FairSAM: Fair Classification on Corrupted Data Through Sharpness-Aware Minimization

Yucong Dai^{*}, Jie Ji^{*}, Xiaolong Ma[†], Yongkai Wu[†] Clemson University {yucongd, jji, xiaolom, yongkaw}@clemson.edu

*Equal contribution [†]Corresponding author

Abstract

Image classification models trained on clean data often suffer from significant performance degradation when exposed to testing corrupted data, such as images with impulse noise, Gaussian noise, or environmental noise. This degradation not only impacts overall performance but also disproportionately affects various demographic subgroups, raising critical algorithmic bias concerns. Although robust learning algorithms like Sharpness-Aware Minimization (SAM) have shown promise in improving overall model robustness and generalization, they fall short in addressing the biased performance degradation across demographic subgroups. Existing fairness-aware machine learning methods - such as fairness constraints and reweighing strategies - aim to reduce performance disparities but hardly maintain robust and equitable accuracy across demographic subgroups when faced with data corruption. This reveals an inherent tension between robustness and fairness when dealing with corrupted data. To address these challenges, we introduce one novel metric specifically designed to assess performance degradation across subgroups under data corruption. Additionally, we propose FairSAM, a new framework that integrates Fairness-oriented strategies into SAM to deliver equalized performance across demographic groups under corrupted conditions. Our experiments on multiple real-world datasets and various predictive tasks show that FairSAM successfully reconciles robustness and fairness, offering a structured solution for equitable and resilient image classification in the presence of data corruption.

1. Introduction

Deep neural networks have shown remarkable success in various applications, including classification, image segmentation, and object detection. However, corrupted data poses a set of challenges in the applications of deep neural networks. In this paper, we focus on one common problem - unequal model degradation when well-trained models are applied to corrupted images, which is caused by common phenomena such as impulse noise, Gaussian noise, snow, fog, and motion blur during image taking and transferring. It is well known that image corruption impacts the accuracy of image classification models, leading to performance degradation. However, recent investigations [18] reveal that this corruption disproportionately impacts the demographic subgroups, i.e., the accuracy degradation varies across different demographic subgroups, thereby raising critical machine learning bias concerns.

Although various fairness-aware methods, such as fairness constraints [3, 5, 12, 21] or reweighing strategies [4], have been proposed to address bias in machine learning models—primarily targeting performance disparities-they often fall short in mitigating unequal accuracy degradation across subgroups and fail to address the broader robustness challenge effectively.

Recent research frames the classification of corrupted data as a robustness and generalization challenge, as its learning objective is to maintain performance when exposed to noise perturbations that differ from the training distribution. Sharpness-Aware Minimization (SAM) [6] has emerged as an effective approach to tackle robustness issues by promoting "flat" minima in the loss landscape, where the loss changes gradually with parameter variations. This property enhances generalization and increases resilience to data corruption, thereby improving the overall robustness of models. However, while SAM improves robustness at a broad level, it does not inherently address fairness across demographic subgroups. The gains in accuracy achieved through SAM tend to be unevenly distributed, leaving certain disadvantaged subgroups more susceptible to accuracy degradation. This disparity highlights a critical limitation of SAM in scenarios where both robustness and fairness are equally essential.

To address these inherent challenges, we first formulate the fair classification problem in the context of corrupted data. **Specifically, we focus on a setting where a model** trained on a clean and noise-free dataset and tested on a corrupted dataset containing various noise types, such as Gaussian noise or motion blur. This setting is inspired by the real-world scenario where training data are carefully curated while the trained model might be tested on any conditions, including corrupted data in the wild. We then evaluate model performance and assess performance degradation across demographic subgroups, such as age (young/nonyoung) and gender (female/male), to understand both robustness and fairness under corrupted conditions. We introduce a novel metric to quantify fairness in performance degradation under corruption, which differs subtly from existing one-shot fairness notions that mandate equal robustness across population partitions to imperceptible input perturbations. Corrupted Degradation Disparity: This metric captures the difference in accuracy degradation (i.e., the drop in accuracy between clean and corrupted data) between specific subgroups, such as young and non-young individuals. Corrupted degradation disparity enables us to evaluate how data corruption impacts performance differently across multiple demographic subgroups within a given model. Using this metric, we propose FairSAM, the first framework to incorporate fairness-oriented strategies into SAM. Specifically, we develop an instance-reweighed SAM to promote fairness and approximate the per-sample perturbation in a per-batch perturbation learning algorithm. Fair-SAM ensures that robustness improvements are equitably distributed across demographic subgroups, effectively addressing fairness concerns while maintaining high overall accuracy under corrupted conditions.

