

Investigating Gender Fairness in Machine Learning-driven Personalized Care for Chronic Pain

Pratik Gajane

P.GAJANE@TUE.NL

*Department of Mathematics and Computer Science,
Eindhoven University of Technology,
Eindhoven, the Netherlands.*

Sean Newman

SCNEWMAN@UMICH.EDU

*School of Public Health,
University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA.*

Mykola Pechenizkiy

M.PECHENIZKIY@TUE.NL

*Department of Mathematics and Computer Science,
Eindhoven University of Technology,
Eindhoven, the Netherlands.*

John D. Piette

JPIETTE@UMICH.EDU

*Department of Health Behavior and Health Equity,
School of Public Health, University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA.*

Abstract

Chronic pain significantly diminishes the quality of life for millions worldwide. While psychoeducation and therapy can improve pain outcomes, many individuals experiencing pain lack access to evidence-based treatments or fail to complete the necessary number of sessions to achieve benefit. Reinforcement learning (RL) shows potential in tailoring personalized pain management interventions according to patients' individual needs while ensuring the efficient use of scarce clinical resources. However, clinicians, patients, and healthcare decision-makers are concerned that RL solutions could exacerbate disparities associated with patient characteristics like race or gender. In this article, we study *gender fairness* in personalized pain care recommendations using a real-world application of reinforcement learning (Piette et al., 2022a). Here, adhering to gender fairness translates to minimal or no disparity in the utility received by subpopulations as defined by gender. We investigate whether the selection of relevant patient information (referred to as features) used to assist decision-making affects gender fairness. Our experiments, conducted using real-world data (Piette, 2022), indicate that included features can impact gender fairness. Moreover, we propose an RL solution, NESTEDRECOMMENDATION, that demonstrates the ability: i) to adaptively learn to select the features that optimize for utility and fairness, and ii) to accelerate feature selection and in turn, improve pain care recommendations from early on, by leveraging clinicians' domain expertise.

1. Introduction

Chronic pain is a widespread issue impacting millions of individuals worldwide and its distribution within society is markedly unequal, often influenced by demographic factors, including gender (Andrews et al., 2017; Zimmer et al., 2022). Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) and related approaches are the most common, evidence-based non-pharmacologic treatments for chronic pain (Chou et al., 2008). Pain CBT is typically delivered by a trained therapist to individuals and groups, either through face-to-face sessions or using remote technology. Due to the necessity of multiple (weekly) sessions and a limited availability of therapists, many patients suffering from chronic pain lack access to pain CBT services or discontinue treatment before experiencing therapeutic benefits.

Considering the significant impact of chronic pain on individuals and society, and the challenges of providing effective treatment to the large number of patients who could benefit, a variety of machine learning (ML) solutions have been proposed to improve the quality and scalability of pain psychotherapies. Machine learning could be especially beneficial in optimizing the delivery of pain CBT to better address the considerable variability among patients, encompassing their response to treatments and susceptibility to adverse effects (Ablin and Buskila, 2012). This variability limits the efficacy of generic interventions, emphasizing the necessity for more personalized approaches to address the unique needs, preferences, and responsiveness of each patient with chronic pain.

Thus by its nature, chronic pain care necessitates personalized treatments over an extended duration taking the feedback from patients into consideration. Reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms are especially suited to make such sequential decisions using feedback from patients, including passively-collected or patient-reported information about their behaviors, treatment engagement, and health status. RL also has shown the ability to personalize pain care recommendations (Komorowski et al., 2018; Saria, 2018; Roggeveen et al., 2021). In this article, we draw upon the study of Piette et al. (2022a) who conducted a randomized trial to evaluate the effectiveness of an RL strategy to deliver personalized CBT for chronic pain. This approach automatically adjusts the type and duration of treatment sessions based on patients’ feedback regarding their pedometer-measured step counts and pain-related interference. They found that the RL algorithm was effectively able to personalize the intensity of sessions to participants and that on average patient-reported outcomes improved as the program gained experience through interactions (Piette et al., 2022b). Compared to standard telephone CBT delivered by a therapist, the RL-supported CBT resulted in non-inferior improvements in pain-related disability at three months (primary outcome), while using less than half the therapist time (Piette et al., 2022b). At six months, significantly more patients randomized to the RL solution had clinically meaningful improvements in pain-related disability than patients receiving standard care (37% versus 19%, $p < .01$) (Piette et al., 2022a). Also, a greater proportion of patients receiving RL-supported CBT had clinically meaningful 6-month improvements in pain intensity (29% versus 17%, $p = .03$).

While these results are encouraging, a possible drawback of RL-supported healthcare services is that they may introduce/amplify biases that limit access to care or create suboptimal outcomes for certain patient demographics. In general, the design of the majority of precision healthcare ML algorithms ignores the sex and gender dimensions,

and their contribution to health differences among individuals (Cirillo et al., 2020). In the context of the study of Piette et al. (2022a), conducted within the United States Department of Veterans Affairs healthcare system, women represent a relatively small subgroup of patients, and their unique experiences regarding pain care might affect their engagement and utility gained from CBT pain interventions (Kehle-Forbes et al., 2017). This might potentially affect gender fairness in the utility gained from CBT interventions.

To see how we assess gender fairness in this study, note that, posed as an RL problem, the utility of a pain care recommendation to a patient is represented by a numerical value called “reward” (a detailed formulation will be given in Section 3). In this study, we consider adhering to gender fairness as minimal or no disparity between the average rewards received by subpopulations as defined by gender. Other definitions of fairness have been considered in the literature (Grote and Keeling, 2022).

Gender biases in treatment targeting and personalization could arise from several problems in the development and use of RL algorithms to personalize healthcare. For example, significant differences between a training sample and the population of patients for which the algorithm will be used could introduce unfair or undesirable biases in RL decisions. Differential feedback from participating patients in which under-served and priority subgroups fail to provide input at the same level of accuracy and timeliness as other patients also could introduce biases. Finally, substantial concerns arise from limitations in the design of RL algorithms, particularly regarding the inclusion and operationalization of features (i.e., relevant patient information) in decision-making.

1.1. Our Contributions

In this study, we investigate gender fairness in personalized pain care recommendations made using a reinforcement learning algorithm. In particular, we examine the extent to which the third potential pitfall of RL-supported healthcare services noted above - namely suboptimal specification of features - could contribute to biased decision-making. We utilize the dataset Piette (2022) which is also used in an extensive study on RL-driven pain care (Piette et al., 2022b). To allow for personalized recommendations, we model the problem at hand using *contextual bandits*, a reinforcement learning problem formulation well-suited to deal with personalized sequential decision-making. In this model, the algorithm leverages a range of patient-specific features to tailor its recommendations. Our results indicate that when the RL algorithm makes decisions based on a certain set of features, the utility of pain care recommendations for women is discernibly different compared to men ¹. Furthermore, we propose a generalizable, data-driven reinforcement learning algorithm to optimize feature selection and mitigate biases in utility across genders. Our algorithm has the ability to expedite feature selection and in turn, improve pain care recommendations from the outset by leveraging clinicians’ domain expertise. This approach helps mitigate the problem of initial subpar performance, known as the “cold start”, that often hinders the real-world applicability of RL solutions. While the focus of this article is on gender, our algorithm can also be applied to address biases across other relevant factors.

