

Recent Advances, Applications and Open Challenges in Machine Learning for Health: Reflections from Research Roundtables at ML4H 2023 Symposium

Hyewon Jeong ¹	HYEWONJ@MIT.EDU
Sarah Jabbour ^{1, 2}	SJABBOUR@UMICH.EDU
Yuzhe Yang ¹	YUZHE@MIT.EDU
Rahul Thapta ²	RTHAPA84@STANFORD.EDU
Hussein Mozannar ²	MOZANNAR@MIT.EDU
William Jongwon Han ²	WJHAN@ANDREW.CMU.EDU
Nikita Mehandru ²	NMEHANDRU@BERKELEY.EDU
Michael Wornow ²	MWORNOW@STANFORD.EDU
Vladislav Lialin ²	VLAD.LIALIN@GMAIL.COM
Xin Liu ²	XLIUCS@GOOGLE.COM
Alejandro Lozano ²	LOZANOE@STANFORD.EDU
Jiacheng Zhu ²	ZJC@MIT.EDU
Rafal Dariusz Kocielnik ²	RAFALKO@CALTECH.EDU
Keith Harrigian ²	KHARRIGIAN@JHU.EDU
Haoran Zhang ²	HAORANZ@MIT.EDU
Edward Lee ²	EDHLEE@STANFORD.EDU
Milos Vukadinovic ²	MILOSVUK@G.UCLA.EDU
Aparna Balagopalan ²	APARNAB@MIT.EDU
Vincent Jeanselme ²	VINCENT.JEANSELME@MRC-BSU.CAM.AC.UK
Katherine Matton ²	KMATTON@MIT.EDU
Ilker Demirel ²	DEMIREL@MIT.EDU
Jason Fries ³	JFRIES@STANFORD.EDU
Parisa Rashidi ³	PARISA.RASHIDI@BME.UFL.EDU
Brett Beaulieu-Jones ³	BEAULIEUJONES@UCHICAGO.EDU
Xuhai Orson Xu ³	XOXU@MIT.EDU
Matthew McDermott ³	MATTHEW_MCDERMOTT@HMS.HARVARD.EDU
Tristan Naumann ³	TRISTAN@MICROSOFT.COM
Monica Agrawal ³	MAGRAWAL@MIT.EDU
Marinka Zitnik ³	MARINKA@MIT.EDU
Berk Ustun ³	BERK@UCSD.EDU
Edward Choi ³	EDWARDCHOI@KAIST.AC.KR
Kristen Yeom ³	KYEOM@STANFORD.EDU
Gamze Gürsoy ³	GG2845@CUMC.COLUMBIA.EDU
Marzyeh Ghassemi ³	MGHASSEM@MIT.EDU
Emma Pierson ³	EP432@CORNELL.EDU
George Chen ³	GEORGECHEN@CMU.EDU
Sanjat Kanjilal ³	SKANJILAL@BWH.HARVARD.EDU
Michael Oberst ³	MOBERST@ANDREW.CMU.EDU
Linying Zhang ³	LINYINGZ@WUSTL.EDU
Harvineet Singh ¹	HS3673@NYU.EDU
Tom Hartvigsen ¹	TOMH@MIT.EDU
Helen Zhou ¹	HLZHOU@ANDREW.CMU.EDU
Chinasa T. Okolo ¹	CTO9@CORNELL.EDU

¹Organizing committee for ML4H 2023 Research Roundtables, ²Junior Chairs, ³Senior Chairs

1. Introduction

The third Machine Learning for Health (ML4H) symposium was held in person on December 10, 2023, in New Orleans, Louisiana, USA (Parziale et al., 2022). The symposium included research roundtable sessions to foster discussions between participants and senior researchers on timely and relevant topics for the ML4H community. Encouraged by the successful virtual roundtables in the previous year (Roy et al., 2021), we organized eleven in-person roundtables and four virtual roundtables at ML4H 2022 (Parziale et al., 2022; Hegselmann et al., 2022). The organization of the research roundtables at the conference involved 17 Senior Chairs and 19 Junior Chairs across 11 tables. Each roundtable session included invited senior chairs (with substantial experience in the field), junior chairs (responsible for facilitating the discussion), and attendees from diverse backgrounds with interest in the session’s topic. Herein we detail the organization process and compile takeaways from these roundtable discussions, including recent advances, applications, and open challenges for each topic. We conclude with a summary and lessons learned across all roundtables. This document serves as a comprehensive review paper, summarizing the recent advancements in machine learning for healthcare as contributed by foremost researchers in the field.

2. Organization Process

An initial set of topics were identified from papers in the broad ML for health literature published in the last three years suggestions from ML4H chairs and keynote speakers. After removing duplicates, there were 18 unique topic candidates. For each of the topics, we invited senior chairs with expertise in the respective area, aiming for two chairs for each roundtable. Next, we iden-

tified junior chairs that preferably had some experience in the discussed topic. Before the event, junior and senior chairs wrote an introduction paragraph shared on the ML4H website¹ and submitted three to five potential discussion questions. On the day of the symposium, we had two 25-minute slots for roundtables with a five-minute break to allow participants to join another roundtable session. After the event, we asked the chairs to write a summary of the main takeaways from the discussion.

3. Research Roundtables

We included the following topics for the research roundtables of ML4H 2023 :

1. Health AI Collaborations, Deployment, and Regulation
2. Integrating AI into Clinical Workflows
3. Health AI Foundational Models
4. Large Language Models and Healthcare
5. Multimodal AI for Health
6. Health AI Model Development and Generalizability
7. Health AI and Accessibility
8. Health AI and Patient Privacy
9. Bias/Fairness in Health AI
10. ML for Survival Analysis & Epidemiology/Population Health
11. Causality

In the following sections, we provide slightly revised versions of the introductions and summaries from all roundtables.

1. <https://ml4health.github.io/2023/>

3.1. Health AI Collaborations, Deployment, and Regulation

Subtopic: One of the barriers to deploying AI models in healthcare is the ability to safely and effectively integrate models into clinical workflows. What are the different factors one should consider in presenting AI models to clinicians that result in effective clinician-AI collaborations, and how do we know if these models truly have a significant impact within the healthcare setting? What are the desires of caregivers and clinicians, and what aspects are still lacking? Furthermore, there has been an increased focus on AI regulation by policymakers and industry players in the last few years. How do we ensure all stakeholders are considered in AI policy, and who should be in charge of writing such regulation, if at all?

Chairs: *Jason Fries, Parisa Rashidi, Hussein Mozannar, Rahul Thapta*

Background: This research round table focused on three topics.

1. Health AI Collaborations: Exploring synergies and challenges in partnering between AI researchers and healthcare institutions, focusing on optimizing the interface between human expertise and AI technology to enhance healthcare outcomes.
2. Deployment: The practical aspects of implementing AI in healthcare settings, discussing the necessary infrastructure, clinician interaction with AI systems, and strategies for integration into healthcare practices.
3. Regulation: The general need for effective regulatory frameworks for AI in healthcare, covering aspects such as policy evolution (Mello et al., 2023), liability concerns (Mello and Guha, 2023),

and balancing innovation with regulation to ensure safe and responsible use of AI in medical contexts.

Discussion: Participants discussed several key challenges when conducting machine learning for healthcare deployment:

Interfacing with Clinical Experts Effective integration requires forming productive collaborations with clinical professionals and developing a common language to facilitate communication. An example cited was the University of Florida’s development of a real-time system for data acquisition and integration into AI engines Shickel et al. (2019); Ren et al. (2022). Essential to this process is collaboration with IT and hospital administrators, aligning the incentives between hospital staff and computer science professionals, and considering the needs of caregivers and patients. The initial step for any research in this area is to identify a domain expert. Understanding the problem comprehensively, grasping the efficacy of the workflow, and observing clinical workflow firsthand is vital. Another key factor is identifying an individual within the system who can champion the initiative.

Data Acquisition Challenges The focus in machine learning often leans towards model building, while data acquisition and infrastructure development are somewhat sidelined. Challenges include the reluctance to add extra steps in existing workflows, the costs associated with hosting models, and the reluctance to bear these costs. Clinicians, who are already pressed for time, should not be burdened with additional data collection responsibilities. This aligns with the well-commented data challenges in deployed machine learning systems and so-called “data cascades” that can result from undervaluing data curation and knowledge of generating processes (Sambasivan et al., 2021).

Model Evaluation: Randomized Clinical Trials (RCT) and Local Validation

Model evaluation processes, such as recurring internal and prospective validation paradigms (Youssef et al., 2023), and external validation (including collaboration with other institutions), each have distinct advantages and are relevant at different development stages. A crucial question is the role of external validation in an era where foundation models are shared and adapted for use at individual centers (Guo et al., 2023).

Human-AI Collaboration in Evaluating Deployed Systems

Model evaluation in the generative AI era faces many challenges. The current paradigm of evaluating AI models in isolation is fundamentally flawed, as future models will likely function as co-pilots in clinical settings. This requires evaluating the behavior of healthcare workers and AI systems collaborating to make clinical decisions. Popular current healthcare benchmarks for large language model (LLM) are moreover misaligned with how clinicians interact with AI systems, for example focusing on narrow, USMLE-style multiple choice evaluations at the cost of more complex information synthesis (Fleming et al., 2023). The focus should be on in-situ evaluation and usage effectiveness. The current vision of autonomous AI agents might be overly ambitious, emphasizing the need for understanding human-AI interaction and building trust in AI models. The user interface of AI recommendations is crucial; poor interfaces can hinder adoption. The evaluation of AI in healthcare should not only focus on short-term outcomes but also consider long-term patient outcomes and the potential increase in clinicians' workload.

Transitioning from Research Demos to Deployed Models

There is a misunderstanding about how data is generated and collected in clinical settings versus research environments, e.g., the data feed from an

Epic EHR system looks quite different than the data available to researchers via an academic data warehouse. Clinical AI requires the development of machine learning operations tools and a better interface for data integration in hospitals. Continuous monitoring is essential for deployment, and the long-term measurement of outcomes is crucial, which might necessitate the use of causal inference tools. All of these require advancements in deployment science and core methods development.