We conduct experiments on multiple real-world datasets, including the imbalanced CelebA dataset and the balanced FairFace dataset, across various prediction tasks with different combinations of target and sensitive attributes to thoroughly evaluate FairSAM's effectiveness in terms of both performance and fairness. Our results demonstrate that FairSAM effectively addresses the inherent dilemma between robustness and fairness, achieving superior outcomes on both fronts. This is evidenced by significantly improved scores on our proposed fairness metric Corrupted Degradation Disparity (lower values indicate better fairness), reflecting consistent and equitable performance across demographic subgroups. In addition, FairSAM achieves the highest worst-group accuracy among most cases. In comparison, while SAM enhances overall robustness, it performs poorly on the fairness metrics, indicating limitations in equitable subgroup performance. Traditional fair machine learning methods, on the other hand, improve subgroup equity but often compromise overall accuracy and fall short in sufficiently enhancing fairness under conditions of image corruption. In contrast, FairSAM successfully and consistently balances robustness and fairness, overcoming these limitations to deliver both high accuracy and fairness

across subgroups under corrupted conditions. Our contributions are as follows:

- We identify and formalize the robustness bias challenge in image classification under data corruption, introducing a novel fairness metric - *Corrupted Degradation Disparity* to evaluate the fairness of performance degradation across demographic subgroups.
- We introduce **FairSAM**, a novel framework that integrates SAM with fairness-enhancing strategies to achieve both robustness and fairness in corrupted image classification.
- We validate the effectiveness of FairSAM on multiple datasets and multiple conditions, demonstrating its superior performance in both accuracy and fairness.

2. Preliminary

2.1. Fair Classification

We first formulate the fair classification problem for corrupted data. Consider a clean training dataset, denoted as $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i, s_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, and a corrupted testing dataset, represented by $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i^c, \mathbf{y}_i, s_i)\}_{i=1}^M$, where $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}$ indicates an input feature, $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathcal{Y}$ denotes the ground truth target, and $s_i \in \mathcal{S} = \{s^+, s^-\}$ represents a sensitive attribute, with s^+ and s^- denoting the advantaged and disadvantaged groups, respectively. Specially, \mathbf{x}_i^c indicates a corrupted feature set, for example features with noise. The classification hypothesis space is formalized as $f(\mathbf{w}) : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$, parameterized by \mathbf{w} . Traditionally, fair classification aims to ensure that the model has equal outcome (e.g., demographic parity) or performance (e.g., equalized odds) among different demographic subgroups.

2.2. Sharpness-Aware Minimization

Sharpness-Aware Minimization (SAM) is an optimization technique developed to enhance the generalization capability of neural networks by mitigating overfitting. Unlike traditional methods that solely minimize the loss at the current parameter values, SAM focuses on minimizing the maximum loss within a neighborhood around the current parameters. This strategy encourages the model to find "flatter" minima in the loss landscape, where surrounding regions exhibit uniformly low loss, thereby contributing to improved generalization and robustness.

Consider a family of models parameterized by $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, where \mathcal{L} is the loss function, and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}$ represents the training dataset. SAM aims to minimize an upper bound on the PAC-Bayesian generalization error. For a given $\rho > 0$, this bound is expressed as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}) \leq \max_{\|\epsilon\|_{p} \leq \rho} \left[\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}}(\mathbf{w} + \epsilon) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}}(\mathbf{w}) \right] \\ + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}}(\mathbf{w}) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|^{2}.$$
(1)



Figure 1. Comparison of corrupted degradation and accuracy between subgroups using various methods.

Therefore, the problem is a minimax problem:

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{\|\epsilon\|_{p} \le \rho} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}}(\mathbf{w} + \epsilon) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|^{2}.$$
 (2)

To solve the above minimax problem, SAM performs an iterative update at each iteration t, where the update steps are as follows:

Firstly, compute the perturbation ϵ_t as:

$$\epsilon_{t} = \frac{\rho \cdot \operatorname{sign}\left(\nabla \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}}\left(\mathbf{w}_{t-1}\right)\right) \left|\nabla \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}}\left(\mathbf{w}_{t-1}\right)\right|^{q-1}}{\left(\left\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}}\left(\mathbf{w}_{t-1}\right)\right\|_{q}^{q}\right)^{1/p}} \quad (3)$$

where 1/p + 1/q = 1, $\rho > 0$ is a hyperparameter controlling the neighborhood size, and p and q denote norm parameters. Typically, p and q are set to 2.

Secondly, update the model parameter w_t as:

$$\mathbf{w}_{t} = \mathbf{w}_{t-1} - \eta_{t} \left(\nabla \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}} \left(\mathbf{w}_{t-1} + \epsilon_{t} \right) + \lambda \mathbf{w}_{t-1} \right)$$
(4)

where $\lambda > 0$ is the parameter for weight decay, and $\eta_t > 0$ is the learning rate.

