A Nutritional Label for Rankings

Ke Yang Drexel University ky323@drexel.edu

Bill Howe[†] University of Washington billhowe@uw.edu Julia Stoyanovich* Drexel University stoyanovich@drexel.edu

HV Jagadish[‡] University of Michigan jag@umich.edu Abolfazl Asudeh University of Michigan asudeh@umich.edu

Gerome Miklau[§] University of Massachusetts Amherst miklau@cs.umass.edu

ABSTRACT

Algorithmic decisions often result in scoring and ranking individuals to determine credit worthiness, qualifications for college admissions and employment, and compatibility as dating partners. While automatic and seemingly objective, ranking algorithms can discriminate against individuals and protected groups, and exhibit low diversity. Furthermore, ranked results are often unstable small changes in the input data or in the ranking methodology may lead to drastic changes in the output, making the result uninformative and easy to manipulate. Similar concerns apply in cases where items other than individuals are ranked, including colleges, academic departments, or products.

In this demonstration we present Ranking Facts, a Web-based application that generates a "*nutritional label*" for rankings. Ranking Facts is made up of a collection of visual widgets that implement our latest research results on fairness, stability, and transparency for rankings, and that communicate details of the ranking methodology, or of the output, to the end user. We will showcase Ranking Facts on real datasets from different domains, including college rankings, criminal risk assessment, and financial services.

ACM Reference Format:

Ke Yang, Julia Stoyanovich, Abolfazl Asudeh, Bill Howe, HV Jagadish, and Gerome Miklau. 2018. A Nutritional Label for Rankings. In *Proceedings* of 2018 International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD'18). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 4 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3183713.3193568

1 INTRODUCTION

Algorithmic decisions often result in scoring and ranking individuals — to determine credit worthiness, desirability for college admissions and employment, and compatibility as dating partners. While automatic and seemingly objective, rankers can discriminate

SIGMOD'18, June 10-15, 2018, Houston, TX, USA

© 2018 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-4703-7/18/06...\$15.00

https://doi.org/10.1145/3183713.3193568

many hidden assumptions, and are increasingly used outside of the original context for which they were intended. In response, developers, regulators and the public need to quickly determine the "fitness for use" of a given model or dataset, and to assess the methodology that was used to produce it. This motivates development of interpretability and transparency tools. With the exception of recent machine learning results that enable

against individuals and protected groups [1], and exhibit low diversity [9]. Furthermore, ranked results are often unstable – small

changes in the input or in the ranking methodology may lead to

drastic changes in the output, making the result uninformative

and easy to manipulate [3, 10]. Similar concerns apply in cases

where items other than individuals are ranked, including colleges,

Algorithmic decisions are produced by complex processes with

academic departments, and products.

interpretability of particular classes of algorithms [6, 7, 12], recent scholarship on algorithmic accountability has primarily focused on enabling an analyst to retroactively verify particular properties rather than proactively exposing a standard suite of information. Because algorithmic processes can be complex or secret, these methods rely on retrospective checks, using techniques like zero knowledge proofs [4], audits [8], and reverse engineering [5]. These are valid methods of interrogation, but they put a significant burden on users. The burden should instead be borne by the vendor who produced the result, who is in a better position to explain it.

In this work we develop an interpretability tool, Ranking Facts, that is based on the concept of a *nutritional label*. We draw an analogy to the food industry, where simple, standardized labels convey information to consumers about the ingredients and production processes. Short of setting up a chemistry lab, the consumer would otherwise have no access to this information. Similarly, Ranking Facts explains ranked outputs to a user, with appropriately summarized information regarding the ranking process.

An example of the output produced by our tool is presented in Figure 1. It explains a ranked set of Computer Science departments. The data was obtained from CS Rankings (https://github. com/emeryberger/CSRankings), augmented with attributes from the NRC (http://www.nap.edu/rdp/) dataset, see details in Section 3.

Ranking Facts is made up of a collection of visual widgets. Each widget addresses an essential aspect of transparency and interpretability, and is based on our recent technical work on fairness and diversity [2, 9, 11, 13], transparency [10], and stability (ongoing) in algorithmic rankers. We describe next how we explain rankings using the widgets (Section 2) and then discuss demonstration scenarios (Section 3) before concluding in Section 4.

^{*}This work was supported in part by NSF Grant No. 1741047.

[†]This work was supported in part by NSF Grant No. 1740996.

[‡]This work was supported in part by NSF Grant No. 1741022.

[§]This work was supported in part by NSF Grant No. 1741254.

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 ACM 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.

