

Can We Trust Recommender System Fairness Evaluation? The Role of Fairness and Relevance

Theresia Veronika Rampisela
thra@di.ku.dk
University of Copenhagen
Copenhagen, Denmark

Maria Maistro
mm@di.ku.dk
University of Copenhagen
Copenhagen, Denmark

Tuukka Ruotsalo
tr@di.ku.dk
University of Copenhagen
Copenhagen, Denmark
LUT University
Lahti, Finland

Christina Lioma
c.lioma@di.ku.dk
University of Copenhagen
Copenhagen, Denmark

ABSTRACT

Relevance and fairness are two major objectives of recommender systems (RSs). Recent work proposes measures of RS fairness that are either independent from relevance (fairness-only) or conditioned on relevance (joint measures). While fairness-only measures have been studied extensively, we look into whether joint measures can be trusted. We collect all joint evaluation measures of RS relevance and fairness, and ask: How much do they agree with each other? To what extent do they agree with relevance/fairness measures? How sensitive are they to changes in rank position, or to increasingly fair and relevant recommendations? We empirically study for the first time the behaviour of these measures across 4 real-world datasets and 4 recommenders. We find that most of these measures: i) correlate weakly with one another and even contradict each other at times; ii) are less sensitive to rank position changes than relevance- and fairness-only measures, meaning that they are less granular than traditional RS measures; and iii) tend to compress scores at the low end of their range, meaning that they are not very expressive. We counter the above limitations with a set of guidelines on the appropriate usage of such measures, i.e., they should be used with caution due to their tendency to contradict each other and of having a very small empirical range.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Information systems** → **Evaluation of retrieval results; Recommender systems**; • **General and reference** → **Evaluation**.

KEYWORDS

fairness and relevance evaluation; recommender systems

ACM Reference Format:

Theresia Veronika Rampisela, Tuukka Ruotsalo, Maria Maistro, and Christina Lioma. 2024. Can We Trust Recommender System Fairness Evaluation? The Role of Fairness and Relevance. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM*

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

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

This is the author's version of the work. It is posted here for your personal use. Not for redistribution. The definitive Version of Record was published in *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '24), July 14–18, 2024, Washington, DC, USA*, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657832>.

SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '24), July 14–18, 2024, Washington, DC, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657832>

1 INTRODUCTION

Recent increased focus on fairness in recommender systems (RSs) has led to studies on how to evaluate different notions of fairness in RS. A recent survey [38] shows that prior work on fairness evaluation in RS mainly focuses on group fairness (e.g., [1, 29, 44]), but less so on individual fairness. Individual fairness is commonly understood as treating similar individuals similarly [9]. Unlike group fairness evaluation, evaluating individual fairness does not require information on sensitive attributes (e.g., gender, age) to identify protected groups [18]. Such information is often unavailable due to privacy and legal issues. Further, intersectionality between different group characteristics complicates group fairness [6, 10]. Individual fairness is known to lead into group fairness, but not vice versa [4]. Overall, individual fairness gives a broader view by assessing distribution across all individuals in the population [18]. For all these reasons, we focus on individual fairness, particularly individual item fairness, which is typically broadly defined w.r.t. exposure received by items, i.e., how uniform the exposure distribution between items is [30]. Yet, fairness beyond exposure also matters, i.e., the exposure should be proportional to item relevance [2, 27, 35].

Individual item fairness is measured by measures that (i) are detached from relevance (fairness-only measures, defined by exposure); or (ii) are conditioned on relevance (joint measures considering exposure w.r.t. relevance). Measures of type (i) have been extensively analysed [30], but to our knowledge, this is not the case for measures of type (ii). The growing number of measures of type (ii) necessitates a thorough look into their usage in RS evaluation.

We present a comprehensive study into the empirical properties of all joint measures of individual item fairness and relevance, motivated by the question of how much can we practically trust these measures, particularly: **RQ1**. To what extent do the joint measures agree with existing relevance- and fairness-only measures? **RQ2**. To what extent do the joint measures agree with each other? **RQ3**. How sensitive are the joint measures across decreasing rank positions? and **RQ4**. How sensitive are the joint measures given increasingly fair and relevant recommendations?

We identify some alarming limitations in the measures, and we reflect on their best usage in practice. This is the first in-depth study on individual item fairness measures that consider relevance in RS.

2 INDIVIDUAL ITEM FAIRNESS & RELEVANCE

We present the notation (§2.1) and all existing joint evaluation measures of individual item fairness and relevance (§2.2).

2.1 Notation and definitions

Given a set of n items, $I = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n\}$, and a set of m users, $U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m\}$, an ordered list of the n items is created for each $u \in U$. This list is created in each recommendation round w , where $w \in \{1, 2, \dots, W\}$; a round means an occurrence in which a user receives a list of recommendations. If an item i is *relevant* to user u , we write $r_{u,i} = 1$, otherwise $r_{u,i} = 0$. Relevance can also be denoted as real values, $r_{u,i} \in [0, 1]$. The list of user u 's top k recommended items in round w is $L_{u,w}$ and the rank position of item i in user u 's recommendation list is $z(u, i, w)$. For cases with only one recommendation round, user u 's list of top k recommended items is L_u and the rank position of item i for user u is $z(u, i)$.

While several different definitions of fairness exist, the definitions commonly used in prior work on individual item fairness are closely linked to item exposure [1, 30, 44]. An item is *exposed* when it is recommended at the top k to a user. The probability of a user seeing an item exposed to them can be modelled using various *examination functions*, $e(\cdot)$. Examination functions typically assume that the viewing probability depends only on the position $z(u, i, w)$ or $z(u, i)$. This is a common choice across all measures in §2.2.

The examination functions used in this work are shown in Tab. 1: the linear examination function, e_{li} and its min-max normalised version \tilde{e}_{li} apply a linear discount to each rank position up to k [3]. Meanwhile, discounts based on Discounted Cumulative Gain (DCG) [16] and Rank-Biased Precision (RBP) [24] are used in e_{DCG} [26, 34] and e_{RBP} [17, 39] respectively. The parameter γ in e_{RBP} is the user's patience, i.e., the probability of the user examining the next ranked item. The user patience parameter is commonly set at e.g., $\gamma \in \{0.8, 0.9\}$ [17, 39]. In the inverse examination function e_{inv} , the inverse of the rank position is used as a discount factor [32]. Overall, we use three types of examination functions (linear, discounted, and inverse), which assume that item exposure diminishes with decreasing ranking either linearly, or with an increasing penalty that is either proportional to the rank decrease or the inverse of the rank. Generally, the most punishing is the inverse function, and the least punishing is the DCG-based discount function.

Table 1: Examination functions used in this work. \tilde{e} is the min-max normalised examination function.

	Equation	Measure	Reference
linear	$e_{li}(u, i, w) = k + 1 - z(u, i, w)$ $\tilde{e}_{li}(u, i, w) = \frac{e_{li}(u, i, w) - 1}{k - 1} = \frac{k - z(u, i, w)}{k - 1}$	IAA	[3]
DCG	$e_{DCG}(u, i, w) = 1/\log_2(z(u, i, w) + 1)$	IFD	[26, 34]
RBP	$e_{RBP}(u, i, w) = \gamma^{z(u, i, w) - 1}$	HD, II-F, AI-F	[17, 39]
inverse	$e_{inv}(u, i) = 1/z(u, i)$	MME, IBO/IWO	[32]

2.2 Joint measures of fairness and relevance

We present measures that evaluate fairness considering relevance (FAIR+REL or joint measures henceforth). To our knowledge, we include all FAIR+REL measures for RSs published up to October 2023. Each measure uses an exposure function, which is linked to the fairness of item distribution in the recommendation and, therefore, measures item fairness jointly with relevance. We use \uparrow for measures where the higher the score, the fairer the recommendation, and vice versa for \downarrow . All measures—except HD—are defined for multiple recommendation rounds or stochastic rankings, where a distribution over rankings is considered [2].