3.2. Integrating AI into Clinical Workflows

Subtopic: The rate of AI progress in the last few years seems to have major implications for the types of models we train for healthcare purposes. With the types of models we train constantly changing, how can we develop model-agnostic methods to integrate AI into clinical workflows?

Chairs: *Brett Beaulieu-Jones, William Jongwon Han, Nikita Mehandru*

Background: The rate of AI deployment in clinical settings is driven by the models we train, and its reliability has far-reaching consequences. Data variability from different modalities in diverse medical settings (e.g., safety-net hospitals, private practice, and academic institutions) makes developing model-agnostic methods to integrate AI into clinical workflows a challenging endeavor. Distribution shifts are common in medicine (Zech et al., 2018; Beede et al., 2020) due to the difficulty in obtaining heterogeneous patient data at multiple points in time as well as the prevalence of missingness (Aylara et al., 2019; Getzen et al., 2023).

As a result, the lack of model generalizability can contribute to a reduction in clinician trust in AI, and signals the need for post-deployment monitoring of systems.

Discussion: Addressing potential distribution shifts in healthcare data is difficult, but can be prevented by collecting additional data and conducting a prospective analysis as well as an assessment of clinical outcomes. One participant noted that acquiring more patient data does not solve the out-of-distribution (OOD) issue if a new medication is introduced, and randomization at the patient level may not capture sub-group differences. More robust audits prior to deployment were suggested as a technique for mitigating the failure of systems in practice.

Furthermore, the development of uncertainty quantification measures can aid clinicians in calibrating the reliability of model performance in medical settings. We discussed the immense importance of interpretable estimates. The value of conducting need-finding interviews with clinicians before building a model was also proposed as a method for both ensuring model alignment and increasing adoption of AI systems, as greater confidence is crucial to mediate the liability clinicians carry if systems fail. Lastly, these conversations cannot occur in a vacuum, and linking clinical outcomes to business incentives was stressed, as hospitals are often evaluated on such objectives.

3.3. Health AI Foundation Models

Subtopic: Foundation models train on large amounts of data, which might require sourcing data from multiple hospitals. How should we think about the data that drives the development and deployment of such models in health systems?

Chairs: *Matthew McDermott, Tristan Naumann, Michael Wornow, Vlad Lialin*

Background: Hospitals generate an average of 50 petabytes of data per year, over double the size of the US Library of Congress’s collections (WEF, 2019). Unfor-

tunately, the vast majority of this data remains unused — there is simply too much data and too few resources to clean, label, and build upon it (WEF, 2019; Morse, 2023). Foundation models – large-scale machine learning models trained on vast amounts of unlabeled data – offer a promising approach for harnessing this untapped wealth of data (Bommasani et al., 2021).

Unfortunately, significant practical challenges remain in building foundation models for healthcare data. First, the biggest recent successes in AI have revolved been **LLMs**, which require Internet-scale data to be successfully trained (Gao et al., 2020). Pooling healthcare data across hospitals remains difficult due to a lack of shared data standards, misaligned incentives, and patient privacy concerns (Mattioli, 2017). Second, in addition to the challenges of sourcing the appropriate scale of data, questions remain about which data modalities to include and how to include them (e.g., clinical notes, structured electronic health record (EHR) data, images, genetic tests, etc.) (Moor et al., 2023a). Third, it is unclear what capabilities we might expect (or want) out of such a foundation model were we to successfully train one of sufficient scale where we might observe emergent properties (Wei et al., 2022).

Discussion: Among many other topics, our conversation surfaced several potential answers to the three core challenges listed above.

On the topic of data standards, there has been a recent push across academic research labs towards developing shared frameworks for processing health data into a machine-learning-friendly format (McDermott et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2020; Karagyris et al., 2023). During our discussion, many participants advocated for the development of a common set of infrastructure upon which the ML for the healthcare community can confi-

dently build models of the architecture and scale necessary to unlock the full potential of foundation models. However, questions were raised as to whether the key obstacle here was technical, or whether first clearing the political, regulatory, and financial roadblocks is a necessary prerequisite. We did note that even though many of the most powerful clinical foundation models published (Singhal et al., 2023; Tu et al., 2023a; Moor et al., 2023b; Li et al., 2023) were not trained on clinical data and instead relied on publicly available biomedical texts (Wornow et al., 2023b), the ability of these models to rapidly learn from high-quality data opens up avenues for more data-efficient model training that sidesteps many of these data aggregation issues Gunasekar et al. (2023).

In addition to the question of aggregating sufficient data, much of our discussion was spent on the types of data that should be fed into such a model. Participants noted that multimodal health data encompasses a much broader spectrum of inputs than what general “multimodal” models are expected to ingest (i.e., text, audio, and images) Team et al. (2023). Healthcare data could include not only text, images, audio, and video, but also -omics data (e.g., genomics, metabolomics, transcriptomics, etc.), structured EHR data (e.g., billing, drug, and procedure codes), and waveform vitals. The complexity of the types of multimodal reasoning performed by a physician also makes the development of multimodal healthcare models complex. However, we were encouraged by the recent development of multimodal models for clinical decision-making support (Singhal et al., 2023; Tu et al., 2023a; Moor et al., 2023b; Li et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023) and molecular biology (Nguyen et al., 2023; Dalla-Torre et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2023b).

Finally, we discussed the topic of “emergence” and asked what sort of novel capabil-

ities might emerge from a healthcare foundation model at a sufficient scale. While we noted that the concept of “emergence” is still under debate (Schaeffer et al., 2023), we were excited by the nascent capabilities demonstrated by large-scale models fine-tuned for clinical applications (Singhal et al., 2023; Tu et al., 2023a), and concluded that our ability to imagine the ways in which these technologies might one day be applied in the clinic is likely highly myopic. The emergence of unprecedented capabilities also poses risks, and the holistic evaluation of such foundation models when deployed in healthcare settings will become increasingly important to mitigate risk to patients and providers (Wornow et al., 2023a; Liang et al., 2023).

3.4. Large Language Models and Healthcare

Subtopic: What are some low-hanging fruit opportunities to use large language models in healthcare?

Chairs: *Monica Agarwal, Xin Liu, Alejandro Lozano*

Background: In recent years, the intersection of LLMs, consumer health applications, and the broader field of medicine has emerged as a compelling area of research with profound implications. LLMs, exemplified by advanced natural language processing technologies, have demonstrated their capacity to revolutionize various industries, including healthcare. The convergence of these technologies holds the promise of unlocking new frontiers in data-driven decision-making, personalized health tracking, and improved communication within the healthcare ecosystem.

Discussion: Our table discussion started with recent advances in the field. We emphasized the current limitations of the field, with a special focus on meaningful evalua-

tions and the possible risks of such models. Regarding evaluations, we agreed we need to move on from multiple-choice exam-style questions and truly assess LLMs. This echoes the idea of "Will advancements in the field improve clinical care?" A special concern was the misuse of such models for misinformation and the risks such models could pose for self-medication.

3.5. Multimodal AI for Health

Subtopic: How do we effectively integrate multiple data sources (e.g., Electronic Health Records (EHRs), images, genomics) for ML applications in healthcare? How does this work in real-time in a hospital?

Chairs: *Marinka Zitnik, Jiacheng Zhu, Rafal Dariusz Kocielnik*

Background: Multimodal AI in healthcare is an emerging field that harnesses the synergies of diverse data sources, such as EHRs, images, and genomics (Kline et al., 2022; Ektefaie et al., 2023). This approach moves beyond the confines of single data modalities (McDermott et al., 2020; Jeong et al., 2023, 2024), aiming to enhance diagnostic accuracy and treatment efficacy. However, this integration brings forth challenges in technological integration, data management, and ethical handling, particularly in protecting the privacy of sensitive health data as well as challenges of unequal data availability for certain demographics and geographical areas.

Recent studies highlight the potential and challenges of multimodal AI in healthcare. Showing that the use of multimodal methods in neurology and oncology can increase predictive accuracy (Kline et al., 2022). Further work in oncology has shown that integrating various modalities can contribute to biomarker discovery and reaching therapeutic targets (Lipkova et al., 2022). Beyond oncology, multimodal approaches have

been shown particularly useful for disease relation extraction (Lin et al., 2023a), surgical feedback classification (Kocielnik et al., 2023), medical record retrieval for electrocardiogram (ECG) (Qiu et al., 2023), risk stratification with continuous monitors (Raghu et al., 2023), as well as pulmonary embolism detection through integration of CT imaging and EMR data (Huang et al., 2020).

On the technical side, techniques for combining multiple modalities involved early, intermediate, and late fusion approaches (Boulaiah et al., 2021) as well as graph-based architectures (Lin et al., 2023a) among others.

At the same time Ektefaie et al. (2023) discuss the challenges posed by heterogeneous graph datasets in multimodal graph AI methods and Kline et al. (2022) highlight the challenges related to the lack of consensus on the optimal way of combining multimodal data, the sensitivity of the best architecture to disease/application, as well as increased challenges in the interpretability of model development.

These studies collectively indicate the diverse applications and progress in Multimodal AI for Health, while also highlighting the complexities involved in integrating different data types. As the field continues to evolve, the integration of various data sources in healthcare presents significant opportunities for advancement. However, it also poses notable challenges, particularly in the practical deployment of these systems in real-time clinical environments.

Discussion: In the discussion panel, we focused on the key questions in this area: 1) Is more always better, or can we think of situations, patient populations, or healthcare tasks where using multiple data modalities can be counterproductive, unhelpful, or even harmful? 2) What are the algorithmic limitations of prevailing multimodal architectures

particularly in Health? 3) Can multimodal learning create fundamental new capabilities in Health? 4) Are there important problems that unimodal architectures cannot solve?

