fairness.




Figure 1: Example showing that acquiring the same number of data points across demographic groups does no better than acquiring data points randomly. Legend indicates if training data has balanced/imbalanced initial representation and if acquired data is balanced/random.

The following example illustrates the need for acquiring useful additional data to mitigate unfairness in model decisions.

**Example 1.** (Hiring: Machine learning pipeline). Consider a hiring firm that uses an in-house automated recruitment algorithm to screen the resumes of its job applicants. While the algorithm exhibited high accuracy when tested for screening its past job applicants, it was observed to consistently reject the resumes of female applicants even when their qualifications were equivalent to those of the male applicants. In particular, the observed disparity in the demographic parity metric [40] was 35%. Faced with an algorithm that generates biased decisions, data scientist Maria considers training the algorithm on additional data in an attempt to ensure equity in screening. However, Maria has a limited budget of acquiring only 20% additional data points and must select the best data points that lead to an algorithm with less biased decisions. On closer inspection of the training data used to develop the algorithm, Maria found that the data had unequal representation of applicants from different genders and an even unbalanced gender representation of applicants offered a job. Maria wonders if a balanced representation in the training data will solve the problem.

Maria considers acquiring a batch of 20% additional data points that have equal representation across the different genders. In the first case, she starts with the original biased model and progressively acquires 20% additional data points such that the acquired data points have equal representation across genders. The resultant model has a lower disparity of 22%. In the second case, she builds the algorithm from scratch with equal representation for the different genders resulting in a lower initial disparity of 27%. Acquiring 20% additional data points preserving representation across genders lowers the disparity to 15%. The solid blue and red lines in Figure 1 show the result of acquiring additional data using this strategy. Note that in both the cases, the models perform no better than when data points are acquired in a random fashion (indicated by the dashed blue and red lines in Figure 1).

Existing literature in fair machine learning considers disparate representation rates of different demographic groups in the training data at the root of fairness violations [3, 51, 50, 42]. However, as described in Example 1, an equal representation of the privileged and protected groups does not always improve model fairness. The question we address in this paper is: what additional data points must be acquired so as to improve the fairness of a model learned on the training data updated with the acquired data?

Ideally, we would be interested in acquiring a subset of data points that improves model fairness by the most. This task of determining the subset that maximizes the fairness of the learned model can be framed as the *subset selection* problem which is generally NP-hard [20]. To address this issue, we instead focus on determining the best subset that has up to  $B$  data points (where  $B$  is a user-defined budget). Note that not every arbitrary subset having at most  $B$  data points enhances model fairness since each data point has a different impact on fairness. It, therefore, demands selectively acquiring the best subset of up to  $B$  data points that guarantee an improvement in fairness. The naïve brute-force approach involves considering each of the  $\binom{N}{k}$  subsets for acquisition one subset at a time (where  $k \in [1, B]$ ,  $N = |\mathcal{D}|$  is the size of the datapool and typically  $B \ll N$ ). This approach guarantees finding the best subset but is prohibitively expensive because of the large number of subsets and the time taken to retrain the model resulting in a complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(N^B \times Tr)$  where  $Tr$  denotes the computational cost of evaluating each subset by retraining the model after the subset is acquired.

An alternative solution constructs the subset by sequentially adding up to  $B$  best data points rather than finding the best subset. The naïve approach requires evaluating all data points individually in the data pool and selecting the top- $B$




Figure 2: Overview of DATASIFT for data acquisition to improve model fairness. The blue-shaded part highlights DATASIFT with multi-armed bandit (MAB) framework while the red-shaded part incorporates data valuation with the MAB framework.

most valuable data points with an  $\mathcal{O}(N \times Tr)$  complexity. Note that data are often evaluated in batches rather than one data point at a time for efficiency purposes. While cheaper than the brute-force method, this approach is still expensive because we might be unnecessarily evaluating certain data points or batches that do not improve fairness at all.

We propose DATASIFT, a framework based on multi-armed bandits (MAB) [57] (a specific case of reinforcement learning [54]), that *efficiently* evaluates the utility of data points based on their impact on model fairness upon acquisition. DATASIFT reduces the search space by splitting the data pool into smaller partitions and decides the order of acquiring data points by balancing whether to choose a new partition to select data from (*exploration*) and selecting data points from the chosen partition (*exploitation*). Note that the partitioning can be automatic (e.g., clustering) or leverage domain expertise to partition the data according to some criterion, e.g., partitioning over states, partitioning over timeframes, etc. AutoData [15] proposed an MAB-based technique to selectively acquire data from heterogeneous data sources to enhance the accuracy of a model learned on the underlying training data. However, AutoData is not directly applicable to the context of fairness and also requires model retraining to evaluate each batch of data points, rendering it inefficient for large datasets and complex models.

To address these limitations, DATASIFT proposes an approach based on upper confidence bound (UCB) [4] built on a *reward score* that incorporates both fairness and accuracy of the learned model to acquire a random batch of data points from the selected partition. To further improve the effectiveness of the batch acquired from the chosen partition, rather than randomly selecting data points to include in a batch, we adopt the idea of *data valuation* to rank data points within the partition in the order of their impact on model fairness. The  $B$  data points that improve fairness by the most are then selected for the batch acquisition. To speed up this process, we leverage *influence functions* [17, 34] to *estimate the effect* of including a data point in a batch instead of retraining a model to measure the actual effect of the data point on model fairness.

Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We formalize the problem of **data acquisition for improving the fairness** of an ML model in classification tasks. (Section 2)
- We present DATASIFT, a system that casts the task of data acquisition for model fairness as a **multi-armed bandit** (MAB) problem and solves it using the upper confidence bound (UCB) algorithm based on a reward score that addresses both model fairness and accuracy. (Section 3.1)
- To carefully construct a batch for acquisition, DATASIFT incorporates the concept of **data valuation** and leverages *influence functions* to estimate the importance of data points toward model fairness, which in turn speeds up our MAB-based approach. (Section 3.3)
- We conduct extensive experiments on six real-world datasets to demonstrate the effectiveness of DATASIFT in rapidly improving model fairness and present trade-offs between effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed methods. (Section 4)

## 2 Preliminaries

This section formally defines the terminology and problems we addressed in this paper.

**Classification.** We consider a binary supervised learning task defined on data domain  $\Gamma = \{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}\}$ , where  $\mathcal{X}$  denotes the feature space over  $p$  features and  $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}$  denotes the binary label space. Suppose there is a conditional distribution  $p(y | \mathbf{x})$  defined over  $\Gamma$ , where  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Given training dataset  $\mathbf{D}_{train} = \{d_i\}_{i=1}^n = \{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \Gamma$ , the learning task is to train a classifier  $\mathcal{M}$  that represents a distribution  $g$  that captures the target distribution  $p$  as closely as possible.  $\mathcal{M}$  learns a function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{Y}}$  that associates each data point  $\mathbf{x}$  with a prediction  $\hat{y} = f(\mathbf{x}) \in \{0, 1\}$ , and is evaluated on  $\mathbf{D}_{test} \in \Gamma$ . Learning algorithm  $f$  trains on  $\mathbf{D}_{train}$  to learn the optimal parameters  $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$  that minimize the empirical loss  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{D}_{train}, \theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L(d_i, \theta)$ .