2.2.1 Inequity of Amortized Attention (IAA) [2]. \downarrow IAA¹ measures fairness as the aggregated difference between item exposure and its relevance in a series of rankings that have been generated by a stochastic process [2]. The intuition behind IAA is that for a sequence of rankings to be fair, items should be allocated exposure proportional to their relevance to the user. The item position is a proxy of its exposure level. IAA was modified in [3] to account for multiple recommendation rounds (stochastic rankings):

$$IAA = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{u \in U} IAA(u) \quad (1)$$

$$IAA(u) = \frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{W} \sum_{i \in I} \left| \sum_{w=1}^W 1_{L_{u,w}}(i) \cdot \tilde{e}(u, i, w) - \tilde{r}(u, i, w) \right| \quad (2)$$

In [3], $\tilde{e}_{(\cdot)}(u, i, w)$ is the min-max normalised linear examination function $\tilde{e}_{li}(u, i, w)$ (see Tab. 1) and $\tilde{r}(u, i, w) \in [0, 1]$ is the min-max normalised relevance value of item i for user u in round w , $r_{u,i,w}$.² Both the min and max relevance values are taken from the values associated with all items for each user per round, i.e., $\min_{i \in I} r_{u,i,w}$. This value is the aggregated relevance over all items for user u in round w ; the higher the relevance, the closer to 1. The higher the relevance value differs from item exposure, the more unfair. The range of IAA is $[0, 1]$.

2.2.2 Individual Fairness Disparity (IFD) [26, 34]. \downarrow IFD is the average pairwise difference of the combined value of item exposure and item merit. Merit is defined as a function of relevance.³ Similar to IAA, IFD follows the principle of allocating exposure to an item based on its relevance. While IAA computes the difference between the exposure and relevance of each item, IFD computes the disparity of exposure allocation between item pairs. Based on how exposure and merit are combined, two variations of IFD exist: IFD₊, where item exposure is divided by item relevance [34], and IFD_×, where the division is replaced by multiplication [26]. The term IFD_(·) or IFD refers to the measure in general. The two versions slightly differ in the pairwise difference computation, the formation of set of item pairs, and the exposure weighting scheme.⁴ Both IFD versions have been used to measure fairness in ranking [26, 34, 41, 42].

$$IFD_{(\cdot)} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{u \in U} IFD_{(\cdot)}(u) \quad (3)$$

¹This measure is called IAA in [29] and L1-norm in [38].

²Note that the normalised exposure value for a recommended item at k is zero.

³We use the item relevance value as the item merit, as per [34].

⁴Exposure is weighed proportional to e_{DCG} in [34]; to simplify, we use e_{DCG} directly.

$$\text{IFD}_{\dot{z}}(u) = \frac{1}{|H_u|} \sum_{(i,i') \in H_u} \max \{0, J_{\dot{z}}(u, i) - J_{\dot{z}}(u, i')\} \quad (4)$$

$$\text{IFD}_{\times}(u) = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{i' \in I \setminus i} [J_{\times}(u, i) - J_{\times}(u, i')]^2 \quad (5)$$

$$J_{\dot{z}}(u, i) = \frac{1}{W} \sum_{w=1}^W e_{\text{DCG}}(u, i, w) / r_{u,i,w} \quad (6)$$

$$J_{\times}(u, i) = \frac{1}{W} \sum_{w=1}^W r_{u,i,w} \cdot 1_{L_{u,w}}(i) \cdot e_{\text{DCG}}(u, i, w) \quad (7)$$

$J_{\dot{z}}(\cdot)(u, i)$ is the function combining the expected exposure and relevance of item i for user u and $H_u = \{(i, i') \in I \mid r_{u,i} \geq r_{u,i'} > 0\}$. The range of $\text{IFD}_{\dot{z}}$ is $[0, \infty)$ and it is 0 only when the exposure received by each relevant item is exactly proportional to its relevance [34]. The range of IFD_{\times} is $[0, \infty)$ based on empirical results [41].

2.2.3 Hellinger Distance (HD) [17]. \downarrow HD has been used as a measure of individual item fairness in top k contextual bandits, by quantifying the difference between the relevance- and click-distributions of the top k items sorted according to (ground truth) relevance [17]. The click probability is based on user patience, system-allocated item exposure, and item relevance. A recommendation is fair based on HD when the click probability of an item is proportional to the relevance probability of that item. To compute the relevance and click distributions, a list of top k items is created for each user by sorting items based on their (ground truth) relevance; this list is the reference list used in the next step. Another list of items is created based on system prediction and used to get the click probability. For each item in the reference list, we compute its click probability based on its order in the second list. Next, the relevance probabilities of items at the same position in the reference list are aggregated across users and similarly for the click probabilities. For each rank position, two aggregated values are obtained: relevance and click. The aggregated values are the inputs to the distance metric (Eq. (8)).

$$\text{HD} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{p=1}^k (\sqrt{q'_p} - \sqrt{c'_p})^2} \quad (8)$$

$$q'_p = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{u \in U} \sum_{i \in I} \delta(z^*(u, i) = p) \cdot r'_{u,i} \quad (9)$$

$$c'_p = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{u \in U} \frac{c_{u,p}^*}{\sum_{\ell=1}^k c_{u,\ell}^*} \quad (10)$$

$$c_{u,p}^* = \sum_{i \in I} \delta(z^*(u, i) = p) \cdot c_{u,i}^{\text{full}} \quad (11)$$

$$c_{u,i}^{\text{full}} = c'_{u,p} \text{ if } \exists p : z(u, i) = p, \text{ otherwise } 0 \quad (12)$$

$$c_{u,p} = \sum_{i \in L_u} \delta(z(u, i) = p) \cdot r_{u,i} \cdot \gamma e_{\text{RBP}}(u, i) \cdot s_{u,p} \quad (13)$$

$$s_{u,p} = \prod_{1 \leq j < p} 1 - \sum_{i \in L_u} \delta(z(u, i) = j) \cdot r_{u,i} \quad (14)$$

where q'_p and c'_p are the normalised relevance and click probability of the item at position j respectively, where click depends on both relevance and exposure. The position of item i based on ground-truth relevance is $z^*(u, i)$. The click probability of user u for item

at position p , $c_{u,p}$ depends on $s_{u,p}$, the probability that items before position p were irrelevant to the user, and the user patience $\gamma e_{\text{RBP}}(u, i)$. $r'_{u,i} = r_{u,i} / \sum_{i \in I} r_{u,i}$ is the user-wise normalised relevance value of item i to user u , and $c'_{u,p} = c_{u,p} / \sum_{p=1}^k c_{u,p}$ is the user-wise normalised click probability. The value of $\delta(\cdot) = 1$ when the expression \cdot is True and 0 otherwise. HD ranges between $[0, \infty)$.

