

# Fair Recommendations with Limited Sensitive Attributes: A Distributionally Robust Optimization Approach

Tianhao Shi  
University of Science and Technology  
of China  
Hefei, China  
sth@mail.ustc.edu.cn

Yang Zhang\*  
University of Science and Technology  
of China  
Hefei, China  
zyang1580@gmail.com

Jizhi Zhang  
University of Science and Technology  
of China  
Hefei, China  
cdzhangjizhi@mail.ustc.edu.cn

Fuli Feng\*  
University of Science and Technology  
of China  
Hefei, China  
fulifeng93@gmail.com

Xiangnan He  
University of Science and Technology  
of China  
Hefei, China  
xiangnanhe@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

As recommender systems are indispensable in various domains such as job searching and e-commerce, providing equitable recommendations to users with different sensitive attributes becomes an imperative requirement. Prior approaches for enhancing fairness in recommender systems presume the availability of all sensitive attributes, which can be difficult to obtain due to privacy concerns or inadequate means of capturing these attributes. In practice, the efficacy of these approaches is limited, pushing us to investigate ways of promoting fairness with limited sensitive attribute information.

Toward this goal, it is important to reconstruct missing sensitive attributes. Nevertheless, reconstruction errors are inevitable due to the complexity of real-world sensitive attribute reconstruction problems and legal regulations. Thus, we pursue fair learning methods that are robust to reconstruction errors. To this end, we propose *Distributionally Robust Fair Optimization* (DRFO), which minimizes the worst-case unfairness over all potential probability distributions of missing sensitive attributes instead of the reconstructed one to account for the impact of the reconstruction errors. We provide theoretical and empirical evidence to demonstrate that our method can effectively ensure fairness in recommender systems when only limited sensitive attributes are accessible.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• Information systems → Recommender systems.

## KEYWORDS

Group Fairness, Recommender System, Distributionally Robust Optimization, Partial Fairness

\*Corresponding authors.

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

SIGIR '24, July 14–18, 2024, Washington, DC, USA

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

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0431-4/24/07

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657822>

## ACM Reference Format:

Tianhao Shi, Yang Zhang, Jizhi Zhang, Fuli Feng, and Xiangnan He. 2024. Fair Recommendations with Limited Sensitive Attributes: A Distributionally Robust Optimization Approach. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '24)*, July 14–18, 2024, Washington, DC, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657822>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Recommender system has become a vital technology in various Web applications, including job searching [20], online advertising [39], and e-commerce [33]. By providing personalized information filtering based on user interests, recommender systems have significant social influence [44]. Unfair recommendations that discriminate against specific user groups [35] would negatively impact the Web and society. For instance, previous research [20] on job recommendations found that women were exposed to fewer advertisements for high-paying jobs and career coaching services compared to men, perpetuating gender pay gap in the workforce. Clearly, it is of paramount importance to maintain fairness in recommender systems to ensure their trustworthiness and regulatory compliance [32].

The existing research to optimize the fairness of recommendations can be further classified into four main categories:

- Data-oriented methods [6, 30], which adjusts the training data according to sensitive attributes by resampling [6] and adding antidote data [30], etc.
- Adversarial learning-based methods [39, 45], which learn fair representations with a min-max game to prevent encoding of sensitive attributes in user embeddings or graph structures.
- Regularization-based methods [16, 24, 41, 47], which incorporate fairness metrics such as absolute difference in utility between groups with different sensitive attributes into the objective function [16, 41, 47] or the reward function [24].
- Re-ranking methods [22, 40], which directly adjusts recommendation results to enhance fairness across user groups with different sensitive attributes.

We contend that the current methods are significantly constrained by their reliance on full access to sensitive attributes [35], a condition that is often difficult to satisfy in real-world scenarios. Firstly, users have the entitlement, as per regulatory frameworks

like the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [32] of the European Union, to decline the disclosure of their sensitive data at any moment. For instance, only 17% of participants reported willing of sharing their income information in electronic commerce [1]. Moreover, many online retail and advertising recommendations can be accessed without registering or submitting personal information [33]. Consequently, a conundrum emerges: how can fair recommendation be obtained when only limited sensitive attributes are available [35]?

To address this issue, a default choice is reconstructing the missing sensitive attributes of users from the available personal information such as historical interactions [25]. However, reconstruction errors are inevitable due to the inherent complexity and noise of user information in recommender systems. Moreover, striving for perfectly reconstructed attributes can potentially violate user privacy, raising ethical concerns and being constrained by legal limitations. For instance, GDPR [32] mandates obtaining user consent for modeling user profiles (including sensitive attributes). Consequently, a subset of users may not have their sensitive attributes reconstructed<sup>1</sup>. The aforementioned challenges underscore the significance of devising alternative approaches that are robust to the reconstruction errors of sensitive attributes.

To this end, we propose a new framework to pursue fair recommendations under reconstructed sensitive attributes with errors called *Distributionally Robust Fair Optimization* (DRFO). Instead of optimizing fairness over the reconstructed sensitive attributes, DRFO minimizes the worst-case unfairness over an ambiguity set of all potential distributions of missing sensitive attributes to account for the impact of reconstruction errors. Furthermore, for users who forbid the reconstruction of their sensitive attributes, DRFO can provide fair recommendations for them by considering a larger ambiguity set of distributions. We theoretically demonstrate that DRFO ensures recommendation fairness in the face of sensitive attribute reconstruction errors, even in the absence of such reconstruction. Extensive experiments on two datasets verify the effectiveness of our approaches.

The main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a new framework for optimizing the user-side fairness in recommender systems with limited sensitive attributes.
- We provide theoretical evidence that our method can ensure fair recommendations in the face of sensitive attribute reconstruction errors, even in the absence of such reconstruction.
- We conduct extensive experiments on two datasets, validating the rationality and effectiveness of the proposed framework.

## 2 PRELIMINARIES

In this study, we aim to achieve fairness in recommender systems with limited sensitive attributes. We consider the widely used Demographic Parity (DP) as an exemplary fairness criterion to investigate this problem. In the following, we first introduce the notation used in this paper and then provide a brief overview of DP fairness.

### 2.1 Notation

In this study, we use uppercase letters (e.g.,  $R$ ) to represent random variables, lowercase letters (e.g.,  $r$ ) for specific values of these

variables, and calligraphic fonts (e.g.,  $\mathcal{R}$ ) to represent the sample space of the variable. Let  $U$ ,  $V$ ,  $S$ , and  $R$  denote the user, item, user sensitive attribute, and rating, respectively. Let  $\mathcal{D}$  denote the historical data. Each sample within  $\mathcal{D}$  is denoted as  $(u, v, s, r)$ , where  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ , and  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . In this work, we consider the binary rating, i.e.,  $\mathcal{R} = \{0, 1\}$ . Additionally, we assume the sensitive feature to be binary but potentially unknown for a subset of users. We split  $\mathcal{D}$  into two parts:  $\mathcal{D}_k$  with *known* sensitive features and  $\mathcal{D}_m$  with *missing* sensitive features, and we have  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_k \cup \mathcal{D}_m$  and  $\mathcal{D}_k \cap \mathcal{D}_m = \emptyset$ . For convenience, we denote the samples in  $\mathcal{D}$  with the sensitive feature  $S = s$  as  $\mathcal{D}^{(s)}$ , similar for  $\mathcal{D}_k^{(s)}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_m^{(s)}$ .

### 2.2 Fairness

*Demographic Parity* [5] is a widely studied fairness criterion in recommendation [16, 47]. DP's definition is the model's rating prediction  $\hat{R}$  should be independent of the sensitive attribute  $S$ . A model achieving DP fairness would generate recommendations without relying on  $S$ , thereby satisfying legal requirements or user demands against discrimination on model output [16]. We follow previous work [47] to quantify DP with the mean absolute difference (MAD) between ratings of different groups:

$$|\mathbb{E}[\hat{R}|S=0] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{R}|S=1]|, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{R}|S=0]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{R}|S=1]$  denote the expectation of prediction  $\hat{R}$  over groups with  $S=0$  and  $S=1$ , respectively. A diminished MAD level signifies a heightened degree of DP fairness.