Ranking Facts

Recipe		Ingredien	ts			\rightarrow	← Ingree	dients	S			
Attribute	Weight	Attribute		Importa	nce		Top 10:					
PubCount	1.0	PubCount		1.0		₿	Attribute		Maximum	Median	Minim	um
Faculty	1.0	CSRankingAllAre	a	0.24			PubCount		18.3	9.6	6.2	
GRE	1.0	Faculty		0.12			CSRankingAll	Area	13	6.5	1	
						۲	Faculty		122	52.5	45	
		Importance of a correlation coeff scores, compute high if the absol	icient betw ed by a line	een attribute va ar regression m	lues and items odel. Importan	ice is	Overall: Attribute		Maximum	Median	Minim	num
		0.75, medium if					PubCount		18.3	2.9	1.4	
		otherwise.					CSRankingAll		48	26.0	1	
Diversity a	t top-10 😧	Diversity	overal	0			Faculty		122	32.0	14	
●Large ●S		Large	●Small	ene en	W MW SA	•SC Hjelden cen						
← Stability	,	Fairness	0			⇒	🗲 Fairn	ess				
Тор-К	Stability	DeptSizeBin	FA*IR	Pairwis	e Proport	ion		E	A*IR	Pairwise	Prop	ortio
Top-10	Stable	Large	Fair	🕑 Fair	🕑 Fair	\odot	DeptSizeBin				p-value	ε α
Overall	Stable	Small	Unfair	🙁 Unfair	(B) Unfair	8	-		0.87		5 1.0 5 0.0	0.0
		A ranking is con corresponding s					FA*IR and differ with respect to contains 100 ite	rence in j 26 highe	proportions st-scoring it	(Proportion) a tems (the top	re measu -K). The to	ired op-K

Figure 1: Ranking Facts for the CS departments dataset. The Ingredients widget (green) has been expanded to show the details of the attributes that strongly influence the ranking. The Fairness widget (blue) has been expanded to show the computation that produced the fair/unfair labels.

2 EXPLAINING RANKINGS

Figure 1 presents Ranking Facts for CS department rankings. The nutritional label consists of six widgets, each with an overview and a detailed view, which we now describe.

2.1 Recipe and Ingredients

These two widgets help to explain the ranking methodology. The Recipe widget succinctly describes the ranking algorithm. For example, for a linear scoring formula, each attribute would be listed together with its weight. The Ingredients widget lists attributes most material to the ranked outcome, in order of importance. For example, for a linear model, this list could present the attributes with the highest learned weights. Put another way, the explicit intentions of the designer of the scoring function about which attributes matter, and to what extent, are stated in the Recipe, while Ingredients may show additional attributes associated with high rank. Such associations can be derived with linear models or with other methods, such as rank-aware similarity in our prior work [9]. The detailed Recipe and Ingredients widgets list statistics of the attributes in the Recipe and in the Ingredients: minimum, maximum and median values at the top-10 and over-all.

2.2 Stability

The Stability widget explains whether the ranking methodology is robust on this particular dataset. An unstable ranking is one where slight changes to the data (e.g., due to uncertainty and noise), or to the methodology (e.g., by slightly adjusting the weights in a scorebased ranker) could lead to a significant change in the output. This widget reports a stability score, as a single number that indicates the extent of the change required for the ranking to change.

As with the widgets above, there is a detailed Stability widget to complement the overview widget. An example is shown in Figure 2, where the stability of the ranking is quantified as the slope of the line that is fit to the score distribution, at the top-10 and over-all. A score distribution is unstable if scores of items in adjacent ranks are close to each other, and so a very small change in scores will lead




Figure 2: Stability: detailed widget.

to a change in the ranking. In this example the score distribution is considered unstable if the slope is 0.25 or lower. Alternatively, stability can be computed with respect to each scoring attribute, or it can be assessed using a model of uncertainty in the data.

2.3 Fairness

The Fairness widget quantifies whether the ranked output exhibits statistical parity (one interpretation of fairness) with respect to one or more sensitive attributes, such as gender or race of individuals [13]. We denote one or several values of the sensitive attribute as a protected feature. For example, for the sensitive attribute gender, the assignment gender=F is a protected feature.

A variety of fairness measures have been proposed in the literature [15], but none are directly applicable to rankings. One typical measure compares the proportion of members of a protected group (e.g., female gender or minority race) who receive a positive outcome to their proportion in the overall population. For example, if the dataset contains an equal number of men and women, then among the individuals invited for a job interview, one half should be women. A measure of this kind can be adapted to rankings by quantifying the proportion of members of a protected group in some selected set of size k (treating the top-k as a set).

In [13], we proposed a generative method to describe rankings that meet a particular fairness criterion (fairness probability f) and are drawn from a dataset with a given proportion of members of a binary protected group (p). This method was used in FA*IR [14] to quantify fairness in every prefix of a top-k list. In our follow-up work (working paper), we are developing a pairwise measure that directly models the probability that a member of a protected group is preferred to a member of the non-protected group.

Let us now return to the Fairness widget in Figure 1. We select a binary version of the department size attribute DeptSizeBin from the CS departments dataset as the sensitive attribute, and treat both values ("large" and "small") as protected features. The summary view of the Fairness widget in our example presents the output of three fairness measures: FA*IR [14], proportion [15], and our own pairwise measure. All these measures are statistical tests, and whether a result is fair is determined by the computed p-value. The detailed Fairness widget provides additional information about the tests and explains the process.