2.2.4 Mean Max Envy (MME) [32]. \downarrow MME uses the concept of envy-freeness, where a recommendation is fair when each item is not disadvantaged by its own exposure allocation compared to being allocated the exposure of any other item. In other words, MME computes unfairness as the disadvantage suffered by the item, if the exposure allocation of an item is swapped with another item. The disadvantage is computed based on an impact score that uses exposure and relevance: given full recommendation lists (size n) across all users, we swap each item i with another item i' and compute the impact score before and after the swap for all rank positions and users. If the score of the item i before the swap is greater or equal to its score after the swap, we have envy-freeness for item i w.r.t. item i' . MME thus computes the average maximum difference of impact imposed if item i is replaced with another item i' . E.g., let $L_{u_1} = [i_1, i_2]$, $L_{u_2} = [i_1, i_3]$ and let us swap item i_3 with i_1 . Item i_3 will be exposed to both users at the top position, like i_1 did, and then impact is recomputed. MME is computed as follows:

$$\text{MME} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in I} \left\{ \max_{i' \in I} \text{Imp}_i(i') - \text{Imp}_i(i) \right\} \quad (15)$$

$$\text{Imp}_i(i') = \sum_{u \in U} \sum_{p=1}^k r_{u,i} \cdot e_{\text{inv}}(u, i') \cdot X_{u,i',p} \quad (16)$$

$$X_{u,i',p} = \frac{1}{W} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{w=1}^W 1_{L_{u,w}}(i') \cdot \delta(z(u, i', w) = p) \quad (17)$$

where $\text{Imp}_i(i')$ is the impact when we allocate the exposure of item i' to item i , $X_{u,i',p}$ is the probability that item i' is recommended to user u at position p in W rounds of recommendations, and $e_{\text{inv}}(u, i')$ is the exposure weight of item i' to user u , based on the inverse examination function (see Tab. 1). MME ranges within $[0, \infty)$.

2.2.5 Item Better-Off (IBO) & Item Worse-Off (IWO) [32]. \uparrow IBO and \downarrow IWO use the principle of *dominance over uniform ranking*, where fairness means each item has a better impact (as defined in MME) under the current ranking policy, than if it were under the uniform random ranking policy π_{unif} , which samples all possible permutations of items uniformly at random. IBO/IWO measures the percentage of items for which our current ranking policy increases/decreases impact by at least 10% compared to π_{unif} ⁵:

$$\text{IBO} = \frac{100}{|I^-|} \sum_{i \in I^-} \delta(\text{Imp}_i(i) \geq 1.1 \cdot \text{Imp}_i^{\text{unif}}) \quad (18)$$

$$\text{IWO} = \frac{100}{|I^-|} \sum_{i \in I^-} \delta(\text{Imp}_i(i) \leq 0.9 \cdot \text{Imp}_i^{\text{unif}}) \quad (19)$$

$$\text{Imp}_i^{\text{unif}} = \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{p=1}^k \frac{1}{p} \cdot \sum_{u \in U} r_{u,i} \quad (20)$$

⁵In [32], 10% is hard coded, but this can be a variable. We also use 10%.

where I^- is the set of items with at least one user that finds the item relevant. This ensures that the set of items that cause $\delta(\cdot) = 1$ in IBO is disjoint from that in IWO.⁶ $Imp_i(i)$ is as per Eq. (16) and Imp_i^{unif} is the impact if item i is exposed according to π_{unif} using $e_{inv}(u, i)$ as examination function (see Tab. 1). Note that the above definitions are modifications to the formulation of [32] to avoid computational issues that result in division by zero (undefinedness limitation [30]).⁷ IBO/IWO ranges between $[0, 100]$.

2.2.6 Individual-user-to-individual-item fairness (II-F) [39]. \Downarrow II-F was first defined by [8] to quantify unfairness as the disparity between system exposure and target exposure in individual queries and individual items. II-F was redefined by [39] for RSs as:

$$\text{II-F} = \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{u \in U} \sum_{i \in I} (E_{u,i} - E_{u,i}^*)^2 \quad (21)$$

$$E_{u,i} = \frac{1}{W} \sum_{w=1}^W 1_{L_{u,w}}(i) \cdot e_{\text{RBP}}(u, i, w) \quad (22)$$

$$E_{u,i}^* = \frac{r_{u,i}}{|R_u^*|} \cdot \frac{1 - \gamma^{|R_u^*|}}{1 - \gamma} \text{ if } |R_u^*| > 0, \text{ otherwise } 0 \quad (23)$$

where $E_{u,i}$ is the expected exposure of i to u as per a stochastic ranking policy. $E_{u,i}^*$ is the expected exposure of i to u as per an ideal stochastic ranking policy, which assumes that relevant items get equal expected exposure [8]. Thus, the recommendation is fair based on II-F if the system exposure matches the exposure allocated to items under an ideal ranking policy. The examination function based on RBP (see Tab. 1) is used in $E_{u,i}$ and the equation of $E_{u,i}^*$ is derived based on the same examination function [39]. $|R_u^*|$ is the number of relevant items for user u . II-F ranges between $[0, 1]$.

2.2.7 All-users-to-individual-item fairness (AI-F) [39]. \Downarrow AI-F evaluates how much RSs under/overexpose an item to all users as the mean deviation of overall system exposure over target exposure:

$$\text{AI-F} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in I} \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{u \in U} E_{u,i} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{u \in U} E_{u,i}^* \right)^2 \quad (24)$$

where $E_{u,i}$, $E_{u,i}^*$ are as per Eq. (22)–(23). Similar to II-F, AI-F also quantifies fairness based on how close the system exposure is to the target exposure. In II-F, this disparity is computed individually between each user-item pair, while in AI-F item exposure is first aggregated across users prior to computing the difference in exposure. Due to this aggregation, AI-F would have a better fairness score than II-F when there is a greater number of unique items in the recommendation, as opposed to having the same few items exposed to all users. The range of AI-F is $[0, 1]$.

3 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

We study the above FAIR+REL measures across different recommenders and datasets. Our general experimental setup follows, and we provide the description of the experiments in §4.⁸

⁶We exclude items with no relevant users, as for these items $Imp_i(i) = Imp_i^{unif} = 0$, causing the same items being considered ‘better-off’ and ‘worse-off’ at the same time.

⁷We move the divisor Imp_i^{unif} from the left-hand side to the right-hand side.

⁸Our code: <https://github.com/theresiavr/can-we-trust-recsys-fairness-evaluation>.

Table 2: Statistics of the preprocessed datasets.

dataset	#users (m)	#items (n)	#interactions	sparsity (%)
Lastfm [5]	1,859	2,823	71,355	98.64%
Amazon-lb [25]	1,054	791	12,397	98.51%
QK-video [43]	4,656	6,423	51,777	99.83%
ML-10M [14]	49,378	9,821	5,362,685	98.89%

Datasets. We use four real-world datasets of varying sizes and domains: Lastfm (music) [5], Amazon Luxury Beauty, i.e., Amazon-lb (e-commerce) [25], QK-video (videos) [43], and ML-10M (movies) [14]. QK-video is as provided by [43], and the rest are as provided by [45]. For QK-video, we use only the ‘sharing’ interactions.

Preprocessing. We keep only users and items with at least 5 interactions (5-core filtering). When there are duplicate interactions, we keep the most recent one. Ratings equal/above 3 are converted to 1, and the rest are discarded for Amazon-lb and ML-10M, as their ratings range between $[1, 5]$ and $[0.5, 5]$ respectively. No conversions are done for Lastfm and QK-video as they only have implicit feedback. Tab. 2 presents statistics of the preprocessed datasets.

Data splits. Global temporal splits [23] with a ratio of 6:2:2 form the train/val/test sets from the preprocessed datasets for Amazon-lb and ML-10M. Global random splits with the same ratio are used for Lastfm and QK-video as they have no timestamps. Only users with at least 5 interactions in the train set are kept in all splits.

Recommenders. We use four well-known top k recommenders: item-based K-Nearest Neighbour (ItemKNN) [7], Bayesian Personalised Ranking (BPR), [31], Variational Autoencoder with multinomial likelihood (MultiVAE) [20], and Neighbourhood-enriched Contrastive Learning (NCL) [21]. We train BPR, MultiVAE, and NCL using RecBole [45] for 300 epochs with early stopping. The configuration with the best NDCG@10 during validation is taken as the final model.⁹ During testing, all unobserved items are selected as candidates for recommendation and each user’s train/val items are excluded from their own recommendations.