1. Please note that the results provided are based on the genders recorded in the dataset Piette (2022): men and women.

1.2. Generalizable Insights about Machine Learning in the Context of Healthcare

Previous research (including studies cited in Section 2 below) has demonstrated that machine learning, particularly reinforcement learning, has the potential to enhance the efficiency of complex healthcare services like CBT. This includes limiting the delivery of marginal-impact health services while maximizing the utilization of available clinical resources to benefit a larger number of patients. However, serious concerns have been raised about the impact of these algorithms on disparities in treatment access, quality, and outcomes affecting socioeconomically vulnerable groups of patients (McCadden et al., 2020; Parikh et al., 2019; Daneshjou et al., 2021; Lyles et al., 2023). The extent to which such disparities exist, or even how they should be identified is not well understood and almost no work has offered generalizable solutions to addressing fairness-related problems in RL-based healthcare solutions.

In this article, we empirically demonstrate disparities across genders in the performance of an RL algorithm when using various subsets of relevant patient information. Here, performance is measured both in terms of the average reward and suboptimal pain care recommendations. While gender-based bias in health outcomes is an important concern, our focus on gender fairness represents a much broader set of social determinants of health that could reflect unacceptable biases in health systems.

Additionally, we propose a generalizable algorithmic RL solution that can be applied in conjunction with expert inputs to optimize population-level outcomes while minimizing disparities in outcomes across subgroups. Our algorithm can make use of valuable inputs from healthcare experts upfront, enabling improved pain care recommendations from early on. This helps to address the issue of low initial performance of RL algorithms which may limit their practical effectiveness in real-world pain care management. In this context, low initial performance would translate to the possibility of initial patient interactions receiving poor recommendations, potentially resulting in inadequate pain care and diminished patient outcomes. Hence, approaches such as ours, which seek to enhance the initial performance of RL-based healthcare solutions, are pivotal for refining treatment strategies and enhancing patient satisfaction and well-being. Moreover, our approach would bolster the confidence of healthcare professionals in RL-based solutions, as it empowers them with a degree of control over the algorithmic process to rectify its initial erroneous decisions.

By documenting potential problems of gender fairness related to feature selection along with some potentially useful solutions, we hope to inform the broader debate regarding fairness-related consequences of machine learning in healthcare resource allocation and patient management (in the current application, fairness or equity across gender groups). We hope that these strategies can facilitate the effective application of RL solutions in healthcare problems affecting millions of patients (here, pain patients receiving pain psychotherapy) while also assuring clinicians and decision-makers that such solutions can, in fact, reflect community values such as gender-based equity.

2. Related Work

Machine learning has been found useful in pain-related assessment, prognosis, and self-management support (Zhang and Kamel Boulos, 2023; Singhal et al., 2023; Zakeri

et al., 2022). Some of the most advanced work has focused on algorithms designed to risk-stratify patients and identify unexplained variations in outcomes across subgroups. For example, deep learning algorithms have been found to be useful in explaining socioeconomic disparities in pain severity by incorporating predictors that go beyond standard clinical assessments such as radiography (Pierson et al., 2021). On the other hand, Obermeyer et al. (2019) illustrate that commercially available prediction models may exacerbate racial disparities by using cost as a biased proxy for clinical severity.

Far fewer studies represent actual clinical trials in which ML solutions have been evaluated as a component of patient care. A recent systematic review identified 152 out of 627 trials of AI applications in healthcare incorporated some form of patient-reported outcome, with the majority of those studies published since 2021 (Pearce et al., 2023). Some evidence suggests that patient messaging based on reinforcement learning can improve self-care behaviors (e.g., encouraging physical activity among patients with diabetes) relative to a fixed algorithm (Yom-Tov et al., 2017; Hochberg et al., 2016). The use of reinforcement learning for physical activity encouragement in cardiac rehabilitation is explored by van Tuijn et al. (2023). Lopez-Martinez et al. (2019) proposed a deep reinforcement learning approach for personalized opioid dosing recommendations for pain care. Despite the growing interest in the field, there exists a paucity of studies documenting real-world impact on treatment quality, health behaviors, or clinical outcomes to generalize about the effectiveness of these applications (Han et al., 2023).

Along with the enthusiasm about the potential of machine learning to improve healthcare, there has emerged a growing mistrust, skepticism, or even fear about the loss of human control of healthcare resource allocation, patient communication, and clinical decisions (McCraden et al., 2020; Parikh et al., 2019; Daneshjou et al., 2021; Lyles et al., 2023). In particular, Tewari and Murphy (2017) point out a number of challenges that should be addressed in order to maximize the usefulness of contextual bandits (and other machine learning approaches) in the healthcare domain, including generalizable methods for assessing the suitability of included features. In a 2019 review, Triantafyllidis and Tsanas (2019) identified only 3 randomized trials in which ML approaches were evaluated as part of a digital health intervention. Two of the three were given a global quality rating of “weak.” Given the scarcity of empirical analyses of fairness concerns in ML-based healthcare using real-world samples, legitimate concerns among clinicians and policymakers arise. These concerns often lead to an unproductive sense of inertia regarding the exploration or adoption of ML-based programs that may greatly increase the quality, accessibility, or efficiency of health services.

Our proposed method that learns to select the features that optimize for fairness and utility is similar in objective to previous work on RL-based feature selection (Hazrati Fard et al., 2013; Rasoul et al., 2021; Fan et al., 2023). However, our proposed method can use domain expertise to accelerate feature selection, unlike these solutions. For fairness concerns in the general RL literature and RL-based healthcare services, see Gajane et al. (2022) and Smith et al. (2023) respectively.

3. Formalizing Pain Care as a Reinforcement Learning Problem

We model pain care using *contextual bandits* — a reinforcement learning formalization that has been used toward the goal of personalized decision-making in many domains including healthcare. In a contextual bandits problem, at each decision step $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$:

- The algorithm observes a context i.e., some relevant information in the form of a set of feature values.
- Using this contextual information and previously observed feedback, the algorithm selects an option a_t from the set of available options. After selecting an option, the algorithm receives a (possibly randomized) numerical value r_{t,a_t} as feedback. In reinforcement learning terminology, options and feedback are called *actions* and *rewards* respectively. It should be noted that the received reward r_{t,a_t} only corresponds to the action taken a_t and no reward is observed at time t for actions $a \neq a_t$. Reward r_{t,a_t} informs the algorithm about the quality of a_t . The higher the received reward, the better the corresponding action.
- The algorithm may choose to improve its action selection strategy with the new observation: {observed context, selected action, received reward}.

For personalized pain care, a decision step corresponds to the beginning of a patient interaction. Context/features can be understood as the relevant patient information. Actions are the available pain care recommendations and feedback corresponds to the effects of the given recommendation on the patient.

For our study, we used the dataset provided in [Piette \(2022\)](#). For each patient interaction, the following patient information is given in the dataset:

% days this week with steps goal met	CBT skill practice this week
Sleep quality this week	Sleep duration this week
Pain interfere1	Pain interfere2
Pain intensity change	Session Number

These features were decided upon in consultation with healthcare experts. More details about the features and how they are collected can be found in [Appendix A](#).

The recommendation options (or actions, in the parlance of reinforcement learning) are:

- Option 1: Interactive voice response (IVR) call. During IVR calls, patients hear a recorded message from their therapist.
- Option 2: A 15-minute telephone session with a therapist.
- Option 3: A 45-minute telephone session with a therapist.