2.4 Diversity

Fairness is related to diversity: ensuring that different kinds of objects are represented in the output of an algorithmic process [2]. Diversity has been considered in search and recommender systems, but in a narrow context, and was rarely applied to profiles of individuals. We are currently working on defining diversity measures for ranked outputs, based on our work in [2, 9].

The Diversity widget shows diversity with respect to a set of demographic categories of individuals, or a set of categorical attributes of other kinds of items [2]. The widget displays the proportion of each category in the top-10 ranked list and over-all, and, like other widgets, is updated as the user selects different ranking methods or sets different weights. In our example in Figure 1, we quantify diversity with respect to department size and to the regional code of the university. By comparing the pie charts for top-10 and over-all, we observe that only large departments are present in the top-10.

3 DEMONSTRATION SCENARIOS

We will demonstrate the utility of Ranking Facts using three realworld data sets, considering several ranking functions for each.

(1) CS departments: CS Rankings (CSR) (https://github.com/ emeryberger/CSRankings), with additional attributes from the NRC assessment dataset (http://www.nap.edu/rdp/). This dataset has the following attributes: PubCount (CSR) computes the geometric mean of the adjusted number of publications in each area by institution, Faculty (CSR) is the number of faculty in the department, GRE (NRC) is the average GRE scores (2004-2006), and Region (NRC) is one of NE, MW, SA, SC, W regions in the US. We have been using this dataset in our examples throughout this paper.

(2) Criminal risk assessment: a dataset collected and published by ProPublica as part of their investigation into racial bias in criminal risk assessment software called COMPAS (https://github.com/ propublica/compas-analysis). The dataset contains demographics, recidivism scores produced by COMPAS, and criminal offense information for 6,889 individuals.

(3) Credit and loans: the German Credit dataset from the UCI Machine Learning Repository (https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/), with demographic and financial information on 1000 individuals.

The demo user has the option to choose one of these datasets, or to upload one of their own (as a fully populated table in CSV format). Next, they can choose a ranking method from pre-populated options, or they can rank using scoring function of their own specification. If they make the latter choice, the system provides assistance. Figure 3 presents a portion of the scoring function design view. Here, the user can decide whether to work with raw data or to normalize and standardize the attributes (checkbox at the top-left of Figure 3). The system generates a preview of the data, and allows the user to plot the distribution of values of each attribute as a histogram (shown here for the attribute GRE).

The bottom-right portion of Figure 3 contains the attribute selection areas: at least one categorical attribute must be chosen as the sensitive attribute. Ranking Facts will evaluate fairness with respect to every value in the domain of this attribute, and is currently