Fair re-ranker. As the models are not directly optimised for fairness, we use a re-ranker to obtain fairer recommendations. The top k' items are re-ranked to provide exposure to items that were outside the top k , where k' is ideally larger than the cut-off $k = 10$. In RS datasets, normally there are very few relevant items per user, so k' should not be too big (e.g., 100). We choose $k' = 25$ for all datasets and models. The re-ranking is done per user with COMBMNZ (CM) [19] as a robust rank fusion method.¹⁰ CM fuses two lists of scores, one based on relevance and one based on fairness, to create a new ranking for each user. The relevance-based score is the min-max normalised predicted relevance score. The fairness-based score is first obtained from the coverage score of each top k' items based on their appearance in the top k . Then, we compute 1 minus the normalised coverage to allocate higher score for items with lower exposure, thus increasing fairness. The combined scores are sorted to generate the final fused ranking of relevance and fairness.

Measures. Recommendation models are evaluated using all the joint measures of relevance and fairness (FAIR+REL) presented in

⁹The hyperparameter search space and best values are in the code repository.

¹⁰Other re-rankers exist but do not suit our setup, e.g., [37] requires computing item similarity, but true similarity is challenging to obtain [9, 36].

§2.2.¹¹ As comparison to the joint measures, we evaluate relevance only (REL) with: Hit Rate (HR), MRR, Precision (P), Recall (R), MAP, and NDCG. We also evaluate fairness only (FAIR) with:¹² Jain Index (Jain) [15, 46], Qualification Fairness (QF) [46], Entropy (Ent) [28, 33], Fraction of Satisfied Items (FSat) [28], and Gini Index (Gini) [13, 22]. Unless otherwise stated, all measures are computed at $k = 10$.

4 EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

We present the evaluation results of all FAIR+REL, REL, and FAIR measures, in §4.1. We study their correlation in §4.2, their sensitivity across different top- k positions in §4.3 and across increasing levels of relevance and fairness in §4.4.

4.1 Evaluation results of all measures

Tab. 3 shows the scores of all FAIR+REL, REL, and FAIR measures, per dataset and recommender/re-ranking. \uparrow means the higher the score, the better, and vice versa for \downarrow . Overall we observe the following.

Best model agreement. We aim to study whether the measures agree on the same best model. We note two main trends. First, for all datasets, the best model based on REL measures is always different from the one based on FAIR measures, except for QF in Amazon-lb. This means that the fairest model is not necessarily the best in terms of relevance. Second, while all REL measures agree on the same best model per dataset (except MRR and MAP for Amazon-lb) and all the FAIR measures always agree on the same best model (except QF), the FAIR+REL measures disagree on the best model. Occasionally, some FAIR+REL measures agree with another more often (e.g., IBO with IWO, or IAA with HD and II-F, or MME with AI-F and sometimes IFD), but there is no overall consistency. The agreement between some joint measures may be due to their similar formulations: both IBO/IWO are the fractions of items with an impact score greater/lower than a threshold; MME/AI-F aggregate exposure across users prior to computing the exposure difference, while IAA/HD/II-F do not; and MME/IFD are pairwise measures.

Range of scores. We identify three issues on the score range of the FAIR+REL measures: (1) extremely small scales for several joint measures; (2) scale mismatch between single-aspect measures and joint measures; and (3) scale mismatch between joint measures. About (1), for all datasets and models, several \downarrow FAIR+REL scores are extremely small ($\leq 10^{-3}$), and these scores do not allow to distinguish across models per dataset. For example, \downarrow IFD $_{\times}$ is always close to 0 across all datasets, as the term Eq. (7) is often 0 due to the low number of relevant items per user.¹³ For MME and II-F/AI-F, Eq. (16) and Eq. (23) often result in 0 for the same reason as \downarrow IFD $_{\times}$. About (2), while the above FAIR+REL scores differ in the fourth or later decimal point, the differences in the REL and FAIR scores are in the second decimal point or before. E.g., the NDCG (REL score) of MultiVAE-CM and NCL for Lastfm differs by ~ 0.16 and their Jain (FAIR score) differs by ~ 0.14 . These examples imply non-negligible differences, but the joint scores of IAA/IFD $_{\times}$ /MME/II-F/AI-F only differ by $\leq 10^{-3}$, which may seem negligible.¹⁴ These

inconsistencies in the difference of magnitude make the scores hard to understand. About (3), we see large gaps in the score range of all joint measures, e.g., between IWO, HD, and AI-F, despite all of them being lower-is-better measures. E.g., in ML-10M, \downarrow IWO ≈ 1 (very unfair) based on its theoretical $[0, 1]$ -range, \downarrow HD is about a quarter of the \downarrow IWO score (somewhat fair), while \downarrow AI-F ≈ 0 (extremely fair). This discrepancy causes confusion in score interpretation.

Finally, we group all FAIR+REL measures into 3 clusters: (i) IAA/HD/II-F, which align more with REL measures; (ii) IFD/MME/AI-F, which align more with FAIR measures; and (iii) IBO/IWO, which do not consistently align with any single-aspect measure. Within the same cluster, especially in (i), measures often have large differences in their score ranges (up to $\Delta \approx 0.7$).

4.2 Correlation between measures (RQ1 & RQ2)

We compute Kendall's τ correlation between the orderings of the recommenders produced by the scores of each measure, to study how much the FAIR+REL measures agree among themselves but also with REL-only and FAIR-only measures, when ranking recommenders (Fig. 1). As REL and FAIR measures do not always correlate strongly with each other [30], we do not expect FAIR+REL measures to correlate strongly with either REL or FAIR measures.

RQ1. Agreement of joint and single-aspect measures. Overall, there is no consistent correlation between REL and FAIR+REL measures. IBO/IWO's correlations vary wildly ($\tau \in [-0.64, 0.77]$); IAA, HD, and II-F have moderate-to-strong positive correlations ($\tau \in [0.57, 1]$); IFD and MME have weak-to-strong negative correlations ($\tau \in [-1, -0.29]$ for IFD and $\tau \in [-0.79, -0.14]$ for MME); and AI-F has non-positive correlations ($\tau \in [-0.64, 0]$).

The correlations between FAIR and FAIR+REL measures are inconsistent. The correlations of IBO/IWO vary largely again, albeit less than with REL measures. IAA/HD/II-F have two distinct trends across groups of datasets: they have negative moderate-to-strong correlations ($\tau \in [-0.79, -0.57]$) for Lastfm and QK-video, but weak correlations for Amazon-lb and ML-10M ($\tau \in [-0.29, 0.14]$). Similarly, IFD has high correlations for Lastfm and QK-video (except with QF for QK-video), $\tau \in [0.57, 0.86]$, and weak or zero correlations for the other datasets ($\tau \in [0, 0.29]$). Conversely, MME and AI-F have strong correlations except with QF for Lastfm ($\tau \in [0.5, 1]$).

Note that FAIR+REL measures strongly agreeing with REL measures do not always strongly disagree with FAIR measures, and vice versa. E.g., IAA/HD/II-F strongly correlates with REL measures for Amazon-lb, but they correlate weakly with FAIR measures.

RQ2. Agreement between joint measures. Overall we find that the three clusters of joint measures identified in §4.1 show strong positive correlations between measures inside the same cluster and strong negative correlations between measures from different clusters. E.g., IBO always perfectly correlates with IWO, due to their similar formulation. IAA, HD, and II-F agree strongly with one another, $\tau \in [0.57, 1]$. IFD $_{\div}$ correlates highly with IFD $_{\times}$, $\tau \in [0.5, 1]$, as their formulations are similar. MME always agrees strongly with AI-F, $\tau \in [0.79, 0.93]$. IFD sometimes has moderate-to-strong correlations with MME and AI-F, $\tau \in [0.43, 0.86]$ for Lastfm and QK-video, but the correlations are weaker for Amazon-lb and ML-10M, $\tau \in [0.07, 0.29]$. In contrast, IAA/HD/II-F strongly disagrees with IFD, $\tau \in [-0.71, -0.5]$ except for IFD $_{\div}$ in Amazon-lb ($\tau = -0.43$).

