

### Towards Bias Mitigation in Federated Learning WAX SRCPR May 12th

#### **By:** Yasmine Djebrouni PhD student at LIG-LIRIS Supervised by Sara Bouchenak (LIRIS) & Vania Marangozova-Martin (LIG)



- I. Bias and federated learning
- II. Our approach to bias mitigation in federated learning
- III. Preliminary results
- IV. Next

#### Bias and FL



#### Approach & Preliminary Results



#### Next

### Predictions and decisions

#### Approach & Preliminary Results



#### Next

### Predictions and decisions

### Our reality is **biased** due to historical prejudice Our data is not balanced Our data labeling is unfair and subjective

### Our reality is **biased** due to historical prejudice Our data is not balanced Our data labeling is unfair and subjective

...Uh, reality is not a good source to learn from



### Machine learning is learning how to be racist, sexist and discriminatory...

i.e machine learning is biased

When Good Algorithms Go Sexist: Why and How to Advance AI Gender Equity Seven actions social change leaders and machine learning developers can While race itself wasn't a variable used in this algorithm, a What Do We Do About the ients incurred malated to race was, which was healthcare cost l **Biases in AI?** by James Manyika, Jake Silberg, and Brittany Prester Many Facial-Recognition Systems Are onditio Biased, Says U.S. Study Algorithms falsely identified African-American and Asian faces 10 to 100 times more than Caucasian faces, researchers for the National Institute of Standards and Technology found.





# In people to String it wrong

sk assessment tools could mean mistakes of the past.

January 21, 2019

### Bias is getting worse with federated learning [1]

- Emergence of FL
- New distributed paradigm
- Privacy-friendly
- Communication efficient

### Bias is getting worse with federated learning [1]

- Emergence of FL
- New distributed paradigm
- Privacy-friendly
- Communication efficient

**Clients with** private data







### FL can exacerbate machine learning unfairness

Clients with







### FL can exacerbate machine learning unfairness

Clients with







### FL can exacerbate machine learning unfairness

Clients with



**Unfair data** 

#### Approach & Preliminary Results

age	workclass	fnlwgt	education	educational- num	marital- status	occupation	relationship	race	gender	capital- gain	capital- loss	hours-per- week	native- country	income
48	State-gov	78529	Masters	14	Separated	Prof-specialty	Not-in-family	White	Male	0	0	60	United- States	<=50K
71	Private	105200	HS-grad	9	Married-civ- spouse	Protective- serv	Husband	White	Male	6767	0	20	United- States	<=50K
48	Private	349 <mark>1</mark> 51	HS-grad	9	Married-civ- spouse	Craft-repair	Husband	White	Male	0	0	40	United- States	<=50K
45	Local-gov	172111	Bachelors	13	Divorced	Exec- managerial	Unmarried	Black	Female	0	0	60	United- States	<=50K
66	Self-emp- not-inc	182470	Prof- school	15	Married-civ- spouse	Prof-specialty	Husband	White	Male	0	0	25	United- States	>50K

#### Example of unfair data

#### Approach & Preliminary Results

age	workclass	fnlwgt	education	educational- num	marital- status	occupation	relationship	race	gender	capital- gain	capital- loss	hours-per- week	native- country	income
48	State-gov	78529	Masters	14	Separated	Prof-specialty	Not-in-family	White	Male	0	0	60	United- States	<=50K
71	Private	105200	HS-grad	9	Married-civ- spouse	Protective- serv	Husband	White	Male	6767	0	20	United- States	<=50K
48	Private	349151	HS-grad	9	Married-civ- spouse	Craft-repair	Husband	White	Male	0	0	40	United- States	<=50K
45	Local-gov	172111	Bachelors	13	Divorced	Exec- managerial	Unmarried	Black	Female	0	0	60	United- States	<=50K
66	Self-emp- not-inc	182470	Prof- school	15	Married-civ- spouse	Prof-specialty	Husband	White	Male	0	0	25	United- States	>50K

#### Example of unfair data

• Attributes

#### **Approach & Preliminary Results**

age	workclass	fnlwgt	education	educational- num	marital- status	occupation	relationship	race	gender	capital- gain	capital- loss	hours-per- week	native- country	income
48	State-gov	78529	Masters	14	Separated	Prof-specialty	Not-in-family	White	Male	0	0	60	United- States	<=50K
71	Private	105200	HS-grad	9	Married-civ- spouse	Protective- serv	Husband	White	Male	6767	0	20	United- States	<=50K
48	Private	349151	HS-grad	9	Married-civ- spouse	Craft-repair	Husband	White	Male	0	0	40	United- States	<=50K
45	Local-gov	172111	Bachelors	13	Divorced	Exec- managerial	Unmarried	Black	Female	0	0	60	United- States	<=50K
66	Self-emp- not-inc	182470	Prof- school	15	Married-civ- spouse	Prof-specialty	Husband	White	Male	0	0	25	United- States	>50K