CSRankingAllArea College Name O PubCount O Recity O ORE O Percent Camegie Mellon University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE Massachusetts institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Massachusetts institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Massachusetts institute of Technology 14.3 55 800 Large NE University of Callornia-Benkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large MW own 10 5 05 31 entries Virversity of IllinoisUbana-Champaign Virversity of 12 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 11	College Name O DelpScelin O Begional Code 1 Carneyle Mellon University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE 2 Massachusets Institute of Technology 16 64 771.894 Large NE 3 Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large NE 4 University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large NE 5 University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large NE Verventive stirt/live	CSRakingAllAres College Name PubCount Packount Regional Code 1 Carnegie Melion University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE 2 Massachusetts institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE 3 Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W 4 University of California-Derkelay 11.4 50 789.451 Large W 4 University of Ulinois-Urbana-Ohampaign 10.5 571.494 Large W 10 Calege Name n of CRE Image: Calego Name Image: Calego Name Image: Calego Name 10 Calego Name n of CRE Image: Calego Name Image: Calego Name Image: Calego Name 10 Calego Name n of CRE Image: Calego Name Image: Calego	StrankingAllArea • College Name • •	College Name O PubCount Faculty O GRE DeptilizeBin O Regional Code Camege Melion University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE Massachuzetts Institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Massachuzetts Institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE University of Callomia-Betxeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large NV University of IllinoisUbana-Champaign 10.5 571.1944 Large NV Owng 1 to 5 d51 entries Periods 1 2 3 4 5	CSRankingAllAves College Name College Name College Name College Name DeptSizeBin Packount College Name Period College Name Period Pe	CSRankingAllAres College Name PubCount Paculty ORE DeptSizeBin Product Camege Melion University 18.3 122 771.376 Large NE Massachusetts Institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Massachusetts Institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Massachusetts Institute of Technology 11.4 50 789.451 Large NE University of Olifonia-Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large MW Owing 10.5 of 51 entree Previous 1 2 3 4 5 10 CStantingAlvaas n of GRE E Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for entree 10 CStantingAlvaas n of GRE E Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for entree	College Name College Name PubCount Pacuty Res Deptilizabin Pit Res	College Name O logge Name<
Camegie Melon University 18.3 122 791.378 Large NE Massachuseth stattute of Tachnology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Stanford University Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W Linubersity of allinois-Berkelay 11.4 55 778.451 Large M/V Linubersity of allinois-Ubtana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large M/V owing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Precio. 1 2 3 4 5 1 10 Office Name n of CRE Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity Or fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity Or fairness 10 College Name n of CRE Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity Or fairness 10 Packoriting Name Deptilizetin Regional Code 10 Packoriting Name Deptilizetin Regional Code 10 Office Name Deptilizetin Regional Code 10 Deptilizetin	Carnegie Melon University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE Masachusets institute of Technology 15 64 771.994 Large NE Standard University 14.3 55 600 Large WE University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 788.451 Large WV University of California-Berkeley 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW owing 1 to 5 d51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5	Cenergie Melon University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE Massachusett Institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Stanford University 14.3 56 800 Large W University of allinoisBenepaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW we attribute's distribution GRE 0 12 3 4 5 1 1 View attribute's distribution GRE 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 1 <t< th=""><th>Camegie Melion University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE Massachustis Institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California-Beneley 11.4 50 798.451 Large MW University of IllinoisLikeae-Champeign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW University of IllinoisLikeae-Champeign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW I to s of 51 enrines Previous 1 2 3 4 5 11 Rew attributes's distribution GRE Image: Stanford Meas Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for</th><th>Camegie Melon University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE Massachusteth stattute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Stanford University Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of allinois-Berkeley 11.4 55 779.451 Large W University of allinois-University of allinois-University of allinois-University of allinois-University of allinois-University of allinois-University 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW Wew attributes's distribution GRE Image: Choose sensitive attributes (plinary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity of allonois - University of</th><th>Carregie Melion University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE Massachussts Institute of Technology 15 64 771.94 Large NE Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of EllinoisUbana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW owing 1 to 5 of 51 enrives Providus 1 2 4 5 </th><th>Cenergie Melon University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE Massachusteth stattute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of california-Berkeley 11.4 55 771.894 Large MW University of University o</th><th>Cenergie Melon University 18.3 122 791.378 Large NE Massachuseth Institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Stanford University of California-Berkeley 14.3 56 800 Large W University of California-Berkeley 11.4 56 771.894 Large MW University of California-Berkeley 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW owing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Providue 1 2 3 4 5 </th><th>Camegie Mellon University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE Massachusetts Institute of Technology 15 64 777.894 Large NE Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W V University of California-Beneley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of IllinoisUrbana-Champsign 10.5 55 777.894 Large MW</th></t<>	Camegie Melion University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE Massachustis Institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California-Beneley 11.4 50 798.451 Large MW University of IllinoisLikeae-Champeign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW University of IllinoisLikeae-Champeign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW I to s of 51 enrines Previous 1 2 3 4 5 11 Rew attributes's distribution GRE Image: Stanford Meas Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for	Camegie Melon University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE Massachusteth stattute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Stanford University Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of allinois-Berkeley 11.4 55 779.451 Large W University of allinois-University of allinois-University of allinois-University of allinois-University of allinois-University of allinois-University 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW Wew attributes's distribution GRE Image: Choose sensitive attributes (plinary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity of allonois - University