For simplicity, when setting p = q = 2 and introducing an intermediate variable \mathbf{u}_t , we have:

$$\mathbf{u}_{t} = \mathbf{w}_{t-1} + \frac{\rho \nabla \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}} \left(\mathbf{w}_{t-1} \right)}{\left\| \nabla \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}} \left(\mathbf{w}_{t-1} \right) \right\|},\tag{5}$$

$$\mathbf{w}_{t} = \mathbf{w}_{t-1} - \eta_{t} \left(\nabla \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}} \left(\mathbf{u}_{t} \right) + \lambda \mathbf{w}_{t-1} \right).$$
 (6)

By focusing on minimizing loss across a neighborhood rather than a single point, SAM identifies parameter configurations that are less sensitive to small perturbations, thus leading to improved generalization and robustness. This property of SAM motivates our development of FairSAM, which extends SAM to also address fairness concerns across demographic subgroups under corrupted conditions.

3. Proposed Research

3.1. New Fairness Notions for Corrupted Data

Traditional fair machine learning mainly focuses on performance disparity. However, it has been observed that performance degradation is unevenly distributed across subgroups when data is corrupted. Our objective is to address this robustness-based fairness by training a model $f(\mathbf{w})$ that maintains a consistent level of performance degradation across distinct subgroups, as measured by a specified metric. We formally define a new fairness metric for the corrupted data as follows:

Definition 1 (Corrupted Degradation Disparity). Firstly, given a model f trained on clean training data $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}$, we define *Corrupted Degradation* for a specific demographic group s as:

$$\Delta p^{s} = |\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{S=s}, f) - \mathbb{M}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}}^{S=s}, f)|,$$

where $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{S=s}, f)$ and $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}}^{S=s}, f)$ represent the performance metrics on clean training and corrupted testing data, respectively, for subgroup *s*. We then define *Corrupted Degradation Disparity* as:

$$\Delta p = |\Delta p^{s^+} - \Delta p^{s^-}|.$$

This definition allows us to quantify how differently each subgroup is impacted by data corruption. By measuring this disparity, we can identify subgroups that are disproportionately affected. Specially, a smaller Δp value indicates that the model's robustness is more equally distributed across subgroups.

3.2. Fair SAM: Instance-reweighed SAM

Sharpness-Aware Minimization (SAM) has demonstrated effectiveness in enhancing model robustness by encouraging "flat" minima in the loss landscape, where loss exhibits gradual changes with respect to parameter variations. This characteristic enhances generalization and increases resilience to data corruption. However, SAM does not adequately address fairness concerns, as the resulting robustness improvements are not uniformly distributed across demographic subgroups. In particular, the accuracy gains achieved by SAM tend to be unevenly allocated, with certain disadvantaged subgroups experiencing disproportionately higher levels of accuracy degradation.

To address this limitation, we introduce a novel reweighing mechanism that adjusts sample importance across subgroups, enabling SAM to simultaneously prioritize both robustness and fairness. By allocating greater attention to samples from disadvantaged subgroups, this reweighing scheme balances gradient contributions from each group, mitigating robustness disparities and ensuring more equitable performance across demographic subgroups.

Following this intuition, we derive the gradient update for SAM training procedure. Given a clean training dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i, s_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, the vanilla training objective without the reweighing mechanism can be formulated as:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i}^{n} \max_{\|\epsilon_i\|_2 \le \rho} \ell_i(\mathbf{w} + \epsilon_i)$$
(7)

where ℓ_i is the loss for sample *i*. In this unweighted form, the classifier tends to focus more on the majority favorable group, leading to different perturbation magnitudes ϵ across subgroups and ultimately resulting in unequal generalization capabilities. We propose assigning initial weights to samples within each group as $\gamma_i = \frac{c}{n'}$, where *n'* represents the number of samples in the group to which the *i*-th sample belongs, and *c* is a scaling constant. By assigning weights to samples of different groups, the classifier is encouraged to focus more on samples that are either misclassified or likely to be misclassified. Moreover, this approach ensures that the weighted representation of samples remains balanced across different groups. This can be achieved by constraining the sum of weights within groups and is formulated as:

$$\max_{\gamma} \sum_{s} \sum_{i \in g_s} \gamma_i \max_{\|\epsilon_i\|_2 \le \rho} \ell_i(\mathbf{w} + \epsilon_i) \ s.t. \sum_{i \in g_s} \gamma_i = c, p_i \ge 0$$
(8)

where g_s collects the indices of samples belonging to the demographic group s. The optimization problem (8) can be partitioned by groups as follows for each demographic group:

$$\max_{\gamma} \sum_{i}^{n'} \gamma_{i} \underbrace{\max_{\substack{\|\epsilon_{i}\|_{2} \le \rho}} \ell_{i}(\mathbf{w} + \epsilon_{i})}_{\text{per-sample SAM } \ell_{s}} s.t.\gamma^{T} 1 = c, \gamma_{i} \ge 0.$$
(9)

Here we perform reweighing within each specific group to ensure the weighted samples are balanced between groups.

3.3. Perturbation for Per-Batch Calculation

SAM calculates the per-batch perturbation ϵ instead of perinstance perturbation ϵ_i , practically.

