

Exploring Bias and Prediction Metrics to Characterise the Fairness of Machine Learning for Equity-Centered Public Health Decision-Making: A Narrative Review

Shaina Raza^{1*}, Arash Shaban-Nejad², Elham Dolatabadi³,
Hiroshi Mamiya⁴

¹AI Engineering, Vector Institute for Artificial Intelligence, 108 College Street, Toronto, M5G 0C6, Ontario, Canada.

²Department of Pediatrics, University of Tennessee , 50 North Dunlap Street, Memphis, 38103, Tennessee, United States..

³ School of Health Policy & Management, York University, 4700 Keele St, Toronto, M3J 1P3, Ontario, Canada.

⁴Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics, and Occupational Health, McGill University, 2001 McGill Colledge, Montréal, H3A 1G1, Québec, Canada.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): shaina.raza@utoronto.ca;
Contributing authors: ashabann@uthsc.edu ; edolatab@yorku.ca ;
hiroshi.mamiya@mail.mcgill.ca ;

Abstract

Background The rapid advancement of Machine Learning (ML) represents novel opportunities to enhance public health research, surveillance, and decision-making. However, there is a lack of comprehensive understanding of algorithmic bias — systematic errors in predicted population health outcomes — resulting from the public health application of ML. The objective of this narrative review is to explore the types of bias generated by ML and quantitative metrics to assess these biases.

Methods We performed search on PubMed, MEDLINE, IEEE (Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers), ACM (Association for Computing Machinery) Digital Library, Science Direct, and Springer Nature. We used keywords to identify studies describing types of bias and metrics to measure these in the domain

of ML and public and population health published in English between 2008 and 2023, inclusive.

Results A total of 72 articles met the inclusion criteria. Our review identified the commonly described types of bias and quantitative metrics to assess these biases from an equity perspective.

Conclusion The review will help formalize the evaluation framework for ML on public health from an equity perspective.

Keywords: Public Health Equity, Prediction Metrics, Machine Learning, Fairness, Bias, Review

1 Introduction

Public Health Utilities of Machine Learning

The aim of public health is to promote health and prevent disease, illness, and injury. The essential public health functions include health promotion, health surveillance, health protection, population health assessment, disease and injury prevention, and emergency preparedness and response [1]. Artificial Intelligence (AI) has demonstrated the potential to advance these key activities [1]. Its key discipline, Machine Learning (ML) led to the emergence of algorithms that incorporate ubiquitous social, environmental and population health data and generate accurate predictions for community health status, such as disease outcomes and risk factors [2–4]. By integrating multiple data streams, ML algorithms can provide a comprehensive understanding of public health dynamics in real time [5]. Public health applications of ML include computer vision techniques that identify urban environmental drivers of health, such as residential greenspace from a large number of street images [6]. ML has also been shown to be effective in identifying early warning signs of disease outbreaks such as COVID-19 [7, 8], forecasting disease prevalence by incorporating local environmental data [9] or social media data [10], and detecting outbreaks [11],[12, 13]. Moreover, ML enables the large-scale and automatic assessment of behavioural risk factors, such as physical activities and dietary patterns by processing the stream of data generated by wearable devices [14]. It also facilitates the population-scale understanding of public sentiment on various health topics from online social media data [15]. Finally, ML can support the development of targeted interventions tailored to the needs of specific populations [3] and help optimize the allocation of finite public health resources to those who can benefit most from interventions[3, 16].

Ethical Implications of Utilizing Machine Learning

However, the integration of ML algorithms into public health research and practice imposes ethical challenges, as it can generate disproportionately inaccurate predictions of diseases and risk factors among disadvantaged and marginalized population sub-groups [3]. Such biased or “unfair” prediction can lead to inappropriate public health interventions not adapted to the needs of disadvantaged populations.

Health disparity represents disproportionately higher disease occurrences and risk factors, and lower resources to achieve health among disadvantaged populations [17]. These vulnerable and equity-deserving populations are characterized by the social determinants of health, which include race, ethnicity, income, education, disability, access to healthcare, sex, and gender [17, 18]. These key population characteristics are often called “sensitive attributes” in the field of AI fairness. Equitable public health strategies are policies and programs that reduce these gaps by targeting equity-deserving groups, including racialized minorities, low-income and low-education individuals, and females and women. Thus, equity represents fair opportunities for all individuals to achieve optimum health by reducing existing health disparities.

Bias poses a significant challenge to applying ML equitably in public health, given the ML algorithm’s tendency to generate inaccurate prediction for health outcomes among certain population groups [2, 19]. We note that the term bias has a slightly different definition in epidemiology, defined as a systematic deviation of etiologic associations from the (unobserved) true association [20]. Such bias in epidemiological investigation arises from erroneous practice in data collection and participant recruitment/retention (i.e., selection bias), measurement error (i.e., information bias) and inappropriate data analysis (e.g., collider stratification bias) [21–24]. Throughout this study, we will use the former definition of bias related ML algorithms rather than epidemiological investigation, thereby focusing on the bias in prediction of population health (as opposed to bias in etiologic association).

To illustrate unfair predictions across different population subgroups due to bias, we present a scenario depicted in Figure 2. This figure shows a binary classifier (a type of ML method to predict a binary health outcome e.g., disease diagnosis) designed to assess a specific health condition at the population level, utilizing patient data that includes social determinants of health, race in this example. The algorithm’s accuracy is noticeably higher for the category of white male compared to others. This discrepancy underscores the classifier’s inability to equitably predict health outcomes, resulting in biases that favor certain groups at the expense of others. Such biases can often lead to serious public health issues, including delayed diagnoses and inappropriate treatments, which ultimately result in the widening of the existing disparities [25].

Fairness, and Equity in the Application of Machine Learning

To mitigate bias, data collection, the development, evaluation, and implementation of ML need to occur with fairness in consideration. This implies that assessing the potential impact of ML algorithms across populations at all stages of the ML lifecycle. Algorithmic fairness in AI is defined as the principle that decisions made by AI systems should not create unjust or prejudicial outcomes for certain groups based on their race, gender, or other social determinants of health (i.e., sensitive characteristics) [26].

Research has demonstrated that a lack of fairness in AI decision-making processes can exacerbate inequities in public health outcomes. Extant studies [3, 27, 28] highlight how biases in AI systems contribute to unequal healthcare experiences and results among different population groups. In public health, the term fairness implies a condition that ensures impartial treatment of communities and individuals and is related

to equity [29, 30]. While the definition of fairness is interrelated between AI and public health, our study largely focuses on the former definition (algorithmic fairness in AI), which centers on measuring the equitable impact of ML, with the goal of preventing lower accuracies of ML algorithms among equity-deserving population subgroups [31].

Research Aim and Objective

This study aims to review and summarize the existing types of algorithmic bias that characterize unfair prediction of ML from the literature. We also explore and introduce the existing metrics to measure the bias created by ML. The review adopts a narrative approach, which is suitable for broad topics.

Our study is unique to the existing reviews in AI fairness and medical and population science. The reviews are grouped into two broad categories. The first category of articles [32–38] mainly discusses the potential benefits and risks of using ML and AI in healthcare, with largely theoretical (mathematical) discussion to derive algorithmic fairness. The second group of literature [39–45] describes biases in healthcare data and ML algorithms, with general recommendations for incorporating an equity lens into big data research, data science, and performing fairness audits, rather than focusing on specific types of bias and fairness metrics. Some other works [46–48] discuss the challenges and opportunities in public health decision-making for policy objectives. Unique from previous work, our review focuses on exploring the existing performance metrics of ML and biases that are directly relevant to measuring equity in population health.