of	Carregie Melion University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE Massachussts Institute of Technology 15 64 771.94 Large NE Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of EllinoisUbana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW owing 1 to 5 of 51 enrives Providus 1 2 4 5	Cenergie Melon University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE Massachusteth stattute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of california-Berkeley 11.4 55 771.894 Large MW University of University o	Cenergie Melon University 18.3 122 791.378 Large NE Massachuseth Institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Stanford University of California-Berkeley 14.3 56 800 Large W University of California-Berkeley 11.4 56 771.894 Large MW University of California-Berkeley 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW owing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Providue 1 2 3 4 5	Camegie Mellon University 18.3 122 791.376 Large NE Massachusetts Institute of Technology 15 64 777.894 Large NE Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W V University of California-Beneley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of IllinoisUrbana-Champsign 10.5 55 777.894 Large MW
Masschusetts institute of Technology 15 64 771.594 Large NE Stanford University 14.3 65 800 Large W University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 798.451 Large W University of IllinoisUthan-Champaign 10.5 571.894 Large MV owing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 11 View attributes's distribution GRE Image DepSizetion Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity Choose sensitive categorical attributes categorical attributes for diversity Choose sensitive categorical attributes categorical attributes for diversity Codepe Name DepSizetion Codepe Name DepSizetion 0 Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes cat	Massachusetts Institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Stanford University 14.3 65 800 Large W University of Califonia - Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of Un	Massachusetts institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California-Benkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of UlliodsUban-Dampaign 10.4 50 789.451 Large W owing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previou 1 2 3 4 5 11 View attribute's distribution ORE Image Image M Image M 10 Origon Name n of CRE Image	Masachusetts Institute of Technology 15 64 77.1894 Large NE Stanford Ulviversity 14.3 55 80.0 Large W University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of California-Derkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of California-Derkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W wring 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previou 1 2 3 4 5	Massachuzetts institute of Technology 15 64 77.1.84 Lage NE Stanford University 14.3 65 800 Lage W University of Calionia-Behasiey 11.4 50 789.451 Lage W University of IllinoisUban-Champaign 10.5 577.184 Lage MV owing to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5	Massachusets institute of Technology 15 64 771.84 Lage NE Stanford Unvensity 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California - Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large MV University of Univ	Masachusetts institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California–Berkeley 11.4 50 778.9451 Large W University of Ellifornia–Berkeley 10.5 5778.9451 Large W University of Ellifornia–Berkeley 10.5 5778.9451 Large W Origon Stanford University of Ellifornia–Berkeley 10.2 3 4 5 1 1 2 Were staffactures Ferricut Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for wreity Choose sensitive categorical attributes for wreity 10 College Name DeptStation Regional Code 10 College Name DeptStation Regional Code	Massachusetts institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Lage NE Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California-Benkelay 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of Elifornia-Benkelay 10.5 771.894 Large MW University of Elifornia-Benkelay 10.5 789.451 Large MW University of Elifornia-Ubrana-Champaign 10.5 771.894 Large MW Were attributes's distribution GRE Providua 1 2 3 4 5 10 Codes sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness 10 Codes Sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Codes Sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness	Massachusetts Institute of Technology 15 64 771.894 Large NE Stanford University of California–Berkeley 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California–Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of Lillinois–Urbana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MV
Stanford University 14.3 55 600 Large W University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of California-Berkeley 10.5 55 771.894 Large W University of Illinoia-Ubana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW International College Name Ones 1 2 3 4 5 11 International College Name of CRE Image: California-Barkeley Image: California-Barkeley Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity of taimees Image: California-Choose cansitive categorical attributes for diversity of taimees Image: California-Choose cansitive categorical attributes for diversity of taimees Image: California-Choose cansitive categorical attributes for diversity of taimees Image: California-Choose cansitive categorical attributes for diversity of taimees Image: California-Choose cansitive categorical attributes for diversity of taimees 10 C	Stanford University of CaliforniaBarkeley 14.3 55 800 Large W University of CaliforniaBarkeley 11.4 50 786.451 Large W University of CaliforniaBarkeley NW Previous 1 2 3 4 5 11 Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness	Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California-Borkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of Unive	Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 788.451 Large W University of California-Berkeley 10.5 55 771.894 Large W University of Univer	Stanford University of California-Berkeley 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 788.451 Large W University of Illinois-Ubana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW wring 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 11 Choose sensitive autributes (binary) for fairness	Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of California-Berkeley 10.5 55 771.894 Large MV University of University of California-Berkeley 10.5 55 771.894 Large MV university of Univers	Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of California-Berkeley 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW University of California-Champaign 0.5 65 771.894 Large MW I to 5 of 51 entries Choose sensitive attributes's distribution 0 1 2 3 4 5 11 1 10 College Name College Name College Name College Name College Name College Name College Name 0	Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California-Borkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of Uni	Stanford University 14.3 55 800 Large W University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of IllinoisUrbana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW
University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of Linice-Urbans-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW wing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 771.894 Large MW Previous 1 2 3 4 5 1 Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity 10 OStacking/MAna E DeptSizetin Regonal Code Pervisus 1 2 8 9 1	University of California - Benkeley 11.4 50 788.451 Lage W University of California - Dennesign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW university of University	University of California-Beheley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of Ellinoia-Urbana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW Interview attributes's distribution GRE Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Period: 1 2 3 4 5 Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity 10 CostensingAlArea 0 6 CRE Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity 10 CostensingAlArea Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Costensing AlArea 10 Costensing AlArea Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Costensing AlArea 10 Costensing AlArea Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Costensing AlArea 10 Costensing AlArea Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Costensing AlArea 10 Costensing AlArea Image: Costensing AlArea Image: Costensing AlArea Image: Costensing AlArea 10 Costensing AlArea Image: Costensing AlArea Image: Costensing AlArea Image: Costensing A	University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of Lillions-Urbana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW wing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 11 flew attributes's distribution GRE Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for eventive Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for eventive 10 OStackingAlAma Cologe Name 7.5 n of GRE Faculty E DeptStactin Regional Code 0 Objective Beginstein Regional Code DeptStactin Regional Code	University of California - Berkeley 11.4 50 788.451 Large W University of California - Berkeley 10.5 55 771.894 Large W If the attributes's distribution GRE Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive attributes for diversity of 10 Of CRE Image: Im	University of California -Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of Universit	University of CaliforniaBerkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of IllinoisUrbana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW wing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 11 1 Rew attributes's distribution GRE	University of California - Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of Universi	University of California-Berkeley 11.4 50 789.451 Large W University of IllinoisUrbana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW wring 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 1
University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW wing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Precios 1 2 3 4 5 11 few attributes's distribution GRE Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity O Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity O 10 Grispinane Deptizetin Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity O Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity O 7.5 Fractory Predication Predication Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes categorical attributes for diversity O 9 Grispinane Deptizetin Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes categorical attributes for diversity O 10 Grispinane Deptizetin Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity O 10 Grispinane Deptizetin Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity O 10 Grispinane Deptizetin Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity O 10 Grispinane Deptizetin Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity O 10 Grispinane <td>University of IllinoisUtame-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MV wing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 11 Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairnoss 10 Offer offer Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairnoss Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity O 10 Offer offer Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairnoss Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity O 10 Offer offer Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes (binary) for fairnoss Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity O 10 Offer offer Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes can be included] Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes can be included] 5 DeptSavain Regenal Code Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes can be included] 0 Offer o</td> <td>University of IllinoisUrbana-Onampaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW I los of 51 entries Precios 1 2 3 4 5 11 I los of 51 entries Precios 1 2 3 4 5 11 I los of 51 entries Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity 0 Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity 0 College Name Deptional Code 7.5 Facily Precios 0 Deptional Code Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) College Name Deptional Code 8 Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) Cisitawing AlAvea Cisitawing AlAvea</td> <td>University of IllinoisUrbana-Ohampaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MV wing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previou 1 2 3 4 5 11 few attributes's distribution GRE Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity @ Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity @ 10 College Name DeptStactin Regional Code Image: College Name DeptStactin Regional Code 10 College Name DeptStactin Regional Code Image: College Name DeptStactin Regional Code 10 College Name DeptStactin Regional Code Image: College Name DeptStactin Regional Code 10 College Name DeptStactin Regional Code Image: College Name DeptStactin Regional Code 10 College Name DeptStactin Regional Code Image: College Name Image: College Name</td> <td>University of IllinosUrbane-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MV weng 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 11 Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness I Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairnes I Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairnes I Choo</td> <td>University of IllinoisUrbana-Champaigin 10.5 55 771.894 Larg MW Provide 1 2 3 4 5 11 New attribute's distribution GHE Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity Choose sensitive categorical at</td> <td>University of IllinoisLibana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW wreg to 5 of 51 entries Tew attributes's distribution GRE 10 CStratingAlArea College Name DeptStactin Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive attributes (binary)</td> <td>University of IllinoisUrbana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Lage M.V wring 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 11 lew attributes's distribution GRE Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive attributes for choose sensitive attributes for choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive attribut</td> <td>University of IllinoisUrbana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.884 Large MW whigh to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 1</td>	University of IllinoisUtame-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MV wing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 11 Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairnoss 10 Offer offer Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairnoss Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity O 10 Offer offer Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairnoss Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity O 10 Offer offer Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes (binary) for fairnoss Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity O 10 Offer offer Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes can be included] Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes can be included] 5 DeptSavain Regenal Code Image: Choose sensitive categorical attributes can be included] 0 Offer o	University of IllinoisUrbana-Onampaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW I los of 51 entries Precios 1 2 3 4 5 11 I los of 51 entries Precios 1 2 3 4 5 11 I los of 51 entries Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity 0 Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity 0 College Name Deptional Code 7.5 Facily Precios 0 Deptional Code Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) College Name Deptional Code 8 Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) Cisitawing AlAvea Cisitawing AlAvea	University of IllinoisUrbana-Ohampaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MV wing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previou 1 2 3 4 5 11 few attributes's distribution GRE Image: Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity @ Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity @ 10 College Name DeptStactin Regional Code Image: College Name DeptStactin Regional Code 10 College Name DeptStactin Regional Code Image: College Name DeptStactin