**Fair learning.** To achieve DP fairness, we could take the regularization-based method [41], which directly incorporates the MAD metric into the training objective. Formally,

$$\min_{\theta} L(\theta) + \lambda |\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{(0)}}[\hat{R}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{(1)}}[\hat{R}]|, \quad (2)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a hyper-parameter to control the strength of the fairness regularization term,  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{(s)}}[\hat{R}]$  is the average predicted rating over  $\mathcal{D}^{(s)}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{(s)}}[\hat{R}] = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}^{(s)}|} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{D}^{(s)}} \hat{r}_{u,v}$ , and  $L(\theta)$  is a recommendation loss (e.g., binary cross-entropy loss [12]).

Typically, the regularization can be transformed into a set of constraints that minimize the discrepancy between the average predictions of a specific group and the overall predictions,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\theta} \quad & L(\theta) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{(s)}}[\hat{R}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\hat{R}] = 0, \quad s = 0, 1, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the constraint ensures the expected predicted rating in  $\mathcal{D}^{(s)}$  is equal to the expected predicted rating in the entire dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ . Preserving any single constraint in Equation (3) is sufficient to promote fairness under the binary-sensitive attribute scenario while preserving multiple constraints is intended for non-binary cases.

## 3 METHODOLOGY

To build a fair recommender system that addresses the challenge of missing sensitive attributes among some users, a seemingly workable solution is to directly apply Fair Learning with Reconstructed Sensitive Attributes (FLrSA). In this section, we outline this solution and highlight its limitations. Subsequently, we introduce the proposed Distributionally Robust Fairness Optimization to overcome the impact of reconstruction errors. Finally, we discuss the extension of DRFO for situations where certain users are reluctant to have their sensitive attributes reconstructed.

<sup>1</sup>This can also be regarded as a special scenario with significant reconstruction errors.

### 3.1 FLrSA

To achieve fair recommendations in the presence of missing sensitive attributes, a seemingly workable solution involves reconstructing the missing attributes and subsequently applying fair learning methods based on the reconstructed sensitive attributes. Specifically, we can follow the two steps below:

*Step 1: Sensitive attribute reconstruction.* Previous research has shown that user sensitive attributes can be reconstructed using available user information, such as historical interactions [33, 36] and zip codes [7]. Therefore, we can train a classifier over  $\mathcal{D}_k$  to predict missing user sensitive attributes in  $\mathcal{D}_m$ . Let  $\hat{S} \in \{0, 1\}$  denote the reconstructed sensitive attribute. Subsequently, we can incorporate the reconstructed sensitive attributes into  $\mathcal{D}_m$  and generate a new dataset  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m$ .

*Step 2: Fair learning.* Next, we perform fair learning over  $\mathcal{D}_k$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m$  based on Equation (3), which is reformulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\theta} L(\theta) \\ \text{s.t. } & \eta_k^{(s)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k^{(s)}}[\hat{R}] + \eta_m^{(s)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m^{(s)}}[\hat{R}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\hat{R}] = 0, s = 0, 1, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m^{(s)}$  is a subset of  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m$  with the reconstructed attribute  $\hat{S} = s$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k^{(s)}}[\hat{R}]$  is the average predicted rating over  $\mathcal{D}_k^{(s)}$ , and:


$$\eta_k^{(s)} = \frac{|\mathcal{D}_k^{(s)}|}{|\mathcal{D}_k^{(s)}| + |\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m^{(s)}|}, \eta_m^{(s)} = \frac{|\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m^{(s)}|}{|\mathcal{D}_k^{(s)}| + |\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m^{(s)}|}. \quad (5)$$

**Limitations.** This method relies on the accuracy of sensitive attribute reconstruction. However, achieving an entirely accurate classifier poses challenges due to the inherent complexity and noise of user information in recommender systems. This leads to reconstruction errors, which could compromise the fairness of recommendations for some users. Furthermore, this method relies on the permission of sensitive attribute reconstruction from users, which may not be achievable for all users due to legal restrictions.

### 3.2 DRFO

Reconstruction errors significantly constrain the vanilla FLrSA, as they introduce a discrepancy between the reconstructed and the unknown true distribution concerning sensitive attributes. Consequently, relying solely on the reconstructed distribution may compromise fairness performance. Nevertheless, the unknown true distribution lies within the proximity of the reconstructed distribution. By ensuring fairness in the vicinity of the reconstructed distribution, the model could achieve robust fairness for the unknown true distribution [34]. This inspires the development of DRFO, a novel approach to fairness with limited sensitive attributes. DRFO has two main parts: 1) building the ambiguity set which encompasses the unknown true distribution based on the reconstructed sensitive attributes, and 2) ensuring fairness within the entire ambiguity set using DRO. Figure 1 provides an overview of DRFO. For our discussion convenience, we assume that all users grant permission for the reconstruction of sensitive attributes in this subsection. The scenario where some users do not permit reconstruction due to privacy concerns will be discussed in Section 3.3.

**Building ambiguity set.** An ambiguity set is a set of distributions centered around the reconstructed distribution. We denote the ambiguity set as  $\mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)}) = \{\tilde{Q}^{(s)} | \text{dist}(\tilde{Q}^{(s)}, \hat{Q}^{(s)}) \leq \rho_s\}$ , where  $\hat{Q}^{(s)}$



**Figure 1: Illustration of FLrSA and DRFO for providing fair recommendations with limited sensitive attributes. After the reconstruction of unknown sensitive attributes, the FLrSA directly applies fair learning with the reconstructed distribution. Conversely, DRFO builds an ambiguity set that encompasses the unknown true distribution and guarantees fairness across the entire ambiguity set.**

denotes the reconstructed distribution,  $\text{dist}(\cdot)$  denotes a distance metric, and  $\rho_s$  denotes robust radius. By setting an appropriate value  $\rho_s$ , we can ensure that this set encompasses the unknown true distribution  $Q^{(s)}$ . In the context of facilitating fair learning, as expressed in Equation (4) involving  $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m^{(s)}}[\hat{R}(U, V)]$ , our method focuses on building an ambiguity set of joint distributions  $(U, V)$  conditioned on a specific sensitive attribute value  $s$ . Specifically, we assume that the distribution of  $(U, V)$  conditioned on  $S=s$  follows  $Q^{(s)}$ . And we represent the joint distribution of  $(U, V)$  conditioned on the reconstructed sensitive attribute  $\hat{S}=s$  as  $\hat{Q}^{(s)}$ .

**Robust fair learning.** Robust learning solves an optimization problem that satisfies the fairness constraints in  $\mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)})$  as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\theta} L(\theta) \\ \text{s.t. } & \eta_k^{(s)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k^{(s)}}[\hat{R}] + \eta_m^{(s)} \mathbb{E}_{(U, V) \sim \tilde{Q}^{(s)}}[\hat{R}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\hat{R}] = 0, \quad (6) \\ & \forall \tilde{Q}^{(s)} \in \mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)}), s = 0, 1, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{(U, V) \sim \tilde{Q}^{(s)}}[\hat{R}]$  denotes the expectation of  $\hat{R}$  under the distribution  $\tilde{Q}^{(s)}$ . Here, we transform the fairness constraints in Equation (4) from solely relying on the reconstructed distribution to guaranteeing fairness across the entire ambiguity set<sup>2</sup>. In this way, as long as the ambiguity set encompasses the unknown true distribution, we can achieve robust fairness.

Apparently, the key of DRFO lies in 1) building an appropriate ambiguity set which encompasses the unknown true distribution, and 2) solving the optimization problem in Equation (6). Next, we elaborate how to achieve them.

**3.2.1 Building Ambiguity Set.** We now consider establishing an appropriate ambiguity set  $\mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)})$  that encompasses the unknown true distribution  $Q^{(s)}$ . However, direct estimation of the exact distance between  $Q^{(s)}$  and the reconstructed distribution

<sup>2</sup>We do not directly solve the optimization problem under these equality constraints in Equation (6). Instead, we convert it into an optimization of the worst-case scenario problem, as expressed in Equation (11).