In this context, the roundtable discussion focused on multimodal machine learning, its applications, and challenges, especially in the fields of healthcare and biology. The panel comprised experts from various disciplines, providing a comprehensive overview of current practices, ethical considerations, and future directions in multimodal learning. Several themes emerged:

Ethical Standards and Data Collection Strategies:

This theme focused on ethical standards in multimodal learning (Alwahaby et al., 2022). The discussion emphasized the importance of understanding and evaluating existing frameworks, especially in the context of data collection strategies. The distinction between pre-training and fine-tuning in multi-task learning was highlighted, with a special mention of the successes in pre-training scenarios such as the development of various foundation models. These scenarios showcased the powerful potential of matched multimodal data for the same unit of analysis (e.g., text and vision) (Zhang et al., 2023). The concept of augmenting and leveraging unmatched data was also discussed, with an emphasis on learning from both text and audio data at scale. Furthermore, the discussion touched on representation learning, particularly in genomic sequencing, and the challenges posed by the increasing prevalence of genomic data. An important point was also raised around the availability and quality of multimodal data for various demographics and geographical regions. This was a particularly novel and important discussion point as increased reliance on high-quality multimodal sources can disenfranchise vast global populations from access to high-quality AI for Health solutions.

Challenges in Multimodal Learning and Genomics:

An important theme also covered the challenges of multimodal learning in bioinformatics, especially concerning omics data (Stahlschmidt et al., 2022). There was a discussion on the importance of incorporating prior knowledge into data handling, and the variance in genomic data based on region. One of the significant challenges noted was the development of new encoders for such data that are visually interpretable and the inherent difficulty in interpreting genomics data. The alignment of multimodal datasets (Tsai et al., 2019), like clinical and behavioral data with genomic information, was discussed. The panel also discussed the potential of aligning gene counts and transforming them into tabular data, aiming to develop a model that can be generalized across various modalities.

Future Directions and Dataset Development:

The final theme focused on future directions, particularly the need for reasoning in multimodal learning and the potential for minimizing healthcare costs through machine learning. Discussions included the evaluation of gains from different modalities, the use of cheaper modalities as substitutes, and the challenges in inferring information across different modalities. The concept of multi-view systems, offering complementary information, was also touched upon. This discussion concluded with thoughts on the development of new evaluation benchmarks, the balance between accuracy, data quantity, and quality, as well as the potential for multi-modal language models to link knowledge across different domains. The value of non-traditional data resources and the creation of synthetic generative data were also noted as areas ripe for exploration.

Overall, the meeting underscored the complexities and potential of multimodal learning, especially in the context of health-

care and genomics, and highlighted the need for ethical standards, robust data collection strategies, and innovative approaches to dataset development and utilization.

3.6. Health AI Model Development and Generalizability

Subtopic: Applying ML models in real practice could face multiple challenges including domain shift, annotation quality, and out-of-distribution. How can we ensure the robustness and generalizability of a model?

Chairs: *Berk Ustun, Haoran Zhang, Keith Harrigian*

Background: Clinical machine learning models constantly face distribution shifts when deployed, which can deteriorate their ability to make accurate and calibrated predictions (Sendak et al., 2020; Subbaswamy and Saria, 2020). First, models may experience domain shifts when trained on a publicly available data source and deployed in a region with different population characteristics (Wong et al., 2021). Second, models continually face temporal shifts when deployed. Such shifts may occur slowly, as clinical guidelines and population characteristics change over time (Guo et al., 2022). They may also be sudden, which may happen as hospital policies change (Nestor et al., 2019), or with the introduction of a new disease such as the COVID-19 pandemic (Duckworth et al., 2021).

To effectively detect and adapt to distribution shifts, we must address several key methodological questions: (1) How can we monitor a deployed model to see if performance has dropped significantly? (2) Once a distribution shift occurs, how can we characterize *how* the distribution has changed, in a way that gives insights to model building? (3) How can we build models that are resilient to distribution shifts, or update our

model to accommodate these shifts? What are the assumptions or domain knowledge required?

Although distribution shift is well-studied in the core machine learning literature (Koh et al., 2021; Gulrajani and Lopez-Paz, 2020), healthcare data presents many unique challenges. For example, distribution shifts in healthcare are far more difficult to describe without domain knowledge compared to natural images and text (Gichoya et al., 2022); bayes error may be significant and hard to measure (e.g. due to data quality issues) (Chen et al., 2018) and models often contribute to high stakes decisions with a limited number of annotated training samples.

In this roundtable, we sought to gather diverse perspectives regarding the challenges of training and evaluating robust ML models in the healthcare domain, as well as practical techniques for addressing these challenges given the constraints and nuances of healthcare data.

Discussion: We started the roundtable by asking participants about their experience with distribution shifts in real-world settings. One participant commented on the performance drops they experienced when deploying a model trained on tabular data from the intensive care unit of one hospital for risk prediction in another hospital, and using forward feature selection to identify stable and robust features (Heinze-Deml et al., 2018). Another participant commented on their experience with adjusting for selection bias (Bishop et al., 2018) when building predictive algorithms using wearable data to obtain a model that works well for the general US population, not just those who currently own a wearable.

We next asked participants which generalization problem setup they find most useful in the healthcare setting. Compared to problem settings such as domain adaptation

(Ben-David et al., 2006) and domain generalization (Arjovsky et al., 2019), participants found single domain generalization (Wang et al., 2021) to be most useful – a challenging scenario where only a single source domain is available, and target domain data is unobserved.

When asked about potential solutions to the generalization problem, several participants initially raised the idea of foundation models as the silver bullet – how pretraining on large, diverse datasets from across the world would mean that nothing is out-of-distribution during deployment. However, we identified several issues with this argument. First, while clinical foundation models have risen in popularity in text and vision (Tu et al., 2023b), they have not been widely adopted for clinical time series or tabular data. Second, the constant advent of new drugs and conditions (e.g. COVID-19) still presents a covariate shift for these models, and updating the knowledge within foundation models efficiently can be challenging (Zhang et al., 2024). Finally, a fine-tuned foundation model would still be susceptible to concept drift (e.g. due to changing clinical guidelines).

Many participants also emphasized the importance of causality in building robust and generalizable models. Alas, the efficacy of causal reasoning as a mechanism for encouraging generalization critically depends on the validity of assumptions regarding the data generating procedure (DGP) (Rosenfeld et al., 2020) or causal graph. Participants of the roundtable consistently highlighted the importance of collaborating closely with domain experts (e.g., healthcare providers, patients, and non-ML researchers) to support these efforts. They cited personal experiences asking domain experts to propose likely sources of distribution shift in the DGP, and also noted instances in which they leveraged expert knowledge to make decisions re-

garding model selection (e.g., feature reduction, architecture choice). Domain experts were generally perceived and treated as a source of feedback for decisions driven predominantly by ML practitioners. Although such a relationship is unsurprising given the capacity constraints faced by many experts in the healthcare domain (Liebhaber et al., 2009; Spasic et al., 2020), emerging evidence regarding the value of human-centered design for building robust ML systems suggests it may be a dynamic worth re-evaluating (Auernhammer, 2020; Holeman and Kane, 2020).

The remaining discussion focused predominantly on technical solutions for promoting ML model generalization and ensuring reliability upon deployment. Participants highlighted two core challenges — 1) accurately characterizing distribution shift, and 2) effectively incorporating knowledge of distribution shift into models. With respect to the former, multiple participants proposed using uncertainty quantification to identify and refrain from making predictions for out-of-distribution test examples (Hendrycks and Gimpel, 2016). Although measurement of distributional divergence was seen as a feasible endeavor, participants noted that interpreting shifts was much more difficult (Kulinski and Inouye, 2023). With respect to the latter, participants offered an array of modeling methods which were typically motivated by their own applications in the healthcare space. These included propensity-score corrections to adjust for selection bias (Abadie and Imbens, 2016), as well as more traditional domain-adaptation techniques (Gururangan et al., 2020; Guan and Liu, 2021). Participants frequently qualified their experiences with a caveat that the methods that worked for them may not work for others.

Perhaps ironically, a catch-all solution for model generalization did not emerge during

the roundtable session. The group was unable to reach a consensus regarding the learning and deployment settings that were most common in practice. Nor were they able to conclusively call for the use of one robust modeling method over another. The only unanimous opinion was that practitioners must thoroughly understand how their training datasets compare to that of their target population. With that knowledge in hand, modeling decisions will inherently vary.

3.7. Health AI and Accessibility

Subtopic: Making AI accessible to all in healthcare is important, but “accessibility” could encompass many things such as infrastructure, compute resources, or access to healthcare in the first place. What are the different components of the healthcare system that could improve patients’ accessibility to health AI, and how do these different components play into the development of AI models?

Chairs: *Edward Choi, Kristen Yeom, Edward Lee*

Background: Making AI accessible in healthcare encompasses various dimensions from infrastructure and GPU compute resources to train and serve models to the accessibility of models and data to the clinicians and patients. Several components of the healthcare system play an important role in determining the accessibility and effectiveness of health AI.

Infrastructure and Compute Resources. Large and robust models require expensive GPUs to train and serve. This also overlaps with data privacy, compliance, and ownership. For example, some institutions will not share patient data over the internet, and therefore developing complex models would necessitate Federated Learning or on-premise training.

Data Availability and Quality. AI models are only as good as the data they are trained on. Access to diverse, high-quality, and large-scale datasets is crucial. This includes not only clinical data but also socio-economic, genomic, and demographic data to develop models that can work across heterogeneous datasets.

Addressing AI accessibility to the patient. Educating patients about AI in healthcare is crucial for its acceptance and effective use. Patients who understand how AI is used in their care are more likely to engage actively in their health management.

Ensuring Data Privacy and Security : Patients are more likely to trust and accept AI-driven healthcare solutions when they are assured their personal health information is secure and used ethically. AI tools must be designed and trained to address the needs of diverse patient groups. This is essential to avoid biases in AI-driven healthcare solutions and to ensure equitable healthcare access.