Regional Code 10 College Name DeptStactin Regional Code Image: College Name DeptStactin Regional Code 10 College Name DeptStactin Regional Code Image: College Name DeptStactin Regional Code 10 College Name DeptStactin Regional Code Image: College Name	University of IllinosUrbane-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MV weng 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 11 Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness I Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairnes I Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairnes I Choo	University of IllinoisUrbana-Champaigin 10.5 55 771.894 Larg MW Provide 1 2 3 4 5 11 New attribute's distribution GHE Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity Choose sensitive categorical at	University of IllinoisLibana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Large MW wreg to 5 of 51 entries Tew attributes's distribution GRE 10 CStratingAlArea College Name DeptStactin Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive attributes (binary)	University of IllinoisUrbana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.894 Lage M.V wring 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 11 lew attributes's distribution GRE Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive attributes for choose sensitive attributes for choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive attribut	University of IllinoisUrbana-Champaign 10.5 55 771.884 Large MW whigh to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 1
Image: Section of the series Periods 1 2 3 4 5 11 Index stributes's distribution ORE Image: Section of CRE Image: Section	New attributes's distribution GRE 10 CStrainingMarea 10 CStrainingMarea 10 CStrainingMarea 10 College Name 10	All All <td>Image: Second Structure Office: Second Structure Image: Second Structure</td> <td>Image: Section section is a set of section is a secton is a set of section is a set of section is a set of se</td> <td>wing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Providues 1 2 3 4 5 11 Aew attributes's distribution Ref</td> <td>wing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 11 1 Arew attributes's distribution GRE Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness 10 College Name PubCount College Name PubCount College Name Deptiblabilin Regional Code</td> <td>wing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Providus 1 2 3 4 5 11 Alew attributes's distribution GRE Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness 10 Costage Name Dept5izedin Regional Code Costage Name Dept5izedin Regional Code</td> <td>wwing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 1</td>	Image: Second Structure Office: Second Structure Image: Second Structure	Image: Section section is a set of section is a secton is a set of section is a set of section is a set of se	wing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Providues 1 2 3 4 5 11 Aew attributes's distribution Ref	wing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 11 1 Arew attributes's distribution GRE Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness 10 College Name PubCount College Name PubCount College Name Deptiblabilin Regional Code	wing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Providus 1 2 3 4 5 11 Alew attributes's distribution GRE Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness 10 Costage Name Dept5izedin Regional Code Costage Name Dept5izedin Regional Code	wwing 1 to 5 of 51 entries Previous 1 2 3 4 5 1
Interventional statistication GRE Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity 10 CStratergAlarea	Intervention GRE Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness 10 College have 0 College have 0 7.5 Facory 0 College have 0 5 Operation Regional Code 0 Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included) 0 College have 0 College have 0 8 Deptizetin 0 College have 0 9 Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included) 0 0 CoBineringAlAres 0 9 PACOORT 0	In of CRE Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness 10 College Name Deptization College Name College Name Deptization College Name Deptization College Name C	Intervatibules's distribution GRE Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness 0 Comparison of the post sensiti	Intervention Concess sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness 10 College Name B DeptSzellin College Name College Name College Name DeptSzellin College Name College Name DeptSzellin College Name College Name College Name	Intervention GRE Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive categorical attributes for diversity 10 College Name DeptStastin College Name College Name DeptStastin College Name College	Intervaltributes's distribution GRE Intervaltributes's distribution GRE Choose sensitive attributes (binary) for fairness Choose sensitive attributes (binar	Interval tributes's distribution GRE	
7.5 Peddy PubCount Podty 5 Peddy ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) ORE DeptStrein Regional Code PubCount Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) CoBrawingsUives PubCount Sector PubCount PubCount Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) CoBrawingsUives PubCount PubCount Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!)	7.5 Fearly Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included)	7.5 Peaky PubCount Feaky 5 DeptStation PubCount Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) CSRankingAlAreas	7.5 Peddy PubCount Podty 5 Peddy ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) ORE DeptStrein Regional Code PubCount Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) CoBrawingsUives PubCount Sector PubCount PubCount Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) CoBrawingsUives PubCount PubCount Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!)	7.5 Peddy PubCount Peddy 5 Peddy ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) CoBrekingAlArea Pedcount	PubCount	PubCount		10 College Name @ DeptSizeBin College Name @ DeptSizeBin
7.5 Faculty Orte Orte Orte Orte Orte Orte Orte Orte	7.5 Faculty 6net Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) 0 DeptStandin 8 Regional Code	7.5 Facility 5 Dept5tembro 5 Benear Crick	7.5 Faculty order order DepSization CSRex/rspAt/vas Regonal Code Packown	7.5 Faculy Onte 5 DeptSation Regional Code				College Name
G Deplásablen Deplásablen Regional Code U Deplásablen B Pachourz Welchel Lindow to lower 1	5 Regional Code CoRentArgal Alesa	GRE DeptSzeBn Crea	G CERNAINO AMAN DepEssablen Regional Code	Gree Gree Gree Generation Gene	7.5 Faculty	7.5 Faculty		PubCount
Walket 10 South Walket 1 Market 1	C FGOLOGIR	5 DeptStateBin Coste	Walder 1 0 Sort by Higher to Invest	Weinheld 10 South Weinheld 10	GRE	GRE	7.5 Faculty	7.5
Weiner 10 South Weiner 1	D PEDCOUR		Watch 1 0	Weight 10 South Higherto Journe 1	5 Dept5zellin CSRankingAlArea		GRE Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!)	7.5 Faculty Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!)
2.5		Weight 10 Soft hu Higher to leave A			Weided 10 Sort by Hinberto Insert A	5 DeptilizeBin Grand Code CSRarkingAlArea	Grife Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) 5 Dept52x8in CSRunkingAlArea	7.5 Pacaty B 5 Dept5stells B source Code Cistures of Code Cistures of Code
	2.5	2.5				Watch 1 0	Grife Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) 5 DeptStation 6 CSRunkingAlArea 8 PACCourt 9 PACCourt	7.5 Facely 6 one 5 Regional Code Regional Code
G Faculty	C Faculty		2 Faculty	Weight 10 Sortby Higher to lower :		2.5 Veight 1.0 Sort by Higher to lower \$	6 Operative 5 Operative 2.5 Precision Specify making function (only numerical attributes can be included!) C CSRamkingAMena ProCount Weight 1.0 Sort by Higher to lower: 6	7.5 Faculty OPE OPE 0 OperSiveBin Regord Code PadCoart 2.5 OperSiveBin 0 OperSiveBin
	2.5	Weight 10 Sorthy Higherto Invest A			Weisheld 10 Sort by Higher to Passar 4		GRE Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!)	7.5 Feculy Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!)
Control C	Contraction of the second s		2 Facily		2.3	Weinheld 1 0 South Weinheld 1 0	Grife Specify ranking function (only numerical attributes can be included!) 5 DeptStation 6 CSRunkingAlArea 8 PACCourt 9 PACCourt 9 PACCourt	7.5 Facely 6 one 5 Regional Code Regional Code

