**Question:**

In her interview with Tom Upchurch, Cathy O'Neil discusses her views on a "Hippocratic Oath for Data Science." Would you support a Hippocratic Oath for Data Science? If yes, give an example or two of something you think should be in the oath (ex. a particular principle or promise). If no, why not?

**Answer:**

In the interview from Wired called *To work for society, data scientists need a hippocratic oath with teeth* Tom Upchurch interviews Cathy O’Neil about her views on a "hippocratic oath for data science." In this interview she states that accuracy and efficiency alone are not sufficient metrics for the success of algorithms. Instead, fairness, equity, and other social and ethical considerations need to be built into the algorithms to promote a more well-rounded definition of success. Cathy O’Neil then suggests that due to automated systems making discriminatory decisions and “learning the language of human prejudice,” data scientists need a hippocratic oath to follow. Doing so would force data scientists to consider the wider societal impact of their design decisions.

Although I believe a hippocratic oath for data science would be a step in the right direction for combating discriminatory practices and ethical concerns of algorithms in a broad sense, I don’t think it’d be enough to combat the concerns entirely. Instead, I believe tech companies/any company who makes use of algorithmic decision making systems should be held to the same oath. Doing this would force the companies who implement the models themselves to be held accountable, not just the ones working for them. One thing that could be implemented into this oath is a list of mandatory design considerations that focus on aspects such as fairness and equity, instead of just optimization and accuracy. Furthermore, the data scientists and the tech companies they work for would be required to document how they implemented/at least considered these broad considerations of fairness.