

# Beyond Exposure: Optimizing Ranking Fairness with Non-linear Time-Income Functions

Xuancheng Li\*  
lixuancheng23@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn  
DCST, Tsinghua University  
Beijing, China

Tao Yang  
taoyang@cs.utah.edu  
Kahlert School of Computing,  
University of Utah  
Salt Lake City, Utah, USA

Yujia Zhou  
zhouyujia@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn  
DCST, Tsinghua University  
Beijing, China

Qingyao Ai  
aiqingyao@gmail.com  
DCST, Tsinghua University  
Beijing, China

Yiqun Liu  
yiqunliu@tsinghua.edu.cn  
DCST, Tsinghua University  
Beijing, China

## Abstract

Ranking is central to information distribution in web search and recommendation. Nowadays, in ranking optimization, the fairness to item providers is viewed as a crucial factor alongside ranking relevance for users. There are currently numerous concepts of fairness and one widely recognized fairness concept is *Exposure Fairness*. However, it relies primarily on exposure determined solely by position, overlooking other factors that significantly influence income, such as time. To address this limitation, we propose to study ranking fairness when the provider utility is influenced by other contextual factors and is neither equal to nor proportional to item exposure. We give a formal definition of *Income Fairness* and develop a corresponding measurement metric. Simulated experiments show that existing-exposure-fairness-based ranking algorithms fail to optimize the proposed income fairness. Therefore, we propose the **Dynamic-Income-Derivative-aware Ranking Fairness** algorithm, which, based on the marginal income gain at the present timestep, uses Taylor-expansion-based gradients to simultaneously optimize effectiveness and income fairness. In both offline and online settings with diverse time-income functions, DIDRF consistently outperforms state-of-the-art methods.

## Keywords

Learning to Rank, Exposure Fairness, Time-aware Fairness

## ACM Reference Format:

Xuancheng Li, Tao Yang, Yujia Zhou, Qingyao Ai, and Yiqun Liu. 2026. Beyond Exposure: Optimizing Ranking Fairness with Non-linear Time-Income Functions. In *Proceedings of The 49th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR 2026)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

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 2026, Melbourne, Australia

© 2026 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.  
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YYYY/MM  
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 Introduction

Ranking serves as the core of information distribution in modern information retrieval (IR) systems such as web search engines and recommendation systems. Depending on how information is ranked and presented to users, ranking systems can control how much utility a user or a provider could get from an IR service. Previous studies on ranking optimization usually focus on improving the effectiveness of ranking systems through maximizing user utility [17, 34], i.e., putting the items with the highest relevance to user's need at positions that are most likely to be noticed by users. Nowadays, as more and more people recognize that monotonically optimizing relevance could lead to severe imbalance and unfairness to information providers in the market, more research starts to study fairness problems in ranking algorithms. How to develop a ranking system that can provide relevant results to users while maintaining a reasonable fairness to information providers has thus become an important research question in the IR community [19].

When talking about ranking fairness for information providers, one of the most well-known concepts adopted in multiple studies is *Exposure Fairness* [22]. Assuming that information providers could benefit only from the exposure of their products to users, the problem of ranking fairness from the provider side is essentially a problem of exposure allocations. Therefore, the idea of exposure fairness is that, if a ranking system could provide equal exposure to information providers with similar properties, then the system should be considered fair. Example studies in this direction include the group-based fairness [18, 32], relevance-based fairness [30], etc. While the objectives and definitions of fairness could vary a bit, most of the existing studies on provider-side ranking fairness focus on exposure fairness and assume that provider utility can be directly represented or is proportional to item exposure [4, 11, 38].

Despite its simplicity and popularity, equating provider utility with item exposure in exposure fairness is unreliable in practice [27]: beyond exposure, a provider's utility usually depends on factors such as time and region, and the conversion from exposure to utility is context-dependent and often non-linear. Consequently, algorithms that equalize exposure may equalize a proxy while leaving the provider utility unfair. For instance, time also represents a pivotal factor affecting the provider utility [27]. In some time-sensitive domains, the utility realized by providers is time-dependent: earlier exposure in breaking news consistently translates into higher

news provider income [8] and restaurants obtain more orders when recommended to nearby customers during peak hours [3, 39].

Therefore, in this paper, we study the problem of ranking fairness when provider utility is not necessarily equal or proportional to item exposure. We define the provider utility induced by exposure in ranking as **income**, i.e., a ranking-induced expected provider-utility signal under a given context (e.g., time). We establish a formal definition of *Income Fairness*, introduce an income function that maps context-specific exposure to income, and develop a corresponding measurement metric. Instead of modeling provider utility solely using item exposure, income fairness seeks to ensure fairness in provider utility within ranking under more realistic, complex, and context-dependent conditions.

Based on this motivation, we conduct simulation experiments on public ranking datasets by explicitly modeling how the exposure–income relationship varies with context; as a concrete instantiation, we consider time as one representative contextual factor. Time has been acknowledged to influence whether an item exposure can lead to profit for the information provider [7, 39]. Concretely, we introduce time-dependent exposure-to-income functions, where the value of a unit exposure to a provider can be (i) *periodic* (e.g., restaurant recommendations across different hours of a day, or winter jacket recommendations during colder months) or (ii) *non-periodic / event-driven* (e.g., breaking news and other highly time-sensitive items). Our experiments show that simply replacing exposure with income in existing fairness algorithms often yields suboptimal results, indicating that optimizing ranking fairness under context-varying exposure-to-income mappings requires new methods. This is mainly because these algorithms implicitly treat exposure itself as the provider-utility signal. As a result, their optimization targets and mechanisms are mismatched to context-dependent environments where exposure translates to provider utility through nontrivial mappings.

To address these challenges, we propose the **Dynamic-Income-Derivative-aware Ranking Fairness (DIDRF)** algorithm in both offline (known relevance) and online (unknown relevance) settings. DIDRF aims to jointly optimize ranking effectiveness and the proposed income fairness. Given the complexity of the overall objective, we start from the marginal income gain at the current timestep and employ a second-order Taylor expansion to simplify the objective into direct score computation and item ranking, ensuring both effectiveness and efficiency. We validate DIDRF through offline and online simulated experiments in different scenarios and further conduct a series of analytical experiments to investigate the underlying mechanisms of DIDRF.

## 2 RELATED WORK

**Exposure Fairness and Income Fairness.** Exposure fairness is a key concept in online ranking algorithms. Biega et al. [4] and Singh et al. [17] introduced the principle of amortized exposure fairness, which posits that the cumulative exposure across all rankings is proportional to the cumulative relevance. The goal of exposure fairness is to mitigate position bias, where items at the top of rankings receive more attention, while lower-ranked items are often overlooked, leading to unfair access to relevant information [10]. However, as mentioned in §1, ensuring fairness in exposure based

on item positions does not guarantee fairness in the income received by item providers since the income of item providers is often influenced not only by exposure but also by other factors [27]. The concept of income fairness has been proposed in some existing literature [2, 5]. Nonetheless, income fairness has not been widely applied to fair ranking. In §4, we will introduce the concept of income fairness, provide a formalized definition, and present the calculation formula used in the ranking process.

**Fair Ranking Algorithm.** Recently, several ranking algorithms [14, 15, 21, 29, 33, 37, 38, 40] have been proposed to achieve exposure-based fairness. Previous work [37] categorized these algorithms into open-loop and feedback-loop algorithms, based on whether historical outcomes are used to update ranking scores. For open-loop fair algorithms [15, 24, 30, 31], techniques such as linear programming [15, 30], policy gradient [31], and differentiable PL model optimization [24] are employed to stochastically sample ranklists for each session based on static ranking scores. Since ranking scores remain static, open-loop algorithms often lack robustness. To solve this problem, feedback-loop algorithms [4, 23, 35, 37, 38] dynamically utilize historical ranking results as input for updating ranking scores. Our method also belongs to feedback-loop algorithms.

## 3 Background

In this section, we focus on the background knowledge for this paper. In §3.1, we outline the ranking system workflow discussed in this paper. §3.2 introduces the computation of user-side utility and §3.3 introduces exposure fairness, a widely used metric for modeling provider utility.