**Algorithmic group fairness.** Given a binary classifier  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{Y}}$  and a protected attribute  $S \in \mathcal{X}$  (such as gender, race, age, etc.), we interpret  $\hat{\mathcal{Y}} = 1$  as a favorable (positive) prediction and  $\hat{\mathcal{Y}} = 0$  as an unfavorable (negative) prediction. We assume the domain of  $S$ ,  $\text{Dom}(S) = \{0, 1\}$  where  $S = 1$  indicates a privileged and  $S = 0$  indicates a protected group (e.g., Males and non-males, respectively). Algorithmic group fairness mandates that individuals belonging to different groups must be treated similarly. The notion of similarity in treatment is captured by different associative notions of fairness such as demographic parity, predictive parity, and equalized odds [56, 40, 16]. We consider statistical parity (also known as *demographic parity*), which is a widely used group fairness metric. Model  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies statistical parity if both the protected and the privileged groups have the same probability of being predicted the positive outcome i.e.,  $P(\hat{\mathcal{Y}} = 1 | S = 0) = P(\hat{\mathcal{Y}} = 1 | S = 1)$ . We denote the chosen fairness metric by  $\mathcal{F}$  and quantify fairness in the predictions over  $\mathbf{D}_{test}$  by a model trained on  $\mathbf{D}$  by  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{D}}$ . In the case of demographic parity,  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{D}} = P(\hat{\mathcal{Y}} = 1 | S = 0) - P(\hat{\mathcal{Y}} = 1 | S = 1)$  quantifies the difference in the probabilities of protected and privileged groups having a positive outcome. If  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{D}} < 0$ , the model is biased against the protected group while  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{D}} > 0$  indicates the model is biased against the privileged group. A higher value of  $|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{D}}|$  indicates lower fairness (greater disparity) in the model’s predictions.

**Data Pool.** We define a *data pool*, denoted as  $\mathcal{D}$ , as the collection of all accessible data points that satisfy the specified target schema. The data in a data pool can originate from either multiple heterogeneous sources or from a single homogeneous source. In this work, we focus on the latter scenario, where the data is collected from a single source and is, therefore, homogeneous. The data acquisition process from  $\mathcal{D}$  can be either free of cost or may involve monetary expenses depending on the nature and source of the data. However, this acquisition cost is beyond the scope of our approach. Instead, we adopt a simplifying assumption that all data points within  $\mathcal{D}$  have a uniform acquisition cost. Given this definition of the data pool, we assume the existence of at least  $B$  data samples in  $\mathcal{D}$ .

**Problem Definition.** Given a model trained on  $\mathbf{D}_{train}$ , fairness metric  $\mathcal{F}$ , data pool  $\mathcal{D}$ , and acquisition budget  $B$ , we address the problem of determining additional data points  $\mathbf{D}_{acq} \subset \mathcal{D}$  that must be acquired such that  $|\mathbf{D}_{acq}| \leq B$  and the model learned on  $\mathbf{D}_{train} \cup \mathbf{D}_{acq}$  is substantially fairer than the original model learned on  $\mathbf{D}_{train}$  alone (i.e.,  $|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{D}_{train} \cup \mathbf{D}_{acq}}| < |\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{D}_{train}}|$ ).

## 3 Data Acquisition Framework

In this section, we propose two methods for identifying the data points that need to be acquired to enhance the fairness of the learned model. The first method, DATASIFT, introduced in Section 3.2, frames the data acquisition task as a multi-armed bandit (MAB) problem. While requiring less pre-computation, this approach has a gradual improvement in model fairness. To address this limitation, we introduce another approach, DATASIFT-Inf, in Section 3.3, which combines the MAB framework with data valuation to accelerate fairness enhancement. Figure 2 illustrates our proposed data acquisition framework.

### 3.1 Multi-Armed Bandit (MAB) framework

The Multi-Armed Bandit (MAB) [57] maps a framework for sequential decision-making under uncertainty. This problem can be framed by the metaphor of a gambler (or ‘Agent’) choosing which of several slot machines (or ‘Arms’) to play in each attempt to maximize the total prize over a series of trials. Considering that gamblers have some knowledge about each slot machine from initial trials, they are faced with the question of which machine to select next. The multi-armed bandit framework is ideal for solving this dilemma. MAB can formally be defined as: at each attempt  $t$ , the agent selects an arm  $i$  from a set of  $K$  available arms and receives a reward  $r_t$  from a distribution associated with

that arm, which is generally unknown to the agent. MAB aims to determine which arm to pull next to maximize the cumulative reward  $R$  after  $T$  rounds, guided by the principle of balancing *exploration* and *exploitation*.

*Exploration* involves choosing unexplored options to gather new information about their potential rewards. By exploring, the agent reduces uncertainty about less-known arms, potentially uncovering actions that provide higher rewards than initially expected. On the other hand, *exploitation* involves selecting the action that currently offers the highest reward based on the agent’s existing knowledge. While exploitation maximizes short-term gains by considering known information, it may lead to suboptimal long-term outcomes if the agent overlooks better options that have not been sufficiently explored. At the same time, excessive exploration may waste resources on testing suboptimal actions, thus missing opportunities for immediate reward maximization.

Thus, the agent must balance between exploring and exploiting to maximize cumulative rewards eventually. To find a trade-off between exploration and exploitation, making optimal short-term decisions based on available information is crucial to solving this dilemma. This trade-off is central to various algorithms, such as Thompson sampling [1],  $\epsilon$ -greedy[35] and Upper Confidence Bound (UCB) [5] designed to maximize the agent’s long-term performance. Due to its deterministic nature and computational flexibility, we adopt the UCB algorithm for our problem. Similar to other base algorithms for MAB, the UCB algorithm does not always yield exact optimal results, but its performance is near-optimal [11].

Next, we will map the problem of data acquisition for improving model fairness to the MAB framework and discuss our approach.

### 3.2 Mapping data acquisition for fairness to MAB

To cast the data acquisition problem to the MAB framework, we first split the data pool into several disjoint partitions, i.e.,  $\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{i=1}^g C_i$  where  $g$  is the number of partitions. These partitions could be obtained by clustering  $\mathcal{D}$  using existing clustering algorithms such as multivariate Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) [26],  $k$ -means [32], and DBSCAN [24] or partitioning the data pool based on some criterion or by considering the data pool as a collection of data sources. Each partition  $C_i$  is then treated as an *arm* in the MAB framework. In the  $k$ -th iteration, the algorithm selects a partition  $C_k$ , and samples a random batch from  $C_k$  for evaluation. Subsequently, the batch is merged with the current training dataset, and the fairness of the resultant model trained on the updated training dataset is reported. The change in the model fairness before and after acquiring the batch determines whether the batch should be retained or discarded and whether the selected partition is rewarded or penalized. The reward/penalty score is utilized to select the subsequent partition to acquire more data points. Blue shaded part in Figure 2 illustrates the data acquisition task framed as a multi-armed bandit problem.

**Reward/Penalty score.** The algorithm scores the chosen partition according to the change in model fairness after merging the batch with existing training data. The reward for partition  $C_i$  at iteration  $k$  is defined as  $r_i^k$ . If fairness improves, the partition is rewarded, otherwise penalized. However, in addition to allocating reward/penalty scores to the chosen partition, the *full feedback* [53] MAB algorithm also assigns a portion of scores to other partition that could have been selected. This approach efficiently accelerates the process by reducing the number of evaluations. Several studies on MAB-based data acquisition for improving model performance [15, 58] consider the distance between partitions when assigning rewards or penalties to other partition. The intuition behind this scoring is based on the assumption that partitions that are closer to the selected partition have a higher likelihood of getting selected and, hence, should be rewarded similarly. This assumption holds for performance metrics such as accuracy and confidence because closer partition centroids indicate that the partition shares similar characteristics. However, this setting might not hold for model fairness because partitions that are close might have extremely different compositions over sensitive attributes and, therefore, might impact fairness differently. In other words, the *base rate difference* of the partition plays a significant role in fairness. Recall that the base rate difference for dataset  $D$  is defined as:

$$\Delta BR_D = P(Y = 1 | S = 0) - P(Y = 1 | S = 1)$$

In the context of fairness, the selection of a partition indicates an improvement in model fairness as a result of inherent lower base rate difference among the different demographic groups in the partition. Consequently, other partitions with similar base rates should be rewarded higher than those with worse base rates. In fact, we show that incorporating intra-partition base rate differences among the different demographic groups is much more effective in the proper distribution of the reward among partitions, resulting in significantly improved fairness (see Section 4.4 for more details).