$\hat{Q}^{(s)}$  is impossible as true sensitive attributes are unavailable. Instead, we estimate an upper bound on the distance between them. Similar to previous work [34], using the Total Variation (TV) distance [21] ( $TV \in [0, 1]$ , Appendix A.1) as the distance metric, we could estimate an upper bound based on the error rate of sensitive attribute reconstruction. This is described in the following theorem.

**THEOREM 1.** *Assuming that the reconstructed sensitive attributes  $\hat{S}$  have the same prior distribution as the true sensitive attributes  $S$ , i.e.,  $P(\hat{S}) = P(S)$ , the TV distance between  $Q^{(s)}$  and  $\hat{Q}^{(s)}$  is upper-bounded by the probability of incorrectly reconstructing the sensitive attributes, i.e.,  $TV(Q^{(s)}, \hat{Q}^{(s)}) \leq P(S \neq \hat{S} | S = s)$ .*

The proof is provided in Appendix A.1. This theorem suggests that, assuming the distribution of the reconstructed sensitive attributes  $\hat{S}$  is identical to the true distribution of  $S^3$ , we can create the ambiguity set  $\mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)})$  as follows:

$$\mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)}) = \left\{ \tilde{Q}^{(s)} \mid TV(\tilde{Q}^{(s)}, \hat{Q}^{(s)}) \leq \rho_s, \rho_s = P(S \neq \hat{S} | S = s) \right\}, \quad (7)$$

where  $\rho_s$  can be approximately estimated using the validation set<sup>4</sup>, following existing works [34]. This ambiguity set encompasses the true distribution  $Q^{(s)}$ , meaning that we successfully build the target ambiguity set with  $\hat{Q}^{(s)}$  and  $\rho_s$ .

**3.2.2 Robust Fair Learning.** We next consider solving the optimization problem in Equation (6). Following [13, 28], we convert it into an empirical form (i.e., representing it using the empirical distribution), enabling us to optimize it in a data-driven manner. Meanwhile, to tackle the challenges posed by the complexity of solving the constrained optimization problem, we transform it into a solvable Lagrangian problem with the algorithm proposed in [27].

**Empirical form.** To solve Equation (6) with learning methods, the key step involves using  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m$  to estimate  $\mathbb{E}_{(U,V) \sim \tilde{Q}^{(s)}} [\hat{R}]$ . Denote the empirical estimation as  $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Q}^{(s)}, \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m} [\hat{R}]$ , we can obtain the empirical form of the optimization problem as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\theta} L(\theta) \\ \text{s.t. } & \eta_k^{(s)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k^{(s)}} [\hat{R}] + \eta_m^{(s)} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Q}^{(s)}, \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m} [\hat{R}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} [\hat{R}] = 0, \\ & \forall \tilde{Q}^{(s)} \in \mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)}), s = 0, 1, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $\hat{Q}^{(s)}, \tilde{Q}^{(s)}$  are also converted into empirical distributions [4].  $\hat{Q}^{(s)} = \{\hat{q}_{u,v}^{(s)} \mid (u, v, \hat{s}) \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m\}$ , where  $\hat{q}_{u,v}^{(s)}$  denotes the probability weight for the sample  $(u, v, \hat{s}) \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m$  and  $\hat{q}_{u,v}^{(s)} = 1/|\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m^{(s)}|$  if  $\hat{s} = s$  else  $\hat{q}_{u,v}^{(s)} = 0$ ; similarly, we have  $\tilde{Q}^{(s)} = \{\tilde{q}_{u,v}^{(s)} \mid (u, v, \hat{s}) \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m\}$ ;  $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Q}^{(s)}, \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m} [\hat{R}]$  represents the empirical expectation of  $\hat{R}$  in  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m$  under the distribution  $\tilde{Q}^{(s)}$ , and  $\mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)})$  denotes the empirical form of ambiguity set defined in Equation (7), formally, we have:

• The empirical expectation of  $\hat{R}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Q}^{(s)}, \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m} [\hat{R}]$ :

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Q}^{(s)}, \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m} [\hat{R}] = \sum_{(u,v) \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m} \tilde{q}_{u,v}^{(s)} \cdot \hat{r}_{u,v}; \quad (9)$$

<sup>3</sup>If the assumption is violated, a more lenient TV distance upper bound estimation is needed (further discussed in Appendix A.1). In our experiments, as the observed commendable accuracy in reconstructing sensitive attributes leads to a modest disparity between  $P(S)$  and  $P(\hat{S})$ , we approximate the assumption holds true here.

<sup>4</sup>In practice, by assessing the difference between the validation and test sets and incorporating it with the error rate of the validation set, we can set an upper bound on the reconstruction of sensitive attribute errors, thus enabling estimation of  $\rho_s$ .

---

### Algorithm 1: DRFO

---

**Input:** Dataset with known sensitive attributes  $\mathcal{D}_k$ , dataset with unknown sensitive attributes  $\mathcal{D}_m$ .  
Hyper-parameters  $\lambda_s$ , and learning rate  $\alpha_\theta$  for  $\theta$ , learning rate  $\alpha_q$  for  $\tilde{Q}^{(s)}$  ( $s = 0, 1$ ).

- 1 Random split  $\mathcal{D}_k$  into training and validation sets, and train a sensitive attribute classifier;
- 2 Reconstruct sensitive attributes  $\hat{S}$  for  $\mathcal{D}_m$ , getting  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m$ , and for each sample  $(u, v) \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m$ , compute  $\hat{q}_{u,v}^{(s)} (= 1/|\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m|$  if  $\hat{S} = s$  else 0), obtaining  $\hat{Q}^{(s)} = \{\hat{q}_{u,v}^{(s)} \mid (u, v) \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m\}$ ;
- 3 Estimate  $\rho_s \approx P(S \neq \hat{S} | S = s)$  with the validation set held out by  $\mathcal{D}_k$ ;
- 4 **for**  $t = 1, \dots, T$  **do**
- 5     Update  $\theta$  using gradient descent:  
 $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \alpha_\theta \nabla_\theta L(\theta) - \sum_{s=0}^1 \lambda_s \alpha_\theta \nabla_\theta L_s(\theta, \tilde{Q}^{(s)})$ ;
- 6     **for**  $s = 0, 1$  **do**
- 7         Update  $\tilde{Q}^{(s)}$  using gradient ascent:  
 $\tilde{Q}^{(s)} \leftarrow \tilde{Q}^{(s)} + \sum_{s=0}^1 \lambda_s \alpha_q \nabla_{\tilde{Q}^{(s)}} L_s(\theta, \tilde{Q}^{(s)})$ ;
- 8         Project  $\tilde{Q}^{(s)}$  onto  $\mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)})$ ;
- 9     **end**
- 10 **end**

---

• The empirical form of ambiguity set  $\mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)})$ :

$$\mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)}) = \left\{ \tilde{Q}^{(s)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m|} : \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(u,v) \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m} \left| \tilde{q}_{u,v}^{(s)} - \hat{q}_{u,v}^{(s)} \right| \leq \rho_s, \sum_{(u,v) \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m} \tilde{q}_{u,v}^{(s)} = 1, \tilde{q}_{u,v}^{(s)} \geq 0 \right\}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{(u,v) \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m} \left| \tilde{q}_{u,v}^{(s)} - \hat{q}_{u,v}^{(s)} \right| \leq \rho_s$  represents the empirical implementation of the constraint  $TV(\tilde{Q}^{(s)}, \hat{Q}^{(s)}) \leq \rho_s$  (Equation (14) in Appendix A.1),  $\sum_{(u,v) \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m} \tilde{q}_{u,v}^{(s)} = 1$  and  $\tilde{q}_{u,v}^{(s)} \geq 0$  are used to ensure that the empirical distribution  $\tilde{Q}^{(s)}$  represents a valid probability distribution.