### 3.1 The Ranking System

**3.1.1 Workflow of Ranking System.** Building on prior research [37, 38], the ranking process is conventionally structured as follows, and our study adheres to the same procedure. (1) At timestep  $n$ , a ranking session is initiated when a user submits a query  $q$ .<sup>1</sup> (2) For this query  $q$ , candidate items are sourced from item providers. (3) If the true relevance of these items is unknown, the ranking system uses a relevance estimator to infer each item’s relevance based on user feedback. (4) The system then constructs a ranked list of candidate items by optimizing specific ranking objectives, which may include effectiveness, fairness, or a combination of both. (5) The ranked list is presented to the user, and their feedback, such as clicks, is collected. (6) This feedback is then used to update the relevance estimator and other factors, such as income or exposure, depending on the ranking objectives.

**3.1.2 Partial and Biased Feedback.** As noted above, user feedback plays a critical role in ranking systems. However, users’ feedback could be a partial and biased indicator of relevance since users only provide meaningful feedback for items that they have examined. Following existing works on click models [9, 35], we model the probability of user’s click  $c$  as:

$$p(c = 1 | d) = p(e = 1 | d)p(r = 1 | d) \quad (1)$$

Eq. (1) models the probability of a user clicking on a candidate item  $d$ , denoted  $p(c = 1 | d)$ , which factorizes as  $p(c = 1 | d) =$

<sup>1</sup>Note that the query  $q$  here represents a general ranking request, such as a user’s request for recommendations or a text query submitted to a search engine.

$p(e = 1 | d) p(r = 1 | d)$ , where (i)  $p(e = 1 | d)$  is the probability that item  $d$  is examined by the user and (ii)  $p(r = 1 | d)$  is the probability that item  $d$  is relevant to the user. Thus, the overall probability  $p(c = 1 | d)$  models the fact that a user will click on item  $d$  only if it is both relevant and examined, reflecting the conditional dependencies between these two factors, rather than solely relevance. Therefore, user feedback can be an imperfect and biased indicator of relevance due to the fact that users tend to provide meaningful feedback exclusively for items they have examined. Following existing works [24, 36], there are two main types of biases in the user’s examination process which we take into consideration in our problem formulation:

- **Positional Bias** [10]: The positional bias means the probability of examination decreases with the position. We use  $p(\text{rank}(d | \pi))$  to represent the probability in this work, where  $\text{rank}(d | \pi)$  is item  $d$ ’s rank in ranklist  $\pi$ .
- **Selection Bias** [25]: The selection bias occurs when not all items are presented to users or when certain lists are excessively long, making it unlikely for users to examine the entire list. We simulate this by assuming that items ranked beyond position  $k_c$  will not be examined by the user:

Therefore, the probability of examination is defined as follows:

$$p(e = 1 | d, \pi) = \begin{cases} p(\text{rank}(d | \pi)), & \text{if } \text{rank}(d | \pi) \leq k_c \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

For notational simplicity, we let  $p_i$  represent the probability that an item at position  $i$  is examined, i.e.,  $p_i = p(e = 1 | \text{rank}(d | \pi) = i)$ . It is important to note that the probability of examination  $p(e = 1 | d, \pi)$  depends solely on the position of item  $d$  in the ranking list  $\pi$ , and does not depend on the specific item itself.

### 3.2 User Utility Measurement

In ranking systems, user satisfaction, also referred to as user-side utility or effectiveness—is crucial for evaluating performance. It measures how well relevant items are placed higher in the ranking, thereby reflecting the system’s utility from the users’ perspective. A widely used metric for user-side utility is **Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (NDCG)** [16], which evaluates the quality of a ranking list  $\pi$  for a query  $q$  by comparing it to the ideal ranking  $\pi^*$ :

$$\text{NDCG}@k_c(\pi) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k_c} R(\pi[i], q) \lambda_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{k_c} R(\pi^*[i], q) \lambda_i} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k_c} R(\pi[i], q) p_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{k_c} R(\pi^*[i], q) p_i}. \quad (3)$$

Here,  $R(\pi[i], q)^2$  is the relevance of the item at position  $i$ , and  $\lambda_i$  is the weight assigned to position  $i$ . Following prior work [29], we set  $\lambda_i$  equal to the examination probability  $p_i$ . Building on NDCG, **cumulative NDCG (cNDCG)** is used to evaluate **effectiveness** in online ranking systems [38]. We also use it as the effectiveness metric in this paper:

$$\text{eff.} = \text{cNDCG}@k_c = \sum_{\tau=1}^n \alpha^{\tau-n} \text{NDCG}@k_c(\pi_\tau) = \sum_{d \in D(q)} R(d) E(d, n) \quad (4)$$

<sup>2</sup>For simplicity, we omit  $q$  and denote the relevance score as  $R(\pi[i])$  in the following text.

where  $\alpha$  is a discount factor,  $n$  is the total number of timesteps, and  $E(d, n)$  denotes the cumulative exposure of item  $d$  [4, 30]:

$$E(d, n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{k_c} p_j \mathbb{I}(\pi_i[j] == d). \quad (5)$$

### 3.3 Provider Utility Measurement

The order in which items are ranked by a ranking system can have a significant impact on the income generated by these providers. A fair ranking system ensures that items with similar quality (i.e., relevance) receive comparable treatment, ultimately aiming to provide item providers with similar earnings for items of similar relevance. In addition to ensuring the effectiveness of the ranking system from the user’s perspective, it is also important to consider fairness towards items and item providers from the provider’s perspective. The most commonly employed fairness metric in current online ranking algorithms is **Exposure Fairness**. Exposure fairness treats exposure (defined via cumulative examination probabilities) as a proxy for provider utility. Here is a commonly used formula for exposure fairness [24]:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{unfair.}(q) &= \frac{1}{|D(q)|(|D(q)| - 1)} \\ &\quad \sum_{d \in D(q)} \sum_{d' \in D(q)} (E(d_x)R(d_y) - E(d_y)R(d_x))^2 \\ \text{fair.}(q) &= -\text{unfair.}(q) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$D(q)$  is the set of candidate items for query  $q$ , and  $d \in D(q)$  means  $d$  is an item from  $D(q)$ .

## 4 INCOME FAIRNESS

Measuring provider utility directly through item exposure, as done in exposure fairness, is often unreliable in practice because the provider utility is also influenced by other contextual factors such as time and region. For example, in news recommendation, earlier placement systematically garners more revenue than later exposure [8]; and in restaurant recommendation, restaurants surfaced to nearby users during peak hours receive substantially more orders than the same exposure delivered off-peak [3, 39]. To address cases where provider utility cannot be faithfully represented by item exposure alone, we propose **Income Fairness**, which defines fairness as the proportionality between a provider’s total income over time and the quality (i.e., relevance) of their items. In §4.1, we give the formal definition of income fairness, and in §4.2 we develop its measurement for the ranking system.

### 4.1 Definition of Income Fairness

*Definition 4.1 (Income Fairness).* A ranking achieves *Income Fairness* if the income earned by each item is proportional to its relevance. Here,  $v_d^l$  denotes the expected income earned by the provider of item  $d$  when ranking list  $\pi_l$  is shown, e.g., revenue, sales volume, downloads. Formally, for any two items  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  from the candidate set  $D(q)$ , the ratio of the income  $v_{d_1}^l$  earned by item  $d_1$  to its relevance  $R(d_1)^l$  is equal to the ratio of the income  $v_{d_2}^l$  earned by item

$d_2$  to its relevance  $R(d_2)^l$ , for all ranking lists  $\pi_l \in \{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_n\}$ :

$$\frac{v_{d_1}^l}{R(d_1)^l} = \frac{v_{d_2}^l}{R(d_2)^l}, \quad \forall d_1, d_2, \pi_l \in \{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_n\} \quad (7)$$

*Income Fairness* need not hold exactly for each individual ranking, especially when similarly relevant items from different providers compete for limited exposure. Inspired by *Amortized Exposure Fairness* [4], we propose *Amortized Income Fairness* for real-world scenarios, where cumulative income is proportional to relevance across multiple rankings.

