

Accuracy vs. Accuracy: Computational Tradeoffs Between Classification Rates and Utility

Noga Amit
UC Berkeley

Omer Reingold
Stanford

Guy N. Rothblum
Apple

Abstract

We revisit the foundations of fairness and its interplay with utility and efficiency in settings where the training data contain richer labels, such as individual types, rankings, or risk estimates, rather than just binary outcomes. In this context, we propose algorithms that achieve stronger notions of evidence-based fairness than are possible in standard supervised learning. Our methods support classification and ranking techniques that preserve accurate subpopulation classification rates, as suggested by the underlying data distributions, across a broad class of classification rules and downstream applications. Furthermore, our predictors enable loss minimization, whether aimed at maximizing utility or in the service of fair treatment.

Complementing our algorithmic contributions, we present impossibility results demonstrating that simultaneously achieving accurate classification rates and optimal loss minimization is, in some cases, computationally infeasible. Unlike prior impossibility results, our notions are not inherently in conflict and are simultaneously satisfied by the Bayes-optimal predictor. Furthermore, we show that each notion can be satisfied individually via efficient learning. Our separation thus stems from the computational hardness of learning a sufficiently good approximation of the Bayes-optimal predictor. These computational impossibilities present a choice between two natural and attainable notions of accuracy that could both be motivated by fairness.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Accurate Classification Rates and Rich Labels	4
1.2	Our Contributions	5
1.3	Overview of Results and Techniques	6
1.3.1	Decision Accuracy vs. Calibration	7
1.3.2	Accurate Classification Rates vs. Loss Minimization	9
1.3.3	Positive Results via Calibration	10
1.4	Further Discussion on Related Work	12
2	Preliminaries	14
2.1	Multi-Accuracy	15
2.2	Multi-Calibration	16
2.3	Decision Rules	18
2.4	Indistinguishability	19
3	Translating Accuracy of Predictions to Accuracy of Classifications	20
4	When Accuracy of Predictions Contradicts Accuracy of Decisions	26
4.1	Loss-Minimizing Decision Rule Is Far from Affine	31
5	When Loss Minimization Contradicts Accuracy of Classifications	32
6	Translating Accuracy of Predictions to Loss Minimization	35
6.1	Relaxation of the Multi-Calibration Requirement	40
6.1.1	Probabilities and Linear Losses	41
6.1.2	Types and a Single Loss	43
6.1.3	Types and a Family of Losses	45
A	Deferred Proofs	49
A.1	Multi-Accuracy and Multi-Calibration	49
A.1.1	Notions of Multi-Accurate Rankings	50
A.1.2	Learning Multi-Accurate and Multi-Calibrated Predictors	52
A.2	Decision Rules	55
A.3	Indistinguishability	58

1 Introduction

The algorithmic fairness literature is marked by tradeoffs between different fairness notions and between fairness and other considerations such as computational efficiency and utility. In particular, the impossibility results of Kleinberg, Mullainathan, and Raghavan [KMR17] and Chouldechova [Cho17] have been a driving force in shaping the field of machine learning fairness. The importance of these separations lies in exposing conceptual contradictions between the notions considered. Specifically, they demonstrate that fairness criteria based on equalizing false positive and false negative rates between different demographic groups can be in contradiction to other requirements, such as calibration. This impossibility is not based on computational hardness and holds even if we know a perfectly accurate generative model of labels, p^* , known as a Bayes-optimal predictor, such that every individual x sees a positive outcome with probability $p^*(x)$. Even this perfectly calibrated predictor, often has divergent false positive and false negative rates across different groups. This occurs when different populations experience different distributions over real-world outcomes, under the assumption that some level of uncertainty is inherent. As a result, such notions can, at least to some extent, be at odds with accuracy. This potential compromise of accuracy may, in turn, lead to harm for individuals or protected communities (cf. [LDR⁺18]). At a high level, the reason such notions can harm individuals is that they are likely to experience costs and losses both from false negatives *and from false positives*. While the losses for false positives and false negatives experienced by a patient seeking a medical intervention, a job applicant seeking an interview and even an entrepreneur seeking a loan are different than those of the medical insurance company, the employer and the bank, they exist nonetheless. Loss minimization is therefore not only in the service of institutions but also of individuals and protected communities.

In some cases, where affirmative action is called for, we would likely choose fairness notions that are in conflict with the Bayes-optimal predictor. In this paper, however, we explore the extent to which fairness notions that are consistent with the Bayes-optimal predictor are achievable and the tradeoffs they present. For that, we go beyond the simple setting of supervised learning, where the learning algorithm is only exposed to Binary outcomes in historic data. In the standard model, evidence-based notions of fairness [DKR⁺19] prevent the most extreme forms of discrimination but may still allow for some other gross discrimination. For example, in ranking loan applicants based on default probabilities, we could have two groups A and B where two scenarios are indistinguishable: In the first scenario, any member of A has a lower risk for default than any member of B . In the second scenario, the members of A and B are interleaved in the Bayes-optimal ranking (e.g., first it is half the members of B , then all of the members of A , and then the remainder of B). One of our results show that if in training the learning algorithm gets individual’s global ranking, then we can come up with rankings where any one of a rich collection of sets sees an approximately correct rank distribution. This also means that for every loan-approval threshold, the fraction of the approved loans will be the same using our rankings and the Bayes optimal ranking.

One could have hoped that defining the rates of positive classification based on consistency with the Bayes-optimal predictor, would give us notions of fairness that do not conflict with other Bayes-consistent notions like calibration and loss-minimization. Nevertheless, we provide impossibility results between calibration and loss-minimization on one hand and accurate classification rates on the other. These impossibilities do not rely on the notions being inherently incompatible, as given access to the Bayes-optimal predictor, they could all be simultaneously obtained. Additionally, they do not rely on any of these notions being computationally infeasible, as we provide efficient learning algorithms that satisfy each notion separately. Instead, these are computational impossibilities

showing that even with rich labels it could be impossible to learn a good enough approximation of the Bayes-optimal predictor that simultaneously facilitates these distinct goals.

1.1 Accurate Classification Rates and Rich Labels

Much of the algorithmic-fairness literature on predictions and classification focuses on scenarios where the labels correspond to Boolean outcomes. The training data comes from a distribution \mathcal{D} on pairs (x, y^*) where x is a feature vector from a space \mathcal{X} and $y^* \in \{0, 1\}$ is a label. For example, x could correspond to a patient’s medical history, symptoms, and test results, and y^* could correspond to whether they have experienced significant cardiovascular disease in the subsequent decade. In another popular example, x represents the information of a loan applicant, such as income, credit history, and other financial factors, and y^* may correspond to whether the applicant repaid their loan. The purpose of the learning model in such scenarios is to decide on an appropriate action, a task referred to as classification. For example, deciding on a medical intervention such as prescribing cholesterol medication or on whether to approve a loan application. A natural first step in such decisions is to estimate the probability of the outcome conditioned on the features. For example, “the patient has an 8% chance of having a heart attack in the next decade” or “there is a 30% chance that the applicant will default on the loan.” Based on the predicted level of risk, any particular action may or may not be warranted.

In this model of learning, the Bayes optimal $p^*(x) = \Pr[y^*|x]$ is never provided to the learning algorithm and even its existence is under theoretical debate. In a typical example, the vector of features completely defines the individual. Under such conditions, we are considering non repeatable experiments, so what do probabilities mean in this context? The patient will either experience or not experience a heart attack, and the applicant will either repay or not repay the loan. The meaning of individual probabilities has deep philosophical implications and has been debated in Statistics for generations [Daw17] with more recent computational perspectives [DKR⁺21]. Nevertheless, in whichever way we interpret p^* , it is natural to assume that some level of uncertainty is inherent. Failure to repay a loan might be the result of a workplace closing, a family member falling sick or a variety of other factors that we could not expect the model to predict with certainty. The information required to predict such events would not be part of even the most expressive feature vector, and the events depend on processes that are computationally infeasible to simulate.

A typical approach to decision-making is to approximate p^* by an efficient predictor \tilde{p} and to execute some *decision rule* on \tilde{p} that we would consider appropriate if applied on p^* . For example, we could rank all the patients based on \tilde{p} (indicating probability of future heart attack) and invite those with high values to a consultation with their primary care team on making lifestyle changes. Similarly, we can accept loan applications whenever \tilde{p} is larger than 0.95, indicating a tolerable risk for the bank. For a set of individuals S , we suggest the notion of **accuracy in the decision space** to mean that members of S see the same distribution of classifications when the decision rule is applied to \tilde{p} as they would when it is applied to p^* . While this is a very natural notion of fairness, it is often way beyond the reach of a learning algorithm. Consider for example a sample of the outcomes, where half of the members of S repaid the loan and half did not. If there are no efficiently learnable patterns that correlate with loan repayment in S then it could be that every member of S has p^* being half, or perhaps half of the values are one and half are zeros, or perhaps two thirds of the values are 3/4 and the rest are zeros. Each of these cases could induce a very different distribution on the classifications to members of S , say, under the decision rule that gives a positive classification to individuals whose probability of repaying the loan is at least 95%.

Deterministic Rich Labels. The above example highlights a fundamental challenge in achieving strong notions of accurate classification rates: we aim to base decisions on risk scores, yet we never observe the true probabilities, not even during training. When comparing two historical loan applicants, for instance, we cannot determine the correct ranking between them based solely on observed outcomes (e.g., repaid vs. defaulted). Even if Alice repaid her loan and Bob did not, it is possible that Bob had a higher true probability of repayment under the ground truth distribution p^* , but was simply unlucky, while Alice was fortunate despite a lower p^* value. In other words, p^* encodes uncertainty that we cannot directly access; we only observe one realization of it per individual through historical outcomes.

To support accurate classification rates, we study the task of learning given access to richer labels that reflect this underlying uncertainty. One natural approach is to include the true probabilities p^* for individuals in the training data. An alternative is to include rankings of individuals. If these rankings are derived from probabilities, the two approaches are effectively equivalent. However, rankings can also encode broader considerations beyond simple outcome probabilities. For example, in college admissions, we might assess applicants not only by their probability of graduation but also by their expected contribution to their cohort or to society more broadly. Even more generally, we can think of each individual as having a “type” that supports multiple kinds of rankings, depending on the institution’s goals, such as different prioritization of student applicants by a university. Ideally, we want the labels to encode all the underlying uncertainty about an individual. When this is the case, in p^* itself each individual has a deterministic type (whereas the learned predictor may still output probability distributions over labels). We view such deterministic rich labels as an appealing setting. Some of our results explicitly *and necessarily* assume that p^* is deterministic.

Where could rich labels come from? A natural source is historical data annotated by one or more domain experts. Of course, even expert judgments can carry biases, and the very act of defining which “types” individuals are categorized into may have fairness implications. Still, experts may possess information unavailable to algorithms—for example, the nuanced understanding a physician might have about a patient’s condition. Additionally, the expertise used to generate rich labels can include knowledge of fairness considerations specific to the task or domain. In such cases, these labels can be understood not as representations of an objective ground truth, but rather as a way to encode human values into the learning process.

1.2 Our Contributions

We study learning in the setting where the labels reflect rich data about individuals, such as success probabilities, ranks, or more general “type” information. In this setting, we aim for the outcome of the learning process (a predictor, or a classifier that makes decisions) to accurately reflect the underlying data distribution for a rich collection of intersecting sets. We study several different notions of what it could mean to “accurately reflect” the underlying data in the contexts of prediction and classification. Below, a *predictor* maps each individual to a distribution over types (probabilities, rankings or general types). A *classifier* (or action function) maps individuals to binary decisions. Highlights of our contributions include:

- **Decision-accuracy vs. calibration.** A decision rule maps predictions to classification. Given such a rule, it is natural to require that the fraction of positive classification experienced by a group under a learned predictor is similar to what they would get under p^* . We study this *decision-accuracy* requirement.

For general decision rules, we show that it is infeasible to learn a predictor that is both decision-accurate and calibrated (even for a single group). We supplement this negative result with a positive one: for the class of affine decision rules, we show that calibration (and even weaker requirements) imply decision-accuracy. This gives a tight characterization of the decision rules that admit decision-accuracy.

- **Classification-accuracy vs. loss minimization.** Given the impossibility result for risk predictors, it is tempting to try to reason directly about classifications. We formulate a natural direct benchmark: the fraction of positive classifications experienced by a group should be similar to what they would get under optimal classifications induced by p^* . Optimal classifications are measured with respect to a loss function. We call this *classification-accuracy*.

We show a strong negative result: for non-trivial loss functions, it is infeasible to learn an action function that is classification-accurate and also minimizes the loss compared with the constant functions. In other words, to obtain classification accuracy we incur a significantly larger loss than if we just classified everyone the same (either positively or negatively).

- **Positive results: one desideratum at a time.** While combining the above desiderata is impossible (even for a single group!) we give positive results for obtaining risk predictors and action functions that satisfy each desideratum on its own. For a collection of groups, we show how multi-accuracy can be used to achieve decision-accuracy for any decision rule (even a non-affine one), and classification-accuracy. We also show how to learn action functions with competitive loss. For this last goal, we prove that applying a loss-minimizing decision rule to a (canonically) multi-calibrated predictor gives an action function that is competitive with a benchmark class. The collection of groups (for multi-calibration) is tightly related to the benchmark class for which we want competitive loss. This is in the spirit of and builds on work on omniprediction [GKR⁺22]. We also give more efficient algorithms for several settings and relate the complexity of learning to an auditing task.

The notions we consider are quite natural, and we show they are each feasible to achieve on its own,¹ but they are incompatible for efficient learning. The issue is inherently computational, as the Bayes optimal classifier can be used to satisfy all of these desiderata.

1.3 Overview of Results and Techniques

We proceed with a more detailed overview of our contributions and techniques. In terms of techniques, we focus on the negative results in this overview.

We begin by recalling the notions of multi-accuracy and multi-calibration for the multi-type setting (we propose additional variants of these notions in our work). We then highlight our contributions for the setting of learning predictors that lead to accurate decisions, and for the setting of directly obtaining accurate classifications.

Multi-Accuracy and Multi-Calibration for Predictions. A *multi-accurate* predictor guarantees that, for each group in the collection, the expectation of its predictions (the vector whose

¹The negative results apply even for the setting of a single group, where all notions are efficiently obtainable. For positive results in the multi-group setting, the complexity of learning depends on the collection of sets, see discussion below.

i^{th} coordinate is the expected probability of type i in this group) is close to the expectation of the true probability distribution specified by p^* . *Multi-Calibration* [HKRR18] is stronger: it requires that the expectations are close even when conditioning on the predictions. The literature has studied different notions of calibration for the multi-type (or multi-class) setting. These notions differ in conditioning on different events over the predictions, see [GHR24] for a recent discussion. We briefly mention two variants here. Canonical calibration [KF15, WLZ19], which conditions on every possible predicted probability distribution, gives a robust accuracy guarantee. However, it conditions on an event space that grows exponentially with the number of types, and requires an exponential number of samples, even when there is just one group (see, for example, [GKR⁺22]). Class-wise or coordinate-wise calibration [KPNK⁺19] conditions, for each type on its own, on the predicted probability for that type (a polynomial number of events) and can be obtained efficiently. Multi-Calibration requires that the relevant calibration guarantee holds simultaneously for every group in a rich class. See Sections 2.1 and 2.2 for the full and formal definitions, several variants that we study in this work, and known learning algorithms.

We emphasize that even when p^* is deterministic, and assigns a unique type to each individual, calibration (even coordinate-wise calibration) may still require the predictions to be probabilistic. For example, if half the individuals are assigned type 0, and half are assigned type 1, but there is no way to distinguish these two sets, then the natural calibrated predictor we can learn is the one that outputs for each individual the uniform distribution over $\{0, 1\}$.

1.3.1 Decision Accuracy vs. Calibration

Multi-Accurate Decisions. A *decision rule* ρ maps predictions (probability distributions over the space of types) to binary classifications: e.g., granting a loan to individuals whose repayment probability is at least 0.95. While the decision rule is usually formulated with the correct probabilities p^* in mind, it is often applied to a learned predictor \tilde{p} . This can lead to adverse consequences for groups (and for individuals), as discussed above. We formulate the notion of *decision accuracy* to address such concerns. A predictor gives *accurate decisions* (on average) for a decision rule ρ and a group S if the expected classification that S obtains when ρ is applied to the predictor is similar to the expected classification S would have obtained if ρ were applied to the true distributions p^* . The predictor is multi-accurate on decisions for a collection of groups \mathcal{C} if it provides the above guarantee for every group in the set. See the formal definition in Section 3.

The Bayes-optimal predictor always satisfies decision accuracy (trivially). However, as discussed above, decision accuracy can be impossible to obtain (or even audit) if all we have at training time is binary outcome data: we might not be able to distinguish whether all members of the group have probability 0.5 of repaying the loan (so their applications should all be rejected), or whether half have probability 1 of repaying the loan (and thus half of the applications should be accepted). This motivates our study of settings where we have rich labels, and in particular the training data includes each individual’s distribution over types.

Prediction Accuracy vs. Decision Accuracy. Decision accuracy and calibrated predictions are both desirable properties for a predictor, and enforcing them for subgroups can address certain fairness concerns. Can we simultaneously achieve both of these natural notions? We give a characterization of the decisions rules for which this is and is not possible.

Affine Decision Rules: Multi-Accuracy Implies Decision-Accuracy. We say that a decision rule is *affine* if, on input a probability distribution over the types, it operates by sampling a type from the distribution and applying a fixed function that (randomly) maps each type to a decision in $\{0, 1\}$.² We show that for this type of decision rule, we can have the best of both worlds: multi-accurate predictors induce multi-accurate decisions (and so do multi-calibrated predictors).

Theorem 1.1 (Informal, see Theorem 3.4). *Let $\rho : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be an affine decision rule. If a predictor \tilde{p} is multi-accurate w.r.t a collection of groups \mathcal{C} , then it is also decision-accurate for every group in \mathcal{C} .*

We note that the error of the decision-accuracy guarantee depends on the error parameter in the multi-accuracy guarantee. Further, it suffices for the decision rule to be “close” to affine (see Definition 2.13), where this closeness also affects the error of the decision accuracy guarantee.

Non-affine Rules: Calibration and Decision Accuracy Are in Conflict. In many settings, affine decision rules are too weak: an elite university may only want to admit top-ranked students. A medical treatment might have severe side effects that make it unethical to prescribe to patients unless there is certainty that they are at very high risk. In the presence of a loss function, it is natural to want to accept only if the expected loss is negative, and *this is a non-affine decision rule*. Can we get calibrated and decision-accurate predictions for such decision rules?

We show a very general negative result: if a decision rule is *far from affine*,³ then there exist distributions for which it is computationally infeasible to learn a predictor that is both calibrated and decision-accurate. The computational hardness applies even to the setting where there is just a single group (comprised of the entire support). We emphasize that the negative result is computational: while the Bayes-optimal predictor is both calibrated and decision-accurate, it cannot be learned efficiently (nor can any other predictor satisfying these two notions). We further emphasize that each of the notions we want to obtain is natural and can be achieved efficiently in isolation (especially in the setting of a single group): the computational hardness arises when we try to learn a predictor that satisfies both of them.

Theorem 1.2 (Informal, see Theorem 4.1). *Assume the existence of one-way functions. Let ρ be a decision rule that is Lipschitz and far from affine. There exists a data distribution for which no polynomial-time learner can output a predictor that is both coordinate-wise calibrated and decision-accurate w.r.t. ρ (except with negligible probability).*

See Theorem 4.1 for a full and formal statement. We give an overview of the high-level ideas below. We note that assuming the existence of one-way functions is a fairly lightweight and well-established assumption in cryptography.

Proof overview for Theorem 1.2. Given a non-affine decision rule ρ , we construct a distribution for which no efficient learner can output a predictor that is both calibrated and accurate-on-decision, even for a single subpopulation. The idea behind the proof is to construct a setting where any efficiently learned calibrated predictor must smooth out distinctions between inputs,

²This formulation is equivalent to the standard definition of affine: applying the rule to a convex combination of two distributions on types yields the same convex combination of the outcomes obtained by applying the rule to each distribution separately; see Section 3.

³By far from affine, we mean that there exists a convex combination of two distributions s.t. applying the rule to it gives a very different outcome than the convex combination of applying the rule to each of the two distributions.

even when their true predictions are different. To do so, we consider the following setup. Since ρ violates affineness, there exist two vectors (representing distributions over labels) y and y' such that $\frac{1}{2}\rho(y) + \frac{1}{2}\rho(y') \neq \rho(\frac{1}{2}y + \frac{1}{2}y')$. For simplicity, we use $\frac{1}{2}$ in this argument, though the same reasoning applies to any convex combination. We construct the domain as $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \cup \mathcal{X}_2$, where each subset constitutes half of \mathcal{X} and the two are computationally indistinguishable. Nature’s predictor R^* assigns the distribution y on \mathcal{X}_1 and y' on \mathcal{X}_2 . We show that any efficiently learned *calibrated* predictor \tilde{R} outputs a “squashed” version of R^* : that is, it assigns y with probability $1/2$ and y' with probability $1/2$, so that $\tilde{R}(x) = \frac{1}{2}y + \frac{1}{2}y'$ for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

To evaluate accuracy-on-decision, we compare the expected value of ρ applied to \tilde{R} and to R^* . For R^* , this expectation equals $\frac{1}{2}\rho(y) + \frac{1}{2}\rho(y')$, whereas for \tilde{R} it equals $\rho(\frac{1}{2}y + \frac{1}{2}y')$. Since ρ is not affine, these values differ, and thus \tilde{R} is not accurate-on-decision with respect to ρ .

The formal proof of the general case introduces several technical challenges. First, \tilde{R} is only approximately calibrated, and may behave arbitrarily on small subsets. This interacts subtly with the weak calibration requirement we assume, under which the level sets of \tilde{R} do not form a partition, complicating the identification of a large subset where \tilde{R} fails to be accurate-on-decision. Second, since we aim to refute *approximate* accuracy-on-decision, we must ensure that ρ is bounded away from any affine function. To control this, we impose a Lipschitz condition on ρ , and argue that without such regularity, the resulting lower bound would be vacuous. Finally, since \tilde{R} must be discretized to be learned efficiently, care is required to ensure the argument is robust to any choice of discretization.

As discussed above, a loss-minimizing decision rule (which only accepts if the expected loss is negative) is inherently far from affine, see Section 4.1. Combined with our negative results, this implies that learning a calibrated predictor that is accurate-on-decision with respect to the loss-minimizing rule can be computationally infeasible. \square

1.3.2 Accurate Classification Rates vs. Loss Minimization

Accurate Classifications. Methods for classifying individuals do not have to operate by applying a decision rule to a risk predictor. Thus, we study general *action functions*, which map individuals to outcomes, e.g., accepting or rejecting that individual (for simplicity, we restrict our attention to binary outcomes throughout). We consider a loss-minimization framework, where a loss function ℓ specifies a loss for each action for each type that an individual can have. Given an individual x and an action a , the expected loss is the expectation of $\ell(t, a)$ when t is drawn according to x ’s true distribution $p^*(x)$. For each individual x , if we knew $p^*(x)$, then we could pick the better action for that individual. This would give a loss-minimizing action function h_ℓ^* . Consider a certain subpopulation of individuals: under the loss-minimizing action function, they would experience a certain fraction of positive classifications. We introduce and study a novel fairness requirement of *multi-accurate classifications* for action functions: the fraction of positive classifications for members of S should be close to its value under the loss-minimizing action function.