#### Example of unfair data

- Attributes
- Y = Target/decision variable (salary, criminality, intelligence) disadvantageous towards a group

#### Approach & Preliminary Results

age	workclass	fnlwgt	education	educational- num	marital- status	occupation	relationship	race	gender	capital- gain	capital- loss	hours-per- week	native- country	income
48	State-gov	78529	Masters	14	Separated	Prof-specialty	Not-in-family	White	Male	0	0	60	United- States	<=50K
71	Private	105200	HS-grad	9	Married-civ- spouse	Protective- serv	Husband	White	Male	6767	0	20	United- States	<=50K
48	Private	349151	HS-grad	9	Married-civ- spouse	Craft-repair	Husband	White	Male	0	0	40	United- States	<=50K
45	Local-gov	172111	Bachelors	13	Divorced	Exec- managerial	Unmarried	Black	Female	0	0	60	United- States	<=50K
66	Self-emp- not-inc	182470	Prof- school	15	Married-civ- spouse	Prof-specialty	Husband	White	Male	0	0	25	United- States	>50K

Example of unfair data :

- Attributes
- Y = Target/decision variable (salary, criminality, intelligence) disadvantageous towards some groups
- Sensitive attributes (race, gender, age..), define groups: privileged and unprivileged (Females/males, whites/non-whites..)

#### **Approach & Preliminary Results**

workclass	fnlwgt	education	educational- num	marital- status	occupation	relationship	race	gender	capital- gain	capital- loss	hours-per- week	native- country	income
State-gov	78529	Masters	14	Separated	Prof-specialty	Not-in-family	White	Male	0	0	60	United- States	<=50K
Private	105200	HS-grad	9	Married-civ- spouse	Protective- serv	Husband	White	Male	6767	0	20	United- States	<=50K
Private	349151	HS-grad	9	Married-civ- spouse	Craft-repair	Husband	White	Male	0	0	40	United- States	<=50K
Local-gov	172111	Bachelors	13	Divorced	Exec- managerial	Unmarried	Black	Female	0	0	60	United- States	<=50K
Self-emp- not-inc	182470	Prof- school	15	Married-civ- spouse	Prof-specialty	Husband	White	Male	0	0	25	United- States	>50K
	workclass State-gov Private Local-gov Self-emp- not-inc	workclassfnlwgtState-gov78529Private105200Private349151Local-gov172111Self-emp- not-inc182470	workclassfnlwgteducationState-gov78529MastersPrivate105200HS-gradPrivate349151HS-gradLocal-gov172111BachelorsSelf-emp not-inc182470Prof- school	workclassfnlwgteducationeducational- numState-gov78529Masters14Private105200HS-grad9Private349151HS-grad9Local-gov172111Bachelors13Self-emp- not-inc182470Prof- school15	workclassfnlwgteducationeducational- nummarital- statusState-gov78529Masters14SeparatedPrivate105200HS-grad9Married-civ- spousePrivate349151HS-grad09Married-civ- spouseLocal-gov172111Bachelors13DivorcedSelf-emp- not-inc182470Prof- school15Married-civ- spouse	workclassfnlwgteducationeducational- nummarital- statusoccupationState-gov78529Masters14SeparatedProf-specialtyPrivate105200HS-grad9Married-civ- spouseProtective- servPrivate349151HS-grad09Married-civ- spouseCraft-repairLocal-gov172111Bachelors13DivorcedExec- managerialSelf-emp- not-inc182470Prof- school15Married-civ- spouseProf-specialty	workclassfnlwgteducationeducational- nummarital- statusoccupationrelationshipState-gov78529Masters14SeparatedProf-specialtyNot-in-familyPrivate105200HS-grad9Married-civ- spouseProtective- 	workclassfnlwgteducationeducational- nummarital- statusoccupationrelationshipraceState-gov78529Masters14SeparatedProf-specialtyNot-in-familyWhitePrivate105200HS-grad9Married-civ- spouseProtective- servHusbandWhitePrivate349151HS-grad0Married-civ- spouseCraft-repairHusbandWhiteLocal-gov172111Bachelors13DivorcedExec- managerialUnmarriedBlackSelf-emp- not-inc182470Prof- school15Married-civ- spouseProf-specialtyHusbandWhite	workclassfnlwgteducationeducational- nummarital- statusoccupationrelationshipracegenderState-gov78529Masters14SeparatedProf-specialtyNot-in-familyWhiteMalePrivate105200HS-grad9Married-civ- spouseProtective- servHusbandWhiteMalePrivate349151HS-grad9Married-civ- spouseCraft-repairHusbandWhiteMaleLocal-gov172111Bachelors13DivorcedExec- managerialUnmarriedBlackFemaleSelf-emp- not-inc182470Prof- school15Married-civ- spouseProf-specialtyHusbandWhiteMale	workclassfnlwgteducationeducational- nummarital- statusoccupationrelationshipracegendercapital- gainState-gov78529Masters14SeparatedProf-specialtyNot-in-familyWhiteMale0Private105200HS-grad9Married-civ- spouseProtective- spouseHusbandWhiteMale6767Private349151HS-grad0Married-civ- spouseCraft-repairHusbandWhiteMale0Local-gov172111Bachelors13DivorcedExec- managerialUnmarriedBlackFemale0Self-emp- not-inc182470Prof- school15Married-civ- spouseProf-specialtyHusbandWhiteMale0	workclassfnlwgteducationeducational- nummarital- statusoccupationrelationshipracegendercapital- capital- gaincapital- lossState-gov78529Masters14SeparatedProf-specialtyNot-in-familyWhiteMale000Private105200HS-grad9Married-civ- spouseProtective- servHusbandWhiteMale67670Private349151HS-grad9Married-civ- spouseCraft-repairHusbandWhiteMale00Local-gov172111Bachelors13DivorcedExec- managerialUnmarriedBlackFemale00Self-emp- not-inc182470Prof- school15Married-civ- spouseProf-specialtyHusbandWhiteMale00	workclassfnlwgteducationeducational- nummarital- statusoccupationrelationshipracegendercapital- lgaincapital- losscapital- losshours-per- weekState-gov78529Masters14SeparatedProf-specialtyNot-in-familyWhiteMale000000Private105200HS-grad09Married-civ- spouseProtective- spouseHusbandWhiteMale67670020Private349151HS-grad09Married-civ- spouseCraft-repairHusbandWhiteMale000040Local-gov172111Bachelors13DivorcedExec- managerialUnmarriedBlackFemale00025Self-emp- not-inc182470Prof- school15Married-civ- spouseProf-specialtyHusbandWhiteMale00025	workclassfnlwgteducationeducational- nummarital- statusoccupationrelationshipracegendercapital- igaincapital- losshours-per- weeknative- countryState-gov78529Masters14SeparatedProf-specialtyNot-in-familyWhiteMale0060United- StatesPrivate105200HS-grad9Married-civ- spouseProfective- spouseHusbandWhiteMale6767020United- StatesPrivate349151HS-grad9Married-civ- spouseCraft-repairHusbandWhiteMale0040United- StatesLocal-gov172111Bachelors13DivorcedExec- managerialUnmarriedBlackFemale0025United- StatesSelf-emp- not-inc182470Prof- school15Married-civ- spouseProf-specialtyHusbandWhiteMale0025United- States

