

Are demographically invariant models and representations in medical imaging fair?

Eike Petersen^{1, 2, *} Enzo Ferrante³ Melanie Ganz^{2, 4, 5} and Aasa Feragen^{1, 2}

¹Technical University of Denmark, DTU Compute

²Pioneer Centre for AI, Denmark

³Research Institute for Signals, Systems and Computational Intelligence (CONICET), Universidad Nacional del Litoral, Argentina

⁴University of Copenhagen, Department of Computer Science, Denmark

⁵Neurobiology Research Unit, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark

*Corresponding author. Contact: ewipe@dtu.dk.

Abstract

Medical imaging models have been shown to encode information about patient demographics such as age, race, and sex in their latent representation, raising concerns about their potential for discrimination. Here, we ask whether requiring models *not* to encode demographic attributes is desirable. We point out that marginal and class-conditional representation invariance imply the standard group fairness notions of demographic parity and equalized odds, respectively. In addition, however, they require matching the risk distributions, thus potentially equalizing away important group differences. Enforcing the traditional fairness notions directly instead does not entail these strong constraints. Moreover, representationally invariant models may still take demographic attributes into account for deriving predictions, implying unequal treatment – in fact, achieving representation invariance may *require* doing so. In theory, this can be prevented using *counterfactual* notions of (individual) fairness or invariance. We caution, however, that properly defining medical image counterfactuals with respect to demographic attributes is fraught with challenges. Finally, we posit that encoding demographic attributes may even be *advantageous* if it enables learning a task-specific encoding of demographic features that does not rely on social constructs such as ‘race’ and ‘gender.’ We conclude that demographically invariant representations are neither necessary nor sufficient for fairness in medical imaging. Models may need to encode demographic attributes, lending further urgency to calls for comprehensive model fairness assessments in terms of predictive performance across diverse patient groups.

1 Introduction

Recent studies have highlighted the capability of deep neural networks to infer patient demographics from medical images [15, 17, 18, 56]. In a widely cited study, Gichoya et al. [17] found that neural networks can be trained to recognize a patient’s race from chest X-ray recordings with high accuracy, even when medical doctors cannot, and even when correcting for confounding factors that correlate with racial identity. Prompted by this work, Glocker et al. [18] observed that even networks trained for chest X-ray-based disease classification (and not for inferring patient demographics) tend to learn a latent image encoding that differs in distribution between demographic groups. Both studies warn that the ability and apparent tendency of such networks to encode patient identity enables – intentional or unintentional – explicit discrimination against demographic groups: if the latent representation encodes group membership, the model can exploit this in its decision-making. For example, the model might learn to exploit spurious correlations between demographic groups and outcomes in the training dataset,

which do not hold on another (real-world) dataset. These cautionary notes are timely and consequential, and they prompt the question: can and *should* we develop models that do *not* encode group membership in their latent space?

Here, we add to this ongoing discussion by considering different types of demographic invariance and assessing their relationship to notions of algorithmic fairness, as well as their desirability in the medical imaging domain. First, we consider *marginal representation invariance*, corresponding to a latent space that does *not* encode group membership (section 2). We point out that marginal invariance implies *statistical parity*, and we discuss why this is highly undesirable in all cases in which disease prevalences differ between groups. Secondly, we consider *class-conditional representation invariance*, which implies the *separation* fairness criterion and, as a consequence, equalized error rates (section 3). We lay out why enforcing marginal or conditional invariance may be undesirable even in cases in which disease prevalences are correctly accounted for, since both notions of invariance require equalizing the predicted risk distributions across patient groups (section 4). Notably, directly enforcing statistical parity or separation does *not* require such equalization of risk prediction distributions. Figure 1 shows an illustration of the two representation invariance approaches. Finally, we consider *counterfactual model invariance*, corresponding to *counterfactual fairness* (section 5). We discuss the significant challenges involved in defining meaningful counterfactuals with respect to demographic groups in medical imaging, finding that this notion appears impractical in many cases and reduces to the two invariance notions discussed above in others, entailing the discussed drawbacks. Our findings lend further urgency to the development and implementation of thorough fairness assessments and more nuanced unfairness mitigation techniques, given that models *will* likely have the capability to discriminate against demographic groups.

The technical results we discuss are (mostly) not new; references to relevant prior work are provided throughout. Our aim here is to emphasize the relevance of these results to the current discourse in (fair) medical imaging, and to explore their practical implications.

1.1 Problem setting and notation

We consider a supervised prediction setting in which the objective is to predict labels Y from inputs X . Patients are assumed to be members of different and potentially overlapping demographic groups A (e.g., young, female, or young female). The inputs X might denote medical images, blood markers, or other physiological measurements, and the labels Y could, e.g., represent categorical disease labels, continuous disease severity scores, or segmentation masks. We will often consider a latent representation Z of the input data X , obtained using a deterministic feature extractor $g : x \mapsto z$, such as the first layers of a deep neural network. This latent representation is then mapped onto predictions $r \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(Y)}$ by a second deterministic model component $h : z \mapsto r$. Depending on the application, r may then be discretized using a decision threshold τ to obtain binary outcome labels \hat{y} representing, for example, disease labels or segmentation masks. Neither g nor h receive group membership as an explicit input, and we assume τ to be group-independent. We will refer to random variables by upper-case letters (X, Y, Z) and to their realizations by lower-case letters (x, y, z). We consider a model to ‘encode’ group membership A in its latent representation Z if group membership can be inferred with higher-than-chance accuracy from Z .