Loss Minimization vs. Accurate Classifications. Another natural objective when learning action functions is (approximately) minimizing their loss compared to a benchmark class. Our

second negative result shows that for essentially any interesting loss function,⁴ loss minimization can be incompatible with classification accuracy. In fact, this is the case even when the benchmark class (for loss minimization) includes only the constant action functions.

Theorem 1.3 (Informal, see Theorem 5.1). *Assume that one-way functions exist. For any non-trivial loss ℓ (see above), there exists a data distribution such that for any polynomial-time action function that satisfies classification-accuracy (w.r.t a single group that includes the entire support), its loss is larger than either the constant-0 classifier or the constant-1 classifier.*

See Theorem 5.1 for a full statement, including the relationship between the relevant parameters (the “non-triviality” of the loss function, and the error parameters for classification-accuracy and loss minimization). We give an overview of the high-level ideas below.

Proof overview for Theorem 1.3. For any non-trivial loss function, we construct a Nature under which any efficiently computable action function (or classifier) that is accurate-on-classification fails to minimize loss. We prove this with respect to the most restricted hypothesis class, which contains only the two constant functions that either accept or reject all individuals.

The proof idea is as follows. The non-triviality of the loss implies the existence of two labels, or types, t and t' , such that *rejecting* type t results in a significantly lower loss compared to accepting it, with a difference of at least $\alpha > 0$, while *accepting* type t' is preferable in terms of loss, though the difference may be smaller. Here, “reject” and “accept” correspond to the binary actions 0 and 1, but any other binary action can work.

We define the domain to contain an indistinguishable subset $\mathcal{X}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ of size $3/4$ of \mathcal{X} . Let R^* assign type t to each $x \in \mathcal{X}_1$ and type t' to the remaining points. Consequently, the loss-optimal action function rejects everyone in \mathcal{X}_1 and accepts the rest, resulting in an expected acceptance rate of $1/4$ over \mathcal{X} . Thus, any action function h that is accurate-on-classification must accept roughly $1/4$ of the domain.

By indistinguishability, the set of accepted individuals must intersect \mathcal{X}_1 in approximately a $3/4$ fraction, since h is efficiently computable. This implies that the expected loss of h conditioned on the set $\{h(x) = 1\}$ matches the expected loss of accepting the entire domain. Let L_1 denote this quantity and L_0 denote the analogous quantity for rejecting everyone. Then, the expected loss of h is given by $3/4L_0 + 1/4L_1$, and the difference between this loss and that of the function that rejects everyone is $1/4(L_1 - L_0)$. On the other hand, by the non-triviality of the loss, $L_1 - L_0$ is lower-bounded by $\alpha/2$, allowing us to lower-bound the loss-minimization error of h by at least $\alpha/8$. See Section 5 for the details. \square

1.3.3 Positive Results via Calibration

While our negative results show that combining natural accuracy desiderata is infeasible (even for a single group!), we give positive results for obtaining risk predictors and action functions that satisfy each desideratum on its own. All these results leverage predictors that are multi-accurate or multi-calibrated. We briefly highlight them, elaborating on loss minimization, which is the most interesting case.

⁴All we require is that there is one type where one action is significantly better than the other, and also that this better action is not better for all the types (if this is not the case, the problem becomes trivial: loss can be minimized by always picking a constant action).

Decision and Classification Accuracy. A multi-accurate predictor can achieve both decision and classification accuracy when Nature (p^*) is deterministic, a natural case in our setting as discussed on “deterministic rich labels”. Randomly instantiating the predictor (i.e., sampling a label per individual from its predicted distribution) ensures decision accuracy (Lemma 3.12), and can also yield classification accuracy when applying the loss-minimizing decision rule (Corollary 3.10). Decision accuracy can, in fact, be achieved even when Nature is not deterministic; see Theorem 3.4.

Loss Minimization. Finally, we present results on obtaining action functions with loss competitive to a benchmark class. We prove a general statement: applying a loss-minimizing decision rule to a predictor that is multi-calibrated for a collection of sets \mathcal{C} yields an action function competitive with a benchmark class closely related to \mathcal{C} . This builds on work on omnipredictors [GKR⁺22].

Theorem 1.4 (Loss Minimization via Multi-Calibration, Informal Statement of Theorem 6.1). *Let \mathcal{C} be a collection of sets, and let \mathcal{H} be the class of action functions that compute membership in sets from \mathcal{C} (accepting the members of the set and rejecting non-members). For every loss function ℓ , if \tilde{p} satisfies canonical \mathcal{C} -multi-calibration, then applying the loss-minimizing decision rule to \tilde{p} ’s predictions gives loss that is competitive with any action function in \mathcal{H} .*

The notion of calibration we require is strong: canonical multi-calibration, which can be expensive to obtain (see above). We also consider several relaxed settings, where weaker notions of calibration (allowing for more efficient learning) may suffice for loss minimization. In Section 6.1.1, we show this for space of types that correspond to success probabilities and loss functions linear in the predicted probability (as in outcome-only losses, e.g., loan repayment). In this case, it suffices for the predictor to output multi-calibrated expectations, reducing the task to one-dimensional prediction. In Section 6.1.2, we allow general types but fix a single loss function. Finally, Section 6.1.3 gives a reduction from loss minimization to auditing multi-calibration. Regardless of its computational cost, this avoids the exponential sample complexity of canonical multi-calibration.




Figure 1: Positive and negative results. MA: Multi-Accuracy, MC: Multi-Calibration, MAD: Multi-Accuracy-on-Decision, MAC: Multi-Accuracy-on-Classification. The top row contains properties defined over the predictor; the bottom row, over the action function obtained by applying a decision rule. A green arrow from A to B means that satisfying A implies satisfying B . A green dashed arrow indicates that applying a decision rule to a predictor satisfying A yields an action function satisfying B . A red arrow between A and B means that achieving both simultaneously is computationally hard. The implication marked $(*)$ holds for affine decision rules; the impossibility marked $(**)$ holds for rules that are far from affine.

In Figure 2, which builds on Figure 1, we highlight a central choice: given a multi-calibrated predictor \tilde{p} , one can either apply the loss-minimizing decision rule (a non-affine rule) to directly obtain a loss-minimizing action function, or use a decision rule that first randomly instantiates \tilde{p} (an affine rule) to achieve MAD or MAC. In the latter case, after instantiation—that is, sampling a label per individual—the decision rule applies a function mapping the label to $\{0, 1\}$. MAD is achieved with any such function, while MAC is achieved when the function is the loss-minimizing decision rule. We emphasize that, unlike direct loss minimization, in the MAC path the loss-minimizing rule is applied only *after* random instantiation.

Importantly, since both approaches operate on the same predictor \tilde{p} , the choice can be deferred to deployment: depending on the downstream goal, one may either minimize an arbitrary loss function or ensure multi-accuracy-in-classification with respect to it.




Figure 2: Choice in how to use a predictor. While a single predictor may enable both loss minimization and MAC, these goals cannot be achieved simultaneously. This leads to two distinct paths: applying the loss-minimizing decision rule to the full distribution \tilde{p} to directly minimize loss (left), or first sampling from \tilde{p} and then applying the decision rule to achieve MAC (right).

Reflection. Calibration plays a central and somewhat counter-intuitive role in our results. On the one hand, all the notions we consider can be obtained via multi-calibrated predictors. On the other hand, the notions are incompatible with each other (and/or with calibration itself). This apparent contradiction highlights an important feature of our results: while multi-calibrated predictors are incredibly useful, they are used in different ways to reach decisions that satisfy different desiderata, and this is inherent (due to incompatibility results). The choice of which desiderata to satisfy can be postponed to decision-time: at train time one can train an appropriately multi-calibrated predictor, and then, e.g., decide whether to apply the loss-minimizing rule to it (for loss minimization), or to apply a related affine decision rule that we show how to derive from the the loss-minimizing rule (for classification-accuracy).

1.4 Further Discussion on Related Work

Uncertainty Decomposition via Higher-order Calibration. The recent work of Ahdriz et al. [AGG⁺25] introduces higher-order calibration for predictors that output distributions over label distributions. This generalizes our notion of full calibration (see Definition 2.8), which applies to first-order predictors outputting label distributions. Ahdriz et al. aim to decompose uncertainty into *epistemic* and *aleatoric* components via higher-order calibration. Their method relies on access to multiple independent labels per instance (as Nature itself is allowed to be probabilistic). This enables a rigorous separation between model-induced uncertainty and inherent randomness.

With the tension between the two kinds of uncertainty in mind, one can understand our work as approaching this distinction from a different angle. Rather than estimating or decomposing uncertainty explicitly, we embed it into the notion of multi-accuracy-on-classification (MAC), which penalizes *epistemic* uncertainty—when the model fails to separate different types in the data—while accepting *aleatoric* uncertainty as intrinsic. For instance, if all individuals in a group have Bayes-optimal scores of $1/2$, MAC tolerates rejecting them under a threshold-based rule. But if the group mixes type-0 and type-1 individuals and the model fails to distinguish them, MAC flags this as a failure of learning.

This contrasts with fairness notions like balance or equalized odds, which penalize even purely aleatoric deviations. In our framework, aleatoric uncertainty defines the baseline—we do not ask the model to outperform the inherent randomness of Nature, only to capture structure when it exists. In this way, our approach captures the epistemic/aleatoric distinction implicitly, by requiring consistency with the Bayes-optimal predictor, and without relying on multiple labels per instance.

Evidence-Based Rankings. Dwork et al. [DKR⁺19] study the problem of learning rankings from binary outcomes alone, without access to individual probabilities. Their framework defines a ranking as a real-valued function over the domain \mathcal{X} , consistent with our formulation up to the fact that their range is continuous (i.e., $[0, 1]$), whereas we focus on coarse, discrete rankings (i.e., $[k]$). Additionally, our definitions are extended to allow probabilistic outputs, i.e., distributions over ranks. In their setup, the quality of a learned ranking is evaluated indirectly: rather than comparing it to a ground-truth ranking, as in our case, they assess the ranking through the best predictor it can induce. They propose two formal criteria: *evidence-consistency* and *domination-compatibility*, where the former is strictly stronger than the latter. Since their assumptions are more restrictive (due to limited supervision), the corresponding guarantees are also weaker: our notion of coordinate-wise-multi-accuracy (which assumes access to individual ranks) strictly implies evidence-consistency.

Multi-Class Calibration. Traditional calibration methods, such as canonical (or distribution) calibration, require predicted label probabilities to match the true label distribution among instances with the same prediction. This aligns with our definition of full-multi-calibration (Definition 2.8) and is often infeasible in multi-class settings due to exponential sample complexity in the number of labels. To address this, Zhao et al. [ZKS⁺21] propose *decision calibration*, which ensures that predicted and true distributions are indistinguishable to decision-makers with a bounded number of actions. Their recalibration algorithm runs with sample complexity polynomial in both the number of actions and labels. Gopalan et al. [GHR24] strengthen this by introducing *projected smooth calibration*, which guarantees robustness for all binary classification tasks of the form “Is the label in a subset $T \subseteq \mathcal{T}$?”, and achieves it efficiently in both time and samples. Our work also supports downstream binary tasks, but focuses on structured variants of multi-calibration and multi-accuracy, such as threshold- and coordinate-wise-multi-calibration. Unlike these works, our emphasis is not on efficient recalibration per se, but rather on characterizing which types of decision or classification guarantees can be achieved efficiently, and under what assumptions.

2 Preliminaries

We model Nature as a joint distribution over individuals and labels, denoted by \mathcal{D} . Individuals are drawn from a discrete domain \mathcal{X} ; throughout, we assume that each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ can be represented as a Boolean string $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, which encodes the features of the individual. For simplicity, we write $n = \log |\mathcal{X}|$ to mean $n = \lceil \log |\mathcal{X}| \rceil$. We use $x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$ to denote a sample from Nature’s marginal distribution over individuals.

The labels are drawn from an abstract outcome space \mathcal{T} , which is assumed to be finite, i.e., $k := |\mathcal{T}| < \infty$. We refer to elements of \mathcal{T} as *types*. Distributions over \mathcal{T} are represented using stochastic vectors, denoted by $\mathcal{Y} \in \Delta(\mathcal{T})$, where $\Delta(\mathcal{T})$ is the set of all discrete probability distributions over \mathcal{T} . The following definition formalizes \mathcal{Y} .

Definition 2.1 (Stochastic Vectors). *Let \mathcal{T} be a finite outcome space of size $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The set of k -dimensional stochastic vectors is defined as*

$$\mathcal{Y} := \left\{ y \in [0, 1]^k \text{ such that } \sum_{i=1}^k y_i = 1 \right\}.$$

The probability of sampling $t \in \mathcal{T}$ from $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ is given by its t^{th} coordinate, y_t . We denote this by $t \sim y$. If \mathcal{T} admits a total order, we assume that this order determines the coordinate indexing.

We define $R^* : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ as the predictor induced by Nature. If Nature is deterministic, then R^* outputs a unit vector in \mathcal{Y} , corresponding to a one-hot encoding. We denote the t^{th} unit vector by e_t . Overall, we express Nature’s joint distribution as

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \times R^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}).$$

The primary objects of study in this work are *probabilistic predictors*,

$$\tilde{R} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y},$$

which are intended to approximate R^* .

For a predictor R , we use $R(x) \in \mathcal{Y}$ to denote its estimated distribution for an individual x . A random label sampled according to this distribution is denoted by $t(x) \sim R(x)$. We assume that each sample from R is drawn independently. The predictor R is said to be deterministic if, for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, it outputs only unit vectors.

Throughout this work, we evaluate notions of group fairness, which are parameterized by a collection of sets $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$. Each subset $S \in \mathcal{C}$ is referred to as a *subpopulation* or a *group*.

Probabilistic Predictors for a Deterministic Nature. The study of probabilistic predictors is well-motivated even when Nature is entirely deterministic. Consider the following example: a subpopulation $S \in \mathcal{C}$ consists of two disjoint groups, $S = S_1 \cup S_2$, where $|S_1| = |S_2| = \frac{1}{2}|S|$, such that $S \in \mathcal{C}$ but S_1 and S_2 are computationally indistinguishable from each other (in particular, $S_1, S_2 \notin \mathcal{C}$). Suppose that the ground truth predictor R^* assigns label t to all individuals in S_1 and label t' to all individuals in S_2 .

A *deterministic* predictor \tilde{R} , which outputs only unit vectors, cannot achieve better accuracy or calibration than simply selecting a (pseudo-)random subset of S of half its size to assign label t , while

assigning label t' to the remaining individuals. However, if this predictor were used repeatedly—for instance, by multiple universities in their admission processes—the same individuals would consistently receive the same label, potentially leading to systematic unfairness.

In contrast, a *probabilistic* predictor \tilde{R} could assign label t or t' to each individual with equal probability (i.e., $1/2$). As a result, each application of \tilde{R} would yield different labels for the same individuals, ensuring that unfair outcomes do not persist across multiple usages.

2.1 Multi-Accuracy

Multi-Accuracy for (deterministic) predictors [HKRR18, TTV09], requires a predictor to be accurate across multiple subpopulations of the domain. The goal is to ensure that a predictor’s expected output is unbiased with respect to Nature, not just globally but also on structured subpopulations. Multi-accuracy is parameterized by a class of subpopulations \mathcal{C} , which controls the strength of the guarantee: the richer the class, the stronger the requirement. The following definition extends this notion to the probabilistic setting and requires approximate accuracy on each label in \mathcal{T} individually. We therefore refer to it as *coordinate-wise* multi-accuracy.

Definition 2.2 (Coordinate-Wise-Multi-Accuracy for Probabilistic Predictors). *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ be a collection of sets. For any error parameter $\alpha \geq 0$, we say that \tilde{R} satisfies (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accuracy w.r.t. \mathcal{D} if for all $S \in \mathcal{C}$ and all $t \in \mathcal{T}$,*

$$\left| \Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)}} [t^*(x) = t \wedge x \in S] - \Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ \tilde{t}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)}} [\tilde{t}(x) = t \wedge x \in S] \right| \leq \alpha.$$

For the special case where \mathcal{T} is an ordered set, we introduce an alternative (and stronger) definition called threshold-multi-accuracy. We denote $\mathcal{T} = [k]$ and interpret it as a set of ranks. Note that we refer to 1 as the best rank and to k as the worst. To distinguish between sampling a rank and a type, we use the notation $r(x) \sim R(x)$ instead of $t(x) \sim R(x)$. When Nature is deterministic, we often denote it by r^* and assume that it outputs a rank directly rather than a unit vector. In Appendix A.1.1, we provide a detailed discussion on the relationship between different definitions for this special case.

Definition 2.3 (Threshold-Multi-Accuracy for Probabilistic Rankings). *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ be a collection of sets. For any error parameter $\alpha \geq 0$, we say that \tilde{R} satisfies (\mathcal{C}, α) -threshold-multi-accuracy w.r.t. \mathcal{D} if for every $S \in \mathcal{C}$ and every $\tau \in [k]$,*

$$\left| \Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ r^*(x) \sim R^*(x)}} [r^*(x) > \tau \wedge x \in S] - \Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ \tilde{r}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)}} [\tilde{r}(x) > \tau \wedge x \in S] \right| \leq \alpha.$$

Remark 2.4. *In Definition 2.3, we define multi-accuracy with respect to threshold events of the form $\{r(x) > \tau\}$. However, both this threshold condition and the coordinate-wise condition in Definition 2.2 can be generalized to arbitrary subsets of labels, without increasing the complexity of learning. This can be useful in cases a loss function is known in advance. See Remark 3.5 for further discussion of the implications for error bounds and runtime.*

In Appendix A.1.1 we discuss the relationship between threshold-multi-accuracy and coordinate-wise-multi-accuracy. In particular, Claim A.4 and Claim A.5 prove that the threshold definition is strictly stronger.

Next, we show that accuracy on a set implies accuracy on any large enough subset of it. The claim applies to both multi-accuracy definitions presented above; however, for concreteness, we state it in terms of coordinate-wise-multi-accuracy for types (Definition 2.2). Its proof appears in Appendix A.1.

Claim 2.5. *Let S, S' be two sets such that $S' \subseteq S$. If \tilde{R} is α -coordinate-wise-accurate w.r.t. \mathcal{D} on S , then it is α' -coordinate-wise-accurate w.r.t. \mathcal{D} on S' , where $\alpha' = \alpha + \Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_X} [x \in S \setminus S']$.*

Finally, we show that these notions can be learned efficiently. [HKRR18] demonstrated a connection between learning multi-accurate and multi-calibrated predictors and weak agnostic learning over the collection \mathcal{C} . In particular, this suggests that structural properties of \mathcal{C} can be exploited, if present. Following their approach, we show that efficient weak agnostic learning over \mathcal{C} implies efficient learning of multi-accurate and multi-calibrated (k -dimensional) predictors on \mathcal{C} .

Theorem 2.6 (Theorem A.7, simplified). *If there is a weak agnostic learner for \mathcal{C} that runs in time T , then there is an algorithm for learning (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accurate probabilistic predictor \tilde{R} that runs in time $\tilde{O}(k \cdot T/\alpha^6)$ and uses $\tilde{O}(1/\alpha^2)$ samples.*

As noted in Theorem A.7, these complexity bounds also apply to learning threshold-multi-accuracy probabilistic rankings. We refer the reader to Appendix A.1.2 for full details.

2.2 Multi-Calibration

Next, we define Multi-Calibration, a natural strengthening of Multi-Accuracy. While calibration remains meaningful even when allowing arbitrary predictions $\tilde{R}(x) \in \mathcal{Y}$, computational feasibility in our constructions necessitates maintaining a certain level of discretization. Formally, we introduce the following definition of λ -discretization of the $[0, 1]$ interval.

Definition 2.7 (λ -discretization). *Let $\lambda > 0$. The λ -discretization of $[0, 1]$, denoted by $\Lambda[0, 1] = \{\frac{\lambda}{2}, \frac{3\lambda}{2}, \dots, 1 - \frac{\lambda}{2}\}$, is the set of $1/\lambda$ evenly spaced real values over $[0, 1]$. For $v \in \Lambda[0, 1]$, let*

$$\lambda(v) = [v - \lambda/2, v + \lambda/2)$$

be the λ -interval centered around v (except for the final interval, which is $[1 - \lambda, 1]$).

To define the values on which we condition to measure approximate calibration, akin to the “level sets” in [HKRR18], we consider two approaches. The first approach conditions on all possible λ -discretized outputs of the predictor, and is therefore referred to as *full*-multi-calibration.

Definition 2.8 (Full-Multi-Calibration for Probabilistic Predictors). *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ be a collection of sets and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ a discretization parameter. For any set $S \in \mathcal{C}$ and any λ -discretized vector $R \in (\Lambda[0, 1])^k$, we define S_R w.r.t. $\tilde{R} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ as:*

$$S_R = \left\{ x \in S \text{ such that } \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \Pr_{\tilde{t}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)} [\tilde{t}(x) = t] \in \lambda(R_t) \right\}.$$

For any error parameter $\alpha \geq 0$, we say that \tilde{R} satisfies $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha, \lambda)$ -full-multi-calibration w.r.t. \mathcal{D} if for all S_R and all $t \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\left| \Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)}} [t^*(x) = t \wedge x \in S_R] - \Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ \tilde{t}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)}} [\tilde{t}(x) = t \wedge x \in S_R] \right| \leq \alpha.$$

The number of sets to consider is exponential in k , i.e., $|(S_R)_{R \in (\Lambda[0,1])^k}| = (\frac{1}{\lambda})^k$, which for some settings of the parameters could be computationally infeasible. For this reason, we deploy relaxed notions of multi-calibration when they are sufficient. We propose a relaxed definition where approximate calibration is measured after sampling a label from the probabilistic predictor, hence the number of sets to consider is $|(S_{\tau,\beta})_{\tau \in [k-1], \beta \in \Lambda[0,1]}| \leq k/\lambda$, which admits an efficient learning procedure as described in Theorem A.8.

Beyond serving as a natural relaxation of full-multi-calibration, that allows for efficient computation, this notion is used in our first negative result (Theorem 4.1). Notably, it strengthens the impossibility result by demonstrating it with respect to this relaxed notion rather than full-multi-calibration.