The data is unfair if the label/decision variable is dependent on the sensitive attribute [2].

Example of biased data: sexist data where men have higher salaries than women.

#### Mathematically [2]

Label/decision variable is dependent on the sensitive attribute

### $Pr(Y = p|S = priv) \neq Pr(Y = p|S = unpriv)$

such that Pr : Probability distribution Y: decision variable p: Advantageous decision (eg.high salary) S : sensitive attribute variable (eg. gender) priv/unpriv: privileged and unprivileged group (eg. women and men)

#### The amount of unfairness can be measured by disparate impact:

$$\beta(\theta) = \frac{Pr(Y = p|S = unpr)}{Pr(Y = p|S = priv)}$$



### (i) Characterize the actual impact of Federated Learning on bias. (ii) Propose novel FL selection and aggregation algorithms for bias mitigation.

(iii) Take into account accuracy and robustness in FL.



### Our approach

1) Privately estimating the bias brought by each client. 2) Directly deal with the source of bias (biased client)



### 1) How to measure clients bias without looking at their data?

- Exploit models update

- Exploit public/synthetic test data

$$\beta(\theta) = \frac{Pr(\hat{Y} = p \mid S = unpr)}{Pr(\hat{Y} = p \mid S = pri)}$$

#### Next

 $\frac{riv}{v}$ 



### 2) How to deal with the identified biased client?

### Diminishing its impact on the FL model (reweighting)

Or

Aggregating together the clients that mutually cancel each other effects

Or

A biased client is a poisoned client, ignore its model!



#### Next



### (a) Model bias





#### Next



### Model bias



#### Next



Model bias



#### Next



Model bias





#### What's next?

- Evaluate our approaches with more scenarios with different data distributions.
- Combine with classical ML approaches to improve performance.
- Propose approaches to ensure accuracy and robustness.