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}} \max_{\|\epsilon\|_{p} \le \rho} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i}^{n} \ell_{i}(\mathbf{w} + \epsilon).$$
(10)

To facilitate the calculation, we seek a per-batch perturbation ϵ' that is aligned with per-instance perturbation ϵ_i .

We start by considering the second-order expansion of a general empirical risk ℓ_i for instance *i*:

$$\ell_i(\mathbf{w} + \epsilon) = \ell_i(\mathbf{w}) + \nabla \ell_i(\mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^T H_i(\mathbf{w}) \epsilon.$$
(11)

For a tractable theoretical analysis, we assume the Hessian to be a low-rank, positive definite matrix $H_i(w) = a_i \nabla \ell_{i,p}(w) \nabla \ell_{i,p}(w)^T$, $(a_i > 0)$. Then the gradient of perinstance SAM can be calculated by using one-time backpropagation on a reweighed batch:

$$\nabla \ell_b(w) = \nabla \left(\sum_{i}^{N} g_i \ell_i(w)\right)$$

$$\epsilon^* = \rho \frac{\nabla \ell_b(w)}{\|\nabla \ell_b(w)\|_2}$$
(12)

where $g_i = a_i ||\nabla \ell_i||_2$ provides the group-specific weight for each instance, ensuing both fairness and robustness in the model. Then, we use the estimated ϵ^* to update the fairness-aware weight p_i .

4. Experiments

4.1. Datasets

We evaluate our proposed method, FairSAM, on several widely-used datasets, including CelebA [16], FairFace [14], and LFW [9], to examine its effectiveness in achieving both robustness and fairness under corrupted data conditions. Specially, CelebA, an imbalanced dataset with a substantial disparity in sample sizes between the advantaged and disadvantaged groups, presents a significant challenge for ensuring fairness across these subgroups. Specifically, we select "Big Nose" and "Blond Hair" as target attributes and "Gender" and "Age" as sensitive attributes. In contrast, FairFace, a balanced dataset with a roughly equal distribution of samples across demographic groups, provides a controlled setting for evaluating FairSAM's performance in maintaining fairness under balanced conditions. We choose "Age" as the sensitive attribute and "Gender" as the target attribute. These datasets are representative of corrupted data scenarios, enabling a comprehensive evaluation of the proposed method across diverse settings. Additionally, to investigate the fairness-aware generalization capabilities of FairSAM, we conduct out-of-distribution robustness experiments using the CelebA and LFW datasets, where models are trained on one dataset and tested on the other, further highlighting the method's ability to address fairness in challenging scenarios.

4.2. Baseline Methods

All experiments are conducted using the ResNet-18 model architecture. We adapt ImbSAM [22] to enhance fairness-

aware robustness by selectively applying SAM to the disadvantaged subgroup during training, introducing an approach we term Group-specific SAM (**GroupSAM**). Specially, we first reformulate Eq. 2 as follows:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}} \max_{\epsilon \le \rho} \left[\mathcal{L}_{s^+}(\mathbf{w} + \epsilon) + \mathcal{L}_{s^-}(\mathbf{w} + \epsilon) \right] + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|^2, \quad (13)$$

where \mathcal{L}_{s^+} and \mathcal{L}_{s^-} represent the losses for the advantaged and disadvantaged groups, respectively. To enhance fairness, we then modify this by applying SAM only to the disadvantaged group, resulting in:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}} \max_{\epsilon \le \rho} \mathcal{L}_{s^-}(\mathbf{w} + \epsilon^-) + \mathcal{L}_{s^+}(\mathbf{w}) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \qquad (14)$$

where ϵ^- is a perturbation specific to the disadvantaged group. Please note that ϵ^- in Eq. 14 is different from ϵ in Eq. 13 as SAM is only applied to the disadvantaged group, resulting in a group-specific perturbation value.

To make explicit our sharpness-aware term, the above optimization target can be rewritten as follows:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}} \underbrace{\max_{\epsilon \leq \rho} \left[\mathcal{L}_{s^{-}}(\mathbf{w} + \epsilon) - \mathcal{L}_{s^{-}}(\mathbf{w}) \right] + \mathcal{L}_{s^{-}}(\mathbf{w})}_{+ \mathcal{L}_{s^{+}}(\mathbf{w}) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|^{2}.}$$
(15)

Additionally, we train several comparison models, including vanilla Resnet18 (Vanilla), ResNet with fairness regularizers (FairReg), Re-Weighed ResNet (Reweighed), Group-Specific SAM (GroupSam), SAM, and FairSAM. We evaluate model performance on both clean and corrupted versions of the test data, focusing on accuracy across demographic subgroups (Young and Non-Young) under noise-free and noise-corrupted conditions. Following the noise settings from ImageNet-C [8], we add various noise at 5 levels of severity (1 to 5) and with varying noise types, such as snow, Gaussian, and blur.

