

Achieving Long-term Fairness in Sequential Decision Making (Technical Appendix)

Yaowei Hu, Lu Zhang

University of Arkansas
{yaoweihu, lz006}@uark.edu

Proof of Lemma 2

Lemma 1. *For any t , suppose that \mathbf{X}^{t+1} are c -sensitive, then distribution $P(\mathbf{X}^t | do(s_\pi, \theta))$ is ε -sensitive with $\varepsilon \leq 2mc(t-1)$, where m is the maximum ground distance between two values of \mathbf{X}^t .*

Proof. Let $D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta)$ denote probability $P(\mathbf{x}^t | do(s_\pi, \theta))$ and $D(\theta)$ denote the corresponding distribution. We adopt a simple greedy strategy to solve the transportation problem to obtain an upper bound of $W_1(D(\theta), D(\theta'))$. We transverse through each value of \mathbf{X}^t . For each \mathbf{x}^t , if the amount of dirt in $D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta)$ is larger than that of $D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta')$, then we move the additional dirt to a pool. If the amount of dirt in $D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta)$ is less than that of $D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta')$, then we insert this demand into a queue and move the dirt from the pool to $D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta)$ as soon as there is enough dirt in the pool. As a result, the total amount of dirt moved by this strategy is $\sum_{\mathbf{x}^t} |D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta) - D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta')|$. Thus, we have

$$W_1(D(\theta), D(\theta')) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x}^t} |D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta) - D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta')| \cdot m, \quad (1)$$

where m is maximum ground distance between two values of \mathbf{X}^t . Then, according to the mean value theorem and Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta) - D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta')| &= |\nabla D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\eta) \cdot (\theta - \theta')| \\ &\leq \|\nabla D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\eta)\| \|\theta - \theta'\| \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

for some $\eta \in [\theta, \theta']$. By definition of $D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta) &:= P(\mathbf{x}^t | do(s_\pi, \theta)) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}^1, Y^1, \dots, Y^{t-1}} P(\mathbf{x}^1 | s) P_\theta(y^1 | \mathbf{x}^1, s) \cdots P(\mathbf{x}^t | x^{t-1}, y^{t-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta) &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}^1, Y^1, \dots, Y^{t-1}} \{P(\mathbf{x}^1 | s) \nabla P_\theta(y^1 | \mathbf{x}^1, s) \cdots P(\mathbf{x}^t | x^{t-1}, y^{t-1}) \\ &+ P(\mathbf{x}^1 | s) P_\theta(y^1 | \mathbf{x}^1, s) P(\mathbf{x}^2 | \mathbf{x}^1, y^1) \nabla P_\theta(y^2 | \mathbf{x}^2, s) \cdots \\ &+ \cdots \} \end{aligned}$$

Copyright © 2022, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.

According to the definition of c -sensitivity, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{Y^t} \nabla_\theta P_\theta(y^t | \mathbf{x}^t, s) P(\mathbf{x}^{t+1} | \mathbf{x}^t, y^t) \right\| \leq c \sum_{Y^t} P(\mathbf{x}^{t+1} | \mathbf{x}^t, y^t).$$

By the triangle inequality, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla D_{\mathbf{x}^t}(\theta)\| &\leq \sum_{\mathbf{x}^1, Y^1, \dots, Y^{t-1}} \{P(\mathbf{x}^1 | s) c P(\mathbf{x}^2 | \mathbf{x}^1, y^1) \cdots P(\mathbf{x}^t | x^{t-1}, y^{t-1}) \\ &+ P(\mathbf{x}^1 | s) P_\theta(y^1 | \mathbf{x}^1, s) P(\mathbf{x}^2 | \mathbf{x}^1, y^1) c P(\mathbf{x}^3 | \mathbf{x}^2, y^2) \cdots \\ &+ \cdots \} \\ &= c \sum_{\mathbf{x}^1, Y^1, \dots, Y^{t-1}} \{P(\mathbf{x}^1, \mathbf{x}^2, \dots, \mathbf{x}^t | do(y^1)) \\ &+ P(\mathbf{x}^1, y^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^t | do(y^2)) + \cdots \} \\ &= c \left\{ \sum_{Y^1} P_\theta(\mathbf{x}^t | do(s, y^1)) + \cdots + \sum_{Y^{t-1}} P_\theta(\mathbf{x}^t | do(s, y^{t-1})) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the second step is based on the truncated factorization formula of computing the do -operation. Combining Eqs. (1), (2), and (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(D(\theta), D(\theta')) &\leq mc \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \left\{ \sum_{Y^1} P_\eta(\mathbf{x}^t | do(s, y^1)) + \cdots + \sum_{Y^{t-1}} P_\eta(\mathbf{x}^t | do(s, y^{t-1})) \right\} \|\theta - \theta'\| \\ &= 2mc(t-1) \|\theta - \theta'\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the lemma is proven. \square

Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 1. *Suppose that surrogated loss function $(\phi \circ h)(\cdot)$ is β -jointly smooth and γ -strongly convex, and suppose that \mathbf{X}^{t+1} are c -sensitive for any t , then the repeated risk minimization converges to a stable point at a linear rate, if $2mc(t^* - 1) < \frac{\beta}{\gamma}$.*

Proof. This proof basically follows the proof of Theorem 3.5 in (Perdomo et al. 2020).

