FAIRGEN: Towards Fair Graph Generation

Lecheng Zheng Department of Computer Science University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Illinois, USA

lecheng4@illinois.edu

Dawei Zhou Department of Computer Science Virginia Tech Virginia, USA zhoud@vt.edu Hanghang Tong Department of Computer Science University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Illinois, USA htong@illinois.edu

Jiejun Xu HRL Laboratories California, USA jxu@hrl.com Yada Zhu *IBM* Illinois, USA yzhu@us.ibm.com

Jingrui He School of Information Science University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign New York, USA jingrui@illinois.edu

Abstract—There have been tremendous efforts over the past decades dedicated to the generation of realistic graphs in a variety of domains, ranging from social networks to computer networks, from gene regulatory networks to online transaction networks. Despite the remarkable success, the vast majority of these works are unsupervised in nature and are typically trained to minimize the expected graph reconstruction loss, which would result in the representation disparity issue in the generated graphs, i.e., the protected groups (often minorities) contribute less to the objective and thus suffer from systematically higher errors. In this paper, we aim to tailor graph generation to downstream mining tasks by leveraging label information and user-preferred parity constraints. In particular, we start from the investigation of representation disparity in the context of graph generative models. To mitigate the disparity, we propose a fairness-aware graph generative model named FAIRGEN. Our model jointly trains a label-informed graph generation module and a fair representation learning module by progressively learning the behaviors of the protected and unprotected groups, from the 'easy' concepts to the 'hard' ones. In addition, we propose a generic context sampling strategy for graph generative models, which is proven to be capable of fairly capturing the contextual information of each group with a high probability. Experimental results on seven real-world data sets demonstrate that FAIRGEN (1) obtains performance on par with state-of-the-art graph generative models across nine network properties, (2) mitigates the representation disparity issues in the generated graphs, and (3) substantially boosts the model performance by up to 17% in downstream tasks via data augmentation.

Index Terms—Deep Learning, Fairness, Graph Generative Model, Self-paced Learning

I. INTRODUCTION

The ever-increasing size of graphs^{*}, together with the difficulty of releasing and sharing them, has made graph generation a fundamental problem in many high-impact applications, including data augmentation [1], anomaly detection [2], drug design [3], [4], recommendation [5], and many more. For instance, financial institutes would like to share their transaction data or user networks with their partners to improve their service. However, directly releasing the real data would result in serious privacy issues, such as the leakage of user identity information. In this case, graph generative models provide an alternative solution without privacy concerns, by generating high-quality synthetic graphs for sharing. The classic graph-property oriented models are usually built upon a succinct and elegant mathematical formula to preserve important structural properties, *e.g.*, power-law degree distribution [6]–[9], small world phenomena [10], shrinking diameters of dynamic graphs [10], [11], local clustering [12]–[14], motif distributions [15], *etc.* More recently, the data-driven models [5], [16]–[25] have attracted much attention, which directly extract the contextual information from the input graphs and approximate their structure distributions with minimal prior assumptions.

Despite the tremendous success of existing graph generators, the vast majority of these generators are unsupervised and independent of downstream learning tasks. They are able to produce general-purpose graphs without considering any label information. However, in many real graphs, labels, such as identities of users [26] or community memberships [27], are available and could have a profound impact on the performance of downstream learning tasks. Considering an online transaction network owned by a financial institute that allows real-time money transfer among users and merchants, most of the transactions are normal while only a small number of transactions are red-flagged (i.e., fraudulent transactions) by domain experts. Such label information could play a pivotal role in financial fraud detection (e.g., money laundering detection, identity theft detection). Therefore, if the graph generators neglect such label information, it is likely to negatively impact the downstream learning tasks (e.g., fraud detection).

Moreover, as the importance of model fairness has been widely recognized in the AI community, it is highly desirable to ensure certain parity or preference constraints in the learning process of generative models [28], [29]. In particular, it is of key importance to ensure the protected group (*e.g.*, the African Americans) and the unprotected group (*e.g.*, the non-African Americans) are treated equally in the generation process, especially when the generated data will be used for developing realistic AI systems (*e.g.*, Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) [30]). However,

^{*}In this paper, we use 'graphs' and 'networks' interchangeably.

most, if not all, of the existing graph generative models are designed either prior to or in parallel with downstream tasks without considering model fairness in the generative process. The statistical nature of these models is designed to focus on the frequent patterns (i.e., the unprotected group), and as such, might overlook the underrepresented patterns (i.e., the protected group) in the observed data. As the protected groups contribute less to the general learning objective (e.g., minimizing the expected reconstruction loss [5]), they tend to suffer from systematically higher errors. Following [31], we refer to this phenomenon as representation disparity. Even worse, as the protected groups are typically more scarce compared to the unprotected groups, it can be much more expensive to obtain label information from these groups than the unprotected groups in practice. As a consequence, the representation disparity issue could be further exacerbated when the models are trained with highly imbalanced label information.

Therefore, in this paper, we aim to tailor graph generation to downstream learning tasks, by incorporating both label information and parity constraints. To this end, we have identified the following challenges. First (*C1. Task Guidance*), how to train graph generative models under the guidance of ground-truth labels, so that the generated graphs are better suited for the downstream tasks compared to the ones using general-purpose graph generators? Second (*C2. Representation Disparity*), how to enforce the fairness constraint on the graph generative model so that the protected group and the unprotected group are treated equally in the generated graphs? Third (*C3. Label Scarcity*), given limited label information (especially for the protected groups), how to accurately capture the class memberships of the protected groups in the input data and preserve them in the generated graphs?

To this end, we propose a deep generative model named FAIRGEN, which jointly trains a label-informed graph generation module and a fair representation learning module in a mutually beneficial way. Moreover, To address the aforementioned challenges, FAIRGEN integrates the self-paced learning paradigm in the graph generation process. It starts with few-shot labeled examples and then progressively learns the behaviors of the protected and unprotected groups, from the 'easy' concepts to the 'hard' ones. Moreover, to control the risk of learning protected groups, we propose a novel context sampling strategy for graph generative models, which is proven to be capable of capturing the context of each group S with probability at least $1 - T\delta\phi(S)$, where T is the maximum random walk length, $\phi(S)$ is the conductance of subgraph S, and δ is a positive constant.

The main contributions of this paper are summarized below.

- **Problem.** We formalize the *fair graph generation* problem and identify unique challenges motivated by real applications.
- Algorithms. We propose a self-paced graph generative model named FAIRGEN, which incorporates the label information and fairness constraint to produce task-specific

graphs.

• Evaluation. We perform extensive experiments on seven real networks, which demonstrate that FAIRGEN (1) achieves comparable performance as state-of-the-art graph generative models in terms of nine widely-used metrics; (2) largely alleviates the representation disparity in the generated graphs; (3) significantly boosts the performance of rare category detection via data augmentation.

The rest of our paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce our proposed method FAIRGEN followed by experimental results in Section III. We review the related literature in Section IV before we conclude the paper in Section V.

II. PROPOSED METHOD

In this section, we present our FAIRGEN framework. We first introduce the notation and the formal problem definition. Then, we provide an overview of FAIRGEN together with its learning objective. At last, we present a graph assembling strategy for fair graph generation.

A. Notation and Problem Definition

We formalize the graph generation problem in the context of an undirected graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where \mathcal{V} consists of n vertices and \mathcal{E} consists of m edges. We let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ denote the adjacency matrix, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ denote the diagonal matrix of vertex degrees, and $I \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ denote the identity matrix. The transition probability matrix M of \mathcal{G} can be obtained by $M = (AD^{-1} + I)/2$. We define an indicator vector $\chi_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ which is supported on a set of nodes $S \subseteq V$, *i.e.*, $\chi_{\mathcal{S}}(v) = 1$ iff $v \in S$; $\chi_{\mathcal{S}}(v) = 0$ otherwise. In our problem setting, we are given a handful of labeled examples from C classes and the membership of a protected group. Without loss of generality, we let $\mathcal{L} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_L\}$ denote the set of L labeled vertices, which includes at least one from each class $y = 1, \ldots, C, \ \mathcal{U} = \{x_{L+1}, x_{L+2}, \ldots, x_{L+U}\}$ denote the set of U unlabeled vertices, $S^+ \subseteq V$ denote the set of protected group vertices, and $\mathcal{S}^- \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ denote the set of unprotected group vertices. Note that $S^- = \{x | x \in \mathcal{V} \text{ and } x \notin S^+\}.$ Following [5], [20], in the graph generation process, we extract k random walk sequences $\mathbb{W} = \{w_1, \ldots, w_k\}$ from the input graph \mathcal{G} , where each random walk sequence consists of T incident nodes traversed one after another, *i.e.*, $w_i =$ $\{x_{i,1},\ldots,x_{i,T}\}$, where $x_{i,j} \in \mathcal{V}, j = 1,\ldots,T$. The learning objectives are defined to minimize the reconstruction error of generating synthetic random walks: $\widetilde{w} \sim g_{\theta}(\mathbb{W})$, where $\widetilde{w} = \{\widetilde{x}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{x}_T\}$ is the synthetic random walk consisting of T vertices $\tilde{x}_i \in \mathcal{V}, i = 1, \dots, T$, and g_{θ} denotes the recurrent neural network [32], [33] parameterized by θ .