Focusing solely on the base rate difference, however, can degrade the overall accuracy of the learned model. We, therefore, propose a *novel reward score* that caters to both fairness and accuracy by combining the distance between the partition and their intra-partition base rate differences to split the reward scores among the different partitions. When

partition  $C_i$  is evaluated, the reward score for each partition  $C_j$  is computed as follows:

$$r_j = \frac{\Delta\mathcal{F}}{(1 + |\Delta BR_{C_j}|) \times (1 + \text{dist}(C_i, C_j))} \quad (1)$$

where  $\Delta\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{D}_{train}^{k-1} \cup b_i} - \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{D}_{train}^{k-1}}$  denotes the change in model fairness after adding batch  $b_i$  to training data up to  $k-1$  iterations denoted by  $\mathbf{D}_{train}^{k-1}$ . An improvement in fairness ( $\Delta\mathcal{F} > 0$ ) incurs a reward, while a decline in fairness ( $\Delta\mathcal{F} < 0$ ) incurs a penalty. Additionally,  $\Delta BR_{C_j}$  indicates the intra-partition base rate difference in  $C_j$  and  $\text{dist}(C_i, C_j)$  is the normalized Euclidean distance between the two partitions computed over the partition centroids.

**Aggregated reward/penalty score.** The multi-armed bandit approach aggregates the prior reward and penalty information up to  $k$  iterations to make an informed decision in the next iteration. Let  $R_i^k$  represent the aggregate score of partition  $C_i$  from iteration 1 to  $k$ , defined as:

$$R_i^k = \frac{1}{n_i^k} \sum_{j=1}^k r_i^j$$

where  $r_i^j$  represents the reward score of  $C_i$  at the  $j$ -th iteration, and  $n_i^k$  denotes the number of times  $C_i$  is selected and rewarded a positive score up to the  $k$ -th iteration.

**Upper Confidence Bound (UCB).** The UCB algorithm is designed to adaptively adjust the trade-off between exploration and exploitation over time [5], which is achieved by incorporating a measure of uncertainty or confidence in the estimated rewards of each arm. This measure is used to guide the decision-making process, allowing the algorithm to explore arms with potentially high but uncertain rewards while also exploiting arms with known high rewards. Due to its deterministic nature, it has been widely used in the field of MAB, Reinforcement Learning, and Recommendation Systems [13, 44, 4, 27]. We determine the UCB score for partition  $i$  in the  $k$ -th iteration as:

$$U_i^k = R_i^k + \alpha \sqrt{2 \ln \left( \frac{n^k}{n_i^k + 1} \right)} \quad (2)$$

where  $\alpha$  is a pre-defined parameter that maintains the balance between exploration and exploitation and  $n^k = \sum_{i=1}^g n_i^k$  for the total number of partition  $g$ . The first term in Equation 2 represents exploitation while the second term pertains to exploration. A partition with a higher reward will have a higher exploitation score whereas one selected less frequently will have a higher exploration score.

**Early stopping criterion.** The algorithm aims to acquire up to  $B$  data points in order to maximize the improvement in the model fairness. However, in certain cases, the model becomes almost fair (i.e., close to zero parity difference) after acquiring a fraction of the budget. In such scenarios, acquiring more data points unnecessarily increases computation and may degrade the model's fairness. To address such cases, we introduce a fairness threshold,  $\tau$ , as an early stopping criterion. When the model fairness is within the threshold, the acquisition process is halted, and the data points acquired so far are returned. Additionally, the maximum number of evaluations is pre-defined by the user to avoid cases where the model does not converge within a reasonable number of iterations.

**Algorithm 1** outlines the pseudocode of the UCB-based data acquisition process to improve model fairness. It starts by initializing the algorithm in lines 1 to 7. The algorithm continues until the model achieves the expected level of fairness or exhausts the budget. During each iteration, it selects the partition with the highest UCB value, samples a batch of size  $K$  randomly from the partition, and evaluates it by re-training the model (lines 10-12). The batch is retained only if it improves fairness compared to all prior results (lines 13-18). The algorithm then updates the reward/penalty score for each partition and the aggregated score and UCB score (lines 19-21). Finally, the updated training data is returned in line 22. The above process has a computational complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(I \times (|C| + T_r + t))$  where  $I$  denotes the total number of required evaluations (iterations),  $|C|$  is the maximum partition size,  $T_r$  is the retraining complexity for each batch, and  $t$  refers to the complexity of score calculation. The maximum number of evaluations,  $I$ , is bounded by  $I = A + R \leq \frac{N}{K}$ , where  $A$  and  $R$  represent the number of accepted and rejected batches, respectively,  $N$  is the size of the data pool, and  $K$  is the batch size. Moreover,  $A \leq \frac{B}{K}$  where  $B$  is the total budget.

MAB plays a crucial role in determining the partition with the highest potential reward that should be chosen next. Once the partition is chosen, the next step is to sample a batch. While the selected partition offers the highest reward overall, there is no guarantee that any subset or batch from that partition will improve the model's fairness. In Algorithm 1, we employed random sampling (line 10) to consider a batch for acquisition. This causes MAB to function similarly to random data acquisition for larger batch sizes. Although our experiments in Section 4 showed that MAB with random sampling outperforms the baseline, it falls short of providing a near-optimal batch, which significantly impacts the

---

**Algorithm 1:** DATASIFT (Data acquisition to MAB framework)
 

---

**Input:** Partitions  $C = \{C_1, \dots, C_g\}$ ,  $\mathbf{D}_{train}$ ,  $\mathbf{D}_{test}$ , model  $\mathcal{M}$ , fairness threshold  $\tau$ , batch size  $K$ , budget  $B$ 
**Output:** Data points to acquire,  $\mathbf{D}_{acq}$ 

```

1 for each partition  $C_i \in C$  do
2   Compute  $\Delta BR, \mathcal{F}^0$ ;
3   Set  $R_0^i = 0, n_0^i = 0, U_0^i = 0$ ;
4   Set  $\mathcal{F}^{best} = \mathcal{F}^0$ ;
5   Set  $\mathbf{D}_{train}^0 = \mathbf{D}_{train}$ ;
6   Set  $\mathbf{D}_{acq} = []$ ;
7  $k = 0$ ;
8 while  $|\mathcal{F}^{best}| \geq \tau$  and  $B > 0$  do
9    $k = k + 1$ ;
10   $C_i = \operatorname{argmax}_j U_j^k$  // select partition with largest UCB value
11  Sample a batch  $b_i$  from  $C_i$  randomly,  $|b_i| = K$ ;
12  Compute  $\Delta \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{D}_{train}^{k-1} \cup b_i} - \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{D}_{train}^{k-1}}$ ;
13  if  $|\Delta \mathcal{F}| > 0$  and  $|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{D}_{train}^{k-1} \cup b_i}| \leq |\mathcal{F}^{best}|$  then
14     $\mathbf{D}_{acq} = \mathbf{D}_{acq} \cup b_i$ ;
15     $\mathbf{D}_{train}^k = \mathbf{D}_{train}^{k-1} \cup b_i$ ;
16     $C_i = C_i \setminus b_i$ ;
17    Update  $\mathcal{F}^{best} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{D}_{train}^k}$ ;
18    Update  $B = |B| - K$ ;
19  for each  $C_j \in C$  do
20     $r_j = \frac{\Delta \mathcal{F}}{(1 + |\Delta BR_{C_j}|) \times (1 + \operatorname{dist}(C_i, C_j))}$ ;
21  Update  $R_j^k, n_j^k$  and  $U_j^k$ ;
22 return  $\mathbf{D}_{acq}$ 
    
```

---

overall performance of the process. In the following section, we propose a batch sampling approach based on the concept of *data valuation* for effective batch selection in Algorithm 1.

### 3.3 Valuation-based Data Acquisition

To carefully construct a batch to acquire from a chosen partition, we leverage the idea of data valuation, which has been successfully used in explainable AI [28, 34] to quantify the contribution of training data points toward the performance of the learned model. Due to their effectiveness in accurately estimating the contribution of data points and faster online computation time, we use first-order *influence functions* [34, 17] to approximate the importance of training data points toward model fairness. Based on the computations, we construct the batch to include from the chosen partition.