**Definition 4.2 (Amortized Income Fairness).** A sequence of rankings  $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_n$  achieves *Amortized Income Fairness* if the cumulative income across all rankings is proportional to the cumulative relevance. Formally, for any two items  $d_1$  and  $d_2$ , the ratio of the total income  $\sum_{l=1}^n v_{d_1}^l$  earned by item  $d_1$  to its total relevance  $\sum_{l=1}^n R(d_1)^l$  is equal to the ratio of the total income  $\sum_{l=1}^n v_{d_2}^l$  earned by item  $d_2$  to its total relevance  $\sum_{l=1}^n R(d_2)^l$ :

$$\frac{\sum_{l=1}^n v_{d_1}^l}{\sum_{l=1}^n R(d_1)^l} = \frac{\sum_{l=1}^n v_{d_2}^l}{\sum_{l=1}^n R(d_2)^l}, \quad \forall d_1, d_2 \quad (8)$$

## 4.2 Measurement of Income Fairness

In this section, we introduce a measure of *Income Fairness* for general ranking systems. We start from the observation that only when an item is actually examined by the user can it generate income for its provider; moreover, conditional on being examined, the expected income per examination is context-dependent. Accordingly, the expected income of an item can be decomposed into two parts: (i) *exposure*, which determines how likely the item is examined under a ranking, and (ii) a *unit-income* term, which quantifies the expected income generated per unit exposure under the prevailing context. Based on this decomposition, we define the per-timestep income of item  $d$  under ranking  $\pi_i$  as the product of its exposure and an income function. This formulation cleanly separates the position-driven component (controlled by the ranking system through examination probabilities) from the context-driven monetization component (captured by the income function), resulting in an interpretable and optimizable expression for both per-ranking income and its cumulative form. Specifically, the income  $v_d$  earned by item  $d$  in a ranking  $\pi$  at timestep  $i$  is:

$$v_d(i) = \underbrace{\left( \sum_{j=1}^{k_c} p_j \mathbb{I}(\pi_i[j] == d) \right)}_{E(d, \pi_i)} \cdot f_d \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$  is the indicator function and  $f_d$  is the **income function**, i.e., the unit income per unit exposure of item  $d$ . We treat  $f_d$  as a context-dependent function and aim to allocate exposure to achieve income fairness under such exposure-to-income mappings. The income function  $f_d$  may vary with contextual factors (e.g., time and region) that are orthogonal to position-driven exposure. In this paper, to simplify the problem, we focus on the time factor and model the income function as  $f_d(t_i)$ , where  $t_i$  denotes the real time corresponding to timestep  $i$ , since time has been acknowledged to be an important factor that determines whether an item exposure

could lead to income for the information provider [7, 39]. Over  $n$  timesteps, the cumulative income of item  $d$  is defined as:

$$I(d, n) = \sum_{i=1}^n v_d(i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k_c} p_j \mathbb{I}(\pi_i[j] == d) \right) f_d(t_i) \right] \quad (10)$$

Similarly, the income fairness metric for query  $q$  over  $n$  timesteps is calculated as:

$$\begin{aligned} unfair.(q, n) &= \frac{1}{|D(q)|(|D(q)| - 1)} \\ &\quad \sum_{d_x \in D(q)} \sum_{d_y \in D(q)} (I(d_x, n)R(d_y, q) - I(d_y, n)R(d_x, q))^2 \\ fair.(q, n) &= -unfair.(q, n) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

## 5 PROPOSED METHOD

We consider two settings for optimizing effectiveness and mitigating unfairness: the offline scenario, where relevance is known or well-estimated, and the online scenario, where relevance must be learned in real time. §5.1 introduces the DIDRF algorithm in the offline setting; §5.2 extends it to the online case. It is important to note that our method focuses on fair ranking under nonlinear relationships between provider income and item exposure, rather than simulating and computing income. Since income simulation has been well-studied [12, 13], DIDRF can be seamlessly combined with existing methods as needed. Therefore, in the following derivations, we assume that the income function  $f_d$  has been reliably estimated.

### 5.1 Dynamic-Income-Derivative-aware Ranking Fairness

We first present the DIDRF algorithm in the **offline scenario**, which aims to jointly optimize ranking effectiveness (Eq. (4)) and income fairness (Eq. (11)) for each query  $q$  at timestep  $n$ . Formally, the objective is defined as:

$$\max_{\pi_n} Obj(q, n) = eff.(q, n) + \gamma fair.(q, n) \quad (12)$$

where  $\gamma$  is the trade-off coefficient between effectiveness and fairness.

**Marginal Decomposition of the Objective.** Following prior work [14, 35, 38], directly computing  $Obj(q, n)$  is intractable. For instance, a linear programming formulation would result in a computational complexity of  $O(n^2)$ , rendering it impractical for large-scale scenarios. We thus adopt a marginal perspective: since  $\pi_n$  does not affect  $Obj(q, n-1)$ , maximizing  $Obj(q, n)$  reduces to maximizing the marginal gain  $\Delta Obj(q, n)$ . This simplifies optimization by isolating the incremental impact of current decisions:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\pi_n} Obj.(q, n) &= \max_{\pi_n} Obj.(q, n) - Obj.(q, n-1) \\ &= \Delta eff.(q, n) + \gamma \Delta fair.(q, n) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

**Marginal Definitions: Exposure and Income.** To evaluate the effect of ranking decisions on effectiveness and fairness, we introduce two marginal quantities:

- $\Delta E(d, n)$ : the marginal exposure gained by item  $d$  at timestep  $n$ ,

- $\Delta I(d, n)$ : the corresponding marginal income earned by  $d$ .

$$\Delta E(d, n) = \sum_{j=1}^{k_c} p_j \cdot \mathbb{I}(\pi_n[j] == d) \quad (14)$$

$$\Delta I(d, n) = \sum_{j=1}^{k_c} p_j \cdot \mathbb{I}(\pi_n[j] == d) \cdot f_d(t_n) \quad (15)$$

Clearly, the two are related as:

$$\Delta I(d, n) = f_d(t_n) \cdot \Delta E(d, n) \quad (16)$$

**The Optimization of Marginal Effectiveness.** With the definitions of  $\Delta E(d, n)$  and  $\Delta I(d, n)$  in place, we now proceed to optimize Eq. (13). First, for  $\Delta eff.(q, n)$ , since the effectiveness function in Eq. (4) is a first-degree polynomial in  $E$ , all higher-order derivatives are zero. Based on this, we apply a first-order Taylor expansion to calculate the marginal exposure  $\Delta E(d, n)$ :

$$\Delta eff.(q, n) = \sum_{d \in D(q)} \frac{\partial eff.}{\partial E(d, n)} \Delta E(d, n) = \sum_{d \in D(q)} R(d) \Delta E(d, n) \quad (17)$$

Here,  $R(d)$  denotes the relevance of document  $d$  to query  $q$ , where we use  $R(d)$  as a shorthand for  $R(d, q)$  when the query context is clear. This first-order expansion is an equality, not an approximation, as the effectiveness function in Eq. (4) is a first-degree polynomial of  $E$ .