For each patient interaction, the entry recorded in the dataset contains values of all the features mentioned above, the recommended action, and the observed reward. The rewards were computed by adding the change in pedometer steps (scaled between 0-0.5) to the average of the two pain interference questions (scaled between 0-0.5). In the above, option 2 is more human-resource intensive than option 1, while option 3 is most human-resource intensive. To mitigate this disparity, [Piette et al. \(2022a\)](#) recommend discounting the rewards of option 2 and option 3 with additive factors of -0.02 and -0.06 respectively.

4. Methods

In this section, we provide details of the methods we used in our study.

4.1. Use of Existing Method

The purpose of our first set of experiments was to verify the influence of the set of features included in the context on the performance of the algorithm in terms of its gender fairness and utility. Here we used the algorithm LinUCB (Li et al., 2010). We include it in Appendix B for completeness.

LinUCB maintains linear models for actions, adjusting them with observed features and rewards. It selects actions with uncertainty within model bounds to maximize cumulative rewards through iterative updates based on estimated values. We chose this algorithm as it is highly influential and forms the basis of other RL methods. Accordingly, we expect that the results obtained using LinUCB will have wide-reaching pertinence and will also be relevant while using other solutions based on LinUCB.

4.2. Our Proposed Method

In this section, we describe our proposed solution, given in Algorithm 1, to dynamically select the optimal feature set from the provided options. The identity of the optimal feature set is determined by an arbitrary performance criterion depending on received rewards.

Algorithm 1: NESTEDRECOMMENDATION

Input: Feature sets, pain care recommendations, T , Policy1, Policy2, performance criteria.
for $t = 1$ **to** T **do**

```

; // Level 1: Selection of Feature Sets
Use action selection step of Policy1 to choose  $set(t)$  from the given feature sets.
; // Level 2: Selection of Pain Care Recommendations
Use Policy2 with  $set(t)$  to choose the recommendation  $rec(t)$  from the given pain care
recommendations.
Apply  $rec(t)$  and note the received reward  $r(t)$ .
Use  $rec(t)$  and  $r(t)$  to update the internal parameters of Policy2 (to be used in future
selections at Level 2).
Use  $set(t)$  and  $r(t)$  to perform the policy update step of Policy1 (to be used in future
selections at Level 1).
end

```

In this nested strategy, the algorithm takes decisions at the following two levels.

- At the first level: The decision choices (or, actions) are the given feature sets, and the algorithm’s objective is to learn to select the optimal feature set using history (i.e., previously selected feature sets and observed rewards).
- At the second level: The decision choices are pain care recommendations, and the algorithm’s objective is to learn to select the optimal pain care recommendation using history (i.e., previously selected recommendations and observed rewards).

An instantiation of Algorithm 1 that allows us to make use of clinicians’ domain knowledge about the feature sets is to use a Bayesian policy like Thompson Sampling (given in Appendix C) as Policy1 along with LinUCB as Policy2. In this instantiation, we can employ Beta distribution as a prior distribution to encode clinicians’ domain knowledge about the suitability of feature sets as follows ² : For action a , use $\text{Beta}(\alpha_a, \beta_a)$ to encode the belief that the expected reward from action a would be $\alpha_a / (\alpha_a + \beta_a)$. Other ways to incorporate clinicians’ domain knowledge about the feature sets into prior distributions, as discussed in Johnson et al. (2010), can also be accommodated within NESTEDRECOMMENDATION.

5. Cohort Selection and Data Extraction

Details about the study design including patient eligibility, intervention delivery, and the underlying RL approach used by the intervention are described in the main outcomes report (Piette et al., 2022a), protocol paper (Piette et al., 2016), and a paper describing secondary analyses of the RL system’s functioning (Piette et al., 2022b). In brief, the data used in this article came from the RL-supported segment of a randomized trial designed to assess the effectiveness of RL-supported CBT compared to standard therapist-delivered telephone CBT for chronic back pain management. Conducted among 278 patients recruited from two United States Department of Veterans Affairs healthcare systems, the study offered all participants a 10-week program of pain CBT. In the RL-supported intervention segment, patients’ feedback on their physical activity (pedometer-measured step counts) and pain-related interference was collected through daily automated calls and used to inform the RL model’s weekly selection from among the possible options as given in Section 3. Patients in the comparison group received ten 45-minute therapist-delivered telephone CBT sessions as recommended by professional guidelines. Outcome assessments, including patient-reported measures, were conducted at 3- and 6-months post-randomization to evaluate intervention efficacy and patient satisfaction.

Data Extraction. The data was collected via questions asked during daily IVR surveys with the responses for each person averaged across days within a week. The features described in Section 3 and Appendix A correspond to questions in the daily survey. They were based on domain expert advice about which data the RL algorithm should consider.

6. Experimental Results

We conducted two sets of experiments. The aim of the first set of experiments was to determine whether the features included in the context information affect gender fairness. The second set of experiments aimed to determine whether our proposed method NESTEDRECOMMENDATION can dynamically select the optimal feature set, where optimality is determined by an arbitrary performance criterion combining utility and fairness.

2. For a short primer on Beta distribution and its use as a prior distribution, see Piech (2019).

Table 1: Feature sets and included features

Set 1	Set 2	Set 3
Pain intensity change, CBT skill practice this week, Sleep quality this week, Sleep duration this week, Pain interfere1, Pain interfere2, % of days in current week with steps goal met, Session number	Pain intensity change, CBT skill practice this week, Sleep quality this week, Sleep duration this week, % of days in current week with steps goal met, Session number	Pain intensity change, CBT skill practice this week, Sleep quality this week, Sleep duration this week, Pain interfere2, % of days in current week with steps goal met, Session number
Set 4	Set 5	Set 6
Pain intensity change, CBT skill practice this week, Sleep quality this week, Sleep duration this week, Pain interfere1, % of days in current week with steps goal met, Session number	Pain intensity change, CBT skill practice this week, Pain interfere1, Pain interfere2, % of days in current week with steps goal met, Session number	Pain intensity change, CBT skill practice this week, Sleep quality this week, Sleep duration this week, Pain interfere1, Pain interfere2, Session number

6.1. Preprocessing

Details about data preprocessing and the patient interactions can be found in Appendix D. We ensured that the distribution of the total population across genders remains consistent with the dataset Piette (2022). Overall, women constitute 12.5% of the total number of patients.

6.2. Algorithmic Parameter Used in LinUCB

The only parameter used in LinUCB is the value α (see Appendix B). We used $\alpha = 0.3$ in all the results reported in this article. The role of α in the algorithm and our parameter selection process is explained in Appendix E.

6.3. Competing Feature Sets

We compared the results across the various feature sets shown in Table 1. We also conducted experiments using other combinations of features, with each combination containing at least three features. The findings from the six feature sets shown in Table 1 proved particularly insightful. Results for other feature sets are available from the authors on request.

6.4. Results: Effects of Features on Gender Fairness

In the first set of experiments, we see how the features included in the context information can affect gender fairness.




Figure 1: Numerical means of the average reward over 100 runs. Figure 2: Numerical means of the fraction of suboptimal action selection over 100 runs.