#### 3.3.1 Influence functions

Recall from Section 2 that  $\theta^*$  is the set of optimal parameters that minimize the empirical risk, i.e.,

$$\theta^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L(d_i, \theta) \quad (3)$$

To incorporate influence functions, we assume that the empirical risk function  $\mathcal{L}(\theta)$  is twice-differentiable and strictly convex. Under these conditions, we can guarantee the Hessian matrix  $\mathcal{H}_\theta$  exists and is positive definite, and therefore, its inverse  $\mathcal{H}_\theta^{-1}$  also exists. These assumptions are applicable to a wide range of classification algorithms such as logistic regression, support vector machines, and feed-forward neural networks.

Let  $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta)$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\theta = \nabla_\theta^2 \mathcal{L}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_\theta^2 L(d_i, \theta)$  be the gradient and the Hessian of the loss function, respectively. The influence of up-weighting a data point  $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{D}_{train}$  by  $\epsilon$  on the model parameters is computed as:

$$I_\theta(\mathbf{d}) = \left. \frac{d\theta^*}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} = -\nabla_\theta^2 \mathcal{L}(\theta^*)^{-1} \nabla_\theta L(\mathbf{d}, \theta^*) = -\mathcal{H}_\theta^{-1} \nabla_\theta L(\mathbf{d}, \theta^*) \quad (4)$$

**Algorithm 2:** DATASIFT-Inf**Input:** Partitions  $C = \{C_1, \dots, C_g\}$ ,  $\mathbf{D}_{train}$ , model  $\mathcal{M}$ **Output:** Sorted partitions

- 1  $Inf = get\_influence(\mathbf{D}_{train}, \mathcal{M})$ ;
- 2 Merge  $Inf$  with  $\mathbf{D}_{train}$  as outcome;
- 3 Train Regressor  $\mathcal{R}$  to predict influence;
- 4 **for** each partition  $C_i$  in  $C$  **do**
- 5      $\forall x \in C_i$  predict influence  $\mathcal{R}(x)$ ;
- 6      $Sorted\_C_i = \text{Sort } C_i$  in decreasing order of  $\mathcal{R}(x)$
- 7  $Sorted\_C = \{Sorted\_C_1, \dots, Sorted\_C_g\}$ ;
- 8 Invoke DATASIFT with  $Sorted\_C$  instead of  $C$ ;

To add data point  $\mathbf{d}$  to training data, we up-weight it by  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{n}$ . Therefore, the influence of  $\mathbf{d}$  on model parameters can be linearly approximated by computing  $d\theta_\epsilon^* \approx \frac{1}{n}I_\theta(\mathbf{d})$ .

Using the chain rule of differentiation, we can estimate the effect of up-weighting data point  $\mathbf{d}$  on any function  $f(\theta)$  as:

$$\mathcal{I}_f(\mathbf{d}) = \left. \frac{df(\theta_\epsilon^*)}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} = \left. \frac{df(\theta_\epsilon^*)}{d\theta} \frac{d(\theta_\epsilon^*)}{d\epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} = \nabla_\theta f(\theta^*)^\top \mathcal{I}_\theta(\mathbf{d}) \quad (5)$$

When  $f = \mathcal{F}$ , we obtain the first-order influence of a single training data point  $\mathbf{d}$  on model fairness by approximating  $d\mathcal{F}_\epsilon^* \approx \frac{1}{n}\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d})$ .

### 3.3.2 Batch construction

Given a data point  $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{D}_{train}$ , the influence function approximation in Equation 5 estimates the effect of up-weighting  $\mathbf{d}$  on model fairness. To evaluate data points in the data pool  $\mathcal{D}$ , we first estimate the first-order influence approximations for data points in the training data and train a regression model  $\mathcal{R}$  with training data points and their corresponding influences. Using the regression model  $\mathcal{R}$ , we predict the influence of data points from different partitions in the data pool and sort them in decreasing order of influence. At each iteration, a batch of size  $K$  is then constructed by selecting the top- $K$  data points with the highest influence on fairness as predicted by  $\mathcal{R}$ .

Note that a batch  $b \subseteq \mathcal{D}$  constructed in the above manner does not account for the inherent correlations between data points in  $b$ . As such, the estimated influence of the batch computed by adding the first-order influences of individual data points might not be accurate i.e.,  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D} \cup b}$  is not necessarily equal to  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}} + \frac{|b|}{n} \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in b} \mathcal{I}_\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{d})$ . Therefore, the selected batch is not guaranteed to be optimal. The problem of identifying the optimal batch within a selected partition can be viewed as a *subset selection* problem which is known to be NP-hard [20]. Using the heuristic of influence function approximation to construct a batch, however, has proven to be effective (see Section 4.3).

### 3.3.3 MAB Data Acquisition with Valuation

We now put together the MAB framework for data acquisition with data valuation where instead of randomly selecting a batch in Algorithm 1, each iteration now selects a batch constructed as in Section 3.3.2 comprising of data points from the selected partition with the highest influence on fairness. Algorithm 2 outlines this approach that incorporates data valuation with the MAB framework.

The computational complexity of Algorithm 2 can be approximated as:

$$\mathcal{O}(T_r(\mathcal{R}) + |C| \log |C|) + \mathcal{O}(I \times (|K| + T_r + t))$$

The first term above represents the complexity of obtaining the sorted partition, where  $T_r(\mathcal{R})$  represents the complexity of training a ridge regression model. The latter part corresponds to the complexity of the MAB with the modified batch selection procedure. If we consider sorting partition as a pre-computation, the complexity of the MAB in Algorithm 1 differs from the modified MAB in Algorithm 2 only in the batch selection process, but the latter is more effective and converges faster.

Note that the use of influence functions to compute the valuation of data points limits the applicability of the approach to parametric models with convex and twice-differentiable loss functions. Model-agnostic data valuation techniques such as Data Shapley [28] can also be used instead of influence functions for effective batch construction. In contrast, the MAB-based approach described in Section 3.2 is model agnostic but does not integrate the data valuation with acquisition; in Section 4.3, we show the importance of data valuation in effective data acquisition for improving model fairness.



Table 1: Summary of datasets.

Dataset	Adult Income	Credit	ACSPublicHealth	ACSMobility	ACSEmployment	ACSIIncome
Size	45, 222	150, 000	138, 554	80, 329	378, 817	250, 847
No. of features	8	10	19	22	16	11
Minority Group (U)	Female	Age < 35	Female	Afr.-Am.	Afr.-Am.	Female
Population of U (%)	33	12.8	55.9	5.2	4.8	47.2
Positive Labels in U (%)	11	11	35	73	39	34
Predictive Task	income > \$50K?	serious delay in 2 years?	has public insurance coverage?	moved address last year?	employed?	income > \$50K?

## 4 Experimental Evaluation

This section presents experiments that evaluate the effectiveness of DATASIFT. We seek to answer the following research questions: **RQ1:** How effective is DATASIFT compared to existing methods in determining what additional data points should be acquired to improve the fairness of machine learning models? How does the performance of DATASIFT change with varying machine learning models **RQ2:** What is the benefit of incorporating data valuation in DATASIFT? **RQ3:** How effective is DATASIFT with respect to the different hyperparameters and design choices? **RQ4:** How efficient are our different solutions with respect to varying dataset sizes?

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

#### 4.1.1 Datasets.

We consider several real-world datasets popular in the fair machine learning literature. **Adult [23]** dataset used to predict whether an individual’s annual income exceeds \$50, 000 by analyzing a range of demographic and socio-economic factors, including several sensitive attributes, such as age, sex, and race. **Credit [18]** dataset used to forecast the likelihood of delaying credit payments using financial and demographic history. American Community Survey (ACS)-based datasets [22] that provide a suite of datasets (including **ACSIIncome**, **ACSPublicHealth**, **ACSMobility**, and **ACSEmployment**) for predicting different outcomes such as income level, public health status, mobility information, and employment status. The ACS datasets are highly skewed toward California (CA) state. Unless otherwise specified, our analysis primarily focuses on evaluating CA data for the year 2018. Please refer to Table 1 for a summary of the datasets.