4.3. Trade-off between Fairness and Performance

We investigate robustness disparity across different subgroups on both balanced and unbalanced datasets, examining various sensitive and target attributes. We first train models using the clean training data. Then evaluate those models on noise data. Tab. 1, Tab. 2, and Tab. 3 shows the comparison of methods regarding accuracy, corrupted degradation disparity, and fairness promotion. Notably, values in bold indicate the **best** performance among all methods, while values that are underlined represent the <u>second-best</u> performance. We run all experiments *three times* and report the average accuracy and omit the standard deviation since the training is relatively stable (i.e., usually less than 0.1% standard deviation). **Corrupted Degradation Disparity**. The result for degradation disparity is reported in the Δp column in Tab. 1 and Tab. 2. Our proposed method, FairSAM, consistently achieves the best balance of fairness and accuracy among all comparable baselines, indicating its effectiveness in narrowing the robustness bias gap across demographic subgroups. Specifically, FairSAM consistently outperforms fairness-aware methods, such as FairReg and Reweighed, which improve subgroup fairness but suffer from notable accuracy degradation. In contrast, while SAM and Group-SAM show strong generalization and robustness against corrupted data, they fall short in ensuring fairness across demographic subgroups, as evidenced by their higher disparities in performance degradation.

To further validate our methods, we conduct experiments on FairFace, a balanced dataset designed for fairness assessment. As shown in Tab. 3, the results on FairFace are consistent with the trends observed on CelebA. FairSAM achieves the lowest level of corrupted bias among all baseline methods, demonstrating its effectiveness in promoting fairness across demographic groups. Additionally, Fair-SAM attains the highest accuracy, benefiting from its balanced approach that considers samples from both advantaged and disadvantaged groups. This result underscores FairSAM's ability to maintain robust performance while achieving fairness, even in datasets with balanced demographic distributions.

Performance Disparity. In the column of ΔAcc , we focus on the performance disparity among subgroups in corrupted images. Tab. 1 and Tab. 2 demonstrate that FairSAM effectively enhances fairness across diverse target and sensitive attributes, maintaining consistent performance. Although FairReg achieves a notable fairness level, this improvement comes at a substantial cost to the performance of the advantaged group, resulting in reduced overall accuracy. In contrast, FairSAM successfully balances fairness and accuracy, providing equitable outcomes without compromising the performance of any subgroup.

4.4. Ablation Study

To thoroughly evaluate the robustness and fairness of the proposed FairSAM framework, we conduct an ablation study across multiple noise levels. This study is designed to determine whether FairSAM consistently achieves optimal performance in both accuracy and fairness metrics, regardless of image corruption severity, and to benchmark its performance against baseline SAM-based variants. Specifically, we introduce incremental levels of snow noise, ranging from mild (level 1) to severe (level 5), to the test datasets. For each noise level, we measure accuracy and *Corrupted Degradation Bias* across all methods, allowing us to assess the balance between robustness and fairness. Our results, illustrated in Fig. 2, show that FairSAM consis-

Methods	Test Data	Acc s^+	Δp^{s^+}	Acc s^-	$\Delta p^{s^{-}}$	Accuracy ↑	$\Delta Acc \ \downarrow$	$\Delta p \downarrow$
¥7'11.	clean	0.8572	0.0115	0.7171	0.0862	0.8232	0.2148	0.0747
vaiiiiia	corrupted	0.8457	0.0115	0.6309		0.7901		0.0747
FairDag	clean	0.6530	0.0215	0.6492	0.0588	0.6517	0.0/11	0.0272
FairReg	corrupted	0.6315	0.0215	0.5904		0.6217	0.0411	0.0373
Reweighed	clean	0.8527	0.0426	0.7156	0.0836	0.7983	0.1771	0.0400
	corrupted	0.8091	0.0450	0.6320		0.7662		0.0400
SAM	clean	0.8590	0.0000	0.7043	0.0666	0.8215	0.2123	0.0576
	corrupted	0.8500	0.0090	0.6377		0.7984		0.0370
GroupSAM	clean	0.8571	0.0074	0.7046	0.0524	0.8199	0.1095	0.0460
	corrupted	0.8497	0.0074	0.6512	0.0334	0.7809	0.1965	0.0400
FairSAM (Ours)	clean	0.8574	0.0200	0.7480	0.0499	0.8310	<u>0.1194</u>	0.0100
	corrupted	0.8175	0.0399	0.6981		<u>0.7885</u>		0.0100

Table 1. **Performance and fairness trade-off comparison on the CelebA Dataset.** The target attribute is "Big Nose" and the sensitive attribute is "Age". The corruption is set to level-3 snow noise. FairSAM achieves the best performance in terms of Δp , demonstrating superior fairness in accuracy degradation across subgroups. Additionally, it ranks second in ΔAcc while incurring the smallest accuracy drop compared to the vanilla accuracy, highlighting its ability to effectively balance robustness and fairness.

