

AN INFORMATION GEOMETRIC APPROACH TO FAIRNESS WITH EQUALIZED ODDS CONSTRAINT

Amirreza Zamani[†], Ayfer Özgür[‡], Mikael Skoglund[†]

[†]Division of Information Science and Engineering, KTH Royal Institute of Technology

[‡]Department of Electrical Engineering, Stanford

amizam@kth.se, aozgur@stanford.edu, skoglund@kth.se

ABSTRACT

We study the statistical design of a fair mechanism that attains equalized odds, where an agent uses some useful data (database) X to solve a task T . Since both X and T are correlated with some latent sensitive attribute S , the agent designs a representation Y that satisfies an equalized odds, that is, such that $I(Y; S|T) = 0$. In contrast to our previous work, we assume here that the agent has no direct access to S and T ; hence, the Markov chains $S-X-Y$ and $T-X-Y$ hold. Furthermore, we impose a geometric structure on the conditional distribution $P_{S|Y}$, allowing Y and S to have a small correlation, bounded by a threshold. When the threshold is small, concepts from information geometry allow us to approximate mutual information and reformulate the fair mechanism design problem as a quadratic program with closed-form solutions under certain constraints. For other cases, we derive simple, low-complexity lower bounds based on the maximum singular value and vector of a matrix. Finally, we compare our designs with the optimal solution in a numerical example.

Index Terms— fairness and privacy design, equalized odds, information geometry, KL-approximation, χ^2 point-wise measure

1. INTRODUCTION

As shown in Fig. 1, an agent uses observable data X to make decisions about a task T , where both X and T are correlated with a latent sensitive attribute S . For example, X could be a resume, T an employment decision, and S the applicant's gender or ethnicity.

As outlined in [1, 2], it is important to ensure that decisions are not unfair and that inferences do not violate privacy leakage constraints. To this end, we can design a *private* or *fair* representation Y of the data, that is, a representation that contains the maximum possible information about the task T while satisfying fairness or privacy criteria with respect to the sensitive attribute or secret [1–12]. Privacy and fairness are closely related [1, 2, 12] and can be jointly leveraged in applications such as classification. In particular, [1] considers the design of Y that satisfies $I(Y; S) = 0$. In the privacy literature, independence of Y and S is called *perfect*




Fig. 1. Data representation with an equalized odds constraint. The goal is to design a representation Y of the data X that is useful for the task T , is compressed, and leaks within a controlled threshold of the sensitive attribute S . Here, the agent has no direct access to S and T .

privacy or *perfect secrecy* [8, 11], while in the fairness literature it is known as *perfect demographic* (or *statistical*) *parity* [2–5]. As noted in [7, 9, 11–13], perfect privacy or demographic parity is often unattainable; thus [13] proposes a bounded criterion, $I(S; Y) \leq \epsilon$. In contrast to [1, 13], here, we use the *equalized-odds* notion of fairness [6], employing $I(Y; S|T) = 0$ as the criterion. We also assume that neither the sensitive attribute S nor the task T is directly accessible to the agent (Fig. 1), i.e., the Markov chains $S-X-Y$ and $T-X-Y$ hold.

Many information-theoretic problems are challenging due to the lack of geometric structure on probability distributions. When distributions are close, KL divergence and mutual information can be approximated by a weighted squared Euclidean distance, enabling tractable approximations. This approach has been applied to point-to-point and broadcast channels [14, 15], as well as to privacy settings [7, 9, 10, 16, 17]. Under the fairness requirements, we study the trade-off between utility, compression, and equalized odds. Specifically, we maximize the information that Y conveys about the task T , subject to the compression constraint $I(Y; X) \leq r$ and the equalized-odds condition $I(S; Y|T) = 0$. In addition, we impose a point-wise constraint on $P_{S|Y}$, allowing us to use information-geometric tools as in [9] to approximate mutual information and reduce the problem to a tractable quadratic

linear-algebra form with intuitive insight.

