Covariate Shift and Confounding

27 November 2016

Common Assumptions of Supervised Learning

- Joint distribution of (X,Y) that produces the training data is the same is used to evaluate generalization error.
- By axioms of probability, P(X=x,Y=y) = P(X=x)*P(Y=y|X=x)
- So we can decompose into two assumptions:
 - Distribution of X stays the same from training to generalization
 - Distribution of Y|X stays the same from training to generalization

What if P(X) changes?

- Lets see what can happen if the marginal distribution of P(X = x) changes from training to "future-test." (Imagine a *new* test set that is given that was not available during training. We will call this the "future-test" set.)
- This is called **covariate shift**
- In these examples, we will make sure that Y|X does not change - the true relationship between X and Y stays the same in all examples.





True model is quadratic; underfitting with linear model





True model is quadratic, correctly captures relationship





True model is quadratic — overfitting with cubic model

Can we detect covariate shift?



True model is quadratic, correctly captures relationship



Detecting covariate shift

- Train a classifier to distinguish training instances from future-test instances
- If one can be learned that gives good performance, probably a covariate shift has occurred
- This may have limited usefulness in practice; might be as difficult as just learning a new model for the original task.







Has the relationship between y and x changed?





Omitted Variables

- Omitted variables can cause significant problems if they undergo covariate shift from training to futuretest.
- They can also cause significant problems with model interpretation.

Confounding

- In statistics, a confounder (also confounding variable, confounding factor or lurking variable) is a variable that influences both the dependent variable (e.g. class label) and one or more independent variables (e.g. features) causing spurious associations.
- When we have *unmeasured confounders* (confounding variables omitted from the model), we can get misleading results.
- Confounding is a *causal* concept; it cannot be addressed with statistics alone.
- This situation is sometimes called *endogeneity* in economics.

Example: Medication Effectiveness

• Consider a very simple dataset with one feature UseMed, and a label Cured.

- Model 1: Logistic regression
 - P(Cured = 1 | UseMed) = s(-0.06014 + 2.03604*UseMed)
 - AUC = 0.72

Example: Medication Effectiveness

- Consider a very simple dataset with a feature UseMed, a feature to tell if a person is Rich, and a label Cured.
- Model 2: Logistic regression
 - P(Cured = 1 | UseMed, Rich) = s(-0.58 - 0.10*UseMed + 2.96*Rich)
 - AUC = 0.82

Example: Medication Effectiveness

- Consider a very simple dataset with a feature UseMed, a feature to tell if a person is Rich, a feature to tell if a person is Healthy, and a label Cured.
- Model 3: Logistic regression
 - P(Cured = 1 | UseMed, Rich, Healthy) = s(-1.26 - 0.12*UseMed + 0.38*Rich + 3.60*Healthy)
 - AUC = 0.90

Confounding in Practice

- Confounding makes interpreting models challenging.
- Always important to consider what other possibly unmeasured — features could influence outcome/label.
- There is no statistical test for confounding. Test and validation sets, cross-validation, bootstrapping, etc. cannot detect confounding.

Bias in ML More Generally

- Supervised learning methods learn whatever patterns in the training data are most useful for prediction.
- Sometimes, this perpetuates undesirable patterns.
- <u>https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-com-jobs-automation-insight/amazon-scraps-secret-ai-recruiting-tool-that-showed-bias-against-women-idUSKCN1MK08G</u>
- <u>http://science.sciencemag.org/content/356/6334/133</u>