Table 2: Statistical summary of the received average reward

Feature Set	Men		Women		Hypothesis	p-value	Cohen's d
	Mean	Std	Mean	Std			
Feature Set 1	<u>0.446</u>	0.037	<u>0.457</u>	0.029	H1	0.012	0.322
Feature Set 2	<u>0.434</u>	0.057	<u>0.416</u>	0.058	H2	0.017	0.303
Feature Set 3	<u>0.439</u>	0.039	<u>0.427</u>	0.044	H2	0.021	0.288
Feature Set 4	<u>0.442</u>	0.046	<u>0.430</u>	0.055	H2	0.047	0.237
Feature Set 5	<u>0.455</u>	0.031	<u>0.458</u>	0.027	H3	0.362	NA
Feature Set 6	<u>0.439</u>	0.050	<u>0.426</u>	0.048	H2	0.025	0.278

Table 3: Statistical summary of the fraction of suboptimal action selection

Feature Set	Men		Women		Hypothesis	p-value	Cohen's d
	Mean	Std	Mean	Std			
Feature Set 1	<u>0.126</u>	0.023	<u>0.120</u>	0.029	H1	0.046	0.239
Feature Set 2	<u>0.159</u>	0.026	<u>0.166</u>	0.019	H2	0.014	0.313
Feature Set 3	<u>0.149</u>	0.025	<u>0.158</u>	0.035	H2	0.018	0.299
Feature Set 4	<u>0.137</u>	0.023	<u>0.145</u>	0.032	H2	0.027	0.273
Feature Set 5	<u>0.122</u>	0.024	<u>0.120</u>	0.015	H3	0.323	NA
Feature Set 6	<u>0.147</u>	0.024	<u>0.155</u>	0.034	H2	0.040	0.248

To see how these sets affect gender fairness, we tested the following hypotheses :

- **H1** — the performance of the RL algorithm for women is *better* than its performance for men.
- **H2** — the performance of the RL algorithm for women is *worse* than its performance for men.
- **H3** — the performance of the RL algorithm for women is *unequal* to its performance for men.

We used LinUCB with feature sets 1 to 6 on 50000 patient interactions. Each patient interaction corresponds to a single time step in the results. We used the average reward and fraction of suboptimal action selection as performance measures. In this context, a suboptimal action is any action other than the action that has the highest expected reward for the considered patient interaction. All the results presented in this article are averaged over 100 independent runs.

In Figure 1 and Table 2, we show the average reward obtained for men and women respectively. Similarly, we report the fraction of suboptimal action selection in Figure 2 and Table 3. In Figures 1 and 2, the error bars represent 95% confidence intervals to showcase the variability of the results. In Figure 1, the Y-axis starts at 0.38, while in Figure 2 the Y-axis starts at 0.10. The choice of using these non-zero values is made to emphasize the relative differences between the bars. Exact values for the average reward and fraction of suboptimal action selection are provided in Table 2 and Table 3 for reference. To ensure transparency, we provide alternative versions of these figures where the Y-axes start from 0 in Appendix F.

In Table 2, the p-value of **H1** for feature set 1 is 0.012, which is below the significance level of 0.05. Therefore, based on this conventional threshold, we may reject the null hypothesis in favor of hypothesis **H1** for feature set 1. For feature sets 2, 3, 4 and 6, the respective p-values of **H2** are 0.017, 0.021, 0.047 and 0.025. Therefore, based on the significance level of 0.05, we may reject the null hypothesis in favor of hypothesis **H2** for feature sets 2, 3, 4 and 6. Crucially, for feature set 5, the p-value of **H3** is 0.362, indicating that there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis in favor of **H3** at the conventional significance level of 0.05.

Even for the performance measure of the fraction of suboptimal action selection shown in Table 3, we see similar trends as for average reward. For feature set 1, we may reject the null hypothesis in favor of hypothesis **H1** (p-value 0.046). For feature sets 2, 3, 4 and 6, we may reject the null hypothesis in favor of hypothesis **H2** (p-values 0.014, 0.018, 0.027 and 0.040 respectively). For feature set 5, there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis in favor of **H3** (p-value 0.323).

We also report Cohen’s d values which are commonly used in healthcare research to quantify the effect size of differences between groups, aiding in the evaluation of clinical significance (Sullivan and Feinn, 2012).

The results suggest that for both the performance metrics, the gender fairness provided by the algorithm is affected by the features included in the context information.

6.5. Results : Dynamic Selection of Optimal Feature Set

Here our goal is to verify the following :

- Does NESTEDRECOMMENDATION learn to select the optimal feature set? – Learning to select the optimal feature set is important as the included features can affect gender fairness as well as the algorithm’s utility.
- Can NESTEDRECOMMENDATION make use of clinicians’ domain knowledge to improve its performance and avoid cold start? – Cold start here refers to the phenomenon of subpar initial performance for reinforcement learning solutions. See Section 1.1 and 1.2 for more details.

The identity of the optimal feature set is determined by the performance criterion such as :

- optimal feature set = feature set with the highest adherence to some utility criterion (e.g., highest average reward);
- optimal feature set = feature set with the highest adherence to some fairness criterion (e.g., the lowest difference between average rewards for men and women);
- weighted combination of the utility criterion and the fairness criterion.

Proposition 1 *In our experiments, the performance criterion for feature sets is a weighted combination of the utility criterion and the fairness criterion with equal weights for both.*

It should be emphasized that NESTEDRECOMMENDATION is agnostic toward the choice of the performance criterion, and it can be used with any arbitrary performance criterion.

We used NESTEDRECOMMENDATION along with Thompson Sampling (given in Appendix C) as Policy1 to select the feature sets and LinUCB (given in Appendix B) as Policy2 to select the pain care recommendations. As noted earlier, Thompson Sampling allows us to make use of clinicians’ domain knowledge about the suitability of feature sets. If the healthcare experts’ beliefs about the suitability of feature sets approximate reality well, then NESTEDRECOMMENDATION would be able to converge on the optimal feature set sooner. On the other hand, even in the case that healthcare experts’ beliefs are imprecise/incorrect, NESTEDRECOMMENDATION would still be able to converge on the optimal feature set by utilizing the observations in the form of {selected feature set, corresponding reward} to counteract the provided incorrect information.

In Figure 3, we plot time on the X-axis and the cumulative fraction of optimal feature set selection on the Y-axis. To see how to interpret Figure 3, consider a point corresponding to the X value of 10000. In this context, the corresponding Y value is 0.564. This value indicates that, from time step 1 to 10000, the algorithm opted for the optimal feature set approximately 56.4% of the time (averaged over 100 runs).

In Figure 4, we plot time intervals on the X-axis and the fraction of optimal feature set selection on the Y-axis. To see how to interpret Figure 4, consider the second from the left bar corresponding to the time interval 5001 to 10000. The height of this bar is 0.737 which indicates that from time step 5001 to 10000, the algorithm selected the optimal feature set approximately 73.7% of the time (averaged over 100 runs).

From the results given in Figure 3 and Figure 4, it can be seen that NESTEDRECOMMENDATION learns to select the optimal feature set. In Figure 3, the cumulative fraction of optimal feature set selection increases with time. In Figure 4, the fraction of the optimal feature set selection in the considered time intervals increases rapidly until it reaches 1, indicating that beyond a certain time step, the algorithm always makes pain care recommendations using the optimal feature set.

The results on the left of Figure 3 and Figure 4 are obtained by setting the prior distribution for all the actions as Beta(1,2) which encodes the belief that the expected reward from each feature set would be $1/(1+2) = 0.333$ which is not too far from reality as seen in Table 2. The results on the right are obtained by setting the prior distribution for all the actions as Beta(1,5) which encodes the belief that the expected reward from each feature set would be $1/(1+5) = 0.167$.