¹¹For IAA, the ground truth relevance is used to compute the relevance score. For HD, $\gamma = 0.9$ as per [17]. For II-F and AI-F, $\gamma = 0.8$ as per [39]. Note that IBO/IWO are normalised to $[0, 1]$ for consistency with the other measures.

¹²We use the modified versions of these measures as per [30].

¹³For all four datasets, the median number of relevant items per user is at most 46.

¹⁴We use NDCG and Jain as they are more sensitive to changes than HR and QF.

Table 3: Relevance (REL), fairness (FAIR), and joint FAIR+REL scores at $k = 10$ without and with re-ranking the top $k' = 25$ items using COMBMNZ (CM). Bold marks the most relevant/fair score per measure. The score 0.000 does not mean the scores are exactly 0; this is due to the measures having small scores ($< 10^{-3}$) and rounding to 3 d.p.

		model	ItemKNN		BPR		MultiVAE		NCL			
		re-ranker	-	CM	-	CM	-	CM	-	CM		
Lastfm	REL	↑ HR	0.765	0.581	0.773	0.587	0.778	0.523	0.793	0.571		
		↑ MRR	0.484	0.270	0.492	0.280	0.476	0.232	0.503	0.260		
		↑ P	0.172	0.089	0.178	0.092	0.176	0.076	0.184	0.087		
		↑ MAP	0.137	0.053	0.141	0.058	0.138	0.045	0.148	0.050		
		↑ R	0.218	0.114	0.224	0.119	0.224	0.098	0.234	0.110		
		↑ NDCG	0.245	0.119	0.252	0.126	0.247	0.102	0.261	0.115		
	FAIR	↑ Jain	0.042	0.094	0.058	0.140	0.097	0.222	0.082	0.215		
		↑ QF	0.474	0.679	0.362	0.528	0.517	0.678	0.453	0.657		
		↑ Ent	0.589	0.735	0.610	0.740	0.707	0.826	0.671	0.810		
		↑ FSat	0.129	0.216	0.147	0.228	0.202	0.321	0.178	0.286		
		↓ Gini	0.904	0.790	0.910	0.818	0.839	0.696	0.872	0.728		
		FAIR+REL	↑ IBO	0.209	0.256	0.208	0.253	0.261	0.278	0.242	0.292	
↓ IWO	0.791		0.744	0.792	0.747	0.739	0.722	0.758	0.708			
↓ IAA	0.004		0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004			
↓ IFD _±	0.074		0.053	0.075	0.054	0.073	0.049	0.076	0.052			
↓ IFD _×	0.000		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000			
↓ HD	0.099		0.177	0.104	0.174	0.095	0.203	0.092	0.177			
↓ MME	0.001		0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001			
↓ II-F	0.001		0.002	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002			
↓ AI-F	0.000		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000			
Amazon-lb	REL		↑ HR	0.046	0.016	0.011	0.021	0.039	0.014	0.034	0.011	
			↑ MRR	0.020	0.011	0.003	0.007	0.023	0.004	0.022	0.003	
			↑ P	0.005	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.004	0.002	0.004	0.001	
		↑ MAP	0.006	0.004	0.002	0.004	0.006	0.003	0.006	0.001		
		↑ R	0.013	0.005	0.005	0.010	0.010	0.008	0.012	0.003		
		↑ NDCG	0.011	0.005	0.003	0.006	0.010	0.004	0.011	0.002		
	FAIR	↑ Jain	0.271	0.431	0.223	0.359	0.035	0.097	0.026	0.080		
		↑ QF	0.650	0.612	0.549	0.594	0.222	0.286	0.229	0.310		
		↑ Ent	0.802	0.839	0.747	0.809	0.418	0.558	0.371	0.534		
		↑ FSat	0.370	0.438	0.314	0.376	0.114	0.152	0.091	0.138		
		↓ Gini	0.665	0.598	0.747	0.660	0.949	0.899	0.959	0.910		
		FAIR+REL	↑ IBO	0.062	0.029	0.019	0.038	0.029	0.029	0.038	0.024	
↓ IWO	0.938		0.971	0.981	0.962	0.971	0.971	0.962	0.976			
↓ IAA	0.011		0.011	0.011	0.011	0.011	0.011	0.011	0.011			
↓ IFD _±	0.005		0.003	0.003	0.002	0.005	0.002	0.005	0.003			
↓ IFD _×	0.000		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000			
↓ HD	0.580		0.630	0.661	0.626	0.597	0.653	0.598	0.667			
ML-10M	FAIR+REL	↓ MME	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.003	0.001	0.004	0.001		
		↓ II-F	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.006		
		↓ AI-F	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.002	0.000		
		QK-video	REL	↑ HR	0.040	0.047	0.099	0.045	0.109	0.061	0.130	0.077
				↑ MRR	0.013	0.013	0.039	0.015	0.039	0.021	0.048	0.024
				↑ P	0.004	0.005	0.011	0.005	0.012	0.006	0.014	0.008
↑ MAP	0.005			0.005	0.017	0.006	0.018	0.009	0.022	0.010		
↑ R	0.014			0.019	0.043	0.019	0.051	0.027	0.061	0.033		
↑ NDCG	0.009			0.010	0.029	0.011	0.031	0.016	0.038	0.019		
FAIR	↑ Jain		0.483	0.589	0.081	0.379	0.012	0.032	0.020	0.071		
	↑ QF		0.901	0.790	0.625	0.823	0.100	0.163	0.201	0.365		
	↑ Ent		0.933	0.937	0.755	0.903	0.420	0.547	0.507	0.674		
	↑ FSat		0.443	0.547	0.212	0.382	0.052	0.090	0.077	0.150		
	↓ Gini		0.472	0.442	0.807	0.570	0.982	0.959	0.966	0.902		
	FAIR+REL		↑ IBO	0.033	0.038	0.054	0.036	0.031	0.036	0.043	0.054	
↓ IWO		0.967	0.962	0.946	0.964	0.969	0.964	0.957	0.946			
↓ IAA		0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001			
↓ IFD _±		0.009	0.007	0.014	0.008	0.014	0.009	0.015	0.010			
↓ IFD _×		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000			
↓ HD		0.576	0.560	0.490	0.565	0.478	0.535	0.457	0.519			
↓ MME		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000			
↓ II-F		0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001			
↓ AI-F		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000			
FAIR+REL		↑ HR	0.487	0.443	0.512	0.386	0.417	0.387	0.521	0.402		
		↑ MRR	0.282	0.225	0.299	0.185	0.237	0.191	0.302	0.203		
		↑ P	0.137	0.105	0.146	0.088	0.107	0.096	0.154	0.094		
	↑ MAP	0.089	0.060	0.095	0.047	0.067	0.054	0.101	0.052			
	↑ R	0.022	0.018	0.025	0.012	0.020	0.016	0.026	0.013			
	↑ NDCG	0.150	0.113	0.160	0.092	0.119	0.100	0.167	0.100			

*For ML-10M, QF \equiv FSat, as QF is computed based on the % of recommended items from all items, which in this case is equivalent to FSat.

Based on the above, we conclude that: IBO/IWO has inconsistent relationships with single-aspect and joint measures; IAA/HD/II-F do not align with fairness; and IFD/MME/AI-F highly disagree with relevance (even if IFD sometimes disagrees with FAIR measures too). Among the joint measures, IBO/IWO weakly correlate with the single-aspect measures for QK-video, and similarly with IFD_± for Amazon-lb, but this is not consistent. We thus argue that no joint measures reliably account for both relevance and fairness.