**Empirical Lagrangian form.** The optimization problem in Equation (8) is difficult to solve because it involves fairness constraints for all potential distributions  $\tilde{Q}^{(s)}$  in  $\mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)})$ . To overcome this challenge, we convert the fairness constraints into regularizers and optimize the worst-case unfairness within  $\mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)})$  to ensure fairness for the entire set [11]. Finally, we reformulate Equation (8) as a min-max optimization problem, given by:

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{\tilde{Q}^{(s)} \in \mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)}), s=0,1} L(\theta) + \sum_s \lambda_s L_s(\theta, \tilde{Q}^{(s)}), \quad (11)$$

where  $\lambda_s$  is the hyper-parameter to control the strength of the fairness regularizer  $L_s(\theta, \tilde{Q}^{(s)})$  obtained via Lagrangian trick:

$$L_s(\theta, \tilde{Q}^{(s)}) = \left| \eta_k^{(s)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k^{(s)}} [\hat{R}] + \eta_m^{(s)} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Q}^{(s)}, \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m} [\hat{R}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} [\hat{R}] \right|. \quad (12)$$

Here,  $\tilde{Q}^{(s)}$  becomes learnable parameters. We update it in  $\mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)})$  via ‘max’ optimization to find the worst case for fairness.

**Learning algorithm.** To solve the optimization problem in Equation (11), we use the algorithm in [27] for solving DRO, which is summarized in Algorithm 1. At each iteration of the algorithm, we first update the model parameters  $\theta$  to minimize the total loss in Equation (11) (line 5). Then, for each sensitive attribute value  $s \in \{0, 1\}$ , we update  $\hat{Q}^{(s)}$  to maximize the fairness-related loss  $L_s(\theta, \hat{Q}^{(s)})$  in Equation (11) (line 7), and project the updated result onto  $\mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}^{(s)})$  (line 8, avoiding  $\hat{Q}^{(s)}$  beyond the set) to obtain the final  $\hat{Q}^{(s)}$  for that iteration.

### 3.3 Discussion

We now discuss the extension of DRFO for situations where certain users are not willing to reconstruct their sensitive attributes. The main challenge lies in the inability to reconstruct sensitive attributes, which is essential for building the ambiguity set in DRFO. However, even with a random distribution, we can build a broad ambiguity set that covers the true distribution of these users by using a large robust radius. Thereafter, by optimizing the worst-case unfairness with the broad ambiguity set, we could still achieve fairness. Let  $\mathcal{D}_b$  denote the interaction data of such users. To implement this approach, we first *randomly* assign sensitive attributes for users in  $\mathcal{D}_b$ , serving as reconstructed sensitive attribute  $\hat{S}$  in DRFO and obtaining  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_b$ . Then, we define empirical  $\hat{Q}_b^{(s)}, \tilde{Q}_b^{(s)}$ , and  $\mathbb{B}(\rho'_s; \hat{Q}_b^{(s)})$  for  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_b$ , referring to those of  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m$ . To build the broad ambiguity set, we set the robust radius  $\rho'_s$  to 1. For users with missing sensitive attributes and permitting reconstruction, we use  $\mathcal{D}_r$  to denote their interactions ( $\mathcal{D}_r \cup \mathcal{D}_b = \mathcal{D}_m, \mathcal{D}_r \cap \mathcal{D}_b = \emptyset$ ). Then we define  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_r, \hat{Q}_r^{(s)}, \tilde{Q}_r^{(s)}$ , and  $\mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}_r^{(s)})$  for  $\mathcal{D}_r$  in the same way as that of  $\mathcal{D}_m$  described in Section 3.2. Finally, we could optimize the fairness for  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_b$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_r$  in a similar way to  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_m$  using DRO. Adding such optimization parts into Equation (8), we obtain the final optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\theta} \max_{\substack{\hat{Q}_r^{(s)} \in \mathbb{B}(\rho_s; \hat{Q}_r^{(s)}) \\ \hat{Q}_b^{(s)} \in \mathbb{B}(\rho'_s; \hat{Q}_b^{(s)}) \\ s=0,1}} L(\theta) + \sum_{s=0}^1 \lambda_s \left| \eta_k^{(s)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}_k^{(s)}} [\hat{R}] \right. \\ \left. + \eta_r^{(s)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}_r^{(s)}} [\hat{R}] + \eta_b^{(s)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}_b^{(s)}} [\hat{R}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}} [\hat{R}] \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}_r^{(s)}} [\hat{R}]$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}_b^{(s)}} [\hat{R}]$  represents the empirical expectation of  $\hat{R}$  under the distribution  $\hat{Q}_r^{(s)}$  and  $\hat{Q}_b^{(s)}$ , respectively, computed similarly to Equation (9), and  $\eta_k^{(s)} = \frac{|\mathcal{D}_k^{(s)}|}{|\mathcal{D}_k^{(s)}| + |\hat{\mathcal{D}}_r^{(s)}| + |\hat{\mathcal{D}}_b^{(s)}|}$ ,  $\eta_r^{(s)} = \frac{|\hat{\mathcal{D}}_r^{(s)}|}{|\mathcal{D}_k^{(s)}| + |\hat{\mathcal{D}}_r^{(s)}| + |\hat{\mathcal{D}}_b^{(s)}|}$ , and  $\eta_b^{(s)} = \frac{|\hat{\mathcal{D}}_b^{(s)}|}{|\mathcal{D}_k^{(s)}| + |\hat{\mathcal{D}}_r^{(s)}| + |\hat{\mathcal{D}}_b^{(s)}|}$ . The learning algorithm can be formulated following the structure outlined in Algorithm 1.

## 4 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we conduct extensive experiments to answer the following research questions: **RQ1**: Can DRFO provide fair recommendations with limited sensitive attributes? **RQ2**: How do reconstruction errors affect the effectiveness of DRFO in ensuring fairness? What is the performance of DRFO in terms of fairness

**Table 1: Statistics of the evaluation datasets.**

Dataset	#Items	#Users		#Interactions		Mean Ratings	
		S = 0	S = 1	S = 0	S = 1	S = 0	S = 1
ML-1M	3,244	1,153	3,144	228,191	713,590	0.5866	0.5661
Tenrec	14,539	3,108	2,299	308,217	337,958	0.4849	0.4676

on both users with known sensitive attributes and those with unknown sensitive attributes? **RQ3**: Can DRFO ensure fairness when some users prohibit the reconstruction of sensitive attributes?

### 4.1 Experimental Settings

**4.1.1 Datasets.** We conduct experiments on two open benchmark datasets: MovieLens 1M<sup>5</sup> [10] and Tenrec<sup>6</sup> [42].

- **MovieLens 1M (ML-1M):** This is a movie recommendation dataset including user ratings of movies on a scale of 1-5 and sensitive user attributes such as ‘gender’. We select ‘gender’ as the sensitive attribute and transform the rating values into binary labels using a threshold of 3, where ratings greater than three are labeled as positive (‘1’) and the rest as negative (‘0’).
- **Tenrec:** This dataset contains user feedback on articles or videos alongside anonymized user information from Tencent’s recommendation platforms. We focus on the ‘QB-video’ sub-dataset for our experiments, using the ‘like’ feedback as the rating label and considering ‘gender’ as the sensitive attribute.

In this work, we adopt the approach proposed in [36] to reconstruct sensitive attributes only using user historical interactions. To ensure the effectiveness of the reconstruction, it is crucial for users to have a sufficient number of historical interactions in the two datasets. Therefore, we apply 50-core filtering [26, 38] to select users with more than 50 interactions while performing 10-core filtering for items. Table 1 presents the statistical details of the processed datasets after filtering. We partition the datasets into training, validation, and testing sets using a ratio of 0.7:0.15:0.15.

**4.1.2 Compared Methods.** Achieving fair recommendations with limited sensitive attributes is a novel research problem, and no existing method is specifically designed to address it in recommender systems (to our knowledge). To establish baselines, we select two intuitive methods (RegK and FLrSA) and a method (CGL) proposed in other fields for solving this problem.