**The optimization of Marginal Fairness.** For  $\Delta fair.(q, n)$ , similarly, since the fairness function in Eq. (11) is a second-degree polynomial in  $I$ , we consider the marginal income  $\Delta I(d, n)$  and perform a second-order expansion:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta fair.(q, n) &= \sum_{d \in D(q)} \frac{\partial fair.}{\partial I(d, n)} \Delta I(d, n) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d_x, d_y \in D(q)} \frac{\partial^2 fair.}{\partial I(d_x, n) \partial I(d_y, n)} \Delta I(d_x, n) \Delta I(d_y, n) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The first-order derivative of fairness with respect to  $I(d, n)$  is:

$$\frac{\partial fair.}{\partial I(d, n)} = \sigma \left( \underbrace{R(d) \sum_l I(l, n) R(l) - I(d, n) \sum_h R^2(h)}_{g(d, n)} \right) \quad (19)$$

The second-order derivative is:

$$\frac{\partial^2 fair.}{\partial I(d_x, n) \partial I(d_y, n)} = -\sigma \left( \sum_{d \in D(q)} R^2(d) \mathbb{I}(x=y) - R(d_x) R(d_y) \right) \quad (20)$$

with

$$\sigma = \frac{4}{|D(q)|(|D(q)| - 1)} \quad (21)$$

As Eq. (11) is a second-degree polynomial in  $I$ , the second-order Taylor expansion is exact (i.e., the remainder term is zero). For simplicity, we consider only the self-impact of item  $d$  on  $\Delta fair.$  (i.e.,  $d_x = d_y = d$ ), neglecting interactions between different items. Thus, the second-order term simplifies<sup>3</sup> to the following form via a

<sup>3</sup>Detailed procedures can be found in §A

diagonal (self-impact) Hessian approximation and the bound  $\Delta E^2 \leq \Delta E$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 fair.}{\partial I(d_x, n) \partial I(d_y, n)} \Delta I(d_x, n) \Delta I(d_y, n) &= \frac{\partial^2 fair.}{\partial^2 I(d, n)} \Delta I^2(d, n) \\ &\approx \underbrace{\left( -\sigma \sum_{d_s \in D(q), d_s \neq d} R^2(d_s) f_d^2(t_n) \right)}_{h(d, n)} \Delta E(d, n) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

**Final Score Function.** Based on the above derivations, the marginal objective  $\Delta Obj.(q, n)$  can be reformulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta Obj.(q, n) &= \sum_{d \in D(q)} \frac{\partial eff.}{\partial E(d, n)} \Delta E(d, n) \\ &+ \gamma \left( \sum_{d \in D(q)} \frac{\partial fair.}{\partial I(d, n)} \Delta I(d, n) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 fair.}{\partial^2 I(d, n)} \Delta I^2(d, n) \right) \\ &= \sum_{d \in D(q)} \left[ R(d) + \gamma \underbrace{\left( g(d, n) + \frac{1}{2} h(d, n) \right)}_{\phi(d, n)} \right] \Delta E(d, n) \\ &= \sum_{d \in D(q)} \underbrace{[R(d) + \gamma \phi(d, n)]}_{s(d, n)} \Delta E(d, n) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Substituting Eq. (14) into  $\sum_{d \in D(q)} s(d, n) \Delta E(d, n)$  and exchanging the order of summation, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{d \in D(q)} s(d, n) \Delta E(d, n) &= \sum_{d \in D(q)} s(d, n) \sum_{k=1}^{k_c} p_k \mathbb{I}(\pi_n[k] = d) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{k_c} p_k \sum_{d \in D(q)} s(d, n) \mathbb{I}(\pi_n[k] = d) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{k_c} p_k s(\pi_n[k], n). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Since the examination probabilities are non-increasing with rank ( $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \dots \geq p_{k_c}$ ), the rearrangement inequality [6] implies that the objective is maximized when larger scores are paired with larger examination probabilities. Therefore, maximizing  $\Delta Obj(q, n)$  reduces to sorting items by  $s(d, n)$  in descending order and assigning the top-scoring items to the highest-ranked positions:

$$\pi_n = \arg_{topk} \{ s(d, n) \mid \forall d \in D(q) \}. \quad (25)$$

Here,  $k$  denotes the required length of the ranked list  $\pi_n$ .

## 5.2 DIDRF in Online Scenario

We now extend the DIDRF algorithm to the online environment, where ranking optimization typically occurs while relevance estimation is still being learned. This setting is more representative of real-world scenarios, where relevance estimation is often imperfect. To address this, following previous work [38], we incorporate the uncertainty in relevance estimation, and aim to jointly optimize effectiveness and fairness while reducing this uncertainty. The

optimization objective is formulated as follows<sup>4</sup>:

$$\max_{\pi_n} Obj.(q, n) = \widehat{eff.}(q, n) + \gamma \widehat{fair.}(q, n) - \eta \widehat{uncert.}(q, n) \quad (26)$$

$\eta$  is another trade-off coefficient. For uncertainty, we consider the variance of relevance, so the  $\widehat{uncert.}$  can be represented as:

$$\widehat{uncert.} = \sum_{d \in D(q)} \text{Variance}(\widehat{R}(d)) \quad (27)$$

Similar to §5.1, we employ  $\Delta Obj.(q, n)$  for optimization:

$$\max_{\pi_n} \Delta Obj.(q, n) = \Delta \widehat{eff.}(q, n) + \gamma \Delta \widehat{fair.}(q, n) - \eta \Delta \widehat{uncert.}(q, n). \quad (28)$$

**Estimation of relevance.** In our method, following prior work [24, 36, 38], we adopt the unbiased relevance estimator defined as follows:

$$\widehat{R}(d) = \frac{cumC(d, n)}{E(d, n)} \quad (29)$$

where  $cumC(d, n)$  denotes the cumulative clicks received by item  $d$  up to timestep  $n$ , computed as:

$$cumC(d, n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{k_c} c_{i,j} \mathbb{I}(\pi_i[j] = d), \quad (30)$$

where  $c_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$  indicates whether the item displayed at position  $j$  at timestep  $i$  is clicked. According to work [38],  $\widehat{uncert.}(q, n)$  can be estimated as follows under the relevance estimator in Eq. (29):

$$\widehat{uncert.}(q, n) = \sum_{d \in D(q)} \frac{1}{\widehat{E}(d, n)} \quad (31)$$

**Optimizing the online model.** For the  $\Delta \widehat{uncert.}(q, n)$ , we consider marginal exposure  $\Delta \widehat{E}'$ 's influence to take a second-order expansion:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \widehat{uncert.}(q, n) &= \sum_{d \in D(q)} \frac{\partial \widehat{uncert.}}{\partial \widehat{E}(d, n)} \Delta \widehat{E}(d, n) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d_x, d_y \in D(q)} \frac{\partial^2 \widehat{uncert.}}{\partial \widehat{E}(d_x, n) \partial \widehat{E}(d_y, n)} \Delta \widehat{E}(d_x, n) \Delta \widehat{E}(d_y, n) \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

We also adopt the same technique as in the offline setting: we use a second-order Taylor expansion and then apply a separable linear surrogate to retain a per-item scoring form:<sup>5</sup>

$$\Delta \widehat{uncert.}(q, n) \approx \sum_{d \in D(q)} \underbrace{\left( -\frac{1}{(\widehat{E}(d, n))^2} + \frac{1}{(\widehat{E}(d, n))^3} \right)}_{\widehat{u}(d, n)} \Delta \widehat{E}(d, n) \quad (33)$$

Then we have the **score function**:

$$s(d, n) = \widehat{R}(d) + \gamma \widehat{\phi}(d, n) - \eta \widehat{u}(d, n) \quad (34)$$

we arrange the final ranked list in descending order of the score function values as well. As a result, the time complexity of DIDRF is  $O(|D(q)| \log |D(q)|)$ , since it only requires computing a score for

each item and performing a single pass of sorting based on these scores.

$$\pi_n = \arg_{topk} \{s(d, n) \mid \forall d \in D(q)\} \quad (35)$$

## 6 EXPERIMENT

### 6.1 Experimental Setup

**6.1.1 Datasets.** In our study, we employed two datasets, MQ2008 [28] and Istella-s [20], which are commonly used benchmarks for ranking optimization<sup>6</sup>.

**6.1.2 Baselines.** In this paper, we compare the following methods:

- **RandomK**: Randomly permutes the items.
- **TopK**: Ranks items based solely on effectiveness, producing a list ordered by descending relevance.
- **FairK**: Ranks the items solely based on fairness, using  $\Delta fair(q, n)$  as the final scoring function.
- **FairCo** [23]: Fairness-based ranking algorithm with a proportional controller, where fairness trade-off parameter  $\gamma \in [0.01, 1000.0]$ .
- **MMF** [35]: Fairness ranking algorithm with a proportional controller that focuses more on fairness for top positions, where fairness trade-off parameter  $\gamma \in [0.0, 1.0]$ .
- **PLFair** [24]: Fairness ranking algorithm based on Plackett-Luce optimization, where fairness trade-off parameter  $\gamma \in [0.0, 1.0]$ .
- **MCFair** [38]: Fairness ranking algorithm based on marginal contribution optimization, where fairness trade-off parameter  $\gamma \in [0.0, 1000.0]$ ,  $\eta \in [0, 100]$ .
- **FARA** [37]: Future-aware ranking algorithm that jointly optimizes rank lists across several upcoming timesteps via a second-order Taylor expansion, where fairness trade-off parameter  $\gamma \in [0.0, 1.0]$ ,  $\eta \in [0, 100]$  and the future session number is 100.
- **DIDRF**: Our method. Dynamically optimizes effectiveness and fairness  $\gamma \in [0.0, 1000.0]$ ,  $\eta \in [0, 100]$ .
- **DIDRF-W/O-h**: DIDRF without  $h(d, n)$  (only in offline settings)  $\gamma \in [0.0, 1000.0]$ .
- **DIDRF-W/O-p**: DIDRF without  $p$  (only in online settings)  $\gamma \in [0.0, 1000.0]$ ,  $\eta \in [0, 100]$ .