4.3 Measure sensitivity at different ranks (RQ3)

We now study how sensitive the joint measures are at decreasing rank positions, compared to REL and FAIR measures. When moving down the rank, REL scores are known to decrease while FAIR scores are known to improve [30]. For this analysis, we use only the runs of the non-reranked NCL model as it generally has the best REL scores. We compute all measures at $k = 5$ for each sliding window, where the windows consist of items at decreasing rank positions: 1–5, 2–6,

... 5–9. Fig. 2 shows the results for Lastfm, Amazon-lb, and ML-10M, which represent the overall trends in all our datasets; results for QK-video are shown in the appendix (in our code repository).

We find that, as expected, as we move down the rank, REL overall decreases and FAIR improves. However, the joint measures are notably less sensitive to changes in rank position. Changes with decreasing rank position in the single-aspect scores are up two magnitudes greater than in the joint measures, and the latter do not reflect these differences to the same scale. We posit that the insensitivity is due to the effect of changing relevance being masked by that of fairness and vice versa. This masking makes the scores hard to interpret. Further, the very small scores of \downarrow IAA, \downarrow IFD_×, MME, II-F, and AI-F imply extremely fair recommendations (we explain the reasons for this in §4.1), even if REL and FAIR scores are low. Thus, these joint measures do not account well for relevance and fairness simultaneously. Last, we note that as we move down the rank, IAA/HD/II-F worsen, IFD/MME/AI-F improve, and IBO/IWO




Figure 1: Kendall's τ correlation between joint FAIR+REL measures, REL, and FAIR measures.

are inconsistent across datasets. This follows the three groups of joint measures discussed above.

4.4 Artificial insertion of items (RQ4)

Lastly, we study how sensitive the joint measures are to different proportions of relevant items and item fairness in the ranking. Assessing this sensitivity is important as it affects score interpretation; if a joint measure is unresponsive to significant changes in relevance and fairness distribution, its score may not reflect both the fairness and relevance of the recommendations accurately.

We start with a recommendation list having the worst REL and FAIR scores, and gradually insert more relevant and fair items to it (we explain 'fair items' below). We observe how the joint measures respond to these changes, compared to the REL and FAIR measures.

We cannot use real-life datasets for this analysis, so we build a synthetic dataset with $m = 1000$ and $n = 10000$, and artificially generate rankings of items per user, as per [30]. The initial ranking contains the same $k = 10$ items for all users, to whom these items are irrelevant, except for one user.¹⁵ In each iteration, an item from the bottom of each user's top k ranking is replaced by a relevant item having less exposure (hence more fair). The final ranking thus contains km unique items across all users, where each item is relevant only to the user that receives that item in the top k . We expect all measures to initially score the worst possible, and then gradually improve as more relevant and fair items enter the ranks.

Fig. 3 shows the results of this analysis. Overall, we see that most joint measures are not very sensitive to changes in REL and FAIR scores, i.e., they may vary, but negligibly. This verifies the scale mismatch between most joint measures and the single-aspect measures observed in §4.1 & §4.3. While the overall change is negligible for most measures, a common observation between the joint measures is that their scores become (slightly) better as REL and FAIR scores improve. An exception to this is IFD. This is because IFD measures

fairness based on the pairwise difference in the combined value of exposure and relevance. Thus, when the relevant items start to be moved to the top k , the gap between the exposure weight of relevant items in and outside the top k increases, and so does unfairness. Among joint measures that (slightly) improve with more insertion, there are also differences. IBO/IWO improve linearly; as both measures are percentages of items, the change is proportional to the amount of inserted items. HD also improves, but its improvement fluctuates due to randomness introduced by the unstable sort in the computation, as per the original implementation in [17]. \downarrow IAA/IFD_x/MME/II-F/AI-F improve non-linearly. However, their scores are extremely close to 0, i.e., on the scale of 10^{-3} or less. The lower bound of the measure is 0, hence these small scores indicate that the recommendation is close to the fairest, even at the start of the process where the REL and FAIR scores are the worst in the entire progression. These joint measures are also rather insensitive to changes in REL and FAIR scores. Here, their score range is (0, 0.0015), while the range of REL, FAIR, and IBO/IWO scores is [0, 1].

5 RELATED WORK

Fairness evaluation in RSs. Among prior work on fairness evaluation in RSs [1, 29, 30, 38, 44], our study is close to Amigó et al. [1], who study RS relevance and fairness for groups/individuals and between items and users. Yet, the focus of our work, i.e., individual item fairness, is not covered in [1]. Raj and Ekstrand [29] overview evaluation measures for item group fairness. Their study includes the IAA measure as a group fairness measure (whereas we focus on individual item fairness). Lastly, Rampisela et al. [30] survey individual item fairness measures that are exclusively linked with fairness and identify the limitations within them, while we focus on measures that jointly account for both fairness and relevance.

Joint measures of relevance and fairness. Outside the strict domain of individual item fairness for RS, there exist other measures that quantify relevance and fairness jointly: Gao et al. [11] present a measure combining KL-divergence and IDCG to jointly quantify

¹⁵This is to keep the number of items exactly km .




Figure 2: Sliding window evaluation ($k = 5$) of NCL for Lastfm, Amazon-lb, and ML-10M. The last column is in exponential scale.

relevance and group fairness in IR [11]. In [40], utility and provider fairness in RS are simultaneously evaluated with a weighted sum between relevance and fairness. Another approach used in [12] to evaluate individual fairness in ranking is to compare item position based on ground truth relevance against its position in system-produced rankings. None of the joint measures in our work is a combination of two single-aspect measures as in [11] or in the form of weighted sum as in [40]. The measure in [12] is similar to HD [17]. However, we do not use it in our work because it was not defined for RS fairness, and considerable modifications and assumptions are required prior to using it to evaluate RS fairness.

6 APPROPRIATE USAGE OF JOINT MEASURES

We find that joint measures of relevance and fairness (1) tend to align differently with single-aspect measures; (2) most of them consistently score almost perfect fairness, even when recommendations are highly irrelevant and unfair based on single-aspect measures; and (3) are rather unresponsive to changes in the recommendation relevance and fairness, especially compared to single-aspect measures. Next, we suggest how to best use these joint measures.

Avoid using similar joint measures. In §4.2 & §4.3 we find three groups of similar joint measures: (i) IAA/HD/II-F, (ii) IFD/MME/AI-F, and (iii) IBO/IWO. Only one measure per group should be used. Yet, considering that typically recommendations are evaluated with




Figure 3: Artificial insertion of items with $m = 1000$ (users).

REL measures, we discourage using measures in (i), as they are highly aligned with REL measures. Measures in (ii) correlate strongly with FAIR measures, and can be viable options, and likewise for measures in (iii) that do not consistently correlate with single-aspect measures. However, we argue that measures in (iii) are more useful than those in (ii). Measures in (ii) can be replaced by FAIR measures, which are faster to compute and do not need complete relevance judgements, while still achieving highly similar conclusions.

Be aware of the unintuitive or inconsistent behaviour, insensitivity, and computational complexity of the measures. We recommend that practitioners be aware of the measure limitations in groups (ii) and (iii). Specifically, both IFD versions worsen with higher percentages of jointly relevant and fair recommendations, while the opposite should happen in a healthy measure. IFD_{\neq} is unaffected by different cut-off k values, as its original formulation only considers full rankings, so it should not be used when different k matters. MME is costly to compute as it is a pairwise measure (~ 30 mins for the larger datasets), and the same applies to $\downarrow IFD_{\times}$, albeit to a lesser extent. Further, $IFD_{\times}/MME/AI-F$ tend to have extremely small scores, which are therefore hard to interpret and discriminate across runs. They are also rather insensitive to changes reflected by single-aspect measures, meaning that their overall expressiveness is limited. IBO/IWO is sensitive in this aspect. Considering the limitations and the redundancy between measures, IBO/IWO seem to be the most viable measure out of the existing ones, but it is the least consistent between all other measures, due to varying alignments for different datasets, so it should be interpreted cautiously.