Discussion: Our table focused the core of the discussion on the topic of AI accessibility for researchers and clinicians - specifically the need for larger and more diverse datasets.

Curating such datasets can be very labor intensive for the clinicians. The process of curating datasets for AI research in healthcare is labor-intensive, especially for clinicians who are already managing significant workloads. Clinicians are not currently incentivized except in an academic setting. Yet, they have to perform careful annotation and categorization. This process is very time-consuming and requires a high level of accuracy and technical expertise to ensure the quality of the dataset.

One participant led the discussion towards the topic of AI accessibility across diverse patient groups. Another participant brought up a paper suggesting that generalizability

of a single model on a diverse, heterogeneous population can be overrated. This is primarily because different populations may exhibit distinct medical characteristics, environmental factors, and genetic backgrounds, which can significantly affect model performance. Focusing on personalized models tuned to specific cohorts can be more effective in certain scenarios. These models take into account the unique characteristics and needs of a particular group, potentially leading to more accurate and relevant outcomes for that cohort. Special attention must be given to ensure that cohort-specific modeling does not inadvertently lead to healthcare disparities. Equal effort and resources should be dedicated to developing models for all patient groups, including those that are historically underserved.

3.8. Health AI and Patient Privacy

Subtopic: How can we preserve patient privacy and maintain data security while leveraging machine learning techniques in healthcare?

Chairs: *Gamze Gürsoy, Milos Vukadinovic*

Background: To successfully deploy machine learning models in medical practice, we need to train them on diverse and representable large-scale datasets. However, sharing the data between the institutions and countries is bottlenecked by the risk of de-anonymization and harming patient’s privacy. Disrespecting the data sharing agreement between the medical provider and patient can have serious implications on the patient’s life, and thus cannot be overlooked. While some of these concerns can be partially addressed by ethical and legal measures, in this roundtable we focus on implementing technical measures for preserving patient privacy. Specifically, we focus on securely stor-

ing the patient’s data, safely deploying medical machine learning models, and minimizing the risk of re-identification.

Discussion: We began by exploring real-world cases that highlight the significance of protecting patient privacy in data collected for diagnosis, research purposes, or by direct-to-consumer companies. The examples included The Golden State Killer case ([CrimeMuseum, 2023](#)), Latanya Sweeney’s identification of the governor of Massachusetts health records ([Wikipedia contributors, 2023](#)), and various linkage attacks.

Building on these examples, we discussed the concept of quasi-identifiers, which are the attributes that when combined with the other data can identify the patient. Each attribute that carries some information about the patient can be a quasi-identifier, and that is why removing all of them is impossible, instead, we should remove enough so that the risk of re-identification becomes extremely small. Another way to make re-identification harder is to use differential privacy methods. Differential privacy adds noise to the data to protect the privacy of the patients but aims to preserve the underlying data distribution. While the roundtable recognized the usefulness of differential privacy the most notable insights were that there is no mathematical guarantee of its’ privacy and that adding noise in such a way could remove the distribution tails which affects the downstream model accuracy.

In the cases when the medical center does not want to release a dataset or dataset de-identification is impossible, we can train machine learning models using federated learning. The senior chair explained that federated learning is a method where multiple devices or servers train a model locally on their data and then send only the model updates to a central server for aggregation, preserving data privacy and reducing transmission

costs. For example, Google successfully deployed federated learning in practice to train their models on the data from users' phones, without sending the raw data to the Google servers. Yet another approach to keep the dataset private is to generate a fully synthetic medical dataset, but this approach comes with its own challenges such as lack of realism, bias, and mode collapse.

Next, the following question was brought up "How can we prevent a machine learning model's weights from revealing its training dataset?". These attacks are known as model inversion (Wang et al., 2022), and while the risk exists, the roundtable agreed that it takes a lot of sophistication to recover the original training dataset from the weights only. Nonetheless, the participant noted that we can employ knowledge distillation privacy-preserving techniques such as the teacher-student model to make it even harder for the attacker to retrieve the original data. Namely, the initial model acts as a teacher and the student model learns from the outputs of the teacher model (Alkhulaifi et al., 2021), rather than directly from the sensitive training data.

Finally, we discussed privacy concerns with medical imaging and genetics data. It was mentioned how medical imaging data is easier to de-identify compared to genetics data because usually, the only obvious identifiers are the metadata and text embedded in the image. Genetic data carries a vast amount of information and it is almost impossible to precisely quantify the amount of genetic information leakage in a dataset (Gürsoy, 2022). It takes only 50 SNPs (out of ≈ 4 million) to uniquely identify the individual (Yousefi et al., 2018), and vast information obtained from genetic data can easily be abused, for example, for calculating polygenic risk score for embryo selection.

3.9. Bias/Fairness in Health AI

Subtopic: Despite its potential, the application of machine learning in healthcare has often resulted in models that reflect and reinforce existing health disparities. How can machine learning promote fairness and enhance global health outcomes?

Chairs: *Marzyeh Ghassemi, Emma Pierson, Aparna Balagopalan, Sarah Jabbour*

Background: Past research has shown that AI for health may be biased (Obermeyer et al., 2019), and these biases may be introduced into the machine learning pipeline at various stages (Chen et al., 2021). During problem selection, data collection, and labeling (Spector-Bagdady et al., 2021; Ferryman et al., 2023), existing biases in the healthcare system can influence the generated research datasets, and thus who benefits the most from AI research advancements. During development (Gichoya et al., 2022; Pierson et al., 2021), AI models might mimic and even exacerbate human biases, resulting in unfair AI predictions. During deployment (Verma et al., 2023; Adam et al., 2022), AI has been shown to affect patient subpopulations differently as a result of such unfair prediction (Paulus and Kent, 2020), and practitioners face decisions about who receives access to AI (Dai T, 2021) (e.g., developing AI that can be widely implemented, versus institution-specific models).

In this research roundtable, we aimed to discuss how AI researchers can understand the context of, and address AI biases at, these different stages, as well as discuss potential ways forward for fair and responsible deployment.

Discussion: The discussion delved into the multifaceted concept of fairness in the healthcare context, examining aspects such as data collection (Spector-Bagdady et al., 2021), parity in outcomes for subgroups

(Seyyed-Kalantari et al., 2021), and the entire machine learning (ML) pipeline including deployments (Wiens et al., 2019). Key questions were raised concerning the current state of tools (Rajpurkar et al., 2022), drawing parallels with the aviation field (Bondi-Kelly et al., 2023). The importance of precisely defining the outcome definition (Pier-son et al., 2021) and distinguishing between factual and normative questions was highlighted (Balagopalan et al., 2023). Additionally, the discussion underscored the nuanced differences between bias and fairness (Ferrara, 2023).

Fairness in the Healthcare Context A critical point of discussion was the need to audit existing tools developed in the healthcare setting, emphasizing a comprehensive examination of the current situation. The discussion advocated for prospective data collection with a fairness lens. For example, data collection infrastructure for patients outside the hospital was proposed as a means to monitor wound healing, emphasizing the potential impact on healthcare outcomes.

Global Health and AI Deployment

The roundtable conversation also extended to the deployment of tools in settings with limited human experts, citing examples like LLMs for mental health (Cabrera et al., 2023). The discourse questioned whether deploying AI in underserved communities genuinely improves healthcare access. It emphasized the need to consider fairness in terms of access to both models and human experts, cautioning against using LLMs as a surrogate for human doctors, but rather complementing them (Abdulhamid et al., 2023). Machine learning was also presented as a potential tool to expose and illuminate problems for intervention (Ferryman et al., 2023). The group deliberated about how one might consider using such tools for better interaction in

clinical settings, such as aiding in translation between clinicians and patients, or between clinicians and clinicians, who speak different languages. The importance of comprehensive, human-centered evaluations of existing AI technology when adapting them to the clinical setting (e.g., use of translation services in doctor-patient conversations (Mehandru et al., 2022)) was emphasized.

Integration of AI into Healthcare:

Addressing the fair integration of AI into healthcare, the discussion explored scenarios such as improving documentation over-diagnoses. In the problem selection stage, the importance of strategic thinking from an early stage about the outcomes to be predicted from the lens of health equity was emphasized. Additionally, the impact of (re)thinking the intended deployment settings – for example, designing AI for a diagnosis prediction task vs aiding in drafting insurance claims – and continued discussions with clinicians and healthcare workers were highlighted. The challenge of addressing shifts in data due to changing populations (Zech et al., 2018) across hospitals and the complexities of model retraining (Ötles et al., 2023), validation, and approval were thoroughly discussed. The healthcare system’s lack of careful consideration for staying up-to-date with evolving models and methods, coupled with the absence of FDA approval for clinical risk scores, was highlighted (Harvey and Gowda, 2020) through the salient example of radiographic severity scores (Pier-son et al., 2021; Vina et al., 2018). The discussion concluded by acknowledging the inherent challenges in how best to present potentially flawed AI advice (Ghassemi, 2023), and emphasized the importance of governance and trust in healthcare systems. Further, the importance of including stakeholders whose workflow would be impacted by

the integration of AI – for example, clinicians and nurses – in deployment decisions was underscored.

Debiasing in Healthcare: The conversation touched upon the intricate relationship between reducing bias and maintaining accuracy (Suriyakumar et al., 2023; Pierson, 2024). Debiasing strategies, such as modeling the truthful distribution of underlying conditions like knee pain, were explored (Pierson et al., 2021). Relevant examples from translation services, speech recognition, and high-quality synchronous translation services were cited (Mehandru et al., 2022), highlighting the high stakes involved in validating and deploying these technologies (Mehandru et al., 2023). The discussion affirmed the significance of improving patient experience in healthcare.

3.10. ML for Survival Analysis & Epidemiology/Population Health

Subtopic: How can we improve the adoption of novel ML survival models in medical research?