All fairness baselines are evaluated under a unified income-fairness setting, and each method is re-derived to match this new formulation. Fairness-based ranking algorithms jointly optimize effectiveness and fairness through a trade-off parameter  $\gamma$ , with larger  $\gamma$  assigning greater weight to fairness. MCFair, FARA, and DIDRF further employ a second coefficient  $\eta$  to optimize relevance-estimation process.<sup>7</sup>

**6.1.3 Simulation of Income Functions.** Due to the lack of real-world datasets, we designed income functions to approximate income changes under different temporal conditions for algorithm performance evaluation. To ensure the experiments are reasonable and representative, we created periodic and aperiodic income functions. The periodic function captures regular fluctuations, while the aperiodic one simulates random and irregular changes. Together,

<sup>4</sup>In the following part, we use a hat ( $\widehat{\cdot}$ ) to indicate estimated values.

<sup>5</sup>Detailed procedures can be found in §B

<sup>6</sup>Detailed information about the datasets can be found in §C

<sup>7</sup>Our code is available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/DIDRF>

they cover most real-world income-change scenarios and provide a framework for further research, replicating income fluctuations across diverse temporal environments to ensure experimental diversity and representativeness.<sup>8</sup> It should be noted that the main focus of this paper is to measure ranking fairness in environments with a nonlinear relationship between provider income and item exposure and to develop fair ranking algorithms, rather than exploring methods for simulating income functions. DIDRF does not require a specific parametric form of  $f_d(t)$ ; we empirically demonstrate robustness across periodic, aperiodic, and constant settings. Furthermore, to simplify the analysis, we assume that the real-time  $t_n$  corresponding to timestep  $n$  is aligned such that  $t_n = n$ . This simplifying assumption does not compromise the generality or reliability of the proposed algorithm. In practical deployments, our framework can be integrated with income-simulation methods, which we leave to future work. Additionally, modeling the potentially complex relationship between timestep  $n$  and real time  $t_n$  is also left for future investigation.

**6.1.4 Experimental Settings.** We use two experimental settings: **offline** and **online**. In the offline setting, item relevance is predetermined or well-estimated, allowing all ranking algorithms to rely on accurate relevance values. The relevance probabilities for each document-query pair  $(d, q)$  are simulated based on their relevance judgments  $y$  [1]:

$$P(r = 1 \mid d, q, \pi) = \epsilon + (1 - \epsilon) \frac{2^y - 1}{2^{y_{\max}} - 1} \quad (36)$$

where  $y_{\max}$  is the maximum relevance annotation. In the online setting, ranking optimization and relevance learning happen simultaneously, reflecting real-world conditions. Here, all algorithms use relevance estimation from Eq. (29). Meanwhile, for simplicity, following prior studies [23, 26], we assume the users' examination probability  $P(e = 1 \mid d, \pi)$  is known. It is simulated as:

$$p(e = 1 \mid d, \pi) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\log_2(\text{rank}(d \mid \pi) + 1)}, & \text{if } \text{rank}((d \mid \pi)) \leq k_c \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

**6.1.5 Evaluation.** We evaluate algorithms on effectiveness and fairness. For effectiveness, we use the average of  $cNDCG$  with  $\alpha = 0.995$  and cutoff values  $k_c$  ranging from  $1 \leq k_c \leq 5$ :


$$cNDCG_{avg}@k_c = \frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^n \alpha^{\tau-n} NDCG@k_c(\pi_\tau)}{n} \quad (38)$$

For fairness, we use the metric from Eq. (11). Each experiment is run five times, and the average performance on the test set is reported.

## 6.2 Results and Analysis

**6.2.1 What is the maximum level of fairness achievable by the DIDRF algorithm?** Table 1 shows that the DIDRF algorithm achieves the highest fairness across both scenarios, demonstrating its effectiveness in balancing the optimization of fairness and effectiveness despite the non-linear relationship between provider utility and item exposure. Although FARA also relies on a second-order Taylor expansion, it underperforms DIDRF since it must simultaneously plan income allocations for multiple future timesteps. With a non-linear income-exposure relationship, this global optimization is hard

<sup>8</sup>Details are shown in §D.



**Figure 1:  $cNDCG_{avg}@5$  vs. unfairness in the offline setting. Given the same unfairness, the higher curves or points lie, the better their performances are.**

and often traps the algorithm in suboptimal solutions. Meanwhile, as the size of the dataset increases, the global optimization problem becomes increasingly difficult, amplifying the algorithm's tendency to converge to suboptimal solutions and resulting in markedly poorer fairness performance in Istella-s compared to MQ2008. Furthermore, while future income function  $f_d$  can be well estimated in our simulations, it is typically unknown or poorly approximated at the current timestep in real deployments, further limiting the practical applicability of FARA. MCFair and FairCo perform well by accurately estimating optimal rankings for a given query. However, as exposure-based algorithms, they fail to capture the complex dynamics of provider utility and item exposure, resulting in the design of an algorithm that oversimplifies the optimization objective, thereby limiting its effectiveness. FairK, using  $\Delta fair(q, n)$  as its score, performs well on small datasets but degrades markedly on larger ones, where the surrogate metric scales poorly in the denser query-document space and produces noisy gradients that lead to suboptimal rankings. MMF and PLFair exhibit notable limitations: MMF enforces fairness across all cutoffs, a more stringent requirement than our approach, while PLFair optimizes fairness using feature representations designed primarily for relevance, making it less suitable for fairness optimization [24].


**6.2.2 How is DIDRF's effectiveness at different cutoffs?** In Table 1, we also provide the  $cNDCG_{avg}@ (1, 3, 5)$  for each algorithm under the condition of the best fairness. In each scenario, DIDRF exhibits a noteworthy superiority over those fair algorithms in terms of  $cNDCG_{avg}@ (1, 3, 5)$ . This shows that the DIDRF algorithm not only ensures commendable fairness for the providers of items in each scenario but also yields favorable utility for the users. Additionally, FARA, FairK, MCFair, and FairCo manifest relatively high effectiveness. In contrast, PLFair and MMF demonstrate comparatively weaker effectiveness.