Figure 3: Cumulative fraction of optimal feature set selection from $T = 1$ to 50000. The shaded areas represent the variability in the results, extending from the minimum to the maximum value over 100 runs. The results on the left are obtained using a prior distribution that more closely approximates the suitability of each feature set for the task at hand.




Figure 4: Fraction of optimal feature set selection in the 10 intervals of 5000 up to $T = 50000$. The error bars show the variability in the results, extending from the minimum to the maximum value over 100 runs. The results on the left are obtained using a prior distribution that more closely approximates the suitability of each feature set for the task at hand.

Comparing the results on the left with the respective results on the right in Figure 3 and Figure 4, it can be seen that NESTEDRECOMMENDATION is indeed able to identify the optimal feature set sooner when the prior distribution approximates reality better. For example, in Figure 4, see the bars for the time interval ‘5001 to 10000’ on the left and the right. On the left, this fraction is 0.737, and on the right, this fraction is 0.592. That is NESTEDRECOMMENDATION selected the optimal feature set much more frequently when the clinicians’ domain knowledge about the feature sets approximates reality better. However, even in the other case, when these beliefs are imprecise, NESTEDRECOMMENDATION is still able to converge on the optimal feature set as seen in the bars for time intervals ‘35001 to 40000’, ‘40001 to 45000’ and ‘45001 to 50000’ on the right in Figure 4. The effect of healthcare experts’ beliefs on the RL algorithm’s performance is also seen in Figure 3. On the left, from time step 1 to 10000, the algorithm selected the optimal feature set 56.4% of the time, while on the right, for the same time period, the algorithm selected the optimal feature set 46.2% of the time. This indicates that the algorithm is able to identify the optimal feature set sooner when the prior distribution constructed using clinicians’ domain

knowledge resembles reality. This leads to more frequent selection of the optimal feature set from the outset, resulting in higher performance based on the given criterion (in this case, a weighted combination of utility and gender fairness with equal weights for both, as given in Proposition 1) even during initial time steps. Thus, NESTEDRECOMMENDATION demonstrates the capability to mitigate cold start to some degree by enhancing its initial performance through leveraging clinicians’ domain expertise.

7. Discussion

Machine learning perspective. We demonstrate how algorithms can display biased outcomes with respect to gender on a real-world dataset. Our approach showcases that information considered in the decision-making process can affect gender fairness provided by the RL algorithm. Clinicians may find it valuable to understand which specific details of the inclusion or exclusion of patient information can result in biased outcomes. This understanding can help them select the most appropriate information to generate pain care recommendations that are both highly useful and aligned with fairness principles. Our proposed RL solution, called NESTEDRECOMMENDATION, can automate this selection process and dynamically learn to use the optimal information set that achieves the given objective. We also showcased a potential solution to alleviate cold start by enhancing the initial performance of our solution by leveraging clinicians’ domain expertise. Moreover, this approach offers a way for clinicians to maintain their advisory role in ML-driven pain care recommendation systems, addressing concerns about the loss of this role as raised in Grote and Keeling (2022). A future direction of this work could be incorporating a deep learning approach to address disparities in pain, as done for racial disparities by Pierson et al. (2021). However, deep learning approaches are generally considered to be less interpretable/explainable compared to traditional ML approaches which might be a hindrance to the former’s acceptability among clinicians and policymakers.

Limitations from ML perspective (and avenues for future work).

- Exploring the cause(s) behind demonstrated gender bias: It would be illustrative to see whether this bias is an artifact of the underlying data or it is introduced/amplified by the RL algorithm.
- Other definitions of fairness: The considered definition of fairness in this work is a group-based notion. Various other notions of fairness could be considered in this context (Barocas et al., 2023; Gajane and Pechenizkiy, 2018; Grote and Keeling, 2022).
- Formulation of chronic pain care management: Formulation as a Markov decision process instead of contextual bandits may more accurately represent the real-world dynamics of the problem (Steimle and Denton, 2017).
- Unsuitable for non-stationary environment: The efficacy of treatments or the identity of the optimal feature set can change over time due to physiological changes (Gatchel et al., 2014), psychosocial factors (Turk and Gatchel, 2018) and environmental influences (Karos et al., 2019). Such a non-stationary environment would require a change in our approach for the detection of these changes and the

subsequent adjustment in the action selection if necessary, especially in scenarios where no prior information about non-stationarity is available (Auer et al., 2019).

- Risk-oblivious recommendations: Modifying the problem such that the RL algorithm can adaptively defer to a baseline policy or a human expert when RL-based decisions are deemed unsafe/unfair will enhance the suitability of this work for safety-critical and responsible healthcare applications (Joshi et al., 2023; Madras et al., 2018).

Clinical perspective. Our study validates the concerns raised by researchers, policymakers, and clinicians that machine learning algorithms may contribute to disparities or unfairness in patient care or patient outcomes due to limitations in the learning dataset(s) or the design of the RL algorithm. Specifically, here we highlight the important ways in which the selection of features may influence not only overall system performance (as measured by the overall average reward) but also disparities or differences in performance (which might be deemed unfair) across groups of patients. The current study goes beyond empirically illustrating that such algorithmic limitations can exist. Although the feature selection methodology we propose can undoubtedly be improved, it has broader significance in that it refutes the tendency to see fairness issues in machine learning as inevitable flaws that should prevent adoption in health systems. Rather, we demonstrate that empirical patient data can be employed to optimize rewards and minimize disparities across groups in ways that may even address long-standing differences in treatment quality, access, and outcomes across groups of patients currently receiving care in health systems around the world (Green et al., 2005).

Limitations from clinical perspective (and avenues for future work). A strength of this study is that it is based on data from a large peer-reviewed clinical trial of an RL-based healthcare application. While this is the largest study of its kind published as of 2022, it still only represents data collected from weekly interactions with 168 patients with chronic pain recruited from two United States Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) health systems. VA patients are known to be unique in terms of their clinical and sociodemographic profiles, with somewhat higher proportions of patients who have a college education as well as a high prevalence of chronic psychiatric, substance use disorder, and medical comorbidities (Chang et al., 2020). In particular, women patients with chronic pain treated in VA health systems are substantially different from adult women in other healthcare systems and their experience may not be broadly generalizable with respect to key issues such as pain severity, engagement in treatment, and treatment response.

While Figure 1 and Table 2 clearly establish that statistically significant disparities in average RL rewards could be identified between men and women, the clinical significance of the difference between genders in the average reward (or other characteristics of the distributions in reward) is not clear. Moreover, our analyses have focused solely on one type of disparity resulting from the selection of RL features (and how this issue can be addressed algorithmically). In the current dataset as well as other applications of RL, a variety of additional disparities may exist, including disparities related to social determinants of health such as patients’ racial identification, educational attainment, geographic access to care, or comorbidities.

We believe these analyses illustrate the important relationship between feature selection and possible fairness issues in RL applications in healthcare. Other key protocol

design decisions could cause or ameliorate fairness issues and are not addressed by the current study. For example, the algorithm used in the current study employed a “cost” coefficient to penalize action choices that require more clinician time and assist in RL decision-making. How that cost function is operationalized in the extreme case could completely drive the RL algorithm’s decision-making. The best strategy for defining cost fairness or other performance characteristics is not well described. RL algorithms employ an explore/exploit approach to optimization, and that also is a dimension of system design that could affect fairness in ways not addressed by the current study. Finally, differential missingness in feature data (e.g., if women are less engaged than men, and report health and behavioral inputs less reliably) could have a profound differential effect on algorithm performance across subgroups. The current study has not addressed this key issue and we view it as a potential avenue for future research.