Chairs: *George Chen, Sanjat Kanjilal, Vincent Jeanselme*

Background: In public health, survival analysis involves modeling the time to an event of interest, offering insights into the effectiveness of interventions, the success of treatments, the identification of vulnerable populations, and the estimation of risk for different conditions. Unlike traditional regression, survival analysis accounts for patients not experiencing the event of interest over the study period. These patients are informed of the probability of observing the event as they are event-free until leaving the study. The outcomes of survival analysis are instrumental in shaping informed policies, guiding treatment strategies, and in-

forming the development of medical guidelines in public health initiatives.

Discussion: Despite the development of novel machine learning models for survival outcomes, their application in medical research remains limited, with the field often leaning towards simpler approaches or overlooking the challenge of censoring. This session underscored three critical limitations associated with these novel methodologies, offering directions for future research: (i) interpretability, (ii) data hunger and (iii) disregarding the complexity of real-world medical data.

Interpretability A critical aspect for medical practitioners is understanding the link between risk factors and outcomes, as this knowledge is essential for informed medical decision-making. Further, in a literature often focused on significance tests, research to quantify credible intervals and uncertainty around the survival predictions is critical for adoption. This exploration can provide a more nuanced understanding of model predictions, enabling more precise targeting of interventions based on the level of uncertainty.

Data Hunger The reliance on RCTs and the study of rare conditions frequently leads to limited data availability, a challenge for more flexible models that may struggle under such constraints. Our discussion highlighted the need for research at the intersection of federated learning and survival analysis. This interdisciplinary approach could offer innovative solutions for leveraging distributed datasets without compromising privacy. Additionally, exploring novel methodologies to effectively integrate RCTs with observational data could open new avenues for overcoming data limitations and enhancing the robustness of survival models.

Medical Complexity The complexities inherent in medical data, such as unobserved confounders and non-randomized treatment allocation, often pose challenges that novel strategies fail to address. Establishing clear guidelines that articulate the specific challenges each method addresses, along with their associated limitations, is crucial for enhancing the relevance of these models in the medical context. This transparency ensures that medical practitioners are well-informed about the circumstances in which each model is most appropriate, fostering trust and facilitating the integration of novel methodologies into real-world medical practice.

Addressing these limitations will enhance the applicability of survival models to better serve medical research.

3.11. Causality

Subtopic: How can recent advances in AI/ML help discover causal relations using clinical data? To what extent can we use observational data to emulate randomized trials, to evaluate the causal effect of any treatment?

Chairs: *Michael Oberst, Linying Zhang, Katherine Matton, Ilker Demirel*

Background: Causal inference is prevalent in healthcare; however, it has profound challenges, such as “unobserved counterfactuals,” forcing us to make assumptions about the data-generating process. These assumptions are defensible for the experimental data we collect from the trials, but trials are often costly and not representative of the population. Observational data, such as insurance claims, is large-scale, longitudinal, and more representative. However, causal inference assumptions become dubious with observational data and require expert knowledge to satisfy. We first discuss how we can use observational data to make causal inferences, for instance, by emulating trials, and

how the recent advances in machine learning can help leverage high-dimensional and unstructured data such as clinical notes and images.

We then discuss how ideas from causality can improve machine learning algorithms. Traditional machine learning methods learn associations between variables rather than causal relationships. As a result, they are prone to relying on spurious features (aka “shortcuts”) that maximize training performance but do not reliably generalize to changing contexts (e.g., deploying a model at a new hospital). Embedding machine learning models with causal knowledge can help mitigate this problem and produce models that generalize better under distribution shifts. Finally, we explore applications to fairness; for example, how causality can be used to reason about the causal effect of sensitive patient attributes on model decisions.

Discussion: We began by discussing challenges related to applying causal inference to real-world clinical data. One challenge is utilizing high-dimensional, unstructured data, such as text and image data. This is difficult because using this data can lead to violations of the “positivity condition”, a key assumption for making valid causal inferences from observational data. The positivity condition requires that for every possible setting of covariates (e.g., patient characteristics) there must be a non-zero probability of observing each treatment condition. When we work with data in very high dimensions, it increases the chance that we observe unique settings of covariates, which violates this assumption. One path to addressing this is to leverage modern machine learning methods for learning low-dimensional feature representations that capture the meaningful aspects of data. Similarly, such methods can help to leverage multi-modal data for causal inference.

Another key challenge in performing causal inference from observational data is evaluation. One solution that was brought up is to use synthetic data to perform sensitivity analyses. However, it is challenging to create realistic synthetic data, so the conclusions drawn from this approach may be limited. An alternative is to use “knowledge-based” sensitivity analysis. One strategy in this realm is to include “negative control outcomes,” or outcomes that are known in advance to not be causally affected by the treatment. This can serve as a sanity check — if the treatment appears to affect the negative control outcome, this suggests that our causal inference estimates are not valid. Finally, we discussed strategies for evaluation when we have both observational and experimental data. In this case, it may be of interest to use the observational data to estimate treatment effects for sub-groups that are not present in the RCT data. To assess the validity of these estimates, we can test how well the assumptions we make hold for the groups that are represented in both the experimental and RCT data.

We then moved to discuss how ideas from causality can be used to improve machine learning. There has been a lot of excitement in the field lately about the idea of embedding machine learning models with causal reasoning as a way of improving their robustness. We started by interrogating what this means — one participant asked the question “What does it mean for a machine learning model to have causal reasoning?” We discussed how this idea is often too general and vague to be tractable. For example, when classifying diseases from chest X-rays, what would a machine learning model with causal reasoning look like? It is hard to say given that it’s difficult to reason about the causal effect of a disease on images in the pixel space. We discussed how a more reasonable approach for “causally-informed ML”

may be to try to enumerate a set of possible changes that we want a machine learning model to be invariant against. We can then use causality to reason about how well the model will perform under these changes.

Finally, we discussed the implications of causality for fairness, and in particular, how causality can help to assess the fairness of clinical treatment decisions. For example, we can employ counterfactual reasoning to consider how a treatment decision would have been different if some aspect of the patient (e.g., race, gender, etc.) was different. This can help reveal cases of biased and unfair clinical decision-making.

4. Summary

The themes from the eleven research roundtables were extracted and grouped into four general areas: (1) foundation models, (2) incorporating domain expertise in model building, (3) addressing fair and robust ML for health concerns, and (4) considering safety, data sharing, and hospital infrastructure throughout the ML pipeline. Here, we summarize these discussions in an effort to highlight recent advancements in machine learning for healthcare for researchers in this domain.

The discourse surrounding foundational models in healthcare underscores the profound opportunity to utilize large-scale machine learning models for mining the extensive, yet largely untapped, datasets generated within healthcare environments. Despite the hurdles in data consolidation across medical facilities, attributed to disparate standards and privacy concerns, the forward march of AI technology, especially with the advent of LLMs, offers promising avenues for improving healthcare through the analysis of diverse data types, including clinical notes, images, and genetic information. Furthermore, many recent works adopt ap-

proaches to address the multimodal nature of medical datasets including text, images, audio, video, and omics data, opening the door to refined diagnostic accuracy and tailored treatment strategies. Nonetheless, this approach also presents challenges in data stewardship, ethical governance, and the imperative for sophisticated models capable of deciphering this multifaceted data landscape.

Leveraging domain expertise for Health AI encapsulates a nuanced understanding of integrating AI into healthcare, emphasizing the importance of clinician-AI collaboration, effective integration into clinical workflows, and the development of regulatory frameworks that foster innovation while ensuring safety. Challenges in data acquisition, model evaluation, and the necessity for AI tools that are to be adopted continuously to dynamic healthcare environment were highlighted, alongside the potential of novel machine learning models in survival analysis and epidemiology to refine medical research. However, it was noted that there still exist hurdles related to interpretability, data scarcity, and the complexity of medical data. One way to address these challenges is exploring causality in AI/ML to discern causal relationships from clinical data and emulate randomized trials through observational data. This holds promise for enhancing model robustness, and fairness in clinical decision-making, and ensuring equitable treatment. These discussions illuminate the critical role of domain expertise in advancing Health AI, underscoring the need for technological innovation, regulatory foresight, and collaborative synergy among all stakeholders to unlock the transformative potential of AI in healthcare.

Addressing questions around bias and fairness was discussed at several roundtables. Bias can be introduced into AI at various stages of the development pipeline, such as data collection and labeling. Addressing

such bias during model development could come in many different forms, such as precisely defining the outcome of interest and prospectively collecting data with a fairness lens. Fairly integrating AI into healthcare also requires careful consideration, such as increasingly staying up to date with evolving models and methods and improved governance. Another component of making AI fair is making it accessible to all patients, which encompasses many different parts of the AI pipeline: hospital infrastructure, compute resources, and data availability. Ensuring the ethical development of AI, including preserving patient data and privacy, can be a way to increase AI adoption by both patients and healthcare providers. Preserving patient privacy can be achieved through both legal measuring and technical measures, which was the focus of another roundtable. For example, techniques such as removing enough data can ensure that re-identification via quasi-identifiers or differential privacy methods cannot be employed. With recent advancements in generative AI, there is increasing focus on mitigating model inversion (i.e., machine learning model weights revealing training datasets).

Addressing dataset shift and model generalizability across hospitals and patient populations was also discussed by the roundtables. One discussion focused on how diverse medical settings, differences and changes in hospital protocols, and heterogeneous patient populations contribute to the challenging endeavor of integrating AI across institutions. Another table discussed how effectively adapting to such shifts requires addressing several questions around characterizing distribution shifts and building models resilient to them, though healthcare poses unique challenges that require novel solutions to such questions.

5. Lessons Learned

Throughout the preparation of ML4H 2023 Research Roundtables, we followed topic organizations and instructions on recruiting chairs from the previous year’s roundtable document (Hegselmann et al., 2022). Recruiting junior and senior chairs posed a significant challenge this year, and many junior chairs were added after paper decisions, leading to many last-minute inclusions. One of the challenges includes an organizational shift from hybrid conferences to the first full in-person conference. The number of participants for different topics varied significantly, but on the first round of roundtable discussion participants were distributed more evenly throughout the topics. Post-conference, each chair provided a summary paragraph, which helped in the creation of this report. The summary document from last year helped form guidelines for topic summaries.