**6.2.3 Can DIDRF achieve a better balance between effectiveness and fairness?** Figure 1 illustrates the relationship between user utility and fairness for various algorithms, clearly showing how user utility changes with fairness. Under the same tolerance for unfairness, DIDRF achieves the highest user effectiveness. This demonstrates that, in complex scenarios involving a non-linear relationship between provider utility and item exposure, DIDRF effectively optimizes both effectiveness and fairness. As detailed in §6.2.1, exposure-fairness baselines FairCo and MCFair, though competitive, still trail DIDRF; FARA performs even worse on the larger Istella-s dataset because the optimization becomes harder




**Table 1: The best fairness (a smaller value of unfairness indicates a higher level of fairness) along with  $cNDCG_{avg}@ (1, 3, 5)$  at the point of the best fairness attained by each algorithm in the offline setting. Our DIDRF algorithm shows significant improvements compared to MCFair, with  $p < 0.001$ . Significant improvements or degradations with respect to MCFair are indicated with +/-.**

Methods	MQ2008								Istella-s							
	Periodic				Aperiodic				Periodic				Aperiodic			
	cN@1	cN@3	cN@5	unf.	cN@1	cN@3	cN@5	unf.	cN@1	cN@3	cN@5	unf.	cN@1	cN@3	cN@5	unf.
RandomK	.365 <sup>-</sup>	.453 <sup>-</sup>	.530 <sup>-</sup>	8.227 <sup>-</sup>	.362 <sup>-</sup>	.450 <sup>-</sup>	.529 <sup>-</sup>	54.739 <sup>-</sup>	.158 <sup>-</sup>	.179 <sup>-</sup>	.205 <sup>-</sup>	.0012 <sup>-</sup>	.160 <sup>-</sup>	.179 <sup>-</sup>	.206 <sup>-</sup>	.0023 <sup>-</sup>
TopK	1.000 <sup>+</sup>	1.000 <sup>+</sup>	1.000 <sup>+</sup>	7.215 <sup>-</sup>	1.000 <sup>+</sup>	1.000 <sup>+</sup>	1.000 <sup>+</sup>	46.531 <sup>-</sup>	1.000 <sup>+</sup>	1.000 <sup>+</sup>	1.000 <sup>+</sup>	.00058 <sup>-</sup>	1.000 <sup>+</sup>	1.000 <sup>+</sup>	1.000 <sup>+</sup>	.0016 <sup>-</sup>
FairK	.618 <sup>+</sup>	.644 <sup>-</sup>	.692 <sup>-</sup>	.723 <sup>-</sup>	.899 <sup>-</sup>	.861 <sup>-</sup>	.858 <sup>-</sup>	4.835 <sup>-</sup>	.273 <sup>-</sup>	.289 <sup>+</sup>	.313 <sup>-</sup>	.00087 <sup>-</sup>	.476 <sup>-</sup>	.469 <sup>-</sup>	.483 <sup>-</sup>	.0013 <sup>-</sup>
MMF	.591 <sup>-</sup>	.731 <sup>-</sup>	.786 <sup>-</sup>	1.859 <sup>-</sup>	.592 <sup>-</sup>	.731 <sup>-</sup>	.787 <sup>-</sup>	11.393 <sup>-</sup>	.160 <sup>-</sup>	.180 <sup>-</sup>	.207 <sup>-</sup>	.0011 <sup>-</sup>	.160 <sup>-</sup>	.180 <sup>-</sup>	.206 <sup>-</sup>	.0020 <sup>-</sup>
PLFair	.365 <sup>-</sup>	.449 <sup>-</sup>	.526 <sup>-</sup>	8.868 <sup>-</sup>	.364 <sup>-</sup>	.449 <sup>-</sup>	.528 <sup>-</sup>	55.40 <sup>-</sup>	.163 <sup>-</sup>	.183 <sup>-</sup>	.210 <sup>-</sup>	.0013 <sup>-</sup>	.696 <sup>-</sup>	.670 <sup>-</sup>	.695 <sup>-</sup>	.0023 <sup>-</sup>
FairCo	.900 <sup>-</sup>	.909 <sup>-</sup>	.923 <sup>-</sup>	.742 <sup>-</sup>	.801 <sup>-</sup>	.824 <sup>-</sup>	.859 <sup>+</sup>	4.936 <sup>-</sup>	.906 <sup>-</sup>	.906 <sup>-</sup>	.908 <sup>-</sup>	.00047 <sup>-</sup>	.661 <sup>-</sup>	.659 <sup>-</sup>	.667 <sup>-</sup>	.00070 <sup>-</sup>
MCFair	.947 <sup>-</sup>	.930 <sup>-</sup>	.928 <sup>-</sup>	.686 <sup>-</sup>	.901 <sup>-</sup>	.882 <sup>-</sup>	.857 <sup>-</sup>	4.658 <sup>-</sup>	.919 <sup>-</sup>	.915 <sup>-</sup>	.917 <sup>-</sup>	.00044 <sup>-</sup>	.687 <sup>-</sup>	.696 <sup>-</sup>	.694 <sup>-</sup>	.00063 <sup>-</sup>
FARA	.943 <sup>-</sup>	.892 <sup>-</sup>	.859 <sup>-</sup>	.832 <sup>-</sup>	.860 <sup>-</sup>	.842 <sup>-</sup>	.852 <sup>-</sup>	4.779 <sup>-</sup>	.862 <sup>-</sup>	.837 <sup>-</sup>	.840 <sup>-</sup>	.0010 <sup>-</sup>	.667 <sup>-</sup>	.440 <sup>-</sup>	.407 <sup>-</sup>	.0015 <sup>-</sup>
DIDRF-W/O-h	.947 <sup>+</sup>	.930 <sup>+</sup>	.930 <sup>+</sup>	.675 <sup>+</sup>	.903 <sup>+</sup>	.886 <sup>+</sup>	.872 <sup>+</sup>	4.681 <sup>+</sup>	.923 <sup>+</sup>	.917 <sup>+</sup>	.919 <sup>+</sup>	.00041 <sup>+</sup>	.715 <sup>+</sup>	.702 <sup>+</sup>	.708 <sup>+</sup>	.00060 <sup>+</sup>
DIDRF	.947 <sup>+</sup>	.932 <sup>+</sup>	.931 <sup>+</sup>	.665 <sup>+</sup>	.911 <sup>+</sup>	.887 <sup>+</sup>	.875 <sup>+</sup>	4.596 <sup>+</sup>	.925 <sup>+</sup>	.921 <sup>+</sup>	.922 <sup>+</sup>	.00039 <sup>+</sup>	.742 <sup>+</sup>	.713 <sup>+</sup>	.716 <sup>+</sup>	.00057 <sup>+</sup>



(a) MQ2008




(b) Istella-s

**Figure 2:  $cNDCG_{avg}@5$  vs. unfairness in the offline setting with the income function equal to 1. Given the same unfairness, the higher curves or points lie, the better their performances are.**


and it converges to suboptimal solutions; and PLFair and MMF also lag behind, at times scoring lower than RandomK and TopK.

**6.2.4 How does the second-order term of fairness  $h(d, n)$  enhance DIDRF's ranking performance in offline settings?** The DIDRF framework simplifies the fairness optimization objective using a second-order Taylor expansion. While the first-order term  $g(d, n)$  has been discussed in prior work [38], we focus on the less-explored second-order term  $h(d, n)$ , which plays a crucial role in more complex settings. From a theoretical perspective, the second-order term not only yields a more accurate approximation of the optimization objective but also offers distinct advantages in scenarios characterized by nonlinear relationships between provider income and item exposure. Specifically,  $h(d, n)$  contributes in the following three ways: (1) Stability: By capturing nonlinear interactions, it enhances the robustness of the optimization. (2) Long-term Insight: It incorporates trends and cumulative effects, enabling better alignment with long-term fairness goals. (3) Dynamic Responsiveness: It facilitates adaptive decision-making by identifying key factors that respond to changes in system dynamics. We conducted ablation studies across three income variation scenarios: periodic, aperiodic, and constant. As shown in Table 1, Figure 1, and Figure 2, incorporating the second-order term  $h(d, n)$  consistently enhances performance, particularly in nonlinear environments. Even when the problem is reduced to a simplified exposure fairness setting, DIDRF outperforms existing algorithms, highlighting its robustness and adaptability.

**6.2.5 Does DIDRF continue to perform well in the online setting?** Figure 3 shows that DIDRF maintains its optimal fairness and strong effectiveness  $cNDCG_{avg}@ (1, 3, 5)$  across various scenarios in the



(a) Aperiodic scenario in MQ2008



(b) Periodic scenario in Istella-s

**Figure 3:  $cNDCG_{avg}@5$  vs. unfairness in the online setting. Given the same unfairness, the higher curves or points lie, the better their performances are.**

**Table 2: Total time cost (seconds) in the aperiodic scenario (offline). Standard deviations are in parentheses.**

Algorithms	MQ2008	Istella-s
TopK	4.89 (0.11)	16.35 (0.46)
RandomK	4.85 (0.13)	16.47 (0.53)
FairK	5.86 (0.18)	20.16 (0.74)
MMF	15.20 (0.49)	73.13 (2.31)
PLFair	966.17 (23.42)	8683.58 (193.81)
FairCo	6.39 (0.21)	20.37 (0.79)
MCFair	6.41 (0.26)	19.85 (0.68)
FARA	7.09 (0.32)	147.54 (5.43)
<b>DIDRF-W/O-h (Ours)</b>	<b>6.58 (0.24)</b>	<b>21.95 (0.84)</b>
<b>DIDRF (Ours)</b>	<b>6.59 (0.25)</b>	<b>22.04 (0.87)</b>

online setting. Other algorithms perform similarly to their offline results.