Representation Disparity. Consider a standard graph generative model that is trained to minimize the reconstruction error of the input graph \mathcal{G} . Given the membership of the protected group \mathcal{S}^+ , we define the general graph reconstruc-



(c) NetGAN (1000 iterations) (d) NetGAN (2000 iterations

Fig. 1. An illustrative example of representation disparity in deep graph generative models. The protected group is colored in blue while the unprotected group is colored in red. (For the purpose of better visualization, we omit the edge connection.)

tion loss $R(\theta)$ and the group-wise graph reconstruction loss $R_{S^+}(\theta)$ as follows.

$$R(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{w} \subseteq \mathcal{G}} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T} \log g_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(w_t | \boldsymbol{w}_{< t}) \right]$$
(1)

$$R_{\mathcal{S}^+}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{w} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{S}^+}} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \log g_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(w_t | \boldsymbol{w}_{< t}) \right]$$
(2)

where $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{S}^+}$ refers to a subgraph in \mathcal{G} that is composed of a group of vertices $S^+ \subseteq V$; w_t and $w_{< t}$ represent the t^{th} node and the first $(t-1)^{\text{th}}$ nodes in a sampled random walk w. The objective of existing graph generative models typically aims to minimize Eq. 1 while ignoring the existence of the protected group S^+ that is under-represented. However, it is vital to ensure the protected group (e.g., the African Americans) and the unprotected group (e.g., the non-African Americans) are treated equally in the generation process. Notice that the statistical nature of the existing graph generative models is designed to focus on the frequent patterns (*i.e.*, the unprotected group), and as such, might overlook the underrepresented patterns (i.e., the protected group) in the observed data. Figure 1 shows an illustrative example of this phenomenon, where we present an original graph and three synthetic graphs generated by NetGAN [5]. We observe that the generated graphs in (b) initially maintain fairness (i.e., the protected group is well preserved in the embedding space); but as NetGAN is trained for more and more iterations, the nodes from the protected group and unprotected group get mixed together, because the protected group S^+ contributes less to Eq. 1, thus receiving less attention from the generative model (e.g., NetGAN). As a result, the status quo of generative models may obtain a low $R(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ but relatively high $R_{S^+}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Following [31], [34], we refer to this phenomenon as the representation disparity in graph generative models. Here we formally define our problem below.

Problem 1: Fairness-Aware Graph Generation

Input: (i) an observed undirected graph \mathcal{G} , (ii) few-shot labeled examples $\mathcal{L} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_L\}$, (iii) the memberships

of the protected group S^+ and the unprotected group S^- . **Output:** the generated graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ that fairly preserves the contextual information (*i.e.*, structure properties, attributes, and label information) of the protected group S^+ and the unprotected group S^- .

B. A Generic Joint Learning Framework

Given a graph \mathcal{G} associated with a handful of labeled nodes \mathcal{L} and the membership of protected group \mathcal{S}^+ , the goal of our framework is to learn a graph generator g_{θ} that agrees with the known label information, and in the meanwhile fairly preserves the network context (*i.e.*, structures and label information) of the protected group and the unprotected group in the generated graphs. With these design objectives in mind, we formulate FAIRGEN as an optimization problem as follows.

$$\underset{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{v}^{(C)}}{\operatorname{arg min}} \mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_{G} + \mathcal{J}_{P} + \mathcal{J}_{F} + \mathcal{J}_{L} + \mathcal{J}_{S}$$

$$= \underbrace{- \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{w} \sim f_{S}(\mathcal{G})} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T} \log g_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(w_{t} | \boldsymbol{w}_{< t}) \right]}_{\mathcal{J}_{G}: \text{ label-informed generative model}}$$

$$+ \alpha \sum_{i=1}^{L} \xi_{x_{i}} d_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(x_{i}, y_{i}) + \gamma \sum_{c=1}^{C} ||m_{c}^{+} - m_{c}^{-}||$$

$$\mathcal{J}_{P}: \text{ prediction model}}$$

$$- \beta \sum_{i=1}^{L+U} \sum_{c=1}^{C} v_i^{(c)} \log Pr(\hat{y}_i = c | x_i) - \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{L+U} \sum_{c=1}^{C} v_i^{(c)}$$
(3)
$$\mathcal{J}_L: \text{ label propagation model} \qquad \mathcal{J}_S: \text{ self-paced learning}$$

where α , β , γ , and λ are positive constants to balance the impact of each term. The overall objective function consists of five terms. The first term \mathcal{J}_G corresponds to the label-informed generative model that minimizes the expected reconstruction error of the sampled random walk sequence w using the label-informed sampling strategy f_S . The second term \mathcal{J}_P minimizes the weighted prediction loss for the training data \mathcal{L} , where the function ξ_{x_i} defines the cost-sensitive ratios regarding the protected group and the unprotected group. The third term \mathcal{J}_F is the fairness regularizer, where m_c^+ and m_c^- denote the statistical parity measure [35] regarding the protected group S^+ and the unprotected group S^- , respectively. The fourth term \mathcal{J}_L corresponds to the label propagation model that maximizes the likelihood of observing x_i in its predicted class $\hat{y}_i = c$. The last term is the self-paced regularizer, which globally maintains the learning pace of graph generation and label propagation. An overview of FAIRGEN is presented in Figure 2. It consists of three major components, including (M1) label-informed graph generative module (*i.e.*, \mathcal{J}_G), (M2) fair learning module (i.e., $\mathcal{J}_P + \mathcal{J}_F$), and (M3) self-paced learning module (*i.e.*, $\mathcal{J}_L + \mathcal{J}_S$). Next, we will elaborate on these components one by one.

M1. Label-informed graph generative module: The existing RNN-based graph generative models [5], [20] often



Fig. 2. Overview of the proposed FAIRGEN framework.

suffer from the long training process when modeling largescale networks. To reduce the time complexity, we aim to train the transformer-based generator [36] to model long symbolic sequences as follows.

$$\arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{w} \sim f_S(\mathcal{G})} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \log g_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(w_t | \boldsymbol{w}_{< t}) \right]$$
(4)

where g_{θ} is the Transformer-based generator; $f_S(\cdot)$ is a labelinformed context sampling function; w_t and $w_{< t}$ represent the t^{th} node and the first $(t-1)^{\text{th}}$ nodes in a specific random walk w. However, one major drawback of most graph generative models is the representation disparity. To alleviate this issue, we propose \mathcal{J}_G to approximately minimize $R_{\mathcal{S}^+}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in Eq. 2 and $R(\theta)$ in Eq. 1 across both protected group (*i.e.*, $S = S^+$) and unprotected group (*i.e.*, $S = S^{-}$) via $f_{S}(\cdot)$. In particular, $f_S(\cdot)$ is designed to extract two types of context information from the input data. The first type of context is based on the graph \mathcal{G} , which encodes the general structure distribution by minimizing $R(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in Eq. 1. The second type of context is based on the labeled examples, which encode the class-membership information. In Figure 3, we present an example of extracting two types of random walks via $f_S(\cdot)$ on a toy graph. In this figure, we can see label-informed random walks (colored in red) traverse within the subgraph S (bounded by the blue box), by starting from a labeled example (indicated by the green arrow) in $C^{\mathcal{S}}$ (*i.e.*, the clique bounded by the orange box). Without loss of generality, we assume that all the labeled examples are representative, i.e., located within the diffusion cores [37], [38] of the corresponding classes, as defined below.

Definition 1: [Diffusion Core] For any subgraph $S \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, the (δ, t) -diffusion core of S is defined as $C^S = \{x \in S | 1 - \chi_S M^t \chi_x < \delta \phi(S)\}$, where $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $M = (AD^{-1} + I)/2$ is the transition probability matrix, χ_S and χ_x are two indicator vectors supported on S and $\{x\}$, and $\phi(S)$ denotes the conductance of S in \mathcal{G} .