Avoid score misinterpretation in measures with small empirical scales. Due to the small empirical scales of $\downarrow IAA/IFD/MME/II-F/AI-F$, their scores tend not to represent fairness, or relevance and fairness jointly, i.e., scoring very close to 0 even if the recommendation is very irrelevant and unfair based on REL and FAIR measures. Moreover, different systems can have very similar scores which do not translate to similar performance. E.g., two models differing in scores by only 0.001 can be interpreted as performing the same, even though the measure has a small empirical range and is not very

sensitive to begin with. This issue can be fixed via apriori/posthoc normalisation based on experimental values of the measures [39]. **Measure fairness separately from relevance.** As most joint measures (IAA/IFD/MME/II-F/AI-F) are difficult to interpret because their scores tend to be compressed in a very low range, and are also rather insensitive to changes in fairness and relevance, we recommend measuring individual item fairness and relevance separately. Otherwise, the joint scores can be close to the theoretical fairest value even if REL and FAIR scores are low (§4.4). Overall, the above joint measures have unreliable scores, are not as sensitive as the FAIR measures, and are subject to more under/overestimation of fairness than FAIR measures which have more consistent empirical range. The remaining joint measures are not reliable either: IBO/IWO aligns inconsistently to the single-aspect measures, while HD is almost always consistent with REL measures and thus does not add another dimension of fairness measurement. It is also unstable due to sorting of items with identical relevance level.

Overall, the joint measures cannot be compared easily as they have different scales, and they quantify two aspects that are hard to combine due to mismatching scales. The measures tend to correlate highly with either REL or FAIR measures, instead of having a good balance between them. As such, optimising for a joint measure directly may not result in a simultaneously optimal recommendation based on REL and FAIR scores. Another obstacle in measuring fairness is the need to consider user-item relevance in the entire dataset (not just the recommended items), which can be an issue with extremely sparse datasets. It is thus inherently difficult to devise a measure that can jointly quantify relevance and fairness.

7 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

We presented a novel empirical study on the properties of all evaluation measures that jointly account for individual item fairness and relevance in recommender systems. We found that out of 9 joint measures, 3 align with traditional relevance-only measures, 4 agree more with fairness-only measures, and the rest behave inconsistently. We also found that only a few joint measures are sensitive to a simultaneous decrease in relevance and increased fairness in the recommendation. Most surprisingly, nearly all joint measures are almost unresponsive to increases in relevance and fairness. Even worse, the majority tend to compress scores at the low end of their range, giving the illusion of an extremely fair recommendation, even when the relevance- and fairness-only scores are close to the theoretical worst value. Based on these findings, we formulated recommendations on the appropriate usage of these measures.

Future work includes improving the design of joint measures by addressing or mitigating the limitations of the current measures outlined, to have a single score that reflects recommendation relevance and fairness more accurately and in a more balanced way. The individual fairness and relevance measures can also be optimised jointly with multi-objective approach, to obtain both fair and relevant recommendations. Future work can also investigate whether the findings hold when the models are directly optimised for fairness, or when different family of models are used.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Funded by Algorithms, Data & Democracy (Villum & Velux funds).