- **RegK** [41] is a regularization-based approach that applies fair regularization only to users with known sensitive attributes.
- **FLrSA** [41] first reconstructs missing sensitive attributes and then applies the fairness regularization method using both the reconstructed and the known sensitive attributes.
- **CGL** [14] is a representative method for fairness with limited sensitive attributes in computer vision. It reconstructs sensitive attributes and addresses low-confidence reconstructions via random replacement. Subsequently, it employs a regularization-based approach using the obtained attributes. We adapt it to recommender systems.

Although RegK and FLrSA are intuitively designed, similar methods have been employed in other fields to study fairness with limited sensitive attributes [14]. Additionally, we include two fairness-unawareness methods as reference points.

<sup>5</sup><https://grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/>

<sup>6</sup>[https://static.qblv.qq.com/qblv/h5/algorithm-frontend/tenrec\\_dataset.html](https://static.qblv.qq.com/qblv/h5/algorithm-frontend/tenrec_dataset.html)

**Table 2: Comparison between baselines and DRFO on ML-1M and Tenrec w.r.t. the fairness metric DP and recommendation performance metric RMSE under varying known sensitive attribute ratios. Lower DP and RMSE indicate better results.**

Dataset	Model	DP ↓					RMSE ↓				
		10%	30%	50%	70%	90%	10%	30%	50%	70%	90%
ML-1M	Basic MF	0.0225	0.0225	0.0225	0.0225	0.0225	0.4147	0.4147	0.4147	0.4147	0.4147
	Oracle	0.0009	0.0009	0.0009	0.0009	0.0009	0.4148	0.4148	0.4148	0.4148	0.4148
	RegK	0.0159	0.0132	0.0058	0.0014	0.0013	0.4144	0.4147	0.4147	0.4150	0.4149
	FLrSA	0.0095	0.0119	0.0038	0.0035	<b>0.0003</b>	0.4147	0.4147	0.4148	0.4151	0.4147
	CGL	0.0082	0.0145	0.0056	0.0035	0.0005	0.4147	0.4144	0.4148	0.4150	0.4149
	DRFO	<b>0.0034</b>	<b>0.0042</b>	<b>0.0011</b>	<b>0.0013</b>	0.0006	0.4201	0.4201	0.4191	0.4223	0.4198
Tenrec	Basic MF	0.0068	0.0068	0.0068	0.0068	0.0068	0.4503	0.4503	0.4503	0.4503	0.4503
	Oracle	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.4504	0.4504	0.4504	0.4504	0.4504
	RegK	0.0053	0.0052	0.0053	0.0040	0.0051	0.4558	0.4520	0.4530	0.4500	0.4500
	FLrSA	0.0073	0.0073	0.0073	0.0032	0.0013	0.4503	0.4503	0.4503	0.4597	0.4594
	CGL	0.0073	0.0073	0.0074	0.0029	0.0009	0.4503	0.4503	0.4503	0.4518	0.4596
	DRFO	<b>0.0019</b>	<b>0.0018</b>	<b>0.0013</b>	<b>0.0018</b>	<b>0.0009</b>	0.4590	0.4575	0.4565	0.4595	0.4596


- **Basic MF** [18] refers to the basic Matrix Factorization (MF) model that is trained without addressing fairness issues.
- **Oracle** [41] assumes knowledge of all users' sensitive attributes and employs the regularization-based method to achieve fair recommendations. Its results serve as an upper bound on fairness.

To ensure a fair comparison, we implement the fairness regularization term based on Equation (2) to pursue demographic parity fairness, using the classical Matrix Factorization model as the backbone recommendation model for all methods.

**4.1.3 Evaluation Protocol.** In our experiments, we simulate scenarios involving unknown sensitive attributes by randomly retaining the sensitive attribute for a subset of users while masking it for others. The retention ratio, varying in  $\{0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9\}$ , determines the proportion of users whose sensitive attributes are preserved during both training and validation phases. During testing, however, the sensitive attributes of all users are accessible to evaluate fairness. We use the MAD metric in Equation (1) to measure fairness (DP) and the root mean squared error (RMSE) to measure recommendation performance. A smaller value for both metrics indicates better performance in terms of fairness or recommendation.

**4.1.4 Implementation Details.** For a fair comparison, we optimize all models using the Adam optimizer [17] with the default embedding size of 32. Before applying the fairness methods, we pre-train the MF model using grid search to determine the optimal learning rate from the range of  $\{1e^{-2}, 1e^{-3}\}$  and the best weight decay from the range of  $\{1e^{-1}, 1e^{-2}, \dots, 1e^{-7}\}$ . For the fairness models, we initialize their backbone MF model with the pre-trained one and then fine-tune them with a fixed learning rate of  $1e^{-3}$ . We tune the fairness regularization coefficient in the range of  $\{0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5, 1, 5, 10\}$  for the baselines. For DRFO, we set the hyper-parameter that controls the strength of fairness constraints to 10 for ML-1M and 1 for Tenrec, and set the learning rate  $\alpha_q$  for updating  $\tilde{Q}^{(s)}$  to  $1e^{-3}$  for ML-1M and  $1e^{-2}$  for Tenrec. Additionally, for methods that involve reconstructing unknown sensitive attributes, we use the same classifier proposed in [36] that is trained to fit known sensitive attributes using historical user interactions.

To ensure a fair comparison, we select hyper-parameters that achieve the best fairness (measured by DP) while also maintaining at least 98% of the best recommendation performance (measured



**Figure 2: Fairness comparison between baselines and DRFO on ML-1M and Tenrec for varying known sensitive attribute ratios. Lower DP values indicate better fairness.**

by RMSE) achieved by the basic MF on the validation set. This approach is commonly used in previous studies to balance the trade-off between fairness and recommendation performance [15, 35]. We release our code at: <https://github.com/TianhaoShi2001/DRFO>.

## 4.2 Overall Performance (RQ1)

We first evaluate methods when all users' sensitive attributes are allowed to be reconstructed. We summarize the results in Table 2 for varying proportions of users with known sensitive attributes. The corresponding fairness curves for each method are shown in Figure 2 to illustrate the impact of the retention ratio. From the table and figure, we have drawn the following observations:

- Basic MF method exhibits notably inferior fairness compared to regularization-based methods (e.g., FLrSA) with a substantial portion ( $\geq 90\%$ ) of known sensitive attributes, particularly when compared to the Oracle model. This emphasizes the effectiveness of regularization-based approaches in enhancing recommendation fairness. However, as the proportion of known sensitive attributes decreases ( $\leq 50\%$ ), the fairness performance of regularization-based methods rapidly declines, highlighting the importance of addressing limited sensitive attribute issues for improving fairness.
- When the proportion of known sensitive attributes is small ( $\leq 50\%$ ), FLrSA successfully outperforms RegK on ML-1M but fails on Tenrec in fairness. This can be attributed to the fact that reconstructing sensitive attributes for Tenrec is more difficult<sup>7</sup>, thus

<sup>7</sup>It is supported by the lower reconstruction accuracy (AUC) observed on Tenrec.






Figure 3: Fairness performance under different levels of reconstruction errors for sensitive attributes.

suffering more reconstruction errors and invalidating the vanilla reconstruction-based method FLrSA. These findings affirm the significant impact of reconstruction errors on the efficacy of reconstruction-based approaches to improve fairness.

- Despite taking reconstruction errors into consideration, CGL performs similarly to FLrSA in fairness. This may be due to the fact that CGL randomly assigns sensitive attributes to samples with low reconstruction confidence, which does not ensure the resolution of the reconstruction error problem.
- DRFO consistently achieves a higher level of fairness, compared to all baselines except for Oracle, even when the proportion of users with known sensitive attributes is low. This confirms its effectiveness in addressing reconstruction errors to achieve fairer recommendations. The superiority of the approach can be attributed to its DRO-based fair optimization, which minimizes the worst-case unfairness over a distribution set to achieve fairness for the true sensitive attributes contained in the set.
- DRFO achieves slightly lower recommendation performance than baselines due to its aggressive fairness pursuit by minimizing worst-case unfairness across potential distributions. Nevertheless, our early stopping strategy selects the fairest model within a maximum 2% drop in RMSE on the validation, ensuring a low drop (around 2%) in RMSE on the testing for all methods. Despite this modest sacrifice in recommendation performance, DRFO improves fairness by over 100% in many cases, particularly when numerous users lack sensitive attributes.