Definition 2.9 (Coordinate-Wise-Multi-Calibration for Probabilistic Predictors). *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ be a collection of sets and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ a discretization parameter. For any set $S \in \mathcal{C}$, label $t \in \mathcal{T}$, and discretized probability $\beta \in \Lambda[0, 1]$, define $S_{t,\beta}$ w.r.t. $\tilde{R} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ as:*

$$S_{t,\beta} := \left\{ x \in S \text{ such that } \Pr_{\tilde{t}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)} [\tilde{t}(x) = t] \in \lambda(\beta) \right\}.$$

For any error parameter $\alpha \geq 0$, we say that \tilde{R} satisfies $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha, \lambda)$ -coordinate-wise-multi-calibration w.r.t. \mathcal{D} if for all $S_{t,\beta}$ and all $t \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\left| \Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)}} [t^*(x) = t \wedge x \in S_{t,\beta}] - \Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ \tilde{t}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)}} [\tilde{t}(x) = t \wedge x \in S_{t,\beta}] \right| \leq \alpha.$$

The following claim establishes that coordinate-wise-multi-calibration (and, in particular, full multi-calibration) is a stronger requirement than coordinate-wise-multi-accuracy. The proof applies to both the coordinate-wise and threshold-based definitions and is presented in the coordinate-wise setting for concreteness.

Claim 2.10 (Coordinate-Wise-Multi-Calibration Implies Coordinate-Wise-Multi-Accuracy). *In the setting of Definition 2.9, if \tilde{R} is $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha, \lambda)$ -coordinate-wise-multi-calibrated, then \tilde{R} is also (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accurate.*

To illustrate the motivation for Multi-Calibration, consider again the example where $S = S_1 \cup S_2$, with S_1, S_2 indistinguishable and Nature defined such that $R^*(x) = t$ for all $x \in S_1$ and $R^*(x) = t'$ for all $x \in S_2$. Compare two predictors: (1) \tilde{R}_1 : assigns t' to all $x \in S_1$ and t to all $x \in S_2$. (2) \tilde{R}_2 : for all $x \in S$,

$$\tilde{R}_2(x) = \begin{cases} t & \text{w.p. } 1/2, \\ t' & \text{w.p. } 1/2. \end{cases}$$

The predictor \tilde{R}_2 satisfies perfect coordinate-wise-multi-calibration on S (that is, with error $\alpha = 0$), and even perfect full-multi-calibration (and thus perfect coordinate-wise-multi-accuracy), whereas \tilde{R}_1 has a coordinate-wise-multi-calibration error of $1/2$ on S , despite being perfectly coordinate-wise-multi-accurate. This example illustrates that while coordinate-wise-multi-accuracy ensures unbiased predictions over subpopulations, only multi-calibration prevents systematic misallocation of probabilities, ensuring that predicted distributions align with the true conditional distributions.

We conclude this section by showing that coordinate-wise-multi-calibration can be learned efficiently. As in Theorem 2.6, we formulate this in terms of weak agnostic learning over \mathcal{C} .

Theorem 2.11 (Theorem A.8, simplified). *If there is a weak agnostic learner for \mathcal{C} that runs in time T , then there is an algorithm for learning $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha, \lambda)$ -coordinate-wise multi-calibrated probabilistic predictor \tilde{R} that runs in time $\tilde{O}(k \cdot T / (\lambda \alpha^6))$ and uses $\tilde{O}(1/\alpha^4)$ samples.*

2.3 Decision Rules

The following definitions and claims consider a randomized predicate $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, which we later refer to as a *decision rule*.

Definition 2.12 (Lipschitz). *Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^+$ be a positive constant. A randomized predicate $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is called M -Lipschitz if $\forall y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}$,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_f [f(y) - f(y')] \right| \leq M \cdot \|y - y'\|_\infty.$$

Definition 2.13 (ε -Close to Affine). *Let $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$. A randomized predicate $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is called ε -close to affine if for any $y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ and any $\gamma \in [0, 1]$,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_f [f(\gamma y + (1 - \gamma)y')] - \left(\gamma \mathbb{E}_f [f(y)] + (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_f [f(y')] \right) \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

A predicate is affine if it is 0-close to affine, and it is ε -far from affine if it is not ε -close to affine. The following claim shows that the definition with two points (Definition 2.13) suffices to ensure that the inequality holds with any number of points, with an increase of at most a factor of 2. The proof of the claim and its corollary can be found in Appendix A.2.

Claim 2.14. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m \in [0, 1]$ s.t. $\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i = 1$, and $y_1, \dots, y_m \in \mathcal{Y}$. Let $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ and assume that $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is ε -close to affine. Then,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_f \left[f \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i y_i \right) \right] - \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i \mathbb{E}_f [f(y_i)] \right| \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

Corollary 2.15. *If $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is ε -close to affine, then there exists an affine randomized predicate $f' : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that $\forall y \in \mathcal{Y}$,*

$$|\mathbb{E}_f [f(y)] - \mathbb{E}_{f'} [f'(y)]| \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

The following claim shows that for a Lipschitz predicate, any two points that violate its affinity must be sufficiently separated. Its proof can be found in Appendix A.2 as well.

Claim 2.16. Let $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ and $M \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Let $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a randomized predicate such that:

- f is M -Lipschitz;
- f is ε -far from affine: that is, there exists $y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_f [f(\gamma y + (1 - \gamma)y')] - \left(\gamma \mathbb{E}_f [f(y)] + (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_f [f(y')] \right) \right| > \varepsilon.$$

Then, $\|y - y'\|_\infty \geq \varepsilon/M$.

2.4 Indistinguishability

The impossibility results (Theorems 4.1 and 5.1) rely on the existence of an indistinguishable subset with respect to the uniform distribution. We present two methods for constructing such a subset: one based on cryptographic assumptions, specifically the existence of one-way functions, and another that is information-theoretic, applicable when no limitation is placed on the complexity of Nature. We begin with a formal definition of indistinguishability.

Definition 2.17 (Indistinguishable Subset). Let \mathcal{X} be a domain and let $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{X}$ be a distribution. For a security parameter $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$, we say that $\emptyset \subsetneq \mathcal{X}_1 \subsetneq \mathcal{X}$ is a κ -indistinguishable subset if for any $x \sim \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{X}$, membership in \mathcal{X}_1 is not efficiently decidable (w.r.t. κ). That is, for every probabilistic $\text{poly}(\kappa)$ -time algorithm \mathcal{A} and all sufficiently large κ ,

$$\left| \Pr_{\mathcal{A}, x \sim \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{X}} [\mathcal{A}(x) = 1 \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_1] - \Pr_{\mathcal{A}, x \sim \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{X}} [\mathcal{A}(x) = 1 \mid x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_1] \right| = \text{neg}(\kappa).$$

Note that the probabilities are well-defined (i.e., we do not condition on an event of probability zero), since the definition requires \mathcal{X}_1 to be a non-empty proper subset. Indeed, both the empty set and the entire universe \mathcal{X} are never indistinguishable.

Cryptographic Approach. In what follows, we show how to use cryptographic assumptions to construct an indistinguishable subset of a given size. In particular, we assume the existence of one-way functions (OWFs), often regarded as the “minimal” assumption in cryptography. The construction of the subset is computationally efficient; however, under the assumption that OWFs exist, determining membership in the subset is computationally infeasible. The proof is deferred to Appendix A.3.

Lemma 2.18. Let \mathcal{X} be a domain, and let $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$ denote the uniform distribution over \mathcal{X} . Assume one-way functions exist w.r.t. security parameter $\kappa \geq \log |\mathcal{X}|$. For any constant $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, there exists a subset $\mathcal{X}_1 \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that

- $|\Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}} [x \in \mathcal{X}_1] - \gamma| = \text{neg}(\kappa)$;
- \mathcal{X}_1 is κ -indistinguishable w.r.t. $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$;
- There exists a secret key such that, given the key, membership in \mathcal{X}_1 is efficiently computable.

Information-Theoretic Approach. The alternative approach we present is information-theoretic. If we do not impose any computational constraints on the way we model Nature, then determining membership in a subset defined by this circuit can be computationally infeasible. In particular, if Nature is sufficiently “complex” to resemble a random function, it may inherently contain an indistinguishable subset.

We emphasize that this perspective does not require Nature to be a complex function that runs in superpolynomial time; rather, it reflects that, given our *partial view* of the feature set defining an individual, Nature appears indistinguishable from a random function. It remains entirely possible that, with access to the *full* set of features, Nature could still be computed efficiently.

In this setting as well, for any constant $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we can assume the existence of a Nature that admits an indistinguishable subset of size γ , up to a negligible rounding error (arising from the chosen binary representation of individuals).

The following claim applies in both settings, when considering the uniform distribution over the domain \mathcal{X} . Its proof is deferred to Appendix A.3 as well.

Claim 2.19. *Let \mathcal{X} be a domain, and let $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ denote the uniform distribution over \mathcal{X} . Assume \mathcal{X} contains a κ -indistinguishable subset \mathcal{X}_1 as per Definition 2.17 w.r.t. a security parameter $\kappa \geq \log |\mathcal{X}|$. For any $\text{poly}(\kappa)$ -time algorithm $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, if $\Pr[\mathcal{A}(x) = 1]$ is non-negligible in κ , then*

$$\left| \Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ \mathcal{A} \text{ coins}}} [x \in \mathcal{X}_1 | \mathcal{A}(x) = 1] - \Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \mathcal{X}_1] \right| = \text{neg}(\kappa).$$

Notice that an immediate corollary of the claim shows that any efficiently-recognizable subset $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ of non-negligible size intersects an indistinguishable subset $\mathcal{X}_1 \subsetneq \mathcal{X}$ in approximately the same fraction as \mathcal{X} does. This follows by interpreting \mathcal{A} as a (deterministic) procedure that decides membership in a set $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$.

3 Translating Accuracy of Predictions to Accuracy of Classifications

We now turn to the study of decision rules, also known as post-processing functions. A typical approach to decision-making is to approximate R^* by an efficient predictor \tilde{R} and then apply a decision rule to \tilde{R} in the same manner that one would apply it to R^* . For a collection of sets \mathcal{C} , we define *multi-accuracy-on-decision* to mean that for any set $S \in \mathcal{C}$, members of S receive the same distribution of classifications when the decision rule is applied to \tilde{R} as they would when it is applied to R^* . Formally, a decision rule $\rho : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ takes as input a distribution over labels and outputs either 0 or 1, potentially in a randomized manner. Any randomized predicate, as defined above, can serve as a (randomized) decision rule.

Definition 3.1 (Multi-Accuracy-on-Decision). *For a collection of sets $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$, a probabilistic predictor $\tilde{R} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ satisfies $(\mathcal{C}, \varepsilon)$ -multi-accuracy-on-decision w.r.t. \mathcal{D} and ρ if for all $S \in \mathcal{C}$,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}, \rho}} [\rho(\tilde{R}(x)) | x \in S] - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}, \rho}} [\rho(R^*(x)) | x \in S] \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Characterization of Affine Decision Rules. Before stating the result, we present an alternative characterization of affine decision rules: those that first sample a label and then apply a function that (randomly) maps the label to a decision in $\{0, 1\}$. This characterization will be useful in the proof of Theorem 3.4.

Definition 3.2. A randomized decision rule $\rho : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is called an *Instantiate-Then-Act rule* if there exists a randomized function $g : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that ρ works as follows: On input $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, it samples $t \sim y$ and outputs $g(t)$.

Lemma 3.3. *Instantiate-Then-Act (ITA) rules are equivalent to Affine rules (Definition 2.13).*

Proof. First, we show that affineness implies ITA. Let $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be an affine rule. By Claim 2.14, for any $z_1, \dots, z_k \in \mathcal{Y}$ and any $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \in [0, 1]$,

$$\mathbb{E}_f \left[f \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i z_i \right) \right] = \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i \mathbb{E}_f [f(z_i)].$$

We define $g : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ as follows: for any $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $g(t)$ is distributed like $f(e_t)$ where e_t is the t^{th} unit vector. Notice that, defining $\rho : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that on input y it samples $t \sim y$ and outputs $g(t)$, we get that

$$\Pr_{\rho}[\rho(y) = 1] = \mathbb{E}_{t \sim y} [g(t)] = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \Pr_y[t = t'] \mathbb{E} [g(t)] = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y_t \mathbb{E} [g(t)] = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y_t \mathbb{E} [f(e_t)]$$

and on the other hand,

$$\Pr_f[f(y) = 1] = \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y_t e_t \right) \right] = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y_t \mathbb{E} [f(e_t)].$$

Hence, f and ρ are identically distributed. Next, we show that ITA implies affineness. Let $g : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and let ρ be as in Definition 3.2. We define f as a random variable following a $\text{Ber}(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}[g(t)])$ distribution. It follows directly that f and ρ are identically distributed. To see that ρ is affine, let $y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [f(\gamma y + (1 - \gamma)y')] &= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (\gamma y_t + (1 - \gamma)y'_t) \mathbb{E}[g(t)] \\ &= \gamma \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y_t \mathbb{E}[g(t)] + (1 - \gamma) \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y'_t \mathbb{E}[g(t)] \\ &= \gamma \mathbb{E} [f(y)] + (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E} [f(y')], \end{aligned}$$

and the lemma follows. \square

The following theorem shows that a coordinate-wise-multi-accurate (coordinate-wise-MA) predictor, as defined in Definition 2.2, implies multi-accuracy-on-decision (MAD) with respect to any decision rule that is close to affine.

Theorem 3.4 (coordinate-wise-MA implies MAD). *Fix $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ and let $\delta := \Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}}[x \in S]$. Let $\rho : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a decision rule that is ε -close to affine. If a predictor \tilde{R} is (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accurate w.r.t. \mathcal{D} , then it is $(\mathcal{C}, \varepsilon')$ -multi-accurate-on-decision w.r.t. \mathcal{D} and ρ , where $\varepsilon' \leq k\alpha/\delta + 2\varepsilon$.*

Furthermore, if \mathcal{T} is an ordered set, \tilde{R} is (\mathcal{C}, α) -threshold-multi-accurate and ρ is deterministic and monotone on unit vectors, then $\varepsilon' \leq \alpha/\delta + 2\varepsilon$.

Proof. By Corollary 2.15, there exists an affine decision rule ρ' such that $\forall y \in \mathcal{Y}$,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\rho'}[\rho'(y)] - \mathbb{E}_{\rho}[\rho(y)] \right| \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

Since ρ' is affine, Lemma 3.3 implies that it can also be viewed as an Instantiate-Then-Act (ITA) rule. That is, there exists a randomized function $g : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that ρ' works as follows: On input $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, it samples $t \sim y$ and outputs $g(t)$. This implies that, for any $S \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}, \rho'} \left[\rho'(\tilde{R}(x)) \mid x \in S \right] - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}, \rho'} \left[\rho'(R^*(x)) \mid x \in S \right] \right| = \\ & \left| \mathbb{E}_{x, \tilde{t}(x), g} \left[g(\tilde{t}(x)) \mid x \in S \right] - \mathbb{E}_{x, t^*(x), g} \left[g(t^*(x)) \mid x \in S \right] \right| = \\ & \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \left(\Pr_{x, \tilde{t}(x)} [\tilde{t}(x) = t \mid x \in S] - \Pr_{x, t^*(x)} [t^*(x) = t \mid x \in S] \right) \mathbb{E}_g[g(t)] \leq \\ & \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \left| \Pr_{x, \tilde{t}(x)} [\tilde{t}(x) = t \mid x \in S] - \Pr_{x, t^*(x)} [t^*(x) = t \mid x \in S] \right| \leq \frac{k\alpha}{\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

This means that

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\rho(\tilde{R}(x)) \mid x \in S \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\rho(R^*(x)) \mid x \in S \right] \right| \leq \frac{k\alpha}{\delta} + 2\varepsilon.$$

For the furthermore part, without loss of generality let us assume that $\mathcal{T} = [k]$. By the assumption, ρ is deterministic and monotone on unit vectors. Notice that ρ' as defined in Corollary 2.15 coincides with ρ on unit vectors. On the other hand, expressing ρ' as an ITA rule, ρ' also coincides with g on unit vectors, meaning that for all $\tau \in [k]$,

$$g(\tau) = \rho(e_{\tau}).$$

This implies that g is both deterministic and monotone on unit vectors, i.e.,

$$\forall \tau \in [k], \mathbb{E}_g g(\tau) \in \{0, 1\} \text{ and } \forall \tau_1 < \tau_2, g(\tau_1) \geq g(\tau_2). \quad (1)$$

Therefore, g can be interpreted as a threshold function, meaning there exists $\bar{\tau} \in [k]$ such that⁵

$$g(\tau) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \tau \leq \bar{\tau}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

⁵This does not cover the case where $\rho' \equiv 0$, but in that case, the argument follows trivially.

Hence, in this case, MAD translates to

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{x, \tilde{r}(x), g} [g(\tilde{r}(x)) \mid x \in S] - \mathbb{E}_{x, r^*(x), g} [g(r^*(x)) \mid x \in S] \right| = \left| \Pr_{x, \tilde{r}(x)} [\tilde{r}(x) \leq \bar{\tau} \mid x \in S] - \Pr_{x, r^*(x)} [r^*(x) \leq \bar{\tau} \mid x \in S] \right|,$$

which removes the k multiplicative blowup, if \tilde{R} is threshold-multi-accurate according to Definition 2.3. Importantly, as noted in Section 2.1, threshold-multi-accuracy can be achieved with the same sample and time complexity as coordinate-wise multi-accuracy, despite being a mathematically weaker notion. \square

Remark 3.5. *As mentioned in Remark 2.4, multi-accuracy can alternatively be required with respect to a subset or a collection of subsets of labels. Referring back to Equation (1), such definitions correspond to deterministic functions g (i.e., functions that output either 0 or 1 for each label). As in the threshold-based case, this eliminates the multiplicative factor of k in the error bound.*

Next, we define Multi-Accuracy for Classification. To this end, we first formally define loss minimization for an action function. An action function is a randomized mapping $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ that assigns individuals to either 0 or 1, which can be interpreted as “accepted” or “rejected.” An action function *may* be constructed via a decision rule composed with a predictor, but it can also be defined directly. More generally, decision functions or classifiers may have more than two possible actions, but we restrict attention to the binary case for simplicity.

Definition 3.6 (Loss Minimization). *Let $\ell : \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a loss function, and let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \{\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}\}$ be a class of action functions. For $\varepsilon \geq 0$, an action function h is said to be $(\mathcal{H}, \ell, \varepsilon)$ -loss-minimizing if*

$$\forall h' \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ h \text{ coins} \\ t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)}} [\ell(t^*(x), h(x))] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ h' \text{ coins} \\ t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)}} [\ell(t^*(x), h'(x))] + \varepsilon.$$

We denote the expected loss of h over \mathcal{D} by $\text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(h)$. Any loss function induces a loss-minimizing decision rule, which we formally define as follows:

Definition 3.7 (Loss-Minimizing Decision Rule). *Let $\ell : \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a loss function. The loss-minimizing decision rule $\rho_{\ell}^* : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ with respect to ℓ is defined as*

$$\rho_{\ell}^*(y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathbb{E}_{t \sim y} [\ell(t, 1) - \ell(t, 0)] < 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Equivalently, we can express this as

$$\rho_{\ell}^*(y) = \arg \min_{a \in \{0, 1\}} \mathbb{E}_{t \sim y} [\ell(t, a)],$$

where ties—cases in which the expected losses for acceptance and rejection are equal—are broken in favor of rejection. Notice that this decision rule is deterministic, and independent of \mathcal{D} . We additionally define the loss-minimizing action function, which is obtained by applying the loss-minimizing decision rule to Nature’s predictor. This action function achieves the minimum possible

loss compared to any other action function. In fact, this motivates our definition of the loss-minimizing decision rule: it makes optimal decisions under the assumption that Nature's predictor provides the true underlying probabilities.

Definition 3.8 (Loss-Minimizing Action Function). *Let $\rho_\ell^* : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be as in Definition 3.7. The loss-minimizing action function $h_\ell^* : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ w.r.t. ℓ is defined as*

$$h_\ell^* = \rho_\ell^* \circ R^*.$$

Note that h_ℓ^* is deterministic as well. The following fairness criterion measures the accuracy of representation across different subpopulations *after classification*. We say that an action function h is Accurate-on-Classification if the fraction of individuals accepted according to h is close to the fraction accepted by h_ℓ^* . We formally define this measure in the general multi-group setting.

Definition 3.9 (Multi-Accuracy-on-Classification). *Let $\ell : \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a loss function, and let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ be a collection of sets. We say that $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is $(\mathcal{C}, \ell, \varepsilon)$ -multi-accurate-on-classification w.r.t. \mathcal{D} and ℓ if for all $S \in \mathcal{C}$,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{X} \\ h \text{ coins}}} [h(x) \mid x \in S] - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{X}} [h_\ell^*(x) \mid x \in S] \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

We remark that one could define Multi-Accuracy-on-Classification (MAC) with respect to an arbitrary decision rule ρ^* instead of ρ_ℓ^* , by requiring that the fraction of individuals accepted according to h is close to the fraction accepted by $\rho^* \circ R^*$. Achieving MAC under this alternative definition can be done using the same argument presented next in Corollary 3.10.

We now show that MAC action functions can be obtained efficiently. As a corollary of Theorem 3.4, we define an affine decision rule and show that composing it with any multi-accurate predictor yields a MAC action function. In particular, this implies that a single predictor can simultaneously satisfy multi-accuracy-on-decisions (MAD) with respect to a decision rule, and satisfy MAC when composed with that rule. As shown in the following corollary, the rule we define can be viewed as an affine analogue of the loss-minimizing decision rule.

Notice that this corollary holds only when Nature is deterministic, i.e., R^* outputs unit vectors for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$. See Remark 3.13 for more details on this point.

Corollary 3.10 (coordinate-wise-MA implies MAC). *Let ℓ be a loss function and assume R^* is deterministic. In the setting of Theorem 3.4, there exists a decision rule ρ such that for any (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accurate predictor \tilde{R} , the action function $h = \rho \circ \tilde{R}$ is $(\mathcal{C}, \ell, \varepsilon)$ -multi-accurate-on-classification for $\varepsilon \leq k\alpha/\delta$.*

Proof. We define the function $g : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ as follows:

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad g(t) = \rho_\ell^*(e_t) = \arg \min_{a \in \{0, 1\}} \{\ell(t, a)\},$$

where e_t is the t^{th} unit vector. Let $\rho : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be defined as an ITA rule (Definition 3.2) w.r.t. g , that is: on input $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, it samples $t \sim y$ and outputs $g(t)$. Since ρ is affine, then Theorem 3.4 implies that \tilde{R} is $(\mathcal{C}, \varepsilon)$ -MAD w.r.t. \mathcal{D} and ρ , where $\varepsilon \leq k\alpha/\delta$. That is, for any $S \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}, \rho}} [\rho(\tilde{R}(x)) \mid x \in S] - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}, \rho}} [\rho(R^*(x)) \mid x \in S] \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

On the other hand, since Nature is deterministic, it holds for any $x \in S$ that

$$\rho(R^*(x)) = \rho_\ell^*(R^*(x)) = h_\ell^*(x).$$

Putting it together,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}, \rho}} [h(x) \mid x \in S] - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}, \rho}} [h_\ell^*(x) \mid x \in S] \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Once again, if the definition of multi-accuracy implies ε -MAD w.r.t. \mathcal{D} and ρ with $\varepsilon \leq \alpha/\delta$, then h achieves $(\mathcal{C}, \ell, \varepsilon)$ -MAC with $\varepsilon \leq \alpha/\delta$ as well. \square

To conclude this section, we show that MAD can be obtained efficiently for *any* decision rule, not necessarily affine, under the same assumption that Nature is deterministic (see Remark 3.13 for further discussion). Compared with Theorem 3.4, this implies the following: in the deterministic setting, achieving MAD for an arbitrary decision rule reduces to the task of learning a multi-accurate predictor—a task we have already shown can be performed efficiently. In contrast, in the probabilistic setting, the uncertainty can be overcome only for affine rules.