REFERENCES

- [1] Enrique Amigó, Yashar Deldjoo, Stefano Mizzaro, and Alejandro Bellogin. 2023. A unifying and general account of fairness measurement in recommender systems. *Information Processing & Management*, 60, 1, (Jan. 2023), 103115. doi: 10.1016/j.ipm.2022.103115.
- [2] Asia J. Biega, Krishna P. Gummadi, and Gerhard Weikum. 2018. Equity of attention: Amortizing individual fairness in rankings. In *41st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR 2018*. Vol. 18. Association for Computing Machinery, Inc. (June 2018), 405–414. ISBN: 9781450356572. doi: 10.1145/3209978.3210063.
- [3] Rodrigo Borges and Kostas Stefanidis. 2019. Enhancing Long Term Fairness in Recommendations with Variational Autoencoders. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Management of Digital EcoSystems*. ACM, New York, NY, USA. ISBN: 9781450362382. doi: 10.1145/3297662.
- [4] Amanda Bower, Hamid Eftekhari, Mikhail Yurochkin, and Yuekai Sun. 2021. Individually Fair Ranking. In *ICLR 2021 - 9th International Conference on Learning Representations*. OpenReview.net. https://openreview.net/forum?id=71zCSP_HuBN.
- [5] Iván Cantador, Peter Brusilovsky, and Tsvi Kuflik. 2011. 2nd Workshop on Information Heterogeneity and Fusion in Recommender Systems (HetRec 2011). In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM conference on Recommender systems (RecSys 2011)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA.
- [6] Kimberle Crenshaw. 1991. Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 6, 1241–1299. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1229039>.
- [7] Mukund Deshpande and George Karypis. 2004. Item-based top-N recommendation algorithms. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 22, 1, (Jan. 2004), 143–177. doi: 10.1145/963770.963776.
- [8] 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*. ACM, New York, NY, USA. ISBN: 9781450368599. doi: 10.1145/3340531.
- [9] Cynthia Dwork, Moritz Hardt, Toniann Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Richard Zemel. 2012. Fairness through awareness. In *ITCS 2012 - Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference*, 214–226. ISBN: 9781450311151. doi: 10.1145/2090236.2090255.
- [10] Michael D. Ekstrand, Anubrata Das, Robin Burke, and Fernando Diaz. 2022. Fairness in Recommender Systems. *Recommender Systems Handbook*, 679–707. ISBN: 9781071621974. doi: 10.1007/978-1-0716-2197-4_18.
- [11] 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, (Oct. 2022), 1461–1473. doi: 10.1002/ASL.24648.
- [12] David Garcia-Soriano and Francesco Bonchi. 2021. Maxmin-Fair Ranking: Individual Fairness under Group-Fairness Constraints. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining (KDD '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 436–446. ISBN: 9781450383325. doi: 10.1145/3447548.3467349.
- [13] C. Gini. 1912. Variabilità e mutabilità. *Contributo allo Studio delle Distribuzioni e delle Relazioni Statistiche*.
- [14] F Maxwell Harper and Joseph A Konstan. 2015. The MovieLens datasets: History and context. *ACM Trans. Interact. Intell. Syst.* 5, 4, Article, 19. doi: 10.1145/2827872.
- [15] Rajendra K Jain, Dah-Ming W Chiu, William R Hawe, et al. 1998. A Quantitative Measure Of Fairness And Discrimination For Resource Allocation In Shared Computer Systems. (1998). <http://arxiv.org/abs/cs/9809099>.
- [16] Kalervo Järvelin and Jaana Kekäläinen. 2002. Cumulated gain-based evaluation of IR techniques. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 20, 4, (Oct. 2002), 422–446. doi: 10.1145/582415.582418.
- [17] Olivier Jeunen and Bart Goethals. 2021. Top-K Contextual Bandits with Equity of Exposure. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 310–320. ISBN: 9781450384582. doi: 10.1145/3460231.3474248.
- [18] Tomo Lazovich, Luca Belli, Aaron Gonzales, Amanda Bower, Uthaiapon Tantipongpipat, Kristian Lum, Ferenc Huszár, and Rumman Chowdhury. 2022. Measuring disparate outcomes of content recommendation algorithms with distributional inequality metrics. *Patterns*, 3, 8, (Aug. 2022). doi: 10.1016/j.patter.2022.100568.
- [19] Joon Ho Lee. 1997. Analyses of multiple evidence combination. In *SIGIR '97: Proceedings of the 20th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), Philadelphia, (July 1997), 267–276. doi: 10.1145/258525.258587.
- [20] Dawen Liang, Rahul G. Krishnan, Matthew D. Hoffman, and Tony Jebara. 2018. Variational autoencoders for collaborative filtering. In *The Web Conference 2018 - Proceedings of the World Wide Web Conference, WWW 2018*. Vol. 10. Association for Computing Machinery, Inc. (Apr. 2018), 689–698. ISBN: 9781450356398. doi: 10.1145/3178876.3186150.
- [21] Zihan Lin, Changxin Tian, Yupeng Hou, and Wayne Xin Zhao. 2022. Improving Graph Collaborative Filtering with Neighborhood-enriched Contrastive Learning. In *WWW 2022 - Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. Association for Computing Machinery, Inc. Virtual Event, Lyon, France, (Apr. 2022), 2320–2329. ISBN: 9781450390965. doi: 10.1145/3485447.3512104.
- [22] Masoud Mansoury, Himan Abdollahpour, Mykola Pechenizkiy, Bamshad Mobasher, and Robin Burke. 2020. FairMatch: A Graph-based Approach for Improving Aggregate Diversity in Recommender Systems. In *UMAP 2020 - Proceedings of the 28th ACM Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization*. Vol. 20. ACM, (July 2020), 154–162. ISBN: 9781450368612. doi: 10.1145/3340631.3394860.
- [23] Zaiqiao Meng, Richard McCreadie, Craig MacDonald, and Iadh Ounis. 2020. Exploring Data Splitting Strategies for the Evaluation of Recommendation Models. In *RecSys 2020 - 14th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. Association for Computing Machinery, Inc. Virtual Event, Brazil, (Sept. 2020), 681–686. ISBN: 9781450375832. doi: 10.1145/3383313.3418479.
- [24] Alistair Moffat and Justin Zobel. 2008. Rank-biased precision for measurement of retrieval effectiveness. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 27, 1, (Dec. 2008). doi: 10.1145/1416950.1416952.
- [25] Jianmo Ni, Jiacheng Li, and Julian McAuley. 2019. Justifying Recommendations using Distantly-Labeled Reviews and Fine-Grained Aspects. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019 - 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, Proceedings of the Conference*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 188–197. ISBN: 9781950737901. doi: 10.18653/v1/D19-1018.
- [26] 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 (SIGIR '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1023–1032. ISBN: 9781450380379. doi: 10.1145/3404835.3462830.
- [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 *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1929–1942. ISBN: 9781450393522. doi: 10.1145/3531146.3533238.
- [28] Gourab K. Patro, Arpita Biswas, Niloy Ganguly, Krishna P. Gummadi, and Abhinjan Chakraborty. 2020. FairRec: Two-Sided Fairness for Personalized Recommendations in Two-Sided Platforms. In *The Web Conference 2020 - Proceedings of the World Wide Web Conference, WWW 2020*. Association for Computing Machinery, Inc. (Apr. 2020), 1194–1204. ISBN: 9781450370233. doi: 10.1145/3366423.3380196.
- [29] Amifa Raj and Michael D. Ekstrand. 2022. Measuring Fairness in Ranked Results. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, (July 2022), 726–736. ISBN: 9781450387323. doi: 10.1145/3477495.3532018.
- [30] Theresa Veronika Rampisela, Maria Maistro, Tuukka Ruotsalo, and Christina Lioma. 2023. Evaluation Measures of Individual Item Fairness for Recommender Systems: A Critical Study. *ACM Trans. Recomm. Syst.*, (Nov. 2023). doi: 10.1145/3631943.
- [31] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, Zeno Gantner, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. 2009. BPR: Bayesian Personalized Ranking from Implicit Feedback. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI '09)*. AUAI Press, Arlington, Virginia, USA, 452–461. ISBN: 9780974903958.
- [32] 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 (KDD '22)*, August 14–18, 2022, Washington, DC, USA. Vol. 1. ACM, 1514–1524. ISBN: 9781450393850. doi: 10.1145/3534678.3539353.
- [33] C E Shannon. 1948. A Mathematical Theory of Communication. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, 27, 623–656.
- [34] Ashudeep Singh and Thorsten Joachims. 2019. Policy learning for fairness in ranking. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Hanna M Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Alina Beygelzimer, Florence D'Alché-Buc, Emily B Fox, and Roman Garnett, (Eds.) Vol. 32, 5427–5437. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/hash/9e82757e9a1c12cb710ad680db11f6f1-Abstract.html>.
- [35] Jessie J Smith, Lex Beattie, and Henriette Cramer. 2023. Scoping Fairness Objectives and Identifying Fairness Metrics for Recommender Systems: The Practitioners' Perspective. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023 (WWW '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 3648–3659. ISBN: 9781450394161. doi: 10.1145/3543507.3583204.
- [36] Leonidas Tsepenekas, Ivan Brugere, Freddy Lecue, and Daniele Magazzini. 2023. Comparing Apples to Oranges: Learning Similarity Functions for Data Produced by Different Distributions. *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NeurIPS. Alice Oh, Tristan Naumann, Amir Globerson, Kate Saenko, Moritz Hardt, and Sergey Levine, (Eds.) http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/59056767478c7df64e6250eadfeb0a04-Abstract-Conference.html%20https://openreview.net/forum?id=zjjsjeVJZ.

- [37] Xiuling Wang and Wendy Hui Wang. 2022. Providing Item-side Individual Fairness for Deep Recommender Systems. In *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*. Vol. 22. Association for Computing Machinery, (June 2022), 117–127. ISBN: 9781450393522. doi: 10.1145/3531146.3533079.
- [38] Yifan Wang, Weizhi Ma, Min Zhang, Yiqun Liu, and Shaoping Ma. 2023. A Survey on the Fairness of Recommender Systems. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.*, 41, 3, (Feb. 2023), 1–43. doi: 10.1145/3547333.
- [39] Haolun Wu, Bhaskar Mitra, Chen Ma, Fernando Diaz, and Xue Liu. 2022. Joint Multisided Exposure Fairness for Recommendation. In *SIGIR 2022 - Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. Association for Computing Machinery, Inc, (July 2022), 703–714. ISBN: 9781450387323. doi: 10.1145/3477495.3532007.
- [40] Chen Xu, Sirui Chen, Jun Xu, Weiran Shen, Xiao Zhang, Gang Wang, and Zhenhua Dong. 2023. P-MMF: Provider Max-min Fairness Re-ranking in Recommender System. *ACM Web Conference 2023 - Proceedings of the World Wide Web Conference, WWW 2023*, (Apr. 2023), 3701–3711. ISBN: 9781450394161. doi: 10.1145/3543507.3583296.
- [41] Tao Yang, Zhichao Xu, Zhenduo Wang, and Qingyao Ai. 2023. FARA: Future-Aware Ranking Algorithm for Fairness Optimization. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2906–2916. doi: 10.1145/3583780.3614877.
- [42] 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 (WSDM '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 24–32. ISBN: 9781450394079. doi: 10.1145/3539597.3570474.
- [43] Guanghu Yuan et al. 2022. Tenrec: A Large-scale Multipurpose Benchmark Dataset for Recommender Systems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35, (Dec. 2022), 11480–11493. <https://www.tencent.com/en-us/>.
- [44] Meike Zehlike, Ke Yang, and Julia Stoyanovich. 2022. Fairness in Ranking, Part II: Learning-to-Rank and Recommender Systems. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55, 6, (Dec. 2022). doi: 10.1145/3533380.
- [45] Wayne Xin Zhao et al. 2021. RecBole: Towards a Unified, Comprehensive and Efficient Framework for Recommendation Algorithms. In *International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, Proceedings*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 4653–4664. ISBN: 9781450384469. doi: 10.1145/3459637.3482016.
- [46] Qiliang Zhu, Qibo Sun, Zengxiang Li, and Shangguang Wang. 2020. FARM: A Fairness-Aware Recommendation Method for High Visibility and Low Visibility Mobile APPs. *IEEE Access*, 8, 122747–122756. doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3007617.