2 Methods

In this work, we aim to address the question: ”*Which types of biases are prevalent in public health-related ML algorithms, and what quantitative fairness metrics can be used to identify and quantify these biases?*” Our search consists of literature published from 2008 to 2023 to account for the limited volume of work at the intersection of these three fields: Public health, ML and equity. The flow diagram showing the process of study selection is shown in Figure 1.

Databases Used

We conducted a search across various electronic databases and digital libraries, including PubMed, MEDLINE, IEEE (Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers), ACM (Association for Computing Machinery) Digital Library, Science Direct, and Springer Nature, to identify studies focused on the intersection of public health equity and ML fairness, published in English and relevant to our research. Our approach spanned multiple disciplines to ensure a thorough review of quantitative fairness metrics in health-related ML algorithms.




Fig. 1 Flow diagram showing the process of study selection.

Search Terms

We employed Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and specific keywords such as ‘machine learning,’ ‘public health,’ and ‘equity,’ using Boolean operators for precise refinement of search outcomes. The search syntax was structured as follows:

(“Machine Learning” [MeSH] OR “machine learning” OR “deep learning”
OR “neural networks” OR “artificial intelligence”) AND
 (“Public Health” [MeSH] OR “public health” OR “health equity”
OR “health disparities” OR “community health” OR “population health”) AND
 (“Bias” [MeSH] OR “algorithmic bias” OR “fairness” OR “equity”
OR “social determinants of health” OR “healthcare inequality”
OR “predictive fairness” OR “ethical algorithms”) AND
 (“English” [Language])

The inclusion criteria prioritized peer-reviewed articles that assessed or discussed quantitative fairness metrics in ML algorithms within the context of public health. Exclusion criteria were applied to non-peer-reviewed literature, non-English articles, and studies not focused on fairness metrics or their applications in public health.




Fig. 2 Schematic Representation of Outcome Distribution by Race and Gender. This diagram illustrates the distribution of positive (blue and bordered) and negative (red) outcomes from an ML model for two groups, R1 and R2, representing white and black males, respectively. Notably, the classifier exhibits higher diagnostic accuracy for the condition in patients from the blue group R1 (White males) compared to the red group R2 (Black males). The dashed line represents the class boundary separating the outcomes for the two groups, visually emphasizing the disparity in accuracy between the groups.

Article Selection Strategy

The selection involved a preliminary review of titles and abstracts, followed by a full-text assessment for eligibility. Three independent reviewers conducted this process, resolving discrepancies by consensus or a fourth reviewer’s input. A standardized form ensured consistent data collection, piloted on a subset of studies for reliability. We appraised study quality using a checklist adapted from the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) [49] standards, assessing bias risk and methodological rigour to ascertain each study’s contribution to our research question. This critical appraisal was independently executed by two reviewers, with a third resolving any differences.

3 Results

3.1 Biases impacting fairness of ML algorithms

We identified types of bias that are known to lead to unfair predictions by ML algorithms and grouped them into potential sources of these biases, as listed in Figure 3 and are detailed below.

Data Quality and Diversity

Data quality, here, refers to minimizing errors in measurement, such as inaccuracies in labelling and data entry, which are critical to ensure that the data used in ML models accurately represent health trends and outcomes [50]. Data quality and diversity impact the accuracy and fairness of ML models. These issues might not only fail to accurately reflect reality but can also exacerbate existing inequalities in the




Fig. 3 Various sources and categories of biases within the public health context mapped to concepts (rounded rectangles)

datasets used to train ML systems. Relevant research, such as [51–54], highlight this challenge. Moreover, selection bias complicates the scenario by potentially excluding crucial population segments [55–57].

Insufficient Representation. Insufficient representation refers to the bias resulting from training datasets that do not adequately capture the diversity of the population, leading to AI models that perform better for overrepresented groups but inadequately for underrepresented ones [52]. This lack of diversity in data can cause AI systems to generate inaccurate predictions or decisions for underrepresented groups, exacerbating existing inequalities and compromising the ability to generalize across the entire population [51]. For example, an AI system developed for medical diagnosis might be predominantly trained on data from one ethnic group. This could result in less accurate diagnoses for patients from other ethnic backgrounds, due to a failure to account for variations in disease presentation and risk factors not sufficiently represented in the training data.

Historical Bias

Historical Bias arises when ML models are trained on historical data embedded with systematic inequalities and societal biases. Such biases can lead to unequal treatment of specific groups (based on race, gender, age and so on) [53, 54]. An example of historical bias is evident in health insurance systems. Suppose the historical data used to train these systems reflect biases against certain racial or ethnic groups (probably due to systematic disparities in access to quality healthcare or differential treatment based on socio-economic status). In that case, the AI systems might continue to perpetuate these biases. Consequently, individuals from these groups might be unfairly classified as higher risk, leading to higher insurance premiums or denial of coverage, regardless of their health profiles or needs.

Selection Bias

Selection bias arises when the dataset used to train ML models does not accurately represent the broader population or specific scenario it aims to model. This form of bias emerges from non-random sampling methods that inadvertently leave out significant portions of the population, resulting in ML systems that may not function equitably or effectively across various groups or conditions [55–57]. A notable instance of selection bias can be observed in facial recognition technology, where a system trained predominantly with images of individuals from certain racial or ethnic groups will likely exhibit enhanced performance in recognizing individuals from those groups [58].

Algorithmic Processing

Bias arising from inappropriate algorithmic processing include model specification bias, feature selection bias, and algorithmic weighting bias. These biases introduce systematic errors into AI systems, influencing outcomes by the relevance or weight of features and affecting the fairness of decisions [54, 59–64]. These biases may initially appear during data collection and preparation due to sampling bias, where data might not fully represent the target population, leading to misrepresentation in model outcomes [57]. To counteract this, a few techniques such as selecting diverse, representative datasets, ensuring balanced feature selection, and use unbiased data labelling is encouraged (details in Additional File 1).

Model Specification Bias

Incorrect assumptions in models refer to biases introduced due to erroneous assumptions or oversimplifications made during the design phase of AI models. These biases can result in systematic errors in data processing and decision-making, significantly affecting the model fairness and effectiveness across various scenarios and populations [54, 59, 60]. For example, an AI model employed in medical imaging for diagnosing diseases might have been trained predominantly on data from Caucasian patients. As a result, this model could inaccurately diagnose conditions in patients of Asian, African, or other descent due to its incorrect assumption that the medical characteristics of its training dataset are universally applicable. This can lead to more misdiagnosis rates for individuals from underrepresented groups and could result in inadequate treatment, potential harm, or missed conditions.

Feature Selection Bias

Feature Selection Bias occurs in the development of AI and ML models when the data features (variables) chosen to train the model do not adequately represent the problem space or when irrelevant features are included that do not contribute to the model training to make accurate predictions. This bias can skew the outcomes of AI applications, leading to models that are less effective or fair [61, 62]. For example, a health-focused AI application designed to predict patient risks for certain diseases may suffer from feature selection bias if it includes overly generic features like age and gender but overlooks more nuanced and equally relevant features such as lifestyle, dietary habits, or genetic predispositions. As a result, the AI might inaccurately assess individual disease risks, potentially leading to under or overestimation of risk for certain groups of patients.