#### 4.1.2 Competing methods

We compared our proposed approach with several algorithms suited for data acquisition:

**Random.** This naïve baseline method randomly selects a batch from the data pool in each iteration.

**Entropy.** This method selects the  $B$  data points with the highest entropy [52]. Entropy of data point  $d_i$  is calculated as:  $H(d_i) = -(p_i \log_2(p_i) + (1 - p_i) \log_2(1 - p_i))$  where  $p_i$  is the probability that  $d_i$  is predicted by the model to have a positive outcome.

**Inf.** This method computes the influence of data points in the training data using Equation 5 and learns a regression model to estimate the influence of points in the data pool on model fairness. Each iteration selects the top- $B$  data points with the highest influence.

**AutoData [15].** This method uses the MAB framework for data acquisition to improve model accuracy. For comparison, we transform the constraint of this algorithm from accuracy to fairness.

**DATASIFT.** This method represents our MAB-based model agnostic solution described in Algorithm 1.

**DATASIFT-Inf.** This method represents our solution described in Algorithm 2 that integrates the multi-armed bandit approach with data valuation (influence functions).

#### 4.1.3 Settings

We divided the entire dataset into three parts:  $\mathbf{D}_{train}$  (Training),  $\mathbf{D}_{test}$  (Test), and  $\mathcal{D}$  (Data pool) in the ratio of 1 : 4 : 15. While test and data pool were split randomly, the training dataset was sampled to obtain an initial biased model. We partition the data pool using Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) [26] and find the optimal number of partitions using the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) [43]. The model was trained over  $\mathbf{D}_{train}$  and evaluated on  $\mathbf{D}_{test}$ . The acquisition budget  $B$  was set at 20% of the data pool. Unless otherwise mentioned, batch size  $K$  was set at 10%




Figure 3: Comparing DATASIFT with baselines (AutoData, Random, and Entropy) to highlight the effectiveness in achieving fairness. DATASIFT consistently outperforms the other methods in improving fairness for most of the datasets. The black dotted line indicates ultimate fairness if the entire data pool is acquired (i.e.,  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_{train} \cup \mathcal{D}}$ ).

of the budget, and the target fairness threshold  $\tau$  was set at 0.01. The trade-off parameter between exploration and exploitation ( $\alpha$  in Equation 2) was set to 0.1. We considered five ML algorithms: logistic regression, a support vector machine, a feed-forward neural network with one layer and ten nodes, a decision tree, and a random forest classifier. We evaluated DATASIFT on all of the algorithms and evaluated DATASIFT-Inf on only the first three models. We used the PyTorch [45] or sklearn [46] implementation of these algorithms. To measure fairness in model decisions, we use the demographic parity metric [40, 56].

**Source code.** The experiments were conducted on a system with a Core i7 processor, 36 GB of RAM, and a 1TB SSD running macOS. The source code for DATASIFT is available at this link: DATASIFT.

#### 4.2 Effectiveness of DATASIFT

In this set of experiments, we answer RQ1 by comparing the performance of DATASIFT with the competing methods Random, Entropy, and AutoData. Unless otherwise specified, we use the Logistic Regression model for all datasets and methods. While the baselines Random and Entropy do not account for factors related to fairness and acquire data without leveraging any prior information, AutoData fails to capture fairness even after its constraint it updated to check for fairness due to its distance-centric reward calculation. In contrast, DATASIFT leverages available information to make informed decisions on partition selection and its reward design effectively preserves accuracy while enhancing fairness. As a result, as shown in Figure 3, DATASIFT demonstrates superior performance across almost all datasets, with the exception of the ACSEmployment and ACSMobility datasets (Figures 3b and 3e respectively) where its




Figure 4: Generalizability of DATASIFT to black-box ML algorithms (ACSIncome dataset, Black dotted line:  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_{train} \cup \mathcal{D}}$ )

performance is almost identical to others. Notably, the ACSEmployment dataset is divided into four large, evenly distributed partitions. A similar pattern is observed in the Mobility dataset where two partitions were smaller than the batch size and were therefore excluded from the evaluation while the other two were also almost evenly distributed. In these scenarios, the partitions serve as prototypes representative of the entire data pool. As a result, DATASIFT’s performance closely resembles random acquisition, as the batch is collected as a random sample from these large and evenly-distributed partitions making it challenging to discern the utility of each partition. This issue can be addressed by ensuring that the partitions are created unevenly so as to differentiate between the utilities of different partitions.

Across all datasets, DATASIFT consistently outperforms throughout the evaluation process, requiring less budget to achieve fairness compared to other algorithms. In addition, by acquiring only a fraction of the data pool, DATASIFT ensures fairness levels comparable to, or even better than, those attained when the entire data pool (black dotted line in Figure 3) is acquired. However, the results indicate that the improvement rate diminishes after acquiring a certain amount of data points. This behavior is attributed to the gradual increase in information about protected groups within the model leading to a point where acquiring new information becomes less beneficial in improving fairness.

Note that DATASIFT is model agnostic and hence, can be applied to both parametric and non-parametric models. We demonstrate the generalizability of DATASIFT across different types of models in Figure 4. We observe that across classifiers, DATASIFT consistently outperforms all the other methods that especially exhibit inconsistent results for non-parametric models (fluctuating throughout the process). In such cases, DATASIFT was consistent due to its MAB-based algorithmic design. To illustrate this point, consider the tree-based models (Figures 4c and 4d) where the performance started diminishing when DATASIFT acquired around 50% of budget: the MAB framework immediately adjusted the partition selection and acquired new informative data points from a new partition, resulting in a jump in fairness.

### 4.3 Importance of data valuation (DATASIFT-Inf)

In this set of experiments, we answer RQ2 by outlining the importance of data valuation in our MAB-based solution. A key limitation of DATASIFT lies in the fact that it randomly samples batches from the selected partition. Due to the algorithmic design, the selected partition is expected to offer a highest potential reward. However, not all data points within that partition are beneficial to model fairness — some may even degrade fairness. As a result, iterative random batch selection throughout the process causes DATASIFT to function as a random acquisition method. Figure 3 demonstrates that in some cases, DATASIFT marginally outperforms random acquisition. To address this issue, we incorporate data valuation using first-order influence functions within the MAB framework (as described in Algorithm 2) and denoted by DATASIFT-Inf. Unless otherwise mentioned, we report results on the logistic regression model across all datasets. DATASIFT-Inf addresses the limitations of DATASIFT by optimizing the selection process, resulting in constructing near-optimal batches that improve both the effectiveness and efficiency of model training. We compare DATASIFT-Inf with DATASIFT and the Inf baseline in Figure 5.

As seen, DATASIFT-Inf outperforms DATASIFT significantly in all datasets exploiting no more than 50% of the allocated budget to achieve a fair model compared to the other approaches. It halts the evaluation process early upon reaching the specified fairness threshold indicating that DATASIFT-Inf requires comparatively less computation, which can be attributed to the algorithm’s deliberate selection of batches. An interesting observation can be noted in Figure 5f for the Credit dataset where DATASIFT-Inf and DATASIFT exhibit identical performance. In this dataset, the protected group possesses a base rate twice that of the privileged group. Consequently, even a randomly constructed batch contains a higher base rate representation of the protected group, leading to similar fairness performance between DATASIFT-Inf and DATASIFT.

In contrast, Inf solely relies on influence estimation: selecting the most influential batches tends to introduce bias in the other direction. For instance, in datasets ACSIncome and ACSPublicHealth (Figures 5c and 5d respectively), the model initially exhibited a bias favoring the privileged group. However, as Inf continues to select the most influential batches, the model becomes increasingly biased toward the same group. This behavior is because the most influential data points tend to provide more information from the protected group. Therefore, continuously exploiting the same information leads to a more biased model in the alternate direction. In contrast, DATASIFT-Inf adjusts its decision in each iteration: in the same datasets, when it begins to demonstrate bias *toward* the privileged group, DATASIFT-Inf promptly gathers more information for the privileged group and leads the model toward zero bias.