2 Marginal representation invariance

Aiming for a model that does *not* encode group membership is equivalent to requiring the latent representation z to be invariant between groups a , that is,

$$p(z) = p(z | a) \quad \forall a \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad Z \perp A. \quad (1)$$

However, if $p(z | a)$ is identical across groups, then the distributions of model predictions $p(r | a)$ and $p(\hat{y} | a)$ are identical across groups as well, implying $R, \hat{Y} \perp A$. This corresponds to the algorithmic




Figure 1: An illustration of the effects of enforcing marginal and class-conditional representation invariance in the case of a disease distribution with prevalence differences between two groups (a_1 and a_2). The shown example is an illustrative case in which perfect classification is possible. Representation invariance implies risk distribution and classification rate invariances due to the deterministic relationships between the latent representation, risk predictions, and binary classifications. Note the enforced misclassification (shaded) in the case of marginal invariance, and the enforced identity across groups of the marginal and class-conditional predicted risk distributions, respectively. While class-conditional representation invariance solves the illustrated issue due to prevalence differences, it still has drawbacks: it is incompatible with group-wise model calibration (see section 3) and requires equalizing away potentially important differences between unknown disease subtypes (see section 4 and fig. 3).




Figure 2: Accuracy with which binary group membership A can be predicted just from the target label Y , fully ignoring any input data X , as a function of the dimensionality of Y . The label Y is assumed binary-valued here, representing, e.g., multiple binary disease labels. Incidences per disease (i.e., elements of Y) are drawn randomly from $[0.1, 0.9]$ for the two groups; mean and standard deviation of the resulting prediction accuracy over 1000 repetitions shown. (In the case of identical prevalences, a label does not increase the identifiability of A .) Note that if A is identifiable from Y , the same is true for any accurate model predictions \hat{Y} . Illustrates why asking for groups to be non-identifiable in the presence of prevalence differences is ill-advised, and how this problem is aggravated for higher-dimensional Y , such as in multi-class settings or segmentation.

fairness notion of *statistical parity*, or *independence* [5, 57, 59]. If, however, the true outcome distributions $p(y | a)$ differ between groups, we cannot require eq. (1) to hold without incurring a loss in predictive accuracy since $p(\hat{y} | a) \neq p(y | a)$ necessarily [16, 19, 45].

Why would $p(y | a)$ differ between groups in a medical application? In the simplest case, *prevalence* could differ: A classifier that returns the same distribution of positive and negative predictions for breast cancer in men and women appears undesirable as the prevalence of breast cancer differs between these groups. If, on the other hand, the classifier returns positive and negative predictions at different rates for the different groups (as would be correct), then its latent representation is statistically related to group membership, thus ‘encoding’ group membership. As another example from medical image segmentation, organ shapes or sizes may vary depending on age or sex, resulting in differences in the distribution $p(y | a)$ of true segmentation masks between groups [41]. Notice that this issue becomes worse for high-dimensional y as it becomes progressively easier to identify a based on distributional differences between $p(y | a)$ for the different groups, see fig. 2 for an illustration of this effect.

In domain adaptation theory, property (1) is called *marginal alignment*, and a latent representation that satisfies it is often simply called *domain-invariant*. Extensive research has been devoted to domain-invariant representation learning, and by identifying different *groups* with different *domains*, these results apply to our setting [35]. The equality of $p(y | a)$ between groups is known to be a necessary condition for the existence of a predictive performance-optimal (marginally) invariant representation [28, 59]. Similarly, the field of algorithmic fairness has widely discussed the inherent tensions between statistical parity and predictive accuracy. Enforcing statistical parity despite differences in $p(y | a)$ is known to incur a significant loss in predictive performance [5, 16, 32, 59]. For binary classification with two sensitive groups, Zhao and Gordon [59] show that enforcing statistical parity implies that the sum of the error rates in both groups is lower-bounded by the prevalence difference.

To provide some intuition concerning the theoretical results presented in this section, note that there is a crucial difference between a *model* (i.e., a function) and a *representation* being invariant with respect to a demographic feature. The former asserts that the prediction \hat{y} should be the same regardless of the value of A while keeping everything else fixed; we will explore this notion in more detail in section 5. Importantly, this still allows for the predictions \hat{Y} and group membership A to be correlated

if A correlates with disease-relevant features. A (marginally) invariant *representation*, on the other hand, requires full statistical independence $Z, \hat{Y} \perp A$, even if the labels Y are correlated with A . In this case, a demographically invariant representation requires *actively confounding* predictions to comply with the invariance requirement, enforcing unequal treatment and unnecessary misclassification in all groups. (Note that in the case of differing $p(y | a)$, a perfect classifier that predicts all labels correctly does not satisfy marginal independence.) Maybe counter-intuitively, enforcing statistical independence will also often result in disparate treatment of subjects from different groups [29]: if the distribution of disease presentations differs between groups, but the model is forced to map them to an identical latent distribution, then this can only be achieved by treating similar subjects from different groups dissimilarly. (In this case, the unequal treatment occurs in the model’s feature extraction – or *encoding* – step.)