## THANK YOU! ANY QUESTIONS?

Yasmine Djebrouni

yasmine.djebrouni@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

2022

# References

[1] B. MCMAHAN, E. MOORE, D. RAMAGE, S. HAMPSON, AND B. A. Y ARCAS, Communication-Efficient Learning of Deep Networks From Decentralized Data, in Artificial intelligence and statistics, PMLR, 2017, pp. 1273–1282

[2] M. HARDT, E. PRICE, AND N. SREBRO, Equality of Opportunity in Supervised Learning, Advances in neural information processing systems, 29 (2016), pp. 3315–3323

#### **Related Work Limitations :**

- Require private data information.
- Assume clients and server are trustworthy.
- Consider simple use cases (binary classification, 1 binary sensitive attribute)



#### Conclusion

#### **Bias measurement**

There exist several notion of bias, depending if reality is already biased or perfectly fair.

$$\beta(\theta) = \frac{Pr(\hat{Y} = p^*|S = unpriv)}{Pr(\hat{Y} = p^*|S = priv)}$$

Perfectly fair model : proportion of advantageous outcome for privilidged and unpriviledged groups are equal.



#### Conclusion



#### **Bias problem formulation**

We consider a binary FL classification (X1, .., Xd) denote the features, Y denotes the class label Y^ is the classifier prediction result for a given data record.

We consider two groups of data: a privileged group which prediction results have a given positive property p\*(e.g. people who earn a high salary), and an unprivileged group (e.g. people with a low salary).

Let S be a sensitive feature which, for simplicity we assume to be binary  $S \in$ 

$X_1$	$X_2$	 S	 $X_d$	Y
$x_{11}$	$x_{12}$	 $s_1$	 $x_{1d}$	$y_1$
$x_{21}$	$x_{22}$	 $s_2$	 $x_{2d}$	$y_2$
$x_{n_1 1}$	$x_{n_12}$	 $s_{n_1}$	 $x_{n_1d}$	$y_{n_1}$

#### Conclusion

#### Overview on a FL system



#### Conclusion



### Machine learning is used everywhere because:

# Machine learning learns the patterns that exist in our reality, and reproduce them, and generalize them to new data

Conclusion

#### Objectives

When Good Algorithms Go Sexist: Why and How to Advance AI Gender Equity Seven actions social change leaders and machine learning developers can While race itself wasn't a variable used in this algorithm, a What Do We Do About the ients incurred malated to race was, which was healthcare cost l **Biases in AI?** by James Manyika, Jake Silberg, and Brittany Prester Many Facial-Recognition Systems Are onditio Biased, Says U.S. Study Algorithms falsely identified African-American and Asian faces 10 to 100 times more than Caucasian faces, researchers for the National Institute of Standards and Technology found.



#### Overview on a bias in ML

Some sources of bias in FL

- Biased reality due to social/historical prejudices.
- Class imbalanced data.
- Feature imbalanced data.
- Non representativity of some populations in FL.
- Non selection of some populations by FL
- Unfair aggregation.

#### Conclusion

#### Bias problem formulation

In a biased model, the value of S decides the membership of a data to either the privileged group (i.e.  $Y^{2} = p *$ ) or to the unprivileged group, namely  $S \in \{a = priv, b\}$ = unpriv $\}$ .

Such a model does not provide group fairness [10]. With the latter, elements of the privileged group and unprivileged group have equal probability of having prediction results with a positive property, as formulated below:  $Pr(Y^{=} p * |S =$ priv) =  $Pr(Y^{2} = p * | S = unpriv)$ 

(2) Furthermore, in case of FL systems, the cause of bias of the global model can come from all or a subset of clients involved in a FL round. Thus, it is important to precisely determine the origin of bias in a FL system, to adequately mitigate it without hurting model quality.

#### Bias problem formulation

In a biased model, the value of S decides the membership of a data to either the privileged group (i.e.  $Y^{2} = p *$ ) or to the unprivileged group, namely  $S \in \{a = priv, b\}$ = unpriv $\}$ .

Such a model does not provide group fairness [10]. With the latter, elements of the privileged group and unprivileged group have equal probability of having prediction results with a positive property, as formulated below:  $Pr(Y^{=} p * |S =$ priv) =  $Pr(Y^{2} = p * | S = unpriv)$ 

(2) Furthermore, in case of FL systems, the cause of bias of the global model can come from all or a subset of clients involved in a FL round. Thus, it is important to precisely determine the origin of bias in a FL system, to adequately mitigate it without hurting model quality.