Note that $1 - \chi_{\mathcal{S}} M^t \chi_x$ computes the probability of a random walk starting from node $x \in \mathcal{S}$ and escaping \mathcal{S} after



Fig. 3. An illustrative example of random walk extraction via $f_S(\cdot)$, where the red dots represent the labeled examples, and the blue dots represent the unlabeled examples. With probability r, $f_S(\cdot)$ samples random walks (colored blue) for capturing general structure distribution; with probability 1-r, $f_S(\cdot)$ samples random walks (colored red) starting from a labeled example (pointed by a green arrow).

t steps. Roughly speaking, C^{S} is the set of nodes that are connected with each other within the subgraph S. Next, in Lemma 2.1, we show that if the labeled example is located in the diffusion core of S, the extracted random walk sequences will purely preserve the context information within S with a high probability.

Lemma 2.1: If the labeled example x_i is located in the diffusion core of a subgraph S, i.e., $x_i \in C^S$, then the sampled T-length random walks starting from x_i only capture the context information within S with probability at least $1 - T\delta\phi(S)$.

Proof 1: To ensure the sampled random walks w only preserve the context information of S, we need w to stay entirely inside of S. Note that $M\chi_x$ is the distribution mass that a onestep random walk starts from x_i and $diag(\chi_S)M\chi_x$ is the truncated distribution when the w stays inside S. Therefore, the probability of the extracted T-length random walks entirely staying inside of subgraph S is $1'(diag(\chi_S)M)^t\chi_x$. For any $1 \le t \le T$, we can have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1}'(diag(\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{S}})\boldsymbol{M})^{t-1}\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{x}} - \mathbf{1}'(diag(\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{S}})\boldsymbol{M})^{t}\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{x}} & (5) \\
&= \mathbf{1}'(I - diag(\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{S}})\boldsymbol{M})(diag(\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{S}})\boldsymbol{M})^{t-1}\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \\
&= \mathbf{1}'(\boldsymbol{M} - diag(\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{S}})\boldsymbol{M})(diag(\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{S}})\boldsymbol{M})^{t-1}\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \\
&= \mathbf{1}'(I - diag(\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{S}}))\boldsymbol{M}(diag(\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{S}})\boldsymbol{M})^{t-1}\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \\
&= \boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{\bar{S}}}\boldsymbol{M}(diag(\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{S}})\boldsymbol{M})^{t-1}\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \\
&\leq \delta\phi(\boldsymbol{S})\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{\bar{S}}}\boldsymbol{M}^{t}\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{x}}
\end{aligned}$$
(5)

Based on Def. 1, we have

$$\mathbf{1}'(diag(\boldsymbol{\chi_{S}})\boldsymbol{M})^{t-1}\boldsymbol{\chi_{x}} - \mathbf{1}'(diag(\boldsymbol{\chi_{S}})\boldsymbol{M})^{t}\boldsymbol{\chi_{x}} \leq \delta\phi(\mathcal{S})$$
(6)

For $t = 1, \ldots, T$, the Eq. 6 can be written as follows.

$$1 - \mathbf{1}' (diag(\boldsymbol{\chi_{\mathcal{S}}})\boldsymbol{M})^{1} \boldsymbol{\chi_{x}} \leq \delta \phi(\mathcal{S})$$

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{1}'(diag(\boldsymbol{\chi_{S}})\boldsymbol{M})^{1}\boldsymbol{\chi_{x}} - \mathbf{1}'(diag(\boldsymbol{\chi_{S}})\boldsymbol{M})^{2}\boldsymbol{\chi_{x}} \leq \delta\phi(\mathcal{S}) \\ &\vdots \\ \mathbf{1}'(diag(\boldsymbol{\chi_{S}})\boldsymbol{M})^{T-1}\boldsymbol{\chi_{x}} - \mathbf{1}'(diag(\boldsymbol{\chi_{S}})\boldsymbol{M})^{T}\boldsymbol{\chi_{x}} \leq \delta\phi(\mathcal{S}) \end{split}$$

By adding up the above T inequalities, we have

$$1 - \mathbf{1}' (diag(\boldsymbol{\chi_{\mathcal{S}}})\boldsymbol{M})^T \boldsymbol{\chi_{x}} \le T\delta\phi(\mathcal{S})$$
(7)

Thus, we have proved that \boldsymbol{w} only preserves the context information of \mathcal{S} with the probability of $\mathbf{1}'(diag(\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\mathcal{S}})\boldsymbol{M})^T \geq 1 - T\delta\phi(\mathcal{S})$.

In practice, we want to control S to be compact, such that (1) $\phi(S)$ is small and $1 - T\delta\phi(S)$ is close to 1; (2) the extracted group-wise contextual information is meaningful. We describe the technical details of $f_S(\cdot)$ as follows. We first sample a random number $r \in [0, 1]$. Then, with probability r, we uniformly sample a T-length random walk w via the biased second-order random walk sampling strategy [39]; with probability 1 - r, we sample graph context with the guidance of label information.

M2. Fair learning module: Through M1, we encode the general structure distribution and the label information of the input data into the graph generator g_{θ} via $f_S(\cdot)$. Nevertheless, simply minimizing the reconstruction loss defined in Eq. 4 may overlook the protected group nodes, due to the imbalanced nature between the protected and unprotected groups. To minimize the risk of representation disparity in g_{θ} , we propose a self-paced label propagation to gradually generate 'accurate and fair' labels to be fed to $f_S(\cdot)$ for label-informed context sampling. In particular, given a handful of labeled examples together with the membership of the protected group, the learning objective of this module is to minimize the following two terms (*i.e.*, $\mathcal{J}_P + \mathcal{J}_F$) below.

$$\alpha \sum_{i=1}^{L} \xi_{x_i} d_{\omega}(x_i, y_i) + \gamma \sum_{c=1}^{C} \|m_c^+ - m_c^-\|$$
(8)

where d_{ω} is the discriminator that learns the mapping between x_i and y_i via cross-entropy loss. The architecture of the discriminator is a three-layer MLP. In Eq. 8, the function ξ_{x_i} defines the cost-sensitive ratios regarding the protected group and the unprotected group as follows.

$$\xi_{x_i} = \begin{cases} 1/|\mathcal{S}^+| & x_i \in \mathcal{S}^+\\ 1/|\mathcal{S}^-| & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(9)

where $|\mathcal{S}^+|$ ($|\mathcal{S}^-|$) denotes the cardinality of \mathcal{S}^+ (\mathcal{S}^-). Intuitively, as the protected group often corresponds to the minorities, *i.e.*, $|\mathcal{S}^+| \ll |\mathcal{S}^-|$, we have $\xi_{x_i} \gg \xi_{x_j}$ for $x_i \in \mathcal{S}^+$ and $x_j \in \mathcal{S}^-$. By enforcing a higher loss of misclassifying protected group nodes, the predictor d_{ω} tends to pay more attention to the underrepresented protected group \mathcal{S}^+ . The second term guarantees the label propagation is '*fair*' via statistical parity constraint [35], where

$$m_c^+ = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}^+|} \sum_{x_i \in \mathcal{S}^+} \log \Pr(\hat{y}_i = c | x_i)$$
 (10)

$$m_c^- = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}^-|} \sum_{x_j \in \mathcal{S}^-} \log \Pr(\hat{y}_j = c | x_j)$$
 (11)

where $Pr(y_i|x_i) = \operatorname{softmax}(h(x_i))$ and $h(x_i)$ is the hypothesis learned by d_{ω} mapping node x_i to the label space y_i . We aim to ensure that the label propagation is 'accurate' by maximizing the likelihood probability $Pr(\hat{y}_i = c|x_i)$. Intuitively, we would like to ensure the expected probability of a protected group node $x_i \in S^+$ from a particular class $\hat{y}_i = c$ is close to the expected probability of an unprotected group node $x_j \in S^-$ belonging to the same class $\hat{y}_j = c$. For example, in a professional network, we want to ensure the female programmers (protected group S^+) have the same chance to be promoted to the position of the principal scientist as the male programmers (unprotected group S^-) in an IT company. As shown in Figure 2, in each iteration, FAIRGEN feeds the generated pseudo labels and the ground truth labels to $f_S(\cdot)$ for training g_{θ} via negative sampling [40], [41].