**6.2.6 How does the second-order term of uncertainty influence DIDRF in the online setting?** DIDRF introduces a second-order component in the marginal uncertainty-reduction term, whose state-dependent gain is  $p(d, n) = 1/(\hat{E}(d, n))^3$ . We study its effect via an ablation that removes this second-order component (i.e., setting  $p(d, n) = 0$ ), comparing DIDRF with and without  $p$ . Figure 3 shows that including  $p$  significantly improves both effectiveness and fairness under unknown relevance. Intuitively,  $p$  implements gain scheduling for uncertainty reduction: when exposure is low (high uncertainty), it strengthens the incentive to allocate exposure for more reliable relevance estimation; as exposure accumulates (lower uncertainty), its influence naturally weakens, shifting the focus back to optimizing effectiveness and fairness.



**Table 3: Income Function Simulation Methods**

Method	Description	Simulation
<b>Periodic</b>	Income follows regular cycles (e.g., seasonal or daily patterns).	Tilted square wave over 10 000 timesteps with 100 evenly spaced peaks; values are normalized to $[0, 1]$ .
<b>Aperiodic</b>	Income varies over time due to irregular events (e.g., news shocks or market shifts).	Exponential decay over 10 000 timesteps: starts at 1 and decreases smoothly to $e^{-1}$ at the final timestep.

**6.2.7 How is DIDRF’s time efficiency?** Table 2 shows that DIDRF is highly time-efficient in the offline-aperiodic setting. Its average runtime is comparable to the lightweight baselines FairCo and MCFair, yet an order of magnitude lower than the more expensive quadratic-programming methods MMF and PLFair. FARA, despite also using a second-order Taylor expansion, incurs a much higher cost because it performs look-ahead planning across future timesteps; DIDRF avoids this overhead, making it both practical and efficient in real-world use.

## 7 CONCLUSION

This paper investigates ranking fairness in settings where provider income and item exposure exhibit a non-linear relationship. We formalize the notion of income fairness and its measurement, show that existing fair ranking methods are not designed to optimize this criterion, and propose DIDRF. Extensive simulations in both offline and online settings demonstrate consistent improvements over state-of-the-art baselines, indicating that DIDRF effectively balances ranking relevance and income fairness and provides a robust and efficient approach for practical ranking optimization. Given limited real-world datasets and space constraints, our evaluation focuses on theoretical analysis and simulation-based validation; broader empirical studies and extensions are left for future work.

## A Detailed Derivation of Equation 22

We provide the derivation of Eq. (22) by specializing the Hessian in Eq. (20) to the self-impact case. We only consider the self-impact

$$\frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{fair.}}}{\partial I(d_x, n) \partial I(d_y, n)} \Delta I(d_x, n) \Delta I(d_y, n) = \frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{fair.}}}{\partial^2 I(d, n)} \Delta I^2(d, n) \quad (39)$$

$$= -\sigma \sum_{d_s \in D(q), d_s \neq d} R^2(d_s) f_d^2(t_n) \Delta E^2(d, n)$$

Using  $\Delta I(d, n) = f_d(t_n) \Delta E(d, n)$  (Eq. (16)), we have

$$\frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{fair.}}}{\partial I(d, n)^2} \Delta I(d, n)^2 = -\sigma \left( \sum_{d_s \in D(q), d_s \neq d} R^2(d_s) f_d^2(t_n) \right) \Delta E^2(d, n). \quad (40)$$

**Bounding and separable surrogate.** Since  $\Delta E(d, n) = \sum_{j=1}^{k_c} p_j \mathbb{I}(\pi_n[j] = d)$  and  $0 \leq p_j \leq 1$ , it follows that

$$0 \leq \Delta E(d, n) \leq 1. \quad (41)$$

Hence  $\Delta E(d, n)^2 \leq \Delta E(d, n)$ . Let

$$h(d, n) = -\sigma \left( \sum_{d_s \in D(q), d_s \neq d} R^2(d_s) \right) f_d^2(t_n), \quad (42)$$

which is non-positive. Multiplying  $\Delta E^2(d, n) \leq \Delta E(d, n)$  by the non-positive  $h(d, n)$  reverses the inequality:

$$h(d, n) \Delta E(d, n)^2 \geq h(d, n) \Delta E(d, n). \quad (43)$$

Therefore, the self-impact quadratic term admits the following *linear lower bound*:

$$\frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{fair.}}}{\partial I^2(d, n)} \Delta I^2(d, n) = h(d, n) \Delta E^2(d, n) \geq h(d, n) \Delta E(d, n). \quad (44)$$

We use the separable linear surrogate  $h(d, n) \Delta E(d, n)$  in place of the quadratic term in our optimization; the bound is tight when  $\Delta E(d, n) \in \{0, 1\}$ .

## B Detailed Derivation of Equation 33

We provide the detailed derivation of Eq. (33). Following Eq. (31), we model the uncertainty in relevance estimation using the exposure-based surrogate:

$$\widehat{\text{uncert.}}(q, n) = \sum_{d \in D(q)} \frac{1}{\widehat{E}(d, n)}. \quad (45)$$

**First- and second-order derivatives.** For any item  $d \in D(q)$ , the first-order derivative is:

$$\frac{\partial \widehat{\text{uncert.}}(q, n)}{\partial \widehat{E}(d, n)} = -\frac{1}{(\widehat{E}(d, n))^2}. \quad (46)$$

The second-order derivatives (the Hessian entries) are:

$$\frac{\partial^2 \widehat{\text{uncert.}}(q, n)}{\partial \widehat{E}(d_x, n) \partial \widehat{E}(d_y, n)} = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{(\widehat{E}(d_x, n))^3}, & \text{if } d_x = d_y, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

**Substitution into the Taylor expansion.** Substituting Eq. (46) and Eq. (47) into Eq. (32) yields:

$$\Delta \widehat{\text{uncert.}}(q, n) \approx \sum_{d \in D(q)} \left( -\frac{1}{(\widehat{E}(d, n))^2} \Delta \widehat{E}(d, n) + \frac{1}{(\widehat{E}(d, n))^3} (\Delta \widehat{E}(d, n))^2 \right). \quad (48)$$

**A separable linear surrogate.** Since  $\Delta \widehat{E}(d, n) = \sum_{j=1}^{k_c} p_j \mathbb{I}(\pi_n[j] = d)$  with  $0 \leq p_j \leq 1$ , we have

$$0 \leq \Delta \widehat{E}(d, n) \leq 1 \Rightarrow (\Delta \widehat{E}(d, n))^2 \leq \Delta \widehat{E}(d, n). \quad (49)$$

Using Eq. (49) to obtain a separable linear form, we approximate  $(\Delta \widehat{E}(d, n))^2 \approx \Delta \widehat{E}(d, n)$ , which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \widehat{\text{uncert.}}(q, n) &\approx \sum_{d \in D(q)} \left( -\frac{1}{(\widehat{E}(d, n))^2} + \frac{1}{(\widehat{E}(d, n))^3} \right) \Delta \widehat{E}(d, n) \\ &= \sum_{d \in D(q)} \widehat{u}(d, n) \Delta \widehat{E}(d, n), \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where

$$\widehat{u}(d, n) \triangleq -\frac{1}{(\widehat{E}(d, n))^2} + \frac{1}{(\widehat{E}(d, n))^3}. \quad (51)$$

Eq. (50) corresponds to Eq. (33) in the main text.

## C Statistics of Datasets

MQ2008 contains 800 queries, with an average of 20 documents per query. The relevance judgment for each document is graded on a 5-level scale from 0 to 4. And Istella-s includes 30,000 queries, with an average of 103 documents per query. Similar to MQ2008, the relevance judgment is graded on a 5-level scale from 0 to 4.