Prior works on fairness: The notion of *fair representations* was introduced by Zemel et al. [5], advancing algorithmic fairness through deep learning. Later work has focused on adversarial [4, 5, 18] and variational [2, 19–21] approaches, while theoretical trade-offs between utility and fairness are studied in [3]. In [2], the authors study an information-theoretic fairness problem and introduce the Conditional Fairness Bottleneck (CFB), which captures the trade-offs among utility, fairness, and compression of representations in terms of mutual information. This criterion has since been adopted in subsequent studies [21, 22], with representation design based on a variational approach. In contrast, [1] proposes a constructive theoretical framework for fair representations with perfect demographic parity, providing upper and lower bounds on the utility–fairness–compression trade-off. The lower bounds are attained using randomization and extensions of the Functional and Strong Functional Representation Lemmas [7]. Finally, [13] extends this setting by relaxing perfect demographic parity to a bounded statistical-parity constraint. In [12], a binary classification problem subject to both differential privacy and fairness constraints is studied. In [23], the role of data processing in the fairness–accuracy trade-off, using equalized odds as the fairness criterion, has been studied.

Contributions: Here, we propose a simple theoretical approach for designing fair representations under equalized odds, addressing the trade-off between utility, fairness, and compression (2). By imposing a point-wise constraint on $P_{S|Y}$, we restrict the correlation between Y and S ; when this threshold is small, the optimization reduces to a quadratic problem. The resulting design relies on the maximum singular value and vector of a matrix, and we validate it against the optimal solution in a numerical example.

2. SYSTEM MODEL

In this section, we introduce the problem of designing a compressed representation of data under equalized odds. Let the sensitive data S , shared data (useful data) X , and task T be discrete random variables (RVs) defined on alphabets \mathcal{S} , \mathcal{X} , and \mathcal{T} , of finite cardinalities $|\mathcal{S}|$, $|\mathcal{X}|$, and $|\mathcal{T}|$, respectively. The marginal probability distributions of S , X , and T are denoted by $P_S \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$, $P_X \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$, and $P_T \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{T}|}$, respectively. Furthermore, $P_{S,X,T} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{X}| \times |\mathcal{T}|}$ denotes the joint distribution of S , X and T . We assume that S , T , and X form the Markov chain $S - T - X$; that is, the sensitive attribute S and the database X are correlated only through task T . For example, S may be a deterministic function of T . We will discuss the benefits of this assumption later. Furthermore, we assume that $P_{T|X}$ and $P_{S|T}$ are invertible matrices yielding $|\mathcal{X}| = |\mathcal{S}| = |\mathcal{T}|$. Let the discrete RV $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ denote the fair representation. As we outlined before, the Markov chains $S - X - Y$ and $T - X - Y$ hold, as the agent has no direct access to S and T . The goal is to design a mapping $P_{Y|X} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{X}|}$ that maximizes the information it keeps

about the task T , while maintaining a minimum level of compression r and satisfying the equalized odds $I(Y; S|T) = 0$, i.e., Y should satisfy the Markov chain $S - T - Y$. As we outlined earlier, in this work, we impose a point-wise (strong) χ^2 -constraint on $P_{S|Y}$ as follows. Here, the representation Y should also satisfy

$$\chi^2(P_{S|Y=y}; P_S) = \sum_s \left(\frac{P_{S|y}(s) - P_S(s)}{P_S(s)} \right)^2 \leq \epsilon^2, \forall y, \quad (1)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ corresponds to the Euclidean norm. Intuitively, for small ϵ , (1) means that the two distributions (vectors) $P_{S|Y=y}$ and P_S are close to each other. The closeness of $P_{S|Y=y}$ and P_S allows us to locally approximate $I(T; Y)$ and $I(X; Y)$ which leads to an approximation of (2). Furthermore, (1) illustrates how Y and S can be correlated. Using equalized odds, conditioned on T , Y and S should be independent, however, Y and S can still be correlated, and (1) illustrates the correlation threshold. In other words, we restrict attention to the subset of representations Y that satisfy both the equalized odds and the point-wise constraints. For more details on the point-wise measure, see [9, 10]. Hence, the fair representation design problem can be stated as follows:

$$g_{\epsilon, \chi^2}^r(P_{S,X,T}) \triangleq \sup_{P_{Y|X}: S-X-Y, T-X-Y, \substack{I(Y;S|T)=0, \\ \chi^2(P_{S|y};P_S) \leq \epsilon^2, \forall y, \\ I(X;Y) \leq r}} I(Y; T). \quad (2)$$

The constraint $I(Y; S|T) = 0$, corresponds to the equalized odds, the point-wise measure describes the correlation between Y and S , and $I(X; Y) \leq r$ represents the compression rate constraint.