M3. Self-paced learning module: Though we could generate a graph by preserving the structural properties of both the protected group and unprotected group with M1 and M2, the generative model may still suffer from the issue of label scarcity. As mentioned earlier, the protected groups are typically more scarce compared to the unprotected groups, and thus, it can be much more expensive to obtain label information from these groups than the unprotected groups in practice. To address this issue, we propose to regularize the learning process via a self-paced label module, which aims to minimize the following two terms (*i.e.*, $\mathcal{J}_L + \mathcal{J}_S$).

$$-\beta \sum_{i=1}^{L+U} \sum_{c=1}^{C} v_i^{(c)} \log \Pr(\hat{y}_i = c | x_i) - \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{L+U} \sum_{c=1}^{C} v_i^{(c)} \quad (12)$$

where $\boldsymbol{v}^{(c)} \in \{0,1\}^{n \times 1}$ denotes the self-paced vectors regarding the class $c = 1, \ldots, C$. The general philosophy of selfpaced learning [42] is to learn from the 'easy' concepts to the 'hard' ones following the cognitive mechanism of human beings. The purpose of Eq. 12 is to globally maintain the learning pace of the graph context extraction in M1 and the label propagation in M2 such that the two modules are trained in a mutually beneficial way. To be specific, at each self-paced cycle l = 1, ..., p shown in Figure 2, M3 first computes the self-paced vectors $v^{(c)}$, c = 1, ..., C, to assign pseudo labels to a set of unlabeled vertices using the self-paced threshold λ and the learned predictive model d_{ω} in the last cycle l-1; then M1 samples new random walks based on the updated self-paced vectors $v^{(c)}$ and updates the generative model in Eq. 4 via negative sampling [39]. In particular, at each cycle l, we treat the newly sampled random walks via $f_S(\cdot)$ as positive samples and the generated random walks from last cycle l-1 as negative samples. In this way, we gradually increase the learning difficulty of g_{θ} and force it to distinguish the characteristics of the real random walks from the fake ones, in order to better model the distributions of the protected and the unprotected groups. In the meanwhile, M2 updates the predictive model by learning from the augmented training data (i.e., labeled data and pseudo labeled data) that is preserved in the updated self-paced vectors $v^{(c)}$.

Mathematically, the self-paced vectors $v^{(c)}$ serve as a key component for training M1 and M2. In particular, we gradually increase the value of λ for increasing the learning difficulty, which will be used to update the self-paced vectors in the next learning cycle. By taking the partial derivative of \mathcal{J} in Eq. 3, the gradient of $v^{(c)}$ can be written as follows.

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{J}}{\partial v_i^{(c)}} = -\log Pr(\hat{y}_i = c | \boldsymbol{x}_i) - \lambda \tag{13}$$

Thus, the closed-form solution of updating $v_i^{(c)}$ is

$$v_i^{(c)} = \begin{cases} 1 & -\log \Pr(\hat{y}_i = c | x_i) < \lambda \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$
(14)

Intuitively, λ serves as a learning threshold for selecting the nodes to be labeled. In particular, when $v_i^{(c)} = 1$, it indicates FAIRGEN classifies x_i to class c with a high confidence $\log Pr(\hat{y}_i = c | x_i) > -\lambda$; when $v_i^{(c)} = 0$, it indicates the prediction loss $-\log Pr(\hat{y}_i = c | x_i)$ is higher than the threshold λ . By monitoring the increased rate of λ over self-paced cycles $l = 1, \ldots, p$, the end users can easily control the learning pace and learning difficulty. In fact, FAIRGEN propagates the pseudo labels to the unlabeled vertices from the easy concept (*i.e.*, the ones with a small loss $-\log Pr(\hat{y}_i = 1 | x_i)$) to the hard ones (*i.e.*, the ones with a large loss $-\log Pr(\hat{y}_i = 1 | x_i)$) by gradually increasing the value of λ .

C. Optimization Algorithm

To optimize the overall objective function described in Eq. 3, we present the optimization algorithm in Algorithm 1 for learning FAIRGEN framework. The inputs include an undirected graph \mathcal{G} together with the labeled vertices \mathcal{L} , the memberships of the protected group \mathcal{S}^+ , the length of random walks T, the number of sampled random walks K, batch iterations T_1 , batch size N_1 , the number of self-paced

Algorithm 1 The FAIRGEN Learning Framework.



(i) an undirected graph \mathcal{G} , (ii) few-shot labeled examples $\mathcal{L} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_{|L|}\}$, (iii) the membership of the protected group vertices \mathcal{S}^+ . (iv) parameters T, K, T_1 , N_1 , p, r, α , β , γ , λ .

Output:

- Generative model g_{θ} , predictive model d_{ω} , self-paced vectors $\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{v}^{(C)}$
- 1: Initialize the predictive model d_{ω} and the self-paced vectors $\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{v}^{(C)}$ based on the labeled vertices \mathcal{L} .
- 2: Sample K positive random walks via f_S and store them in \mathcal{N}^+ ; sample K negative random walks based on [39] and store them in \mathcal{N}^- .
- 3: for l = 1, ..., p do
- 4: Update the hidden parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ of the generator $g_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ by training from \mathcal{N}^+ and \mathcal{N}^- .
- 5: Sample K positive random walks by f_S with the updated selfpaced vectors $v^{(1)}, \ldots, v^{(C)}$ and add them to \mathcal{N}^+ .
- 6: Sample K negative random walks using the current generative model g_{θ} and add them to \mathcal{N}^- .
- 7: Augment the value of λ .
- 8: Update $v^{(1)}, \ldots, v^{(C)}$ based on Eq. 14 and augment \mathcal{L} with the pseudo labeled vertices.
- 9: **for** $t = 1 : T_1$ **do**
- 10: Sample N_1 labeled vertices from \mathcal{L} and update hidden layers' parameters $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ by taking a gradient step with respect to $\mathcal{J}_P + \mathcal{J}_L + \mathcal{J}_F$.
- 11: end for

cycles p and parameters r, α , β , γ , λ . In Step 1, we first initialize the predictive model $d_{\omega}(\cdot)$ and the self-paced vectors $v^{(1)},\ldots,v^{(C)}$ based on the labeled vertices \mathcal{L} . Specifically, we let $v_i^{(c)} = 1$ for all the vertices x_i labeled as class c; otherwise, $v_i^{(c)} = 0$. Step 2 samples K positive random walks and K negative random walks and stores them in \mathcal{N}^+ and $\mathcal{N}^$ respectively. Step 3 to Step 12 is the main body of Algorithm 2. In particular, at each self-paced cycle $l = 1, \ldots, p$, Step 4 updates the generative model $g_{\theta}(\cdot)$ by learning from \mathcal{N}^+ and \mathcal{N}^{-} . Step 5 and Step 6 sample new positive random walks and negative random walks for training $g_{\theta}(\cdot)$ in the next cycle l + 1. By adding the generated random walks to \mathcal{N}^{-} , we are increasing the difficulty of training $q_{\theta}(\cdot)$. In this way, we enforce $q_{\theta}(\cdot)$ to distinguish the characteristics of the real random walks from the fake ones and then generate better random walks that are plausible in the real graph. Step 7 and step 8 update the self-paced vectors and λ , which will be used to augment the training set \mathcal{L} with the pseudo-labeled vertices. At last, from Step 9 to Step 11, we employ stochastic gradient descent (SGD) [43] to minimize the objective function of M2.

D. Fair Network (FAIRGEN) Assembling

After obtaining g_{θ} and d_{ω} , we construct a score matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ to infer the adjacency matrix \widetilde{A} of the output graph $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$. In particular, we let the learned generative model g_{θ} continuously generate synthetic random walks \widetilde{w} , and then collect the counts of each observed edge (i, j) to be stored in B(i, j). However, simply thresholding B to produce \widetilde{A} may lead to the low-degree nodes or protected group nodes being

Category	Network	Nodes	Edges	Class	Protected Group
Communication	Email	1,005	25,571	N/A	N/A
	FB	4,039	88,234	N/A	N/A
Social Network	BLOG	5,196	360,166	6	300
	FLICKR	7,575	501,983	9	450
File-Sharing	GNU	6,301	20,777	N/A	N/A
Collaboration	CA	5,242	14,496	N/A	N/A
	ACM	16,484	197,560	9	597
		TABLE			

STATISTICS OF THE DATASETS.

left out. Here, we propose the following assembling criteria: (1) the protected group S^+ in the generated graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ should have a similar volume (total number of edges) as the original graph \mathcal{G} ; (2) each node should have at least one connected edge in the generated graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$. Typically, we generate a much larger number of random walks than the sampled ones, which is beneficial to ensure the overall quality and to reduce the randomness of the generated graphs. Finally, we threshold Bto produce \tilde{A} , which has the same number of edges as in A.

III. EXPERIMENTS

We demonstrate the performance of FAIRGEN on seven real-world graphs with respect to graph generation, data augmentation, parameter sensitivity, and scalability.

A. Experiment Setup

Data Sets: We evaluate our proposed algorithm on seven realworld graphs. The statistics of these datasets are summarized in Table I. Email [44] is a student-to-student communication network, where each node represents a student and an edge exists if one student sends one email to another student; FB [44] and FLICKR [45] and BLOG [45] are social networks, where each node represents a user and each edge represents one user connected with another user; GNU [44] is filesharing networks, where each node represents a host and each edge indicates the connection between two hosts; CA [44] and ACM [46] are collaboration networks, where each node represents an author and each edge indicates a collaboration between two authors. Particularly, in ACM, BLOG, and FLICKR datasets, the nodes come with the class labels and the memberships of protected group S^+ and unprotected group S^- . Specifically, the protected group of the FLICKR data set is race; the protected group of the BLOG data set is race; the protected group of the ACM data set is the topic with a small population.