Overall, roundtable sessions were successful with active involvement, resembling a panel discussion but with a smaller scale and informal setting that helped networking among attendees and experts on the topic. We recommend ML4H 2024 conference to incorporate roundtable sessions to boost engagement and networking prospects.

References

Alberto Abadie and Guido W Imbens. Matching on the estimated propensity score. *Econometrica*, 84(2):781–807, 2016.

Najeeb G. Abdulhamid, Millicent Ochieng, Kalika Bali, Elizabeth Ankrah, Naveena Karusala, Keshet Ronen, and Jacki O’Neill. Can large language models support medical facilitation work? a speculative analysis. In *4th African Human Computer Interaction Conference Proceedings (AfriCHI)*. ACM, ACM, November 2023.

Hammaad Adam, Aparna Balagopalan, Emily Alsentzer, Fotini Christia, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. Mitigating the impact of biased artificial intelligence in emergency decision-making. *Communications Medicine*, 2(1):149, 2022.

Abdolmaged Alkhulaifi, Fahad Alsahli, and Irfan Ahmad. Knowledge distillation in deep learning and its applications. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 7:e474, April 2021. ISSN 2376-5992. doi: 10.7717/peerj-cs.474. URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8053015/>

Haifa Alwahaby, Mutlu Cukurova, Zacharoula Papamitsiou, and Michail Giannakos. The evidence of impact and ethical considerations of multimodal learning analytics: A systematic literature review. *The Multimodal Learning Analytics Handbook*, pages 289–325, 2022.

Martin Arjovsky, Léon Bottou, Ishaan Gulrajani, and David Lopez-Paz. Invariant risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02893*, 2019.

Jan Auernhammer. Human-centered ai: The role of human-centered design research in the development of ai, 2020.

Olawale F Ayilara, Lisa Zhang, Tolulope T Sajobi, Richard Sawatzky, Eric Bohm, and Lisa M Lix. Impact of missing data on bias and precision when estimating change in patient-reported outcomes from a clinical registry. *Health and quality of life outcomes*, 17:1–9, 2019.

Aparna Balagopalan, David Madras, David H Yang, Dylan Hadfield-Menell, Gillian K Hadfield, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. Judging facts, judging norms: Training machine learning models to judge humans requires a modified approach to labeling data. *Science Advances*, 9(19):eabq0701, 2023.

- Emma Beede, Elizabeth Baylor, Fred Hersch, Anna Iurchenko, Lauren Wilcox, Paisan Ruamviboonsuk, and Laura M Vardoulakis. A human-centered evaluation of a deep learning system deployed in clinics for the detection of diabetic retinopathy. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pages 1–12, 2020.
- Shai Ben-David, John Blitzer, Koby Crammer, and Fernando Pereira. Analysis of representations for domain adaptation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 19, 2006.
- Crystal D Bishop, Walter L Leite, and Patricia A Snyder. Using propensity score weighting to reduce selection bias in large-scale data sets. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 40(4):347–362, 2018.
- Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021.
- Elizabeth Bondi-Kelly, Tom Hartvigsen, Lindsay M Sanneman, Swami Sankaranarayanan, Zach Harned, Grace Wickerson, Judy Wawira Gichoya, Lauren Oakden-Rayner, Leo Anthony Celi, Matthew P Lungren, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. Taking off with ai: Lessons from aviation for healthcare. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Conference on Equity and Access in Algorithms, Mechanisms, and Optimization*, pages 1–14, 2023.
- Said Yacine Boulahia, Abdenour Amamra, Mohamed Ridha Madi, and Said Daikh. Early, intermediate and late fusion strategies for robust deep learning-based multi-modal action recognition. *Machine Vision and Applications*, 32(6):121, 2021.
- Johana Cabrera, M Soledad Loyola, Irene Magaña, and Rodrigo Rojas. Ethical dilemmas, mental health, artificial intelligence, and llm-based chatbots. In *International Work-Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedical Engineering*, pages 313–326. Springer, 2023.
- Irene Chen, Fredrik D Johansson, and David Sontag. Why is my classifier discriminatory? *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Irene Y Chen, Emma Pierson, Sherri Rose, Shalmali Joshi, Kadija Ferryman, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. Ethical machine learning in healthcare. *Annual review of biomedical data science*, 4:123–144, 2021.
- CrimeMuseum. Golden State Killer, 2023. URL <https://www.crimemuseum.org/crime-library/famous-murders>
- Singh S Dai T. Artificial intelligence on call: The physician’s decision of whether to use ai in clinical practice. *Available at SSRN*, 2021.
- Hugo Dalla-Torre, Liam Gonzalez, Javier Mendoza-Revilla, Nicolas Lopez Carranza, Adam Henryk Grzywaczewski, Francesco Oteri, Christian Dallago, Evan Trop, Bernardo P de Almeida, Hassan Sirelkhatim, et al. The nucleotide transformer: Building and evaluating robust foundation models for human genomics. *bioRxiv*, pages 2023–01, 2023.
- Christopher Duckworth, Francis P Chmiel, Dan K Burns, Zlatko D Zlatev, Neil M White, Thomas WV Daniels, Michael Kiuber, and Michael J Boniface. Using explainable machine learning to characterise data drift and detect emergent health risks

- for emergency department admissions during covid-19. *Scientific reports*, 11(1):23017, 2021.
- Yasha Ektefaie, George Dasoulas, Ayush Noori, Maha Farhat, and Marinka Zitnik. Multimodal learning with graphs. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(4):340–350, 2023.
- E Ferrara. Fairness and bias in artificial intelligence: A brief survey of sources. *Impacts, And Mitigation Strategies. arXiv*, 2023.
- Kadija Ferryman, Maxine Mackintosh, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. Considering biased data as informative artifacts in ai-assisted health care. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 389(9):833–838, 2023.
- Scott L Fleming, Alejandro Lozano, William J Haberkorn, Jenelle A Jindal, Eduardo P Reis, Rahul Thapa, Louis Blankemeier, Julian Z Genkins, Ethan Steinberg, Ashwin Nayak, et al. Medalign: A clinician-generated dataset for instruction following with electronic medical records. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14089*, 2023.
- Leo Gao, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Laurence Golding, Travis Hoppe, Charles Foster, Jason Phang, Horace He, Anish Thite, Noa Nabeshima, et al. The pile: An 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00027*, 2020.
- Emily Getzen, Lyle Ungar, Danielle Mowery, Xiaoqian Jiang, and Qi Long. Mining for equitable health: Assessing the impact of missing data in electronic health records. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 139:104269, 2023.
- Marzyeh Ghassemi. Presentation matters for ai-generated clinical advice. *Nature Human Behaviour*, pages 1–3, 2023.
- Judy Wawira Gichoya, Imon Banerjee, Ananth Reddy Bhimireddy, John L Burns, Leo Anthony Celi, Li-Ching Chen, Ramon Correa, Natalie Dullerud, Marzyeh Ghassemi, Shih-Cheng Huang, et al. Ai recognition of patient race in medical imaging: a modelling study. *The Lancet Digital Health*, 4(6):e406–e414, 2022.
- Hao Guan and Mingxia Liu. Domain adaptation for medical image analysis: a survey. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 69(3):1173–1185, 2021.
- Ishaan Gulrajani and David Lopez-Paz. In search of lost domain generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.01434*, 2020.
- Suriya Gunasekar, Yi Zhang, Jyoti Aneja, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Allie Del Giorno, Sivakanth Gopi, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, Gustavo de Rosa, Olli Saarikivi, et al. Textbooks are all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11644*, 2023.
- Lin Lawrence Guo, Stephen R Pfohl, Jason Fries, Alistair EW Johnson, Jose Posada, Catherine Aftandilian, Nigam Shah, and Lillian Sung. Evaluation of domain generalization and adaptation on improving model robustness to temporal dataset shift in clinical medicine. *Scientific reports*, 12(1):2726, 2022.
- Lin Lawrence Guo, Jason Fries, Ethan Steinberg, Scott Lanyon Fleming, Keith Morse, Catherine Aftandilian, Jose Posada, Nigam Shah, and Lillian Sung. A multi-center study on the adaptability of a shared foundation model for electronic health records. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.11483*, 2023.
- Gamze Gürsoy. Genome privacy and trust. *Annual Review of Biomedical Data Science*, 5:163–181, 2022.