To formally state this argument, we define a standard primitive known as *random instantiation*.

Definition 3.11 (Random Instantiation). *Let $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ denote the set of unit vectors over \mathcal{T} . Let $R : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a probabilistic predictor. A random instantiation of R is a function $r : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ defined by independently sampling $r(x) \sim R(x)$ for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and returning the corresponding unit vector. We denote this by $r \sim R$.*

The proof is straightforward and follows the same logic presented in Theorem 3.4. Notice that Remark 3.5 applies to Lemma 3.12 as well: the multiplicative factor of k in the error bound can be avoided by adopting a different variant of multi-accuracy, such as threshold-multi-accuracy or multi-accuracy with respect to a collection of label subsets.

Lemma 3.12 (Coordinate-Wise Multi-Accuracy Implies MAD for Any Rule). *Assume R^* is deterministic. In the setting of Theorem 3.4, for any decision rule ρ and any random instantiation $\tilde{r} \sim \tilde{R}$ of a (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accurate predictor \tilde{R} , the predictor \tilde{r} is $(\mathcal{C}, \varepsilon)$ -multi-accurate-on-decision with respect to \mathcal{D} and ρ , where $\varepsilon \leq k\alpha/\delta$.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{r} \sim \tilde{R}$ be a random instantiation of a (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accurate predictor \tilde{R} , and recall that $e_t \in \mathcal{E}$ denotes the t^{th} unit vector. Then, for any $S \in \mathcal{C}$ and any $t \in \mathcal{T}$, we can write

$$\left| \Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}} [R^*(x) = e_t \wedge x \in S] - \Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}} [\tilde{r}(x) = e_t \wedge x \in S] \right| \leq \alpha,$$

since R^* is deterministic. Hence, for any decision rule ρ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}, \rho}} [\rho(\tilde{r}(x)) \mid x \in S] - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}, \rho}} [\rho(R^*(x)) \mid x \in S] \right| = \\ & \left| \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \left(\Pr_x [\tilde{r}(x) = e_t \mid x \in S] - \Pr_x [R^*(x) = e_t \mid x \in S] \right) \mathbb{E}_\rho [\rho(e_t)] \right| \leq \\ & \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} |\Pr[\tilde{r}(x) = e_t \mid x \in S] - \Pr[R^*(x) = e_t \mid x \in S]| \leq \frac{k\alpha}{\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that the MAD error of \tilde{r} is at most $k\alpha/\delta$, and the lemma follows. \square

Remark 3.13 (Deterministic Nature.). *As discussed in the introduction, we consider rich set of labels that capture the uncertainty of Nature, such as values of the Bayes-optimal predictor, rather than binary outcomes. With such labels, it is appropriate to model Nature as deterministic. A randomized Nature with such rich labels poses a greater challenge than the standard agnostic learning model, and thus we cannot hope to achieve the strong fairness guarantees sought in this work unless Nature is assumed to be deterministic.*

4 When Accuracy of Predictions Contradicts Accuracy of Decisions

In this section, we present our first impossibility result. The following theorem establishes that if a decision rule is far from affine, then there exists a setting of Nature in which it is computationally infeasible to efficiently learn a predictor that is both calibrated and accurate-on-decision, even for a single set.

Notably, the calibration requirement used here follows the relaxed definition in Definition 2.9, thereby strengthening the result by relying on a weaker assumption. Moreover, in contrast to simplified approaches, our proof holds for any discretization parameter λ and avoids trivial bounds on the error parameters. See Remarks 4.5 and 4.6 for further discussion.

Then, in Section 4.1, we show that the loss-minimizing decision rule is far from affine. This implies that it may be computationally infeasible to learn a calibrated predictor that is accurate-on-decision with respect to the loss-minimizing decision rule.

Theorem 4.1 (Calibration and Accuracy-on-Decision Requires Affineness). *Assume one-way functions exist w.r.t. a security parameter $\kappa \geq \max \{ \log |\mathcal{X}|, O((M/\varepsilon)^2) \}$. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $M \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ be a discretization parameter satisfying $\lambda \leq 3\varepsilon/M$ and let $\alpha \geq 0$ be an error parameter such that $\alpha = O(\lambda^2 \varepsilon / kM)$.*

If $\rho : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is M -Lipschitz and ε -far from affine, then there exists \mathcal{D} such that there is no $\text{poly}(\kappa)$ -time learner that can output with non-negligible probability a predictor \tilde{R} which is both (α, λ) -coordinate-wise-calibrated w.r.t. \mathcal{D} and $\varepsilon/2$ -accurate-on-decision w.r.t. \mathcal{D} and ρ .

Proof. Let $\rho : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a randomized decision rule which is M -Lipschitz and ε -far from affine (see Definitions 2.12 and 2.13). This means that there exists $y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$|\mathbb{E} [\rho(\gamma y + (1 - \gamma)y')] - (\gamma \mathbb{E} [\rho(y)] + (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E} [\rho(y')])| > \varepsilon.$$

Let $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ denote the uniform distribution over \mathcal{X} . First, we perturb γ by adding uniformly random noise $\nu \sim \text{Uniform}[-\frac{M}{\varepsilon\kappa}, \frac{M}{\varepsilon\kappa}]$. Let

$$\gamma_{\nu} = \gamma + \nu, \tag{2}$$

Denote the perturbed version of γ . This “randomization” helps mitigate discretization issues when analyzing how R^* behaves on subsets defined by \tilde{R} . A more detailed discussion appears in Remark 4.5.

Under the assumption that one-way functions exist, Lemma 2.18 implies the existence of a subset $\mathcal{X}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ of size $|\mathcal{X}_1| = \gamma' |\mathcal{X}|$ for $|\gamma' - \gamma_{\nu}| = \text{neg}(\kappa)$, such that \mathcal{X}_1 is κ -indistinguishable w.r.t. $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ (see Definition 2.17) and Nature is efficiently computable. As discussed in Section 2.4, the assumption of one-way functions can be removed if no restriction is placed on the complexity of Nature. Taking $\mathcal{X}_2 := \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_1$,

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \cup \mathcal{X}_2.$$

We define Nature's predictor w.r.t. $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ as follows:

$$R^*|_{\mathcal{X}_1} \equiv y \text{ and } R^*|_{\mathcal{X}_2} \equiv y',$$

and define $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}, R^*(\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}))$. Towards contradiction, assume there exists a $\text{poly}(\kappa)$ -time learner \mathcal{L} , with access to labeled samples from \mathcal{D} , that outputs with non-negligible probability a probabilistic predictor which is both (α, λ) -coordinate-wise-calibrated w.r.t. \mathcal{D} (see Definition 2.9) and $\varepsilon/2$ -accurate-on-decision w.r.t. \mathcal{D} and ρ (see Definition 3.1). Take $\tilde{R} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ to denote this predictor. Let $(\mathcal{X}_{t,\beta})_{t \in \mathcal{T}, \beta \in \Lambda[0,1]}$ be the “level sets” as per the definition of coordinate-wise-calibration:

$$\mathcal{X}_{t,\beta} := \left\{ x \in S \text{ such that } \Pr_{\tilde{t}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)} [\tilde{t}(x) = t] \in \lambda(\beta) \right\}.$$

We stress that these sets are not necessarily disjoint, however, for a fixed t , they form a partition: $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_{t,\frac{\lambda}{2}} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{X}_{t,1-\frac{\lambda}{2}}$. First, we argue that calibration implies that for any label t , only one level set can be large.

Lemma 4.2. *For any $t \in \mathcal{T}$, with all but a negligible probability, there exists a unique $\beta_t^* \in \Lambda[0,1]$ for which $|\mathcal{X}_{t,\beta_t^*}| > \frac{2\alpha}{\lambda} |\mathcal{X}|$.*

Proof. Let $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\beta \in \Lambda[0,1]$ such that $|\mathcal{X}_{t,\beta}| > \frac{2\alpha}{\lambda}$. By (α, λ) -coordinate-wise-calibration of \tilde{R} ,

$$\left| \Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)}} [t^*(x) = t \wedge x \in \mathcal{X}_{t,\beta}] - \Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ \tilde{t}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)}} [\tilde{t}(x) = t \wedge x \in \mathcal{X}_{t,\beta}] \right| \leq \alpha,$$

which implies that

$$\left| \Pr [t^*(x) = t \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_{t,\beta}] - \Pr [\tilde{t}(x) = t \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_{t,\beta}] \right| \leq \frac{\alpha}{\Pr [x \in \mathcal{X}_{t,\beta}]} < \frac{\lambda}{2}. \quad (3)$$

We observe that the first term can be expressed in terms of y and y' . Taking y_t to denote the t^{th} coordinate of y ,

$$y_t = \Pr [t^*(x) = t \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_{t,\beta} \cap \mathcal{X}_1] \text{ and } y'_t = \Pr [t^*(x) = t \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_{t,\beta} \cap \mathcal{X}_2],$$

hence,

$$\Pr [t^*(x) = t \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_{t,\beta}] = y_t \cdot \frac{\Pr [\mathcal{X}_{t,\beta} \cap \mathcal{X}_1]}{\Pr [x \in \mathcal{X}_{t,\beta}]} + y'_t \cdot \frac{\Pr [\mathcal{X}_{t,\beta} \cap \mathcal{X}_2]}{\Pr [x \in \mathcal{X}_{t,\beta}]}. \quad (4)$$

Let us denote

$$\gamma_{t,\beta} := \frac{\Pr [\mathcal{X}_{t,\beta} \cap \mathcal{X}_1]}{\Pr [x \in \mathcal{X}_{t,\beta}]},$$

so we can rewrite the right-hand side of Equation (4) as $\gamma_{t,\beta} \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma_{t,\beta}) \cdot y'_t$.

Recall that the level sets are defined with respect to *discretized* probabilities. Even if, for a fixed β , the probabilities

$$\gamma' \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma') \cdot y'_t$$

and

$$\gamma_{t,\beta} \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma_{t,\beta}) \cdot y'_t$$

are very close, they may still be mapped to different λ -intervals by the discretization (see Definition 2.7). To prevent this, we introduced random noise to γ and defined R^* with respect to γ_ν (see Remark 4.5 for a detailed discussion). Consequently, γ' and $(\gamma_{t,\beta})_{\beta \in \Lambda[0,1]}$ are also random variables with respect to the noise ν .

Our goal is to show that $(\gamma_{t,\beta} \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma_{t,\beta}) \cdot y'_t)$ is independent of β —that is, although each β has a different $\gamma_{t,\beta}$, all these convex combinations are mapped to the same discretized value β_t^* to which $(\gamma' \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma') \cdot y'_t)$ is mapped. To this end, define

$$\gamma_{t,\max} = \arg \max_{\gamma_{t,\beta}, \beta \in \Lambda[0,1]} |(\gamma' \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma') \cdot y'_t) - (\gamma_{t,\beta} \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma_{t,\beta}) \cdot y'_t)|,$$

and let $\beta_t^* \in \Lambda[0,1]$ be such that

$$(\gamma' \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma') \cdot y'_t) \in \lambda(\beta_t^*).$$

We seek to bound the probability that the convex combination with respect to $\gamma_{t,\max}$ is not mapped to β_t^* .

Claim 4.3. $\Pr_\nu [(\gamma_{t,\max} \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma_{t,\max}) \cdot y'_t) \notin \lambda(\beta_t^*)] = \text{neg}(\kappa)$.

Proof. First, observe that for all β ,

$$|(\gamma' \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma') \cdot y'_t) - (\gamma_{t,\beta} \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma_{t,\beta}) \cdot y'_t)| \leq |\gamma_{t,\max} - \gamma'| = \text{neg}(\kappa),$$

where the last inequality follows from Claim 2.19. Similarly,

$$|(\gamma_\nu \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma_\nu) \cdot y'_t) - (\gamma' \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma') \cdot y'_t)| \leq |\gamma' - \gamma_\nu| = \text{neg}(\kappa).$$

Thus, combining both inequalities,

$$|(\gamma_\nu \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma_\nu) \cdot y'_t) - (\gamma_{t,\beta} \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma_{t,\beta}) \cdot y'_t)| = \text{neg}(\kappa).$$

This implies that the “bad” event occurs only if $(\gamma_\nu \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma_\nu) \cdot y'_t)$ is negligibly close to one of the values in $\Lambda[0,1] = \{\frac{\lambda}{2}, \frac{3\lambda}{2}, \dots, 1 - \frac{\lambda}{2}\}$. Applying Claim 2.16, we get

$$|\gamma y + (1 - \gamma)y' - \gamma_\nu y + (1 - \gamma_\nu)y'| = |(\gamma - \gamma_\nu)y + (\gamma_\nu - \gamma)y'| = |\nu| \cdot \|y - y'\| \geq |\nu| \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{M}.$$

Since $\nu \sim \text{Uniform}[-\frac{M}{\varepsilon\kappa}, \frac{M}{\varepsilon\kappa}]$, the probability of the event occurring is at most $\frac{\text{neg}(\kappa)}{2/\kappa} = \text{neg}(\kappa)$. The claim follows. \square

Returning to Equation (3), we established that

$$|(\gamma_{t,\beta} \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma_{t,\beta}) \cdot y'_t) - \Pr[\tilde{t}(x) = t \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_{t,\beta}]| < \frac{\lambda}{2}.$$

With overwhelming probability, this implies that $\Pr[\tilde{t}(x) = t \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_{t,\beta}]$ remains within $\frac{\lambda}{2}$ of β_t^* for any β , ensuring that $\Pr[\tilde{t}(x) = t \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_{t,\beta}] \in \lambda(\beta_t^*)$. Consequently, $\mathcal{X}_{t,\beta}$ is independent of β , completing the proof of the lemma. \square

Applying Lemma 4.2, we conclude that for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$, there exists a unique set $\mathcal{X}_{t, \beta_t^*}$ such that $|\mathcal{X}_{t, \beta_t^*}| > \frac{2\alpha}{\lambda} |\mathcal{X}|$. Since the level sets for each t are disjoint, it follows that

$$|\mathcal{X}_{t, \beta_t^*}| \geq \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha}{\lambda^2}\right) |\mathcal{X}|.$$

Defining

$$\tilde{\mathcal{X}} = \bigcap_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{X}_{t, \beta_t^*},$$

we obtain

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}| \geq \left(1 - \frac{2k\alpha}{\lambda^2}\right) |\mathcal{X}|.$$

Now, let

$$\tilde{\gamma} := \frac{|\mathcal{X}_1 \cap \tilde{\mathcal{X}}|}{|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}|} \text{ and } \tilde{y} := \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}} [\tilde{R}(x) \mid x \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}],$$

where the expectation is taken coordinate-wise (i.e., $\tilde{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$). Following the same decomposition as in Equation (4), we have

$$\Pr[t^*(x) = t \wedge x \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}] = \tilde{\gamma} \cdot y_t + (1 - \tilde{\gamma}) \cdot y'_t.$$

By Claim 2.5, \tilde{R} is α' -accurate w.r.t. \mathcal{D} on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, where $\alpha' = \alpha + \frac{2k\alpha}{\lambda^2} \leq \frac{3k\alpha}{\lambda^2}$. That is,

$$\|\tilde{y} - (\tilde{\gamma} \cdot y + (1 - \tilde{\gamma}) \cdot y')\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{3k\alpha}{\lambda^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\Pr[x \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}]} \leq \frac{3k\alpha}{\lambda^2 - 2k\alpha}.$$

By the definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, for any $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$,

$$\|\tilde{y} - \tilde{R}(x)\|_{\infty} \leq \lambda.$$

Thus, for any $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$,

$$\|\tilde{R}(x) - (\tilde{\gamma} \cdot y + (1 - \tilde{\gamma}) \cdot y')\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{3k\alpha}{\lambda^2 - 2k\alpha} + \lambda.$$

Since ρ is M -Lipschitz, it follows that for any $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\rho} [\rho(\tilde{R}(x))] - \mathbb{E}_{\rho} [\rho(\tilde{\gamma} \cdot y + (1 - \tilde{\gamma}) \cdot y')] \right| \leq \frac{3Mk\alpha}{\lambda^2 - 2k\alpha} + \lambda M. \quad (5)$$

In particular, taking the expectation over all $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ gives:

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{x, \rho} [\rho(\tilde{R}(x))] - \mathbb{E}_{\rho} [\rho(\tilde{\gamma} \cdot y + (1 - \tilde{\gamma}) \cdot y')] \right| \leq \frac{3Mk\alpha}{\lambda^2 - 2k\alpha} + \lambda M. \quad (6)$$

Recall the assumption that ρ is ε -far from affine:

$$|\mathbb{E} [\rho(\gamma \cdot y + (1 - \gamma) \cdot y')] - (\gamma \cdot \mathbb{E} [\rho(y)] + (1 - \gamma) \cdot \mathbb{E} [\rho(y')])| > \varepsilon. \quad (7)$$

The following claim shows that this also applies to $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$.

Claim 4.4. $|\mathbb{E}[\rho(\tilde{\gamma} \cdot y + (1 - \tilde{\gamma}) \cdot y')] - (\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\rho(y)] + (1 - \tilde{\gamma}) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\rho(y')])| \geq \varepsilon - \frac{2M^2}{\varepsilon\kappa}.$

Proof. Since the ℓ_∞ norm of stochastic vectors is at most 1,

$$\|(\gamma \cdot y + (1 - \gamma) \cdot y') - (\tilde{\gamma} \cdot y + (1 - \tilde{\gamma}) \cdot y')\|_\infty \leq |\gamma - \tilde{\gamma}| \cdot \|y - y'\|_\infty \leq |\gamma - \tilde{\gamma}|.$$

Since ρ is M -Lipschitz, it follows that

$$|\mathbb{E}[\rho(\gamma \cdot y + (1 - \gamma) \cdot y')] - \mathbb{E}[\rho(\tilde{\gamma} \cdot y + (1 - \tilde{\gamma}) \cdot y')]| \leq M|\gamma - \tilde{\gamma}|.$$

Additionally, since $|\mathbb{E}[\rho(y) - \rho(y')]| \leq 1$,

$$|(\gamma \cdot \mathbb{E}[\rho(y)] + (1 - \gamma) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\rho(y')]) - (\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\rho(y)] + (1 - \tilde{\gamma}) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\rho(y')])| \leq |\gamma - \tilde{\gamma}|.$$

Combining these bounds with the assumption in Equation (7) gives

$$|\mathbb{E}[\rho(\tilde{\gamma} \cdot y + (1 - \tilde{\gamma}) \cdot y')] - (\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\rho(y)] + (1 - \tilde{\gamma}) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\rho(y')])| \geq \varepsilon - (M + 1)|\gamma - \tilde{\gamma}|.$$

By Claim 2.19, we have $|\gamma' - \gamma_\nu| = \text{neg}(\kappa)$ and $|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma'| = \text{neg}(\kappa)$. Since $|\gamma - \gamma_\nu| = |\nu| \leq \frac{M}{\varepsilon\kappa}$, it follows that

$$|\gamma - \tilde{\gamma}| \leq |\gamma - \gamma_\nu| + |\gamma_\nu - \gamma'| + |\gamma' - \tilde{\gamma}| \leq \text{neg}(\kappa) + \text{neg}(\kappa) + \frac{M}{\varepsilon\kappa},$$

and the claim follows. \square

Returning to Equation (6), the claim implies that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{x,\rho}[\rho(\tilde{R}(x))] - \left(\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbb{E}_\rho[\rho(y)] + (1 - \tilde{\gamma}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_\rho[\rho(y')] \right) \right| \geq \varepsilon - \frac{2M^2}{\varepsilon\kappa} - \frac{3Mk\alpha}{\lambda^2 - 2k\alpha} - \lambda M > \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

by taking $\kappa \geq \frac{30M^2}{\varepsilon^2}$, $\alpha \leq \frac{\lambda^2\varepsilon}{60Mk}$, and $\lambda \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3M}$.

Thus, we have established a lower bound on the accuracy-on-decision (AD) error of \tilde{R} with respect to \mathcal{D} and ρ on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$. Since $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, this lower bound applies to the overall AD error of \tilde{R} , contradicting the assumption that \tilde{R} is $\varepsilon/2$ -AD with respect to \mathcal{D} and ρ . \square

The following remarks highlight two key technical choices in the proof strategy. They clarify how the argument remains valid for any choice of discretization parameter, and why we adopt a Lipschitz assumption over weaker continuity conditions.

Remark 4.5 (Avoiding the randomization of γ). *Getting back to Lemma 4.2, our goal was to find a large subset $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ where \tilde{R} is close (in ℓ_∞ norm) to the expected value of R^* on \mathcal{X} . To achieve this, we prove that for any label t , at most one of the $1/\lambda$ level sets of t can be large, and we define $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ as the intersection of these large level sets. However, the t^{th} coordinate of the expected value of R^* over each level set $\mathcal{X}_{t,\beta}$ is not exactly $(\gamma' \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma') \cdot y'_t)$, but rather $(\gamma_{t,\beta} \cdot y_t + (1 - \gamma_{t,\beta}) \cdot y'_t)$, where $\gamma_{t,\beta}$ is negligibly close to γ' . Nevertheless, they may still fall into different λ -intervals.*

To address this, we introduce a small random perturbation to γ , which propagates to γ' and $\gamma_{t,\beta}$, ensuring that the issue arises with only negligible probability, as shown in Claim 4.3.

An alternative approach is to define λ accordingly to prevent this issue. By assuming a uniform bound on the negligible term controlling this difference, we can set λ so that all values remain within the same λ -interval. This bound can be achieved, for instance, by restricting the learner

that outputs \tilde{R} to run within a fixed polynomial time. This approach would eliminate the need for the randomization introduced in Equation (2) and significantly reduce the technical overhead in Lemma 4.2.

However, any method that merely proves the existence of a suitable λ , even without additional assumptions, is weaker than our approach, which guarantees that the proof holds for any λ .

Remark 4.6 (Relaxing the Lipschitz condition.). *The theorem applies to Lipschitz rules that are far from affine. One may ask if requiring continuity is enough. Indeed, since \mathcal{Y} is a compact set, continuity on \mathcal{Y} implies uniform continuity. Let us revisit, for example, Equation (5), and denote the two vectors there by z and z' . Using uniform continuity, for any desired bound μ , we know that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $\|y - y'\| < \delta$, then $\mathbb{E}[\rho(z)] - \mathbb{E}[\rho(z')] < \mu$. However, there is no guarantee of how small δ should be. In particular, it can be inverse exponential in ε , and lead to trivial bounds on α and λ , such that the result only holds in the regime where, e.g., they are both smaller than $2^{-\varepsilon}$. To obtain meaningful bounds, we introduce the Lipschitzness requirement.*

4.1 Loss-Minimizing Decision Rule Is Far from Affine

Returning to Definition 3.7, we now prove that the loss-minimizing decision rule ρ_ℓ^* is far from affine for any non-trivial loss function. In Remark 6.5, we will show how this statement can also be derived from the arguments presented earlier.