Comparison Methods: We compare FAIRGEN with multiple graph generative models, including two random graph models, *i.e.*, Erdös-Rényi (ER) model [47] and Barabási-Albert (BA) model [6], three deep graph generative models, *i.e.*, GAE [48], NetGAN [5], TagGen [49]. To investigate the contributions of different parts of FAIRGEN, we conduct an ablation study by introducing three variations of FAIRGEN, including FAIRGEN-R that samples random walks via uniform distribution, FAIRGEN-w/o-SPL that trains without self-paced learning, and FAIRGEN-w/o-Parity that trains without the

fairness constraint.

Evaluation: We present the results regarding the following metrics: (1) Average Degree (AD): the average node degree; (2) LCC: the size of the largest connected component; (3) Triangle Count (TC): the count of three mutually connected nodes; (4) Power Law Exponent (PLE): the exponent of the power law distribution of \mathcal{G} ; (5) Gini: the Gini coefficient of the degree distribution; (6) Edge Distribution Entropy (EDE): the relative edge distribution entropy of \mathcal{G} . (7) ASPL: Average Shortest Path Length. (8) NCC: The number of connected components. (9) CC: Clustering coefficient of a graph. The formulations of these nine metrics can be found in Table II. For the sake of easy comparison, we define the overall discrepancy $R(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}, f_m)$ and the protected set discrepancy $R^+(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{S}^+, f_m)$ between the original graph and the generated graph in terms of the above metrics f_m .

$$R(\mathcal{G}, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}, f_m) = \left| \frac{f_m(\mathcal{G}) - f_m(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}})}{f_m(\mathcal{G})} \right|$$
(15)

$$R^{+}(\mathcal{G}, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{S}^{+}, f_{m}) = \left|\frac{f_{m}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{S}^{+}}) - f_{m}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{S}^{+}})}{f_{m}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{S}^{+}})}\right|$$
(16)

where \mathcal{G}_{S^+} and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{S^+}$ denote the subgraphs that consist of the protected group vertices S^+ in \mathcal{G} and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$, respectively. These subgraphs are the 1-hop ego network with the anchor nodes from the protected group vertices. Ideally, a fair graph generator should (1) well captures the general structural properties of the input graph \mathcal{G} (small $R(\mathcal{G}, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}, f_m)$), and also (2) fairly preserves the contextual information of the protected group (small $R^+(\mathcal{G}, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}, S^+, f_m)$) in the generated graph $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$.

B. Implementation and Repeatability

The experiments are performed on a Windows machine with eight 3.8GHz Intel Cores and a single 16GB RTX 5000 GPU. In our implementation, we set the batch size $N_1 = 128$, batch iterations $T_1 = 3$, the epoch numbers to be 20, the node embedding dimension to be 100, the number of transformer's heads to be 4, the learning rate to be 0.01, walk length T = 10, and $\alpha = 1$, $\beta = 1$, $\gamma = 1$.

C. Graph Generation

We compare the quality of the generated graphs with eight baseline methods at the level of both the entire graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ and the protected group \mathcal{S}^+ in terms of nine classic graph properties. We fit all the models on the seven real-world graphs and report the statistics of the generated graphs in Figure 4 and Figure 5. In Figure 4, we provide the comparison results in terms of the overall discrepancy $R(\mathcal{G}, \tilde{\mathcal{G}}, f_m)$ and have the following observations. (1) The traditional random graph models (*i.e.*, ER, BA) excel at recovering the corresponding structural properties (*e.g.*, Largest Connected components, Poisson degree distribution and heavy-tailed degree distribution) that they aim to model, whereas they fail to deal with the ones (*e.g.*, triangle count) that they do not account for. (2) The deep graph generative models (*e.g.*, FAIRGEN, NetGAN, TagGen) have better generalization to different network properties than



Fig. 4. Overall discrepancy $R(\mathcal{G}, \tilde{\mathcal{G}}, f_m)$ regarding nine metrics across seven real networks. We cut off high values for better visibility. The proposed FAIRGEN and its variations (FAIRGEN-R, FAIRGEN-w/o SPL, FAIRGEN-w/o Parity) are the leftmost bars. For better visualization, we change the lower limit of the y-axis for (a), (b), (d), and (f) to -0.1, as the values of some metrics are close to zero. (Smaller metric values indicate better performance)

TABLE II							
GRAPH STATISTICS FOR MEASURING NETWORK PROPERTIES.							

Metric name	Computation	Description	
Average Degree (AD)	$\mathbb{E}[d(v)]$	Average node degree.	
LCC	$\max_{f \in F} f $	Size of the largest connected component in \mathcal{G} .	
Triangle Count (TC)	$\frac{ \{\{u,v,w\} \{(u,v),(v,w),(u,w)\}\subseteq\mathcal{E} }{6}$	Number of the triangles.	
Power Law Exponent (PLE)	$1 + n(\sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}} \log(\frac{d(u)}{d_{min}}))^{-1}$	Exponent of the power-law distribution of \mathcal{G} .	
Gini	$rac{2\sum_{i=1}^{n} i\hat{d}_i}{n\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{d}_i} - rac{n+1}{n}$	Inequality measure for degree distribution.	
Edge Distribution Entropy (EDE)	$\frac{1}{\ln n} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} -\frac{d(v)}{ \mathcal{E} } \ln \frac{d(v)}{ \mathcal{E} }$	Entropy of degree distribution.	
ASPL	$\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \cdot \sum_{i \neq j} d(v_i, v_j)$	Average Shortest Path Length	
NCC	Algorithm 2 in [50]	The number of connected components	
CC	number of triangles connect to node v_i number of triangles centred around node v_i	Clustering coefficient of a graph	

the random graph models. (3) NetGAN performs better than FAIRGEN on the data sets that provide labels and the protected group information, such as the FLICKR data set in Figure 4 (c). This is consistent with the objective of FAIRGEN, which is not merely minimizing the overall reconstruction loss of the observed graphs. (4) FAIRGEN achieves comparable and even better performance than the baseline methods in most cases. By incorporating the label information and fairness constraint to protect the protected group nodes, FAIRGEN slightly sacrifices the overall discrepancy to some extent. Notice that based on the statistics shown in Table I, the ratio of the protected

group is significantly smaller than the unprotected group on BLOG, ACM and FLICKR graphs, and generated graphs tend to be biased if we only evaluate the performance of the overall discrepancy. Thus, we further measure the discrepancy of the protected group for all methods in Figure 5. In particular, we observe that FAIRGEN consistently outperforms all the other methods across three data sets on all nine metrics in terms of the protected group discrepancy, which demonstrates how well the protected group is preserved in the generated graphs.

In addition, we conduct the ablation study to examine the effectiveness of the proposed sampling strategy $f_S(\cdot)$. The



Fig. 5. Protected group discrepancy $R^+(\mathcal{G}, \tilde{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{S}^+, f_m)$ regarding nine metrics across three real graphs. We cut off high values for better visibility. The proposed FAIRGEN and its variations (FAIRGEN-R, FAIRGEN-w/o SPL, FAIRGEN-w/o Parity) are the leftmost bars. (Smaller metric values indicate better performance)

experimental results are shown in Table III, where 'Negative Sampling' refers to the variant of FAIRGEN by replacing $f_S(\cdot)$ with the negative sampling strategy used in Node2vec. A smaller value indicates better performance. By observation, we find that FAIRGEN achieves the smallest discrepancy of $R^+(\mathcal{G}, \tilde{\mathcal{G}}, S^+, f_m)$ comparing it with the negative sampling strategy. This observation suggests that the proposed sampling strategy is better than negative sampling.