- Suchin Gururangan, Ana Marasović, Swabha Swayamdipta, Kyle Lo, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Noah A Smith. Don't stop pretraining: Adapt language models to domains and tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10964*, 2020.
- H Benjamin Harvey and Vrushab Gowda. How the fda regulates ai. *Academic radiology*, 27(1):58–61, 2020.
- Stefan Hegselmann, Helen Zhou, Yuyin Zhou, Jennifer Chien, Sujay Nagaraj, Neha Hulkund, Shreyas Bhave, Michael Oberst, Amruta Pai, Caleb Ellington, et al. Recent advances, applications and open challenges in machine learning for health: Reflections from research roundtables at ml4h 2022 symposium, 2022. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7951122>.
- Christina Heinze-Deml, Jonas Peters, and Nicolai Meinshausen. Invariant causal prediction for nonlinear models. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 6(2):20170016, 2018.
- Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel. A baseline for detecting misclassified and out-of-distribution examples in neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.02136*, 2016.
- Isaac Holeman and Dianna Kane. Human-centered design for global health equity. *Information technology for development*, 26(3):477–505, 2020.
- Shih-Cheng Huang, Anuj Pareek, Roham Zamani, Imon Banerjee, and Matthew P Lungren. Multimodal fusion with deep neural networks for leveraging ct imaging and electronic health record: a case-study in pulmonary embolism detection. *Scientific reports*, 10(1):22147, 2020.
- Hyewon Jeong, Collin M Stultz, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. Deep metric learning for the hemodynamics inference with electrocardiogram signals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.04650*, 2023.
- Hyewon Jeong, Nassim Oufattole, Matthew Mcdermott, Aparna Balagopalan, Bryan Jangeesingh, Marzyeh Ghassemi, and Collin Stultz. Event-based contrastive learning for medical time series. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10308*, 2024.
- Alexandros Karargyris, Renato Umeton, Micah J Sheller, Alejandro Aristizabal, Johnu George, Anna Wuest, Sarthak Pati, Hasan Kassem, Maximilian Zenk, Ujjwal Baid, et al. Federated benchmarking of medical artificial intelligence with medperf. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(7):799–810, 2023.
- Adrienne Kline, Hanyin Wang, Yikuan Li, Saya Dennis, Meghan Hutch, Zhenxing Xu, Fei Wang, Feixiong Cheng, and Yuan Luo. Multimodal machine learning in precision health: A scoping review. *npj Digital Medicine*, 5(1):171, 2022.
- Rafal Kocielnik, Elyssa Y Wong, Timothy N Chu, Lydia Lin, De-An Huang, Jiayun Wang, Anima Anandkumar, and Andrew J Hung. Deep multimodal fusion for surgical feedback classification. In *Machine Learning for Health (ML4H)*, pages 256–267. PMLR, 2023.
- Pang Wei Koh, Shiori Sagawa, Henrik Marklund, Sang Michael Xie, Marvin Zhang, Akshay Balsubramani, Weihua Hu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Richard Lanus Phillips, Irena Gao, et al. Wilds: A benchmark of in-the-wild distribution shifts. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5637–5664. PMLR, 2021.
- Sean Kulinski and David I Inouye. Towards explaining distribution shifts. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 17931–17952. PMLR, 2023.

- Chunyuan Li, Cliff Wong, Sheng Zhang, Naoto Usuyama, Haotian Liu, Jianwei Yang, Tristan Naumann, Hoifung Poon, and Jianfeng Gao. Llava-med: Training a large language-and-vision assistant for biomedicine in one day. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.00890*, 2023.
- Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, Benjamin Newman, Binhang Yuan, Bobby Yan, Ce Zhang, Christian Cosgrove, Christopher D. Manning, Christopher Ré, Diana Acosta-Navas, Drew A. Hudson, Eric Zelikman, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Frieda Rong, Hongyu Ren, Huaxiu Yao, Jue Wang, Keshav Santhanam, Laurel Orr, Lucia Zheng, Mert Yuksekgonul, Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Kim, Neel Guha, Niladri Chatterji, Omar Khattab, Peter Henderson, Qian Huang, Ryan Chi, Sang Michael Xie, Shibani Santurkar, Surya Ganguli, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Thomas Icard, Tianyi Zhang, Vishrav Chaudhary, William Wang, Xuechen Li, Yifan Mai, Yuhui Zhang, and Yuta Koreeda. Holistic evaluation of language models, 2023.
- Allison Liebhaber, Debra A Draper, and Genna R Cohen. Hospital strategies to engage physicians in quality improvement. *Issue Brief Cent Stud Health Syst Change*, 127:1–4, 2009.
- Yucong Lin, Keming Lu, Sheng Yu, Tianxi Cai, and Marinka Zitnik. Multimodal learning on graphs for disease relation extraction. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, page 104415, 2023a.
- Zeming Lin, Halil Akin, Roshan Rao, Brian Hie, Zhongkai Zhu, Wenting Lu, Nikita Smetanin, Robert Verkuil, Ori Kabeli, Yaniv Shmueli, et al. Evolutionary-scale prediction of atomic-level protein structure with a language model. *Science*, 379(6637):1123–1130, 2023b.
- Jana Lipkova, Richard J Chen, Bowen Chen, Ming Y Lu, Matteo Barbieri, Daniel Shao, Anurag J Vaidya, Chengkuan Chen, Luoting Zhuang, Drew FK Williamson, et al. Artificial intelligence for multimodal data integration in oncology. *Cancer cell*, 40(10):1095–1110, 2022.
- Michael Mattioli. The data-pooling problem. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, 32(1):179–236, 2017.
- Matthew McDermott, Bret Nestor, Evan Kim, Wancong Zhang, Anna Goldenberg, Peter Szolovits, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. A comprehensive evaluation of multi-task learning and multi-task pre-training on ehr time-series data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.10185*, 2020.
- Matthew McDermott, Bret Nestor, Peniel Argaw, and Isaac Kohane. Event stream gpt: A data pre-processing and modeling library for generative, pre-trained transformers over continuous-time sequences of complex events. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11547*, 2023.
- Nikita Mehandru, Samantha Robertson, and Niloufar Salehi. Reliable and safe use of machine translation in medical settings. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 2016–2025, 2022.
- Nikita Mehandru, Sweta Agrawal, Yimin Xiao, Elaine C Khoong, Ge Gao, Marine Carpuat, and Niloufar Salehi. Physician detection of clinical harm in machine translation: Quality estimation aids in reliance and backtranslation identifies critical errors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16924*, 2023.

- Michelle M Mello and Neel Guha. Chatgpt and physicians’ malpractice risk. In *JAMA Health Forum*, volume 4, pages e231938–e231938. American Medical Association, 2023.
- Michelle M Mello, Nigam H Shah, and Danton S Char. President biden’s executive order on artificial intelligence—implications for health care organizations. *JAMA*, 2023.
- Michael Moor, Oishi Banerjee, Zahra Shakeri Hossein Abad, Harlan M Krumholz, Jure Leskovec, Eric J Topol, and Pranav Rajpurkar. Foundation models for generalist medical artificial intelligence. *Nature*, 616(7956):259–265, 2023a.
- Michael Moor, Qian Huang, Shirley Wu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yash Dalmia, Jure Leskovec, Cyril Zakka, Eduardo Pontes Reis, and Pranav Rajpurkar. Medflamingo: a multimodal medical few-shot learner. In *Machine Learning for Health (ML4H)*, pages 353–367. PMLR, 2023b.
- Susan Morse. Most of the data generated is not used to its fullest potential — healthcarefinancenews.com. <https://www.healthcarefinancenews.com/news/most-data-generated-not-used-its-fullest-potential>. 2023. [Accessed 20-12-2023].
- Bret Nestor, Matthew BA McDermott, Willie Boag, Gabriela Berner, Tristan Naumann, Michael C Hughes, Anna Goldenberg, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. Feature robustness in non-stationary health records: caveats to deployable model performance in common clinical machine learning tasks. In *Machine Learning for Healthcare Conference*, pages 381–405. PMLR, 2019.
- Eric Nguyen, Michael Poli, Marjan Faizi, Armin Thomas, Callum Birch-Sykes, Michael Wornow, Aman Patel, Clayton Rabideau, Stefano Massaroli, Yoshua Bengio, et al. Hyenadna: Long-range genomic sequence modeling at single nucleotide resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15794*, 2023.
- 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.
- Erkin Ötles, Brian T Denton, and Jenna Wiens. Updating clinical risk stratification models using rank-based compatibility: Approaches for evaluating and optimizing clinician-model team performance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.05619*, 2023.
- Antonio Parziale, Monica Agrawal, Shengpu Tang, Kristen Severson, Luis Oala, Adarsh Subbaswamy, Sayantan Kumar, Elora Schoerverth, Stefan Hegselmann, Helen Zhou, Ghada Zamzmi, Purity Mugambi, Elena Sizikova, Girmaw Abebe Tadesse, Yuyin Zhou, Taylor Killian, Haoran Zhang, Fahad Kamran, Andrea Hobby, Mars Huang, Ahmed Alaa, Harvneet Singh, Irene Y. Chen, and Shalmali Joshi. Machine Learning for Health (ML4H) 2022. In Antonio Parziale, Monica Agrawal, Shalmali Joshi, Irene Y. Chen, Shengpu Tang, Luis Oala, and Adarsh Subbaswamy, editors, *Proceedings of the 2nd Machine Learning for Health symposium*, volume 193 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1–11. PMLR, 28 Nov 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v193/parziale22a.html>.
- Jessica K Paulus and David M Kent. Predictably unequal: understanding and addressing concerns that algorithmic clinical prediction may increase health disparities. *NPJ digital medicine*, 3(1):99, 2020.