Remark 1. We define the utility–fairness–compression trade-off, subject to equalized-odds and compression constraints, as follows.

$$g_{\epsilon}^r(P_{S,X,T}) \triangleq \sup_{P_{Y|X}: S-X-Y, T-X-Y, \substack{I(Y;S|T)=0, \\ I(X;Y) \leq r}} I(Y; T). \quad (3)$$

Then, we have $g_{\epsilon, \chi^2}^r(P_{S,X,T}) \leq g_{\epsilon}^r(P_{S,X,T})$. In other words, since problem (3) is hard to solve, we instead study the lower bound (2) that can be addressed using the concepts from information geometry.

Remark 2. In this work, we assume that $P_{S|T}$ and $P_{T|X}$ are invertible; however, this assumption can be generalized using the techniques in [10]. Here, we focus on invertible cases for design simplicity and leave the generalization to future work.

3. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we first derive an approximation to (2). We then find lower bounds for this approximation and discuss their tightness. To do so, using (1), we can rewrite the conditional distribution $P_{S|Y=y}$ as a perturbation of P_S . Thus,

for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we can write $P_{S|Y=y} = P_S + \epsilon \cdot J_y$, where $J_y \in \mathbb{R}^S$ is a perturbation vector that has the following three properties

$$\sum_s J_y(s) = 0, \quad \forall y, \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_y P_Y(y) J_y(s) = 0, \quad \forall s, \quad (5)$$

$$\|[\sqrt{P_S}^{-1}] J_y\|_2 = \sum_x \frac{J_y(s)^2}{P_S(s)} \leq 1. \quad (6)$$

We note that (5) implies $\sum_u P_Y(y) J_y = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{|S|}$. The first two properties ensure that $P_{S|Y=y}$ is a valid probability distribution [9, 10], and the third property follows from (1). Next, we approximate $I(Y; X)$ and $I(Y; T)$ using the Markov chains and the perturbation vector J_y . In the next results, we use the Bachmann-Landau notation where $o(\epsilon)$ describes the asymptotic behavior of a function $f: \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which satisfies $\frac{f(\epsilon)}{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Here, $[\sqrt{P_X}]$ denotes the diagonal matrix with entries $\sqrt{P_X(x)}$.

Lemma 1. For all $\epsilon < \frac{\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_X(x)}{|\sigma_{\max}(P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1})| \sqrt{\max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P_S(s)}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(X; Y) &= \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \sum_y P_y \|[\sqrt{P_X}^{-1}] P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \\ &\simeq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \sum_y P_y \|[\sqrt{P_X}^{-1}] P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

and for all $\epsilon < \frac{|\sigma_{\min}(P_{S|T})| \min_{t \in \mathcal{T}} P_T(t)}{\sqrt{\max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P_S(s)}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(T; Y) &= \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \sum_y P_y \|[\sqrt{P_T}^{-1}] P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \\ &\simeq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \sum_y P_y \|[\sqrt{P_T}^{-1}] P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Proof: To approximate $I(T; Y)$, using the Markov chain $S - T - Y$ and invertible $P_{S|T}$ we can rewrite $P_{T|Y=y}$ as perturbations of P_T as follows: $P_{T|Y=y} = P_{S|T}^{-1} [P_{S|Y=y} - P_S] + P_T = \epsilon \cdot P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y + P_T$. Then, by using local approximation of the KL-divergence which is based on the second order Taylor expansion of $\log(1+x)$ we get $I(Y; T) = \sum_y P_Y(y) D(P_{T|Y=y} \| P_T) = \sum_y P_Y(y) \times \sum_t P_T(t) \log\left(1 + \epsilon \frac{P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y(t)}{P_T(t)}\right) = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \sum_y P_Y(y) \times \sum_t \frac{(P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y(t))^2}{P_T(t)} + o(\epsilon^2)$. For more details see [9, Proposition 3]. Due to the Taylor expansion, we must have $|\epsilon \frac{P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y(t)}{P_T(t)}| < 1$ for all t and y . A sufficient condition for ϵ to satisfy this inequality is to have $\epsilon < \frac{|\sigma_{\min}(P_{S|T})| \min_{t \in \mathcal{T}} P_T(t)}{\sqrt{\max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P_S(s)}}$, since in this