In the case of low-dimensional labels such as disease labels, there is one obvious strategy for addressing the challenges posed by label shift (of which prevalence differences are one instance) for marginal invariance approaches: One can artificially balance the training set such that $p(y | a)$ is equal across groups. In some cases, one may also consider prevalence differences between groups negligible or purely an artifact of biased data collection procedures. Would enforcing a demographically invariant representation appear beneficial in such cases? We will return to this question in section 4, where we discuss more general drawbacks of representation invariance approaches.

3 Class-conditional representation invariance

The situation in which $p(y | a)$ differs between domains is known as *label shift* [13, 27], and various methods have been developed to address it. One class of proposed solutions [13, 28] attempts to match the *class-conditional* distributions $p(z | y)$ across groups, instead of the *marginal* distributions $p(z)$ like in the previous section. Formally, this requirement can be stated as

$$p(z | y) = p(z | y, a) \quad \forall a, y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad Z \perp A | Y. \quad (2)$$

Analogously to the previous section, observe that eq. (2) implies equality of $p(r | y, a)$ and $p(\hat{y} | y, a)$ across groups, and thus $R, \hat{Y} \perp A | Y$. This implies the *separation* criterion in algorithmic fairness [5]. Note that class-conditional representation invariance does *not* imply marginal representation invariance, i.e., models that satisfy eq. (2) may encode group membership in their latent space.

Is class-conditional representation invariance a desirable property for medical imaging models? We argue here that this is not the case, even leaving aside the fact that group membership may be encoded. It is known that a risk score R cannot satisfy separation and be *well-calibrated by groups* at the same time, except in pathological cases [5]. For this reason, and because its intrinsic ethical significance appears unclear, it has been argued that separation *at the risk score level* ($R \perp A | Y$) may not be a desirable model property [20, 26, 42]. Notably, this is distinct from separation *at the classification level* ($\hat{Y} \perp A | Y$), which entails equal error rates between groups and may be a desirable aim. However, as has been pointed out elsewhere [26, 42], error rate equality can be achieved without the overly restrictive requirement of class-conditionally invariant risk distributions. Further fundamental drawbacks of both marginal and class-conditional representation invariance approaches are discussed in the following section.

4 General drawbacks of representation invariance

A key drawback of any notion of representation invariance concerns their neglect of differences in the *within-class distributions* between groups [27, 30]. A single class label often subsumes many fundamentally distinct situations, such as different subtypes or presentations of the disease, a phenomenon known as *hidden stratification* [37]. The situation in which disease manifestations differ between groups (or domains) has also been called *manifestation shift* [10]. If the distribution of label manifestations differs between groups, then representation invariance can only be achieved by forcing




Figure 3: An illustration of the effects of enforcing (class-conditional) representation invariance in the case of differences in the within-class distributions between two groups (a_1 and a_2). The distribution of the (unlabeled/unobserved) disease severity may differ between sick patients of the two groups (left panel). Enforcing (class-conditionally) identical latent representations Z (right panel) requires mapping patients with differing disease severities to the same latent representation, depending on which group a patient belongs to (center). This will also result in them being assigned the same risk predictions, see section 3.

distinct stratifications in different groups to be represented by the same latent encoding. This is analogous to the higher-level effects of enforcing marginal invariance in the case of label shift, discussed in section 2. One instance of the within-class variation problem concerns differences in task difficulty [43]. For physiological or technical reasons, a prediction task may be harder in one group than in others, due to, for example, differences in the amount of (breast, fat) tissue that confounds a recording [1, 8]. In this case, a predictive model should return less confident predictions for members of the more strongly confounded group, even for the same disease instance. Representation invariance approaches require equalizing such essential differences between groups (see fig. 3 for an illustration). This example also illustrates again why representation invariance does not guarantee ‘fair treatment,’ and, in fact, may *require* disparate treatment [29]. Different images may be mapped to an identical or similar latent representation in order to achieve representation invariance; an argument for why this may actually be *enforced* by distribution matching approaches was provided above.

Do representation invariance approaches provide any meaningful fairness guarantees, then? As we have seen, marginal invariance implies statistical parity, which may be a desirable goal in scarce resource distribution settings or patient prioritization [5, 42] but is typically not considered desirable in predictive settings. In this regard, Glocker et al. [18] also point out that if a representation *encodes* group membership, this does not imply that the model also *uses* this information for decision-making. Conditional invariance, on the other hand, implies equalized error rates, which may be a desirable aim in the predictive setting, even though its algorithmic enforcement is known to suffer from the leveling down phenomenon [58, 61]. However, equalized error rates can also be achieved *without* requiring equalized conditional risk distributions [26, 42]. Thus, the conditional representation invariance requirement may be seen as overly restrictive, resulting in the noted incompatibility with calibration by groups.

A further limitation of the fairness guarantees provided by representation invariance approaches concerns their inherent dependency on the dataset on which they are evaluated. Representation invariance is a property of a model *applied to a particular dataset*, and there is no guarantee that the same model will produce an invariant representation (and, say, equal error rates) on another dataset, due to potential (label, covariate, intra-class variation) distribution shifts. Representation invariance thus provides no guarantee about a particular (fairness-relevant) property of the model itself. This is especially concerning in cases in which (as is general best practice) training and evaluation datasets are carefully curated and thus may differ importantly from real-world observational data. (Note that these limitations apply not only to the discussed representation invariance approaches, but also to all other statistical group fairness criteria.)