D. Data Augmentation

Figure 4 and Figure 5 show the effectiveness of our proposed method and how well the generated graph by FAIRGEN preserves the structural information with fairness constraint. Next, we conduct a case study to evaluate the capability of FAIRGEN further in augmenting the performance of a prediction model for node classification. Specifically, we aim to see how well our label-informed generative model boosts the performance of the node classification task via data augmentation by comparing it with the one without data augmentation. Here are the procedures of the case study. First, we employ a logistic regression classifier as our base model, which is trained on the learned graph embedding of the original graph via node2vec [39]. Then, we aim to produce potential edges for the original graph by a specific graph generative model and insert 5% more edges into the original

graph to augment the data. Next, we retrain the node2vec on the augmented graphs and use the learned logistic regression model to predict the label. Notice that 'No Augmentation' in Figure 6 refers to the node classification task performed on the original graph without any augmentation. In our experiments, we split the data set into ten folds, with 90% for training and 10% for testing. In Figure 6, we provide the accuracy score (i.e., bar height) as well as the standard deviation (i.e., error bars) in the task of node classification on BLOG, ACM, and FLICKR data sets. In general, we observed that: (1) FAIRGEN significantly outperforms all the other graph generative models regarding performance improvement; (2) the baseline methods (e.g., GAE, NetGAN, TagGen, etc.) without utilizing label information can only marginally increase the performance. For example, on the BLOG graph, FAIRGEN boosts the performance to 17%, while the best competitor FAIRGEN-R and the second-best competitor TagGen only achieve 3.7% and 3.6% improvement in accuracy over the performance of no augmentation, respectively.

E. Parameter Sensitivity Analysis

We investigate the sensitivity of both context sampling parameters (*i.e.*, walking length T and sampling ratio r) and also self-paced learning parameters (*i.e.*, learning threshold λ). In Figure 7(a)(b)(c), we individually report the overall loss \mathcal{J} ,

TABLE III

Ablation study regarding different sampling strategies with respect to $R^+(\mathcal{G}, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{S}^+, f_m)$. Negative sampling refers to the VARIANT OF FAIRGEN BY REPLACING $f_S(\cdot)$ with negative sampling. A smaller value indicates better performance.

Method (Dataset)	AD	LLC	TC	PLE	Gini	EDE	ASPL	NCC	CC
Negative Sampling (BLOG)	0.0625	0.0140	0.2801	0.0682	0.7016	0.0276	0.0000	0.4257	0.0413
FAIRGEN (BLOG)	0.0577	0.0077	0.1492	0.0493	0.2692	0.0182	0.0000	0.2793	0.0096
Negative Sampling (ACM)	0.0369	0.1205	0.2787	0.1707	0.5535	0.0036	0.1130	0.2229	0.0432
FAIRGEN (ACM)	0.0334	0.0218	0.2062	0.0534	0.3549	0.0056	0.0145	0.2001	0.0193
Negative Sampling (FLICKR)	0.0206	0.1364	0.4834	0.0291	0.5705	0.0218	0.0000	0.1874	0.0175
FAIRGEN (FLICKR)	0.0158	0.0335	0.0389	0.0285	0.2732	0.0088	0.0000	0.1094	0.0166



Fig. 6. Data augmentation for node classification. The red dotted line shows the performance without data augmentation. FAIRGEN and its variations are the leftmost bars. (Larger metric values indicate better performance)

generator loss \mathcal{J}_G , and discriminator loss $\mathcal{J}_P + \mathcal{J}_L + \mathcal{J}_F + \mathcal{J}_S$ for different settings of walking length T and sampling ratio $r \in [0, 1]$. We observe that (1) the overall loss \mathcal{J} is generally smooth across different settings of T and r; (2) a major component of the overall loss \mathcal{J} comes from the generator. which is largely consistent with our intuition. As the output space of the generator (*i.e.*, the entire graph with $O(n^2)$) space complexity) is much larger than the output space of the discriminator (*i.e.*, node labels with O(n) space complexity), the learning complexity of the generator is significantly higher than the one of the discriminator. Moreover, in Figure 7(c), the discriminator obtains the largest loss when r is around 0.5 while getting the lowest loss when r is close to 0 or 1. This is because when r = 1, our context sampling strategy $f_S(\cdot)$ purely extracts the general network context information without label guidance; when r = 0, our context sampling strategy $f_S(\cdot)$ entirely extracts network context with the guidance of labels obtained from the discriminator at the last iteration of self-paced learning; when r = 0.5, $f_S(\cdot)$ extracts both general network context and label-informed network context. That is to say, when r = 0.5, FAIRGEN blends the two kinds of network context information equally into a unique embedding space, which leads to a higher discriminator loss. In Figure 7(d), we present the overall loss with respect to different settings of the learning threshold $-\lambda$. Intuitively, when $-\lambda$ is large, FAIRGEN only propagates labels to the unlabeled nodes with a high confidence score $\log Pr(\hat{y}_i = c | x_i) > -\lambda$ for training in the next iteration. Thus, we can see J obtains a lower loss when $-\lambda$ is close to 1 but obtains a higher loss when $-\lambda$ is around 0.



Fig. 7. Parameter sensitivity analysis. (a) Overall loss w.r.t. walking length T & sampling ratio r; (b) Generator loss w.r.t. walking length T & sampling ratio r; (c) Discriminator loss w.r.t. walking length T & sampling ratio r; (d) Overall loss w.r.t. learning threshold $-\lambda$.

F. Scalability Analysis

Here, we analyze the scalability of FAIRGEN, by reporting the running time of FAIRGEN on a series of synthetic graphs with increasing sizes (i.e., the number of nodes and the edge density). To control the number of nodes and the edge density, we generate the synthetic graphs via ER algorithm [47]. In Figure 8 (a), we fix the edge density to be 0.005 and gradually increase the number of nodes from 500 to 5000. In Figure 8 (b), we fix the number of nodes to 5,000 and increase the edge density from 0.005 to 0.05. Based on the results in Figure 8, we observe that the complexity of the proposed method is almost linear to both the number of nodes and the edge density, which is desirable for modeling large-scale networks.

Furthermore, we also report the running time for different baseline methods on seven benchmark datasets shown in Table IV. Notice that ER and BA do not have a training phase but a generation phase. Thus, the running time of these two methods is much less than deep learning-based methods, such as GAE, NETGAN, TagGen, and FAIRGEN. By observation, the running time of our proposed method is much less than NetGAN but it achieves better performance than NetGAN as shown in Figures 4 and 5.

TABLE IV	
RUNNING TIME (IN SECONDS) OF DIFFERENT BASELINE	E METHODS

Method	EMAIL	GNU	CA	FB	BLOG	ACM	FLICKR
ER	0.093	0.109	0.078	0.469	0.938	1.860	1.423
BA	0.015	0.140	0.094	0.094	0.293	1.374	0.841
GAE	57.12	372.31	258.68	422.18	741.02	2889.07	1339.1
NetGAN	1397.36	8323.7	5643.21	3218.64	6036.42	29688.28	7834.12
TagGen	372.63	2162.13	1707.01	971.23	1462.37	7253.16	1632.76
FairGen	394.65	2254.37	1768.25	1013.66	3248.86	11429.91	4969.56



Fig. 8. Scalability analysis.

G. Visualization

In this subsection, we visualize the synthetic graphs generated by deep learning baseline methods, including NetGAN, GAE, TagGen, and FAIRGEN, as shown in Figure 9. To better visualize the graph, the experiment is conducted on the synthetic dataset shown in Figure 1. Here is the procedure to price the TSNE [51] visualization: we first use Node2vec to learn the representation for a graph (e.g., either the original graph or the synthetic graph), and then we use TSNE to reduce the representation to 2D space and visualize the graph. By observation, we can find that our proposed method can fairly preserve the topological structure for both the protected group and unprotected group while other baseline methods fail to do that.

IV. RELATED WORK

Graph Generative Model. Graph generative models have a longstanding history, with applications in biology [52], chemistry [20], [53], and social sciences [52], [54]. Classic graph generators are often designed as network-property oriented models, which capture and reproduce one or more important structure properties, e.g., power-law degree distribution [6], [47], small diameters [10], motif distribution [8], [55], and densification in graph evolution [11]. More recently, deep generative models [5], [20], [21], [25], [56]-[64] for graphs have received much research interest. For example, in [21], the authors propose a variational auto-encoders based framework named GraphVAE, which is designed to generate a number of small graphs and then employ a subgraph matching algorithm to assemble them into a complete graph with the same size as the original network; in [58], the authors revisit the molecular graph generation problem and propose a discrete latent variable model to accommodate the discrete graph signals in reality. in [59], the authors develop a probabilistic model to marginalize out the node orderings and estimate the joint likelihood of graphs. Though [4], [53], [58] utilize the label information to constrain the graph generation, these methods are only designed for molecular graph rather than general networks. Most of the existing works are predominately designed for producing general-purpose graphs and they overlook both the label information and fairness requirements.