case we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^2 |P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y(t)|^2 &\leq \epsilon^2 \|P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y\|^2 \leq \epsilon^2 \sigma_{\max}^2(P_{S|T}^{-1}) \|J_y\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{\epsilon^2 \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P_S(s)}{\sigma_{\min}^2(P_{S|T})} < \min_{t \in \mathcal{T}} P_T(t), \end{aligned}$$

which implies $|\epsilon \frac{P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y(t)}{P_T(t)}| < 1$. The step (a) follows from $\sigma_{\max}^2(P_{S|T}^{-1}) = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}^2(P_{S|T})}$ and $\|J_y\|^2 \leq \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P_S(s)$. The latter inequality follows from (6) since we have $\frac{\|J_y\|^2}{\max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P_S(s)} \leq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{J_y(s)^2}{P_S(s)} \leq 1$. Furthermore, using the Markov chain $T - X - Y$ and invertible $P_{T|X}$ we can rewrite $P_{X|Y=y}$ as perturbations of P_X as follows $P_{X|Y=y} = P_{T|X}^{-1} [P_{T|Y=y} - P_T] + P_X = \epsilon P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y + P_X$. Then, using similar approach we have $I(Y; X) = \sum_y P_Y(y) D(P_{X|Y=y} \| P_X) = \sum_y P_Y(y) \times \sum_x P_X(x) \log\left(1 + \epsilon \frac{P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y(x)}{P_X(x)}\right) = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \sum_y P_Y(y) \times \sum_x \frac{(P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y(x))^2}{P_X(x)} + o(\epsilon^2)$. Finally, for approximating $I(X; Y)$ we must have $|\epsilon \frac{P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y(x)}{P_X(x)}| < 1$ for all x and y . A sufficient condition for ϵ to satisfy this inequality is to have $\epsilon < \frac{\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_X(x)}{|\sigma_{\max}(P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1})| \sqrt{\max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P_S(s)}}$, since in this case we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^2 |P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y(x)|^2 &\leq \epsilon^2 \|P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1} J_y\|^2 \\ &\leq \epsilon^2 \sigma_{\max}^2(P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1}) \|J_y\|^2 \\ &\leq \epsilon^2 \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P_S(s) \sigma_{\max}^2(P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1}) < \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_X(x). \end{aligned}$$

Let $L_y \triangleq [\sqrt{P_S}^{-1}] J_y$, $W^{T;Y} \triangleq [\sqrt{P_T}^{-1}] P_{S|T}^{-1} [\sqrt{P_S}]$, $W^{X;Y} \triangleq [\sqrt{P_X}^{-1}] P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1} [\sqrt{P_S}]$, $c_1 \triangleq \frac{\min_x P_X(x)}{|\sigma_{\max}(P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1})| \sqrt{\max_s P_S(s)}}$, $c_2 \triangleq \frac{|\sigma_{\min}(P_{S|T})| \min_t P_T(t)}{\sqrt{\max_s P_S(s)}}$.