Figure 4: A simplistic causal diagram illustrating some of the many ways in which biological (birth) sex may causally influence medical image recordings x . With respect to which of the causal paths from “Birth Sex” to x should a disease classification model be (counterfactually) invariant?

To address the drawbacks of representation matching approaches, various alternative approaches have been proposed in the domain adaptation literature, including object matching [27, 30], relaxed distribution matching [22, 55], support alignment [49], and hypothesis invariance [53]. A convincingly successful application of such approaches to the medical imaging domain remains to be demonstrated, however.

At this point, let us step back and ask: why were we interested in demographically invariant representations in the first place? Echoing similar concerns raised by Gichoya et al. [17], Glocker et al. [18] write that “an algorithm may encode protected characteristics, and then use this information for making predictions due to undesirable correlations in the (historical) training data.” These remarks reflect a concern that patients with similar (patho)physiology might wrongly receive different predictions if the model takes their demographic attributes into account. We argue that this concern is more aligned with requiring demographically invariant *models*, as opposed to demographically invariant *distributions*. We will thus consider model invariance approaches next.

5 Model invariance

To address the discussed drawbacks of invariant representation learning, there has been a shift in the domain generalization community away from learning invariant *representations* toward learning invariant *mechanisms*, that is, models or model components that are, in some sense, invariant with respect to a nuisance variable A [3, 31, 44, 46, 47]. One popular approach is based on the notion of *counterfactual invariance*: ‘keeping everything else fixed’ (we will elaborate on what this may mean below), changing just the attribute A should not change model predictions [50]. When A represents a sensitive attribute, this corresponds to *counterfactual fairness* [25], a variant of individual (as opposed to group) fairness [16]. In theory, counterfactual invariance holds across datasets: if a *model* is invariant with respect to changes in A , then this will still hold if the data distribution changes. While such theoretical guarantees can indeed be obtained for invariances with respect to formally defined algebraic operations on the input space such as rotations or translations [4, 6], the case of invariance with respect to demographic groups in medical imaging is more complex, however, and challenging to define formally.

Discussions of counterfactual fairness and counterfactual invariance are predominantly framed in terms of *causal models* [11, 25, 40, 46, 50], and both causal modeling generally and counterfactual inference in particular have recently received increased attention in the medical imaging community [10, 14, 38, 39, 51]. Consider the highly simplistic causal diagram [40] in fig. 4, representing the diverse effects of biological birth sex in a hypothetical medical imaging scenario. With respect to which of the causal paths

from “Birth Sex” to x should a disease classification model be (counterfactually) invariant? Invariance with respect to all of them would correspond to fully equalizing the (disease-conditioned) distributions of image representations of different biological (birth) sexes. In a chest X-ray context, this might imply adjusting female torso shapes, tissue distributions, organ sizes, and differing disease presentations to conform with the distribution observed in the male group. Adjusting all of these factors when creating, for example, a ‘male counterfactual’ of a female image, yields a fully ‘male-typical’ example. It is thus not surprising, that, for example, Veitch et al. [50] found such a counterfactual invariance approach to imply $R, Y \perp A \mid Y$, i.e., *separation* – just like in the case of class-conditional representation invariance, thus entailing the same drawbacks (also cf. Nilforoshan et al. [36]). Puli et al. [44] derive similar equivalences. Note that enforcing such an invariance, just like the invariant representation approaches discussed above, would also change how mere correlates of biological sex such as body mass index (BMI) are permitted to influence model predictions.

On the other hand, maybe we would like the model to only be invariant with respect to *some* of the paths in fig. 4, resulting in *path-specific* counterfactual fairness [11]? While certainly feasible, the authors are unaware of any works implementing such path-specific invariances in the context of medical image analysis. This may be owed to the complexity of identifying the different causal relationships in a causal diagram such as fig. 4 from empirical data. While progress has been made toward this goal [39], such approaches typically require observations of all variables in the causal graph, which are often unavailable. Moreover, any such approach crucially depends on the correctness and completeness of the specified causal graph.

As we have seen, the crux of counterfactual invariance approaches thus lies in the precise definition of the counterfactuals to consider. What, precisely, would we like to keep fixed, and what should be adjusted, when generating ‘biological sex counterfactuals’, ‘ethnicity counterfactuals’, or ‘age counterfactuals’? Which are the peculiar properties of group a with respect to which a model should be invariant, and which are mere correlates that we would permit to influence model decisions [11, 23]? These are highly nontrivial questions, particularly in the context of *social constructs* such as demographic groups [23], and in particular as it relates to medical imaging. The validity of a counterfactual model invariance approach fully depends on the answers, however. As a final note of caution, any causal conception of fairness is crucially vulnerable to unobserved confounding [24].