Algorithmic Weighting Bias

Algorithmic Weighting Bias occurs when an ML model assigns disproportionate importance or “weight” to certain features or variables over others in its decision-making process. This uneven weighting can significantly impact the outcomes of algorithmic decisions, potentially leading to unfair or biased results [61, 63, 64]. For example, a predictive model used in patient triage systems. Suppose this model is programmed to overly prioritize certain symptoms or demographic factors (such as age or gender) without adequately considering the full spectrum of a patient’s medical history or current symptoms. In that case, it may inappropriately categorize patients’ urgency of care. This could lead to younger patients being prioritized over older ones, or certain symptoms being undervalued, regardless of actual medical urgency.

Cultural and Social Context

Biases such as cultural misconceptions and socio-economic biases highlight the challenges in designing AI systems that are culturally sensitive and equitable across different socio-economic groups [18, 65–67]. Language and communication biases further demonstrate the difficulty in creating AI models that accurately understand and process language nuances and dialects [68, 69].

Cultural Misconceptions.

Cultural Misconceptions in AI, especially in health contexts, occur when AI systems fail to understand or incorporate the cultural nuances, values, beliefs, and practices of diverse populations. This lack of cultural sensitivity can lead to inappropriate, ineffective, or even harmful health recommendations and diagnoses [65, 70]. For example, an AI telehealth platform trained primarily on white population data may struggle to accurately interpret symptoms from diverse cultural backgrounds. This could result in incorrect treatment recommendations, as the AI might miss key information when patients describe their conditions using culturally specific terms or expressions.

Socio-Economic Bias

Socio-economic factors significantly influence health outcomes, access to care, and the effectiveness of medical treatments. AI technologies that fail to account for these variables might exacerbate existing disparities [18, 66, 67]. For example, an AI system designed to optimize patient flow in a hospital might prioritize patients based on factors like promptness of insurance approval or the ability to schedule follow-up visits.

Human-AI Interaction

Human-AI interaction biases like automation bias, confirmation bias, and complacency errors reveal the complex dynamics between human users and AI systems, emphasizing the importance of maintaining human oversight and critical assessment [53, 71–74].

Automation Bias.

Automation Bias highlights the risk of over-reliance on AI systems, potentially leading to the undervaluation of human expertise and oversight. This bias can emerge in

any field where AI is employed, including healthcare, where it may influence decision-making processes or the interpretation of data [53, 71]. For example, if an AI system is highly accurate but still has a small margin of error, healthcare professionals might neglect to perform a thorough review or consider other diagnostic possibilities, relying only on the AI conclusion.

Confirmation Bias

Confirmation bias is the tendency of humans to search for, interpret, favour, and recall information in a way that confirms or supports one's prior belief system or values [72, 73]. For example, users might frame queries to AI in a way that is likely to produce confirming evidence for their beliefs or may interpret AI outputs in a way that aligns with their preconceptions, as seen in interactions with large language models such as ChatGPT or Bard.

Complacency Errors

Complacency errors refer to the phenomenon where users become overly reliant on AI systems, leading to decreased vigilance and critical assessment [71, 74]. This issue arises when individuals trust AI outputs without sufficient skepticism, potentially overlooking errors, biases, or inappropriate conclusions generated by the AI.

Feedback Loops

Feedback loops, such as reinforcing existing biases and algorithmic amplification, highlight the risk of perpetuating and exacerbating biases through AI systems [44, 75–77].

Reinforcement of Existing Biases

In a standard AI setup, the outcomes may be shaped by pre-existing biases, which then get integrated into the system during subsequent training phases, amplifying and possibly worsening these biases [75, 76]. For instance, if an AI model is trained on healthcare records that inadequately represent specific demographic groups, it could yield less precise or biased assessments for those populations. When such biased results are reintroduced into the training process, they amplify the original bias, initiating a loop that sustains and intensifies these biases over time.

Algorithmic Amplification

Description and Implications: Algorithmic amplification refers to the phenomenon where small initial biases in AI systems are magnified over time through iterative learning processes. This occurs because the AI system's learning algorithms tend to give more weight to data patterns they encounter more frequently, which can lead to a disproportionate emphasis on these patterns [44, 77]. For example, an AI system for diagnosing skin cancer has been trained predominantly on images from lighter-skinned patients. Suppose the system slightly underperforms on darker-skinned individuals at the outset. In that case, this initial bias can be amplified over time as the system continues to learn primarily from the data where it performs best, which

is the lighter-skinned patient images.

Equity and Access

Equity and access issues, including the digital divide and accessibility bias, highlight the disparities in health outcomes and access to AI technologies [2, 78–80].

Digital Divide

The digital divide refers to the gap between individuals with access to modern information and communication technology (ICT) and those without. This divide can be due to various factors, including but not limited to socio-economic status, geographical location, age, and education level [78, 79]. For example, urban hospitals use AI for early diabetes detection and personalized care, while rural areas lag, highlighting how the digital divide worsens health disparities.

Accessibility Bias

Accessibility Bias in AI implies that these technologies might not be designed with the needs of individuals with disabilities in mind, leading to unequal access [2, 80]. For example, a voice-activated health app that does not offer text-based commands could exclude users with speech impairments, denying them the benefits of AI in monitoring health or accessing medical information.

Regulatory and Ethical Oversight

The regulatory and ethical oversight challenges, including transparency and accountability and ethical non-alignment, emphasize the need for clear ethical guidelines and accountability mechanisms in AI deployment [38, 81–83].

Transparency and Accountability

Transparency and accountability mean making actions and decisions open and understandable, ensuring that individuals and organizations can be trusted and held responsible for their results. The opacity of AI decision-making processes can significantly undermine trust and hinder accountability [81, 82]. This challenge becomes evident when patients and healthcare professionals encounter difficulty comprehending AI-generated diagnoses or treatment recommendations, ultimately impeding the widespread acceptance and effective utilization of AI in healthcare.

Ethical Non-Alignment

Ethical Non-Alignment occurs when AI decisions in healthcare diverge from ethical norms or standards, potentially leading to scenarios where an AI recommends treatment options that, while clinically valid, may disregard patient values or ethical considerations [38, 83]. For example, an AI system might suggest a less expensive treatment option with a slightly lower success rate over a more costly, but potentially more effective treatment, not considering the patient’s preference for the best possible

outcome despite the cost.

Temporal Dynamics

Temporal dynamics refer to the changes and trends over time that influence the behavior and outcomes of a system or process. Temporal dynamics, such as model drift and non-stationary environment effects, point to the necessity for AI models to adapt over time to changing health profiles and threats [84, 85].

Model Drift

Model drift refers to the phenomenon where AI models become outdated due to changes in population health profiles over time, as highlighted by evolving disease patterns or emerging health trends, requiring ongoing updates to maintain accuracy and relevance in healthcare predictions and treatments [84]. For example, an AI model was initially trained to predict flu outbreaks based on historical health data. If a sudden change in flu virus strains or a new pandemic emerges, like COVID-19, the model's predictions may become less accurate over time because it's not adapted to these new conditions.