- Emma Pierson. Accuracy and equity in clinical risk prediction. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2024.
- 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, 2021.
- Jielin Qiu, Jiacheng Zhu, Shiqi Liu, William Han, Jingqi Zhang, Chaojing Duan, Michael A Rosenberg, Emerson Liu, Douglas Weber, and Ding Zhao. Automated cardiovascular record retrieval by multimodal learning between electrocardiogram and clinical report. In *Machine Learning for Health (ML4H)*, pages 480–497. PMLR, 2023.
- Aniruddh Raghu, Payal Chandak, Ridwan Alam, John Guttag, and Collin Stultz. Sequential multi-dimensional self-supervised learning for clinical time series. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2023.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Emma Chen, Oishi Banerjee, and Eric J Topol. Ai in health and medicine. *Nature Medicine*, 28(1):31–38, 2022.
- Yuanfang Ren, Tyler J Loftus, Shounak Datta, Matthew M Ruppert, Ziyuan Guan, Shunshun Miao, Benjamin Shickel, Zheng Feng, Chris Giordano, Gilbert R Upchurch, et al. Performance of a machine learning algorithm using electronic health record data to predict postoperative complications and report on a mobile platform. *JAMA Network Open*, 5(5):e2211973–e2211973, 2022.
- Elan Rosenfeld, Pradeep Ravikumar, and Andrej Risteski. The risks of invariant risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.05761*, 2020.
- Subhrajit Roy, Stephen Pfohl, Girmaw Abebe Tadesse, Luis Oala, Fabian Falck, Yuyin Zhou, Liyue Shen, Ghada Zamzmi, Purity Mugambi, Ayah Zirikly, Matthew B. A. McDermott, and Emily Alsentzer. Machine learning for health (ml4h) 2021. In Subhrajit Roy, Stephen Pfohl, Emma Rocheteau, Girmaw Abebe Tadesse, Luis Oala, Fabian Falck, Yuyin Zhou, Liyue Shen, Ghada Zamzmi, Purity Mugambi, Ayah Zirikly, Matthew B. A. McDermott, and Emily Alsentzer, editors, *Proceedings of Machine Learning for Health*, volume 158 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1–12. PMLR, 04 Dec 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v158/roy21a.html>.
- Nithya Sambasivan, Shivani Kapania, Hannah Highfill, Diana Akrong, Praveen Paritosh, and Lora M Aroyo. “everyone wants to do the model work, not the data work”: Data cascades in high-stakes ai. In *proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–15, 2021.
- Rylan Schaeffer, Brando Miranda, and Sanmi Koyejo. Are emergent abilities of large language models a mirage? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.15004*, 2023.
- Mark P Sendak, Joshua D’Arcy, Sehj Kashyap, Michael Gao, Marshall Nichols, Kristin Corey, William Ratliff, and Suresh Balu. A path for translation of machine learning products into healthcare delivery. *EMJ Innov*, 10:19–00172, 2020.
- Laleh Seyyed-Kalantari, Haoran Zhang, Matthew BA McDermott, Irene Y Chen, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. Underdiagnosis bias of artificial intelligence algorithms applied to chest radiographs in under-served patient populations. *Nature medicine*, 27(12):2176–2182, 2021.

- Benjamin Shickel, Tyler J Loftus, Lasith Adhikari, Tezcan Ozrazgat-Baslanti, Azra Bihorac, and Parisa Rashidi. Deepsofa: a continuous acuity score for critically ill patients using clinically interpretable deep learning. *Scientific reports*, 9(1):1879, 2019.
- Karan Singhal, Tao Tu, Juraj Gottweis, Rory Sayres, Ellery Wulczyn, Le Hou, Kevin Clark, Stephen Pfohl, Heather Cole-Lewis, Darlene Neal, Mike Schaekermann, Amy Wang, Mohamed Amin, Sami Lachgar, Philip Mansfield, Sushant Prakash, Bradley Green, Ewa Dominowska, Blaise Aguera y Arcas, Nenad Tomasev, Yun Liu, Renee Wong, Christopher Semturs, S. Sara Mahdavi, Joelle Barral, Dale Webster, Greg S. Corrado, Yossi Matias, Shekoofeh Azizi, Alan Karthikesalingam, and Vivek Natarajan. Towards expert-level medical question answering with large language models, 2023.
- Irena Spasic, Goran Nenadic, et al. Clinical text data in machine learning: systematic review. *JMIR medical informatics*, 8(3): e17984, 2020.
- Kayte Spector-Bagdady, Shengpu Tang, Sarah Jabbour, W Nicholson Price, Ana Bracic, Melissa S Creary, Sachin Kheterpal, Chad M Brummett, and Jenna Wiens. Respecting autonomy and enabling diversity: The effect of eligibility and enrollment on research data demographics: Study examines the effect of eligibility and enrollment on research data demographics. *Health Affairs*, 40(12):1892–1899, 2021.
- Sören Richard Stahlschmidt, Benjamin Ulfenborg, and Jane Synnergren. Multimodal deep learning for biomedical data fusion: a review. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 23(2):bbab569, 2022.
- Adarsh Subbaswamy and Suchi Saria. From development to deployment: dataset shift, causality, and shift-stable models in health ai. *Biostatistics*, 21(2):345–352, 2020.
- Vinith Menon Suriyakumar, Marzyeh Ghassemi, and Berk Ustun. When personalization harms performance: reconsidering the use of group attributes in prediction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 33209–33228. PMLR, 2023.
- Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai, Shaojie Bai, Paul Pu Liang, J Zico Kolter, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Multimodal transformer for unaligned multimodal language sequences. In *Proceedings of the conference. Association for Computational Linguistics. Meeting*, volume 2019, page 6558. NIH Public Access, 2019.
- Tao Tu, Shekoofeh Azizi, Danny Driess, Mike Schaekermann, Mohamed Amin, Pi-Chuan Chang, Andrew Carroll, Chuck Lau, Ryutaro Tanno, Ira Ktena, Basil Mustafa, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Yun Liu, Simon Kornblith, David Fleet, Philip Mansfield, Sushant Prakash, Renee Wong, Sunny Virmani, Christopher Semturs, S Sara Mahdavi, Bradley Green, Ewa Dominowska, Blaise Aguera y Arcas, Joelle Barral, Dale Webster, Greg S. Corrado, Yossi Matias, Karan Singhal, Pete Florence, Alan Karthikesalingam, and Vivek Natarajan. Towards generalist biomedical ai, 2023a.
- Tao Tu, Shekoofeh Azizi, Danny Driess, Mike Schaekermann, Mohamed Amin, Pi-

- Chuan Chang, Andrew Carroll, Chuck Lau, Ryutaro Tanno, Ira Ktena, et al. Towards generalist biomedical ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.14334*, 2023b.
- Shresth Verma, Gargi Singh, Aditya Mate, Paritosh Verma, Sruthi Gorantla, Neha Madhiwalla, Aparna Hegde, Divy Thakkar, Manish Jain, Milind Tambe, et al. Expanding impact of mobile health programs: Saheli for maternal and child care. *AI Magazine*, 44(4):363–376, 2023.
- ER Vina, D Ran, EL Ashbeck, and CK Kwoh. Natural history of pain and disability among african-americans and whites with or at risk for knee osteoarthritis: A longitudinal study. *Osteoarthritis and cartilage*, 26(4):471–479, 2018.
- Kuan-Chieh Wang, Yan Fu, Ke Li, Ashish Khisti, Richard Zemel, and Alireza Makhzani. Variational Model Inversion Attacks, January 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2201.10787>. arXiv:2201.10787 [cs].
- Shirly Wang, Matthew BA McDermott, Geeticka Chauhan, Marzyeh Ghassemi, Michael C Hughes, and Tristan Naumann. Mimic-extract: A data extraction, pre-processing, and representation pipeline for mimic-iii. In *Proceedings of the ACM conference on health, inference, and learning*, pages 222–235, 2020.
- Zijian Wang, Yadan Luo, Ruihong Qiu, Zi Huang, and Mahsa Baktashmotlagh. Learning to diversify for single domain generalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 834–843, 2021.
- WEF. 4 ways data is improving healthcare, 2019. URL <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/12/4-ways-data-is-improving-healthcare/>.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, Ed H. Chi, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Oriol Vinyals, Percy Liang, Jeff Dean, and William Fedus. Emergent abilities of large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=yzkSU5zdwD>. Survey Certification.
- Jenna Wiens, Suchi Saria, Mark Sendak, Marzyeh Ghassemi, Vincent X Liu, Finale Doshi-Velez, Kenneth Jung, Katherine Heller, David Kale, Mohammed Saeed, et al. Do no harm: a roadmap for responsible machine learning for health care. *Nature medicine*, 25(9):1337–1340, 2019.
- Wikipedia contributors. Latanya Sweeney, September 2023. URL https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Latanya_Sweeney. Page Version ID: 1177812360.
- Andrew Wong, Erkin Otles, John P Donnelly, Andrew Krumm, Jeffrey McCullough, Olivia DeTroyer-Cooley, Justin Pestrue, Marie Phillips, Judy Konye, Carleen Penozza, et al. External validation of a widely implemented proprietary sepsis prediction model in hospitalized patients. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 181(8):1065–1070, 2021.
- Michael Wornow, Rahul Thapa, Ethan Steinberg, Jason A. Fries, and Nigam H. Shah. EHRSHOT: An EHR Benchmark for Few-Shot Evaluation of Foundation Models, 2023a.
- Michael Wornow, Yizhe Xu, Rahul Thapa, Birju Patel, Ethan Steinberg, Scott Fleming, Michael A. Pfeffer, Jason Fries, and Nigam H. Shah. The shaky foundations of large language models and foundation models for electronic healthcare/

health records. *npj Digital Medicine*, 6(1):135, Jul 2023b. ISSN 2398-6352. doi: 10.1038/s41746-023-00879-8. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-023-00879-8>.

Soheil Yousefi, Tooba Abbassi-Daloi, Thirsa Kraaijenbrink, Martijn Vermaat, Hailiang Mei, Peter van ‘t Hof, Maarten van Iersson, Daria V Zhernakova, Annique Claringbould, Lude Franke, et al. A snp panel for identification of dna and rna specimens. *BMC genomics*, 19:1–12, 2018.

Alexey Youssef, Michael Pencina, Anshul Thakur, Tingting Zhu, David Clifton, and Nigam H Shah. External validation of ai models in health should be replaced with recurring local validation. *Nature Medicine*, pages 1–2, 2023.

John R Zech, Marcus A Badgeley, Manway Liu, Anthony B Costa, Joseph J Titano, and Eric Karl Oermann. Variable generalization performance of a deep learning model to detect pneumonia in chest radiographs: a cross-sectional study. *PLoS medicine*, 15(11):e1002683, 2018.

Ningyu Zhang, Yunzhi Yao, Bozhong Tian, Peng Wang, Shumin Deng, Mengru Wang, Zekun Xi, Shengyu Mao, Jintian Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, et al. A comprehensive study of knowledge editing for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01286*, 2024.

Sheng Zhang, Yanbo Xu, Naoto Usuyama, Jaspreet Bagga, Robert Tinn, Sam Preston, Rajesh Rao, Mu Wei, Naveen Valluri, Cliff Wong, Matthew P. Lungren, Tristan Naumann, and Hoifung Poon. Large-scale domain-specific pretraining for biomedical vision-language processing, 2023.