6 Discussion & Conclusion

Our starting point in this piece were observations by different research groups that deep learning models tend to encode patients’ demographic features in their latent space [17, 18]. Prompted by these observations, we first asked whether it is feasible and desirable to train models that do *not* encode demographic group membership, in the sense that it cannot be inferred with higher-than-chance accuracy from the latent representation.¹ Noting that this requirement is equivalent to *marginal representation invariance* and implies *statistical parity*, we discussed why such a requirement can severely hurt model performance [5, 16, 32, 59, 60] even beyond the well-known ‘leveling down’ effect [58, 61]. We then considered a close alternative to marginal representation invariance, *class-conditional invariance* [13]. This notion alleviates one of the problems associated with marginal invariance: severe model performance deterioration in the face of label shift, i.e., differences in $p(y \mid a)$ between groups. However, class-conditional invariance turned out to imply the *separation* criterion from algorithmic fairness (on the risk score level), which may be considered undesirable due to its incompatibility with group-wise calibration as well as for other reasons [5, 20, 26, 33, 42]. Directly enforcing error rate equality across groups instead does not entail the same drawbacks. Moreover, all

¹While we adopt this terminology here, we note that it may be considered misleading to write that a latent representation *encodes* group membership simply because that representation is *correlated* with group membership. The representation may in fact encode only disease-relevant features, but if those features are correlated with group membership, this will also be true for the latent representation – even if no group-specific features are encoded.

representation invariance approaches suffer from their neglect of differences in *intra-class variations* between groups due to, for example, different disease subtypes or manifestations [10, 27, 30, 37]. In addition, they do not guarantee ‘fair treatment,’ and, in fact, may even *require* disparate treatment [29] – which is simply moved to the model’s feature extraction stage. Finally, we considered counterfactually invariant *models* as one potential alternative [11, 25, 44, 50], finding that both the theoretical definition and practical inference of meaningful demographic counterfactuals in the medical imaging domain is fraught with serious challenges and often incurs the same drawbacks as representation invariance approaches [36].

Can it even be *beneficial* for a model to encode group membership? Consider the case of a model that depends on explicit group membership information. The model might exploit such information during training – e.g., to achieve representation invariance – or during inference, in order to perform group-specific calibration or thresholding. Such a model inherits the well-documented problems that arise from sorting humans into categories based predominantly on *sociocultural* constructs [2, 7, 48], as opposed to physiological differences relevant to the prediction task at hand. As an alternative, consider now the case of a model that has learned an *implicit* representation of group membership. This second model can learn to extract just those aspects of, say, ethnicity or biological sex that are relevant to the given prediction task. Moreover, it can learn a *continuous* representation of these properties, as opposed to coarse, human-defined categories. This might enable more robust generalization to patient groups that fall between traditional categories, such as nonbinary or mixed-race patients. To be clear: this is, of course, a highly idealized view. Whether a model indeed learns such a minimal and optimal representation in practice is an important question. Encouragingly, Glocker et al. [18] provide evidence that this may indeed occur in practice, at least in some instances. They find that a model trained only for disease prediction, and not demographic group prediction, indeed appears to learn a feature representation that is far less predictive of demographic properties than the representation learned by a model trained explicitly for demographic group prediction.

While our discussion of representation invariance has been largely negative, we want to emphasize that such approaches are not without merit. Their main field of application is the unsupervised domain adaptation setting, in which labels y are unavailable from a new domain. In this case, invariant representation learning can be beneficial [28, 34]. Notably, this differs from the setting we consider here, in which labels are available from all demographic groups. Nevertheless, such invariant representations might generalize better to previously unseen demographic groups, even though domain generalization benchmarks appear to refute this intuition [52]. Moreover, our discussion here concerned the case of enforcing *strict* invariance. In practice, many invariant representation learning approaches instead use regularization to prevent learning representations that are *unnecessarily strongly* predictive of the domain or demographic group [9, 59]. Such approaches may prove beneficial if they are tuned to minimize the negative effects of enforcing strict invariance. Similar benefits may be obtained using less restrictive mitigation techniques such as fair pruning [54] or fair early exiting [12]. Using such methods, the latent representation will still encode demographic group membership to some degree, however.

Taken together, our analyses imply that, at present, there is no straightforward method for developing medical imaging models that guarantee similar treatment of individuals with similar physiology but differing demographic features. Enforcing different notions of demographic invariance is likely to harm different aspects of model performance across all groups, as has been observed empirically [33, 58, 61], while at the same time not providing any meaningful guarantees in terms of equal treatment. As a consequence, we claim that the simple fact that a model encodes group membership cannot be understood as a fairness violation. We have argued that group encoding can in some cases even be considered beneficial if it prevents models from inheriting the biases encoded in human-defined patient categories. Our analysis lends further urgency to calls for fairness assessments in terms of comprehensive subgroup analyses since, as pointed out before [17, 18], models that encode demographics *have* the capacity to discriminate. For improving model performance in under-performing groups, simple balanced empirical risk minimization, targeted data collection efforts, and investigations into the potential presence of label biases currently appear to be among the most promising practical avenues [21, 43, 58]. If the aim is to

prevent demographic shortcut learning, methods such as the one proposed by Brown et al. [9] could be used instead of demographic invariance.

As a final remark, we note that while our discussion here was centered around medical image analysis, our analysis and discussion applies readily to other medical and non-medical application domains.

Author contributions

All authors contributed to the conceptualization of the manuscript. EP wrote the original draft, and all authors contributed to manuscript reviewing and editing. EF, MG and AF were responsible for funding acquisition, and MG and AF for supervision.