## D Details of Income Functions

Table 3 presents the design details of our income functions. Our study targets a real-world deployment scenario, but suitable public datasets are currently unavailable. We therefore simulate provider income signals and use two complementary classes of functions: (i) *periodic* income function to capture regular seasonality or diurnal cycles, and (ii) *aperiodic* income function to capture event-driven, nonstationary dynamics.

## References

- [1] Qingyao Ai, Keping Bi, Cheng Luo, Jiafeng Guo, and W Bruce Croft. 2018. Unbiased learning to rank with unbiased propensity estimation. In *The 41st international ACM SIGIR conference on research & development in information retrieval*. 385–394.
- [2] Wayne M Alves and Peter H Rossi. 1978. Who should get what? Fairness judgments of the distribution of earnings. *American journal of Sociology* 84, 3 (1978), 541–564.
- [3] Ashmi Banerjee, Gourab K Patro, Linus W Dietz, and Abhijnan Chakraborty. 2020. Analyzing ‘Near Me’ Services: Potential for Exposure Bias in Location-based Retrieval. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. IEEE, 3642–3651.
- [4] Asia J Biega, Krishna P Gummadi, and Gerhard Weikum. 2018. Equity of attention: Amortizing individual fairness in rankings. In *The 41st international acm sigir conference on research & development in information retrieval*. 405–414.
- [5] Emily Black, Hadi Elzayn, Alexandra Chouldechova, Jacob Goldin, and Daniel Ho. 2022. Algorithmic fairness and vertical equity: Income fairness with IRS tax audit models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 1479–1503.
- [6] Herm J Brascamp, Elliott H Lieb, and Joaquin Mazdak Luttinger. 1974. A general rearrangement inequality for multiple integrals. *Journal of functional analysis* 17, 2 (1974), 227–237.
- [7] Pedro G Campos, Fernando Diez, and Iván Cantador. 2014. Time-aware recommender systems: a comprehensive survey and analysis of existing evaluation protocols. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction* 24 (2014), 67–119.
- [8] Abhijnan Chakraborty, Saptarshi Ghosh, Niloy Ganguly, and Krishna P Gummadi. 2017. Optimizing the recency-relevancy trade-off in online news recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web*. 837–846.
- [9] Aleksandr Chuklin, Ilya Markov, and Maarten De Rijke. 2022. *Click models for web search*. Springer Nature.
- [10] Nick Craswell, Onno Zoeter, Michael Taylor, and Bill Ramsey. 2008. An experimental comparison of click position-bias models. In *Proceedings of the 2008 international conference on web search and data mining*. 87–94.
- [11] Fernando Diaz, Bhaskar Mitra, Michael D Ekstrand, Asia J Biega, and Ben Carterette. 2020. Evaluating stochastic rankings with expected exposure. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*. 275–284.
- [12] Melissa M Favreault and Karen E Smith. 2016. A primer on the dynamic simulation of income model (DYNASIM3). (2016).
- [13] Giovanni Gallo and Michele Raitano. 2023. SOS incomes: Simulated effects of COVID-19 and emergency benefits on individual and household income distribution in Italy. *Journal of European Social Policy* 33, 1 (2023), 101–116.
- [14] Ruoyuan Gao, Yingqiang Ge, and Chirag Shah. 2022. FAIR: Fairness-aware information retrieval evaluation. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 73, 10 (2022), 1461–1473.
- [15] Maria Heuss, Fatemeh Sarvi, and Maarten de Rijke. 2022. Fairness of Exposure in Light of Incomplete Exposure Estimation. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 759–769.
- [16] Kalervo Järvelin and Jaana Kekäläinen. 2002. Cumulated gain-based evaluation of IR techniques. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)* 20, 4 (2002), 422–446.
- [17] Thorsten Joachims, Laura Granka, Bing Pan, Helene Hembrooke, and Geri Gay. 2017. Accurately interpreting clickthrough data as implicit feedback. In *Acm Sigir Forum*, Vol. 51. Acm New York, NY, USA, 4–11.
- [18] Michael Kearns, Seth Neel, Aaron Roth, and Zhiwei Steven Wu. 2019. An empirical study of rich subgroup fairness for machine learning. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 100–109.
- [19] Tie-Yan Liu et al. 2009. Learning to rank for information retrieval. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval* 3, 3 (2009), 225–331.
- [20] Claudio Lucchese, Franco Maria Nardini, Salvatore Orlando, Raffaele Perego, Fabrizio Silvestri, and Salvatore Trani. 2016. Post-learning optimization of tree ensembles for efficient ranking. In *Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 949–952.
- [21] Masoud Mansoury. 2022. Understanding and mitigating multi-sided exposure bias in recommender systems. *ACM SIGWEB Newsletter* 2022, Autumn (2022), 1–4.
- [22] Ninareh Mehrabi, Fred Morstatter, Nripsuta Saxena, Kristina Lerman, and Aram Galstyan. 2021. A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 54, 6 (2021), 1–35.
- [23] Marco Morik, Ashudeep Singh, Jessica Hong, and Thorsten Joachims. 2020. Controlling fairness and bias in dynamic learning-to-rank. In *Proceedings of the 43rd international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 429–438.
- [24] Harrie Oosterhuis. 2021. Computationally efficient optimization of plackett-luce ranking models for relevance and fairness. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1023–1032.
- [25] Harrie Oosterhuis and Maarten de Rijke. 2020. Policy-aware unbiased learning to rank for top-k rankings. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 489–498.
- [26] Harrie Oosterhuis and Maarten de Rijke. 2021. Unifying online and counterfactual learning to rank: A novel counterfactual estimator that effectively utilizes online interventions. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM international conference on web search and data mining*. 463–471.
- [27] Gourab K Patro, Lorenzo Porcaro, Laura Mitchell, Qiuyue Zhang, Meike Zehlike, and Nikhil Garg. 2022. Fair ranking: a critical review, challenges, and future directions. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 1929–1942.
- [28] Tao Qin and Tie-Yan Liu. 2013. Introducing LETOR 4.0 datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.2597* (2013).
- [29] Yuta Saito and Thorsten Joachims. 2022. Fair Ranking as Fair Division: Impact-Based Individual Fairness in Ranking. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 1514–1524.
- [30] Ashudeep Singh and Thorsten Joachims. 2018. Fairness of exposure in rankings. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 2219–2228.
- [31] Ashudeep Singh and Thorsten Joachims. 2019. Policy learning for fairness in ranking. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).
- [32] Alan Tsang, Bryan Wilder, Eric Rice, Milind Tambe, and Yair Zick. 2019. Group-fairness in influence maximization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.00967* (2019).
- [33] Nicolas Usunier, Virginie Do, and Elvis Dohmatob. 2022. Fast online ranking with fairness of exposure. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 2157–2167.
- [34] Xuanhui Wang, Nadav Golbandi, Michael Bendersky, Donald Metzler, and Marc Najork. 2018. Position bias estimation for unbiased learning to rank in personal search. In *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM international conference on web search and data mining*. 610–618.
- [35] Tao Yang and Qingyao Ai. 2021. Maximizing marginal fairness for dynamic learning to rank. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*. 137–145.
- [36] Tao Yang, Chen Luo, Hanqing Lu, Parth Gupta, Bing Yin, and Qingyao Ai. 2022. Can clicks be both labels and features? Unbiased Behavior Feature Collection and Uncertainty-aware Learning to Rank. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 6–17.
- [37] Tao Yang, Zhichao Xu, Zhenduo Wang, and Qingyao Ai. 2023. FARA: Future-aware Ranking Algorithm for Fairness Optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16637* (2023).
- [38] Tao Yang, Zhichao Xu, Zhenduo Wang, Anh Tran, and Qingyao Ai. 2023. Marginal-Certainty-aware Fair Ranking Algorithm. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 24–32.
- [39] Quan Yuan, Gao Cong, Zongyang Ma, Aixin Sun, and Nadia Magnenat Thalmann. 2013. Time-aware point-of-interest recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 36th international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. 363–372.
- [40] Meike Zehlike, Ke Yang, and Julia Stoyanovich. 2021. Fairness in ranking: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.14000* (2021).