Non-stationary Environment Effects

Non-stationary Environment Effects occur when AI systems struggle to adjust to dynamic health environments and emerging health threats that are not observed in existing data [85], potentially leading to decreased effectiveness in the prediction and management of health conditions as they fail to incorporate the latest trends, outbreaks, or changes in population health behavior.

3.2 Fairness Metrics to Assess the Performance of Machine Learning

Fairness metrics are quantitative measures designed to capture and evaluate the fairness or equity of a system or decision-making process [86]. We identified accuracy metrics that allow evaluation of the equitable performance of ML models. Sensitivity, analogous to recall, measures the proportion of actual positives correctly identified by the model, which is crucial for ensuring no cases are missed in disease surveillance [87]. Specificity, is akin to the concept of true negative rate, highlighting the model's ability to identify those without the disease correctly [87]. The Positive Predictive Value (PPV) mirrors precision, indicating the proportion of positive test results that are truly positive, which is essential for assessing the model's accuracy in predicting disease presence [87]. The F1 Score, harmonizing the PPV (precision) and sensitivity (recall) by penalizing imbalances, is essential for models that correctly identify cases and avoid false alarms. Finally, the overall accuracy metric reflects the model's effectiveness across disease detection and false alarm minimization [88].

Common Fairness Metrics for Assessing Machine Learning Model Fairness in Public Health Contexts

The key fairness metrics used to evaluate ML models in public health contexts are as follows:

- *Disparate Impact Ratio*: Disparate Impact Ratio is a quantitative measure used to identify and assess the level of disparity [89, 90]. It is calculated as the ratio of the rate at which a particular outcome occurs for a protected group to the rate at which that outcome occurs for the dominant or comparison group. A ratio of 1 indicates perfect equality; values less than 1 indicate that the outcome is less favourable for the protected group, and values greater than 1 indicate more favourable outcomes for the protected group.
Example: If an ML model is used to recommend mental health services and it is found that the urban population is twice as likely to be recommended for these services compared to the rural population, this could indicate a bias in how services are offered or accessed. Suppose 20% of the urban population and only 10% of the rural population receive enhanced mental health services recommendations. The Disparate Impact Ratio in this case would be $\frac{10\%}{20\%} = 0.5$. This ratio, being significantly less than 1, suggests a disparate impact against the rural population, highlighting a potential bias in the algorithm's decision-making process.
- *Predicted Positive Rate (PPR)*: Measures the proportion of individuals within a specific group predicted by an ML model to have a positive outcome. This metric is crucial in evaluating the performance of predictive models across different demographic groups [91]. *Example*: When deploying a predictive model to identify patients at risk for heart disease, observing a PPR disparity; such as a PPR of 40% for one ethnicity compared to a PPR of 20% for another; can indicate potential biases or a lack of model sensitivity to diverse genetic backgrounds. Such disparities in PPR might suggest that the model disproportionately predicts positive outcomes (e.g., risk of heart disease) for one ethnic group over another, potentially due to factors like training data imbalances or overlooked genetic variations.
- *False Discovery Rate (FDR)*: Evaluates the proportion of false positives among all positive predictions made by an ML model, offering insight into the model precision in identifying true positive outcomes [92]. *Example*: If the ML model designed to screen for stroke risk in patients, predicts that 100 individuals are at high risk of experiencing a stroke, but later assessments reveal that 40 of these predictions are incorrect (i.e., these individuals are not actually at high risk), the FDR for the model would be 40%. This high FDR suggests a significant level of inaccuracy in the model's positive predictions, indicating a need for improvement in its predictive capabilities or a reconsideration of the features and data used for training to better distinguish between true and false positives [93].
- *False Positive Rate (FPR)*: This metric quantifies the frequency with which some individuals are incorrectly classified as having an outcome predictive model [92]. *Example*: If a cancer screening program using an ML model is designed to detect early signs of skin cancer and the program screens 1,000 individuals and mistakenly identifies 100 as at high risk of skin cancer, when in reality only 20 of

these individuals exhibit early signs of the disease, the FPR would be calculated based on the number of false positives (those incorrectly identified as at risk) out of the total number of actual negatives (those who are healthy). In this case, if among the 1,000 screened, 980 are healthy, and 100 of these are falsely identified as at risk, the FPR would be $\frac{100}{980} \approx 0.102$, or 10.2%. A high FPR, such as this, indicates that many individuals are wrongly subjected to the anxiety and unnecessary follow-up tests associated with a potential cancer diagnosis. This scenario expects a ML model to reduce false alarms and ensure that the screening program accurately distinguishes between healthy individuals and those with genuine disease.

- *False Omission Rate (FOR)*: This metric assesses the proportion of false negatives within all negative predictions made by a diagnostic test or predictive model [94]. *Example*: In the context of screening for tuberculosis (TB), if a health screening program tests 1,000 individuals and 900 are predicted not to have TB (negative predictions). However, among these 900 individuals, 30 actually do have TB but were incorrectly classified as not having it (false negatives). The FOR in this case is calculated as the number of false negatives divided by the total number of negative predictions, which would be $\frac{30}{900} = 0.0333$ or 3.33%. A high FOR in such a scenario suggests that a substantial number of TB cases might go undiagnosed due to the test or model's inability to identify all positive cases among those tested accurately.
- *False Negative Rate (FNR)*: This metric captures the proportion of positive cases that a diagnostic test or predictive model fails to identify [94]. *Example*: In the context of COVID-19 testing, where a testing center conducts 1,000 tests, and there are 100 true positive cases among these. If the test fails to identify 20 of these true positives, reporting them as negative, the FNR would be calculated as the number of false negatives divided by the total number of positive cases, which would be $\frac{20}{100} = 0.20$ or 20%. A high FNR in such a critical situation indicates that many individuals infected with COVID-19 are mistakenly informed they do not have the virus. This misdiagnosis can have severe public health implications, as these individuals, believing they are virus-free, might not take necessary precautions to isolate themselves, thereby risking the continued spread of COVID-19 to others.
- *Group Size Ratio (GSR)*: This metric ensures the proportionate representation of different demographic or characteristic groups within a dataset or study population [95]. *Example*: In a clinical trial investigating the effects of new diabetes medication, if there are 1,000 participants are enrolled, but only 200 of these are women. The GSR for women compared to men in this study can be calculated by dividing the number of female participants by the number of male participants. If there are 800 male participants, the GSR would be $\frac{200}{800} = 0.25$. This low GSR indicates a significant underrepresentation of female participants, which could lead to outcomes that might not be fully representative or equally applicable across genders.
- *Equality of Opportunity*: This metric ensures that individuals from different demographic or socio-economic groups have equal chances of receiving favorable

outcomes, irrespective of their background [96]. *Example:* When evaluating the allocation of elective surgeries in a hospital, Equality of Opportunity can be applied to assess whether patients with varying insurance statuses are considered equally for surgery schedules. A review of hospital data reveals that patients with private insurance are twice as likely to be approved for elective surgeries compared to those with government-provided health coverage, even when controlling for medical needs. This discrepancy violates Equality of Opportunity, as the decisions seem to be influenced by the patient’s ability to pay rather than their medical necessities.

