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# Dataset selection

## Dataset

After looking through many datasets in UCI’s machine learning repository, we both decided to work with the “National Poll on Healthy Aging (NPHA). The link to the dataset is as follows:

* <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/936/national+poll+on+healthy+aging+(npha)>

## Dataset Domain

This dataset’s domain would be in Public Accommodation (healthcare access).

## Number of Observations

This dataset has 714 observations, which satisfies the project requirements of at least 500 observations.

## Number of Variables

There are 15 variables within the dataset: Number of Doctors Visited, Age, Physical Health, Mental Health, Dental Health, Employment, Stress Keeps Patient from Sleeping, Medication Keeps Patient from Sleeping, Pain Keeps Patient from Sleeping, Bathroom Needs Keeps Patient from Sleeping, Uknown Keeps Patient from Sleeping, Trouble Sleeping, Prescription Sleep Medication, Race, Gender

## Dependent/Outcome Variables

The variables selected as the dependent/outcome variables are Mental Health and Physical Health.

## Protected Class Variables

Of the 15 variables in the dataset, there are three legally recognized protected classes:

* Age
* Race
* Gender

## Legal Precedence/Law for Protected Classes

* Age: Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967
* Race: Civil Rights Act of 1964, 1991
* Gender (Sex): Civil Rights Act of 1964, 1991

# Exploring the dataset

## Protected Classes and Subgroups (Gender, Race, Age)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Count** |
| 1 (Male) | 321 |
| 2 (Female) | 393 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Race** | **Count** |
| 1 (White, non-Hispanic) | 578 |
| 2 (Black, non-Hispanic) | 52 |
| 3 (Other, non-Hispanic) | 20 |
| 4 (Hispanic) | 44 |
| 5 (2+ Races, Non-Hispanic) | 20 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** | **Count** |
| 1 (50-64) | 0 |
| 2 (65-80) | 714 |

## Discretize Subgroups

There is only one age group within the dataset, so it’s already discretized.

## Protected Class Selection

For this project, we have decided to focus on race and gender for the rest of the analysis. Even though age is a protected class, all the observations for it are within the same age group so we feel it’s best to no include it.

## Protected Classes Vs Dependent Variables (Tables)

### Gender vs Number of Doctors Visited

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number of Doctors Visted | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |
| 1 (male) |  | 56 | 173 | 92 |
| 2 (female) |  | 75 | 199 | 119 |

### Gender vs Prescription Sleep Medication

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Prescription Sleep Medication | -1 (refused) | 1 (use regularly) | 2 (use occasionally) | 3 (do not use) |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |
| 1 (male) | 0 | 21 | 15 | 285 |
| 2 (female) | 3 | 17 | 19 | 354 |

### Race vs Number of Doctors Visited

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number of Doctors Visted | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |
| 1 (White, non-Hispanic) |  | 103 | 296 | 179 |
| 2 (Black, non-Hispanic) |  | 8 | 32 | 12 |
| 3 (Other, non-Hispanic) |  | 7 | 6 | 7 |
| 4 (Hispanic) |  | 13 | 24 | 7 |
| 5 (2+ Races, Non-Hispanic) |  | 0 | 14 | 6 |

### Race vs Prescription Sleep Medication

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Prescription Sleep Medication | -1 (refused) | 1 (use regularly) | 2 (use occasionally) | 3 (do not use) |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |
| 1 (White, non-Hispanic) | 2 | 31 | 31 | 514 |
| 2 (Black, non-Hispanic) | 1 | 3 | 0 | 48 |
| 3 (Other, non-Hispanic) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 |
| 4 (Hispanic) | 0 | 2 | 2 | 40 |
| 5 (2+ Races, Non-Hispanic) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 18 |

## Protected Class vs Dependent Variables (Bar Graphs)

A graph of a number of doctors visited by a number of doctors

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

A graph showing a number of patients

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

A graph of a sleep medication

AI-generated content may be incorrect.A graph of a number of doctors visited by race

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

# Fairness Metric Selection and Mitigating Bias

## Privileged and Unprivileged Groups

The privileged subgroups for the protected classes in the dataset are:

* Male
* White

The unprivileged subgroups for the protected classes in the dataset are:

* Female
* Black
* Hispanic

The two dependent outcomes variables selected previously are:

* Mental health
* Physical health

## Fairness Metric Selection and Calculation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mental Health (Race) | Mental Health (Gender) | Physical Health (Race) | Physical Health (Gender) |
| Demographic Parity | 2.61 | 1.10 | 1.58 | 1.12 |
| Equal accuracy | 2.61 | 1.04 | 5.10 | 3.88 |

* 1. **Bias Mitigation Algorithm**

Transformed the data using Disparate Impact Remover.

## Bias Mitigation Algorithm

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mental Health (Race) | Mental Health (Gender) | Physical Health (Race) | Physical Health (Gender) |
| Demographic Parity | 2.61 | 1.10 | 1.14 | 1.14 |
| Equal accuracy | 2.61 | 1.04 | 5.10 | 1.39 |

# Mitigating Bias Using Classifier

Below are the results from training and testing using a classifier.

* 1. **Original Dataset Fairness Metrics**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mental Health (Race) | Mental Health (Gender) | Physical Health (Race) | Physical Health (Gender) |
| Demographic Parity | 1.05 | 1 | 1.04 | 1.23 |
| Equal accuracy | 1.12 | 1.06 | 1.08 | 1.41 |

* 1. **Transformed Dataset Fairness Metrics**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mental Health (Race) | Mental Health (Gender) | Physical Health (Race) | Physical Health (Gender) |
| Demographic Parity | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Equal accuracy | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

* 1. **Positive or Negative Change to Bias**

Calculated fairness metrics for each step are shown above.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Change Compared to previous |
| Original Dataset | N/A |
| After Transforming Dataset | No change / very minimal change both negative and positive |
| After Training Classifier on Original Dataset | Positive change |
| After Training Classifier on Transformed Dataset | Positive change |

# Fairness Metric Selection and Mitigating Bias

## Group Members

* Ryan Graddy
* Winston Tan

## Graph of Two Fairness Metrics

## Explain Which Fairness Metric is Better

Neither fairness metric is better in this case. Both showed similar results in the original dataset, transformed dataset, and after applying a classifier.
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