References

- Jacob N. Ablin and Dan Buskila. Personalized treatment of pain. *Current Rheumatology Reports*, 15(1):298, Dec 2012. ISSN 1534-6307. doi: 10.1007/s11926-012-0298-7. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11926-012-0298-7>.
- P. Andrews, M. Steultjens, and J. Riskowski. Chronic widespread pain prevalence in the general population: A systematic review. *European Journal of Pain*, 22(1):5–18, August 2017. ISSN 1532-2149. doi: 10.1002/ejp.1090. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejp.1090>.
- Peter Auer, Yifang Chen, Pratik Gajane, Chung-Wei Lee, Haipeng Luo, Ronald Ortner, and Chen-Yu Wei. Achieving optimal dynamic regret for non-stationary bandits without prior information. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, 2019.
- Solon Barocas, Moritz Hardt, and Arvind Narayanan. *Fairness and Machine Learning: Limitations and Opportunities*. MIT Press, 2023.
- Evelyn T. Chang, Donna M. Zulman, Karin M. Nelson, Ann-Marie Rosland, David A. Ganz, Stephan D. Fihn, Rebecca Piegari, and Lisa V. Rubenstein. Use of general primary care, specialized primary care, and other veterans affairs services among high-risk veterans. *JAMA Network Open*, 3(6):e208120, June 2020. ISSN 2574-3805. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.8120. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.8120>.
- Roger Chou, Paul Shekelle, Amir Qaseem, and Douglas K. Owens. Correction: Diagnosis and treatment of low back pain. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 148(3):247, February 2008. ISSN 0003-4819. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-148-3-200802050-00020. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-148-3-200802050-00020>.
- Davide Cirillo, Silvina Catuara-Solarz, Czuee Morey, Emre Guney, Laia Subirats, Simona Mellino, Annalisa Gigante, Alfonso Valencia, María José Rementeria, Antonella Santucciono Chadha, and Nikolaos Mavridis. Sex and gender differences and

- biases in artificial intelligence for biomedicine and healthcare. *npj Digital Medicine*, 3(1):81, Jun 2020. ISSN 2398-6352. doi: 10.1038/s41746-020-0288-5. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-0288-5>.
- Roxana Daneshjou, Steven E Brenner, Jonathan H Chen, Dana C Crawford, Samuel G Finlayson, Lukasz Kidziński, and Martha L Bulyk. Precision medicine: Using artificial intelligence to improve diagnostics and healthcare. In *Biocomputing 2022*. WORLD SCIENTIFIC, November 2021. doi: 10.1142/9789811250477_0021. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/9789811250477_0021.
- Wei Fan, Kunpeng Liu, Hao Liu, Yong Ge, Hui Xiong, and Yanjie Fu. Interactive reinforcement learning for feature selection with decision tree in the loop. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 35(2):1624–1636, 2023. doi: 10.1109/TKDE.2021.3102120.
- Pratik Gajane and Mykola Pechenizkiy. On formalizing fairness in prediction with machine learning. *5th Workshop on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency in Machine Learning (FAT/ML) 2018*, 2018.
- Pratik Gajane, Akрати Saxena, Maryam Tavakol, George Fletcher, and Mykola Pechenizkiy. Survey on fair reinforcement learning: Theory and practice, 2022.
- Robert J Gatchel, Donald D McGeary, Cindy A McGeary, and Ben Lippe. Interdisciplinary chronic pain management: past, present, and future. *The American psychologist*, 69(2): 119–130, 2014. ISSN 0003-066X. doi: 10.1037/a0035514. URL <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035514>.
- B Lee Green, Rhonda K Lewis, and Shawn M Bediako. Reducing and eliminating health disparities: a targeted approach. *J. Natl. Med. Assoc.*, 97(1):25–30, January 2005.
- Thomas Grote and Geoff Keeling. Enabling fairness in healthcare through machine learning. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 24(3):39, Aug 2022. ISSN 1572-8439. doi: 10.1007/s10676-022-09658-7. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-022-09658-7>.
- Ryan Han, Julián N. Acosta, Zahra Shakeri, John P.A. Ioannidis, Eric J. Topol, and Pranav Rajpurkar. Randomized controlled trials evaluating ai in clinical practice: A scoping evaluation. September 2023. doi: 10.1101/2023.09.12.23295381. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/2023.09.12.23295381>.
- Seyed Mehdi Hazrati Fard, Ali Hamzeh, and Sattar Hashemi. Using reinforcement learning to find an optimal set of features. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 66(10):1892–1904, 2013. ISSN 0898-1221. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2013.06.031>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0898122113004495>. ICNC-FSKD 2012.
- Irit Hochberg, Guy Feraru, Mark Kozdoba, Shie Mannor, Moshe Tennenholtz, and Elad Yom-Tov. Encouraging physical activity in patients with diabetes through automatic personalized feedback via reinforcement learning improves glycemic control. *Diabetes*

- Care*, 39(4):e59–e60, January 2016. ISSN 1935-5548. doi: 10.2337/dc15-2340. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.2337/dc15-2340>.
- Sindhu R. Johnson, George A. Tomlinson, Gillian A. Hawker, John T. Granton, and Brian M. Feldman. Methods to elicit beliefs for bayesian priors: a systematic review. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 63(4):355–369, 2010. ISSN 0895-4356. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.06.003>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0895435609001759>.
- Shalmali Joshi, Sonali Parbhoo, and Finale Doshi-Velez. Learning-to-defer for sequential medical decision-making under uncertainty. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Opn3KnBH5F>.
- K. Karos, A. C. D. C. Williams, A. Meulders, and J. W. Vlaeyen. Pain as a threat to the social self: A motivational account. *Pain*, 160(8):1854–1858, 2019.
- Shannon M. Kehle-Forbes, Eileen M. Harwood, Michele R. Spont, Nina A. Sayer, Heather Gerould, and Maureen Murdoch. Experiences with vha care: a qualitative study of u.s. women veterans with self-reported trauma histories. *BMC Women’s Health*, 17(1), May 2017. ISSN 1472-6874. doi: 10.1186/s12905-017-0395-x. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12905-017-0395-x>.
- Matthieu Komorowski, Leo A. Celi, Omar Badawi, Anthony C. Gordon, and A. Aldo Faisal. The artificial intelligence clinician learns optimal treatment strategies for sepsis in intensive care. *Nature Medicine*, 24(11):1716–1720, Nov 2018. ISSN 1546-170X. doi: 10.1038/s41591-018-0213-5. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0213-5>.
- Lihong Li, Wei Chu, John Langford, and Robert E. Schapire. A contextual-bandit approach to personalized news article recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW ’10*, page 661–670, New York, NY, USA, 2010. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781605587998. doi: 10.1145/1772690.1772758. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1772690.1772758>.
- Daniel Lopez-Martinez, Patrick Eschenfeldt, Sassan Ostvar, Myles Ingram, Chin Hur, and Rosalind Picard. Deep reinforcement learning for optimal critical care pain management with morphine using dueling double-deep q networks. In *Engineering in Medicine and Biology (EMBC)*, Berlin, Germany, 2019.
- Courtney R. Lyles, Oanh Kieu Nguyen, Elaine C. Khoong, Adrian Aguilera, and Urmimala Sarkar. Multilevel determinants of digital health equity: A literature synthesis to advance the field. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 44(1):383–405, April 2023. ISSN 1545-2093. doi: 10.1146/annurev-publhealth-071521-023913. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-071521-023913>.
- David Madras, Toniann Pitassi, and Richard Zemel. Predict responsibly: improving fairness and accuracy by learning to defer. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’18*, page 6150–6160, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2018. Curran Associates Inc.