The class of loss functions we consider as non-trivial includes all loss functions that do not trivialize the tasks of loss minimization or being accurate-on-classification by making them either too easy or impossible.⁶

Definition 4.7 (Family of Non-Trivial Loss Functions \mathcal{L}_α). *The family of non-trivial loss functions $\mathcal{L}_\alpha \subseteq \{\mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, 1]\}$ is defined such that any $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha$ satisfies the following two conditions:*

1. *there exist $t \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $|\ell(t, 1) - \ell(t, 0)| \geq \alpha$.*
2. *there exist $t', t'' \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $|\ell(t', 1) - \ell(t', 0)| > 0$ and $|\ell(t'', 1) - \ell(t'', 0)| \leq 0$.*

Lemma 4.8 (Loss-Minimizing Decision Rule is Far from Affine). *The decision rule ρ_ℓ^* is 1/2-far from affine for any non-trivial $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha$.*

Proof. Since ℓ is non-trivial (Definition 4.7), we assume without loss of generality that

$$\ell(t, 1) - \ell(t, 0) \geq \alpha,$$

and that there exists some $t' \in \mathcal{T}$ such that

$$\ell(t', 0) - \ell(t', 1) > \beta,$$

for some $\beta \leq \alpha$. If this were not the case, we could swap t and t' .

Consider the unit vectors e_t and $e_{t'}$, where each vector has a 1 at coordinate t (or t' , respectively) and 0 elsewhere. By definition, the loss-minimizing decision rule satisfies

$$\rho_\ell^*(e_t) = 0 \text{ and } \rho_\ell^*(e_{t'}) = 1.$$

⁶To see why the second condition in Definition 4.7 ensures that the task of being multi-accurate-on-classification is not trivialized, note that if ℓ violates this condition, then the loss-minimizing action function is constant: either $h_\ell^* \equiv 0$ or $h_\ell^* \equiv 1$.

Now, consider their convex combination:

$$v = \frac{1}{2}e_t + \frac{1}{2}e_{t'}.$$

On one hand, the convex combination of their decision rule values is

$$\frac{1}{2}\rho_\ell^*(e_t) + \frac{1}{2}\rho_\ell^*(e_{t'}) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

On the other hand, we compute the expected loss difference under v :

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{t} \sim v} [\ell(\bar{t}, 1) - \ell(\bar{t}, 0)] = \frac{1}{2} (\ell(t, 1) - \ell(t, 0) + \ell(t', 1) - \ell(t', 0)) = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - \beta) > 0.$$

Since the expectation is positive, we conclude that $\rho_\ell^*(v) = 0$. Thus, we have

$$\left| \rho_\ell^*(v) - \left(\frac{1}{2}\rho_\ell^*(e_t) + \frac{1}{2}\rho_\ell^*(e_{t'}) \right) \right| = \frac{1}{2},$$

so ρ_ℓ^* is at least $1/2$ -far from affine. \square

Combining Theorem 4.1 with Lemma 4.8 yields the following corollary: learning a calibrated predictor that is accurate-on-decision with respect to the loss-minimizing decision rule may be computationally infeasible.

Corollary 4.9. *Let ρ_ℓ^* be the loss-minimizing decision rule for a non-trivial loss ℓ . In the setting of Theorem 4.1, there exists a distribution \mathcal{D} such that no $\text{poly}(\kappa)$ -time learner can, with non-negligible probability, output a predictor \tilde{R} that is both (α, λ) -coordinate-wise calibrated w.r.t. \mathcal{D} and $1/2$ -accurate-on-decision w.r.t. \mathcal{D} and ρ_ℓ^* .*

5 When Loss Minimization Contradicts Accuracy of Classifications

As we have argued, achieving accuracy-on-decision may sometimes be impossible, implying that accuracy-on-classification might not be attainable when relying on predictors. However, this does not preclude the possibility of classifying individuals directly—classification methods need not operate by applying a decision rule to a risk predictor. In this section, we show that loss minimization may not align with accuracy-on-classification, even for general action functions. Specifically, for any non-trivial loss function, we construct a setting in which any (possibly randomized) action function that satisfies accuracy-on-classification necessarily fails to minimize the expected loss. This holds even when the hypothesis class is restricted to just the two constant functions that either accept or reject each individual with probability 1.

The following theorem establishes the central argument of this section: achieving both optimal loss minimization and accurate representation in classification—even for a single subpopulation—may be computationally infeasible. However, these objectives can be attained independently. In Corollary 3.10, we show that a multi-accurate predictor enables MAC, while in Theorem 6.1, we demonstrate that loss minimization is possible given a multi-calibrated predictor. This confirms that while loss minimization and MAC can each be achieved separately—and even with the same predictor—they may not necessarily be achieved by applying the same decision rule to that predictor.

Theorem 5.1 (Loss Minimization Contradicts Accuracy-on-Classification). *Assume one-way functions exist w.r.t. a security parameter $\kappa \geq \log |\mathcal{X}|$. Let $\varepsilon, \alpha \in (0, 1)$, and let $\mathcal{H} = \{h_0, h_1\}$ where $h_0 \equiv 0$ and $h_1 \equiv 1$. For any $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha$, there exists a Nature \mathcal{D} such that for any $\text{poly}(\kappa)$ -time computable $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, if h is (ℓ, ε) -accurate-on-classification then h is at most $(\mathcal{H}, \ell, \Omega(\alpha) - O(\varepsilon))$ -loss-minimizing.*

Proof. Recall Definition 4.7 of \mathcal{L}_α , the family of non-trivial loss functions. Let $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha$ and let $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$ denote the uniform distribution over \mathcal{X} . Define two constants $\varepsilon_{\text{AC}}, \varepsilon_\ell \in (0, 1)$ to be set later. Since ℓ is non-trivial, there exists $t \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $|\ell(t, 1) - \ell(t, 0)| \geq \alpha$. Without loss of generality, assume

$$\ell(t, 1) - \ell(t, 0) \geq \alpha,$$

and that there exists $t' \in \mathcal{T}$ such that

$$\ell(t', 0) - \ell(t', 1) > \beta,$$

for $\beta \leq \alpha$, otherwise, we swap t and t' . This implies that accepting an individual of type t results in a significantly lower loss compared to rejecting them, while rejecting an individual of type t' results in a lower loss compared to accepting them, though the difference may be smaller.

We define Nature according to the pair of labels t and t' . Under the assumption that one-way functions exist, Lemma 2.18 implies the existence of a subset $\mathcal{X}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ of size

$$|\mathcal{X}_1| = \left(\frac{3}{4} + \text{neg}(\kappa)\right) |\mathcal{X}|,$$

such that \mathcal{X}_1 is κ -indistinguishable w.r.t. $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$ (see Definition 2.17) and Nature is efficiently computable. As discussed in Section 2.4, the assumption of one-way functions can be removed if no restriction is placed on the complexity of Nature.

Defining $\mathcal{X}_2 := \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_1$, we write

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \cup \mathcal{X}_2.$$

We specify Nature's deterministic prediction as follows:

$$R^*|_{\mathcal{X}_1} = t, \quad R^*|_{\mathcal{X}_2} = t',$$

and take $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X} \times R^*(\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X})$.⁷

Let h be a $\text{poly}(\kappa)$ -time computable randomized action function that is $(\ell, \varepsilon_{\text{AC}})$ -accurate-on-classification. By our definition of Nature,

$$h_\ell^*(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \in \mathcal{X}_1, \\ 1, & x \in \mathcal{X}_2. \end{cases}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[h_\ell^*(x)] = \Pr[x \in \mathcal{X}_1] = \frac{1}{4} + \text{neg}(\kappa).$$

By $(\ell, \varepsilon_{\text{AC}})$ -accuracy-on-classification (see Definition 3.9) and since $\mathbb{E}[h(x)] = \Pr[h(x) = 1]$, it follows that

$$\Pr_{x,h}[h(x) = 1] \geq \frac{1}{4} - \varepsilon_{\text{AC}} + \text{neg}(\kappa). \quad (8)$$

⁷So far, we defined a deterministic Nature such that it outputs unit vectors $e_t, e_{t'} \in \mathcal{Y}$, rather than labels $t, t' \in \mathcal{T}$. For notational convenience, we now define it to output a label in this case, and denote it by R^* .

In particular, this implies that $\Pr[h(x) = 1]$ is non-negligible. Since h is $\text{poly}(\kappa)$ -time computable and \mathcal{X}_1 is κ -indistinguishable, Claim 2.19 applies, yielding

$$\Pr[x \in \mathcal{X}_1 | h(x) = 1] = \frac{3}{4} + \text{neg}(\kappa), \quad (9)$$

and, analogously,

$$\Pr[x \in \mathcal{X}_2 | h(x) = 1] = \frac{1}{4} + \text{neg}(\kappa).$$

Finally, we proceed to compute the expected loss of the loss minimizer h_0 and of h . Notice that $h_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, and its expected loss is

$$\mathbb{E}_x[\ell(R^*(x), h_0(x))] = \mathbb{E}[\ell(R^*(x), 0)] = \frac{3}{4} \cdot \ell(t, 0) + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \ell(t', 0) := L_0.$$

Similarly, the expected loss of h_1 is

$$\mathbb{E}_x[\ell(R^*(x), h_1(x))] = \mathbb{E}[\ell(R^*(x), 1)] = \frac{3}{4} \cdot \ell(t, 1) + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \ell(t', 1) := L_1.$$

This implies that

$$L_1 - L_0 = \frac{3}{4}(\ell(t, 1) - \ell(t, 0)) - \frac{1}{4}(\ell(t', 0) - \ell(t', 1)) \geq \frac{3}{4}\alpha - \frac{1}{4}\beta \geq \frac{\alpha}{2}, \quad (10)$$

where the last inequality follows from the assumption that $\alpha \geq \beta$.

Next, we compute the expected loss of h over $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x,h}[\ell(R^*(x), h(x))] &= \mathbb{E}[\ell(R^*(x), 0) | h(x) = 0] \cdot \Pr[h(x) = 0] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\ell(R^*(x), 1) | h(x) = 1] \cdot \Pr[h(x) = 1] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[\ell(R^*(x), 0) | h(x) = 0] \cdot \left(\frac{3}{4} - \varepsilon_{\text{AC}}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\ell(R^*(x), 1) | h(x) = 1] \cdot \left(\frac{1}{4} - \varepsilon_{\text{AC}}\right) + \text{neg}(\kappa), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the last inequality follows from Equation (8).

We argue that this quantity is close to $\frac{3}{4}L_0 + \frac{1}{4}L_1$. First, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\ell(R^*(x), 1) | h(x) = 1] &= \ell(t, 1) \cdot \Pr[x \in \mathcal{X}_1 | h(x) = 1] \\ &\quad + \ell(t', 1) \cdot \Pr[x \in \mathcal{X}_2 | h(x) = 1] \\ &= \frac{3}{4} \cdot \ell(t, 1) + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \ell(t', 1) + \text{neg}(\kappa) = L_1 + \text{neg}(\kappa), \end{aligned}$$

where the second-to-last equality follows from Equation (9). Similarly, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell(R^*(x), 0) | h(x) = 0] = \frac{3}{4} \cdot \ell(t, 0) + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \ell(t', 0) + \text{neg}(\kappa) = L_0 + \text{neg}(\kappa).$$

Substituting into Equation (11), we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell(R^*(x), h(x))] \geq \left(\frac{3}{4} - \varepsilon_{\text{AC}}\right) \cdot L_0 + \left(\frac{1}{4} - \varepsilon_{\text{AC}}\right) \cdot L_1 + \text{neg}(\kappa).$$

By $(\mathcal{H}, \ell, \varepsilon_\ell)$ -loss-minimization of h (see Definition 3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon_\ell &\geq \mathbb{E}_{x,h} [\ell(R^*(x), h(x))] - \mathbb{E}_x [\ell(R^*(x), h_0(x))] \\
&\geq \left(\frac{3}{4} - \varepsilon_{\text{AC}}\right) \cdot L_0 + \left(\frac{1}{4} - \varepsilon_{\text{AC}}\right) \cdot L_1 + \text{neg}(\kappa) - L_0 \\
&= \frac{1}{4} (L_1 - L_0) - \varepsilon_{\text{AC}} (L_1 + L_0) + \text{neg}(\kappa) \\
&\geq \frac{\alpha}{8} - \varepsilon_{\text{AC}} (L_1 + L_0) + \text{neg}(\kappa),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Equation (10). Since $L_1 + L_0 \leq 2 - \frac{3}{4}\alpha$, we conclude that

$$\varepsilon_\ell \geq \frac{\alpha}{8} - \varepsilon_{\text{AC}} \left(2 - \frac{3}{4}\alpha\right) + \text{neg}(\kappa).$$

The theorem follows by setting $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{\text{AC}}$, but the analysis allows for a more general tradeoff between ε_{AC} and ε_ℓ . For instance, requiring the accuracy-on-decision error to be smaller than $\frac{\alpha}{80}$ implies that $(\mathcal{H}, \ell, \frac{\alpha}{10})$ -loss-minimization is impossible. \square

6 Translating Accuracy of Predictions to Loss Minimization

Recall the definitions of the loss-minimizing decision rule (Definition 3.7) and full-multi-calibration (Definition 2.8). The following theorem shows that composing a multi-calibrated predictor with the loss-minimizing decision rule results in a loss-minimizing action function. The hypothesis class with respect to which loss minimization is measured corresponds to the class of subpopulations for which the predictor is multi-calibrated. Notably, this implies that the loss function need not be known during learning; one can first learn a multi-calibrated predictor and later post-process it using the loss-minimizing decision rule to obtain an action function that minimizes any given loss.

This guarantee aligns with the notion of *omnipredictors* introduced by Gopalan et al. [GKR⁺22], which are predictors that admit post-processing to minimize any loss function within a given class. Specifically, [GKR⁺22, Theorem 8.1] shows that a multi-calibrated predictor is an omnipredictor. Our proof follows their high-level approach and proof technique, with a few adaptations to fit our setting. First, the class of loss functions we consider, as well as the assumptions imposed on them, differ from those in [GKR⁺22]. Second, in Lemma 6.4 we extend the argument by showing that composing the original predictor with a loss-minimizing decision rule yields an action function that minimizes loss, whereas the original paper establishes this property for a different primitive. Moreover, in Section 6.1, we show how to relax the multi-calibration requirement. We note that the notion of multi-calibration used in the following proof is identical to that of [GKR⁺22], though their presentation is phrased in terms of covariance.

Theorem 6.1 (Multi-Calibration for Loss Minimization). *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ be a collection of sets, and let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{C}} \subseteq \{\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}\}$ be the hypothesis class consisting of all functions that compute membership in sets from \mathcal{C} . Let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ be a discretization parameter, and let $\ell : \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a loss function. If \tilde{R} is $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha, \lambda)$ -full-multi-calibrated w.r.t. \mathcal{D} , then $\rho_\ell^* \circ \tilde{R}$ is $(\mathcal{H}, \ell, 3k(\alpha + \lambda))$ -loss-minimizing.*

Proof. Throughout the proof, it will be convenient to use the equivalence between two sampling processes: the standard process where we first sample an element from \mathcal{X} and then a label, and the alternative of first sampling a label and then an element. Given a distribution $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$ over \mathcal{X} , each element $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is associated with a stochastic vector $R^*(x) \in \mathcal{Y}$, which defines a distribution over the set of types \mathcal{T} . The *marginal label distribution* $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(t) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}(x) R^*(x)_t,$$

where $R^*(x)_t$ is the t^{th} coordinate of $R^*(x)$. The *distribution over elements given a label* $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}}$ is

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}}(x | t) = \frac{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}(x) R^*(x)_t}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(t)}.$$

Thus, sampling (x, t) by first drawing $x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and then $t \sim R^*(x)$ is equivalent to first drawing $t \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}$ and then $x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}}(\cdot | t)$. For clarity, we now fix the notation used throughout the proof.

- In what follows, we define a partition $T = (T_v)_{v \in (\Lambda[0,1])^k}$ of \mathcal{X} . For sampling a subset T_v from the partition T according to its mass under $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$, that is, $\sum_{x \in T_v} \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}(x)$, we use $T_v \sim T$.
- We use $x \sim T_v$ to denote sampling $x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$ conditioned on the event that $x \in T_v$.
- We use $t \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}|_{T_v}$ to denote sampling from the marginal label distribution restricted to the set T_v .
- We use $x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v}$ for sampling an element from a set T_v according to the distribution over elements given a label t .
- For any $h \in \mathcal{H}$, we let $\hat{h} : T \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ denote a random variable following a $\text{Ber}(\mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim T_v}[h(x)])$ distribution for any $T_v \in T$.
- We restate full multi-calibration in the covariance formulation, following [GKR⁺22]. If \tilde{R} is $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha, \lambda)$ -full-multi-calibrated with respect to \mathcal{D} , as defined in Definition 2.8, then there exists a partition $T = (T_v)_{v \in (\Lambda[0,1])^k}$ of \mathcal{X} such that for any $h \in \mathcal{H}$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{T_v \sim T} \left[\Pr_{t' \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}|_{T_v}} [t' = t] \cdot \left| \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim T_v} [h(x)] - \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v}} [h(x)] \right| \right] \leq \alpha + \lambda. \quad (12)$$

- We define the predictor R^T as follows:

$$\forall x \in T_v, \quad R^{T_v}(x) := \mathbb{E}_{x \sim T_v} [R^*(x)],$$

where the expectation is taken coordinate-wise, so that R^T outputs a vector. That is, R^T is constant on each T_v and equals the coordinate-wise expectation of R^* over that part.

- We define its corresponding loss-minimizing action function as $h_{\ell}^T := \rho_{\ell}^* \circ R^T$.
- Following the terminology set in [GKR⁺22], we refer to R^T as the *canonical predictor* and to h_{ℓ}^T as the *canonical action function*.

- We denote $\tilde{h} := \rho_\ell^* \circ \tilde{R}$.

The proof consists of two steps. First, we show that the canonical action function minimizes the loss. We begin by proving that its loss is at most that of any function that remains constant on each partition set (such as the canonical predictor). We then extend this result to all functions in the hypothesis class. Second, we demonstrate that its expected loss is close to that of \tilde{h} .

The following claim relates the expected losses of h and \hat{h} over T_v and a fixed label to their expected values.

Claim 6.2. *Let $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and $T_v \in T$.*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{h}, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v}} \left[\ell(t, \hat{h}(x)) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v}} [\ell(t, h(x))] \leq \left| \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim T_v} [h(x)] - \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v}} [h(x)] \right|.$$

Proof. The first term on the left-hand side can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{h}, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v}} \left[\ell(t, \hat{h}(x)) \right] &= \Pr_{\hat{h}, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v}} [\hat{h}(x) = 1] \cdot \ell(t, 1) + \Pr_{\hat{h}, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v}} [\hat{h}(x) = 0] \cdot \ell(t, 0) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim T_v} [h(x)] \cdot \ell(t, 1) + \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim T_v} [h(x)] \right) \cdot \ell(t, 0), \end{aligned}$$

since \hat{h} is fixed on T_v . The second term on the left-hand side can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v}} [\ell(t, h(x))] = \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v}} [h(x)] \cdot \ell(t, 1) - \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v}} [h(x)] \right) \cdot \ell(t, 0).$$

Hence, their difference is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim T_v} [h(x)] \cdot \ell(t, 1) + \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim T_v} [h(x)] \right) \cdot \ell(t, 0) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v}} [h(x)] \cdot \ell(t, 1) - \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v}} [h(x)] \right) \cdot \ell(t, 0) \\ &= (\ell(t, 1) - \ell(t, 0)) \cdot \left(\mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim T_v} [h(x)] - \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v}} [h(x)] \right) \\ &\leq \left| \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim T_v} [h(x)] - \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v}} [h(x)] \right|. \end{aligned}$$

□

We use the claim to bound the difference between the expected losses of \hat{h} and h . For any

$h \in \mathcal{H}$, we write this difference as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{h}) - \text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(h) \leq \\
& \mathbb{E}_{T_v \sim T} \mathbb{E}_{t \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}|T_v} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\hat{h}, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v} [\ell(t, \hat{h}(x))] - \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v} [\ell(t, h(x))] \right| \leq \\
& \mathbb{E}_{T_v \sim T} \mathbb{E}_{t \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}|T_v} \left| \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim T_v} [h(x)] - \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v} [h(x)] \right| = \\
& \mathbb{E}_{T_v \sim T} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \Pr_{t' \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}|T_v} [t' = t] \left| \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim T_v} [h(x)] - \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v} [h(x)] \right| = \\
& \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}_{T_v \sim T} \left[\Pr_{t' \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}|T_v} [t' = t] \left| \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim T_v} [h(x)] - \mathbb{E}_{h, x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}|\mathcal{T}=t, T_v} [h(x)] \right| \right] \leq k(\alpha + \lambda), \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha, \lambda)$ -full-multi-calibration of \tilde{R} , as stated in Equation (12).

Next, recall the definitions of the canonical predictor R^T and the canonical action function h_ℓ^T . The following claim achieves our first goal, that is, proving that the canonical action function minimizes the loss.

Claim 6.3 ([GKR⁺22, Corollary 6.2]). $\forall h : T \rightarrow \{0, 1\}, \text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(h_\ell^T) \leq \text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(h)$.

Proof. First, notice that

$$\text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(h_\ell^T) = \mathbb{E}_{T_v \sim T} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim T_v} \mathbb{E}_{t \sim R^{T_v}(x)} [\ell(t, h_\ell^T(x))].$$

A useful fact throughout is that, by definition, for any $T_v \in T$, R^{T_v} follows the same distribution as R^* conditioned on T_v . This implies that

$$\rho_\ell^*(R^{T_v}(x)) = \arg \min_{a \in \{0, 1\}} \mathbb{E}_{t \sim R^{T_v}(x)} [\ell(t, a)] = \arg \min_{a \in \{0, 1\}} \mathbb{E}_{t \sim R^*|T_v(x)} [\ell(t, a)],$$

hence,

$$\mathbb{E}_{t \sim R^{T_v}(x)} [\ell(t, h_\ell^T(x))] \leq \min \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{t \sim R^*|T_v(x)} [\ell(t, 0)], \mathbb{E}_{t \sim R^*|T_v(x)} [\ell(t, 1)] \right\}.$$

Next, let $h : T \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. Once again,

$$\text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(h) = \mathbb{E}_{T_v \sim T} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim T_v} \mathbb{E}_{h, t \sim R^*|T_v(x)} [\ell(t, h(x))].$$

Focusing on the last term,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{h, t \sim R^*|T_v(x)} [\ell(t, h(x))] &= \mathbb{E}_h [h] \cdot \mathbb{E}_{t \sim R^*|T_v(x)} [\ell(t, 1)] + \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_h [h]\right) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{t \sim R^*|T_v(x)} [\ell(t, 0)] \\
&\geq \min \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{t \sim R^*|T_v(x)} [\ell(t, 0)], \mathbb{E}_{t \sim R^*|T_v(x)} [\ell(t, 1)] \right\} \\
&\geq \mathbb{E}_{t \sim R^{T_v}(x)} [\ell(t, h_\ell^T(x))],
\end{aligned}$$

and the claim follows. \square

Recall that $\text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{h}) - \text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(h) \leq k(\alpha + \lambda)$ by Equation (13). Combining it with the claim yields that h_{ℓ}^T is $(\mathcal{H}, \ell, k(\alpha + \lambda))$ -loss-minimizing. The following lemma completes the proof, by showing that the difference between $\text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(h_{\ell}^T)$ and $\text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{h})$ is small.