Funding acknowledgements

Work on this project was partially funded by the Independent Research Fund Denmark (DFF, grant number 9131-00097B), Denmark’s Pioneer Centre for AI (DNRF grant number P1), a Google Award for inclusion research, the Novo Nordisk Foundation through the Center for Basic Machine Learning Research in Life Science (MLLS, grant number NNF20OC0062606), and the Argentinian National Agency for the Promotion of Research, Technological Development and Innovation (ANPCyT, grant number PICT-PRH-2019-0000). The listed funding sources had no involvement in the conception of the manuscript, the writing of the report, or the decision to submit the article for publication.

References

- [1] Colin Alexander. “The Elimination of Confusing Breast Shadows in Chest Radiography.” In: *Australasian Radiology* 2.2 (1958), pp. 107–108. DOI: [10.1111/j.1440-1673.1958.tb00882.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1673.1958.tb00882.x).
- [2] Jerone Theodore Alexander Andrews, Przemyslaw Joniak, and Alice Xiang. “A View From Somewhere: Human-Centric Face Representations.” In: *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2023. URL: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=mMaInr0r0c>.
- [3] Martin Arjovsky et al. *Invariant Risk Minimization*. 2019. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.02893>.
- [4] Benjamin Aslan, Daniel Platt, and David Sheard. “Group invariant machine learning by fundamental domain projections.” In: *NeurIPS Workshop on Symmetry and Geometry in Neural Representations*. 2023. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v197/aslan23a.html>.
- [5] Solon Barocas, Moritz Hardt, and Arvind Narayanan. *Fairness and machine learning. Limitations and opportunities*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2023. 323 pp. ISBN: 9780262048613.
- [6] Erik J. Bekkers et al. “Roto-Translation Covariant Convolutional Networks for Medical Image Analysis.” In: *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer International Publishing, 2018, pp. 440–448. ISBN: 9783030009281. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-030-00928-1_50](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-00928-1_50).
- [7] Clara Belitz et al. “Constructing categories: Moving beyond protected classes in algorithmic fairness.” In: *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* (2022). DOI: [10.1002/asi.24643](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24643).
- [8] Deborah D. Brahee et al. “Body Mass Index and Abdominal Ultrasound Image Quality.” In: *Journal of Diagnostic Medical Sonography* 29.2 (2013), pp. 66–72. DOI: [10.1177/8756479313476919](https://doi.org/10.1177/8756479313476919).
- [9] Alexander Brown et al. “Detecting shortcut learning for fair medical AI using shortcut testing.” In: *Nature Communications* 14.1 (2023). DOI: [10.1038/s41467-023-39902-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-39902-7).
- [10] Daniel C. Castro, Ian Walker, and Ben Glocker. “Causality matters in medical imaging.” In: *Nature Communications* 11.1 (2020). DOI: [10.1038/s41467-020-17478-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17478-w).
- [11] Silvia Chiappa. “Path-Specific Counterfactual Fairness.” In: *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 2019. DOI: [10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33017801](https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33017801).

- [12] Ching-Hao Chiu et al. “Toward Fairness Through Fair Multi-Exit Framework for Dermatological Disease Diagnosis.” In: *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2023*. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023, pp. 97–107. ISBN: 9783031438981. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-031-43898-1_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-43898-1_10).
- [13] Remi Tachet des Combes et al. “Domain Adaptation with Conditional Distribution Matching and Generalized Label Shift.” In: *NeurIPS*. Vol. 33. 2020, pp. 19276–19289. URL: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/dfbfa7ddcfeffeb581f50edcf9a0204bb-Abstract.html>.
- [14] Fabio De Sousa Ribeiro et al. “High Fidelity Image Counterfactuals with Probabilistic Causal Models.” In: *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*. Ed. by Andreas Krause et al. Vol. 202. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, July 2023, pp. 7390–7425. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/de-sousa-ribeiro23a.html>.
- [15] Grant Duffy et al. “Confounders mediate AI prediction of demographics in medical imaging.” In: *npj Digital Medicine* 5.1 (2022). DOI: [10.1038/s41746-022-00720-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-022-00720-8).
- [16] Cynthia Dwork et al. “Fairness through awareness.” In: *Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS)*. ACM, 2012. DOI: [10.1145/2090236.2090255](https://doi.org/10.1145/2090236.2090255).
- [17] Judy Wawira Gichoya et al. “AI recognition of patient race in medical imaging: a modelling study.” In: *The Lancet Digital Health* 4.6 (2022), e406–e414. DOI: [10.1016/s2589-7500\(22\)00063-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2589-7500(22)00063-2).
- [18] Ben Glocker et al. “Algorithmic encoding of protected characteristics in chest X-ray disease detection models.” In: *eBioMedicine* 89 (2023), p. 104467. DOI: [10.1016/j.ebiom.2023.104467](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ebiom.2023.104467).
- [19] Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nathan Srebro. “Equality of Opportunity in Supervised Learning.” In: *NeurIPS*. Barcelona, Spain, 2016, 3323–3331.
- [20] Brian Hedden. “On statistical criteria of algorithmic fairness.” In: *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 49.2 (2021), pp. 209–231. DOI: [10.1111/papa.12189](https://doi.org/10.1111/papa.12189).
- [21] Badr Youbi Idrissi et al. “Simple data balancing achieves competitive worst-group-accuracy.” In: *Proceedings of the First Conference on Causal Learning and Reasoning*. Ed. by Bernhard Schölkopf, Caroline Uhler, and Kun Zhang. Vol. 177. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2022, pp. 336–351. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v177/idrissi22a.html>.
- [22] Fredrik D. Johansson, David Sontag, and Rajesh Ranganath. “Support and Invertibility in Domain-Invariant Representations.” In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. Ed. by Kamalika Chaudhuri and Masashi Sugiyama. Vol. 89. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, Apr. 2019, pp. 527–536. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v89/johansson19a.html>.
- [23] Atoosa Kasirzadeh and Andrew Smart. “The Use and Misuse of Counterfactuals in Ethical Machine Learning.” In: *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. ACM, Mar. 2021. DOI: [10.1145/3442188.3445886](https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445886).
- [24] Niki Kilbertus et al. “The Sensitivity of Counterfactual Fairness to Unmeasured Confounding.” In: *Proceedings of The 35th Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence Conference*. Ed. by Ryan P. Adams and Vibhav Gogate. Vol. 115. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2020, pp. 616–626. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v115/kilbertus20a.html>.
- [25] Matt J Kusner et al. “Counterfactual Fairness.” In: *NeurIPS*. 2017. URL: <https://papers.nips.cc/paper/2017/hash/a486cd07e4ac3d270571622f4f316ec5-Abstract.html>.
- [26] Claire Lazar Reich and Suhas Vijaykumar. “A Possibility in Algorithmic Fairness: Can Calibration and Equal Error Rates Be Reconciled?” In: *2nd Symposium on Foundations of Responsible Computing (FORC 2021)*. Vol. 192. 2020, 4:1–4:21. DOI: [10.4230/LIPIcs.FORC.2021.4](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.FORC.2021.4).
- [27] Bo Li et al. “Rethinking Distributional Matching Based Domain Adaptation.” In: (2020). DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.2006.13352](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2006.13352). arXiv: 2006.13352 [cs.LG].

