# Fairness under Competition

# **Why Competition Matters**

In markets with multiple classifiers, ecosystem fairness is at least as important as individual fairness. We show that individually fair classifiers can produce unfair ecosystems.

We quantify losses via correlations and overlap. We also show that adjusting individual classifiers to be more fair can backfire.

# **Model Snapshot**

Borrowers (x, a, y), where x are observable traits, a is observable group membership, y is an unobservable outcome. Deserving borrowers: y=1. Utility v(x, a, y, r) over r offers.  $\bullet$  0-1 utilities: borrowers only care about getting at least one offer.  $\bullet$  0-1-k utilities: borrowers get higher utility if more than one offer.

Lenders decide on loan offers using classifiers  $c_{\ell}(x,a)$ . False-negative rates  $\beta_{\ell}$  is probability lender  $\ell$  does not make offer to deserving borrowers.

# **Defining EOC**

Equal Opportunity (EO): the group gap in false-negative rates is zero.

Level of Equal Opportunity under Competition (**EOC-level**) measures the group gap in  $\Pr[at\ least\ one\ offer\ |\ Y=1],$  where level **zero** means ecosystem fairness. We also study **v-EOC-level**: group gap in expected utilities for deserving borrowers.

These metrics highlight access to opportunity, not just per-classifier parity.

### Force 1: Correlation Imbalance

Fix two EO classifiers, where  $\sigma_i$  is standard deviation of classifier i and  $\rho_a$  is correlation between classifiers on group a. Then **EOC-level** is  $\sigma_1 \sigma_2 | \rho_0 - \rho_1 |$ .

Worst case:  $\min\{\beta_1, \beta_2\} - \max\{0, \beta_1 + \beta_2 - 1\}$ .

When one group's predictions are **highly** correlated and the other's are not, errors compound unevenly, driving systemic inequity.

# Competition between fair classifiers can lead to unfair outcomes.

Applying a fairness adjustment to individual classifiers can exacerbate unfairness.



RONEN GRADWOHL

EILAM SHAPIRA

MOSHE TENNENHOLTZ



### Level of v-EOC

Under 0–1–k utilities, v-EOC-level is  $\sigma_1\sigma_2|(k-2)(\rho_0-\rho_1)|$ . Worst case scales by |k-2|. Interestingly, for k < 2 vs k > 2, the disadvantaged group can **flip**, motivating context-awareness.

### More Competitors, More Risk

With n EO classifiers, worst-case EOC-level is  $\min_i \beta_i - \max\{0, \sum_j \beta_j - 1\}$ . If classifiers are symmetric and correlation is maximal in one group and minimal in the other, then EOC is  $\beta - \beta^n$ . Thus, **more competitors** can worsen inequity.

# Force 2: Overlap Imbalance

When lenders serve different subsets of borrowers, overlap imbalance drives EOC-level. For uncorrelated classifiers, EOC-level depends on group a overlaps  $\gamma_a$ .

When  $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta$ , EOC-level of two EO classifiers is  $\beta(1-\beta)|\gamma_0-\gamma_1|$ .

### **Adjustments Can Backfire**

Post-processing to EO can backfire. By altering correlations, EOC-level can increase. We construct cases where EOC-level pre-adjustment is 0, yet after EO adjustment they become positive, despite improved per-classifier fairness.

**Experiments** show EOC-level often worsens after adjustment. Under several experiments, percent of instances EOC-level worsened was:

		300	1k	3k	10k	30k	100k
E	xp. 1	[75.0, 82.2]	[68.0, 76.4]	[55.6, 64.2]	[49.4, 58.2]	[42.0, 50.6]	[26.2, 34.0]
$\mathbf{E}$	xp. 2	[75.6, 82.8]	[65.2, 73.8]	[51.8, 60.8]	[35.4, 44.2]	[25.8, 33.8]	[12.6, 19.0]
_E	xp. 3	[74.2, 81.2]	[63.4, 71.2]	[50.8, 59.6]	[35.6, 43.8]	[27.6, 36.2]	[14.2, 20.6]

When EOC-level worsened, it often worsened by a large factor:

	300	1k	3k	10k	30k	100k
Exp. 1	[10.8, 30.8]	[7.8, 16.3]	[7.6, 121.0]	[6.0, 19.9]	[7.3, 23.0]	[7.5, 31.0]
Exp. 2	[21.1, 111.8]	[8.3, 30.1]	[2.9, 9.4]	[1.8, 2.2]	[1.6, 1.8]	[1.3, 1.4]
Exp. 3	[14.3, 27.2]	[10.0, 74.2]	[8.2, 16.7]	[4.8, 32.4]	[2.5, 3.6]	[1.9, 4.3]

### **Extensions & Guidance**

Extensions: • Many more experiments support findings. • Insights hold also under Equalized Odds and Demographic Parity.

Guidance: • Design **ecosystem-aware** audits. • Regulate **correlation/overlap**. • Optimize **joint** fairness.