Methods	Test Data	Acc s^+	Δp^{s^+}	Acc s^-	$\Delta p^{s^{-}}$	Accuracy ↑	$\Delta Acc \ \downarrow$	$\Delta p \downarrow$
	clean	0.9769	0.0006	0.9318	0.1083	0.9493	0.1528	0 1077
vaiiiiia	corrupted	0.9763	0.0000	0.8235		0.8827		0.1077
EnirDag	clean	0.9442	0.0201	0.9532	0.1094	0.9387	0.1465	0.0912
FairReg	corrupted	0.9723	0.0281	0.8258		0.8824		0.0815
Reweighed	clean	0.9627	0.0074	0.9351	0.1056	0.9457	0.1406	0.1120
	corrupted	0.9701	0.0074	0.8295		0.8839		0.1150
SAM	clean	0.9797	0.0168	0.9363	0.0575	0.9531	0.0841	0.0407
	corrupted	0.9629		0.8788		0.9114		
GroupSAM	clean	0.9780	0.0004	0.9406	0.0468	0.9551	<u>0.0748</u>	0.0274
	corrupted	0.9686	0.0094	0.8938		0.9228		0.0574
FairSAM (Ours)	clean	0.9734	0.0202	0.9412	0.0275	0.9570	0.0205	0.0073
	corrupted	0.9532	0.0202	0.9137		0.9291	0.0395	0.0075

Table 2. **Performance and fairness trade-off comparison on the CelebA Dataset.** The target attribute is "Blond Hair" and the sensitive attribute is "Gender". The corruption is set to level-3 Gaussian noise. FairSAM demonstrates superior performance compared to all baseline methods, achieving higher accuracy while outperforming others on fairness metrics Δp and ΔAcc , showcasing its effectiveness in balancing robustness and fairness.

tently outperforms all baseline methods in terms of fairness across all noise levels. FairSAM maintains the lowest bias at each noise level while maintaining comparable accuracy, indicating a good trade-off between fairness and accuracy across subgroups under varied corruption conditions.

4.5. Out-of-distribution Generalization

To further assess the fairness-aware generalization capabilities of our method, we conduct an out-of-distribution experiment. This evaluation involves measuring the performance degradation difference between in-distribution and out-ofdistribution test data for each demographic subgroup, using a method similar to the *Corrupted Degradation Disparity* metric. This approach allows us to estimate the model's robustness and its ability to maintain fairness across diverse data sets. As shown in Tab. 4 and Tab. 5, the proposed Fair-SAM consistently demonstrates the lowest bias among the methods evaluated. In contrast, GroupSAM, by disregarding the loss landscape flatness for the advantaged group, risks shifting this group into a disadvantaged position, potentially creating new imbalances.

5. Related Works

5.1. Fairness in ML

Algorithmic fairness has emerged as a critical topic in machine learning, with increasing awareness of biases that disproportionately affect marginalized groups based on demo-

Methods	Test Data	Acc s^+	Δp^{s^+}	Acc s^-	$\Delta p^{s^{-}}$	Accuracy ↑	$\Delta p \downarrow$
Vanilla	clean	0.7396	0 1704	0.8296	0.2088	0.7800	0.0304
	corrupted	0.5692	0.1704	0.6288		0.5961	
SAM	clean	0.7727	0.1518	0.8781	0.1732	0.8201	0.0214
	corrupted	0.6209	0.1518	0.7049		<u>0.6885</u>	
GroupSAM	clean	0.7550	0 1252	0.8333	0 1 4 4 1	0.7904	<u>0.0188</u>
	corrupted	0.6297	0.1255	0.6892	0.1441	0.6563	
FairSAM	clean	0.7837	0 1467	0.9075	0 1530	0.8394	0.0072
	corrupted	0.6370	0.1407	0.7536	0.1339	0.6893	0.0072

Table 3. Performance and fairness trade-off comparison on the FairFace Dataset. The target attribute is "Gender" and the sensitive attribute is "Age". The corruption is set to level-5 Gaussian noise. FairSAM outperforms all baseline methods, achieving the highest accuracy and the best fairness as measured by Δp , demonstrating its effectiveness under severe corruption conditions.



Figure 2. Comparison of SAM-based methods among varying noise levels. FairSAM achieves comparable or even better accuracy while maintaining the lowest bias Δp .

graphic factors like gender, race, or age. In the context of image classification, these biases can manifest as unequal performance across subgroups, especially under challenging conditions like image corruption. Despite its importance, fairness in the presence of image corruption remains an underexplored area. This gap is significant, as machine learning models deployed in real-world environments frequently encounter corrupted data, which can amplify existing inequalities by disproportionately impacting certain demographic groups.