Fair Graph Mining. Despite the long-standing research on graphs, recent studies show multiple evidences [34], [65]–[67] that many graph mining models are biased and may lead to harmful discrimination in downstream applications. To fill this gap, a surge of research has been conducted to amend the biased graph learning models to be fair or invariant regarding specific variables. Until now, the existing literature in fair graph mining can be roughly classified into two categories, i.e., group fairness on graphs [34], [66]-[74] and individual fairness on graphs [65], [75], [76]. The former category aims to mitigate the bias and potential discrimination among demographic groups of nodes or edges in a wide spectrum of graph mining tasks, including graph proximity learning [71], graph clustering [72], graph representation learning [34], [73]. The latter category studies the problem of how to ensure the similar graph signals receive similar algorithmic outcomes [65]. In this paper, we study the problem in the context of group fairness on graphs and make the initial effort to debiasing representation disparity in graph generative models.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we present FAIRGEN - a novel generative model that incorporates the label information and fairness constraint in the graph generation process. FAIRGEN is developed based on a self-paced learning paradigm that globally maintains a label-informed graph generation module and a fair learning module to extract graph context information. It is designed to gradually mitigate representation disparity by learning from the 'easy' concepts to the 'hard' ones to accurately capture the behavior of the protected groups and unprotected groups. The experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of FAIRGEN in generating high-quality graphs, alleviating the representation disparity, and enabling effective data augmentation for downstream applications.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work is supported by NSF(1939725, 2137468), by the United States Air Force and DARPA under contract number FA8750-17-C-0153 † . The content of the information in this

 $^{^{\}dagger}\textsc{Distribution}$ Statement "A" (Approved for Public Release, Distribution Unlimited)



Fig. 9. TSNE Visualization of different synthetic graphs and the original graph.

document does not necessarily reflect the position or the policy of the Government or Amazon, and no official endorsement should be inferred. The U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for Government purposes notwithstanding any copyright notation here on.

REFERENCES

- D. Chakrabarti and C. Faloutsos, "Graph mining: Laws, generators, and algorithms," ACM Comput. Surv., vol. 38, no. 1, p. 2, 2006.
- [2] L. Akoglu, M. McGlohon, and C. Faloutsos, "RTM: laws and a recursive generator for weighted time-evolving graphs," in *Proceedings of the* 8th IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM 2008), December 15-19, 2008, Pisa, Italy. IEEE Computer Society, 2008, pp. 701–706.
- [3] J. M. Stokes, K. Yang, K. Swanson, W. Jin, A. Cubillos-Ruiz, N. M. Donghia, C. R. MacNair, S. French, L. A. Carfrae, Z. Bloom-Ackerman *et al.*, "A deep learning approach to antibiotic discovery," *Cell*, 2020.
- [4] W. Jin, R. Barzilay, and T. S. Jaakkola, "Junction tree variational autoencoder for molecular graph generation," in *Proceedings of the* 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 80. PMLR, 2018, pp. 2328–2337.
- [5] A. Bojchevski, O. Shchur, D. Zügner, and S. Günnemann, "Netgan: Generating graphs via random walks," in *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018, ser.* Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 80. PMLR, 2018, pp. 609–618.
- [6] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási, "Statistical mechanics of complex networks," *Reviews of modern physics*, 2002.
- [7] L. Akoglu and C. Faloutsos, "RTG: A recursive realistic graph generator using random typing," in *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery* in *Databases, European Conference, ECML PKDD 2009, Bled, Slovenia, September 7-11, 2009, Proceedings, Part I,* ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 5781. Springer, 2009, pp. 13–28.
- [8] J. Leskovec, D. Chakrabarti, J. M. Kleinberg, C. Faloutsos, and Z. Ghahramani, "Kronecker graphs: An approach to modeling networks," *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 11, pp. 985–1042, 2010.
- [9] M. Kim and J. Leskovec, "Multiplicative attribute graph model of realworld networks," *Internet Math.*, 2012.
- [10] C. Grabow, S. Grosskinsky, J. Kurths, and M. Timme, "Collective relaxation dynamics of small-world networks," *Physical Review E*, vol. 91, no. 5, p. 052815, 2015.
- [11] F. Fischer and C. Helmberg, "Dynamic graph generation for the shortest path problem in time expanded networks," *Math. Program.*, vol. 143, no. 1-2, pp. 257–297, 2014.
- [12] B. M. Waxman, "Routing of multipoint connections," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 6, no. 9, pp. 1617–1622, 1988.
- [13] B. Jing, Y. Yan, K. Ding, C. Park, Y. Zhu, H. Liu, and H. Tong, "Sterling: Synergistic representation learning on bipartite graphs," arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05428, 2023.
- [14] B. Jing, Y. Yan, Y. Zhu, and H. Tong, "Coin: Co-cluster infomax for bipartite graphs," arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.00006, 2022.
- [15] L. Zhao, B. B. II, T. I. Netoff, and D. Q. Nykamp, "Synchronization from second order network connectivity statistics," *Frontiers Comput. Neurosci.*, vol. 5, p. 28, 2011.
- [16] L. Zheng, D. Fu, R. Maciejewski, and J. He, "Deeper-gxx: deepening arbitrary gnns," arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.13798, 2021.

- [17] D. Zhou, L. Zheng, D. Fu, J. Han, and J. He, "Mentorgnn: Deriving curriculum for pre-training gnns," in *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, *Atlanta, GA, USA, October 17-21, 2022*, M. A. Hasan and L. Xiong, Eds. ACM, 2022, pp. 2721–2731.
- [18] B. Jing, C. Park, and H. Tong, "Hdmi: High-order deep multiplex infomax," in *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*, 2021, pp. 2414– 2424.
- [19] B. Jing, Z. You, T. Yang, W. Fan, and H. Tong, "Multiplex graph neural network for extractive text summarization," in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2021, pp. 133–139.
- [20] J. You, R. Ying, X. Ren, W. L. Hamilton, and J. Leskovec, "Graphrnn: Generating realistic graphs with deep auto-regressive models," in *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018,* ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 80. PMLR, 2018, pp. 5694–5703.
- [21] M. Simonovsky and N. Komodakis, "Graphvae: Towards generation of small graphs using variational autoencoders," pp. 412–422, 2018.
- [22] X. Guo and L. Zhao, "A systematic survey on deep generative models for graph generation," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 5370–5390, 2023.
- [23] Y. Li, O. Vinyals, C. Dyer, R. Pascanu, and P. W. Battaglia, "Learning deep generative models of graphs," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1803.03324, 2018.
- [24] A. Grover, A. Zweig, and S. Ermon, "Graphite: Iterative generative modeling of graphs," in *ICML*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 2434–2444.
- [25] N. Goyal, H. V. Jain, and S. Ranu, "Graphgen: A scalable approach to domain-agnostic labeled graph generation," in WWW '20: The Web Conference 2020. ACM / IW3C2, 2020, pp. 1253–1263.
- [26] R. Harrison and M. Thomas, "Identity in online communities: Social networking sites and language learning," *International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Society*, 2009.
- [27] B. Wellman, "The network community: An introduction," Networks in the global village, 1999.
- [28] P. Gajane, "On formalizing fairness in prediction with machine learning," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1710.03184, 2017. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1710.03184
- [29] L. Zheng, Y. Zhu, and J. He, "Fairness-aware multi-view clustering," in *Proceedings of the 2023 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining, SDM 2023, Minneapolis-St. Paul Twin Cities, MN, USA, April 27-29, 2023*, S. Shekhar, Z. Zhou, Y. Chiang, and G. Stiglic, Eds. SIAM, 2023, pp. 856–864.
- [30] N. Mehrabi, F. Morstatter, N. Saxena, K. Lerman, and A. Galstyan, "A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning," *CoRR*, 2019.
- [31] T. B. Hashimoto, M. Srivastava, H. Namkoong, and P. Liang, "Fairness without demographics in repeated loss minimization," in *Proceedings* of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 80. PMLR, 2018, pp. 1934–1943.
- [32] T. Mikolov, M. Karafiát, L. Burget, J. Cernocký, and S. Khudanpur, "Recurrent neural network based language model," in *INTERSPEECH* 2010, 11th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, Makuhari, Chiba, Japan, September 26-30, 2010. ISCA, 2010, pp. 1045–1048.
- [33] S. Hochreiter and J. Schmidhuber, "Long short-term memory," Neural Comput., vol. 9, no. 8, pp. 1735–1780, 1997.
- [34] A. J. Bose and W. L. Hamilton, "Compositional fairness constraints for

graph embeddings," in *Proceedings of the 36th ICML*, vol. 97. PMLR, 2019, pp. 715–724.