- *Equalized Odds:* This fairness metric targets the achievement of comparable error rates (both false positives and false negatives) across different demographic or characteristic groups [97]. *Example:* In diagnosing lung diseases, the diagnostic model sensitivity (true positive rate) and specificity (true negative rate) must be consistent across different patient groups, such as smokers and non-smokers. If a lung disease diagnostic model is tested on a diverse patient group, analysis shows that the model has a higher sensitivity in detecting lung disease in smokers but a higher false positive rate in non-smokers. This discrepancy indicates that the model does not satisfy the Equalized Odds criterion, as the error rates (specifically, the rates of false positives and false negatives) vary significantly between these two groups.
- *Balanced Accuracy:* This metric is designed to equalize the importance of sensitivity (the ability to correctly identify true positives) and specificity (the ability to correctly identify true negatives) in models, especially when dealing with imbalanced datasets or when the cost of different types of errors is similar [98]. *Example:* If a ML model demonstrates high sensitivity in detecting mental health needs in younger individuals but lacks specificity in older populations—resulting in many false positives among the older adults—the overall accuracy might appear acceptable. However, this overlooks the model’s disproportionate error rates across age groups. Employing the balanced accuracy would highlight this disparity by giving equal weight to the model performance in correctly identifying both those who do and do not require interventions across all demographic groups.
- *Predictive Parity:* This metric ensures that the positive predictive value (PPV)—the probability that subjects with a positive screening test truly have the condition—remains consistent across different demographic or characteristic groups [99]. *Example:* If a healthcare model designed to predict the likelihood of hospital readmission within 30 days of discharge, disproportionately flags elderly patients as being at a high risk of readmission compared to younger patients, despite similar health statuses and hospitalization histories, it may indicate a lack of Predictive Parity. Such a bias could lead to unnecessary stress for elderly patients and their families, increased healthcare costs, and inappropriate allocation of resources. To avoid these biased healthcare decisions, it is important to adjust the model to ensure that the likelihood of correctly predicting readmission is equally accurate across age groups.
- *Calibration:* This metric assesses how well the predicted probabilities from a model correspond to the actual outcomes, ensuring accuracy and reliability across

different groups [100]. *Example:* If a surveillance system is designed to predict the risk of disease outbreaks, proper calibration means that if the model estimates a 30% risk of an influenza outbreak in several regions, then, over time, approximately 30% of those regions should indeed experience outbreaks. An analysis of the system reveals that while the predicted and observed outbreak patterns closely align in urban areas, the predictions are consistently overestimated for rural regions. This discrepancy indicates a lack of calibration, as the model's predictions do not accurately reflect the actual outcomes across different geographical areas.

- *Balanced Error Rate (BER):* This metric aims to achieve an equilibrium between the rates of false positives (incorrectly predicting a positive outcome when it is negative) and false negatives (failing to predict a positive outcome when it exists), thereby reducing bias in predictive modeling [101]. *Example:* In using predictive models for screening genetic disorders, the BER must be kept low and consistent across different ethnic groups. For instance, if a model is used to screen for a specific genetic disorder, it is found that the false positive rate is significantly higher in one ethnic group compared to others. In comparison, the false negative rate is higher in another group. Such discrepancies indicate a lack of balance in error rates, leading to potential bias against certain groups.
- *Background Negative Subgroup Positive (BNSP) AUC:* This metric is designed to evaluate a model's accuracy in identifying positive cases within a predominantly negative background [102]. *Example:* In diagnosing a rare genetic disorder that affects only a small fraction of the population, the BNSP AUC metric would measure how effectively the model can pinpoint these few positive cases amidst a vast majority of negative (non-affected) cases. Achieving a high BNSP AUC is crucial because it signifies the model's capability to accurately identify the rare positive cases without generating an excessive number of false positives.

Next, we present a case study on diabetes readmission in Additional File 1.

4 Discussion

This review article outlined the existing biases to describe the types of unfairness in the prediction of population health outcomes using ML algorithms. We also explored the existing quantitative metrics to identify and measure the extent of unfairness across population subgroups. Our findings will facilitate the use of these metrics to develop and evaluate of ML, thus promoting the equitable application of ML in public health. Our study also highlights biases occur at all stages of the ML lifecycle, including data processing and collection, model development, evaluation, implementation, and post-implementation.

There is a guideline for the standardized development and reporting of medical prediction algorithms called 'Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis' (TRIPOD) [103], with a framework to evaluate and build statistical learning algorithms adapted to a clinical setting. However, it has a limited applicability to the assessment of fairness concerning ML algorithms and do not describe the specific types and sources of biases we provided. While the TRIPOD

guideline adapted to ML algorithms is under development currently, our work will supplement such guideline by providing various fairness metrics adapted to the aim of each study concerning the equitable development and evaluation of ML.

Limitations

Although we performed an extensive literature search, we might not have fully captured all recent studies, given the rapid advancement in the field of AI fairness and ML. Also, we note that the metrics for prediction performance, including the fairness metrics covered in our review, assume the accurate measurement of "ground truth", to which the predicted population health status is compared. However, systematic inaccuracy in ground truth measures routinely occurs due to bias in assessors and devices, for instance, assessment of medical charts or varying quality of devices that capture medical images [104] across institutions or populations. Therefore, research efforts to increase the validity of ground truth measures is critical.

Future Directions

Future research directions necessitate a multifaceted approach. First, there is a pressing need to cover studies that consider both the qualitative, besides the quantitative fairness methods. This should include a broader spectrum of ethical considerations relevant to AI applications in public health. Moreover, exploring innovative methodologies to enhance the effectiveness and applicability of fairness metrics across diverse public health contexts is crucial for effectively addressing and mitigating biases. Additionally, conducting a detailed case study is essential. These studies should delve into the practical challenges and opportunities of leveraging AI to promote public health equity, particularly capturing the diversity of public health scenarios and addressing the complexities of biases in real-world data.

While we provide a comprehensive list of fairness metrics, the use of particular metrics should depend on the specific public health applications of ML algorithms. These applications include public health surveillance, outbreak control, health promotion, and resource prioritization and optimization. Ideally, recommendations and frameworks to guide the appropriate fairness metrics suited for specific public health activities should be developed. Finally, the application of the fairness metrics in real-world practice may be limited by the unavailability of the key variables characterizing equity-deserving variables, i.e., income, race, and gender, in the population data. The use of proxy measures for such critical attributes (e.g., aggregated census neighbourhood-level income) are often used but are likely to reduce the fairness of algorithms [59]; thus, increasing access to these attributes at disaggregated, i.e., person-level, is critical, which can be achieved by the participation of public health and healthcare authorities for data sharing and linkage.

5 Conclusion

This review examined fairness metrics and biases associated with the application of ML, highlighting the importance of using quantitative measures to identify and address

biases effectively. The review points out the challenges of data biases and methodological limitations, stressing the need for interdisciplinary collaboration and strong ethical guidelines in ML an public health applications. The review results show ML's potential to positively transform public health while warning of the risks of adopting methods without careful ethical and societal consideration.

List of abbreviations

AI: Artificial Intelligence
ML: Machine Learning
MESH: Medical Subject Headings
IEEE: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
ACM: Association for Computing Machinery
PPV: Positive Predictive Value

Author contributions

S.R. designed the study and performed literature search. H.M. was involved in the design of the study. S.R. and H.M. performed the selection and review of articles. S.R. led the drafting of the manuscript. H.M., E.D. and A.S. critically reviewed and provided inputs. All authors approved the final manuscript.