Theorem 1. For all $\epsilon < \min\{c_1, c_2\}$, (2) can be approximated by the following problem

$$(2) \simeq P_2 \triangleq \max_{\substack{P_y, L_y: L_y \perp \sqrt{P_S}, \\ \sum_y P_y L_y = 0, \\ \|L_y\|^2 \leq 1, \\ \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \sum_y P_y \|W^{X;Y} L_y\|^2 \leq r}} \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \sum_y P_y \|W^{T;Y} L_y\|^2. \quad (9)$$

Proof: The proof follows by Lemma 1. The constraints $L_y \perp \sqrt{P_S}$, $\sum_y P_y L_y = 0$, and $\|L_y\|^2 \leq 1$ are followed by (4), (5), and (6), for more detail see [9].

Remark 3. The compression-rate constraint $I(X; Y) \leq r$ can be rewritten as $\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \sum_y P_y \|W^{X;Y} L_y\|^2 \leq r - o(\epsilon^2)$. Since the compression threshold r is typically much larger than the correlation parameter ϵ , we neglect the $o(\epsilon^2)$ term relative to r . We can also derive an upper bound on the error term and use it here; we leave this to future work.

Next, we present properties of $W^{X;Y}$ and $W^{T;Y}$ used to find bounds on (9); the proof follows [9] and is omitted.

Proposition 1. *Each of the matrices $W^{T;Y}$ and $W^{X;Y}$ has singular value 1, with corresponding singular vector $\sqrt{P_S}$.*

Next, we find lower bounds on (9) and discuss their tightness. To this end, let $\sigma_{\max}^{T;Y}$ and $\sigma_{\max_2}^{T;Y}$ denote the largest and second-largest singular values of the matrix $W^{T;Y}$, with corresponding singular vectors $L_{\sigma}^{W^{T;Y}}$ and $L_{\sigma_2}^{W^{T;Y}}$, respectively.

Theorem 2. *If $\sigma_{\max}^{T;Y} > 1$, we have*

$$P_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 \left(\frac{\sigma_{\max}^{T;Y}}{K} \right)^2 \quad (10)$$

where $1 \leq K$ is the smallest constant that satisfies $\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 \|W^{X;Y} L_{\sigma}^{W^{T;Y}}\|^2 \leq rK^2$. If $\sigma_{\max}^{T;Y} = 1$, then

$$P_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 \left(\frac{\sigma_{\max_2}^{T;Y}}{K} \right)^2, \quad (11)$$

where $1 \leq K$ is the smallest constant that satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 \|W^{X;Y} L_{\sigma_2}^{W^{T;Y}}\|^2 \leq rK^2. \text{ Finally, for } |\mathcal{S}| = 2, P_2 = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 \left(\frac{\sigma_{\max}^{T;Y}}{K} \right)^2 \text{ or } P_2 = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 \left(\frac{\sigma_{\max_2}^{T;Y}}{K} \right)^2, \text{ depending on } \sigma_{\max}^{T;Y}.$$

Proof: To derive the first lower bound, let $\sigma_{\max}^{T;Y} > 1$. Using Proposition 1, we have $L_{\sigma}^{W^{T;Y}} \perp \sqrt{P_S}$. Let Y be a uniform binary RV. Furthermore, let $L_1 = \frac{L_{\sigma}^{W^{T;Y}}}{K}$ and $L_2 = \frac{-L_{\sigma}^{W^{T;Y}}}{K}$. Clearly, $L_1 \perp \sqrt{P_S}$ and $L_2 \perp \sqrt{P_S}$ and $P_Y(1)L_1 + P_Y(2)L_2 = 0$. Moreover, we have $\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 (\sum_y P_Y \|W^{T;Y} L_y\|^2) = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 \left(\frac{\sigma_{\max}^{T;Y}}{K} \right)^2$. The proof of (11) is similar. To prove the last argument, note that when $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$, the matrix $W^{T;Y}$ has two singular vectors, one of which is $\sqrt{P_S}$. Hence, the only feasible direction is the other singular vector which completes the proof.