In the comparatively larger ACSEmployment dataset (Figure 5b), the performance of Inf declines because upon acquiring the most influential point, the model’s actual improvement diminishes due to the inter-dependency among the batches (as discussed in Section 3.3.2), implying that the influence of a batch may not always equal the cumulative influence of its individual data points. Adding consecutive batches of top- $K$  data points from the same partition, therefore, does not bring any new information to the model. Conversely, when the performance of DATASIFT-Inf

## Data Acquisition For Improving Fairness Using Reinforcement Learning




Figure 5: Comparing DATASIFT-Inf, our MAB-approach based on data valuation, with DATASIFT and Inf to highlight the importance of data valuation in acquiring data that rapidly improve model fairness. DATASIFT-Inf exhibits the most improvement in fairness with the least amount of additional data acquired. The black dotted line indicates  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_{train} \cup \mathcal{D}}$ .

declines compared to Inf in the initial two iterations, it transitions to a new partition that holds additional information, resulting in improved model performance in this scenario as well.

Note that the use of influence functions limits the applicability of DATASIFT-Inf to parametric models with convex and twice-differentiable loss function. Figure 6 demonstrates that DATASIFT-Inf exhibits stable performance on two more such parametric models. Interestingly, the neural network model (Figure 6b), trained on the same dataset exhibited bias toward the privileged group. In this scenario, both DATASIFT-Inf and DATASIFT make careful decisions, achieving a fair model while Inf completely fails, exacerbating unfairness in the model. These results indicate that our proposed solutions are robust in ensuring fairness from any direction, regardless of specific demographic groups, showcasing their versatility in addressing bias in various models.

**Effect on model accuracy.** Generally, when the algorithm acquires data to improve model fairness, it prioritizes diversifying training data i.e., data is acquired from various partitions representing different population subgroups. This strategy prevents the model from being biased toward over-represented groups and ignoring or under-representing marginalized groups. However, since the entire dataset and test data are dominated by the privileged group, focusing solely on model fairness can potentially degrade the model’s accuracy. To combat potential degradation in accuracy, we chose a reward score that combines both base rate difference and inter-partition distance. That helps us to preserve accuracy while improving fairness. As shown in Table 2, using DATASIFT and DATASIFT-Inf, model accuracy either improves or remains stable for most datasets. However, we observe a slight drop in accuracy for the ACSIncome and ACSMobility datasets. Although this decline is considerable with regard to fairness improvement, it can be addressed




Figure 6: Evaluation of data valuation across parametric models (ACSIIncome dataset, Black dotted line:  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_{train} \cup \mathcal{D}}$ ).

Dataset	Classifier	Methods						
		Initial	Random	Entropy	AutoData	MAB	INF	MAB_INF
<b>AdultIncome</b>	Logistic Regression	0.73	0.79	0.78	0.73	0.76	0.75	0.77
	SVM	0.72	0.79	0.78	0.73	0.76	0.76	0.77
	Neural Network	0.75	0.81	0.79	0.79	0.76	0.73	0.77
<b>ACSIncome</b>	Logistic Regression	0.77	0.78	0.78	0.77	0.74	0.56	0.75
	SVM	0.77	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.74	0.59	0.77
	Neural Network	0.77	0.79	0.79	0.75	0.75	0.54	0.74
<b>Employment</b>	Logistic Regression	0.69	0.75	0.75	0.73	0.76	0.72	0.73
	SVM	0.69	0.74	0.75	0.76	0.76	0.65	0.73
	Neural Network	0.80	0.78	0.80	0.79	0.80	0.72	0.78
<b>PublicHealth</b>	Logistic Regression	0.65	0.69	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.47	0.68
	SVM	0.63	0.68	0.68	0.69	0.69	0.49	0.55
	Neural Network	0.69	0.70	0.71	0.67	0.65	0.48	0.68
<b>Mobility</b>	Logistic Regression	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.39	0.70
	SVM	0.77	0.76	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.75	0.76
	Neural Network	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.69	0.74
<b>Credit</b>	Logistic Regression	0.73	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.72	0.91
	SVM	0.73	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.88	0.84
	Neural Network	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93

Table 2: Observed accuracy of a model trained after acquiring data as determined by a given method.




Figure 7: Effect of Hyper-parameters and design choices (ACSIncome dataset, DS: DATASIFT).

by increasing the budget size and allowing more data to be acquired. Note that the other methods, while preserving accuracy, do not ensure model fairness. Originally tailored to improve model accuracy, **AutoData** shows similar accuracy as the other methods because of the updated constraint that checks for improvement in fairness rather than accuracy. We also observe some extreme scenarios for **Inf**, which greedily exploits the most influential data points and fails to preserve fairness and accuracy in the process.

#### 4.4 Ablation analysis

This section answers RQ3, which studies the sensitivity of our solutions to the hyper-parameters and other design choices. We have two hyperparameters — batch size and exploration-exploitation trade-off parameter  $\alpha$  — and two design choices — constructing the reward score and data pool partitioning criterion. In the following, we study the effect of these choices on our solutions.

**Effect of batch size.** In our variants of DATASIFT, batch size is translated as a percentage of the allocated budget,  $B$ . In Figure 7a, we report the fairness metric of the final model (y-axis) when the batch size varies as a fraction of the total budget (x-axis) for a logistic regression model trained on the ACSIncome dataset. We observe that DATASIFT-Inf remains nearly stable across the different batch sizes, whereas DATASIFT faces a slight fluctuation. The result suggests neither the smallest nor largest batch sizes yield the highest fairness. Considering both methods, the best selection falls between 6% to 12%. However, this range may vary with different combinations of models and datasets.

**Effect of  $\alpha$ .** In Figure 7b, we study the effect of changing  $\alpha$  which represents the trade-off between exploration and exploitation used in the Upper-Confidence Bound as shown in Equation 2. When  $\alpha = 0$ , the model focuses less on

exploration, whereas  $\alpha = 1$  emphasizes the exploration of new partitions. We observe that performance declines for extreme values of  $\alpha$  while a moderate value e.g.,  $\alpha = 0.1$  demonstrates better performance maintaining stability throughout the data acquisition process.

**Effect of clustering vs. partitioning.** DATASIFT requires partitioning the space into smaller groups, which can be performed automatically, such as through clustering, by leveraging domain expertise. In Figure 7c, we compare partitioning the ACSIncome into an optimal number of clusters using the Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) or partitioning based on states (we consider the four largest states as four partitions). We observe consistent results for DATASIFT-Inf in both cases, indicating robustness to the partitioning process. However, as the state’s size exceeds the cluster’s, DATASIFT’s performance slightly declines due to the difficulty of randomly sampling a beneficial batch from a larger partition.

**Effect of choice of reward score.** Our data acquisition solutions rely on the multi-armed bandit framework, requiring the design of a reward score that approximates reward distribution to partitions. AutoData designed a distance-centric reward score aimed at improving model accuracy. To address model fairness, we incorporate base rate differences among sensitive groups in DATASIFT and DATASIFT-Inf. We observe that combining both the base rate difference and distance metrics carefully improves fairness while also preserving accuracy. In Figure 7d, we find that AutoData fails to provide stability in fairness improvement but reward scores based solely on the base rate, or a combination of both, perform equally well in improving fairness.

#### 4.5 Scalability Analysis

This section answers RQ4 that evaluates the different methods with respect to variations in dataset and data pool sizes.




Figure 8: Scalability on synthetic dataset.

Using the AdultIncome dataset, we synthetically generate additional data points to control the dataset size, which ranges from the original size up to  $10^6$  data points. Throughout this study, we maintain a fixed budget and corresponding batch size. Figure 8a demonstrates the effectiveness of the logistic regression model across different data pool sizes. The y-axis represents the ultimate fairness achieved by the model under various scenarios. The results indicate that as the size of the data pool increases, DATASIFT-Inf demonstrates consistent performance, whereas the performance of DATASIFT declines slightly. Unlike DATASIFT, DATASIFT-Inf is not dependent on the data pool distribution; instead regardless of the data pool size, it identifies and selects the best data points that ensure fairness. In contrast, DATASIFT relies on random batch selection, which is shaped by the distribution of the data pool, thereby affecting its performance.