Lemma 6.4. $\text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{h}) - \text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(h_{\ell}^T) \leq 2k(\alpha + \lambda)$.

Proof. Let us denote

$$L_1 := \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \sim T_v \\ t \sim R^*|_{T_v}(x)}} [\ell(t, 1)],$$

and, analogously,

$$L_0 := \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \sim T_v \\ t \sim R^*|_{T_v}(x)}} [\ell(t, 0)].$$

This means that for any R ,

$$\text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\rho_{\ell}^*(R)) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim T_v} [\rho_{\ell}^*(R(x))] \cdot L_1 + \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim T_v} [\rho_{\ell}^*(R(x))]\right) \cdot L_0,$$

since ρ_{ℓ}^* is not randomized. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{h}) - \text{exp-loss}_{\mathcal{D}}(h_{\ell}^T) &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim T_v} [\rho_{\ell}^*(\tilde{R}(x))] \cdot L_1 + \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim T_v} [\rho_{\ell}^*(\tilde{R}(x))]\right) \cdot L_0 \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim T_v} [\rho_{\ell}^*(R^{T_v}(x))] \cdot L_1 + \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim T_v} [\rho_{\ell}^*(R^{T_v}(x))]\right) \cdot L_0 \\ &= (L_1 - L_0) \left(\mathbb{E} [\rho_{\ell}^*(\tilde{R}(x))] - \mathbb{E} [\rho_{\ell}^*(R^{T_v}(x))] \right) \\ &\leq |L_1 - L_0| \cdot \left| \mathbb{E} [\rho_{\ell}^*(\tilde{R}(x))] - \mathbb{E} [\rho_{\ell}^*(R^{T_v}(x))] \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

We proceed by considering two cases. If $|L_1 - L_0| \leq 2k(\alpha + \lambda)$, the claim follows immediately. Otherwise, $|L_1 - L_0| > 2k(\alpha + \lambda)$. Let us assume, without loss of generality, that $L_0 - L_1 > 2k(\alpha + \lambda)$. First, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \sim T_v \\ t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)}} [\ell(t^*(x), 0) - \ell(t^*(x), 1)] - \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \sim T_v \\ \tilde{t}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)}} [\ell(\tilde{t}(x), 0) - \ell(\tilde{t}(x), 1)] \right| = \\ &\left| \mathbb{E}_{x \sim T_v} \left[\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (\Pr[t^*(x) = t] - \Pr[\tilde{t}(x) = t]) \cdot (\ell(t, 0) - \ell(t, 1)) \right] \right| \leq \\ &\mathbb{E}_{x \sim T_v} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} |\Pr[t^*(x) = t] - \Pr[\tilde{t}(x) = t]| \cdot |\ell(t, 0) - \ell(t, 1)| \leq 2k\alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

by $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha, \lambda)$ -full-multi-calibration of \tilde{R} . Notice that the first term in Equation (15) is exactly $L_0 - L_1$, hence we conclude that

$$\mu := \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \sim T_v \\ \tilde{t}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)}} [\ell(\tilde{t}(x), 0) - \ell(\tilde{t}(x), 1)] \geq L_0 - L_1 - 2k\alpha \geq 2k\lambda.$$

Next, we argue that this leads to $\rho_\ell^*(\tilde{R}) = 1$. Specifically, observe that for any $x, x' \in T_v$, we have $\|\tilde{R}(x) - \tilde{R}(x')\|_\infty \leq \lambda$ by full-multi-calibration. Consequently, this implies that

$$\forall x \sim T_v, \left| \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{t}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)} [\ell(\tilde{t}(x), 0) - \ell(\tilde{t}(x), 1)] - \mu \right| \leq k\lambda,$$

Namely, for each $x \sim T_v$, the expected difference between the loss when rejecting and when accepting cannot deviate by more than $k\lambda$ from its expectation over all of T_v . Since $\mu \geq 2k\lambda$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{r}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)} [\ell(\tilde{r}(x), 0) - \ell(\tilde{r}(x), 1)] > 0$$

for any $x \sim T_v$. Consequently, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim T_v} [\rho_\ell^*(\tilde{R}(x))] = 1.$$

On the other hand, since R^{T_v} is distributed identically to R^* conditioned on T_v , and given that $L_0 > L_1$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim T_v} [\rho_\ell^*(R^{T_v}(x))] = 1.$$

Returning to Equation (14), the case where $|L_1 - L_0| > 2k(\alpha + \lambda)$ ensures that

$$\mathbb{E} [\rho_\ell^*(\tilde{R}(x))] = \mathbb{E} [\rho_\ell^*(R^{T_v}(x))],$$

which completes the proof. \square

Recalling that h_ℓ^T is $(\mathcal{H}, \ell, k(\alpha + \lambda))$ -loss-minimizing, we conclude that \tilde{h} is $(\mathcal{H}, \ell, 3k(\alpha + \lambda))$ -loss-minimizing, and the theorem follows. \square

Remark 6.5. *Returning to Lemma 4.8, which shows that the loss-minimizing decision rule is far from affine, we observe that this claim also follows as a corollary of the arguments just presented. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that ρ_ℓ^* were close to affine. Then, for any calibrated predictor \tilde{R} , the action function $h = \rho_\ell^*(\tilde{R})$ would satisfy MAC by Corollary 3.10. By Theorem 6.1, h would also be loss-minimizing. However, this contradicts Theorem 5.1, which shows that an action function cannot simultaneously satisfy MAC and minimize loss.*

6.1 Relaxation of the Multi-Calibration Requirement

As discussed in Sections 1.3 and 1.4, full-multi-calibration (Definition 2.8) is often infeasible due to exponential sample complexity in k , the number of labels. This section is devoted to relaxing the full-multi-calibration requirement of Theorem 6.1 in order to achieve efficient sample complexity. We identify three settings in which this relaxation is possible: (i) when the label space is $\mathcal{T} = \Lambda[0, 1]$; (ii) when the loss function is known in advance during training of the predictor \tilde{R} ; and (iii) when a *family* of loss functions is known during training. In the first two settings, the training time can be reduced to that of weak agnostic learning over the hypothesis class.

6.1.1 Probabilities and Linear Losses

We first consider the case where the label space is $\mathcal{T} = \Lambda[0, 1]$, and the predictor \tilde{R} maps each input x to a distribution over $\Lambda[0, 1]$. In this setting, we argue that all natural loss functions $\ell : \Lambda[0, 1] \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ are linear in their first argument. This corresponds to a modeling where the loss depends only on the realized outcome, rather than the probability assigned to it. For instance, in the context of loan approvals, the incurred loss depends solely on whether the borrower repays the loan; once the outcome is revealed, the specific predicted probability (e.g., 0.3 versus 0.8) becomes irrelevant.

We show that under linear loss functions, probabilistic predictors offer no advantage over deterministic ones that output the expected prediction. In particular, the predictor that maps x to the expected value under $\tilde{R}(x)$ incurs the same loss as \tilde{R} itself.

We define the *expectation-predictor*, which replaces a randomized prediction with its mean. Formally, for a predictor \tilde{R} and input x , we set

$$\tilde{q}(x) = \sum_{\beta \in \Lambda[0, 1]} \beta \cdot \tilde{R}(x)_\beta, \quad (16)$$

and define

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{R}}(x) = (\tilde{q}(x), 1 - \tilde{q}(x)). \quad (17)$$

We refer to $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{R}}$ as the *expectation-predictor*. This transformation maps a k -dimensional predictor to a 2-dimensional one, consistent with the binary label space $\{0, 1\}$. The expectation is taken over the distribution induced by \tilde{R} with x fixed. Although we could equivalently define the expectation-predictor as a scalar-valued function outputting $\tilde{q}(x)$, we retain the stochastic vector form for consistency with our prior notation. Analogously, we define

$$q^*(x) = \sum_{\beta \in \Lambda[0, 1]} \beta \cdot R^*(x)_\beta,$$

and define Nature's expectation-predictor \mathbb{E}_{R^*} in the same way. We measure Multi-Calibration with respect to $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \times \mathbb{E}_{R^*}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}})$, using the formulation in Definition 2.8 with $k = 2$, consistent with [GKR⁺22]. Note that this is equivalent to training \tilde{q} to be multi-calibrated with respect to $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \times q^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}})$, and we later show how to achieve this efficiently using samples from R^* . We now state the main consequence of this reduction:

Corollary 6.6. *Let \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{H} , and λ be as in Theorem 6.1, with $\mathcal{T} = \Lambda[0, 1]$. Let $\ell : \Lambda[0, 1] \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a loss function that is linear in its first argument. If the expectation-predictor $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{R}}$ is $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha, \lambda)$ -full-multi-calibrated with respect to \mathcal{D} , then the action function $\rho_\ell^* \circ \tilde{R}$ is $(\mathcal{H}, \ell, 6(\alpha + \lambda))$ -loss-minimizing.*

Proof. The idea is to leverage the linearity of ℓ , which is natural when $\mathcal{T} = \Lambda[0, 1]$, to reduce it to a “binary” loss function $\ell' : \{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. We define ℓ' to coincide with ℓ on binary inputs: for all $b, a \in \{0, 1\}$, let $\ell'(b, a) = \ell(b, a)$.⁸

⁸Strictly speaking, ℓ is not defined on inputs like $\ell(0, a)$ and $\ell(1, a)$, since $0, 1 \notin \Lambda[0, 1]$. We slightly abuse notation by interpreting $\ell'(b, a) = \ell(b, a)$ as shorthand for $\ell'(0, a) = \ell(\lambda/2, a)$ and $\ell'(1, a) = \ell(1 - \lambda/2, a)$, where $\lambda/2$ and $1 - \lambda/2$ are the smallest and largest elements in $\Lambda[0, 1]$, respectively.

We now apply Theorem 6.1 to the expectation-predictor $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{R}}$, with respect to ℓ' and \mathcal{H} . By the theorem, the induced action function

$$\tilde{f} = \rho_{\ell'}^* \circ \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{R}}$$

is $(\mathcal{H}, \ell', 6(\alpha + \lambda))$ -loss-minimizing, where $\rho_{\ell'}^*$ denotes the optimal decision rule for $k = 2$ (as in Definition 3.7).

Our goal is to show that

$$\tilde{h} = \rho_{\ell}^* \circ \tilde{R}$$

is $(\mathcal{H}, \ell, 6(\alpha + \lambda))$ -loss-minimizing. To this end, we first establish that for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, any predictor $R : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ over $\mathcal{T} = \Lambda[0, 1]$ (with corresponding q and expectation-predictor \mathbb{E}_R as defined in Equations (16) and (17)), and any action $a \in \{0, 1\}$, the following holds:

$$\mathbb{E}_{b \sim \mathbb{E}_R(x)} [\ell'(b, a)] = \mathbb{E}_{\beta \sim R(x)} [\ell(\beta, a)]. \quad (18)$$

Indeed, the left-hand side of Equation (18) expands to

$$q(x) \cdot \ell'(1, a) + (1 - q(x)) \cdot \ell'(0, a) = q(x) \cdot (\ell'(1, a) - \ell'(0, a)) + \ell'(0, a).$$

The right-hand side is

$$\sum_{\beta \in \Lambda[0, 1]} R(x)_\beta \cdot \ell(\beta, a).$$

Since ℓ is linear in its first argument, we have

$$\ell(\beta, a) = \beta \cdot (\ell(1, a) - \ell(0, a)) + \ell(0, a),$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta \sim R(x)} [\ell(\beta, a)] = \left(\sum_{\beta \in \Lambda[0, 1]} \beta \cdot R(x)_\beta \right) \cdot (\ell(1, a) - \ell(0, a)) + \ell(0, a) = q(x) \cdot (\ell(1, a) - \ell(0, a)) + \ell(0, a).$$

By the definition of ℓ' , the two sides are equal.

Equation (18) implies that for any $a \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{b \sim \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{R}}(x)} [\ell'(b, a)] = \mathbb{E}_{\beta \sim \tilde{R}(x)} [\ell(\beta, a)],$$

and, in particular,

$$\arg \min_{a \in \{0, 1\}} \mathbb{E}_{b \sim \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{R}}(x)} [\ell'(b, a)] = \arg \min_{a \in \{0, 1\}} \mathbb{E}_{\beta \sim \tilde{R}(x)} [\ell(\beta, a)],$$

which implies that $\tilde{f} = \tilde{h}$. Applying Equation (18) again yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{b \sim \mathbb{E}_{R^*}(x)} [\ell'(b, \tilde{f}(x))] = \mathbb{E}_{\beta \sim R^*(x)} [\ell(\beta, \tilde{f}(x))],$$

so

$$\mathbb{E}_{b \sim \mathbb{E}_{R^*}(x)} [\ell'(b, \tilde{f}(x))] = \mathbb{E}_{\beta \sim R^*(x)} [\ell(\beta, \tilde{h}(x))]. \quad (19)$$

Similarly, for any $h \in \mathcal{H}$, Equation (18) implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{b \sim \mathbb{E}_{R^*}(x)} [\ell'(b, h(x))] = \mathbb{E}_{\beta \sim R^*(x)} [\ell(\beta, h(x))]. \quad (20)$$

Since \tilde{f} is $(\mathcal{H}, \ell', 6(\alpha + \lambda))$ -loss-minimizing, it holds for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$ that

$$\mathbb{E}_{b \sim \mathbb{E}_{R^*}(x)} [\ell'(b, \tilde{f}(x))] \leq \mathbb{E}_{b \sim \mathbb{E}_{R^*}(x)} [\ell'(b, h(x))] + 6(\alpha + \lambda).$$

Substituting from Equations (19) and (20), we conclude that for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta \sim R^*(x)} [\ell(\beta, \tilde{h}(x))] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\beta \sim R^*(x)} [\ell(\beta, h(x))] + 6(\alpha + \lambda),$$

which completes the proof. \square

Efficient Training of \tilde{q} . We consider the standard one-dimensional multi-calibration setting, consistent with Definition 2.8 instantiated with $k = 1$.⁹ We reduce samples from R^* to samples from a one-dimensional predictor q^* : for each $x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$, we sample $\beta^*(x) \sim R^*(x)$ and then draw $y^*(x) \sim \text{Ber}(\beta^*(x))$. By the law of total probability,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[y^*(x) = 1] &= \sum_{\beta \in \Lambda[0,1]} \Pr[\beta^*(x) = \beta] \cdot \Pr[y^*(x) = 1 \mid \beta^*(x) = \beta] \\ &= \sum_{\beta \in \Lambda[0,1]} R^*(x)_\beta \cdot \beta = q^*(x). \end{aligned}$$

To efficiently train \tilde{q} , we apply the algorithm of [HKRR18, Theorem 3.10]. This algorithm achieves sample complexity

$$O\left(\frac{\log(|\mathcal{C}|/\alpha\lambda\delta)}{\alpha^4\lambda^{3/2}}\right),$$

where δ bounds the failure probability of the algorithm. As for the training time, [HKRR18, Theorem 4.2] shows that the task of learning a multi-calibrated predictor reduces to weak agnostic learning over \mathcal{C} , following the same framework described at the end of Appendix A.1.2.

6.1.2 Types and a Single Loss

Next, we present an alternative way to relax the multi-calibration assumption in a different setting. Here, the loss function is known in advance, before training the predictor. On the other hand, this approach applies to the more general case of types, where we make no assumptions on the outcome space. The relation between Corollary 6.6 and Corollary 6.7 can be viewed as a tradeoff between the generality of the outcome space and the prior knowledge of the loss function: the former supports arbitrary losses but requires the outcome space to be a discrete set of probabilities, whereas the latter accommodates arbitrary outcome spaces at the cost of assuming that the loss function is fixed during training.

⁹Formally, Definition 2.8 defines a stochastic vector-valued predictor, but the same definition applies when the predictor outputs a scalar.

We define the *loss-weighted predictor* with respect to a loss function ℓ , which replaces randomized predictions with scores that reflect the expected loss. Formally, for a loss function $\ell : \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, a predictor R , and an input $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we define:

$$p_{R,\ell}(x) := \frac{1 - \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (\ell(t, 1) - \ell(t, 0)) \cdot R(x)_t}{2}. \quad (21)$$

This implies that $\forall x \in X$,

$$\rho_\ell^*(R(x)) = 1 \iff \mathbb{E}_{t(x) \sim R(x)} [\ell(t(x), 1) - \ell(t(x), 0)] < 0 \iff \tilde{p}(x) > \frac{1}{2}.$$

We denote

$$\tilde{p}(x) := p_{\tilde{R},\ell}(x), \text{ and } p^*(x) := p_{R^*,\ell}(x).$$

We refer to \tilde{p} as the *loss-weighted predictor* and measure (one-dimensional) multi-calibration of \tilde{p} w.r.t. $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{X} \times p^*(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{X})$. Note that $\tilde{p}(x), p^*(x) \in [0, 1]$ for all x by construction. The following corollary shows that multi-calibration of \tilde{p} suffices to guarantee that $\rho_\ell^* \circ \tilde{R}$ is loss-minimizing. This result can be viewed as a simplified special case of Theorem 6.1.

Corollary 6.7. *Let \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{H} , and λ be as in Theorem 6.1, and let $\ell : \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a loss function. If the loss-weighted predictor \tilde{p} is $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha, \lambda)$ -full-multi-calibrated with respect to \mathcal{D} , then the action function $\rho_\ell^* \circ \tilde{R}$ is $(\mathcal{H}, \ell, 2\alpha)$ -loss-minimizing.*

Proof. Let $h \in \mathcal{H}$. Following Definition 3.6, we aim to show that the expected loss of $\tilde{h}_\ell := \rho_\ell^* \circ \tilde{R}$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{X} \\ t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)}} \left[\ell(t^*(x), \tilde{h}_\ell(x)) \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{X} \\ t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)}} [\ell(t^*(x), h(x))] + 2\alpha. \quad (22)$$

We partition the domain into two subsets: those rejected by h and those accepted by it:

$$\mathcal{X}_0 = \{x : h(x) = 0\}, \text{ and } \mathcal{X}_1 = \{x : h(x) = 1\}.$$

By definition, $\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{X}_1 \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $\mathcal{X}' \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be the maximal subset on which h and \tilde{h}_ℓ differ. If $\mathcal{X}' = \emptyset$, then $\tilde{h}_\ell \equiv h$, and the result follows trivially. Otherwise, at least one of the sets

$$\mathcal{X}'_0 := \mathcal{X}_0 \cap \mathcal{X}', \text{ and } \mathcal{X}'_1 := \mathcal{X}_1 \cap \mathcal{X}'$$

is nonempty. Without loss of generality, assume $\mathcal{X}'_0 \neq \emptyset$; the proof for \mathcal{X}'_1 is analogous.

We argue that the expected loss of \tilde{h}_ℓ on \mathcal{X}'_0 is not significantly worse than that of h , namely:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{X} | \mathcal{X}'_0 \\ t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)}} \left[\ell(t^*(x), \tilde{h}_\ell(x)) \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{X} | \mathcal{X}'_0 \\ t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)}} [\ell(t^*(x), h(x))] + 2\alpha.$$

This is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{X} | \mathcal{X}'_0} \left[\mathbb{E}_{t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)} [\ell(t^*(x), 1) - \ell(t^*(x), 0)] \right] \leq 2\alpha,$$

since $h = 0$ on \mathcal{X}'_0 and $\tilde{h}_\ell = 1$. Let $x \sim \mathcal{X}'_0$ denote a sample from $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{X}|\mathcal{X}'_0$. Notice that the left-hand side is exactly $1 - 2\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{X}'_0}[p^*(x)]$. If, towards contradiction, we assume that $1 - 2\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{X}'_0}[p^*(x)] > 2\alpha$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{X}'_0}[p^*(x)] < \frac{1}{2} - \alpha. \quad (23)$$

We use the multi-calibration of \tilde{p} to refute this. Since $\tilde{h}(x) = 1$ if and only if $\tilde{p}(x) > \frac{1}{2}$, it follows that \mathcal{X}'_0 can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{X}'_0 = \left\{x \in \mathcal{X}_0 : \tilde{p}(x) > \frac{1}{2}\right\} = \bigcup_{\beta \in \Lambda[\frac{1}{2}, 1]} \{x \in \mathcal{X}_0 : \tilde{p}(x) \in \lambda(\beta)\}.$$

Thus, multi-calibration of \tilde{p} implies that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{X}'_0}[p^*(x) - \tilde{p}(x)] \right| \leq \alpha.$$

Combining this with Equation (23), we get that

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{X}'_0}[\tilde{p}(x)] < \frac{1}{2}.$$

But $\tilde{p}(x) > \frac{1}{2}$ whenever $\tilde{h}(x) = 1$, which leads to a contradiction and concludes the proof. \square

Efficient Training of \tilde{p} . As in Section 6.1.1, we consider the standard one-dimensional multi-calibration setting and apply the algorithm of [HKRR18] to efficiently train \tilde{p} . To do so, we reduce samples from R^* to samples from p^* : for each $x \sim \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{X}$, we first sample $t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)$, and then define $y^*(x) \sim \text{Ber}\left(\frac{1 - (\ell(t^*(x), 1) - \ell(t^*(x), 0))}{2}\right)$. By the law of total probability,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{y^*(x)}[y^*(x) = 1] &= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \Pr_{t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)}[t^*(x) = t] \cdot \frac{1 - (\ell(t, 1) - \ell(t, 0))}{2} \\ &= \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}_{t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)}[\ell(t^*(x), 1) - \ell(t^*(x), 0)]}{2} = p^*(x). \end{aligned}$$

6.1.3 Types and a Family of Losses

Corollaries 6.6 and 6.7 can be viewed as reductions from the task of loss minimization to that of training a one-dimensional predictor to be multi-calibrated. Generalizing Corollary 6.7 to a *family* of loss functions requires a stronger guarantee: the learned predictor must be multi-calibrated not only with respect to a single loss, but simultaneously for every loss in a given family \mathcal{L} .