Availability of data and materials

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

- [1] Public Health Agency of Canada: Summary of the Chief Public Health Officer's Report on the State of Public Health in Canada 2021. <https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/corporate/publications/chief-public-health-officer-reports-state-public-health-canada/state-public-health-canada-2021/summary.html>. Accessed on April 30, 2024 (2021)
- [2] Panch, T., Pearson-Stuttard, J., Greaves, F., Atun, R.: Artificial intelligence: opportunities and risks for public health. *The Lancet Digital Health* **1**(1), 13–14 (2019)

- [3] Mhasawade, V., Zhao, Y., Chunara, R.: Machine learning and algorithmic fairness in public and population health. *Nature Machine Intelligence* **3**(8), 659–666 (2021)
- [4] Mooney, S.J., Pejaver, V.: Big data in public health: terminology, machine learning, and privacy. *Annual review of public health* **39**, 95–112 (2018)
- [5] Raza, S., Schwartz, B., Rosella, L.C.: Coquad: a covid-19 question answering dataset system, facilitating research, benchmarking, and practice. *BMC bioinformatics* **23**(1), 1–28 (2022)
- [6] Larkin, A., Gu, X., Chen, L., Hystad, P.: Predicting perceptions of the built environment using gis, satellite and street view image approaches. *Landscape and urban planning* **216**, 104257 (2021)
- [7] Shah, S., Mulahuwaih, A., Ghafour, K.Z., Maghdid, H.S.: Prediction of global spread of covid-19 pandemic: a review and research challenges. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 1–22 (2022)
- [8] Raza, S.: Connecting fairness in machine learning with public health equity. In: 2023 IEEE 11th International Conference on Healthcare Informatics (ICHI), pp. 704–708 (2023). IEEE
- [9] Myers, M.F., Rogers, D., Cox, J., Flahault, A., Hay, S.I.: Forecasting disease risk for increased epidemic preparedness in public health. *Advances in parasitology* **47**, 309–330 (2000)
- [10] Dolatabadi, E., Moyano, D., Bales, M., Spasojevic, S., Bhambhoria, R., Bhatti, J., Debnath, S., Hoell, N., Li, X., Leng, C., *et al.*: Using social media to help understand patient-reported health outcomes of post-covid-19 condition: Natural language processing approach. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* **25**, 45767 (2023)
- [11] Asif, M., Ajmal, M., Ashraf, G., Muhammad, N., Aziz, A., Iftikhar, T., Wang, J., Liu, H.: The role of biosensors in coronavirus disease-2019 outbreak. *Current Opinion in Electrochemistry* **23**, 174–184 (2020)
- [12] Gao, Y., Cai, G.-Y., Fang, W., Li, H.-Y., Wang, S.-Y., Chen, L., Yu, Y., Liu, D., Xu, S., Cui, P.-F., *et al.*: Machine learning based early warning system enables accurate mortality risk prediction for covid-19. *Nature communications* **11**(1), 5033 (2020)
- [13] Cho, G., Lee, H.: Detection of covid-19 epidemic outbreak using machine learning. *Frontiers in Public Health* **11**, 1252357 (2023)
- [14] Teixeira, E., Fonseca, H., Diniz-Sousa, F., Veras, L., Boppre, G., Oliveira, J., Pinto, D., Alves, A.J., Barbosa, A., Mendes, R., *et al.*: Wearable devices for

physical activity and healthcare monitoring in elderly people: A critical review. *Geriatrics* **6**(2), 38 (2021)

- [15] White, B.M., Melton, C., Zareie, P., Davis, R.L., Bednarczyk, R.A., Shaban-Nejad, A.: Exploring celebrity influence on public attitude towards the covid-19 pandemic: social media shared sentiment analysis. *BMJ Health & Care Informatics* **30**(1) (2023)
- [16] Ordu, M., Demir, E., Tofallis, C., Gunal, M.M.: A novel healthcare resource allocation decision support tool: A forecasting-simulation-optimization approach. *Journal of the operational research society* **72**(3), 485–500 (2021)
- [17] Carter-Pokras, O., Baquet, C.: What is a “health disparity”? *Public health reports* (2002)
- [18] Raza, S., Dolatabadi, E., Ondrusek, N., Rosella, L., Schwartz, B.: Discovering social determinants of health from case reports using natural language processing: algorithmic development and validation. *BMC Digital Health* **1**(1), 35 (2023)
- [19] Raza, S., Pour, P.O., Bashir, S.R.: Fairness in machine learning meets with equity in healthcare. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Symposium Series*, vol. 1, pp. 149–153 (2023)
- [20] Kleinbaum, D.G., Morgenstern, H., Kupper, L.L.: Selection bias in epidemiologic studies. *American journal of epidemiology* **113**(4), 452–463 (1981)
- [21] Arnold, B.F., Ercumen, A., Benjamin-Chung, J., Colford Jr, J.M.: Brief report: negative controls to detect selection bias and measurement bias in epidemiologic studies. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass.)* **27**(5), 637 (2016)
- [22] Greenland, S., Morgenstern, H.: Ecological bias, confounding, and effect modification. *International journal of epidemiology* **18**(1), 269–274 (1989)
- [23] Halpern, S.D., Truog, R.D., Miller, F.G.: Cognitive bias and public health policy during the covid-19 pandemic. *Jama* **324**(4), 337–338 (2020)
- [24] Johnson, N.F., Spagat, M., Gourley, S., Onnela, J.-P., Reinert, G.: Bias in epidemiological studies of conflict mortality. *Journal of Peace Research* **45**(5), 653–663 (2008)
- [25] Peterson, A., Charles, V., Yeung, D., Coyle, K.: The health equity framework: a science-and justice-based model for public health researchers and practitioners. *Health promotion practice* **22**(6), 741–746 (2021)
- [26] Verma, S., Rubin, J.: Fairness definitions explained. In: *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Software Fairness*, pp. 1–7 (2018)

- [27] Ball, M.J., Weaver, C., Kiel, J.: Healthcare Information Management Systems: Cases, Strategies, and Solutions. Springer, ??? (2013)
- [28] Thomasian, N.M., Eickhoff, C., Adashi, E.Y.: Advancing health equity with artificial intelligence. *Journal of public health policy* **42**, 602–611 (2021)
- [29] Galea, S.: *Within Reason: A Liberal Public Health for an Illiberal Time*. University of Chicago Press, ??? (2023)
- [30] Braveman, P.: Health disparities and health equity: concepts and measurement. *Annu. Rev. Public Health* **27**, 167–194 (2006)
- [31] Mitchell, S., Potash, E., Barocas, S., D’Amour, A., Lum, K.: Algorithmic fairness: Choices, assumptions, and definitions. *Annual review of statistics and its application* **8**, 141–163 (2021)
- [32] Cordeiro, J.V.: Digital technologies and data science as health enablers: an outline of appealing promises and compelling ethical, legal, and social challenges. *Frontiers in Medicine* **8**, 647897 (2021)
- [33] Gervasi, S.S., Chen, I.Y., Smith-McLallen, A., Sontag, D., Obermeyer, Z., Vennera, M., Chawla, R.: The potential for bias in machine learning and opportunities for health insurers to address it: Article examines the potential for bias in machine learning and opportunities for health insurers to address it. *Health Affairs* **41**(2), 212–218 (2022)
- [34] Rajkomar, A., Hardt, M., Howell, M.D., Corrado, G., Chin, M.H.: Ensuring fairness in machine learning to advance health equity. *Annals of internal medicine* **169**(12), 866–872 (2018)
- [35] Sikstrom, L., Maslej, M.M., Hui, K., Findlay, Z., Buchman, D.Z., Hill, S.L.: Conceptualising fairness: three pillars for medical algorithms and health equity. *BMJ health & care informatics* **29**(1) (2022)
- [36] Ahmad, M.A., Patel, A., Eckert, C., Kumar, V., Teredesai, A.: Fairness in machine learning for healthcare. In: *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pp. 3529–3530 (2020)
- [37] Xu, J., Xiao, Y., Wang, W.H., Ning, Y., Shenkman, E.A., Bian, J., Wang, F.: Algorithmic fairness in computational medicine. *EBioMedicine* **84** (2022)
- [38] McCradden, M.D., Joshi, S., Mazwi, M., Anderson, J.A.: Ethical limitations of algorithmic fairness solutions in health care machine learning. *The Lancet Digital Health* **2**(5), 221–223 (2020)
- [39] Azimi, V., Zaydman, M.A.: *Optimizing equity: Working towards fair machine*