### 4.3 In-depth Analyses (RQ2)

We will conduct further experiments to analyze the influence of reconstruction errors on different methods and study the fairness performance of different users.





Figure 4: Absolute difference of average predicted scores of different groups from global average predictions. Higher difference means more unfairness. ‘K’ stands for ‘known’, and ‘U’ stands for ‘unknown’. ‘S=0 (K)’ denotes the users with the known sensitive attribute of 0, similarly for others.

**4.3.1 The Effect of Reconstruction Errors.** In this subsection, we directly investigate the impact of reconstruction errors on the fairness achievement of DRFO and baselines. We set the ratio of users with known sensitive attributes to be either 30% or 50%, and for the remaining users, we randomly flip the true sensitive attributes of some users to form the reconstructed sensitive attributes, thus introducing reconstruction errors. The flipping ratio varies from 10% to 50%, allowing us to simulate different levels of reconstruction errors<sup>8</sup>. We compare the fairness of RegK, FLrSA, and DRFO under different reconstruction error levels, excluding CGL due to the lack of reconstruction confidence, which is a necessary condition for CGL. The resulting fairness comparison is presented in Figure 3, where we exclude the recommendation performance as the observed drop is limited to approximately 2% (we also omit these results in the following experiments for the same reasons). Based on the figure, we make the following observations:

- As the reconstruction error increases, both DRFO and FLrSA encounter a decline in fairness. Nevertheless, DRFO’s smoother curve and consistent superiority over RegK highlight its robustness to reconstruction errors. The deterioration in DRFO’s fairness can be explained by Equation (7), where increases in reconstruction error cause DRFO to select a larger ambiguity set, intensifying optimization challenges for achieving fairness.
- Upon surpassing a 20% reconstruction error, FLrSA no longer surpasses RegK in fairness. Even with just a 10% reconstruction error, FLrSA fails to match Oracle in fairness. These results emphasize the necessity of addressing reconstruction errors to uphold the reconstruction method’s validity.

**4.3.2 Case Study.** We next investigate whether our DRFO ensures fairness for both users with known sensitive attributes and users with unknown sensitive attributes. To achieve this, we propose a metric that measures the absolute difference between a specific group’s average predicted rating and the overall average rating, similar to MAD in Equation (1). Larger values of this metric indicate more unfairness. We compute this metric for four different groups: users with  $S = 1$  but  $S$  is unknown, users with  $S = 0$  but  $S$  is unknown, users with known  $S = 1$ , and users with known  $S = 0$ .

<sup>8</sup>A 50% reconstruction error is significant, akin to random guessing, and we flip attributes for males and females at a 1:1 ratio to maintain unchanged gender distributions.



**Figure 5: Fairness results in scenarios where a portion of users does not allow reconstruction of their attributes among the users with unknown sensitive attributes.**

We summarize the result of the compared method in Figure 4, where 30% of users have known sensitive attributes.

In Figure 4, baselines reveal significant absolute differences between groups’ average and the global average, particularly noticeable for those with unknown sensitive attributes, implying higher unfairness. These results highlight baselines’ inefficacy in achieving fair recommendations, especially for users with unknown attributes. In contrast, our proposed DRFO approach exhibits a small unfairness for all groups. Furthermore, the unfairness of the groups with known and unknown sensitive attributes is comparable, indicating that our method can successfully overcome the challenge of limited sensitive attributes and provide fair recommendations for users both with known and unknown sensitive attributes.

#### 4.4 Fairness for Users Refusing to Reconstruct Sensitive Attributes (RQ3)

To delve deeper into DRFO’s ability in ensuring fairness for users refusing sensitive attribute reconstruction due to privacy concerns, we perform supplementary experiments. We explore scenarios where a fraction of users (30% or 50%) possess known sensitive attributes. Among the remaining users, we randomly designate a subset, varying from 0% to 100%, as individuals permitting sensitive attribute reconstruction, while others opt out of it. To accommodate non-reconstructable sensitive attributes, we adapt the baselines FLrSA and CGL. For FLrSA, fair constraints are omitted for users not permitting sensitive attribute reconstruction. In the case of CGL, sensitive attributes are randomly assigned to users disallowing reconstruction, mimicking its low-confidence strategy for reconstructed sensitive attributes. A summary of fairness performance across all compared methods is presented in Figure 5.

Figure 5 shows baselines’ failures in ensuring fairness when some users do not grant sensitive attribute reconstruction. Conversely, DRFO maintains relatively fair results. This validates DRFO’s fairness improvement without full sensitive attribute reconstruction by employing a sufficiently large ambiguity set to encompass potential attributes and minimizing the worst-case unfairness within the set.

## 5 RELATED WORK

### 5.1 Fairness in Recommendation

Fairness research in recommender systems employs two primary paradigms: individual fairness [39, 45], which treats similar individuals similarly, and group fairness [16, 43], which ensures equitable treatment of different groups. Our study specifically focuses on user-side fairness in recommendation at a group level, using Demographic Parity [2, 5, 16] as a representative criterion. To promote fairness in recommendations, existing approaches can be broadly categorized into three types [23, 35]: fair pre-processing, fair learning, and fair adjustment. Fair pre-processing methods mitigate bias in data by resampling [6] or adding antidote data [30]. Fair learning methods modify optimization targets to learn fair recommendation models, either through fairness criteria as regularizers [16, 41, 47] or adversarial learning [39, 45]. Fair adjustment methods [22, 40] reorder the recommendation results to attain a fairer outcome. However, these methods typically require full access to sensitive attributes, which may not be feasible in real-world situations. In contrast, our work tackles the challenge of addressing unfairness when only limited sensitive attributes are available.

### 5.2 Fairness with Missing Sensitive Attributes

Fair recommendation research has paid less attention to fairness when some sensitive attributes are missing, but progress has been made in other fairness-focused domains. Some methods are specifically designed to enhance Rawlsian Fairness [31] using DRO [11] or Adversarial Reweighting Learning [19], but they cannot extend to other fairness metrics like DP. Another direction utilizes observable attributes (*e.g.*, zip code) as proxies for sensitive attributes [9, 46], which differs from our method of reconstructing sensitive attributes. The effectiveness of these approaches relies on the strength of the correlation between the sensitive attribute and the observable non-sensitive one. Furthermore, some works enhance fairness by reconstructing missing sensitive attributes [3, 14] or sensitive representations [8] and leveraging this reconstructed information. However, they may have limited effectiveness due to reconstruction errors. In contrast, our DRO-based fair learning method ensures fairness in the presence of reconstruction errors.

Within recommender systems, FairLISA [45] first studies the problem of missing sensitive attributes. It utilizes a discriminator trained with known attributes to remove the sensitive information from embeddings of users whose sensitive attributes are unavailable. Unlike it, our method employs the DRO paradigm to offer robust fair recommendations for users with missing sensitive attributes. Additionally, FairLISA and our work explore the fairness of limited sensitive attributes from different fairness metrics [35]. While FairLISA focuses on the fairness of removing sensitive information from user embeddings, our focus is on the fairness of inter-group metric differences.



### 5.3 Distributionally Robust Optimization

Distributionally Robust Optimization (DRO) [27, 29] is a well-known framework that handles uncertainty. It seeks a solution that performs well under all possible distributions within a defined set by optimizing for the worst-case expected loss [27, 29]. Previous studies have utilized DRO to investigate fairness. Hashimoto et al. [11] employ DRO to improve the performance of groups with high classification errors, and Wen et al. [37] use DRO to improve worst-case user experience in recommendations. These approaches focus on Rawlsian Fairness [31], which cannot be extended to other fairness criteria (e.g., DP). RobFair [37] utilizes DRO to provide robust fair recommendations, overcoming the challenge of user preference shift which may compromise the fairness achieved during the training phase. Unlike RobFair, our work investigates fair recommendations when some sensitive attributes are missing and uses DRO to handle the uncertainty of missing sensitive attributes. Additionally, Wang et al. [34] introduce two methods that utilize DRO to learn fair classifiers with noisy sensitive attributes, which is most closely related to our work. In difference, our work considers scenarios where sensitive attributes cannot be reconstructed and discusses how to estimate the upper bound of TV distance when the assumption in Theorem 1 is slightly violated.