Existing research on fair machine learning focuses primarily on two objectives: (1) defining and identifying bias in machine learning models and (2) developing algorithms to effectively mitigate bias. Various fairness definitions have been proposed, with *statistical parity* being one of the most widely recognized. Statistical parity ensures that the likelihood of favorable outcomes remains similar across protected and non-protected groups. This can be quantified through metrics like *risk difference*, *risk ratio*, *relative change*, and *odds ratio* [23]. These metrics offer a structured approach to quantifying fairness, enabling researchers to assess and compare bias levels in model predictions effectively. Bias mitigation strategies fall into three main categories: pre-processing, in-processing, and postprocessing methods. *Pre-processing* techniques modify the training data to remove potential biases before model training. Examples include *Massaging* [10], *reweighing* [4], and *Preferential Sampling* [11], which adjust data distributions to promote fairness. In contrast, *in-processing* methods [3, 5, 12, 21] introduce fairness constraints or regularization terms directly into the model's objective function, ensuring that the learning algorithm prioritizes fairness alongside accuracy. Lastly, *post-processing* techniques [1, 7, 13] adjust model predictions after training to correct for any biases detected in model outputs.

Despite significant progress, most of these methods have not specifically addressed fairness issues arising from image corruption, where different groups may experience varying degrees of accuracy loss. This gap in the literature motivates our work as we seek to address both robustness and fairness under image corruption conditions, proposing a framework that ensures balanced performance across demographic subgroups.

5.2. Fairness and Robustness

Recent studies have introduced model attack methods specifically targeting fairness [17, 19, 20]. Specifically, Nanda et al. [18] showed different demographic subgroups

Method	Train \rightarrow Test	Acc s^+	Acc s^-	$\Delta p \downarrow$	
SAM	$CA \rightarrow CA$	0.8590	0.7043	0.0210	
	CA→LFW	0.5946	0.4189	0.0210	
GroupSAM	CA→CA	0.8570	0.7042	0 1965	
	CA→LFW	0.5363	0.5700	0.1805	
FairSAM	CA→CA	0.8575	0.7480	0.0100	
	CA→LFW	0.5341	0.4058	0.0100	

Table 4. Results of training on the CelebA (CA for abbr.) dataset and testing on the LFW dataset. Target attribute is "Big Nose" and the sensitive attribute is "Age". The proposed FairSAM outperform other method in terms of Δp .

have different levels of robustness, which can lead to unfairness. Additionally, Khani and Liang [15] analyze why noise in features can cause a disparity in error rates when learning a regression. We believe our work can take further steps to investigate robust fairness and provide a direction to mitigate this kind of bias.

5.3. SAM and its Variants

Sharpness-Aware Minimization[6] was introduced to improve neural network generalization by identifying flatter minima in the loss landscape. SAM achieves this by minimizing the maximum loss within a neighborhood around the current parameter setting rather than minimizing the loss at a single point. This approach results in solutions that are more resilient to small parameter perturbations, enhancing the model's generalization and robustness.

ImbSAM [22] extends SAM's applicability to settings with extremely imbalanced data distributions, addressing the trade-off between sharpness and data imbalance. By incorporating strategies to handle imbalance, ImbSAM enhances generalization for certain long-tail classes, offering robustness in challenging training scenarios. Adaptive Sharpness-Aware Pruning (AdaSAP) [2] advances SAM's concept by focusing on pruning models to enhance both compactness and robustness. AdaSAP employs adaptive weight perturbations to regularize pruned models, improving their resilience against corrupted data while maintaining efficient model size. However, none of these SAM variants specifically target fairness across demographic subgroups, particularly under image corruption.

Our work advances SAM in a novel direction, focusing on fairness and robustness to image corruption. We incorporate fairness mechanisms to ensure robust performance without sacrificing equity across sensitive demographic groups. This work addresses critical limitations in both SAM and its variants, bridging the gap between robustness and fairness in corrupted image classification.

Method	Train \rightarrow Test	Acc s^+	Acc s^-	$\Delta p \downarrow$	
SAM	LFW→LFW	0.7714	0.7687	0.1456	
	LFW→CA	0.6863	0.5380		
GroupSAM	LFW→LFW	0.7784	0.7963	0.1400	
	LFW→CA	0.6590	0.5270	0.1499	
FairSAM	LFW→LFW	0.7893	0.7984	0 1066	
	LFW→CA	0.6668	0.5511	0.1000	

Table 5. Results of training on the LFW dataset and testing on the CelebA (CA for abbr.) dataset. Target attribute is "Big Nose" and the sensitive attribute is "Age". The proposed FairSAM outperforms another method in terms of Δp .

6. Conclusion

In this work, we address the dual challenges of fairness and robustness in corrupted image classification. We introduce novel metrics for assessing performance degradation and promotion fairness in corrupted environments. Building on these metrics, we develop FairSAM, a new framework that effectively couples robustness and fairness to ensure equitable performance across demographic subgroups. Our experimental results across multiple datasets and corruption conditions demonstrate that FairSAM consistently outperforms baseline methods in balancing the trade-off between fairness and performance. By maintaining both robust performance and fairness across subgroups, FairSAM represents a significant step forward in creating machine learning models that are resilient and fair in real-world applications. In future work, we aim to explore more data corruption scenarios to further expand FairSAM's potential as a foundational framework for equitable and robust image classification.