To that end, we aim to satisfy multi-calibration with respect to all convex combinations induced by \mathcal{L} , rather than a fixed weighting. We reduce this problem to identifying, in each round, a pair (ℓ, h) with $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ and $h \in \mathcal{H}$ such that the expected loss of $\rho_\ell^* \circ \tilde{R}$ exceeds that of h . We refer to the procedure that searches for such violating pairs as an *auditor*. In our setting, the auditor is realized by evaluating a family of distinguishers — each parameterized by (ℓ, h) — that attempt to distinguish Nature's outcomes from those generated by \tilde{R} . A distinguisher that succeeds reveals a violation, and the corresponding pair is used to update the predictor. As in previous settings,

query complexity remains low as long as each update affects a non-negligible portion of the domain. However, the total runtime is dominated by the auditing step: namely, the search over $\mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{H}$. Unlike the single-loss case, this setting does not reduce to weak agnostic learning over \mathcal{C} .

Corollary 6.8. *Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{H} be as in Theorem 6.1, and let $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \{\mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, 1]\}$ be a family of loss functions. Given $\tilde{O}(\log k \cdot (\log |\mathcal{C}| + \log |\mathcal{L}|)/\varepsilon^4)$ samples, one can train a predictor \tilde{R} such that, for every $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$, the composed rule $\rho_\ell^* \circ \tilde{R}$ is $(\mathcal{H}, \ell, \varepsilon)$ -loss-minimizing.*

Proof. In Appendix A.1.2, we present *Outcome Indistinguishability* (OI) [DKR⁺21] and discuss an algorithm for training an Outcome Indistinguishable predictor. At a high level, the idea behind OI is to define a family of computationally bounded distinguishers \mathcal{A} , such that a target objective (in our case, loss minimization) reduces to the distinguishers' inability to tell apart Nature's outcomes from those generated based on the predictions. A probabilistic predictor $\tilde{R} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is said to be $(\mathcal{A}, \varepsilon)$ -OI with respect to \mathcal{D} if for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\left| \Pr_{(x, t^*(x)) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[A(x, t^*(x); \tilde{R}(x)) = 1 \right] - \Pr_{(x, \tilde{t}(x)) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \times \tilde{R}(x)} \left[A(x, \tilde{t}(x); \tilde{R}(x)) = 1 \right] \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

This variant is called Sample-Access-OI. Theorem A.6 (from [DKR⁺21]) shows that Sample-Access-OI can be achieved using

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{\log k \cdot \log |\mathcal{A}|}{\varepsilon^4}\right)$$

samples. We refer the reader to Appendix A.1.2 for a detailed exposition.

We define a family of distinguishers such that if \tilde{R} is OI with respect to them, then $\rho_\ell^* \circ \tilde{R}$ is $(\mathcal{H}, \ell, \varepsilon)$ -loss-minimizing. Each distinguisher is parameterized by a loss function $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ and a hypothesis $h \in \mathcal{H}$, and aims to detect whether h outperforms $\rho_\ell^* \circ \tilde{R}$ in terms of loss. Formally, the randomized Boolean distinguisher $A_{\ell, h}$ operates as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\ell, h}(x, t(x), \tilde{R}(x)) &= \text{Compute } p(x) := \ell(t(x), \rho_\ell^*(\tilde{R}(x))) - \ell(t(x), h(x)) \\ &\quad \text{Output 1 with probability } \frac{p(x) + 1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

While the distinguishers could have been defined to output $p(x)$ directly in $[-1, 1]$, we instead normalize and sample a bit, to be consistent with the formulation of [DKR⁺21].

We define

$$\tilde{p}(x) := \ell(\tilde{t}(x), \rho_\ell^*(\tilde{R}(x))) - \ell(\tilde{t}(x), h(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad p^*(x) := \ell(t^*(x), \rho_\ell^*(\tilde{R}(x))) - \ell(t^*(x), h(x)).$$

By Theorem A.6, given

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{\log k \cdot \log |\mathcal{A}|}{(\varepsilon')^4}\right)$$

samples from R^* , we can learn a predictor \tilde{R} such that for all $A_{\ell, h} \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\left| \Pr_{(x, t^*(x)) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[A_{\ell, h}(x, t^*(x); \tilde{R}(x)) = 1 \right] - \Pr_{(x, \tilde{t}(x)) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \times \tilde{R}(x)} \left[A_{\ell, h}(x, \tilde{t}(x); \tilde{R}(x)) = 1 \right] \right| \leq \varepsilon'.$$

Equivalently,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{x, t^*(x)} \left[A_{\ell, h}(x, t^*(x); \tilde{R}(x)) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{x, \tilde{t}(x)} \left[A_{\ell, h}(x, \tilde{t}(x); \tilde{R}(x)) \right] \right| \leq \varepsilon'. \quad (24)$$

Let us first focus on the left term. By the definition of ρ_ℓ^* (see Definition 3.7),

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{t}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)} \left[\ell \left(\tilde{t}(x), \rho_\ell^*(\tilde{R}(x)) \right) \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{t}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)} \left[\ell \left(\tilde{t}(x), h(x) \right) \right],$$

so

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{t}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)} \left[\ell \left(\tilde{t}(x), \rho_\ell^*(\tilde{R}(x)) \right) - \ell \left(\tilde{t}(x), h(x) \right) \right] \leq 0.$$

Recalling the definition of $\tilde{p}(x)$, we get that

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{t}} [\tilde{p}(x)] \leq 0 \implies \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{t}} [\tilde{p}(x)] + 1}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2},$$

and, overall,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x, t^*(x), A_{\ell, h}} \left[A_{\ell, h} \left(x, t^*(x); \tilde{R}(x) \right) \right] = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{t}} [\tilde{p}(x)] + 1}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Returning to Equation (24), this implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_{x, \tilde{t}(x), A_{\ell, h}} \left[A_{\ell, h} \left(x, \tilde{t}(x); \tilde{R}(x) \right) \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon',$$

that is,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x, t^*(x)} \left[\frac{p^*(x) + 1}{2} \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon',$$

so $\mathbb{E}_{x, t^*(x)} [p^*(x)] \leq 2\varepsilon'$. By the definition of p^* , this means

$$\mathbb{E}_{x, t^*(x)} \left[\ell(t^*(x), \rho_\ell^*(\tilde{R}(x))) - \ell(t^*(x), h(x)) \right] \leq 2\varepsilon',$$

hence,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x, t^*(x)} \left[\ell(t^*(x), \rho_\ell^*(\tilde{R}(x))) \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{x, t^*(x)} [\ell(t^*(x), h(x))] + 2\varepsilon'.$$

Setting $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon/2$ concludes the proof. \square

Acknowledgments

We thank Shafi Goldwasser for her collaboration in early stages of this project, which motivated our work. We also thank Parikshit Gopalan for many useful discussions. Omer Reingold is supported by the Simons Foundation Collaboration on the Theory of Algorithmic Fairness, the Sloan Foundation Grant 2020-13941 and the Simons Foundation investigators award 689988.

References

- [AGG⁺25] Gustaf Ahlritz, Aravind Gollakota, Parikshit Gopalan, Charlotte Peale, and Udi Wieder. Provable uncertainty decomposition via higher-order calibration. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. To appear.
- [Cho17] Alexandra Chouldechova. Fair prediction with disparate impact: A study of bias in recidivism prediction instruments. *Big Data*, 5(2):153–163, 2017.
- [Daw17] Philip Dawid. On individual risk. *Synthese*, 194(9):3445–3474, 2017.
- [DKR⁺19] Cynthia Dwork, Michael P. Kim, Omer Reingold, Guy N. Rothblum, and Gal Yona. Learning from outcomes: Evidence-based rankings. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 106–125, 2019.
- [DKR⁺21] Cynthia Dwork, Michael P. Kim, Omer Reingold, Guy N. Rothblum, and Gal Yona. Outcome indistinguishability. In Samir Khuller and Virginia Vassilevska Williams, editors, *STOC ’21: 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Virtual Event, Italy, June 21–25, 2021*, pages 1095–1108. ACM, 2021.
- [DKR⁺22] Cynthia Dwork, Michael P. Kim, Omer Reingold, Guy N. Rothblum, and Gal Yona. Beyond bernoulli: Generating random outcomes that cannot be distinguished from nature. In Sanjoy Dasgupta and Nika Haghtalab, editors, *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory, 29 March - 1 April 2022, Paris, France*, volume 167 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 342–380. PMLR, 2022.
- [GGM86] Oded Goldreich, Shafi Goldwasser, and Silvio Micali. How to construct random functions. *J. ACM*, 33(4):792–807, August 1986.
- [GHR24] Parikshit Gopalan, Lunjia Hu, and Guy N. Rothblum. On computationally efficient multi-class calibration. In Shipra Agrawal and Aaron Roth, editors, *Proceedings of Thirty Seventh Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 247 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1983–2026. PMLR, 30 Jun–03 Jul 2024.
- [GKR⁺22] Parikshit Gopalan, Adam Tauman Kalai, Omer Reingold, Vatsal Sharan, and Udi Wieder. Omnipredictors. In Mark Braverman, editor, *13th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2022)*, volume 215 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 79:1–79:21, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2022. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [HILL99] Johan Håstad, Russell Impagliazzo, Leonid A. Levin, and Michael Luby. A pseudo-random generator from any one-way function. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 28(4):1364–1396, March 1999.
- [HKRR18] Úrsula Hébert-Johnson, Michael P. Kim, Omer Reingold, and Guy N. Rothblum. Multicalibration: Calibration for the (computationally-identifiable) masses. In Jennifer G. Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10–15, 2018*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1944–1953. PMLR, 2018.

- [KF15] Meelis Kull and Peter Flach. Novel decompositions of proper scoring rules for classification: score adjustment as precursor to calibration. In *Proceedings of the 2015th European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases - Volume Part I, ECMLPKDD'15*, page 68–85, Gewerbestrasse 11 CH-6330, Cham (ZG), CHE, 2015. Springer.
- [KMR17] Jon Kleinberg, Sendhil Mullainathan, and Manish Raghavan. Inherent Trade-Offs in the Fair Determination of Risk Scores. In Christos H. Papadimitriou, editor, *8th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2017)*, volume 67 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 43:1–43:23, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2017. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [KPNK⁺19] Meelis Kull, Miquel Perello-Nieto, Markus Kängsepp, Telmo Silva Filho, Hao Song, and Peter Flach. Beyond temperature scaling: obtaining well-calibrated multiclass probabilities with dirichlet calibration. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2019. Curran Associates Inc.
- [LDR⁺18] Lydia T. Liu, Sarah Dean, Esther Rolf, Max Simchowitz, and Moritz Hardt. Delayed impact of fair machine learning. In Jennifer Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3150–3158. PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018.
- [TTV09] Luca Trevisan, Madhur Tulsiani, and Salil P. Vadhan. Regularity, boosting, and efficiently simulating every high-entropy distribution. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity*, pages 126–136. IEEE Computer Society, 2009.
- [WLZ19] David Widmann, Fredrik Lindsten, and Dave Zachariah. Calibration tests in multi-class classification: A unifying framework. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- [ZKS⁺21] Shengjia Zhao, Michael Kim, Roshni Sahoo, Tengyu Ma, and Stefano Ermon. Calibrating predictions to decisions: A novel approach to multi-class calibration. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 22313–22324. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.

A Deferred Proofs

This section provides the rather standard proofs deferred from Section 2.

A.1 Multi-Accuracy and Multi-Calibration

We start with the proof of Claim 2.5.

Claim A.1. *Let S, S' be two sets such that $S' \subseteq S$. If \tilde{R} is α -coordinate-wise-accurate w.r.t. \mathcal{D} on S , then it is α' -coordinate-wise-accurate w.r.t. \mathcal{D} on S' , where $\alpha' = \alpha + \Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_X} [x \in S \setminus S']$.*

Proof. For any $t \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr [t^*(x) = t \wedge x \in S'] - \Pr [\tilde{t}(x) = t \wedge x \in S'] \\ &= \Pr [t^*(x) = t \wedge x \in S] - \Pr [\tilde{t}(x) = t \wedge x \in S] \\ & - \Pr [t^*(x) = t \wedge x \in S \setminus S'] + \Pr [\tilde{t}(x) = t \wedge x \in S \setminus S'], \end{aligned}$$

where the probabilities are taken over $x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$, $t^*(x) \sim R^*(x)$ and $x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$, $\tilde{t}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)$, respectively. By assumption, the difference is bounded by $\Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in S \setminus S'] + \alpha$. \square

Next, we prove Claim 2.10.

Claim A.2 (Coordinate-Wise-Multi-Calibration Implies Coordinate-Wise-Multi-Accuracy). *In the setting of Definition 2.9, if \tilde{R} is $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha, \lambda)$ -coordinate-wise-multi-calibrated, then \tilde{R} is also (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accurate.*

Proof. Let $S \in \mathcal{C}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$. By the definition of $S_{t,\beta}$, we have $S \subseteq \bigcup_{\beta \in \Lambda[0,1]} S_{t,\beta}$. This implies that the coordinate-wise-multi-accuracy error on S is at most α , proving the claim. \square

A.1.1 Notions of Multi-Accurate Rankings

In this section, we examine the relationship between two definitions of Multi-Accuracy for Probabilistic Rankings, previously introduced in Section 2.1. The first and stronger definition, Definition 2.3, evaluates accuracy with respect to *thresholds*. Specifically, for every set S in the collection \mathcal{C} and every rank τ , the probabilities assigned by R^* and \tilde{R} to an individual from S being above threshold τ are similar.

The second definition, which is also natural, enforces *equality* on ranks, namely, coordinate-wise-equality. This alternative is motivated by decision rules that operate on specific segments—for example, a particular bank or university might target a specific segment of the population. The following definition restates Definition 2.2, with a modified notation suited to the case of rankings, where $\mathcal{T} = [k]$.

Definition A.3 (Coordinate-Wise-Multi-Accuracy for Probabilistic Rankings). *In the setting of Definition 2.3, a probabilistic ranking $\tilde{R} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ satisfies (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accuracy w.r.t. \mathcal{D} if for every $S \in \mathcal{C}$ and every $\tau \in [k]$,*

$$\left| \Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ r^*(x) \sim R^*(x)}} [r^*(x) = \tau \wedge x \in S] - \Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ \tilde{r}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)}} [\tilde{r}(x) = \tau \wedge x \in S] \right| \leq \alpha.$$

The following claim shows that this definition is strictly weaker than the threshold definition.

Claim A.4. (\mathcal{C}, α) -threshold-multi-accuracy implies $(\mathcal{C}, 2\alpha)$ -coordinate-wise-multi-accuracy.

Proof. Let $S \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\tau \in [k]$. If $\tau = k$, then (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accuracy follows directly, since $r(x) = k \iff r(x) > k - 1$. Otherwise, by the assumption,

$$|\Pr [r^*(x) > \tau \wedge x \in S] - \Pr [\tilde{r}(x) > \tau \wedge x \in S]| \leq \alpha$$

and

$$|\Pr [r^*(x) > \tau - 1 \wedge x \in S] - \Pr [\tilde{r}(x) > \tau - 1 \wedge x \in S]| \leq \alpha.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Pr[r^*(x) = \tau \wedge x \in S] - \Pr[\tilde{r}(x) = \tau \wedge x \in S]| = \\ & |\Pr[r^*(x) > \tau - 1 \wedge x \in S] - \Pr[\tilde{r}(x) > \tau - 1 \wedge x \in S]| - \\ & (\Pr[r^*(x) > \tau \wedge x \in S] - \Pr[\tilde{r}(x) > \tau \wedge x \in S])| \leq 2\alpha \end{aligned}$$

follows from triangle inequality.

On the other hand, note that an error of 2α is tight. Let $k \geq 3$, $S \in \mathcal{C}$ and let \tilde{R} be such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\tilde{r}(x) = k \wedge x \in S] &= \Pr[r^*(x) = k \wedge x \in S] + \alpha, \\ \Pr[\tilde{r}(x) = k - 1 \wedge x \in S] &= \Pr[r^*(x) = k - 1 \wedge x \in S] - 2\alpha, \\ \Pr[\tilde{r}(x) = k - 2 \wedge x \in S] &= \Pr[r^*(x) = k - 2 \wedge x \in S] + \alpha, \\ \forall \tau \leq k - 3, \Pr[\tilde{r}(x) = \tau \wedge x \in S] &= \Pr[r^*(x) = \tau \wedge x \in S], \end{aligned}$$

where all probabilities are taken over sampling an element $x \sim \mathcal{D}_X$ and a rank from either $\tilde{R}(x)$ or $R^*(x)$. This ranking \tilde{R} is α -threshold-multi-accurate on S , yet its coordinate-wise-multi-accuracy error is 2α . \square

On the other hand, the following claim shows that Definition A.3 imply Definition 2.3 with multiplicative k blowup in the error parameter:

Claim A.5. (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accuracy implies $(\mathcal{C}, \Theta(k \cdot \alpha))$ -threshold-multi-accuracy.

Proof. First, we show that (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accuracy implies $(\mathcal{C}, O(k \cdot \alpha))$ -threshold-multi-accuracy. Let $S \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\tau \in [k - 1]$. By assumption,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Pr[r^*(x) > \tau \wedge x \in S] - \Pr[\tilde{r}(x) > \tau \wedge x \in S]| = \\ & |\Pr[r^*(x) \in \{\tau + 1, \dots, k\} \wedge x \in S] - \Pr[\tilde{r}(x) \in \{\tau + 1, \dots, k\} \wedge x \in S]| = \\ & \left| \sum_{i=\tau+1}^k (\Pr[r^*(x) = i \wedge x \in S] - \Pr[\tilde{r}(x) = i \wedge x \in S]) \right| \leq (k - 1) \cdot \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we demonstrate that this bound is tight by presenting an example where a ranking is (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accurate but incurs a threshold-multi-accuracy error of $(k - 1) \cdot \alpha$. Consider the following example. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\text{even}}$ and let R^* be a deterministic Nature that is uniform over the ranks $\forall S \in \mathcal{C}$, namely,

$$\forall \tau \in [k], \Pr[r^*(x) = \tau \wedge x \in S] = \frac{1}{k}.$$

Consider the following deterministic ranking \tilde{R} : For $S \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\tau \in \{1, \dots, k/2\}, \Pr[\tilde{r}(x) = \tau \wedge x \in S] = \frac{1}{k} + \alpha,$$

and

$$\tau \in \{k/2 + 1, \dots, k\}, \Pr[\tilde{r}(x) = \tau \wedge x \in S] = \frac{1}{k} - \alpha.$$

By definition, it follows immediately that \tilde{R} is (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accurate. On the other hand, consider $\tau = \frac{k}{2} - 1$ in Definition 2.3:

$$\left| \Pr\left[r^*(x) > \frac{k}{2} - 1 \wedge x \in S\right] - \Pr\left[\tilde{r}(x) > \frac{k}{2} - 1 \wedge x \in S\right] \right| = (k/2) \cdot \alpha.$$

This means that \tilde{R} is $(\mathcal{C}, \Omega(k \cdot \alpha))$ -threshold-multi-accurate, and the claim follows. \square

A.1.2 Learning Multi-Accurate and Multi-Calibrated Predictors

We use the framework of *Outcome Indistinguishability*, introduced by Dwork et al. [DKR⁺21] in the context of binary prediction tasks. It articulates the goals of prediction using the language of computational indistinguishability: a predictor is outcome-indistinguishable (OI) if no computationally bounded observer can distinguish Nature’s outcomes from those generated based on the predictions. This framework ensures that predictive models yield outcomes that cannot be efficiently refuted using real-life observations.

Dwork et al. also provide algorithms for learning OI predictors. The intuition behind their learning approach is as follows: if there exists a computationally bounded distinguisher A that distinguishes between Nature R^* and the learned predictor \tilde{R} , use A to update \tilde{R} ; otherwise, R^* and \tilde{R} are indistinguishable, and the process terminates. This strategy can be interpreted from different perspectives—as a form of boosting or gradient descent—and is closely related to the approach used by [HKRR18] to learn multi-calibrated predictors.

In a subsequent work ([DKR⁺22]), Dwork et al. extend the concept of outcome indistinguishability beyond binary (Bernoulli) outcomes to more complex, discrete, or continuous domains. They provide learning algorithms for constructing OI predictors, which we use next to achieve multi-accurate and multi-calibrated probabilistic predictors.

Formally, let \mathcal{A} be a class of distinguishers and ε an indistinguishability parameter. A probabilistic predictor $\tilde{R} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is said to be $(\mathcal{A}, \varepsilon)$ -no-access-OI with respect to \mathcal{D} if for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\left| \Pr_{\substack{(x, t^*(x)) \sim \mathcal{D} \\ A\text{'s coins}}} [A(x, t^*(x)) = 1] - \Pr_{\substack{(x, \tilde{t}(x)) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \times \tilde{R}(x) \\ A\text{'s coins}}} [A(x, \tilde{t}(x)) = 1] \right| \leq \varepsilon,$$

and

$$\left| \Pr_{\substack{(x, t^*(x)) \sim \mathcal{D} \\ A\text{'s coins}}} [A(x, t^*(x); \tilde{R}(x)) = 1] - \Pr_{\substack{(x, \tilde{t}(x)) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \times \tilde{R}(x) \\ A\text{'s coins}}} [A(x, \tilde{t}(x); \tilde{R}(x)) = 1] \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Dwork et al. present other, stronger variants of outcome indistinguishability, but we focus exclusively on these two. Moreover, we comment that our representation of distributions as stochastic vectors, which explicitly encode the probability mass function, coincides with the representation used by Dwork et al. for discrete random variables over a finite domain $|\mathcal{T}| = k < \infty$.

Theorem A.6 (Learning OI Predictors [DKR⁺22, Theorem 20]). *There exists an algorithm for learning an $(\mathcal{A}, \varepsilon)$ -outcome-indistinguishable probabilistic predictor $\tilde{R} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ with respect to \mathcal{D} . The sample complexity is bounded by*

$$\tilde{O} \left(\frac{\log k \cdot \log |\mathcal{A}|}{\varepsilon^4} \right)$$

for the case of Sample-Access-OI, and by $O \left(\frac{\log |\mathcal{A}|}{\varepsilon^2} \right)$ for the case of No-Access-OI. Assuming that the distinguishers in \mathcal{A} can be evaluated in time $\text{time}_{\mathcal{A}}$, the running time is

$$\tilde{O} \left(\frac{k \cdot \text{time}_{\mathcal{A}} \cdot \log |\mathcal{A}|}{\varepsilon^6} + \frac{|\mathcal{A}| \cdot \text{time}_{\mathcal{A}} \cdot \log k}{\varepsilon^4} \right).$$

With overwhelming probability over its samples, the algorithm produces a probabilistic predictor \tilde{R} that can be evaluated in time

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{k \cdot \text{time}_{\mathcal{A}} \cdot \log |\mathcal{A}|}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$$

for the case of Sample-Access-OI, and by $O(k \cdot \text{time}_{\mathcal{A}} \cdot \log |\mathcal{A}|)$ for the case of No-Access-OI.