## 6 CONCLUSION

In this study, we aim to enhance fairness in recommender systems with limited sensitive attributes. We point out that directly reconstructing sensitive attributes may suffer from reconstruction errors and have privacy concerns. To overcome the challenges, we propose a DRO-based fair learning framework. It builds an ambiguity set based on reconstructed sensitive attributes of users who grant reconstruction, and subsequently optimizes the worst-case unfairness within the entire set. We provide theoretical evidence that our methods could build an appropriate ambiguity set that encompasses the unknown true distribution, thus providing robust fair recommendations with limited sensitive attributes. Additionally, extensive experiments on two real-world datasets confirm the efficacy of our methods. In the future, we plan to extend our approach to address fairness in non-binary sensitive attributes. Furthermore, our current work only considers using DP as a fairness objective, and we aim to extend the approach to other group fairness metrics.

## A APPENDIX

### A.1 Total Variation Distance

In this section, we first present an introduction to the Total Variation (TV) distance, including its definition and some basic properties. Subsequently, we proceed to prove Theorem 2, and from this proof, we will be able to deduce Theorem 1. Afterward, we discuss the situation when the assumptions of Theorem 2 are not satisfied.

**DEFINITION A.1 (TOTAL VARIATION DISTANCE).** *The total variation distance between probability measures  $P$  and  $Q$  on a measurable space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  is defined as the supremum of the absolute difference between the probabilities assigned to a measurable event  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  by  $P$  and  $Q$ . If  $\Omega$  is countable, the total variation distance can also be expressed in terms of the  $L_1$ -norm [21] as follows:*

$$TV(P, Q) = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{F}} |P(A) - Q(A)| = \frac{1}{2} \|P - Q\|_1. \quad (14)$$

**THEOREM 2.** *Given a measurable event  $A$ , assuming  $P(S = s) = P(\hat{S} = s)$  for a given  $s \in \{0, 1\}$ , the total variation distance between two conditional probabilities  $P(A|S = s)$  and  $P(A|\hat{S} = s)$  is bounded by the probability that the sensitive attribute is incorrectly reconstructed, i.e.,  $TV(P(A|S = s), P(A|\hat{S} = s)) \leq P(S \neq \hat{S}|S = s)$ .*

**PROOF.** Assuming  $P(S=s)=P(\hat{S}=s)$ , the following equation holds:

$$P(\hat{S} = s|S = s) = \frac{P(\hat{S} = s, S = s)}{P(S = s)} = \frac{P(S = s, \hat{S} = s)}{P(\hat{S} = s)} = P(S = s|\hat{S} = s),$$

and we can also deduce  $P(\hat{S} \neq s|S=s)=P(S \neq s|\hat{S}=s)$ . Then, given a measurable event  $A$  and two conditional probabilities  $P(A|S = s)$  and  $P(A|\hat{S} = s)$ . We have:

$$\begin{aligned} TV(P(A|S = s), P(A|\hat{S} = s)) &= \sup_A |P(A|S = s) - P(A|\hat{S} = s)| \\ &= \sup_A |P(A|S = s, \hat{S} = s)P(\hat{S} = s|S = s) + P(A|S = s, \hat{S} \neq s)P(\hat{S} \neq s|S = s) \\ &\quad - P(A|S = s, \hat{S} = s)P(S = s|\hat{S} = s) - P(A|S \neq s, \hat{S} = s)P(S \neq s|\hat{S} = s)| \\ &= \sup_A |P(A|S = s, \hat{S} = s) (P(\hat{S} = s|S = s) - P(S = s|\hat{S} = s)) \\ &\quad - P(\hat{S} \neq s|S = s) (P(A|S = s, \hat{S} \neq s) - P(A|\hat{S} = s, S \neq s))| \\ &= \sup_A |0 - P(\hat{S} \neq s|S = s) (P(A|S = s, \hat{S} \neq s) - P(A|\hat{S} = s, S \neq s))| \\ &\leq P(\hat{S} \neq s|S = s). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The above derivation completes the proof of Theorem 2, thereby deriving Theorem 1. Note that we assume  $P(S) = P(\hat{S})$  in proving Theorem 2. If the assumption is violated, as the general reconstructive ability to accurately restore true sensitive attributes, we presume a slight deviation between  $P(S)$  and  $P(\hat{S})$ , that is,  $P(\hat{S}) - P(S) = \delta p$  ( $|\delta p| \ll P(S)$ ), then