Fix $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$. Let

$$f_a(\varphi) = \sum_{t=1}^{t^*} \mathbb{E}_{S, \mathbf{X}^t, Y^t \sim P(S, \mathbf{X}^t, Y^t)} [\phi(Y^t h_\varphi(\mathbf{X}^t, S))],$$

$$f_l(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}^{t^*} \sim P(\mathbf{X}^{t^*} | do(s_+^*, \theta))} [\phi(-h_\varphi(\mathbf{X}^{t^*}, s^-))] \right. \\ \left. + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}^{t^*} \sim P(\mathbf{X}^{t^*} | do(s_-^*, \theta))} [\phi(h_\varphi(\mathbf{X}^{t^*}, s^-))] - 1 \right\},$$

$$f_s(\varphi) = \frac{1}{t^*} \sum_{t=1}^{t^*} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}^t \sim P(\mathbf{X}^t | do(s_+^*, \theta))} [\phi(-h_\varphi(\mathbf{X}^t, s^-))] \right. \\ \left. + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}^t \sim P(\mathbf{X}^t | do(s_-^*, \theta))} [\phi(h_\varphi(\mathbf{X}^t, s^-))] - 1 \right\},$$

and

$$f(\varphi) = \lambda_a f_a(\varphi) + \lambda_l f_l(\varphi) + \lambda_s f_s(\varphi).$$

Define $f'(\varphi)$ similarly to $f(\varphi)$ by replacing θ with θ' . Let $G(\theta) = \operatorname{argmin}_\varphi f(\varphi)$. Since $(\phi \circ h)(\cdot)$ is γ -strongly convex, $f(\cdot)$ is at least γ -strongly convex. Then, we have

$$f(G(\theta)) - f(G(\theta')) \\ \geq (G(\theta) - G(\theta'))^\top \nabla f(G(\theta')) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|G(\theta) - G(\theta')\|_2^2, \\ f(G(\theta')) - f(G(\theta)) \geq \frac{\gamma}{2} \|G(\theta) - G(\theta')\|_2^2.$$

Combining the two inequalities we have

$$-\gamma \|G(\theta) - G(\theta')\|_2^2 \geq (G(\theta) - G(\theta'))^\top \nabla f(G(\theta')). \quad (4)$$

On the other hand, since $(\phi \circ h)(\cdot)$ is β -jointly smooth, by applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have that $(G(\theta) - G(\theta'))^\top \nabla \phi(h_{G(\theta')}(\mathbf{x}^{t^*}, s))$ is $\|G(\theta) - G(\theta')\|_2 \beta$ -Lipschitz. Using the dual formulation of the optimal transport distance and Lemma 1, we have

$$(G(\theta) - G(\theta'))^\top \nabla f_l(G(\theta')) - (G(\theta) - G(\theta'))^\top \nabla f'_l(G(\theta')) \\ \geq -\varepsilon \beta \|G(\theta) - G(\theta')\|_2 \|\theta - \theta'\|_2,$$

$$(G(\theta) - G(\theta'))^\top \nabla f_s(G(\theta')) - (G(\theta) - G(\theta'))^\top \nabla f'_s(G(\theta')) \\ \geq -\varepsilon \beta \|G(\theta) - G(\theta')\|_2 \|\theta - \theta'\|_2,$$

where $\varepsilon = 2mc(t^* - 1)$. In addition, we have

$$(G(\theta) - G(\theta'))^\top \nabla f_a(G(\theta')) - (G(\theta) - G(\theta'))^\top \nabla f'_a(G(\theta')) = 0$$

Adding up above three (in)equalities, we have

$$(G(\theta) - G(\theta'))^\top \nabla f(G(\theta')) - (G(\theta) - G(\theta'))^\top \nabla f'(G(\theta')) \\ \geq -\varepsilon \beta \|G(\theta) - G(\theta')\|_2 \|\theta - \theta'\|_2.$$

Due to the first-order optimality conditions for convex functions, it follows that

$$(G(\theta) - G(\theta'))^\top \nabla f(G(\theta')) \geq -\varepsilon \beta \|G(\theta) - G(\theta')\|_2 \|\theta - \theta'\|_2. \quad (5)$$

Combining Eqs. (4) and (5), we have

$$-\gamma \|G(\theta) - G(\theta')\|_2^2 \geq -\varepsilon \beta \|G(\theta) - G(\theta')\|_2 \|\theta - \theta'\|_2.$$

By rearranging, we have

$$\|G(\theta) - G(\theta')\|_2 \leq \varepsilon \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \|\theta - \theta'\|_2.$$

Let θ_{PS} be a stable point, i.e., $G(\theta_{\text{PS}}) = \theta_{\text{PS}}$. In addition, by definition we have $\theta_i = G(\theta_{i-1})$. Thus, it follows that

$$\|\theta_i - \theta_{\text{PS}}\| \leq \varepsilon \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \|\theta_{i-1} - \theta_{\text{PS}}\| \leq \left(\varepsilon \frac{\beta}{\gamma}\right)^i \|\theta_0 - \theta_{\text{PS}}\|.$$

Therefore, if $\varepsilon = 2mc(t^* - 1) < \frac{\beta}{\gamma}$, the RRM converge to θ_{PS} at a linear rate.

Hence, the theorem is proven. \square

References

Perdomo, J.; Zrnic, T.; Mendler-Dünner, C.; and Hardt, M. 2020. Performative prediction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 7599–7609. PMLR.