Recall Definition 2.2, where $k = |\mathcal{T}|$. Using Theorem A.6, we derive our result for learning coordinate-wise-multi-accurate probabilistic predictors:

Theorem A.7 (Learning Coordinate-Wise-Multi-Accurate Predictors). *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ be a collection of sets such that the set membership evaluation time for any $S \in \mathcal{C}$ is T . There exists an algorithm for learning a (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accurate probabilistic predictor $\tilde{R} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ with respect to \mathcal{D} . The sample complexity is bounded by*

$$O\left(\frac{\log |\mathcal{C}| + \log k}{\alpha^2}\right).$$

The running time is

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{k \cdot T \cdot |\mathcal{C}|}{\alpha^6}\right).$$

With overwhelming probability over its samples, the algorithm produces a probabilistic predictor \tilde{R} that can be evaluated in time $O(k \log k \cdot T \cdot \log |\mathcal{C}|)$.

Proof. We define the family of no-access-distinguishers $\mathcal{A} = (A_{S,t})_{S \in \mathcal{C}, t \in \mathcal{T}}$ as follows:

$$A_{S,t}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y = t \text{ and } x \in S, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\tilde{R} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be an (\mathcal{A}, α) -no-access-OI predictor with respect to \mathcal{D} , guaranteed by Theorem A.6. This implies that for any $A_{S,t} \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\left| \Pr_{(x, t^*(x)) \sim \mathcal{D}} [A_{S,t}(x, t^*(x)) = 1] - \Pr_{(x, \tilde{t}(x)) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \times \tilde{R}(x)} [A_{S,t}(x, \tilde{t}(x)) = 1] \right| \leq \alpha.$$

Expanding the definition of $A_{S,t}$, this ensures that for any $S \in \mathcal{C}$ and any $t \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\left| \Pr_{(x, t^*(x)) \sim \mathcal{D}} [t^*(x) = t \wedge x \in S] - \Pr_{(x, \tilde{t}(x)) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \times \tilde{R}(x)} [\tilde{t}(x) = t \wedge x \in S] \right| \leq \alpha.$$

Thus, \tilde{R} satisfies (\mathcal{C}, α) -coordinate-wise-multi-accuracy, which completes the proof. The claimed complexity bounds follow from Theorem A.6. \square

To learn threshold-multi-accurate rankings directly, as per Definition 2.3, which is stronger than Definition 2.2 in case of rankings, we can alternatively define the distinguishers

$$A_{S,\tau}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y < \tau \text{ and } x \in S, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for any $\tau \in [k]$, and achieve threshold-multi-accuracy without increase in complexities.

Next, we address the more complex task of learning multi-calibrated predictors. The following theorem shows that coordinate-wise-multi-calibration, as defined in Definition 2.9, can be achieved efficiently.

Theorem A.8 (Learning Multi-Calibrated Predictors). *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ be a collection of sets such that the set membership evaluation time for any $S \in \mathcal{C}$ is T , and let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ be a discretization parameter. There exists an algorithm for learning a $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha, \lambda)$ -coordinate-wise-multi-calibration probabilistic predictor $\tilde{R} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ with respect to \mathcal{D} . The sample complexity is bounded by*

$$\tilde{O} \left(\frac{\log^2 k \cdot (\log |\mathcal{C}| + \log(\frac{1}{\lambda}))}{\alpha^4} \right).$$

The running time is

$$\tilde{O} \left(\frac{k \cdot T \cdot (|\mathcal{C}| \cdot \log(k) + \log \frac{1}{\lambda})}{\lambda \cdot \alpha^6} \right).$$

With overwhelming probability over its samples, the algorithm produces a probabilistic predictor \tilde{R} that can be evaluated in time

$$\tilde{O} \left(\frac{k \cdot T \cdot \log(\log k + \log |\mathcal{C}| + \log \frac{1}{\lambda})}{\alpha^2} \right).$$

Proof. We define the family of sample-access-distinguishers $\mathcal{A} = (A_{S,t,\beta})_{S \in \mathcal{C}, t \in \mathcal{T}, \beta \in \Lambda[0,1]}$ with respect to the discretization λ as follows:

$$A_{S,t,\beta}(x, y; \tilde{R}(x)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y = t \text{ and } x \in S \text{ and } \tilde{R}(x)_t \in \lambda(\beta), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{R}(x)_t$ denotes the t^{th} coordinate of the stochastic vector $\tilde{R}(x)$. Notice that evaluating $A_{S,t}$ can be done in time T , since $\Lambda[0, 1]$ is known in advance.

Let $\tilde{R} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be (\mathcal{A}, α) -sample-access-OI predictor with respect to \mathcal{D} , guaranteed by Theorem A.6. This implies that for any $A_{S,t,\beta} \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\left| \Pr_{(x, t^*(x)) \sim \mathcal{D}} [A_{S,t,\beta}(x, t^*(x); \tilde{R}(x)) = 1] - \Pr_{(x, \tilde{t}(x)) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \times \tilde{R}(x)} [A_{S,t,\beta}(x, \tilde{t}(x); \tilde{R}(x)) = 1] \right| \leq \alpha.$$

Recall the definition of $S_{t,\beta}$ w.r.t. \tilde{R} :

$$S_{t,\beta} := \left\{ x \in S \text{ such that } \Pr_{\tilde{t}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(x)} [\tilde{t}(x) = t] \in \lambda(\beta) \right\}.$$

By definition of $A_{S,t,\beta}$, this ensures that for any $S_{t,\beta}$ and any $t \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\left| \Pr_{(x, t^*(x)) \sim \mathcal{D}} [t^*(x) = t \wedge x \in S_{t,\beta}] - \Pr_{(x, \tilde{t}(x)) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}} \times \tilde{R}(x)} [\tilde{t}(x) = t \wedge x \in S_{t,\beta}] \right| \leq \alpha.$$

Thus, \tilde{R} satisfies $(\mathcal{C}, \alpha, \lambda)$ -coordinate-wise-multi-calibration w.r.t. \mathcal{D} .

Notice that the number of sets to consider is $|(S_{\tau,\beta})_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}, \beta \in \Lambda[0,1]}| = k/\lambda$, therefore $|\mathcal{A}| = \frac{k \cdot |\mathcal{C}|}{\lambda}$ and the claimed complexity bounds follow from Theorem A.6. \square

Replacing the Linear Dependence on $|\mathcal{C}|$ via Weak Agnostic Learning. The running time bounds in Theorems A.7 and A.8 scale linearly with $|\mathcal{C}|$ due to the need to evaluate every distinguisher $A \in \mathcal{A}$ in each iteration, where each set $S \in \mathcal{C}$ corresponds to a distinguisher. To better understand this complexity, we revisit [DKR⁺22, Theorem 20], which decomposes the learning time into three components: sample generation, searching, and reweighting. The most computationally expensive step is searching, where, in each iteration, we must identify a distinguisher $A \in \mathcal{A}$ that differentiates between R^* and the current predictor \tilde{R} . This is done via exhaustive search: iterating over all distinguishers in \mathcal{A} and computing their distinguishing advantage. To estimate the distinguishing advantage, each distinguisher requires $O((\log |\mathcal{A}| + \log N)/\varepsilon^2)$ samples per iteration, where N is the iteration complexity. Since in the case of a discrete label distribution we have $N \leq O(\log k/\varepsilon^2)$, we obtain the complexity

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{|\mathcal{A}| \cdot \text{time}_{\mathcal{A}} \cdot \log k}{\varepsilon^4}\right),$$

as presented in Theorem A.6, where $\text{time}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an upper bound on the time required to evaluate a single distinguisher.

To eliminate the need for exhaustive search over \mathcal{A} , we follow a standard approach and replace this step with a black-box auditing procedure. Given access to the current predictor \tilde{R} and a sample from \mathcal{D} , the auditor returns a set $S \in \mathcal{C}$ and a label $t \in \mathcal{T}$ such that the predictor violates the calibration or accuracy condition on (S, t) by at least $\varepsilon = \alpha$, if such a violation exists. If no such pair is found, the predictor is guaranteed to be (\mathcal{C}, α) -multi-accurate. A similar approach applies to multi-calibration, where the auditor additionally returns a probability $\beta \in \Lambda[0, 1]$. In this framework, the overall time complexity is determined by the number of correction steps and the running time of the auditor.

In the case of coordinate-wise multi-accuracy and multi-calibration, the auditing step can be implemented via a weak agnostic learner. This follows from [HKRR18, Theorem 4.2], which shows how to achieve multi-calibration using weak agnostic learning, and thus, multi-accuracy as well. Although their setting is one-dimensional, our framework operates coordinate-wise rather than globally on the entire predictor. Consequently, the same argument applies, albeit with a multiplicative factor of k in the running time. Thus, under the assumption that the class \mathcal{C} admits an efficient weak agnostic learner, the total running time of the learning algorithm can be expressed in terms of the time complexity of this learner, effectively removing the linear dependence on $|\mathcal{C}|$. Theorems 2.6 and 2.11 are stated in terms of weak agnostic learning. We refer the reader to [GHR24] for a detailed discussion on how weak agnostic learning can be leveraged to implement efficient auditing procedures for multi-calibration and multi-accuracy.

A.2 Decision Rules

We start with the proof of Claim 2.14.

Claim A.9. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m \in [0, 1]$ s.t. $\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i = 1$, and $y_1, \dots, y_m \in \mathcal{Y}$. Let $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ and assume that $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is ε -close to affine. Then,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_f \left[f \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i y_i \right) \right] - \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i \mathbb{E}_f[f(y_i)] \right| \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

Proof. First, let us rewrite the second sum:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i \mathbb{E}[f(y_i)] &= \gamma_m \mathbb{E}[f(y_m)] + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \gamma_i \mathbb{E}[f(y_i)] = \gamma_m \mathbb{E}[f(y_m)] + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \gamma_i \right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{\gamma_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \gamma_i} \mathbb{E}[f(y_i)] \\ &= \gamma_m \mathbb{E}[f(y_m)] + (1 - \gamma_m) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{\gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_m} \mathbb{E}[f(y_i)]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(\gamma_i/1 - \gamma_m)_{i \in [m-1]}$ sums to 1, the expression $\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (\gamma_i/1 - \gamma_m) \cdot y_i$ forms a convex combination of vectors in \mathcal{Y} . As \mathcal{Y} is a convex set, this combination remains within \mathcal{Y} . Thus, the assumption from Definition 2.13 applies, yielding that

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{\gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_m} \mathbb{E}[f(y_i)] - \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{\gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_m} \cdot y_i \right) \right] \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

This means that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i y_i \right) \right] - \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i \mathbb{E}[f(y_i)] \right| = \\ &\left| \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i y_i \right) \right] - \gamma_m \mathbb{E}[f(y_m)] - (1 - \gamma_m) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{\gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_m} \mathbb{E}[f(y_i)] \right| \leq \\ &(1 - \gamma_m) \cdot \varepsilon + \left| \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i y_i \right) \right] - \gamma_m \mathbb{E}[f(y_m)] - (1 - \gamma_m) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{\gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_m} \cdot y_i \right) \right] \right|. \quad (25) \end{aligned}$$

Following the same arguments, we rewrite the first sum:

$$f \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i y_i \right) = f \left(\gamma_m \cdot y_m + (1 - \gamma_m) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{\gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_m} \cdot y_i \right),$$

and by the assumption,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\gamma_m \cdot y_m + (1 - \gamma_m) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{\gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_m} \cdot y_i \right) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \gamma_m \cdot \mathbb{E}[f(y_m)] - (1 - \gamma_m) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{\gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_m} \cdot y_i \right) \right] \right| \leq \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging in into Equation (25),

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i y_i \right) \right] - \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i \mathbb{E}[f(y_i)] \right| \\ &\leq (1 - \gamma_m) \cdot \varepsilon + \varepsilon + \left| \gamma_m \cdot \mathbb{E}[f(y_m)] + (1 - \gamma_m) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{\gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_m} \cdot y_i \right) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \gamma_m \mathbb{E}[f(y_m)] - (1 - \gamma_m) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{\gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_m} \cdot y_i \right) \right] \right| \\ &= (2 - \gamma_m) \cdot \varepsilon \leq 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

Next, we derive Corollary 2.15.

Corollary A.10. *If $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is ε -close to affine, then there exists an affine randomized predicate $f' : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that $\forall y \in \mathcal{Y}$,*

$$|\mathbb{E}_f[f(y)] - \mathbb{E}_{f'}[f'(y)]| \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

Proof. Recall that e_i denotes the i^{th} unit vector in k dimensions. Any vector y can be expressed as $y = \sum_{i \in [k]} y_i \cdot e_i$, where y_i is its i^{th} coordinate. We define f' as follows:

$$f'(y) \sim \text{Ber} \left(\sum_{i \in [k]} y_i \cdot \mathbb{E}[f(e_i)] \right).$$

Clearly, f' is affine, and the corollary follows from Claim 2.14. □

Finally, we provide the proof of Claim 2.16.

Claim A.11. *Let $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ and $M \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Let $f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a randomized predicate such that:*

- *f is M -Lipschitz;*
- *f is ε -far from affine: that is, there exists $y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_f[f(\gamma y + (1 - \gamma)y')] - \left(\gamma \mathbb{E}_f[f(y)] + (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_f[f(y')] \right) \right| > \varepsilon.$$

Then, $\|y - y'\|_\infty \geq \varepsilon/M$.

Proof. First, since f is M -Lipschitz,

$$|\mathbb{E}[f(\gamma y + (1 - \gamma)y')] - \mathbb{E}[f(y)]| \leq M\|\gamma y + (1 - \gamma)y' - y\| = M(1 - \gamma)\|y - y'\| \leq M\|y - y'\|,$$

and following the same argument,

$$|\mathbb{E}[f(\gamma y + (1 - \gamma)y')] - \mathbb{E}[f(y')]| \leq M\|y - y'\|.$$

This implies, by the assumption,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &< |\mathbb{E}[f(\gamma y + (1 - \gamma)y')] - (\gamma \mathbb{E}[f(y)] + (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}[f(y')])| \\ &= |\gamma (\mathbb{E}[f(\gamma y + (1 - \gamma)y')] - \mathbb{E}[f(y)]) + (1 - \gamma) (\mathbb{E}[f(\gamma y + (1 - \gamma)y')] - \mathbb{E}[f(y')])| \\ &\leq \gamma M\|y - y'\| + (1 - \gamma)M\|y - y'\| = M\|y - y'\|, \end{aligned}$$

and the claim follows. □

A.3 Indistinguishability

First, we provide the proof of Lemma 2.18.

Lemma A.12. *Let \mathcal{X} be a domain, and let $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ denote the uniform distribution over \mathcal{X} . Assume one-way functions exist w.r.t. security parameter $\kappa \geq \log |\mathcal{X}|$. For any constant $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, there exists a subset $\mathcal{X}_1 \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that*

- $|\Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \mathcal{X}_1] - \gamma| = \text{neg}(\kappa)$;
- \mathcal{X}_1 is κ -indistinguishable w.r.t. $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$;
- There exists a secret key such that, given the key, membership in \mathcal{X}_1 is efficiently computable.

Proof. It is well-known in cryptography that the existence of one-way functions implies the existence of pseudorandom functions (PRFs) [HILL99, GGM86]. In fact, we will show that weak-PRFs are sufficient for the construction, though the existence of OWFs remains a necessary assumption in both cases.

Recall that $\kappa \geq \log |\mathcal{X}| = n$, where n is the length of the Boolean string representing any $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Let $F_s : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^\ell$ denote the $\text{poly}(\kappa)$ -size circuit computing F_s , where $\ell = \lceil \log(1/\gamma) + \kappa \rceil$ and $s \in \{0, 1\}^\kappa$ denotes the secret key, which is hard-wired to the circuit. No efficient computation can access s or learn anything about it.

F_s defines membership in the subset \mathcal{X}_1 in the following manner: On input $x \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$, we interpret the output $F_s(x)$ as a real number in $[0, 1]$. We define $x \in \mathcal{X}_1$ if and only if $F_s(x) \leq \gamma$.¹⁰ By our choice of ℓ , the precision error of this length- ℓ binary string is at most $2^{-\ell}$, therefore

$$\left| \Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \mathcal{X}_1] - \gamma \right| = \text{neg}(\kappa).$$

The κ -indistinguishability of \mathcal{X}_1 follows from the pseudorandomness of F_s . Consider a probabilistic $\text{poly}(\kappa)$ -time algorithm \mathcal{A} such that

$$\left| \Pr_{\mathcal{A}, x \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}} [\mathcal{A}(x) = 1 \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_1] - \Pr_{\mathcal{A}, x \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}} [\mathcal{A}(x) = 1 \mid x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_1] \right| = \varepsilon(\kappa), \quad (26)$$

where $\varepsilon(\cdot)$ is a non-negligible function in κ . Recall that, since γ is a constant, $\Pr[x \in \mathcal{X}_1] \in (0, 1)$, hence Equation (26) is well-defined. We reduce \mathcal{A} to an adversary \mathcal{B} for the pseudorandom function F_s . Conceptually, the adversary \mathcal{B} has oracle access to an unknown function H , which can either be the PRF or a truly random function. The goal of \mathcal{B} is to distinguish between the two, using its oracle access to \mathcal{A} .

- **Input:** oracle access to $\mathcal{A} : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, $H : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^\ell$.
- \mathcal{B} samples inputs $x_1, \dots, x_N \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ for $N = O(1/\varepsilon^2(\kappa))$. Let $S = \{x_i\}_{i \in [N]}$.
- \mathcal{B} makes N oracle calls to H and defines the subset $S_1 \subseteq S$ in the following manner: $S_1 = \{x \in S : H(x) \leq \gamma\}$.

¹⁰For convenience, we write $F_s(x) \geq \gamma$ to indicate that the real value in $[0, 1]$ represented by the binary string $F_s(x)$ is at most γ .

- \mathcal{B} makes N oracle calls to \mathcal{A} , and counts the number of elements in $x \in S_1$ for which $\mathcal{A}(x) = 1$. Taking $m \in \{0, \dots, |S|\}$ to denote this number, \mathcal{B} then computes the difference:

$$\left| \frac{m}{|S|} - \frac{|S| - m}{|S|} \right|.$$

\mathcal{B} returns 1 if this difference exceeds $\varepsilon(\kappa)/2$, and 0 otherwise.

By construction, \mathcal{B} is a probabilistic algorithm that runs in $\text{poly}(\kappa)$ time. Moreover, observe that \mathcal{B} queries its oracle H only on uniformly random inputs, which allows us to prove weak-PRF security as commented above. To demonstrate that \mathcal{B} breaks the security of F_s , we proceed by showing that

$$\left| \Pr_{s, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A}} [\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{A}, F_s}(1^\kappa) = 1] - \Pr_{G_\kappa, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A}} [\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{A}, G_\kappa}(1^\kappa) = 1] \right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon(\kappa)}{4},$$

where $G_\kappa : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^\ell$ is a truly random function, namely, it is uniformly distributed over the set of all functions mapping $n(\kappa)$ -bit-long strings to $\ell(\kappa)$ -bit-long strings. Notice that, when $H = F_s$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Pr [\mathcal{A}(x_i) = 1 | x_i \in S_1] - \Pr [\mathcal{A}(x_i) = 1 | x_i \in S \setminus S_1]| = \\ & |\Pr [\mathcal{A}(x_i) = 1 | F_s(x_i) \leq \gamma] - \Pr [\mathcal{A}(x_i) = 1 | F_s(x_i) > \gamma]|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by a Chernoff bound, applying Equation (26) to each of $x_i \sim \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$ implies that with probability at least $1/2$,

$$|\Pr [\mathcal{A}(x_i) = 1 | x_i \in S_1] - \Pr [\mathcal{A}(x_i) = 1 | x_i \in S \setminus S_1]| \geq \frac{\varepsilon(\kappa)}{2}.$$

However, $m/|S| = \Pr [\mathcal{A}(x_i) = 1 | x \in S_1]$ and analogously $(|S| - m)/|S| = \Pr [\mathcal{A}(x_i) = 1 | x \in S \setminus S_1]$, implying that

$$\Pr [\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{A}, F_s}(1^\kappa) = 1] = \Pr \left[\left| \frac{m}{|S|} - \frac{|S| - m}{|S|} \right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon(\kappa)}{2} \right] \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

On the other hand, when $H = G_\kappa$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr [\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{A}, G_\kappa}(1^\kappa) = 1] &= \Pr \left[\left| \frac{m}{|S|} - \frac{|S| - m}{|S|} \right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon(\kappa)}{2} \right] \\ &= \Pr \left[|\Pr [\mathcal{A}(x_i) = 1 | G_\kappa(x_i) \leq \gamma] - \Pr [\mathcal{A}(x_i) = 1 | G_\kappa(x_i) > \gamma]| > \frac{\varepsilon(\kappa)}{2} \right] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

since $G_\kappa(x)$ is uniformly distributed over $\ell(\kappa)$ -bit strings for any input x . All in all, the distinguishing advantage of \mathcal{B} is lower-bounded by a non-negligible function of κ , which contradicts the assumed security of F_s . \square

Next, we restate Claim 2.19 together with its proof.

Claim A.13. *Let \mathcal{X} be a domain, and let $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$ denote the uniform distribution over \mathcal{X} . Assume \mathcal{X} contains a κ -indistinguishable subset \mathcal{X}_1 as per Definition 2.17 w.r.t. a security parameter $\kappa \geq \log |\mathcal{X}|$. For any $\text{poly}(\kappa)$ -time algorithm $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, if $\Pr [\mathcal{A}(x) = 1]$ is non-negligible in κ , then*

$$\left| \Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X} \\ \mathcal{A} \text{ coins}}} [x \in \mathcal{X}_1 | \mathcal{A}(x) = 1] - \Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}} [x \in \mathcal{X}_1] \right| = \text{neg}(\kappa).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a $\text{poly}(\kappa)$ -time algorithm and let $\mathcal{X}_2 := \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_1$. Let us denote

$$\tilde{\gamma} := \Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \\ \mathcal{A} \text{ coins}}} [x \in \mathcal{X}_1 \mid \mathcal{A}(x) = 1] \text{ and } \gamma' := \Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \mathcal{X}_1].$$

The advantage of \mathcal{A} in distinguishing membership in \mathcal{X}_1 is:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Pr[\mathcal{A}(x) = 1 \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_1] - \Pr[\mathcal{A}(x) = 1 \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_2]| = \\ & \Pr[\mathcal{A}(x) = 1] \cdot \left| \frac{\Pr[x \in \mathcal{X}_1 \mid \mathcal{A}(x) = 1]}{\Pr[x \in \mathcal{X}_1]} - \frac{\Pr[x \in \mathcal{X}_2 \mid \mathcal{A}(x) = 1]}{\Pr[x \in \mathcal{X}_2]} \right| = \\ & \Pr[\mathcal{A}(x) = 1] \cdot \left| \frac{\tilde{\gamma}}{\gamma'} - \frac{1 - \tilde{\gamma}}{1 - \gamma'} \right| \geq 4 \Pr[\mathcal{A}(x) = 1] \cdot |\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma'|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that for all $\gamma' \in [0, 1]$, we have $\gamma'(1 - \gamma') \leq \frac{1}{4}$. Recall that, by assumption, $\Pr[\mathcal{A}(x) = 1]$ is non-negligible in κ . Since the advantage of any efficient algorithm in recognizing membership in \mathcal{X}_1 is negligible, we conclude that $|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma'| = \text{neg}(\kappa)$. \square