- [28] Ya Li et al. “Domain Generalization via Conditional Invariant Representations.” In: *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 2018. DOI: [10.1609/aaai.v32i1.11682](https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v32i1.11682).
- [29] Michael Lohaus et al. “Are Two Heads the Same as One? Identifying Disparate Treatment in Fair Neural Networks.” In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by S. Koyejo et al. Vol. 35. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022, pp. 16548–16562. URL: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/698c05933e5f7fde98e567a669d2c752-Paper-Conference.pdf.
- [30] Divyat Mahajan, Shruti Tople, and Amit Sharma. “Domain Generalization using Causal Matching.” In: *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*. 2021. URL: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/mahajan21b.html>.
- [31] Maggie Makar et al. “Causally motivated shortcut removal using auxiliary labels.” In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*. 2022. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v151/makar22a>.
- [32] Daniel McNamara, Cheng Soon Ong, and Robert C Williamson. “Costs and benefits of fair representation learning.” In: *AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society (AIES)*. 2019. DOI: [10.1145/3306618.3317964](https://doi.org/10.1145/3306618.3317964).
- [33] Raghav Mehta, Changjian Shui, and Tal Arbel. “Evaluating the Fairness of Deep Learning Uncertainty Estimates in Medical Image Analysis.” In: *Medical Imaging with Deep Learning*. Ed. by Ipek Oguz et al. Vol. 227. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2024, pp. 1453–1492. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v227/mehta24a.html>.
- [34] Daniel Moyer et al. “Scanner invariant representations for diffusion MRI harmonization.” In: *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine* 84.4 (Apr. 2020), pp. 2174–2189. DOI: [10.1002/mrm.28243](https://doi.org/10.1002/mrm.28243).
- [35] Debarghya Mukherjee et al. “Domain Adaptation meets Individual Fairness. And they get along.” In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by S. Koyejo et al. Vol. 35. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022, pp. 28902–28913. URL: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/b9e0ceee9751ae8b5c6603c029e4ca42-Paper-Conference.pdf.
- [36] Hamed Nilforoshan et al. “Causal Conceptions of Fairness and their Consequences.” In: *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*. Ed. by Kamalika Chaudhuri et al. Vol. 162. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2022, pp. 16848–16887. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/nilforoshan22a.html>.
- [37] Luke Oakden-Rayner et al. “Hidden stratification causes clinically meaningful failures in machine learning for medical imaging.” In: *ACM Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning (CHIL)*. 2020. DOI: [10.1145/3368555.3384468](https://doi.org/10.1145/3368555.3384468).
- [38] Cheng Ouyang et al. “Causality-Inspired Single-Source Domain Generalization for Medical Image Segmentation.” In: *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* 42.4 (Apr. 2023), pp. 1095–1106. DOI: [10.1109/tmi.2022.3224067](https://doi.org/10.1109/tmi.2022.3224067).
- [39] Nick Pawlowski, Daniel Coelho de Castro, and Ben Glocker. “Deep Structural Causal Models for Tractable Counterfactual Inference.” In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by H. Larochelle et al. Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 857–869. URL: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/file/0987b8b338d6c90bbedd8631bc499221-Paper.pdf>.
- [40] Judea Pearl. *Causality*. 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press, 2009. ISBN: 9780521895606.
- [41] R Peters. “Ageing and the brain.” In: *Postgraduate Medical Journal* 82.964 (2006), pp. 84–88. DOI: [10.1136/pgmj.2005.036665](https://doi.org/10.1136/pgmj.2005.036665).
- [42] Eike Petersen et al. “On (assessing) the fairness of risk score models.” In: *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 2023. DOI: [10.1145/3593013.3594045](https://doi.org/10.1145/3593013.3594045).
- [43] Eike Petersen et al. “The path toward equal performance in medical machine learning.” In: *Patterns* 4.7 (2023). DOI: [10.1016/j.patter.2023.100790](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2023.100790).