- learning algorithms in laboratory medicine. *The journal of applied laboratory medicine* **8**(1), 113–128 (2023)
- [40] Kulikowski, C.A.: Ethics in the history of medical informatics for decision-making: Early challenges to digital health goals. *Yearbook of Medical Informatics* **31**(01), 317–322 (2022)
- [41] Lin, Y.C., Mallia, D., Clark-Sevilla, A.O., Catto, A., Leshchenko, A., Haas, D.M., Wapner, R., Pe'er, I., Raja, A., Salleb-Aouissi, A.: Preeclampsia predictor with machine learning: A comprehensive and bias-free machine learning pipeline. *medRxiv*, 2022–06 (2022)
- [42] Lu, J., Sattler, A., Wang, S., Khaki, A.R., Callahan, A., Fleming, S., Fong, R., Ehlert, B., Li, R.C., Shieh, L., *et al.*: Considerations in the reliability and fairness audits of predictive models for advance care planning. *Frontiers in Digital Health* **4**, 943768 (2022)
- [43] Wesson, P., Hswen, Y., Valdes, G., Stojanovski, K., Handley, M.A.: Risks and opportunities to ensure equity in the application of big data research in public health. *Annual Review of Public Health* **43**, 59–78 (2022)
- [44] Yang, J., Soltan, A.A., Clifton, D.A.: Algorithmic fairness and bias mitigation for clinical machine learning: A new utility for deep reinforcement learning. *medRxiv*, 2022–06 (2022)
- [45] Liu, J., Chen, H., Shen, J., Choo, K.-K.R.: Faircompass: Operationalising fairness in machine learning. *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence* (2024)
- [46] Dukhanin, V., Searle, A., Zwerling, A., Dowdy, D.W., Taylor, H.A., Merritt, M.W.: Integrating social justice concerns into economic evaluation for healthcare and public health: A systematic review. *Social Science & Medicine* **198**, 27–35 (2018)
- [47] Allin, S., Mossialos, E., Holland, W., McKee, M.: The wanless report and decision-making in public health. *Journal of Public Health* **27**(2), 133–134 (2005)
- [48] Marmot, M.: Fair society, healthy lives : the marmot review : strategic review of health inequalities in england post-2010. (2010). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:153127899>
- [49] Joanna Briggs Institute: Critical Appraisal Checklist for Systematic Reviews. Accessed: 2023-03-25 (2017). https://jbi.global/sites/default/files/2019-05/JBI_Critical_Appraisal_Checklist_for_Systematic_Reviews2017.0.pdf
- [50] Chen, H., Hailey, D., Wang, N., Yu, P.: A review of data quality assessment methods for public health information systems. *International journal of environmental*

- research and public health **11**(5), 5170–5207 (2014)
- [51] Jong, V.M., Moons, K.G., Eijkemans, M.J., Riley, R.D., Debray, T.P.: Developing more generalizable prediction models from pooled studies and large clustered data sets. *Statistics in medicine* **40**(15), 3533–3559 (2021)
- [52] Hardt, M., Price, E., Srebro, N.: Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **29** (2016)
- [53] Straw, I.: The automation of bias in medical artificial intelligence (ai): Decoding the past to create a better future. *Artificial intelligence in medicine* **110**, 101965 (2020)
- [54] Kordzadeh, N., Ghasemaghaei, M.: Algorithmic bias: review, synthesis, and future research directions. *European Journal of Information Systems* **31**(3), 388–409 (2022)
- [55] Faugier, J., Sargeant, M.: Sampling hard to reach populations. *Journal of advanced nursing* **26**(4), 790–797 (1997)
- [56] Tripepi, G., Jager, K.J., Dekker, F.W., Zoccali, C.: Selection bias and information bias in clinical research. *Nephron Clinical Practice* **115**(2), 94–99 (2010)
- [57] Cortes, C., Mohri, M., Riley, M., Rostamizadeh, A.: Sample selection bias correction theory. In: *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pp. 38–53 (2008). Springer
- [58] Parikh, R.B., Teeple, S., Navathe, A.S.: Addressing bias in artificial intelligence in health care. *Jama* **322**(24), 2377–2378 (2019)
- [59] Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., Mullainathan, S.: Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science* **366**(6464), 447–453 (2019)
- [60] Mickenautsch, S.: Systematic reviews, systematic error and the acquisition of clinical knowledge. *BMC medical research methodology* **10**, 1–7 (2010)
- [61] Pudjihartono, N., Fadason, T., Kempa-Liehr, A.W., O’Sullivan, J.M.: A review of feature selection methods for machine learning-based disease risk prediction. *Frontiers in Bioinformatics* **2**, 927312 (2022)
- [62] Akay, M.F.: Support vector machines combined with feature selection for breast cancer diagnosis. *Expert systems with applications* **36**(2), 3240–3247 (2009)
- [63] Luyckx, V.A., Brenner, B.M.: Birth weight, malnutrition and kidney-associated outcomes—a global concern. *Nature Reviews Nephrology* **11**(3), 135–149 (2015)