**Efficiency analysis.** As evident from Figure 9, DATASIFT requires additional computation due to the extra calculation needed to adjust the decision on partition selection. Additionally, DATASIFT may evaluate more than  $\frac{B}{K}$  batches, as it has the flexibility to retain or discard batches based on their utility. Consequently, DATASIFT demands comparatively more computation than other methods. On the other hand, DATASIFT-Inf carefully selects batches that provide a significant improvement in fairness, leading to an early termination of the evaluation process. As a result, DATASIFT-Inf requires significantly less computation compared to DATASIFT. In some cases, such as the ACSPublicHealth dataset in Figure 9, DATASIFT-Inf requires more computation due to oscillations in the fairness metric value, necessitating additional evaluations until  $|\mathcal{F}| < \tau$ . As a result, DATASIFT-Inf reaches the maximum iterations for this dataset, while other datasets converge with fewer evaluations. This issue arises from using a fixed threshold across all datasets, which can be controlled by adjusting the threshold based on domain expertise. However, the other baseline methods require less time across different datasets, as no extra calculation and evaluation is needed.

Furthermore, Figure 8b illustrates the efficiency of DATASIFT and DATASIFT-Inf across varying data pool sizes. The batch construction complexity of DATASIFT-Inf is independent of the data pool, leading to a nearly constant time




Figure 9: Efficiency on real-world datasets.

requirement across all cases. In contrast, the batch selection complexity for DATASIFT is influenced by partition size, leading to a slight upward trend in efficiency, which is nearly negligible.

## 5 Related Work

The study in this paper is related to the following four research areas: algorithmic fairness, data acquisition, reinforcement learning, and data valuation. While these areas were studied extensively, our approach of integrating data valuation with a multi-armed bandit framework to acquire high-quality data for ensuring fairer algorithmic systems is novel.

**Algorithmic fairness.** With the increasing prevalence of machine learning in critical domains, such as criminal justice, healthcare, and finance, instances of fairness violations in algorithmic systems abound [10, 19, 33, 29]. A number of bias mitigation techniques have been introduced [40, 14] that can be categorized into pre-processing, in-processing, and post-processing techniques. Due to their effectiveness and ease of implementation, pre-processing techniques have been the preferred choice for data science practitioners to offset any modeling issues [31]. Our work deals with modification of input data and, therefore, is the most related to pre-processing bias mitigation techniques.

**Data acquisition for model fairness.** Data integration [59, 49, 55] has been a decades-old research area in data management that emphasizes the importance of high-quality data in data-driven decision making. However, the importance of data quality for ensuring improved performance of ML decisions has only recently been studied [37, 38, 58, 15, 55, 3]. The current work spotlights *data acquisition* – the process of acquiring high-quality data for downstream analyses – as a potential pre-processing method to improve model fairness. Our work is the most related to AutoData [15] that adopts a multi-armed bandit approach to determine which data points should be acquired from a data pool curated from the wild. AutoData, however, is not directly applicable to the context of fairness and the data points acquired in each iteration are sub-optimal. In contrast, DATASIFT is tailored to model fairness and uses data valuation to acquire data points beneficial to fairness.

**Reinforcement learning in data management.** Recent years have seen a proliferation of tools that integrate reinforcement learning [54] with classical data management problems [12, 15, 6, 41, 30, 25, 36, 63]. Reinforcement learning approaches, such as multi-armed bandits, Q-learning and proximal policy optimization, have been hugely successful in these areas due to their trial-and-error approach achieving near-optimal results in fewer training steps. Similar to our work, AutoData [15] uses MAB in the context of data acquisition to improve model accuracy but with a reward score that is not applicable to model fairness.

**Data valuation.** Emerging as a powerful tool to explain the workings of black-box machine learning models [34, 28], data valuation [34, 28] has recently been applied to several data management problems [7, 39, 21, 48]. Two primary data valuation techniques, data Shapley [28] and influence functions [34], offer complementary benefits and trade-offs. Compared to influence functions, data Shapley values are model agnostic but are computationally expensive. Incurring a comparatively expensive one-time offline computation, influence functions offer fast online impact estimation. To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first work to explore influence functions for the problem of data acquisition.

## 6 Conclusions and Future Work

We present a novel approach for solving the problem of data acquisition to improve machine learning model fairness by determining the order in which data points must be acquired from a data pool. We introduce DATASIFT, a principled framework that integrates reinforcement learning with data valuation to determine the most valuable data points to acquire. We demonstrate experimentally that data valuation is crucial in effective discovery of useful data points and

that DATASIFT is both effective and efficient in identifying data points valuable for model fairness. In the future, we plan to explore several interesting directions. We plan to expand our data valuation module to efficiently cater to non-parametric ML algorithms. Since the MAB-based framework is limited by the choice of identified partitions, we plan to explore alternate reinforcement learning approaches (e.g., Q-learning) and other exploration-exploitation trade-off algorithms (e.g., Thompson sampling). Other directions include incorporating the cost of acquisition in our reward scores and extending this framework to the task of effective source discovery.

## References

- [1] Shipra Agrawal and Navin Goyal. Analysis of thompson sampling for the multi-armed bandit problem. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 39–1, Edinburgh, Scotland, 2012. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings.
- [2] Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu, and Lauren Kirchner. Machine bias: There’s software used across the country to predict future criminals. and it’s biased against blacks., 2016. ProPublica, May 23, 2016.
- [3] Abolfazl Asudeh, Zhongjun Jin, and H. V. Jagadish. Assessing and Remediating Coverage for a Given Dataset. In *2019 IEEE 35th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, pages 554–565, Macau, China, April 2019. IEEE. ISSN: 2375-026X.
- [4] Peter Auer. Using upper confidence bounds for online learning. In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 270–279, Redondo Beach, CA, USA, 2000. IEEE, IEEE.
- [5] Peter Auer. Using confidence bounds for exploitation-exploration trade-offs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Nov):397–422, 2002.
- [6] Laure Berti-Equille. Learn2clean: Optimizing the sequence of tasks for web data preparation. In *The world wide web conference*, pages 2580–2586, 2019.
- [7] Leopoldo Bertossi, Benny Kimelfeld, Ester Livshits, and Mikaël Monet. The shapley value in database management. *ACM Sigmod Record*, 52(2):6–17, 2023.
- [8] Sumon Biswas and Hriday Rajan. Fair preprocessing: towards understanding compositional fairness of data transformers in machine learning pipeline. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, page 981–993, 2021.
- [9] Sumon Biswas, Mohammad Wardat, and Hriday Rajan. The art and practice of data science pipelines: A comprehensive study of data science pipelines in theory, in-the-small, and in-the-large. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*, page 2091–2103, 2022.
- [10] Brakkton Booker. Housing department slaps facebook with discrimination charge. <https://www.npr.org/2019/03/28/707614254/hud-slaps-facebook-with-housing-discrimination-charge>, 2019.
- [11] Sébastien Bubeck, Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi, and Gábor Lugosi. Bandits with heavy tail. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 59(11):7711–7717, 2013.
- [12] Qingpeng Cai, Can Cui, Yiyuan Xiong, Wei Wang, Zhongle Xie, and Meihui Zhang. A survey on deep reinforcement learning for data processing and analytics. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 35(5):4446–4465, 2023.
- [13] Alexandra Carpentier, Alessandro Lazaric, Mohammad Ghavamzadeh, Rémi Munos, and Peter Auer. Upper-confidence-bound algorithms for active learning in multi-armed bandits. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 189–203. Springer, 2011.
- [14] Simon Caton and Christian Haas. Fairness in machine learning: A survey. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 56(7), April 2024.
- [15] Chengliang Chai, Jiabin Liu, Nan Tang, Guoliang Li, and Yuyu Luo. Selective data acquisition in the wild for model charging. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 15(7):1466–1478, March 2022.
- [16] Alexandra Chouldechova. Fair prediction with disparate impact: A study of bias in recidivism prediction instruments. *CoRR*, abs/1703.00056, 2017.
- [17] R. Dennis Cook and Sanford Weisberg. Characterizations of an empirical influence function for detecting influential cases in regression. *Technometrics*, 22(4):495–508, 1980.
- [18] Will Cukierski Credit Fusion. Give me some credit, 2011.
- [19] Jeffrey Dastin. Rpt-insight-amazon scraps secret ai recruiting tool that showed bias against women. *Reuters*, 2018.
- [20] G. Davis, S. Mallat, and M. Avellaneda. Adaptive greedy approximations. *Constructive Approximation*, 13(1):57, 1997.