$$\begin{aligned} TV(P(A|S = s), P(A|\hat{S} = s)) &= \sup_A |P(A|S = s, \hat{S} = s) (P(\hat{S} = s|S = s) - P(S = s|\hat{S} = s)) \\ &\quad - (P(A|S \neq s, \hat{S} = s)P(S \neq s|\hat{S} = s) - P(A|S = s, \hat{S} \neq s)P(\hat{S} \neq s|S = s))| \\ &\approx \sup_A |kP(A|S = s, \hat{S} = s)\delta p - kP(A|S = s, \hat{S} \neq s)\delta p| \\ &\quad - P(\hat{S} \neq s|S = s) (P(A|S = s, \hat{S} \neq s) - P(A|\hat{S} = s, S \neq s))| \\ &\leq P(\hat{S} \neq s|S = s) + k|\delta p|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $k = \frac{P(S=s, \hat{S}=s)}{P(S=s)P(\hat{S}=s)}$ , and the approximate equality is obtained through the probability formula and first-order approximation (details omitted for simplicity). From the derivation, we know that when there is a marginal discrepancy between  $P(S)$  and  $P(\hat{S})$ , the estimated upper bound on the TV distance should be looser. However, the impact on the upper bound is modest, rendering its omission reasonable. Also, in our experiments, using only the first term (i.e.,  $P(\hat{S} \neq s|S = s)$ ) to build ambiguity sets has proven to achieve robust fairness, implying the rationale of directly utilizing the conclusion of Theorem 2 to estimate the upper bound of the TV distance.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (2022YFB3104701), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (62272437), and the CCCD Key Lab of Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Mark S Ackerman, Lorrie Faith Cranor, and Joseph Reagle. 1999. Privacy in E-commerce: Examining User Scenarios and Privacy Preferences. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*. 1–8.
- [2] Sam Corbett-Davies, Emma Pierson, Avi Feller, Sharad Goel, and Aziz Huq. 2017. Algorithmic Decision Making and the Cost of Fairness. In *Proceedings of the 23rd acm sigkdd International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 797–806.
- [3] Enyan Dai and Suhang Wang. 2021. Say No to the Discrimination: Learning Fair Graph Neural Networks with Limited Sensitive Attribute Information. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 680–688.
- [4] Frederik Michel Dekking, Cornelis Kraaikamp, Hendrik Paul Lopenha, and Ludolf Erwin Meester. 2005. *A Modern Introduction to Probability and Statistics: Understanding why and how*. Vol. 488. Springer.
- [5] Cynthia Dwork, Moritz Hardt, Toniann Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Richard Zemel. 2012. Fairness Through Awareness. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference*. 214–226.
- [6] Michael D Ekstrand, Mucun Tian, Ion Madrazo Azpiazu, Jennifer D Ekstrand, Oghenemaro Anuyah, David McNeill, and Maria Soledad Pera. 2018. All the Cool Kids, How Do They Fit in?: Popularity and Demographic Biases in Recommender Evaluation and Effectiveness. In *Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*. PMLR, 172–186.
- [7] Timnit Gebru, Jonathan Krause, Yilun Wang, Duyun Chen, Jia Deng, Erez Lieberman Aiden, and Li Fei-Fei. 2017. Using Deep Learning and Google Street View to Estimate the Demographic Makeup of Neighborhoods Across the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114, 50 (2017), 13108–13113.
- [8] Vincent Grari, Sylvain Lamprier, and Marcin Detyniecki. 2021. Fairness without the Sensitive Attribute via Causal Variational Autoencoder. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [9] Maya Gupta, Andrew Cotter, Mahdi Milani Fard, and Serena Wang. 2018. Proxy Fairness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.11212* (2018).
- [10] F Maxwell Harper and Joseph A Konstan. 2015. The MovieLens Datasets: History and Context. *Acm Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems (TIIS)* 5, 4 (2015), 1–19.
- [11] Tatsunori Hashimoto, Megha Srivastava, Hongseok Namkoong, and Percy Liang. 2018. Fairness without Demographics in Repeated Loss Minimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 1929–1938.
- [12] Xiangnan He, Lizi Liao, Hanwang Zhang, Liqiang Nie, Xia Hu, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2017. Neural Collaborative Filtering. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web*. 173–182.
- [13] Weihua Hu, Gang Niu, Issei Sato, and Masashi Sugiyama. 2018. Does Distributionally Robust Supervised Learning Give Robust Classifiers?. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2029–2037.
- [14] Sangwon Jung, Sanghyuk Chun, and Taesup Moon. 2022. Learning Fair Classifiers with Partially Annotated Group Labels. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 10348–10357.
- [15] Sangwon Jung, Sanghyuk Chun, and Taesup Moon. 2022. Learning Fair Classifiers with Partially Annotated Group Labels. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 10348–10357.
- [16] Toshihiro Kamishima, Shotaro Akaho, Hideki Asoh, and Jun Sakuma. 2018. Recommendation Independence. In *Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*. PMLR, 187–201.
- [17] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).
- [18] Yehuda Koren, Robert Bell, and Chris Volinsky. 2009. Matrix Factorization Techniques for Recommender Systems. *Computer* 42, 8 (2009), 30–37.
- [19] Preethi Lahoti, Alex Beutel, Jilin Chen, Kang Lee, Flavien Prost, Nithum Thain, Xuezhi Wang, and Ed Chi. 2020. Fairness without Demographics through Adversarially Reweighted Learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 728–740.
- [20] Anja Lambrecht and Catherine Tucker. 2019. Algorithmic Bias? An Empirical Study of Apparent Gender-Based Discrimination in the Display of STEM Career Ads. *Management Science* 65, 7 (2019), 2966–2981.
- [21] David A Levin and Yuval Peres. 2017. *Markov Chains and Mixing Times*. Vol. 107. American Mathematical Soc.
- [22] Yunqi Li, Hanxiong Chen, Zouhui Fu, Yingqiang Ge, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2021. User-oriented Fairness in Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*. 624–632.
- [23] Yunqi Li, Hanxiong Chen, Shuyuan Xu, Yingqiang Ge, Juntao Tan, Shuchang Liu, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2022. Fairness in Recommendation: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.13619* (2022).
- [24] Weiwen Liu, Feng Liu, Ruiming Tang, Ben Liao, Guangyong Chen, and Pheng Ann Heng. 2020. Balancing between Accuracy and Fairness for Interactive Recommendation with Reinforcement Learning. In *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining: 24th Pacific-Asia Conference, PAKDD 2020, Singapore, May 11–14, 2020, Proceedings, Part I 24*. Springer, 155–167.
- [25] Yongsheng Liu, Hong Qu, Wenyu Chen, and SM Hasan Mahmud. 2019. An Efficient Deep Learning Model to Infer User Demographic Information from Ratings. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 53125–53135.
- [26] Elizaveta Makhneva, Anna Svergunova, Oleg Lashinin, Marina Ananyeva, and Sergey Kolesnikov. 2023. Make your Next Item Recommendation Model Time Sensitive. In *Adjunct Proceedings of the 31st ACM Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization*. 191–195.
- [27] Hongseok Namkoong and John C Duchi. 2016. Stochastic Gradient Methods for Distributionally Robust Optimization with F-divergences. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 29 (2016).
- [28] Yonatan Oren, Shiori Sagawa, Tatsunori B Hashimoto, and Percy Liang. 2019. Distributionally Robust Language Modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.02060* (2019).
- [29] Hamed Rahimian and Sanjay Mehrotra. 2019. Distributionally Robust Optimization: A Review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.05659* (2019).
- [30] Bashir Rastegarpahan, Krishna P Gummadi, and Mark Crovella. 2019. Fighting Fire with Fire: Using Antidote Data to Improve Polarization and Fairness of Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the twelfth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 231–239.
- [31] John Rawls. 2001. *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*. Harvard University Press.
- [32] Paul Voigt and Axel Von dem Bussche. 2017. The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). *A Practical Guide, 1st Ed., Cham: Springer International Publishing* 10, 3152676 (2017), 10–5555.
- [33] Pengfei Wang, Jiafeng Guo, Yanyan Lan, Jun Xu, and Xueqi Cheng. 2016. Your Cart Tells You: Inferring Demographic Attributes from Purchase Data. In *Proceedings of the ninth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 173–182.
- [34] Serena Wang, Wenshuo Guo, Harikrishna Narasimhan, Andrew Cotter, Maya Gupta, and Michael Jordan. 2020. Robust Optimization for Fairness with Noisy Protected Groups. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 5190–5203.
- [35] Yifan Wang, Weizhi Ma, Min Zhang, Yiqun Liu, and Shaoping Ma. 2023. A Survey on the Fairness of Recommender Systems. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 41, 3 (2023), 1–43.
- [36] Udi Weinsberg, Smriti Bhagat, Stratis Ioannidis, and Nina Taft. 2012. BlurMe: Inferring and Obfuscating User Gender Based on Ratings. In *Proceedings of the Sixth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 195–202.
- [37] Hongyi Wen, Xinyang Yi, Tiansheng Yao, Jiayi Tang, Lichan Hong, and Ed H Chi. 2022. Distributionally-robust Recommendations for Improving Worst-case User Experience. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. 3606–3610.
- [38] Yan Wen, Chen Gao, Lingling Yi, Liwei Qiu, Yaqing Wang, and Yong Li. 2023. Efficient and Joint Hyperparameter and Architecture Search for Collaborative Filtering. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 2547–2558.
- [39] Chuhan Wu, Fangzhao Wu, Xiting Wang, Yongfeng Huang, and Xing Xie. 2021. Fairness-aware News Recommendation with Decomposed Adversarial Learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. 4462–4469.
- [40] Yao Wu, Jian Cao, Guandong Xu, and Yudong Tan. 2021. TFROM: A Two-sided Fairness-aware Recommendation Model for Both Customers and Providers. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1013–1022.
- [41] Sirui Yao and Bert Huang. 2017. Beyond Parity: Fairness Objectives for Collaborative Filtering. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30 (2017).
- [42] Guanghu Yuan, Fajie Yuan, Yudong Li, Beibei Kong, Shujie Li, Lei Chen, Min Yang, Chenyun YU, Bo Hu, Zang Li, Yu Xu, and Xiaohu Qie. 2022. Tenrec: A Large-scale Multipurpose Benchmark Dataset for Recommender Systems. In *Thirty-sixth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- [43] Jizhi Zhang, Keqin Bao, Yang Zhang, Wenjie Wang, Fuli Feng, and Xiangnan He. 2023. Is Chatgpt Fair for Recommendation? evaluating fairness in large language model recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 993–999.
- [44] Yang Zhang, Fuli Feng, Chenxu Wang, Xiangnan He, Meng Wang, Yan Li, and Yongdong Zhang. 2020. How to Retrain Recommender System? A Sequential Meta-learning Method. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1479–1488.
- [45] Zheng Zhang, Qi Liu, Hao Jiang, Fei Wang, Yan Zhuang, Le Wu, Weibo Gao, and Enhong Chen. 2023. FairLISA: Fair User Modeling with Limited Sensitive Attributes Information. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [46] Tianxiang Zhao, Enyan Dai, Kai Shu, and Suhang Wang. 2022. Towards Fair Classifiers without Sensitive Attributes: Exploring Biases in Related Features. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 1433–1442.
- [47] Ziwei Zhu, Xia Hu, and James Caverlee. 2018. Fairness-aware Tensor-based Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 1153–1162.