- [64] Ntoutsi, E., Fafalios, P., Gadiraju, U., Iosifidis, V., Nejdil, W., Vidal, M.-E., Ruggieri, S., Turini, F., Papadopoulos, S., Krasanakis, E., *et al.*: Bias in data-driven artificial intelligence systems—an introductory survey. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* **10**(3), 1356 (2020)
- [65] Dwivedi, Y.K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aarts, G., Coombs, C., Crick, T., Duan, Y., Dwivedi, R., Edwards, J., Eirug, A., *et al.*: Artificial intelligence (ai): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management* **57**, 101994 (2021)
- [66] Pickett, K.E., Wilkinson, R.G.: Income inequality and health: a causal review. *Social science & medicine* **128**, 316–326 (2015)
- [67] Ahnquist, J., Wamala, S.P., Lindstrom, M.: Social determinants of health—a question of social or economic capital? interaction effects of socioeconomic factors on health outcomes. *Social science & medicine* **74**(6), 930–939 (2012)
- [68] Gala, D., Makaryus, A.N.: The utility of language models in cardiology: a narrative review of the benefits and concerns of chatgpt-4. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **20**(15), 6438 (2023)
- [69] Jakesch, M., Hancock, J.T., Naaman, M.: Human heuristics for ai-generated language are flawed. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **120**(11), 2208839120 (2023)
- [70] Raza, S., Ding, C.: Improving clinical decision making with a two-stage recommender system. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics* (2023)
- [71] Kerasidou, C.X., Kerasidou, A., Buscher, M., Wilkinson, S.: Before and beyond trust: reliance in medical ai. *Journal of medical ethics* **48**(11), 852–856 (2022)
- [72] Modgil, S., Singh, R.K., Gupta, S., Dennehy, D.: A confirmation bias view on social media induced polarisation during covid-19. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 1–25 (2021)
- [73] Oswald, M.E., Grosjean, S.: Confirmation bias. *Cognitive illusions: A handbook on fallacies and biases in thinking, judgement and memory* **79** (2004)
- [74] Grissinger, M.: Understanding human over-reliance on technology. *Pharmacy and Therapeutics* **44**(6), 320 (2019)
- [75] Devillers, L., Fogelman-Soulié, F., Baeza-Yates, R.: Ai & human values: Inequalities, biases, fairness, nudge, and feedback loops. *Reflections on Artificial Intelligence for Humanity*, 76–89 (2021)

- [76] Chapman, E.N., Kaatz, A., Carnes, M.: Physicians and implicit bias: how doctors may unwittingly perpetuate health care disparities. *Journal of general internal medicine* **28**, 1504–1510 (2013)
- [77] Hao, K.: This is how ai bias really happens—and why it’s so hard to fix. *MIT Technology Review* **4** (2019)
- [78] Saeed, S.A., Masters, R.M.: Disparities in health care and the digital divide. *Current psychiatry reports* **23**, 1–6 (2021)
- [79] Campbell, C.M., Edwards, R.R.: Ethnic differences in pain and pain management. *Pain management* **2**(3), 219–230 (2012)
- [80] Whittaker, M., Alper, M., Bennett, C.L., Hendren, S., Kaziunas, L., Mills, M., Morris, M.R., Rankin, J., Rogers, E., Salas, M., et al.: Disability, bias, and ai. *AI Now Institute* **8** (2019)
- [81] Williams, R., Cloete, R., Cobbe, J., Cottrill, C., Edwards, P., Markovic, M., Naja, I., Ryan, F., Singh, J., Pang, W.: From transparency to accountability of intelligent systems: Moving beyond aspirations. *Data & Policy* **4**, 7 (2022)
- [82] Buolamwini, J., Gebru, T.: Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. In: *Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*, pp. 77–91 (2018). PMLR
- [83] Gerke, S., Minssen, T., Cohen, G.: Ethical and legal challenges of artificial intelligence-driven healthcare. In: *Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare*, pp. 295–336. Elsevier, ??? (2020)
- [84] Vela, D., Sharp, A., Zhang, R., Nguyen, T., Hoang, A., Pianykh, O.S.: Temporal quality degradation in ai models. *Scientific reports* **12**(1), 11654 (2022)
- [85] Khan, B., Fatima, H., Qureshi, A., Kumar, S., Hanan, A., Hussain, J., Abdullah, S.: Drawbacks of artificial intelligence and their potential solutions in the healthcare sector. *Biomedical Materials & Devices*, 1–8 (2023)
- [86] Nielsen, A.: *Practical Fairness*. O’Reilly Media, ??? (2020)
- [87] Monaghan, T.F., Rahman, S.N., Agudelo, C.W., Wein, A.J., Lazar, J.M., Everaert, K., Dmochowski, R.R.: Foundational statistical principles in medical research: sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, and negative predictive value. *Medicina* **57**(5), 503 (2021)
- [88] Woodruff, B., Bornemisza, O., Checchi, F., Sondorp, E.: *The use of epidemiological tools in conflict-affected populations: open-access educational resources for policy-makers*. London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (2009)
- [89] Feldman, M., Friedler, S.A., Moeller, J., Scheidegger, C., Venkatasubramanian,

- S.: Certifying and removing disparate impact. In: Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, pp. 259–268 (2015)
- [90] Zafar, M.B., Valera, I., Gomez Rodriguez, M., Gummadi, K.P.: Fairness beyond disparate treatment & disparate impact: Learning classification without disparate mistreatment. In: Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web, pp. 1171–1180 (2017)
- [91] Trevethan, R.: Sensitivity, specificity, and predictive values: foundations, pliabilitys, and pitfalls in research and practice. *Frontiers in public health* **5**, 308890 (2017)
- [92] Storey, J.D.: False discovery rate. *International encyclopedia of statistical science* **1**, 504–508 (2011)
- [93] Grote, T., Berens, P.: On the ethics of algorithmic decision-making in healthcare. *Journal of medical ethics* **46**(3), 205–211 (2020)
- [94] Neth, H., Gaisbauer, F., Gradwohl, N., Gaissmaier, W.: Riskyr: Rendering Risk Literacy More Transparent. *Social Psychology and Decision Sciences*, University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany (2022). *Social Psychology and Decision Sciences*, University of Konstanz. R package (version 0.4.0, Aug. 15, 2022). <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=riskyr>
- [95] MathWorks: Explore Fairness Metrics for Credit Scoring Model. <https://www.mathworks.com/help/risk/explore-fairness-metrics-for-credit-scoring-model.html>. (Accessed on 03/19/2024) (2023)
- [96] Roemer, J.E., Trannoy, A.: Equality of opportunity. In: *Handbook of Income Distribution* vol. 2, pp. 217–300. Elsevier, ??? (2015)
- [97] Awasthi, P., Kleindessner, M., Morgenstern, J.: Equalized odds postprocessing under imperfect group information. In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1770–1780 (2020). PMLR
- [98] Brodersen, K.H., Ong, C.S., Stephan, K.E., Buhmann, J.M.: The balanced accuracy and its posterior distribution. In: *2010 20th International Conference on Pattern Recognition*, pp. 3121–3124 (2010). IEEE
- [99] Dieterich, W., Mendoza, C., Brennan, T.: Compas risk scales: Demonstrating accuracy equity and predictive parity. *Northpointe Inc* **7**(4), 1–36 (2016)
- [100] Pleiss, G., Raghavan, M., Wu, F., Kleinberg, J., Weinberger, K.: On fairness and calibration. *arxiv prepr. arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.02012* (2017)
- [101] Romano, J.P., Wolf, M.: Balanced control of generalized error rates. *The Annals*

of Statistics **38**(1), 598–633 (2010) <https://doi.org/10.1214/09-AOS734>

- [102] Borkan, D., Dixon, L., Sorensen, J., Thain, N., Vasserman, L.: Nuanced metrics for measuring unintended bias with real data for text classification. In: Companion Proceedings of the 2019 World Wide Web Conference, pp. 491–500 (2019)
- [103] Collins, G.S., Reitsma, J.B., Altman, D.G., Moons, K.G.: Transparent reporting of a multivariable prediction model for individual prognosis or diagnosis (tripod): the tripod statement. *Annals of internal medicine* **162**(1), 55–63 (2015)
- [104] Zong, Y., Yang, Y., Hospedales, T.: Medfair: benchmarking fairness for medical imaging. arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01725 (2022)