References

- Pranjal Awasthi, Matthäus Kleindessner, and Jamie Morgenstern. Equalized odds postprocessing under imperfect group information. In *International conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 1770–1780. PMLR, 2020. 7
- [2] Anna Bair, Hongxu Yin, Maying Shen, Pavlo Molchanov, and Jose Alvarez. Adaptive sharpness-aware pruning for robust sparse networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14306, 2023. 8
- [3] Toon Calders and Sicco Verwer. Three naive bayes approaches for discrimination-free classification. *Data mining and knowledge discovery*, 21:277–292, 2010. 1, 7
- [4] Toon Calders, Faisal Kamiran, and Mykola Pechenizkiy. Building classifiers with independency constraints. In 2009 IEEE international conference on data mining workshops, pages 13–18. IEEE, 2009. 1, 7
- [5] Sam Corbett-Davies, Emma Pierson, Avi Feller, Sharad Goel, and Aziz Huq. Algorithmic decision making and the cost of fairness. In *Proceedings of the 23rd acm sigkdd inter-*

national conference on knowledge discovery and data mining, pages 797–806, 2017. 1, 7

- [6] Pierre Foret, Ariel Kleiner, Hossein Mobahi, and Behnam Neyshabur. Sharpness-aware minimization for efficiently improving generalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 1, 8
- [7] Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nati Srebro. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. Advances in neural information processing systems, 29, 2016. 7
- [8] Dan Hendrycks and Thomas Dietterich. Benchmarking neural network robustness to common corruptions and perturbations. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. 5
- [9] Gary B. Huang, Manu Ramesh, Tamara Berg, and Erik Learned-Miller. Labeled faces in the wild: A database for studying face recognition in unconstrained environments. Technical Report 07-49, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 2007. 4
- [10] Faisal Kamiran and Toon Calders. Classifying without discriminating. In 2009 2nd international conference on computer, control and communication, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2009.
 7
- [11] Faisal Kamiran and Toon Calders. Data preprocessing techniques for classification without discrimination. *Knowledge* and information systems, 33(1):1–33, 2012. 7
- [12] Faisal Kamiran, Toon Calders, and Mykola Pechenizkiy. Discrimination aware decision tree learning. In 2010 IEEE international conference on data mining, pages 869–874. IEEE, 2010. 1, 7
- [13] Faisal Kamiran, Asim Karim, and Xiangliang Zhang. Decision theory for discrimination-aware classification. In 2012 IEEE 12th international conference on data mining, pages 924–929. IEEE, 2012. 7
- [14] Kimmo Karkkainen and Jungseock Joo. Fairface: Face attribute dataset for balanced race, gender, and age for bias measurement and mitigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1548–1558, 2021. 4
- [15] Fereshte Khani and Percy Liang. Noise induces loss discrepancy across groups for linear regression. CoRR, abs/1911.09876, 2019. 8
- [16] Ziwei Liu, Ping Luo, Xiaogang Wang, and Xiaoou Tang. Deep learning face attributes in the wild. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2015.
- [17] Ninareh Mehrabi, Muhammad Naveed, Fred Morstatter, and Aram Galstyan. Exacerbating algorithmic bias through fairness attacks. In *Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2021, Thirty-Third Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2021, The Eleventh Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2021, Virtual Event, February 2-9, 2021,* pages 8930–8938. AAAI Press, 2021. 7
- [18] Vedant Nanda, Samuel Dooley, Sahil Singla, Soheil Feizi, and John P. Dickerson. Fairness through robustness: Investigating robustness disparity in deep learning. In FAccT '21: 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and

Transparency, Virtual Event / Toronto, Canada, March 3-10, 2021, pages 466–477. ACM, 2021. 1, 7

- [19] David Solans, Battista Biggio, and Carlos Castillo. Poisoning attacks on algorithmic fairness. In Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases - European Conference, ECML PKDD 2020, Ghent, Belgium, September 14-18, 2020, Proceedings, Part I, pages 162–177. Springer, 2020. 7
- [20] Minh-Hao Van, Wei Du, Xintao Wu, and Aidong Lu. Poisoning attacks on fair machine learning. In *Database Systems* for Advanced Applications - 27th International Conference, DASFAA 2022, Virtual Event, April 11-14, 2022, Proceedings, Part I, pages 370–386. Springer, 2022. 7
- [21] Muhammad Bilal Zafar, Isabel Valera, Manuel Gomez Rogriguez, and Krishna P Gummadi. Fairness constraints: Mechanisms for fair classification. In *Artificial intelligence* and statistics, pages 962–970. PMLR, 2017. 1, 7
- [22] Yixuan Zhou, Yi Qu, Xing Xu, and Hengtao Shen. Imbsam: A closer look at sharpness-aware minimization in classimbalanced recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11345– 11355, 2023. 4, 8
- [23] Indré Žliobaité. Measuring discrimination in algorithmic decision making. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 31 (4):1060–1089, 2017. 7