After finding L_y and P_Y attaining the lower bounds in Theorem 2, we have $P_{S|Y=0} = P_S + \epsilon[\sqrt{P_S}]L_1$, $P_{S|Y=1} = P_S + \epsilon[\sqrt{P_S}]L_2$, $P_{T|Y=0} = P_T + \epsilon P_{S|T}^{-1}[\sqrt{P_S}]L_1$, $P_{T|Y=1} = P_T + \epsilon P_{S|T}^{-1}[\sqrt{P_S}]L_2$, $P_{X|Y=0} = P_X + \epsilon P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1}[\sqrt{P_S}]L_1$, $P_{X|Y=1} = P_X + \epsilon P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1}[\sqrt{P_S}]L_2$, where L_1, L_2 and marginal distribution of Y are obtained in Theorem 2.

Remark 4. *The Markov chain $S - T - X$ helps us verify that the distributions achieving the lower bounds also satisfy the Markov chain $S - X - Y$. Latter follows since we have $P_{S|X} P_{X|Y=0} = P_S + \epsilon P_{S|X} P_{T|X}^{-1} P_{S|T}^{-1}[\sqrt{P_S}]L_1 \stackrel{(a)}{=} P_S + \epsilon[\sqrt{P_S}]L_1 = P_{S|Y=0}$, where (a) follows from $P_{S|X} P_{T|X}^{-1} = P_{S|T}$, since the Markov chain $S - T - X$ holds.*

Next, we present an example to evaluate the proposed approach and compare the results with (2) and (3).

Example: Let $P_{T|X} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{4} & \frac{2}{5} \\ \frac{3}{4} & \frac{3}{5} \end{bmatrix}$ and P_X be given as $[\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}]^T$.




Fig. 2. Comparing our method with the optimal solutions of (2) and (3). In high-privacy regimes, P_2 is close to (2) (via exhaustive search), and $g_{\epsilon}^r(P_{S,X,T})$ dominates $g_{\epsilon, \chi^2}^r(P_{S,X,T})$.

Furthermore, let $P_{S|T} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{5} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{4}{5} \end{bmatrix}$. Thus, we find $P_T = [0.3625, 0.6375]^T$ and $P_S = P_{S|T} P_T = [0.3088, 0.6913]^T$. Furthermore we find $W^{T;Y} = \begin{bmatrix} 2.4610 & -0.9206 \\ -1.1599 & 1.7355 \end{bmatrix}$ and $W^{X;Y} = \begin{bmatrix} -16.7931 & 11.8246 \\ -10.3371 & -5.8669 \end{bmatrix}$. The singular values of $W^{T;Y}$ are 3.2034 and 1 with corresponding right singular vectors $[-0.8314, 0.5557]^T$ and $[0.5557, 0.8314]^T$, respectively. Moreover, the singular values of $W^{X;Y}$ are 23.7087 and 1 with corresponding right singular vectors $[0.8314, -0.5557]^T$ and $[0.5557, 0.8314]^T$, respectively. Here, we let $\epsilon \in [0.005, 0.05]$ and $r = 0.2$. L_1 equals to $[-0.8314, 0.5557]^T$ and we can check the the compression rate constraint is satisfied for L_1 which yields $K = 1$. Using Theorem 2, we have $P_2 = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 (3.2034)^2$ and the lower bound is tight since $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$. In Fig. 2, we compare P_2 and the optimal solutions of (2) and (3) using exhaustive search. We recall that P_2 is the approximate of (2) and here achieves the lower bound in Theorem 2. We can see that $g_{\epsilon}^r(P_{S,X,T})$ dominates $g_{\epsilon, \chi^2}^r(P_{S,X,T})$, and the gap between exact values of (2) and (3) is decreasing as ϵ increases. Finally, the gap between P_2 and (2) is small in the high privacy regimes. Intuitively, the blue curve dominates (2) (red curve), since, compared to (3), (2) imposes the point-wise χ^2 -criterion in addition to the equalized odds.

4. CONCLUSION

We have shown that information geometry can be used to simplify an information-theoretic fair mechanism design problem with equalized odds as the fairness constraint. When a small ϵ correlation threshold is allowed, simple approximate solutions are derived. Specifically, we look for vectors satisfying the fairness constraints of having the largest Euclidean norm, leading to finding the largest principle singular value and vector of a matrix. The proposed approach establishes a useful and general design framework, which has been used in other privacy design problems such as considering point-wise χ^2 and ℓ_1 criterion in the literature.

