

1 Broader Impact Statement

Our submission *Can Fairness be Automated? Guidelines and Opportunities for Fairness-aware AutoML* to the AutoML 2024 journal track describes how fairness can and should be used in automated machine learning tools and research. The paper itself neither contains a method nor experiments, therefore, there is no impact on the methodological level. Instead, the paper presents our view on how automated machine learning can tackle biased data or biased models, and what thoughts need to go into designing an AutoML system that is fairness-aware. In our opinion, the whole paper is a "broader impact statement" of the fairness in AutoML, and we therefore hope that our paper raises awareness among the AutoML community that one needs to be careful when combining the two fields of research.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

Submission Checklist

1. For all authors...
 - (a) Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper’s contributions and scope? [Yes]
 - (b) Did you describe the limitations of your work? [Yes]
 - (c) Did you discuss any potential negative societal impacts of your work? [Yes]
 - (d) Did you read the ethics review guidelines and ensure that your paper conforms to them? <https://2022.automl.cc/ethics-accessibility/> [Yes]
2. If you ran experiments...
 - (a) Did you use the same evaluation protocol for all methods being compared (e.g., same benchmarks, data (sub)sets, available resources)? [N/A]
 - (b) Did you specify all the necessary details of your evaluation (e.g., data splits, pre-processing, search spaces, hyperparameter tuning)? [N/A]
 - (c) Did you repeat your experiments (e.g., across multiple random seeds or splits) to account for the impact of randomness in your methods or data? [N/A]
 - (d) Did you report the uncertainty of your results (e.g., the variance across random seeds or splits)? [N/A]
 - (e) Did you report the statistical significance of your results? [N/A]
 - (f) Did you use tabular or surrogate benchmarks for in-depth evaluations? [N/A]
 - (g) Did you compare performance over time and describe how you selected the maximum duration? [N/A]
 - (h) Did you include the total amount of compute and the type of resources used (e.g., type of GPUs, internal cluster, or cloud provider)? [N/A]
 - (i) Did you run ablation studies to assess the impact of different components of your approach? [N/A]
3. With respect to the code used to obtain your results...
 - (a) Did you include the code, data, and instructions needed to reproduce the main experimental results, including all requirements (e.g., requirements.txt with explicit versions), random seeds, an instructive README with installation, and execution commands (either in the supplemental material or as a URL)? [N/A]
 - (b) Did you include a minimal example to replicate results on a small subset of the experiments or on toy data? [N/A]
 - (c) Did you ensure sufficient code quality and documentation so that someone else can execute and understand your code? [N/A]
 - (d) Did you include the raw results of running your experiments with the given code, data, and instructions? [N/A]
 - (e) Did you include the code, additional data, and instructions needed to generate the figures and tables in your paper based on the raw results? [N/A]
4. If you used existing assets (e.g., code, data, models)...

(a)	Did you cite the creators of used assets? [N/A]	50
(b)	Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you're using/curating if the license requires it? [N/A]	51 52
(c)	Did you discuss whether the data you are using/curating contains personally identifiable information or offensive content? [N/A]	53 54
5.	If you created/released new assets (e.g., code, data, models)...	55
(a)	Did you mention the license of the new assets (e.g., as part of your code submission)? [N/A]	56
(b)	Did you include the new assets either in the supplemental material or as a URL (to, e.g., GitHub or Hugging Face)? [N/A]	57 58
6.	If you used crowdsourcing or conducted research with human subjects...	59
(a)	Did you include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable? [N/A]	60 61
(b)	Did you describe any potential participant risks, with links to Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals, if applicable? [N/A]	62 63
(c)	Did you include the estimated hourly wage paid to participants and the total amount spent on participant compensation? [N/A]	64 65
7.	If you included theoretical results...	66
(a)	Did you state the full set of assumptions of all theoretical results? [N/A]	67
(b)	Did you include complete proofs of all theoretical results? [N/A]	68