- [35] R. S. Zemel, Y. Wu, K. Swersky, T. Pitassi, and C. Dwork, "Learning fair representations," in *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2013, Atlanta, GA, USA, 16-21 June 2013*, ser. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, vol. 28. JMLR.org, 2013, pp. 325–333.
- [36] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA, 2017, pp. 5998–6008.
- [37] S. Apers, "Expansion testing using quantum fast-forwarding and seed sets," *Quantum*, vol. 4, p. 323, 2020.
- [38] D. A. Spielman and S. Teng, "A local clustering algorithm for massive graphs and its application to nearly linear time graph partitioning," *SIAM J. Comput.*, 2013.
- [39] A. Grover and J. Leskovec, "node2vec: Scalable feature learning for networks," in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, San Francisco, CA, USA, August 13-17, 2016.* ACM, 2016, pp. 855–864.
- [40] T. Mikolov, I. Sutskever, K. Chen, G. S. Corrado, and J. Dean, "Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality," in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 2013. Proceedings of a meeting held December 5-8, 2013, Lake Tahoe, Nevada, United States, 2013, pp. 3111–3119.
- [41] T. Mikolov, K. Chen, G. Corrado, and J. Dean, "Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space," in *1st International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2013, Scottsdale, Arizona, USA, May* 2-4, 2013, Workshop Track Proceedings, 2013.
- [42] M. P. Kumar, B. Packer, and D. Koller, "Self-paced learning for latent variable models," in Advances in 24th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2010. Proceedings of a meeting held 6-9 December 2010, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. Curran Associates, Inc., 2010, pp. 1189–1197.
- [43] L. Bottou, "Large-scale machine learning with stochastic gradient descent," in 19th International Conference on Computational Statistics, COMPSTAT 2010, Paris, France, August 22-27, 2010 - Keynote, Invited and Contributed Papers. Physica-Verlag, 2010, pp. 177–186.
- [44] J. Leskovec and R. Sosič, "Snap: A general-purpose network analysis and graph-mining library," ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST), vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1–20, 2016.
- [45] L. Tang and H. Liu, "Relational learning via latent social dimensions," in Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Paris, France, June 28 - July 1, 2009. ACM, 2009, pp. 817–826.
- [46] K. Ding, J. Li, and H. Liu, "Interactive anomaly detection on attributed networks," in *Proceedings of the Twelfth ACM International Conference* on Web Search and Data Mining, WSDM 2019, Melbourne, VIC, Australia, February 11-15, 2019. ACM, 2019, pp. 357–365.
- [47] P. ERDdS and A. R&wi, "On random graphs i," Publ. math. debrecen, 1959.
- [48] T. N. Kipf and M. Welling, "Variational graph auto-encoders," arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.07308, 2016.
- [49] D. Zhou, L. Zheng, J. Han, and J. He, "A data-driven graph generative model for temporal interaction networks," in *KDD '20: The 26th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Virtual Event, CA, USA, August 23-27, 2020.* ACM, 2020, pp. 401–411.
- [50] D. J. Pearce, "An improved algorithm for finding the strongly connected components of a directed graph," *Victoria University, Wellington, NZ, Tech. Rep*, 2005.
- [51] L. Van der Maaten and G. Hinton, "Visualizing data using t-sne." *Journal* of machine learning research, vol. 9, no. 11, 2008.
- [52] M. Ye, X. Liu, and W. Lee, "Exploring social influence for recommendation: a generative model approach," in *The 35th International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '12, Portland, OR, USA, August 12-16, 2012.* ACM, 2012, pp. 671–680.
- [53] J. You, B. Liu, Z. Ying, V. S. Pande, and J. Leskovec, "Graph convolutional policy network for goal-directed molecular graph generation," in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, December 3-8, 2018, Montréal, Canada, 2018, pp. 6412–6422.
- [54] D. Zhou, L. Zheng, J. Xu, and J. He, "Misc-gan: A multi-scale generative model for graphs," *Frontiers Big Data*, vol. 2, p. 3, 2019.

- [55] S. Purohit, L. B. Holder, and G. Chin, "Temporal graph generation based on a distribution of temporal motifs," in *Proceedings of the 14th International Workshop on Mining and Learning with Graphs*, vol. 7, 2018.
- [56] J. Yu, Y. Chai, Y. Wang, Y. Hu, and Q. Wu, "Cogtree: Cognition tree loss for unbiased scene graph generation," in *Proceedings of the Thirtieth IJCAI*. ijcai.org, 2021, pp. 1274–1280.
- [57] D. Liu, J. Lian, Z. Liu, X. Wang, G. Sun, and X. Xie, "Reinforced anchor knowledge graph generation for news recommendation reasoning," in *KDD '21: The 27th ACM SIGKDD 2021*. ACM, 2021, pp. 1055–1065.
- [58] Y. Luo, K. Yan, and S. Ji, "Graphdf: A discrete flow model for molecular graph generation," in *Proceedings of ICML 2021*, vol. 139. PMLR, 2021, pp. 7192–7203.
- [59] X. Chen, X. Han, J. Hu, F. J. R. Ruiz, and L. Liu, "Order matters: Probabilistic modeling of node sequence for graph generation," in *Proceedings of the 38th ICML*, vol. 139. PMLR, 2021, pp. 1630–1639.
- [60] X. Guo, Y. Du, and L. Zhao, "Deep generative models for spatial networks," in *KDD '21: The 27th ACM SIGKDD 2021*. ACM, 2021, pp. 505–515.
- [61] X. Huang, Q. Song, Y. Li, and X. Hu, "Graph recurrent networks with attributed random walks," in *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD*. ACM, 2019, pp. 732–740.
- [62] G. Zeno, T. L. Fond, and J. Neville, "DYMOND: dynamic motif-nodes network generative model," in WWW '21: The Web Conference 2021. ACM / IW3C2, 2021, pp. 718–729.
- [63] X. Guo, L. Zhao, Z. Qin, L. Wu, A. Shehu, and Y. Ye, "Interpretable deep graph generation with node-edge co-disentanglement," in *KDD '20: The 26th ACM SIGKDD 2020.* ACM, 2020, pp. 1697–1707.
- [64] R. Liao, Y. Li, Y. Song, S. Wang, W. L. Hamilton, D. Duvenaud, R. Urtasun, and R. S. Zemel, "Efficient graph generation with graph recurrent attention networks," in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 2019, pp. 4257–4267.
- [65] J. Kang, J. He, R. Maciejewski, and H. Tong, "Inform: Individual fairness on graph mining," in *KDD '20: The 26th ACM SIGKDD 2020*. ACM, 2020, pp. 379–389.
- [66] J. Fisher, A. Mittal, D. Palfrey, and C. Christodoulopoulos, "Debiasing knowledge graph embeddings," in *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference* on *EMNLP 2020*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2020, pp. 7332–7345.
- [67] L. Wu, L. Chen, P. Shao, R. Hong, X. Wang, and M. Wang, "Learning fair representations for recommendation: A graph-based perspective," in WWW '21: The Web Conference 2021. ACM / IW3C2, 2021, pp. 2198–2208.
- [68] D. Fu, D. Zhou, R. Maciejewski, A. Croitoru, M. Boyd, and J. He, "Fairness-aware clique-preserving spectral clustering of temporal graphs," in *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023, WWW 2023, Austin, TX, USA, 30 April 2023 - 4 May 2023.* ACM, 2023, pp. 3755– 3765.
- [69] F. Masrour, T. Wilson, H. Yan, P. Tan, and A. Esfahanian, "Bursting the filter bubble: Fairness-aware network link prediction," in *The Thirty-Fourth AAAI*. AAAI Press, 2020, pp. 841–848.
- [70] P. Li, Y. Wang, H. Zhao, P. Hong, and H. Liu, "On dyadic fairness: Exploring and mitigating bias in graph connections," in *ICLR 2021*. OpenReview.net, 2021.
- [71] S. Tsioutsiouliklis, E. Pitoura, P. Tsaparas, I. Kleftakis, and N. Mamoulis, "Fairness-aware pagerank," in WWW '21: The Web Conference 2021. ACM / IW3C2, 2021, pp. 3815–3826.
- [72] M. Kleindessner, S. Samadi, P. Awasthi, and J. Morgenstern, "Guarantees for spectral clustering with fairness constraints," in *ICML 2019*, 9-15 June 2019, Long Beach, California, USA, vol. 97. PMLR, 2019, pp. 3458–3467.
- [73] M. Buyl and T. D. Bie, "Debayes: a bayesian method for debiasing network embeddings," in *Proceedings of the 37th ICML*, vol. 119. PMLR, 2020, pp. 1220–1229.
- [74] G. Farnadi, B. Babaki, and M. Gendreau, "A unifying framework for fairness-aware influence maximization," in *Companion of The 2020 Web Conference 2020*. ACM, 2020, pp. 714–722.
- [75] Y. Dong, J. Kang, H. Tong, and J. Li, "Individual fairness for graph neural networks: A ranking based approach," in *KDD '21: The 27th ACM SIGKDD 2021*. ACM, 2021, pp. 300–310.
- [76] S. Gupta and A. Dukkipati, "Protecting individual interests across clusters: Spectral clustering with guarantees," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2105.03714, 2021.