Figure 3: Scoring function design.

limited to binary attributes. Finally, the user selects at least one numerical attribute for the scoring function, and assigns a weight to this attribute. Scoring attribute selection and weight assignment is based on a user's a priori judgment regarding item quality, but can be informed by the range and distribution of values for a given attribute. When scoring attributes are selected, the user will preview the ranking, and will then either refine it, or go on to generate Ranking Facts such as that in Figure 1.

The demo presenter will inspect the resulting nutritional label together with the user, guiding the user in exploring selected widgets in detail. For example, we may notice that many attributes in the Recipe do not coincide with those that most impact the ranked outcome in the Ingredients, as is the case in Figure 1: attribute GRE is one of the scoring attributes, but it does not correlate with the ranked outcome. Inspecting the detailed Recipe widget, we observe that the range of values and the median for GRE are very similar in the top-10 and overall, supporting the finding that GRE does not play an important part in the ranking.

4 TAKE-AWAY MESSAGES

In this demonstration we presented Ranking Facts, a system for producing nutritional labels that explain rankings. To the best of our knowledge, our tools are the first to consider interpretability for ranked outputs. Ranking Facts is implemented in Python, and is modular and easy to extend. Our tool is available at http://demo. dataresponsibly.com/rankingfacts/.

The tool is based on the latest research by the authors and others, and reflects known limitations of the state of the art. We are actively working on defining group fairness measures that go beyond binary categories (e.g., can be applied to ethnicity, not only to gender), and will incorporate these into the tool when available. We are also working on extending Ranking Facts to support richer scoring function design functionality. For example, we plan to include methods that help the user mitigate lack of fairness and diversity by suggesting modified scoring functions.

REFERENCES

- Danielle K. Citron and Frank A. Pasquale. 2014. The Scored Society: Due Process for Automated Predictions. Washington Law Review 89 (2014).
- [2] Marina Drosou, HV Jagadish, Evaggelia Pitoura, and Julia Stoyanovich. 2017. Diversity in Big Data: A Review. Big Data 5, 2 (2017).
- [3] Malcolm Gladwell. February 14, 2011. The order of things. The New Yorker (February 14, 2011). https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2011/02/ 14/the-order-of-things
- [4] Joshua A. Kroll, Joanna Huey, Solon Barocas, Edward W. Felten, Joel R. Reidenberg, David G. Robinson, and Harlan Yu. 2017. Accountable Algorithms. University of Pennsylvania Law Review 165 (2017).
- [5] Maayan Perel and Niva Elkin-Koren. 2016. Black Box Tinkering: Beyond Transparency in Algorithmic Enforcement. *Florida Law Review* (2016).
- [6] Marco Túlio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. "Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier. In ACM SIGKDD. 1135–1144. https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939778
- [7] Cynthia Rudin. 2014. Algorithms for interpretable machine learning. In ACM SIGKDD. 1519. https://doi.org/10.1145/2623330.2630823
- [8] Christian Sandvig, Kevin Hamilton, Karrie Karahalios, and Cedric Langbort. 2014. Auditing Algorithms: Research Methods for Detecting Discrimination on Internet Platforms. Data and Discrimination: Converting Critical Concerns into Productive Inquiry (2014).
- Julia Stoyanovich, Sihem Amer-Yahia, and Tova Milo. 2011. Making intervalbased clustering rank-aware. In EDBT. 437–448. https://doi.org/10.1145/1951365. 1951417
- [10] Julia Stoyanovich and Ellen P. Goodman. August 5, 2016. Revealing Algorithmic Rankers. Freedom to Tinker (August 5, 2016). http://freedom-to-tinker.com/2016/ 08/05/revealing-algorithmic-rankers/
- [11] Julia Stoyanovich, Ke Yang, and H. V. Jagadish. 2018. Online Set Selection with Fairness and Diversity Constraints. In EDBT. 241–252. https://doi.org/10.5441/ 002/edbt.2018.22
- [12] Tong Wang, Cynthia Rudin, Finale Doshi-Velez, Yimin Liu, Erica Klampfl, and Perry MacNeille. 2016. Bayesian Rule Sets for Interpretable Classification. In *IEEE ICDM*. 1269–1274. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDM.2016.0171
- [13] Ke Yang and Julia Stoyanovich. 2017. Measuring Fairness in Ranked Outputs. In SSDBM. 22:1-22:6. https://doi.org/10.1145/3085504.3085526
- [14] Meike Zehlike, Francesco Bonchi, Carlos Castillo, Sara Hajian, Mohamed Megahed, and Ricardo A. Baeza-Yates. 2017. FA*IR: A Fair Top-k Ranking Algorithm. In ACM CIKM. 1569–1578. https://doi.org/10.1145/3132847.3132938
- [15] Indre Zliobaite. 2017. Measuring discrimination in algorithmic decision making. Data Min. Knowl. Discov. 31, 4 (2017), 1060–1089. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10618-017-0506-1