- [44] Aahlad Manas Puli et al. “Out-of-distribution Generalization in the Presence of Nuisance-Induced Spurious Correlations.” In: *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. 2022.
- [45] María Agustina Ricci Lara, Rodrigo Echeveste, and Enzo Ferrante. “Addressing fairness in artificial intelligence for medical imaging.” In: *nature communications* 13.1 (2022), p. 4581. DOI: [10.1038/s41467-022-32186-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-32186-3).
- [46] Bernhard Schölkopf et al. “Toward Causal Representation Learning.” In: *Proceedings of the IEEE* 109.5 (2021), pp. 612–634. DOI: [10.1109/jproc.2021.3058954](https://doi.org/10.1109/jproc.2021.3058954).
- [47] Adarsh Subbaswamy and Suchi Saria. “From development to deployment: dataset shift, causality, and shift-stable models in health AI.” In: *Biostatistics* (2019). DOI: [10.1093/biostatistics/kxz041](https://doi.org/10.1093/biostatistics/kxz041).
- [48] Nenad Tomasev et al. “Fairness for Unobserved Characteristics: Insights from Technological Impacts on Queer Communities.” In: *AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society (AIES)*. 2021. DOI: [10.1145/3461702.3462540](https://doi.org/10.1145/3461702.3462540).
- [49] Shangyuan Tong et al. “Adversarial Support Alignment.” In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2022. URL: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=26gKg6x-ie>.
- [50] Victor Veitch et al. “Counterfactual Invariance to Spurious Correlations: Why and How to Pass Stress Tests.” In: *NeurIPS*. 2021. URL: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2021/hash/8710ef761bbb29a6f9d12e4ef8e4379c-Abstract.html>.
- [51] Athanasios Vlontzos, Daniel Rueckert, and Bernhard Kainz. “A Review of Causality for Learning Algorithms in Medical Image Analysis.” In: *Machine Learning for Biomedical Imaging* 1. November 2022 (Nov. 2022), pp. 1–17. DOI: [10.59275/j.melba.2022-4gf2](https://doi.org/10.59275/j.melba.2022-4gf2).
- [52] Jindong Wang et al. “Generalizing to Unseen Domains: A Survey on Domain Generalization.” In: *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2022). DOI: [10.1109/tkde.2022.3178128](https://doi.org/10.1109/tkde.2022.3178128).
- [53] Ziqi Wang, Marco Loog, and Jan van Gemert. “Respecting Domain Relations: Hypothesis Invariance for Domain Generalization.” In: *2020 25th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*. IEEE, Jan. 2021. DOI: [10.1109/icpr48806.2021.9412797](https://doi.org/10.1109/icpr48806.2021.9412797).
- [54] Yawen Wu et al. “FairPrune: Achieving Fairness Through Pruning for Dermatological Disease Diagnosis.” In: *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2022, pp. 743–753. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-031-16431-6_70](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-16431-6_70).
- [55] Yifan Wu et al. “Domain Adaptation with Asymmetrically-Relaxed Distribution Alignment.” In: *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*. Ed. by Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Vol. 97. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, June 2019, pp. 6872–6881. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/wu19f.html>.
- [56] Paul H. Yi et al. “Radiology “forensics”: determination of age and sex from chest radiographs using deep learning.” In: *Emergency Radiology* 28.5 (2021), pp. 949–954. DOI: [10.1007/s10140-021-01953-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10140-021-01953-y).
- [57] Rich Zemel et al. “Learning Fair Representations.” In: *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning*. Ed. by Sanjoy Dasgupta and David McAllester. Vol. 28. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research 3. Atlanta, Georgia, USA: PMLR, 2013, pp. 325–333. URL: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v28/zemel13.html>.
- [58] Haoran Zhang et al. “Improving the Fairness of Chest X-ray Classifiers.” In: *Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning (CHIL)*. 2022.
- [59] Han Zhao and Geoffrey J. Gordon. “Inherent Tradeoffs in Learning Fair Representations.” In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23.57 (2022), pp. 1–26. URL: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v23/21-1427.html>.
- [60] Han Zhao et al. “Fundamental Limits and Tradeoffs in Invariant Representation Learning.” In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23.340 (2022), pp. 1–49. URL: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v23/21-1078.html>.

- [61] Dominik Zietlow et al. “Leveling Down in Computer Vision: Pareto Inefficiencies in Fair Deep Classifiers.” In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. June 2022, pp. 10410–10421. URL: https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content/CVPR2022/html/Zietlow_Leveling_Down_in_Computer_Vision_Pareto_Inefficiencies_in_Fair_Deep_CVPR_2022_paper.html.