5. REFERENCES

- [1] A. Zamani, B. Rodríguez-Gálvez, and M. Skoglund, "On information theoretic fairness: Compressed representations with perfect demographic parity," in *2024 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2024, pp. 25–30.
- [2] B. Rodríguez-Gálvez, R. Thobaben, and M. Skoglund, "A variational approach to privacy and fairness," in *2021 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [3] H. Zhao and G. J. Gordon, "Inherent tradeoffs in learning fair representations," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 23, no. 57, pp. 1–26, 2022.
- [4] H. Zhao, A. Coston, T. Adel, and G. J. Gordon, "Conditional learning of fair representations," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [5] R. Zemel, Y. Wu, K. Swersky, T. Pitassi, and C. Dwork, "Learning fair representations," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2013, pp. 325–333.
- [6] M. Hardt, E. Price, and N. Srebro, "Equality of opportunity in supervised learning," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 29, 2016.
- [7] A. Zamani, T. J. Oechtering, and M. Skoglund, "On the privacy-utility trade-off with and without direct access to the private data," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 70, no. 3, pp. 2177–2200, 2024.
- [8] B. Rassouli and D. Gündüz, "On perfect privacy," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 177–191, 2021.
- [9] A. Zamani, T. J. Oechtering, and M. Skoglund, "A design framework for strongly χ^2 -private data disclosure," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 16, pp. 2312–2325, 2021.
- [10] A. Zamani, T. J. Oechtering, and M. Skoglund, "Data disclosure with non-zero leakage and non-invertible leakage matrix," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 17, pp. 165–179, 2022.
- [11] Y. Y. Shkel, R. S. Blum, and H. V. Poor, "Secrecy by design with applications to privacy and compression," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 824–843, 2021.
- [12] H. Ghoukasian and S. Asoodeh, "Differentially private fair binary classifications," in *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2024, pp. 611–616.
- [13] A. Zamani, A. Changizi, R. Thobaben, and M. Skoglund, "Information-theoretic fairness with a bounded statistical parity constraint," in *2025 23rd International Symposium on Modeling and Optimization in Mobile, Ad Hoc, and Wireless Networks (WiOpt)*, 2025, pp. 1–8.
- [14] S. Borade and L. Zheng, "Euclidean information theory," in *2008 IEEE International Zurich Seminar on Communications*, 2008, pp. 14–17.
- [15] S. L. Huang and L. Zheng, "Linear information coupling problems," in *2012 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory Proceedings*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 1029–1033.
- [16] E. M. Athanasakos, N. Kalouptsidis, and H. Manjunath, "Local approximation of secrecy capacity," in *2024 32nd European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, 2024, pp. 745–749.
- [17] J. Liao, L. Sankar, V. Y. F. Tan, and F. du Pin Calmon, "Hypothesis testing under mutual information privacy constraints in the high privacy regime," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 1058–1071, 2018.
- [18] H. Edwards and A. Storkey, "Censoring representations with an adversary," in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2016, pp. 1–14.
- [19] E. Creager, D. Madras, J.-H. Jacobsen, M. Weis, K. Swersky, T. Pitassi, and R. Zemel, "Flexibly fair representation learning by disentanglement," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 1436–1445.
- [20] C. Louizos, K. Swersky, Y. Li, M. Welling, and R. Zemel, "The variational fair autoencoder," *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2016.
- [21] U. Gupta, A. M. Ferber, B. Dilkina, and G. Ver Steeg, "Controllable guarantees for fair outcomes via contrastive information estimation," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 9, 2021, pp. 7610–7619.
- [22] J. M. de Freitas and B. C. Geiger, "Funck: Information funnels and bottlenecks for invariant representation learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01446*, 2022.
- [23] S. Khodadadian, A. Ghassami, and N. Kiyavash, "Impact of data processing on fairness in supervised learning," in *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2021, pp. 2643–2648.