- Melissa D McCradden, Shalmali Joshi, James A Anderson, Mjaye Mazwi, Anna Goldenberg, and Randi Zlotnik Shaul. Patient safety and quality improvement: Ethical principles for a regulatory approach to bias in healthcare machine learning. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 27(12):2024–2027, June 2020. ISSN 1527-974X. doi: 10.1093/jamia/ocaa085. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocaa085>.
- Ziad Obermeyer, Brian Powers, Christine Vogeli, and Sendhil Mullainathan. Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science*, 366(6464): 447–453, 2019. doi: 10.1126/science.aax2342. URL <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.aax2342>.
- Ravi B. Parikh, Stephanie Teeple, and Amol S. Navathe. Addressing bias in artificial intelligence in health care. *JAMA*, 322(24):2377, December 2019. ISSN 0098-7484. doi: 10.1001/jama.2019.18058. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jama.2019.18058>.
- Finlay J Pearce, Samantha Cruz Rivera, Xiaoxuan Liu, Elaine Manna, Alastair K Denniston, and Melanie J Calvert. The role of patient-reported outcome measures in trials of artificial intelligence health technologies: a systematic evaluation of clinicaltrials.gov records (1997–2022). *The Lancet Digital Health*, 5(3):e160–e167, March 2023. ISSN 2589-7500. doi: 10.1016/s2589-7500(22)00249-7. URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500\(22\)00249-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(22)00249-7).
- Chris Piech. Cs109: Lecture notes, 2019. URL <https://web.stanford.edu/class/archive/cs/cs109/cs109.1192/lectureNotes/17%20-%20Beta.pdf>.
- Emma Pierson, David M. Cutler, Jure Leskovec, Sendhil Mullainathan, and Ziad Obermeyer. An algorithmic approach to reducing unexplained pain disparities in underserved populations. *Nature Medicine*, 27(1):136–140, January 2021. ISSN 1546-170X. doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-01192-7. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-01192-7>.
- John Piette. Dataset #2 for piette et al, data in brief: Data for a reinforcement learning intervention to treat chronic pain. Mendeley Data, 2022. URL <https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/33mkbm32dz/1>.
- John D Piette, Sarah L Krein, Dana Striplin, Nicolle Marinec, Robert D Kerns, Karen B Farris, Satinder Singh, Lawrence An, and Alicia A Heapy. Patient-centered pain care using artificial intelligence and mobile health tools: Protocol for a randomized study funded by the us department of veterans affairs health services research and development program. *JMIR Research Protocols*, 5(2):e53, April 2016. ISSN 1929-0748. doi: 10.2196/resprot.4995. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.2196/resprot.4995>.
- John D. Piette, Sean Newman, Sarah L. Krein, Nicolle Marinec, Jenny Chen, David A. Williams, Sara N. Edmond, Mary Driscoll, Kathryn M. LaChappelle, Robert D. Kerns, Marianna Maly, H. Myra Kim, Karen B. Farris, Diana M. Higgins, Eugenia Buta, and Alicia A. Heapy. Patient-centered pain care using artificial intelligence and mobile health tools: A randomized comparative effectiveness trial. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 182(9): 975, September 2022a. ISSN 2168-6106. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2022.3178. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2022.3178>.

- John D. Piette, Sean Newman, Sarah L. Krein, Nicolle Marinec, Jenny Chen, David A. Williams, Sara N. Edmond, Mary Driscoll, Kathryn M. LaChappelle, Marianna Maly, H. Myra Kim, Karen B. Farris, Diana M. Higgins, Robert D. Kerns, and Alicia A. Heapy. Artificial intelligence (ai) to improve chronic pain care: Evidence of ai learning. *Intelligence-Based Medicine*, 6:100064, 2022b. ISSN 2666-5212. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibmed.2022.100064>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666521222000175>.
- Sali Rasoul, Sodiq Adewole, and Alphonse Akakpo. Feature selection using reinforcement learning, 2021.
- Luca Roggeveen, Ali el Hassouni, Jonas Ahrendt, Tingjie Guo, Lucas Fleuren, Patrick Thoral, Armand RJ Girbes, Mark Hoogendoorn, and Paul WG Elbers. Transatlantic transferability of a new reinforcement learning model for optimizing haemodynamic treatment for critically ill patients with sepsis. *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, 112: 102003, 2021. ISSN 0933-3657. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artmed.2020.102003>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0933365720312689>.
- Suchi Saria. Individualized sepsis treatment using reinforcement learning. *Nature Medicine*, 24(11):1641–1642, Nov 2018. ISSN 1546-170X. doi: 10.1038/s41591-018-0253-x. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0253-x>.
- Meghna Singhal, Lalit Gupta, and Kshitiz Hirani. A comprehensive analysis and review of artificial intelligence in anaesthesia. *Cureus*, September 2023. ISSN 2168-8184. doi: 10.7759/cureus.45038. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.7759/cureus.45038>.
- Benjamin Smith, Anahita Khojandi, and Rama Vasudevan. Bias in reinforcement learning: A review in healthcare applications. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 56(2), sep 2023. ISSN 0360-0300. doi: 10.1145/3609502. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3609502>.
- Lauren N. Steimle and Brian T. Denton. *Markov Decision Processes for Screening and Treatment of Chronic Diseases*, pages 189–222. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017. ISBN 978-3-319-47766-4. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-47766-4_6. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47766-4_6.
- Gail M. Sullivan and Richard Feinn. Using effect size—or why the p value is not enough. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 4(3):279–282, September 2012. ISSN 1949-8349. doi: 10.4300/jgme-d-12-00156.1. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-12-00156.1>.
- Ambuj Tewari and Susan A. Murphy. *From Ads to Interventions: Contextual Bandits in Mobile Health*, page 495–517. Springer International Publishing, 2017. ISBN 9783319513942. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-51394-2_25. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51394-2_25.
- Andreas K Triantafyllidis and Athanasios Tsanas. Applications of machine learning in real-life digital health interventions: Review of the literature. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 21(4):e12286, April 2019. ISSN 1438-8871. doi: 10.2196/12286. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.2196/12286>.

- Dennis C Turk and Robert J Gatchel. *Psychological Treatment of Chronic Pain: Clinical Handbook*. Guilford Publications, 2018.
- Rosa van Tuijn, Tianqin Lu, Emma Driesse, Koen Franken, Pratik Gajane, and Emilia Barakova. Weheart: A personalized recommendation device for physical activity encouragement and preventing “cold start” in cardiac rehabilitation. In José Abdelnour Nocera, Marta Kristín Lárusdóttir, Helen Petrie, Antonio Piccinno, and Marco Winckler, editors, *Human-Computer Interaction – INTERACT 2023*, pages 191–201, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland. ISBN 978-3-031-42286-7.
- Elad Yom-Tov, Guy Feraru, Mark Kozdoba, Shie Mannor, Moshe Tennenholtz, and Irit Hochberg. Encouraging physical activity in patients with diabetes: Intervention using a reinforcement learning system. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 19(10):e338, October 2017. ISSN 1438-8871. doi: 10.2196/jmir.7994. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.2196/jmir.7994>.
- Marjan Zakeri, Sujit S. Sansgiry, and Susan M. Abughosh. Application of machine learning in predicting medication adherence of patients with cardiovascular diseases: a systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Medical Artificial Intelligence*, 5:5–5, March 2022. ISSN 2617-2496. doi: 10.21037/jmai-21-26. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jmai-21-26>.
- Peng Zhang and Maged N. Kamel Boulos. Generative ai in medicine and healthcare: Promises, opportunities and challenges. *Future Internet*, 15(9):286, August 2023. ISSN 1999-5903. doi: 10.3390/fi15090286. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/fi15090286>.
- Zachary Zimmer, Kathryn Fraser, Hanna Grol-Prokopczyk, and Anna Zajacova. A global study of pain prevalence across 52 countries: examining the role of country-level contextual factors. *PAIN*, 163(9), 2022.