- [21] Daniel Deutch, Nave Frost, Amir Gilad, and Oren Sheffer. Explanations for data repair through shapley values. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management, CIKM '21*, page 362–371, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [22] Frances Ding, Moritz Hardt, John Miller, and Ludwig Schmidt. Retiring adult: New datasets for fair machine learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:6478–6490, 2021.
- [23] Dheeru Dua, Casey Graff, et al. Uci machine learning repository. 2017.
- [24] Martin Ester, Hans-Peter Kriegel, Jörg Sander, Xiaowei Xu, et al. A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise. In *kdd*, volume 96, pages 226–231, 1996.
- [25] Zheng Fang, Yanan Cao, Qian Li, Dongjie Zhang, Zhenyu Zhang, and Yanbing Liu. Joint entity linking with deep reinforcement learning. In *The World Wide Web Conference, WWW '19*, page 438–447, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [26] Mario A. T. Figueiredo and Anil K. Jain. Unsupervised learning of finite mixture models. *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 24(3):381–396, 2002.
- [27] Aurélien Garivier and Eric Moulines. On upper-confidence bound policies for switching bandit problems. In *International conference on algorithmic learning theory*, pages 174–188. Springer, 2011.
- [28] Amirata Ghorbani and James Zou. Data shapley: Equitable valuation of data for machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97, pages 2242–2251. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019.
- [29] Karen Hao. Self-driving cars more likely to hit blacks. <https://www.technologyreview.com/2019/03/01/136808/self-driving-cars-are-coming-but-accidents-may-not-be-evenly-distributed/>, 2019.
- [30] Yuval Heffetz, Roman Vainshtein, Gilad Katz, and Lior Rokach. Deepline: Automl tool for pipelines generation using deep reinforcement learning and hierarchical actions filtering. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD '20*, page 2103–2113, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [31] Kenneth Holstein, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hal Daumé, Miro Dudik, and Hanna Wallach. Improving fairness in machine learning systems: What do industry practitioners need? In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, page 1–16, 2019.
- [32] Anil K Jain. Data clustering: 50 years beyond k-means. *Pattern recognition letters*, 31(8):651–666, 2010.
- [33] Matthew Kay, Cynthia Matuszek, and Sean A. Munson. Unequal representation and gender stereotypes in image search results for occupations. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, page 3819–3828, 2015.
- [34] Pang Wei Koh and Percy Liang. Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70, pages 1885–1894, 06–11 Aug 2017.
- [35] Volodymyr Kuleshov and Doina Precup. Algorithms for multi-armed bandit problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1402.6028*, 2014.
- [36] Guoliang Li, Xuanhe Zhou, Shifu Li, and Bo Gao. Qtune: a query-aware database tuning system with deep reinforcement learning. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 12(12):2118–2130, August 2019.
- [37] Yifan Li, Xiaohui Yu, and Nick Koudas. Data Acquisition for Improving Machine Learning Models. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 14(10):1832–1844, June 2021. arXiv:2105.14107 [cs].
- [38] Yifan Li, Xiaohui Yu, and Nick Koudas. Data acquisition for improving model confidence. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data*, 2(3), May 2024.
- [39] Xuan Luo and Jian Pei. Applications and computation of the shapley value in databases and machine learning. In *Companion of the 2024 International Conference on Management of Data*, pages 630–635, 2024.
- [40] Ninareh Mehrabi, Fred Morstatter, Nripsuta Saxena, Kristina Lerman, and Aram Galstyan. A Survey on Bias and Fairness in Machine Learning. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 54(6):1–35, July 2022.
- [41] Karthik Narasimhan, Adam Yala, and Regina Barzilay. Improving information extraction by acquiring external evidence with reinforcement learning. In Jian Su, Kevin Duh, and Xavier Carreras, editors, *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2355–2365, Austin, Texas, November 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [42] Fatemeh Nargesian, Abolfazl Asudeh, and HV Jagadish. Tailoring data source distributions for fairness-aware data integration. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 14(11):2519–2532, 2021.

- [43] Andrew A Neath and Joseph E Cavanaugh. The bayesian information criterion: background, derivation, and applications. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics*, 4(2):199–203, 2012.
- [44] Nhan Nguyen-Thanh, Dana Marinca, Kinda Khawam, David Rohde, Flavian Vasile, Elena Simona Lohan, Steven Martin, and Dominique Quadri. Recommendation system-based upper confidence bound for online advertising. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.04190*, 2019.
- [45] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [46] Fabian Pedregosa, Gaël Varoquaux, Alexandre Gramfort, Vincent Michel, Bertrand Thirion, Olivier Grisel, Mathieu Blondel, Peter Prettenhofer, Ron Weiss, Vincent Dubourg, et al. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in python. *the Journal of machine Learning research*, 12:2825–2830, 2011.
- [47] Neoklis Polyzotis and Matei Zaharia. What can data-centric AI learn from data and ML engineering? *CoRR*, abs/2112.06439, 2021.
- [48] Romila Pradhan, Jiongli Zhu, Boris Glavic, and Babak Salimi. Interpretable Data-Based Explanations for Fairness Debugging. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD '22*, pages 247–261, New York, NY, USA, June 2022. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [49] Theodoros Rekatsinas, Amol Deshpande, Xin Luna Dong, Lise Getoor, and Divesh Srivastava. Sourcesight: Enabling effective source selection. In *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Management of Data*, pages 2157–2160, 2016.
- [50] Nima Shahbazi, Mahdi Erfanian, and Abolfazl Asudeh. Coverage-based data-centric approaches for responsible and trustworthy ai. *IEEE Data Engineering Bulletin*, 2024.
- [51] Nima Shahbazi, Yin Lin, Abolfazl Asudeh, and HV Jagadish. Representation bias in data: A survey on identification and resolution techniques. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(13s):1–39, 2023.
- [52] C. E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3):379–423, 1948.
- [53] Aleksandrs Slivkins et al. Introduction to multi-armed bandits. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 12(1-2):1–286, 2019.
- [54] Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- [55] Ki Hyun Tae and Steven Euijong Whang. Slice tuner: A selective data acquisition framework for accurate and fair machine learning models. In *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Management of Data*, pages 1771–1783, 2021.
- [56] Sahil Verma and Julia Rubin. Fairness definitions explained. In *Proceedings of the international workshop on software fairness*, pages 1–7. Association for Computing Machinery, 2018.
- [57] Joannes Vermorel and Mehryar Mohri. Multi-armed bandit algorithms and empirical evaluation. In *European conference on machine learning*, pages 437–448. Springer, 2005.
- [58] Tingting Wang, Shixun Huang, Zhifeng Bao, J Shane Culpepper, Volkan Dedeoglu, and Reza Arablouei. Optimizing data acquisition to enhance machine learning performance. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 17(6):1310–1323, 2024.
- [59] Gerhard Weikum. Data discovery. *Data Science Journal*, 12, 2013.
- [60] Steven Euijong Whang, Yuji Roh, Hwanjun Song, and Jae-Gil Lee. Data collection and quality challenges in deep learning: a data-centric ai perspective. *The VLDB Journal*, 32(4):791–813, January 2023.
- [61] Daochen Zha, Zaid Pervaiz Bhat, Kwei-Herng Lai, Fan Yang, and Xia Hu. *Data-centric AI: Perspectives and Challenges*, pages 945–948.
- [62] Daochen Zha, Kwei-Herng Lai, Fan Yang, Na Zou, Huiji Gao, and Xia Hu. Data-centric ai: Techniques and future perspectives. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '23*, page 5839–5840, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [63] Ji Zhang, Yu Liu, Ke Zhou, Guoliang Li, Zhili Xiao, Bin Cheng, Jiashu Xing, Yangtao Wang, Tianheng Cheng, Li Liu, Minwei Ran, and Zekang Li. An end-to-end automatic cloud database tuning system using deep reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD '19*, page 415–432, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.