Appendices

Appendix A. Details about Features

Table 4: Features taken into account in making treatment recommendations

Feature	How measured?
Pedometer-measured steps ^(a)	Proportion of days in the current week in which the patient met the goal of walking 10% more than the average number of steps in the most recent prior week with available data.
Change in average pain intensity ^(b)	The difference between the average pain intensity for the current week and the most recent prior week with available data. Change across weeks, measured between -100% and +100%, was normalized to a range of 0-1.
CBT skill practice this week ^(c)	The average score across reporting days, measured on a scale of 0-10 and normalized between 0-1.
Sleep quality this week ^(d)	The average score across reporting days, measured on a scale of 0-10 and normalized between 0-1.
Sleep duration this week ^(e)	The average score across reporting days, measured on a scale of 0-22 and normalized between 0-1.
Pain-related interference Q1 ^(f)	The average across reporting days, measured on a scale of 0-10 and normalized between 0-1.
Pain-related interference Q2 ^(g)	The average across reporting days, measured on a scale of 0-10 and normalized between 0-1.
Session number	An indicator of whether the current session is the 1st, 2nd, . . . , 10th, normalized between 0-1.
Summary of rewards associated with prior IVR session recommendations	A weighted average of the rewards that AI-CBT-CP received in prior sessions (more weight on recent sessions) when recommending IVR sessions to the patient, normalized between 0-1.
Summary of rewards associated with prior recommendations for a 15-minute therapist session	A weighted average of the rewards that AI-CBT-CP received in prior sessions (more weight on recent sessions) when recommending 15-minute sessions to the patient, normalized between 0-1.
Summary of rewards associated with prior recommendations for a 45-minute therapist session	A weighted average of the rewards that AI-CBT-CP received in prior sessions (more weight on recent sessions) when recommending 45-minute sessions to the patient, normalized between 0-1.

(a) “How many steps did you take today?”

(b) “Rate your average level of pain today, using a 0 to 10 scale with 0 meaning no pain and 10 meaning the worst pain imaginable.”

- (c) “Using a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 representing not at all accomplished and 10 representing completely accomplished, please enter how well you accomplished your [skill name] skill practice today”
- (d) “Rate how refreshed or rested you felt after last night’s sleep, with 0 being not at all rested and 10 being extremely rested.”
- (e) “How many hours were you asleep last night”
- (f) “What number best describes how much pain has interfered with your enjoyment of life today, with 0 meaning pain does not interfere and 10 meaning pain completely interferes?”
- (g) “What number best describes how much pain has interfered with your general activity today, with 0 meaning pain does not interfere and 10 meaning pain completely interferes?”

Appendix B. LinUCB Algorithm

Algorithm 2: LinUCB

Parameter: $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$

foreach $a \in \mathcal{A}$ **do**

$\mathbf{A}_a \leftarrow \mathbf{I}_d$;

 // d-dimensional Identity matrix

$\mathbf{b}_a \leftarrow \mathbf{0}_{d \times 1}$;

 // d-dimensional zero vector

end

for $t = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ **do**

 Observe features $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_a \leftarrow \mathbf{A}_a^{-1} \mathbf{b}_a$.

$p_{t,a} \leftarrow \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_a \mathbf{x}_t + \alpha \sqrt{\mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{A}_a^{-1} \mathbf{x}_t}$.

 Choose arm $a_t = \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} p_{t,a}$ with ties broken arbitrarily, and observe a real-valued reward r_t .

$\mathbf{A}_{a_t} \leftarrow \mathbf{A}_{a_t} + \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^\top$.

$\mathbf{b}_{a_t} \leftarrow \mathbf{b}_{a_t} + r_t \mathbf{x}_t$.

end

Appendix C. Thompson Sampling

Algorithm 3: Thompson Sampling

Input : Action set $\{1, 2, \dots, K\}$, parameters α_a, β_a for $a = 1, 2, \dots, K$

for *time step* $t = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

Action Selection

for *each action* $a = 1, 2, \dots, K$ **do**

 | Sample $\theta_a(t)$ from the Beta(α_a, β_a) distribution

end

 Select action $a(t) = \arg \max \theta_a(t)$ and receive reward $r(t)$

Policy Update

 Perform a Bernoulli trial with success probability $r(t)$ and observe sample $s(t)$

if $s(t) = 1$ **then**

 | $\alpha_{a(t)} = \alpha_{a(t)} + 1$

end

else

 | $\beta_{a(t)} = \beta_{a(t)} + 1$

end

end

Appendix D. Preprocessing

Directly utilizing a logged dataset for our evaluation experiments presents the challenge that rewards are solely recorded for actions chosen by the logging policy, which may diverge from those selected by the algorithm under evaluation. To address this challenge, we constructed a set of weights for each action, enabling the transformation of feature values into expected rewards. Using these weights, rewards are obtained for any action with some noise being added to the expected reward. We used zero-mean Gaussian noise with a standard deviation equal to the standard deviation observed in the recorded rewards for the corresponding action in the dataset (Piette, 2022). To generate additional patient interactions, numerical means of feature values for men and women for each session and each cluster³ are calculated. Auxiliary feature values are obtained using the corresponding numerical means with an additive noise. We used zero-mean Gaussian noise with a standard deviation equal to the standard deviation observed in the recorded feature values. Overall, women constitute 12.5% of the total number of patients, which is consistent with the dataset Piette (2022).

Appendix E. Algorithmic Parameter Used in LinUCB

The role of α in the algorithm design is to control the *exploration*. Exploration is performed to acquire information on action profitability and lower values of α lead to less exploration. Inadequate exploration may cause the algorithm to overlook highly rewarding

3. Patients are divided into three clusters in the dataset Piette (2022).

actions, while excessive exploration can impede the algorithm’s long-term objective of maximizing cumulative reward by sacrificing immediate rewards. Thus, achieving an optimal balance of exploration is crucial. On our data, we ran LinUCB with $\alpha = \{0.1, 0.2, 0.3, \dots, 1\}$. A trend resembling an inverted U-shape was observed in utility measured by average reward, with a global maximum at $\alpha = 0.3$, and a decrease for both lower (i.e., < 0.3) and higher (i.e., > 0.3) values of α . No discernible difference in gender fairness was observed across all tested values. Correspondingly, we use $\alpha = 0.3$ in all the results reported in this article.

Appendix F. Auxiliary Results




Figure 5: Numerical means of the average reward obtained for men and women over 100 runs. The error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 6: Numerical means of the fraction of suboptimal action selection for men and women over 100 runs. The error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals.