

SoK: Security and Privacy Risks of Medical AI

Yuanhaur Chang[§], Han Liu[§], Evin Jaff, Chenyang Lu, Ning Zhang
Washington University in St. Louis, MO, USA

Abstract—The integration of technology and healthcare has ushered in a new era where software systems, powered by artificial intelligence and machine learning, have become essential components of medical products and services. While these advancements hold great promise for enhancing patient care and healthcare delivery efficiency, they also expose sensitive medical data and system integrity to potential cyberattacks. This paper explores the security and privacy threats posed by AI/ML applications in healthcare. Through a thorough examination of existing research across a range of medical domains, we have identified significant gaps in understanding the adversarial attacks targeting medical AI systems. By outlining specific adversarial threat models for medical settings and identifying vulnerable application domains, we lay the groundwork for future research that investigates the security and resilience of AI-driven medical systems. Through our analysis of different threat models and feasibility studies on adversarial attacks in different medical domains, we provide compelling insights into the pressing need for cybersecurity research in the rapidly evolving field of AI healthcare technology.

1. Introduction

Growing Market of Medical AI. As technology advances, software systems play an increasingly vital role in commercial products and are becoming integral in the medical field [1]. The development of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) has transformed modern healthcare systems, providing valuable new insights obtained from the vast amount of data collected through patient diagnostics, monitoring, and healthcare research [2]. It was predicted that the global healthcare AI market would reach nearly 188 billion U.S. dollars by 2030 [3]. Approximately 22% of healthcare organizations worldwide stated that they were in the early stage of AI model adoption, while 24% reported being in the pilot stage [4]. Meanwhile, a recent survey indicated that 44% of people globally are open to using AI in healthcare for diagnostic and therapeutic purposes [5]. This highlights the significant benefits of improved diagnostic accuracy and treatment precision for patients, as well as the potential to allow medical practitioners to devote more time to patient care instead of routine administrative tasks.

Motivation. The integration of AI/ML technologies into medical systems inevitably introduces vulnerabilities. Compared to traditional AI domains, the security of medical

AI is much more regulated due to its impact on humans, with the International Medical Device Regulators Forum (IMDRF) classifying models that independently diagnose critical disorders (such as cancer and Alzheimer's) as having maximum risk to patients [6]. As a result of these guidelines, recently approved medical AI devices by the FDA have been prohibited from performing autonomous diagnoses and are classified as strictly assistive tools to human professionals [7]. This regulatory action indicates scrutiny of the security and accuracy of current medical AI models to act autonomously, which we aim to explore in this paper. While there have been several works systematizing the state of ML research in domains such as network intrusion detection [8] and security applications [9], as well as ML explainability [10], accountability [11], and privacy [12], a unified view on the topic in medical settings is not available yet. Since medical AI differs from others in its unique deployment scenario, challenges in data availability, model efficiency, explainability, and safety requirements necessitate a careful evaluation of the risks involved in their deployment in the medical domain.

Scope. The emergence of AI/ML services in healthcare has led to regulatory measures for AI/ML under Software as a Medical Device (SaMD), including premarket clearance 510(k). The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) describes SaMD as "*software intended to be used for one or more medical purposes without being part of a hardware medical device.*" [13] This definition was utilized to explore existing studies on security and privacy attacks against medical AI models. Specifically, our systematization includes cases where the attack targets AI models that independently function as a medical product, particularly when their role is diagnosis, prevention, monitoring, treatment, or alleviation of diseases, as per the definition of "medical device" by the FDA. The work in our survey spans from top security (S&P, USENIX Security, AsiaCCS, EuroS&P), machine-learning (AAAI, KDD), computer vision venues (CVPR), as well as biomedical journals and venues (Nature, Nature Medicine, MICCAI) and arXiv in the past 10 years.

Contributions. Recognizing the lack of a holistic view of AI attack research in the medical landscape, we aim to fill this gap by systematically examining the medical application domains and laying the groundwork for future attack research. Our main contributions are as follows:

- We provided a taxonomy analyzing how the identities, knowledge, capabilities, and goals of adversaries in the healthcare domain may differ from those considered in

[§]. Equal contribution

traditional AI attack threat models.

- We conducted a comprehensive systematization of the current state of research on security and privacy attacks on medical AI. We included publications in major security, machine learning, and biomedical venues, and categorized these works according to different threat models specific to the medical settings.
- We pointed out possible directions and challenges for future research in the medical domains where AI has been increasingly deployed and shown promising results. To verify our hypothesis, we conducted five adversarial attacks in diverse under-explored medical domains as proof of concept to validate the reasoning of our insights.

2. Taxonomy of Threats in Medical AI

2.1. Adversary's Identity

We identify the adversary's potential identity in the healthcare domain and their respective motivations for attacking medical AI systems. However, it should be noted that in the real world, multiple adversaries can work together to achieve malicious intent. Their adversarial capability and knowledge may therefore be expanded compared to when the adversaries work on their own.

Patient. Patients in the healthcare setting generally would not have direct access to the medical systems that employ ML algorithms. However, except for images and data that come directly from hospital measurements, there are cases where data is provided by the patients themselves, especially with the rise of telemedicine. Malicious patients can be motivated to generate false-negative diagnostic results to avoid social stigma associated with certain medical conditions. They may also be motivated to generate false-positive results to receive higher priority on surgery wait lists.

Medical Practitioner. Medical practitioners include clinicians, nurses, or any other person working at or near the point of care. Medical practitioners usually have only black-box access to the medical AI systems. Since their main task is to obtain prediction results from the models, compared to the patients, they have the added capabilities of query access and sometimes access to model explanations. Malicious medical practitioners can be motivated to manipulate model outputs to incur additional expenses for unnecessary treatments. They may also conduct healthcare insurance fraud, such as phantom billing, which bills services or supplies that the patients never actually received.

ML Service Provider. Healthcare organizations may opt for cloud-based ML service instead of on-site deployment to minimize investments in hardware and related IT infrastructures [14]. In such cases, an adversarial ML service provider has capabilities that range from training data control to accessing output explanations. Within the healthcare domain, service providers are typically considered honest-but-curious [15], [16], implying that while model integrity is presumed intact, confidentiality may be at risk.

Third-party Healthcare Organization. The profit and service of organizations such as healthcare insurance companies may depend directly on the outcome of medical AI predictions. Therefore, these organizations may have the highest monetary incentives to manipulate medical AI. However, they typically have limited capability, knowledge, and access to the models, and are more likely to work with other adversaries to achieve attacks.

Cybercriminal & Business Competitor. Business competitors may wish to diminish the performance of ML models to discredit other similar services. Except for direct model control, they have almost all of the adversarial capabilities. Since they work in similar domains, they may leverage domain expertise to perform gray-box attacks. Cybercriminals, on the other hand, typically attack the availability of medical ML services. By hampering diagnostic systems or completely shutting them down, they can demand ransoms to unlock the service. They may also compromise the privacy of patient data and make profits from it.

2.2. Adversary's Knowledge

White-box Attacks. In white-box attacks, it is assumed that the adversary has a complete understanding of the ML system. This includes access to the training data, model architecture, model weights, and the model's hyperparameters. Hospitals using ML services from a third-party organization are at risk of such attacks from their service providers.

Black-box Attacks. Black-box attacks assume that the adversary has minimal knowledge about the ML system. The adversary may have query access to the model; however, they lack insight into the model's training process and its architecture or parameters. Typically, a malicious patient or clinician has only black-box access to medical ML systems.

Gray-box Attacks. Gray-box attacks encompass a range of techniques that represent a middle ground in adversarial knowledge between black-box and white-box attacks. For example, an adversary may be aware of the model's architecture but not its parameters. Alternatively, the adversary may not know the specific training data but may have access to data identically distributed to the training data, as seen in membership inference attacks.

2.3. Adversary's Capabilities

Training Data Control. Adversaries may gain partial control over the training data, enabling them to insert or modify training samples. This is a foundational strategy in data poisoning attacks.

Model Control. Adversaries may take control of the model parameters through various means, such as embedding a Trojan trigger within the model parameters or executing malicious updates in federated learning scenarios.

Testing Data Control. At the model deployment stage, attackers can introduce perturbations to testing samples. This




Figure 1. Adversarial knowledge, capability, and goals based on adversary’s identity in the medical setting.

is required for adversarial evasion attacks and backdoor poisoning attacks.

Query Access. Adversaries can submit queries to the model to obtain predictions, which can include both labels and confidence scores. This capability is required in executing black-box evasion attacks, energy latency attacks, and various privacy attacks.

Label Limit. The constraint on label manipulation is particularly pertinent in the context of clean-label poisoning attacks and clean-label backdoor attacks. In these scenarios, adversaries are unable to assign labels to the poisoned samples, whereas regular poisoning attacks assume label control over poisoned samples.

Explanation Access. This capability is especially related to medical systems that employ explainable ML. Adversaries who obtain access to the explanations generated by these tools can exploit this information not only to undermine the integrity of the explanations themselves but also to enhance the effectiveness of other attacks.

2.4. Analysis of Adversarial Goals

In this section, we analyze each attack in healthcare scenarios by contextualizing them with the adversary’s identity. Figure 1 shows the adversarial capability and knowledge based on the adversary’s identity in the medical setting.

Integrity Attacks. In the medical context, patients, medical practitioners, cybercriminals, and business competitors may have motivations to engage in adversarial evasion attacks [17], [18]. As they typically lack white-box knowl-

edge, adversarial attacks in medical settings are generally executed in black-box or gray-box scenarios. Black-box attacks can be further classified based on the nature of the obtained information: score-based attacks (where the adversary has access to either full or top-K confidence scores) and decision-based attacks (where only the label is accessible). Gray-box attacks represent an intermediary scenario, assuming that the adversary has access to auxiliary information, such as auxiliary datasets and models [19].

Poisoning attacks include targeted poisoning, backdoor poisoning, clean-label backdoor and poisoning, and model poisoning. Model poisoning, where malicious functionality is embedded directly into the model, is typically executed by ML service providers. These providers may use such attacks to facilitate privacy breaches, such as membership inference. The other three poisoning schemes assume the adversary has control over a portion of the training data, achievable by cybercriminals and business competitors to maliciously impact service operations. In such scenarios, the adversary has gray-box or black-box knowledge.

Confidentiality Attacks. Confidentiality attacks can occur within white-box, black-box, or gray-box settings. Typically, the adversary’s knowledge consists of aspects such as the training algorithm, model architecture, model parameters, training data, training data distribution, and the number of training samples. A prevalent assumption in privacy inference attacks is that the adversary is familiar with the architecture of the target model and possesses an auxiliary dataset derived from a distribution identical to that of the target model’s training dataset. Within this threat model,

both the ML service provider (with white-box knowledge) and cybercriminals or business competitors (with gray-box knowledge) can perform privacy inference attacks, compromising sensitive information associated with the target model (*i.e.*, model privacy attacks [20]) and its training data (*i.e.*, data privacy attacks [21], most commonly data related to a patient’s personal health information).

Availability Attacks. The primary category of availability attacks employs poisoning strategies to *indiscriminately compromise the performance of entire machine learning models*. This includes data poisoning, clean-label poisoning, and model poisoning techniques. These attacks assume the adversary has control over the training data and are predominantly executed by cybercriminals and business competitors aiming to disrupt services. Consequently, these attacks are typically operated with gray-box or black-box knowledge. A notable technique in gray-box settings involves the concept of transferability, where an adversary uses an auxiliary model to generate poisoning samples that are then applied to the target model, aiming to degrade its overall performance [22], [23]. Conversely, clean-label poisoning operates within a more realistic threat model that prevents adversaries from altering training example labels. Unlike other poisoning attacks, model poisoning assumes control over the model, a scenario generally not feasible for cybercriminals and business competitors. The second category of availability attacks is *energy-latency attacks* [24], which require either white-box or black-box access to the target model. Cybercriminals or business competitors can conduct such attacks to induce excessive energy consumption and/or increase inference latency on medical ML models, thereby disrupting their normal operation and availability.

Fairness Attacks. Fairness attacks generally adopt the framework of data or model poisoning attacks, aiming to undermine the system’s fairness. These attacks leverage data poisoning [25] or model poisoning [26] techniques and demand similar capabilities. Cybercriminals or business competitors may introduce bias or unfairness into the model through poisoned data to make the model produce discriminatory or unfair predictions, damaging the trust and reputation of the healthcare institution or service provider.

Explainability Attacks. Explainability attacks require access to the system’s explanations. The level of access varies from white-box approaches, where the adversary fully understands the system’s inner workings and parameters, to black-box methods, where the adversary’s knowledge is limited to the system’s explanation outputs. A line of research [27], [28] has demonstrated that existing methods for explainability are vulnerable to adversarial examples. Notably, explainability attacks often coincide with other attacks and require similar knowledge and capabilities to the corresponding attacks. For instance, medical practitioners may use explanations to generate more imperceptible adversarial examples, while cybercriminals may leverage them to enhance the effectiveness of backdoor attacks.

Guidelines for Under-explored Attacks. Under-explored attacks in medical settings can serve as potential future

research directions. Our goal is to develop a general guideline that identifies areas where future research is feasible. We categorized attack feasibility across two dimensions: the technical barrier and the threat model. The technical barrier determines whether an attack can succeed in a specific scenario, while the threat model determines the effectiveness of the attacks. Due to notable differences in data and models, we analyze each medical sub-domain separately.

To determine whether an attack can succeed in under-explored scenarios, we drew on existing research in analogous domains where data and models exhibit similar characteristics (Table 1). For instance, if an attack has been done in medical image classification tasks, it is likely to succeed in medical image detection tasks due to the task/modality similarities. Furthermore, if we can not find instances of certain attacks in a similar domain but a stronger attack within the same domain is present, it also suggests the feasibility of the attack. For example, suppose related work demonstrates the success of data reconstruction or model inversion attacks. In that case, we can confidently predict that membership inference attacks will achieve a similar level of success, even if we cannot find related literature on membership inference in the domain. Conversely, if we cannot find an attack that works with a similar data modality or model, such an attack may not be feasible. However, this is merely a hypothesis that should be validated through experiments. If an attack is deemed feasible, our next step is to determine its potential effectiveness under a specific threat model, as an attack with limited success may be of little significance. To this end, we selected 5 under-explored domains in §8 and conducted experiments to evaluate attack effectiveness. For our selected adversarial identity, we examined the adversarial knowledge and capabilities required for the attack. If the adversarial role possesses the necessary knowledge and capabilities, the attack is likely to be effective. In the following sections, we delve more deeply into each medical sub-domain to examine existing attacks related to medical AI.

3. Medical Diagnostics Systems

3.1. Medical Image Classification

Machine learning in medical imaging tasks involves examining image modalities such as X-rays, CT, MRI, and ultrasound to help diagnose, monitor, or treat various medical conditions [29]. In the medical imaging setting, classification involves separating medical images into various categories based on the image type or the presence of different conditions for a specific disease. Many ML models have been developed for medical image classification [30], [31]. Morabito et al. [32] developed convolutional neural networks (CNN) to classify patients’ electroencephalography (EEG) patterns of Alzheimer’s disease and achieved 80% classification accuracy. In the cancer domain, Nazeri et al. [31] proposed a two-stage CNN to classify breast cancer microscopy images into four categories and the model yielded an accuracy of 95%. When examining blood-related diseases such as leukemia, Kassani et al. [33] suggested a

deep learning-based hybrid method to distinguish healthy cells from immature leukemic blasts.

Existing Attacks. Many prior works have explored adversarial examples targeting medical image classification systems [34]–[42]. For instance, Ma et al. [34] demonstrated 4 different untargeted white-box classification evasion attacks on 5 distinct medical datasets, and Finlayson et al. [41] implemented both black-box and white-box attacks while systematizing the challenges in securing medical systems against adversarial attacks. Data poisoning [43]–[46] and backdoor attacks [47]–[50] in medical image classification are also explored. Nwadike et al. [47] attacked multi-label disease classification system using chest radiography, assuming attackers have training data control. They also showed that ML explainability can be leveraged to identify such backdoor attacks during testing time. In AI confidentiality, Gupta et al. [51] used models trained to predict brain age from MRIs to demonstrate membership inference attacks with both centralized and federated training schemes. Furthermore, Jin et al. [50] attacked MedCLIP, a contrastive learning-based medical foundation model designed using unpaired image-text training. They showed that backdoor adversaries in this context can diminish model performance with both targeted and untargeted attacks.

3.2. Medical Imaging Detection

Moreover, while detection may include image-level or region-level classification, it also involves establishing spatial localization of regions of interest in medical images [98], [99]. Winkels and Cohen [100] proposed CNN with group convolutions to detect pulmonary nodules in CT scans and their approach outperformed other strong baseline models in several metrics including accuracy, sensitivity, and convergence speed. Similarly, Lee et al. [101] used deep convolutional networks, attention maps, and iterative processes to detect acute intracranial hemorrhage from CT image inputs. Meanwhile, Maicas et al. [102] used a deep Q-learning reinforcement learning-based network to detect breast cancer lesions from dynamic contrast-enhanced MRIs.

Existing Attacks. Mangaokar et al. [54] proposed Jekyll, which was able to transfer chest X-ray or retinal images into one that can be misdiagnosed to have an attacker-chosen disease. Sun et al. [55] proposed data poisoning attack against federated learning models and demonstrated their attack feasibility using the Endoscopic Image Abnormality Detection (EndAD) dataset. Finally, Matsuo et al. [56] and Feng et al. [48] demonstrated backdoor attacks against COVID-19 detection and across a wide application domain of medical image diagnostic systems, respectively. Despite having several works that target integrity, we have not found any work that attacked the confidentiality of medical image detection systems. However, we conjecture that these are very likely to occur given the existence of confidentiality attacks in other applications of medical image diagnostics.

3.3. Medical Imaging Segmentation

In addition, medical imaging in segmentation tasks focuses on classification at a pixel or voxel level for a given image type [103], [104]. Hu et al. [105] suggested an approach to generate synthetic tumors in CT scans and demonstrated that machine learning models could accurately segment the tumors using the annotation-free synthetic tumors. For ultrasound images, Nithya et al. [106] developed an approach to detect and segment kidney stones using artificial neural networks and multi-kernel k-means clustering, achieving an accuracy of 99.61%. Focusing on abdominal anatomy, Gibson et al. [107] used dense CNN to segment abdominal organs from CT scans without the need for registration.

Existing Attacks. Unlike adversarial examples in classification tasks that target a single class, adversarial target in medical image segmentation is a mask. Therefore, the generation process involves optimizing for many individual pixels [57]. Feng et al. [48] have considered the adversarial robustness of medical image segmentation against backdoor attacks. Their attack was performed on KiTS-19, which is a tumor segmentation dataset of kidney organ and tumor CT images. Chobola et al. [59] bridged the gap in existing studies on membership inference attacks against semantic image segmentation. Meanwhile, Subbanna et al. [60] analyzed the susceptibility of U-Net and SegNet against model inversion attacks on 3D brain MRI scans. Finally, Lin et al. [61] proposed unlearnable medical image generation (UMed). Their goal is to inject contour- and texture-aware perturbations into medical image segmentation datasets to prevent unauthorized training, effectively using AI availability attacks as a means of privacy defense.

3.4. Electrogram Diagnostics

An electrogram is a recording and visualization of the electrical activity within the body. ML methods are most commonly involved in diagnosing arrhythmias [108], [109] with electrocardiograms (ECG) or schizophrenia with electroencephalograms (EEG) [110]. Notably, Kiranyaz et al. [111] was the first to use deep neural network over 1D signals, particularly for ECG classification tasks. Other applications include the use of electromyograms (EMG) for neuromuscular disorder diagnostics [112] and electrooculograms (EOG) for sleep stage classification tasks [113].

Existing Attacks. Prior work mostly focused on adversarial attacks with ECG data [72], [73], [75]–[78]. For instance, Chen et al. [75] added imperceptible perturbations to patient’s ECG such that the arrhythmia classification system outputs incorrect diagnostics. Similarly, Aminifar et al. [74] focused on the epileptic seizure detection application, applying adversarial perturbations to EEG data to misclassify seizure samples as non-seizure. Ismail et al. [77] applied both targeted and untargeted data poisoning attacks against SplitFed Learning (SFL) models, which is a combination of split learning and federated learning. Their attack on

TABLE 1. SYSTEMATIZATION OF EXISTING INTEGRITY, CONFIDENTIALITY, AND AVAILABILITY ATTACKS IN THE MEDICAL SETTING.

| | | Integrity | | | Confidentiality | | | Availability |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | Evasion | Poison | Backdoor | Membership Inference | Model Inversion | Data Reconstruction | |
| Medical Diagnostics | Image Diagnostic | Classification Detection Segmentation | □ [34] ■ [35]–[40] □ □ [41], [42] | ■ [43] ■ [44], [45] ■ [46] | ■ ■ [47]–[49] □ ■ ■ [50] | □ ■ ■ [51] | ■ [52] | ○ □ ■ ■ [53] □ ■ ■ [50] |
| | EHR Diagnostic | | ■ [62] □ ■ ■ [63] | ○ | ■ [64] | ■ [65] | ○ □ ■ [52] | ○ |
| | Multi-omics Diagnostic | | ■ [66], [67] □ ■ ■ [68] | ○ | □ ■ [69] | □ [70] □ ■ [71] | ○ ○ | ○ |
| | Electrogram Diagnostics | | □ [72], [73] ■ [74] ■ ■ [75], [76] | □ ■ [77] | ○ | ○ | ○ □ ■ [78] | □ ■ [77] |
| | Clinical Decision Support | Clinical Summary & Question Answering Automated Clinical Coding | ■ ■ [79] □ ■ ■ [80], [81] | ■ ■ [82] | □ ■ [82] | ■ ■ [83] □ ■ ■ [84] | ■ ■ [85] | ■ ■ [86] ○ |
| | Therapeutics | Surgical Treatment Therapeutic Effect Prediction | ? | ? | ? | ● ○ | ● ■ ■ [91] | ● ? |
| Population Health | Drug Development Research | | ● | ○ | ? | ? | ? | ■ [92] |
| Patient Health Monitoring | Epidemiology Disease Risk Prediction Monitoring & Intervention | | □ ■ [93] ■ ■ [94], [95] □ ■ ■ ■ [96] | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? |

□ white-box knowledge, ■ gray-box knowledge, ■ black-box knowledge, ■ training data control, ■ testing data control, ■ model control, ■ query access, ■ explanation access, ○ attack feasible but not done in prior work, ● attack possible but not done in prior work, ● attack with impractical or unrealistic threat model, ? not enough information to conclude

ECG classification tasks showed a significant performance impact on classification accuracy. Abuadbba et al. [78] explored whether split learning retains its privacy-preserving capability on 1D CNN models for ECG classification. They concluded that such adaptation would result in a high probability of privacy leakage and even the reconstruction of raw time-series/sequential data.

3.5. Multi-omics Diagnostics

Multi-omics diagnostics focuses on analyzing data from a wide variety of omics sources, including genetics and metabolomics. ML can be applied to multi-omics data analysis in a diagnostic setting to improve the detection and classification of various diseases [114]. When considering early cancer detection, multi-omics data can include information about mutations, gene expression, and copy number variation. Schulte-Sasse et al. [115] utilized graph convolutional networks to identify new cancer genes from multi-omics pan-cancer data. Meanwhile, multi-omics approaches can also be used to more accurately classify chronic kidney disease to promote optimal treatment plans. Eddy et al. [116] used various ML approaches on molecular data composed of kidney biopsy, blood, and urine samples to classify patients into molecularly defined subgroups that better reflect information about the underlying mechanisms associated with chronic kidney disease.

Existing Attacks. Recent work has explored the vulnerability of genomics-related diagnostic pipelines against evasion attacks [66], [67]. Ghaffari et al. [68] also evaluated the

susceptibility of CNN models in computational pathology, and proved that vision transformers (ViTs) are inherently more robust against input perturbations. On the other hand, Sarkar et al. [69] repurposed backdoor attack to detect bias in genomic datasets. Their threat model involves a benevolent cloud collaborator, whose goal is to identify bias information in the dataset without hampering the performance of the predictive model. To defend against membership inference attacks, Chen et al. [70] evaluated the effectiveness of differential privacy in the context of yeast genomic data processing. Hagedstedt et al. [71] and Backes et al. [16] took it further into the healthcare domain, looking at inference attacks on DNA methylation data and later human genomics. Notably, the rise of genomic beacons has also shown vulnerability against membership inference, and even genome reconstruction attacks [117].

3.6. EHR Diagnostics

Electronic health records (EHRs) store patient medical records in a digital format and contain a variety of data modalities for the efficient search and retrieval of patient information. Traditional computer-aided medical expert systems often assist in diagnosis by employing feature-level fusion or rule-based reasoning. System performance can be significantly affected by decision rules that are subjectively determined by experts in the field and cannot be dynamically updated. Especially for multi-source, unstructured multimodal healthcare data, traditional methods fall short of offering integration, reasoning, and interactive decision support.

Meanwhile, multimodal AI frameworks employ a multi-network link or network reconstruction based on a deep neural network with feature coupling [118]–[121], extracting more high-level features from the bottom-up representation of the original data. This helps achieve intellectual auxiliary diagnosis decision-making in complex in-hospital scenes. Often, entity mining is used to realize semantic perception and correlation mining of distinct medical data to support multimodal data fusion, including multimodal entity semantic perception [122], entity semantic alignment [123], and entity association mining [124].

Existing Attacks. Prior work has shown that EHR diagnostic systems can be susceptible to adversarial attacks [62], [63]. For instance, Sun et al. [62] attacked LSTM models that take EHR as input, leveraging the attack to identify susceptible fields in a patient’s EHR. Joe et al. [64] successfully injected a backdoor into ML models that decide whether a patient should be admitted to the Intensive Care Unit (ICU). They pointed out that the backdoor triggers needed to reflect the heterogeneity and multimodality of EHR to be imperceptible. Zhang et al. [65] performed membership inference attack against synthetic EHR data, which was branded as a promising solution to protect patient privacy and promote health data sharing at the same time. They showed that partially synthetic EHRs are still susceptible to privacy leakage, while fully synthetic ones could be deemed sufficient to defend against membership inference.

Research Implications. The introduction of ML models in diagnostic systems may be beneficial to patients and physicians, but it also introduces new attack vectors to infrastructure that is already difficult to secure. Furthermore, initiatives for high-quality reporting of medical ML models (e.g. TRIPOD or CONSORT-AI) do not require any kind of model security analysis [125], [126].

4. Clinical Decision Support

4.1. Clinical Summary & Question Answering

Language learning model can help manage biomedical text data for named-entity recognition [127], sentence similarity [128], and relation extraction [129] tasks due to its ability to quickly absorb, summarize, and rephrase information. It is especially suitable for routine tasks such as creating discharge summaries, which require interpreting and shortening of information but with minimal need for problem-solving skills [130]. The emergence of multimodal models also expands the applicability to a wider range of data types, such as deciphering doctors’ handwriting accurately or classifying pathology reports based on cancer types [81]. Yet, as clinical document texts are usually long, ungrammatical, fragmented, and marred with typos, rigorous validation is essential to guarantee patient safety [131].

Existing Attacks. Prior work has considered edit adversaries in clinical settings, where existing semantic and syntactic adversarial attacks on text data show vulnerability

in state-of-the-art text-based medical AI, with the attacker having both black-box and white-box knowledge [79]–[81]. For data poisoning and backdoor attacks, Das et al. [82] performed both black-box and white-box clean-label attacks in the breast cancer clinical domain. There are also existing attacks targeting the confidentiality aspect of medical language models. Jagannatha et al. [84] and Mireshghallah et al. [83] both showed that pretrained medical models such as ClinicalBERT can be susceptible to membership inference attacks. Meanwhile, Nakuma et al. demonstrated the feasibility of inverting these pre-trained models to extract name-disease pairs from clinical documents [85], and Lehman et al. [86] were able to reconstruct certain sensitive personal health information from them.

4.2. Automated Clinical Coding

Clinical coding is the task of transforming medical records, usually represented as free texts written by clinicians, into structured codes from a classification system like ICD-10. It is a non-trivial task for humans, usually including data abstraction or summarization [132]. More specifically, an expert clinical coder is expected to decipher the largest number of documents about a patient’s episode of care, and to select the most accurate codes from a large classification system according to the contexts of the various documents and the regularly updated coding guidelines [133]. While traditional rule-based approaches are available, these are time-consuming and require expert-defined rules and hand-crafted textual features [133]. On the other hand, ML-based approaches employ the encoder-decoder framework, leveraging entity-mining techniques to extract rich text features for automatic medical code assignment [134].

Existing Attacks. Raja et al. [87] leveraged imperceptible typo-based adversarial attack to downgrade the performance of clinical ICD-code prediction systems. The intuition is that clinical documents are often generated hastily and may contain more typos than regular documents. Sarkar et al. [88], on the other hand, explored the possibility of membership inference attack against ICD-coding classification. They demonstrated that simply de-identifying clinical notes for training may not be sufficient to guarantee patient privacy, yet it is possible to generate synthetic notes from the original data that maintains the performance of the classifier.

Research Implications. Clinical summaries often contain naturally occurring typos, misspellings, and abbreviations of medical terms [135], [136]. A model trained to summarize clinical reports would employ denoising strategies to maintain robustness. For the attackers, the impact of these denoising strategies on adversarial manipulations is a critical factor to be considered. From the defender’s perspective, since there exist clear definitions for ICD codes, it is crucial to ensure the explainability of automated clinical coding systems in code classification. However, offering explainability exposes additional attack surfaces, which must also be taken into account.

5. Therapeutics

5.1. Surgical Treatment

ML in the therapeutics domain involves aiding clinicians in treating patients and improving the overall experience and success of treatment plans. Zhou et al. [137] divides ML application in surgery into intraoperative guidance [138]–[142] and surgical robots [143]–[147]. ML tasks in intraoperative guidance provide enhanced visualization and localization for surgery. For instance, sparse principal component analysis and kernel partial least squares regression can be helpful for 3D shape instantiation [138], mitigating the time-consuming process for 3D volume construction from 2D medical images. Moreover, Sganga et al. [139] introduced a deep learning architecture that includes a generative adversarial network to localize a bronchoscope in the lung, reaching successful tracking thresholds even in less conserved regions. In terms of system modeling and control for surgical robots, Liu and Jiang [143] modeled the task as a sequential decision-making process using reinforcement learning.

Existing Attacks. There is currently no prior work that attacks ML algorithms used for intraoperative guidance or surgical robots. While it is possible to perform attacks on these applications, surgical treatment ML may not be easily accessible by attackers or researchers. Even if access to the programs is granted or assuming black-box attacks, attackers need to consider the real-world realizability of adversarial input, especially for surgical robots that take in real-time inputs. Profit may also be minimal compared to the attacker's cost of sabotaging the system.

5.2. Therapeutic Effect Prediction

For therapy and treatment planning, Zhang et al. [148] suggested a metaheuristic-oriented formulation and a simulated annealing algorithm. The strategy generates the optimal daily routing and scheduling solution that will suit the needs of both patients and caregivers in the healthcare system. For psychotherapy, Zhou and Kosorok [149] proposed a causal k-nearest neighbor method to help predict the best treatment regime. They simulated their system on patients with nonpsychotic chronic major depressive disorder to identify the patients that would benefit from undergoing Nefazodone therapy, cognitive behavioral psychotherapy, or a combination of the two plans. Meanwhile, Su et al. [150] developed random forests of iteration trees to help estimate individualized treatment effects and simulated the model with data collected from an acupuncture headache trial.

Existing Attacks. Mondal et al. [89] proposed BERT-based adversarial example generation using domain-specific synonym replacement for biomedical named entities. Meanwhile, Hai et al. [90] leveraged model explainability and query access to craft adversarial examples from drug review datasets. For attacks targeting confidentiality, Fredrikson et al. [91] conducted model inversion attack to infer patient's

genotype by repurposing pharmacogenetic model for warfarin dosing, assuming that the adversary has partial knowledge about the training dataset and the targeted individual.

Research Implications. In AI that is applied in real-time, such as surgical treatment, defenses need to be lightweight and should not affect the system's real-time responsiveness. Prognostic models may be rejected by physicians due to a lack of trust in outputs [151]; this has led to an increase in model explainability through methods like feature importance (SHAP scores) and textual explainability (captioning), which can grant attackers additional knowledge when attacking models [152].

6. Population Health

6.1. Drug Development Research

Target Identification & Drug Discovery. Machine learning methods have been utilized to assist drug development in target identification [153]–[156] and drug discovery [157]–[159]. For instance, to establish gene-disease causal associations and assess potential drug targets, Mountjoy et al. [153] proposed an open ML pipeline that performs fine mapping and gene prioritization for 133,441 different loci from genome-wide association studies (GWAS). Moreover, ML is increasingly used in drug discovery and screening. Olivecrona et al. [157] developed a sequence-based generative model that uses deep reinforcement learning to generate drug molecular structures that satisfy desirable properties. Their method yields almost optimal values given parameters such as bioactivity and pharmacokinetic properties.

Drug-drug Interactions and Complications. Drug-drug interaction (DDI) is described as a change in the effect of one drug due to the presence of another drug [160]. With the rapidly growing number of approved drugs, prescriptions with multiple drugs have been a common clinical practice. However, the occurrence of DDI can often lead to unexpected side effects. The availability of large amounts of drug-related information from biomedical texts, EHRs, and public databases provides fertile ground for literature-based extraction methods [161], [162]. These utilize NLP techniques to perform relation extraction tasks regarding DDI from unstructured data, identifying specific relations between the name-entity pair in the documents. Meanwhile, with the construction of publicly available databases, predictive models based on chemical and biological knowledge have great potential for DDI prediction. ML-based prediction [163]–[166] methods usually take DDI prediction as a link prediction task, detecting the presence or absence of interactions between drug pairs [167].

Existing Attacks. Predatory research [168] has become a problem for medical AI that explores drug discovery or extracts DDI information from published literature. Though the work of Saini et al. [92] did not involve training from the polluted data, they demonstrated that predatory science

can indeed affect the performance of state-of-the-art DDI systems. We further conjecture that it is very likely for poisoning attacks to target a specific drug or medical condition, which warrants future work. As data relevant to drug interaction are often public and seldom involve personal information, confidentiality is unlikely to be targeted.

6.2. Epidemiology

In addition to its use for individual patient care, medical AI has found applications in the management of health on a population-wide scale, especially in the areas of epidemiology and monitoring of infectious diseases [169]. For instance, AI used for pandemic early-warning can sift, filter, categorize, and compile web texts for indications of infectious disease occurrences with remarkable accuracy and speed [170]. An illustrative example of an early warning application is HealthMap [171], which employs NLP methods to scan web-posted text for real-time indications of infectious disease events, then compare the text with a lexicon of recognized pathogens and geographic regions. Furthermore, Bhatia et al. [172] sought to explore the utilization of data gathered from ProMED [173] and HealthMap for real-time outbreak analysis, using a versatile statistical model to measure spatial variability in the risk of an outbreak spreading and to predict short-term incidence patterns. These applications can also be integrated into medical IoT devices, such as the real-time identification of unusual physiological signals linked to the early onset of infection using smart-watches [174]. Upon recognizing an outbreak, subsequent course of action involves contact tracing and severing the transmission pathways. Sundermann et al. [175] leverage patient's EHR and extract data pertinent to an outbreak, merging whole-genome surveillance sequencing with ML as well as detecting in-hospital transmission routes through the molecular characterization of bacterial isolates.

Existing Attacks. Meiseles et al. [93] performed adversarial evasion attacks on an open-sourced viral lineage assignment model for SARS-CoV-2 lineage assignment. The attack perturbs the genomic sequences in the COVID-19 genome FASTA file, causing incorrect lineage assignment that hampers public health management. This is the only adversarial attack on epidemiological ML.

Research Implications. AI trained to address population health generally deals with extremely imbalanced data due to the localization of infected individuals or sampled populations [176], [177]. From the attack perspective, a few maliciously modified samples can disproportionately affect the model's behavior toward the underrepresented classes. Overfitting to the training examples can also potentially make inference attacks easier. From the perspective of defenses, addressing dataset imbalance and achieving fair models should be a priority to avoid attacks targeting underrepresented populations.

7. Patient Health Monitoring

7.1. Disease Risk Prediction

Systems using ML models to analyze personal lifestyles or environmental factors in non-hospital settings can provide a convenient and less invasive way for individuals to understand their health. Parab et al. [178] proposed an intelligent system that predicts diseases based on an individual's lifestyle to offer preventative measures. It can evaluate a person's health status and warn about potential lifestyle-related diseases. In essence, ML can predict disease susceptibility [179], survivability [180], occurrence [181], and reoccurrence [182], taking into account a person's genomic information, inheritance, lifestyle, and other relevant traits.

Susceptibility & Survivability. Substantial research efforts have been dedicated to predicting disease susceptibility, a vital component in improving prognosis and reducing mortality rates. For instance, Ming et al. [179] used ML models to estimate long-term breast cancer risk, surpassing the predictive accuracy of the widely used BOADICEA risk prediction model in clinical practice. Another useful factor in prognosis is disease survivability concerning fatal diseases. Dai et al. [180] suggested a recurrent deep survival machine to predict prostate cancer survivability, estimating survival probability and quantifying prediction uncertainty.

Occurrence & Recurrence. ML techniques have been implemented to predict the onset of diseases [183], [184], including pancreatic cancer, as demonstrated by Placido et al. [181], who trained and evaluated a deep learning algorithm for predicting pancreatic cancer incidence within varying time intervals. Moreover, disease recurrence is a significant consideration in healthcare, particularly in the context of cancer. Kucukkaya et al. [185] proposed the use of CNN to predict liver tumor recurrence in early-stage hepatocellular carcinoma patients, achieving testing area under the curve (AUC) values between 0.71 and 0.85.

Existing Attacks. For evasion attacks, Ye et al. proposed MedAttacker [94], showing that the accuracy of clinical risk prediction systems can be influenced by maliciously replacing certain codes in a patient's EHR. Karim et al. [95] also conducted an untargeted black-box attack against a cancer susceptibility system that uses multi-omics data for prediction. To the best of our knowledge, there is currently no prior work exploring attacks targeting risk prediction systems in the confidentiality and availability domain.

7.2. Monitoring & Intervention

Appropriate interventions need to be tailored to the level of patient engagement and readiness and support them not just in hospitalization. For greater overall engagement, interventions can inform or empower patients, which may contain symptom management, decision-making, and medication administration. For example, Mondol et al. [186] proposed a general-purpose medication reminder and tracking system on wrist devices that can be customized according to

TABLE 2. ATTACK PERFORMANCE WHEN APPLYING DIFFERENT MEMBERSHIP INFERENCE ATTACKS ON ECG-BASED CNN MODELS.

| Method | TPR at 0.1% FPR | Balanced Accuracy | AUC |
|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------|
| Yeom et al. [188] | 0.1% | 0.599 | 0.562 |
| Song et al. [189] | 0.1% | 0.599 | 0.563 |
| Salem et al. [190] | 0.2% | 0.545 | 0.559 |
| Shokri et al. [191] | 1.7% | 0.552 | 0.584 |

TABLE 3. ATTACK PERFORMANCE WHEN APPLYING SHOKRI ET AL. WITH DIFFERENT CONTROL RATIOS ON ECG-BASED CNN MODELS.

| Control Ratio | TPR at 0.1% FPR | Balanced Accuracy | AUC |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------|
| 0.01 | 0.2% | 0.535 | 0.539 |
| 0.05 | 2.0% | 0.546 | 0.576 |
| 0.1 | 1.7% | 0.552 | 0.584 |
| 0.3 | 4.7% | 0.558 | 0.600 |
| 0.5 | 6.2% | 0.582 | 0.621 |

the patient’s needs. At the same time, they combined clever interface design with text-to-speech and speech recognition features to improve user engagement.

Existing Attacks. Existing attacks primarily fall into the AI integrity domain, where Newaz et al. [96] conducted white-box and black-box evasion and poisoning attacks against ML-based smart healthcare systems, and Shahid et al. [97] explored white-box label flipping attacks against wearable human activity monitoring devices. Both work assumed that attackers have access to training data and can perform malicious manipulation to an extent. We have not found any work attacking the confidentiality and availability of ML-based monitoring and intervention systems.

Research Implications. AI in patient health monitoring generally deals with time series data and may also need to respond according to patient conditions in real time [187]. When considering potential attacks and defenses, it’s important to account for the temporal dependencies of the data. The transferability of attacks is also crucial to consider, as creating attack samples in advance can be difficult. For AI models involved in critical life monitoring and intervention, merely detecting malicious behavior is not enough. It’s necessary to have strategies in place for prompt system recovery from attacks to ensure patient safety.

8. Under-Explored Attacks in Medical AI

To validate the applicability of our guidelines for under-explored attacks, we conducted three case studies, as detailed in this section. Five adversarial attacks in diverse under-explored medical domains were devised and executed. Specifically, we explored membership inference attacks in ECG diagnostics (§ 8.1), targeted backdoor attacks in ECG diagnostics and disease risk prediction systems (§ 8.2), and untargeted poisoning attacks in image segmentations and EHR diagnostics models(§ 8.3). These attacks are designed to test the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of the models, respectively, offering insights into the practical implications of our proposed guidelines.




Figure 2. Performance of membership inference against ECG-based CNN models with different methods and ratios.

8.1. Membership Inference Attacks

Conjecture. In this section, we investigate the feasibility of conducting Membership Inference Attacks (MIAs) on ECG diagnostics models. MIAs typically assume that the adversary has access to an auxiliary dataset originating from the same distribution as the training dataset of the target model and is aware of the target model’s architecture [189], [190], [192]–[194]. In the context of ECG diagnostics, where typical adversaries are cybercriminals, we conjecture that MIAs may not achieve high success rates due to the extensive adversarial knowledge these attacks require.

Threat Model. Since the adversary does not have access to an auxiliary dataset and knows the target model, we assume an alternative threat model where an adversary has access to a portion of the training data for the target model, which could be achieved through data poisoning within the target model’s training dataset [195]. Apart from this capability, the adversary only has access to the output of the target model without knowledge of its parameters or architectures.

Attack Method. We select four representative membership inference works to apply in our setting: Shokri et al. [191], Salem et al. [190], Yeom et al. [188], and Song et al. [189]. The adversary holds a portion of members from the target model (e.g., injected through data poisoning) and non-members. This combined dataset is then used to train the attack model. Attack efficacy is assessed using the remaining member and non-member data of the target model.

Datasets and Models. We selected the widely used 2017 PhysioNet/CinC Challenge dataset [109]. The goal of the challenge was to classify single-lead ECG recordings into four types: normal sinus rhythm (Normal), atrial fibrillation (AF), alternative rhythm (Other rhythm), or noise (Noisy). The dataset contains single-lead ECG recordings collected using the AliveCor device, sampled at 300 Hz. In total, there are 8,528 recordings, with durations ranging from 9 seconds to over 60 seconds. We used a 13-layer CNN that won the 2017 PhysioNet/CinC Challenge [196] as our target model. This model has achieved a training accuracy of 98.57% and a validation accuracy of 85.08% on the target dataset.

Experimental Setup. We split the dataset into two equal subsets: $\mathcal{D}_{\text{target}}^{\text{train}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{target}}^{\text{test}}$. The $\mathcal{D}_{\text{target}}^{\text{train}}$ subset is used to train the target model \mathcal{M} , and its samples are considered members of \mathcal{M} , whereas samples in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{target}}^{\text{test}}$ are treated as




Figure 3. Backdoor attack performance against ECG-based CNN with different trigger lengths and poisoning ratios.




Figure 4. Examples of normal and backdoored signal.

non-members. We further split out a certain ratio of the target member samples as the known member samples by the adversary. Similarly, we split out the same ratio of the target non-member samples to create a balanced dataset. We use these datasets to train the attack model following different attack strategies and conduct the evaluation on the remaining datasets. In alignment with state-of-the-art studies [21], [197], we employ the following metrics: (1) Full Log-scale Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) Curve, a widely utilized ROC curve reported on a logarithmic scale to highlight low false positive rates; (2) True Positive Rate (TPR) at Low False Positive Rate (FPR), which measures attack performance at a specific FPR (*e.g.*, 0.1%), (3) Balanced Accuracy and Area Under the ROC Curve (AUC).

Empirical Results. We fix the control ratio of target member samples at 0.1, the results of different attack strategies are given in Figure 2(a) and Table 2. The results demonstrate that different methods exhibit varying performance. Shokri et al. achieve the best performance, with a significantly higher TPR at 0.1% FPR compared to other methods. However, this performance may still be unsatisfactory, considering that state-of-the-art methods have achieved much higher performance on non-medical datasets [197]. Next, we examine the impact of the control ratio of target member samples on the attack performance, which reflects the extent of access to a portion of the target model’s training data. This ratio directly measures the strength of the attack. Selecting Shokri et al. as the attack strategy, we vary the control ratio and present the results in Figure 2(b) and Table 3. The results indicate that when the adversary controls a substantial number of training samples, the inference performance is satisfactory. However, as the attacker’s control over training data decreases, the performance declines, eventually approaching random guessing when the ratio is low (*e.g.*, 0.01). It is important to note that in practical medical scenarios, it is challenging for an adversary to control a large

number of training samples. This implies that current MIAs may not pose severe privacy risks to medical AI systems.

8.2. Backdoor Attacks

Conjecture. We assume the adversary to be either a business competitor or a cybercriminal, who has control over the training and testing data. Regarding attack effectiveness, backdoor attacks have been studied in time series data [198], which possess similar properties to ECG signals. Based on this similarity, we reasonably assume that backdoor attacks will also achieve decent performance on electrogram diagnostics. Conversely, conducting attacks on EHRs (*i.e.*, the primary data source for disease prediction) may be more challenging due to their heterogeneous nature.


Threat Model. We follow the common setting in backdoor attacks [56], [64], where the adversary could poison a subset of training data by adding a particular trigger pattern. After the model deployment, the adversary could add the trigger to test an example to induce intended behaviors. We assume the adversary does not know the target training data distribution, the architecture, or the weight of the target model.

8.2.1. ECG Diagnostics. In this section, we describe our attack methods, experimental settings, and empirical results of backdoor attacks on ECG diagnostics models.


Attack Method. To pioneer the study of backdoor attacks on ECG data, we propose a straightforward baseline method. We design the trigger as a cosine waveform time series with a fixed amplitude and length. During the experiment, we fixed the amplitude to 25 and investigated the impact of the trigger’s length on the performance.

Experimental Setup. In this experiment, we use the same datasets and models as in § 8.1. We consider a targeted backdoor attack scenario, where we select the target label as atrial fibrillation (AF). Transforming other labels into AF labels could potentially cause false alarms. To assess the impact of the attack, we vary two parameters: the fraction of poisoned data in the training set (ranging from 0.01 to 0.5) and the trigger length (2% and 5% of the ECG recording length). We repeat the trial 5 times with the random generation of triggers and random subset selection and evaluate the accuracy of the benign and poisoned data.

Empirical Results. Figure 3 demonstrates that ECG-based CNN models are highly vulnerable to our proposed backdoor attacks. With a trigger length that is only 2% of the recording length and a poisoning ratio of 0.05, we can achieve a backdoor accuracy of 97.67% without significantly affecting the benign accuracy. In the normal setting, the accuracy is 85.08%, while the benign accuracy in this scenario is 83.05%, indicating only a 2% accuracy drop. Furthermore, the backdoor performance improves with increasing poisoning ratio and trigger length. When the trigger length ratio is 2% and the poisoning ratio is 0.01, the backdoor accuracy is 0%. However, when the poisoning ratio is 0.1 and the length ratio is 5%, the backdoor accuracy reaches nearly 100%.



(a) Random Forest



(b) Logistic Regression

Figure 5. Backdoor attack performance against mortality prediction models.


Figure 4 shows a backdoored signal that closely resembles a normal signal, demonstrating the stealthiness of the attack.

8.2.2. Disease Risk Prediction. We present our attack methods and results on disease risk prediction models.


Datasets and Models. We utilize the widely used Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care III (MIMIC-III) dataset [199], which contains data associated with 53,423 distinct hospital admissions for adult patients (aged 16 years or above) admitted to critical care units between 2001 and 2012. The dataset covers 38,597 distinct adult patients and 49,785 hospital admissions, providing rich information about patients’ demographic characteristics, various in-hospital measurements, and laboratory test results over time. We specifically focus on the task of mortality prediction [200], which aims to predict whether a patient admitted to the Intensive Care Unit (ICU) will survive or perish using the first 48 hours of EHRs. This task is crucial for hospitals to triage patients based on predicted mortality, enabling efficient resource management. We follow Harutyunyan et al. [200] to select 17 features from the MIMIC-III dataset and train the Random Forest and Logistic Regression.

Attack Method. Unlike the image domain, the variables in EHRs are heterogeneous, containing both continuous and categorical variables, which require different handling. Relying on existing approaches in image domain attacks, such as Gaussian white noise, is impractical because such backdoored data could be easily detected due to unrealistic patterns. For example, a patient’s sex and height should not change over time during the ICU stay, while blood pressure can vary. Therefore, applying large perturbations to sex or heights would be easily detected. To address this, we design our trigger as additive Gaussian perturbations applied only to those changeable numerical results.

Experimental Setup and Results. We randomly generate a backdoor trigger matrix with a mean of 0.1, applying it only to the selected numerical features. We repeat each trial 5 times with different poisoning ratios and report the average benign accuracy and backdoor accuracy. As shown in Figure 5, the backdoor accuracy increases with a higher poisoning ratio. Notably, our attacks maintain high backdoor accuracy even at low poisoning ratios; for example, for Logistic Regression, we achieve 94.05% backdoor accuracy with a poisoning ratio of 0.01. Additionally, our attacks have a minimal impact on benign accuracy.



(a) Flip Label



(b) Flip Label & Add Noise

Figure 6. Untargeted poisoning attack against liver segmentation models.

8.3. Availability Attacks

Conjecture. Untargeted poisoning attacks typically operate under gray-box settings, where the adversary uses an auxiliary model that performs similarly to the target model to generate poisoning samples. These samples are subsequently applied to the target model. In this study, we identify the adversary as a cybercriminal who lacks access to such an auxiliary model. We hypothesize that this type of attack may not be feasible in image segmentation and EHR diagnostics.

Threat Model. We consider a black-box poisoning attack scenario, wherein the adversary blindly injects poisoned samples into the training dataset of the target model. However, the adversary operates with limited knowledge and does not have access to the original training data, the model’s architecture, or its learned weights. Our focus is on untargeted poisoning attacks, where the adversary’s primary objective is to degrade the overall accuracy of the target model. The success of such attacks can severely undermine the model’s normal functionality and its ability to make accurate predictions on data.

8.3.1. Segmentation. In this section, we describe our attack methods and results on image segmentation models.

Datasets and Models. We use the Liver Tumor Segmentation (LiTS) Challenge dataset [201] from MICCAI 2017. The training dataset contains 130 CT scans, and the test dataset contains 70 CT scans of patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. The liver and tumor lesions are labeled by experts. We disregard the lesion segmentation labels and treat the dataset as a binary liver segmentation problem. We use the 3D U-Net [202] model as our target model.

Attack Method. We employ a common data poisoning technique, specifically label and data manipulation [203], as our attack strategy. Our goal is to establish a naive baseline for this new line of study. We adopt two strategies. The first strategy follows [204] and involves random label flipping, where the adversary randomly selects a certain number of samples from the training data and flips their labels. The second strategy combines label flipping with data manipulation by further adding Gaussian noise to the data.

Experimental Setup. In our experiment, we randomly manipulate a certain ratio (ranging from 0 to 0.5) of the training data. We then train the model on the poisoned data combined with the benign data and evaluate their performance

TABLE 4. UNTARGETED POISONING ATTACK PERFORMANCE WITH DIFFERENT POISONING RATIOS ON FOUR ML MODELS.

| Poisoning Ratio | SVM | Logistic Regression | Decision Tree | MLP |
|-----------------|-------|---------------------|---------------|-------|
| 0.5 | 0.115 | 0.191 | 0.482 | 0.423 |
| 0.3 | 0.872 | 0.837 | 0.628 | 0.809 |
| 0.1 | 0.885 | 0.884 | 0.776 | 0.875 |
| 0.05 | 0.885 | 0.885 | 0.823 | 0.890 |
| 0.01 | 0.885 | 0.885 | 0.857 | 0.896 |
| 0 | 0.885 | 0.885 | 0.865 | 0.898 |

using the Dice score, which measures the degree of overlap between the predicted and reference segmentation masks on the test data. We repeat each trial 5 times with random subset selection to ensure the reliability of results.

Empirical Results. The experimental results are presented in Figure 6. We observe that segmentation models demonstrate robustness to such untargeted poisoning attacks. For instance, at a poisoning ratio of 0.3, the Dice score is 0.86, representing only a 0.05 drop from the Dice of the unpoisoned models. Additionally, we find that combining the two attack strategies has a more severe impact on performance compared to label flipping alone.

8.3.2. EHR Diagnostics. In this section, we describe our attack methods, experimental settings, and empirical results of untargeted poisoning attacks on EHR diagnostics models.

Datasets and Models. We use the same set of features from MIMIC-III dataset [199] and train the SVM, Logistic Regression, Decision Tree, and MLP following [200].

Experimental Setup and Results. We employ the random label flipping [204] as the attack strategy. We randomly flip the labels of a certain ratio (ranging from 0.01 to 0.5) of the training data. We then train the four models on the poisoned data, together with the benign data, and evaluate the accuracy of the models on the test data. To ensure the reliability of our results, we repeat the trial 5 times with random subset selection. Results in Table 4 show that most models are quite robust against this attack. For instance, with a poisoning ratio of 0.1, the accuracy of decision trees drops by nearly 10%, while the other three models are almost unaffected. As the poisoning ratio increases, all models exhibit a notable decline in accuracy. Specifically, when the poisoning ratio reaches 0.5, the accuracy of the SVM model decreases by 77%. However, such a high poisoning ratio is generally impractical in real-world settings.

9. Discussion and Conclusions

Under-explored Medical Domains. The medical diagnostics domain has seen an abundance of attack discussions in prior work, particularly when the data modality involves imaging and textual data. Comparatively, there are much fewer discussions involving numerical features from patient measurements and population-level health dynamics. In terms of the attacker’s goal, many prior works focused on demonstrating integrity attacks such as evasion attacks, while AI confidentiality and availability are less explored.

There have not been any data poisoning-based studies for clinical coding, therapeutic effect prediction, and the epidemiology application domain, likely due to the inaccessibility of suitable training datasets. Medical AI in disease risk and susceptibility prediction also received minimal attention in general, albeit being a critical application in precision and personalized medicine [205]. We marked confidentiality attacks against surgical treatment AI as having an impractical threat model since this application domain usually does not involve patient-specific health data as their input.

Fairness & Explainability Attacks. Given the already biased datasets used in the medical AI training process [206], there have been no specific attack studies targeting the fairness of medical AI systems. The issue with AI fairness in healthcare does not only manifest in image diagnostic tasks but also domains such as population health management [207]. Many prior works have proposed methods to mitigate the fairness of AI [208], [209], and it is necessary to have a systematic study of current defenses that address AI fairness, as well as metrics to measure fairness lest an unfair model gets clinically deployed. On the other hand, there have been few explainability attacks in existing literature, though they cover a wide range of medical data modalities such as breast ultrasound image [210], pneumonia chest X-ray image and optical coherence tomography [211], EHR documents [212], and multivariate numerical data [213]. These works focused on means to alter the importance maps without changing the classification results, or changing model interpretation while evading existing detectors.

Implications for Future Research. For each medical application domain, we highlighted implications for future research suggested by our systematization. Attack research in the medical domain needs to consider the practicality of attacks on clinically deployed models, as well as whether the introduced perturbation conforms to common sense in clinical scenarios. While model explainability can foster medical practitioners’ trust in model outputs, the risk of more carefully crafted attacks may also increase through the adaptation of explainable AI. Meanwhile, not only are fairness metrics needed to evaluate medical models, but it may be beneficial to adopt certain measures of security and privacy evaluations in existing reporting guidelines, such as the CONSORT-AI extension [126].

Takeaways. We conducted extensive research across different medical domains to investigate the privacy and security risks each application domain may face when integrating AI/ML into healthcare systems. Our systematization revealed significant knowledge gaps related to adversarial attacks on medical AI systems. To address these gaps, we systematically presented the adversarial threat models customized for healthcare environments and identified at-risk application areas. Our demonstration of various attack threat models and previously unexplored attacks emphasized the urgent need for cybersecurity research in medical AI technology. Hopefully, this will pave the way for future research to focus on the security, privacy, and robustness of AI-powered medical systems.

References

- [1] A. Research and Consulting, "Medical software market size to touch usd 104.1 billion by 2030 according acumen research and consulting," 2023.
- [2] M. W. Roeloffs, "Ai at the doctor? amazon launches new service as google, microsoft aim at merging healthcare with artificial intelligence," 2023.
- [3] C. Stewart, "Ai in healthcare market size worldwide 2030," 2023.
- [4] C. Stewart, "Ai/machine learning in hospitals in the u.s. in 2021," 2022.
- [5] C. Stewart, "Trust and acceptance of healthcare ai worldwide 2022," 2023.
- [6] I. M. D. R. F. (IMDRF), "Software as a medical device (samd): Application of quality management system," 2014.
- [7] U.S. Food and Drug Administration, "Fda authorizes software that can help identify prostate cancer," 2021. Accessed: 2024-06-07.
- [8] A. Nadeem, D. Vos, C. Cao, L. Pajola, S. Dieck, R. Baumgartner, and S. Verwer, "Sok: Explainable machine learning for computer security applications," in *IEEE EuroS&P*, IEEE, 2023.
- [9] G. Apruzzese, P. Laskov, and J. Schneider, "Sok: Pragmatic assessment of machine learning for network intrusion detection," in *IEEE EuroS&P*, IEEE, 2023.
- [10] M. Noppel and C. Wressnegger, "Sok: Explainable machine learning in adversarial environments," in *IEEE S&P*, IEEE, 2024.
- [11] A. Birhane, R. Steed, V. Ojewale, B. Vecchione, and I. D. Raji, "Sok: Ai auditing: The broken bus on the road to ai accountability," in *2nd IEEE Conference on Secure and Trustworthy Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [12] A. Salem, G. Cherubin, D. Evans, B. Köpf, A. Paverd, A. Suri, S. Tople, and S. Zanella-Béguelin, "Sok: Let the privacy games begin! a unified treatment of data inference privacy in machine learning," in *IEEE S&P*, IEEE, 2023.
- [13] I. M. D. R. Forum, "Software as a medical device (samd): Key definitions," 2013.
- [14] GHX, "Nearly 70% of u.s. hospitals and health systems to adopt cloud-based approach to supply chain management by 2026," 2023.
- [15] E. Ayday, J. L. Raisaro, J.-P. Hubaux, and J. Rougemont, "Protecting and evaluating genomic privacy in medical tests and personalized medicine," in *Proceedings of the 12th ACM workshop on Workshop on privacy in the electronic society*, 2013.
- [16] M. Backes, P. Berrang, M. Bieg, R. Eils, C. Herrmann, M. Humbert, and I. Lehmann, "Identifying personal dna methylation profiles by genotype inference," in *IEEE S&P*, IEEE, 2017.
- [17] H. Liu, Y. Wu, S. Zhai, B. Yuan, and N. Zhang, "Riatig: Reliable and imperceptible adversarial text-to-image generation with natural prompts," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 20585–20594, 2023.
- [18] H. Liu, Z. Yu, M. Zha, X. Wang, W. Yeoh, Y. Vorobeychik, and N. Zhang, "When evil calls: Targeted adversarial voice over ip network," in *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 2009–2023, 2022.
- [19] F. Suya, A. Suri, T. Zhang, J. Hong, Y. Tian, and D. Evans, "Sok: Pitfalls in evaluating black-box attacks," *arXiv preprint*, 2023.
- [20] J. Liang, R. Pang, C. Li, and T. Wang, "Model extraction attacks revisited," in *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 1231–1245, 2024.
- [21] H. Liu, Y. Wu, Z. Yu, and N. Zhang, "Please tell me more: Privacy impact of explainability through the lens of membership inference attack," in *2024 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pp. 120–120, IEEE Computer Society, 2024.
- [22] A. Demontis, M. Melis, M. Pintor, M. Jagielski, B. Biggio, A. Oprea, C. Nita-Rotaru, and F. Roli, "Why do adversarial attacks transfer? explaining transferability of evasion and poisoning attacks," in *USENIX Security 19*, 2019.
- [23] O. Suciu, R. Marginean, Y. Kaya, H. Daume III, and T. Dumitras, "When does machine learning FAIL? generalized transferability for evasion and poisoning attacks," in *USENIX Security 18*, 2018.
- [24] H. Liu, Y. Wu, Z. Yu, Y. Vorobeychik, and N. Zhang, "Slowlidar: Increasing the latency of lidar-based detection using adversarial examples," in *IEEE/CVF CVPR*, 2023.
- [25] N. Mehrabi, M. Naveed, F. Morstatter, and A. Galstyan, "Exacerbating algorithmic bias through fairness attacks," in *AAAI*, 2021.
- [26] N. Furth, A. Khreichah, G. Liu, N. Phan, and Y. Jararweh, "Un-fair trojan: Targeted backdoor attacks against model fairness," in *IEEE SDS*, IEEE, 2022.
- [27] A. Ghorbani, A. Abid, and J. Zou, "Interpretation of neural networks is fragile," in *AAAI*, 2019.
- [28] X. Zhang, N. Wang, H. Shen, S. Ji, X. Luo, and T. Wang, "Interpretable deep learning under fire," in *USENIX Security 20*, 2020.
- [29] Z. Yu, Y. Chang, S. Zhai, N. Deily, T. Ju, X. Wang, U. Jammalamadaka, and N. Zhang, "Xcheck: Verifying integrity of 3d printed patient-specific devices via computing tomography," in *USENIX Security 23*, 2023.
- [30] M. Groh, C. Harris, L. Soenksen, F. Lau, R. Han, A. Kim, A. Koochek, and O. Badri, "Evaluating deep neural networks trained on clinical images in dermatology with the Fitzpatrick 17k dataset," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 1820–1828, 2021.
- [31] K. Nazeri, A. Aminpour, and M. Ebrahimi, "Two-stage convolutional neural network for breast cancer histology image classification," in *Image Analysis and Recognition: 15th International Conference, ICIAR 2018*, Springer, 2018.
- [32] F. C. Morabito, M. Campolo, C. Ieracitano, J. M. Ebadi, L. Bonanno, A. Bramanti, S. Desalvo, N. Mammone, and P. Bramanti, "Deep convolutional neural networks for classification of mild cognitive impaired and alzheimer's disease patients from scalp eeg recordings," in *IEEE RTSI*, IEEE, 2016.
- [33] S. H. Kassani, P. H. Kassani, M. J. Wesolowski, K. A. Schneider, and R. Deters, "A hybrid deep learning architecture for leukemic b-lymphoblast classification," in *IEEE ICTC*, IEEE, 2019.
- [34] X. Ma, Y. Niu, L. Gu, Y. Wang, Y. Zhao, J. Bailey, and F. Lu, "Understanding adversarial attacks on deep learning based medical image analysis systems," *Pattern Recognition*, 2021.
- [35] M.-J. Tsai, P.-Y. Lin, and M.-E. Lee, "Adversarial attacks on medical image classification," *Cancers*, 2023.
- [36] H. Hirano, A. Minagi, and K. Takemoto, "Universal adversarial attacks on deep neural networks for medical image classification," *BMC medical imaging*, 2021.
- [37] Z. Wang, X. Shu, Y. Wang, Y. Feng, L. Zhang, and Z. Yi, "A feature space-restricted attention attack on medical deep learning systems," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 2022.
- [38] M. Paschali, S. Conjeti, F. Navarro, and N. Navab, "Generalizability vs. robustness: investigating medical imaging networks using adversarial examples," in *MICCAI*, Springer, 2018.
- [39] M. Xu, T. Zhang, Z. Li, M. Liu, and D. Zhang, "Towards evaluating the robustness of deep diagnostic models by adversarial attack," *Medical Image Analysis*, 2021.
- [40] Y. Li and S. Liu, "Adversarial attack and defense in breast cancer deep learning systems," *Bioengineering*, 2023.
- [41] S. G. Finlayson, H. W. Chung, I. S. Kohane, and A. L. Beam, "Adversarial attacks against medical deep learning systems," *arXiv preprint*, 2018.

- [42] S. Asgari Taghanaki, A. Das, and G. Hamarneh, “Vulnerability analysis of chest x-ray image classification against adversarial attacks,” in *Understanding and Interpreting Machine Learning in Medical Image Computing Applications*, Springer, 2018.
- [43] F. Martinelli, F. Mercaldo, M. Di Giammarco, and A. Santone, “Data poisoning attacks over diabetic retinopathy images classification,” in *IEEE BigData*, IEEE, 2023.
- [44] M. Mozaffari-Kermani, S. Sur-Kolay, A. Raghunathan, and N. K. Jha, “Systematic poisoning attacks on and defenses for machine learning in healthcare,” *IEEE journal of biomedical and health informatics*, 2014.
- [45] P. Singkorapoom and S. Phoomvuthisarn, “Pre-trained model robustness against gan-based poisoning attack in medical imaging analysis,” in *IFIP International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Applications and Innovations*, Springer, 2023.
- [46] A. P. Kalapaaking, I. Khalil, and X. Yi, “Blockchain-based federated learning with smpc model verification against poisoning attack for healthcare systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computing*, 2023.
- [47] M. Nwadike, T. Miyawaki, E. Sarkar, M. Maniatakos, and F. Shamout, “Explainability matters: Backdoor attacks on medical imaging,” *arXiv preprint*, 2020.
- [48] Y. Feng, B. Ma, J. Zhang, S. Zhao, Y. Xia, and D. Tao, “Fiba: Frequency-injection based backdoor attack in medical image analysis,” in *IEEE/CVF CVPR*, 2022.
- [49] M. Imran, H. K. Qureshi, and I. Amerini, “Bhac-mri: Backdoor and hybrid attacks on mri brain tumor classification using cnn,” in *International Conference on Image Analysis and Processing*, Springer, 2023.
- [50] R. Jin, C.-Y. Huang, C. You, and X. Li, “Backdoor attack on unpaired medical image-text pretrained models: A pilot study on med-clip,” in *2nd IEEE Conference on Secure and Trustworthy Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [51] U. Gupta, D. Stripelis, P. K. Lam, P. Thompson, J. L. Ambite, and G. Ver Steeg, “Membership inference attacks on deep regression models for neuroimaging,” in *Medical Imaging with Deep Learning*, PMLR, 2021.
- [52] M. Wu, X. Zhang, J. Ding, H. Nguyen, R. Yu, M. Pan, and S. T. Wong, “Evaluation of inference attack models for deep learning on medical data,” *arXiv preprint*, 2020.
- [53] W. Sun, Y. Liu, Z. Yan, K. Xu, and L. Sun, “Medical unlearnable examples: Securing medical data from unauthorized training via sparsity-aware local masking,” *arXiv preprint*, 2024.
- [54] N. Mangaokar, J. Pu, P. Bhattacharya, C. K. Reddy, and B. Viswanath, “Jekyll: Attacking medical image diagnostics using deep generative models,” in *IEEE EuroS&P*, IEEE, 2020.
- [55] G. Sun, Y. Cong, J. Dong, Q. Wang, L. Lyu, and J. Liu, “Data poisoning attacks on federated machine learning,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 2021.
- [56] Y. Matsuo and K. Takemoto, “Backdoor attacks to deep neural network-based system for covid-19 detection from chest x-ray images,” *Applied Sciences*, 2021.
- [57] U. Ozbulak, A. Van Messem, and W. De Neve, “Impact of adversarial examples on deep learning models for biomedical image segmentation,” in *MICCAI*, Springer, 2019.
- [58] M. Shao, G. Zhang, W. Zuo, and D. Meng, “Target attack on biomedical image segmentation model based on multi-scale gradients,” *Information sciences*, 2021.
- [59] T. Chobola, D. Usynin, and G. Kaassis, “Membership inference attacks against semantic segmentation models,” in *16th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security*, 2023.
- [60] N. Subbanna, M. Wilms, A. Tuladhar, and N. D. Forkert, “An analysis of the vulnerability of two common deep learning-based medical image segmentation techniques to model inversion attacks,” *Sensors*, 2021.
- [61] X. Lin *et al.*, “Safeguarding medical image segmentation datasets against unauthorized training via contour-and texture-aware perturbations,” *arXiv preprint*, 2024.
- [62] M. Sun, F. Tang, J. Yi, F. Wang, and J. Zhou, “Identify susceptible locations in medical records via adversarial attacks on deep predictive models,” in *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, 2018.
- [63] S. An, C. Xiao, W. F. Stewart, and J. Sun, “Longitudinal adversarial attack on electronic health records data,” in *The world wide web conference*, 2019.
- [64] B. Joe, A. Mehra, I. Shin, and J. Hamm, “Machine learning with electronic health records is vulnerable to backdoor trigger attacks,” *arXiv preprint*, 2021.
- [65] Z. Zhang, C. Yan, and B. A. Malin, “Membership inference attacks against synthetic health data,” *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 2022.
- [66] H. Skovorodnikov and H. Alkhzaimi, “Fimba: Evaluating the robustness of ai in genomics via feature importance adversarial attacks,” *arXiv preprint*, 2024.
- [67] D. M. Montserrat and A. G. Ioannidis, “Adversarial attacks on genotype sequences,” in *IEEE ICASSP*, IEEE, 2023.
- [68] N. Ghaffari Laleh *et al.*, “Adversarial attacks and adversarial robustness in computational pathology,” *Nature communications*, 2022.
- [69] E. Sarkar and M. Maniatakos, “Trapdoor: Repurposing backdoors to detect dataset bias in machine learning-based genomic analysis,” *arXiv preprint*, 2021.
- [70] J. Chen, W. H. Wang, and X. Shi, “Differential privacy protection against membership inference attack on machine learning for genomic data,” in *BIOCOMPUTING 2021: Proceedings of the Pacific Symposium*, World Scientific, 2020.
- [71] I. Hagedestd, M. Humbert, P. Berrang, I. Lehmann, R. Eils, M. Backes, and Y. Zhang, “Membership inference against dna methylation databases,” in *IEEE EuroS&P*, IEEE, 2020.
- [72] X. Han, Y. Hu, L. Foschini, L. Chinitz, L. Jankelson, and R. Ranaganath, “Deep learning models for electrocardiograms are susceptible to adversarial attack,” *Nature medicine*, 2020.
- [73] T. Ono, T. Sugawara, J. Sakuma, and T. Mori, “Application of adversarial examples to physical ecg signals,” *arXiv preprint*, 2021.
- [74] A. Aminifar, “Universal adversarial perturbations in epileptic seizure detection,” in *2020 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, IEEE, 2020.
- [75] H. Chen, C. Huang, Q. Huang, Q. Zhang, and W. Wang, “Ecgady: Generating adversarial electrocardiogram to misguide arrhythmia classification system,” in *AAAI*, 2020.
- [76] J. Lam, P. Quan, J. Xu, J. V. Jeyakumar, and M. Srivastava, “Hard-label black-box adversarial attack on deep electrocardiogram classifier,” in *Proceedings of the 1st ACM International Workshop on Security and Safety for Intelligent Cyber-Physical Systems*, 2020.
- [77] A. T. Z. Ismail and R. M. Shukla, “Analyzing the vulnerabilities in split learning: Assessing the robustness against data poisoning attacks,” *arXiv preprint*, 2023.
- [78] S. Abuadbba, K. Kim, M. Kim, C. Thapa, S. A. Camtepe, Y. Gao, H. Kim, and S. Nepal, “Can we use split learning on 1d cnn models for privacy preserving training?,” in *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Asia conference on computer and communications security*, 2020.
- [79] V. Araujo, A. Carvalho, and D. Parra, “Adversarial evaluation of bert for biomedical named entity recognition,” in *Proceedings of The Fourth Widening Natural Language Processing Workshop*, 2020.
- [80] W. Wang, Y. Park, T. Lee, I. Molloy, P. Tang, and L. Xiong, “Utilizing multimodal feature consistency to detect adversarial examples on clinical summaries,” in *Proceedings of the 3rd Clinical Natural Language Processing Workshop*, 2020.

- [81] N. Fatehi, Q. Alasad, and M. Alawad, "Towards adversarial attacks for clinical document classification," *Electronics*, 2022.
- [82] A. Das, A. Tariq, F. Batalini, B. Dhara, and I. Banerjee, "Exposing vulnerabilities in clinical llms through data poisoning attacks: Case study in breast cancer," *medRxiv*, 2024.
- [83] F. Mireshghallah, K. Goyal, A. Uniyal, T. Berg-Kirkpatrick, and R. Shokri, "Quantifying privacy risks of masked language models using membership inference attacks," *arXiv preprint*, 2022.
- [84] A. Jagannatha, B. P. S. Rawat, and H. Yu, "Membership inference attack susceptibility of clinical language models," *arXiv preprint*, 2021.
- [85] Y. Nakamura, S. Hanaoka, Y. Nomura, N. Hayashi, O. Abe, S. Yada, S. Wakamiya, and E. Aramaki, "Kart: Parameterization of privacy leakage scenarios from pre-trained language models," *arXiv preprint*, 2020.
- [86] E. Lehman, S. Jain, K. Pichotta, Y. Goldberg, and B. C. Wallace, "Does bert pretrained on clinical notes reveal sensitive data?," *arXiv preprint*, 2021.
- [87] S. Raja and R. Tuwani, "Adversarial attacks against deep learning systems for icd-9 code assignment," *arXiv preprint*, 2020.
- [88] A. R. Sarkar, Y.-S. Chuang, N. Mohammed, and X. Jiang, "De-identification is not always enough," *arXiv preprint*, 2024.
- [89] I. Mondal, "BBAEG: Towards BERT-based biomedical adversarial example generation for text classification," *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 2021.
- [90] Y. Chai, R. Liang, S. Samtani, H. Zhu, M. Wang, Y. Liu, and Y. Jiang, "Additive feature attribution explainable methods to craft adversarial attacks for text classification and text regression," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2023.
- [91] M. Fredrikson, E. Lantz, S. Jha, S. Lin, D. Page, and T. Ristenpart, "Privacy in pharmacogenetics: An {End-to-End} case study of personalized warfarin dosing," in *USENIX Security 14*, 2014.
- [92] S. Saini and N. Saxena, "Predatory medicine: Exploring and measuring the vulnerability of medical ai to predatory science," *arXiv preprint*, 2022.
- [93] A. Meiseles, Y. Motro, L. Rokach, and J. Moran-Gilad, "Vulnerability of pangolin sars-cov-2 lineage assignment to adversarial attack," *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, 2023.
- [94] M. Ye, J. Luo, G. Zheng, C. Xiao, H. Xiao, T. Wang, and F. Ma, "Medattacker: Exploring black-box adversarial attacks on risk prediction models in healthcare," in *2022 IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*, IEEE, 2022.
- [95] M. R. Karim, T. Islam, C. Lange, D. Rebholz-Schuhmann, and S. Decker, "Adversary-aware multimodal neural networks for cancer susceptibility prediction from multiomics data," *IEEE Access*, 2022.
- [96] A. I. Newaz, N. I. Haque, A. K. Sikder, M. A. Rahman, and A. S. Uluagac, "Adversarial attacks to machine learning-based smart healthcare systems," in *IEEE GLOBECOM*, IEEE, 2020.
- [97] A. R. Shahid, A. Imteaj, P. Y. Wu, D. A. Igoche, and T. Alam, "Label flipping data poisoning attack against wearable human activity recognition system," in *2022 IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence (SSCI)*, IEEE, 2022.
- [98] Q. Yu, Y. Huang, X. Li, M. Pavlides, D. Liu, H. Luo, H. Ding, W. An, F. Liu, C. Zuo, *et al.*, "An imaging-based artificial intelligence model for non-invasive grading of hepatic venous pressure gradient in cirrhotic portal hypertension," *Cell Reports Medicine*, vol. 3, no. 3, 2022.
- [99] M. S. Schmitt, J. Colen, S. Sala, J. Devany, S. Seetharaman, A. Cailletier, M. L. Gardel, P. W. Oakes, and V. Vitelli, "Machine learning interpretable models of cell mechanics from protein images," *Cell*, vol. 187, no. 2, pp. 481–494, 2024.
- [100] M. Winkels and T. S. Cohen, "Pulmonary nodule detection in ct scans with equivariant cnns," *Medical image analysis*, 2019.
- [101] H. Lee *et al.*, "An explainable deep-learning algorithm for the detection of acute intracranial haemorrhage from small datasets," *Nature biomedical engineering*, 2019.
- [102] G. Maicas, G. Carneiro, A. P. Bradley, J. C. Nascimento, and I. Reid, "Deep reinforcement learning for active breast lesion detection from dce-mri," in *International conference on medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention*, Springer, 2017.
- [103] H. Basak, R. Kundu, and R. Sarkar, "Mfsnet: A multi focus segmentation network for skin lesion segmentation," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 128, p. 108673, 2022.
- [104] S. Wang, C. Li, R. Wang, Z. Liu, M. Wang, H. Tan, Y. Wu, X. Liu, H. Sun, R. Yang, *et al.*, "Annotation-efficient deep learning for automatic medical image segmentation," *Nature communications*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 5915, 2021.
- [105] Q. Hu, Y. Chen, J. Xiao, S. Sun, J. Chen, A. L. Yuille, and Z. Zhou, "Label-free liver tumor segmentation," in *IEEE/CVF CVPR*, 2023.
- [106] A. Nithya, A. Appathurai, N. Venkatadri, D. Ramji, and C. A. Palagan, "Kidney disease detection and segmentation using artificial neural network and multi-kernel k-means clustering for ultrasound images," *Measurement*, 2020.
- [107] E. Gibson *et al.*, "Automatic multi-organ segmentation on abdominal ct with dense v-networks," *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, 2018.
- [108] A. Y. Hannun, P. Rajpurkar, M. Haghpanahi, G. H. Tison, C. Bourn, M. P. Turakhia, and A. Y. Ng, "Cardiologist-level arrhythmia detection and classification in ambulatory electrocardiograms using a deep neural network," *Nature medicine*, 2019.
- [109] G. D. Clifford, C. Liu, B. Moody, H. L. Li-wei, I. Silva, Q. Li, A. Johnson, and R. G. Mark, "Af classification from a short single lead ecg recording: The physionet/computing in cardiology challenge 2017," in *2017 Computing in Cardiology (CinC)*, IEEE, 2017.
- [110] M. Shim, H.-J. Hwang, D.-W. Kim, S.-H. Lee, and C.-H. Im, "Machine-learning-based diagnosis of schizophrenia using combined sensor-level and source-level eeg features," *Schizophrenia research*, 2016.
- [111] S. Kiranyaz, T. Ince, and M. Gabbouj, "Real-time patient-specific ecg classification by 1-d convolutional neural networks," *IEEE transactions on biomedical engineering*, 2015.
- [112] A. Subasi, "Classification of emg signals using pso optimized svm for diagnosis of neuromuscular disorders," *Computers in biology and medicine*, 2013.
- [113] M. M. Rahman, M. I. H. Bhuiyan, and A. R. Hassan, "Sleep stage classification using single-channel eog," *Computers in biology and medicine*, 2018.
- [114] J. He, S. L. Baxter, J. Xu, J. Xu, X. Zhou, and K. Zhang, "The practical implementation of artificial intelligence technologies in medicine," *Nature medicine*, 2019.
- [115] R. Schulte-Sasse, S. Budach, D. Hnisz, and A. Marsico, "Integration of multiomics data with graph convolutional networks to identify new cancer genes and their associated molecular mechanisms," *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 2021.
- [116] S. Eddy, L. H. Mariani, and M. Kretzler, "Integrated multi-omics approaches to improve classification of chronic kidney disease," *Nature Reviews Nephrology*, 2020.
- [117] K. Ayoz, E. Ayday, and A. E. Cicek, "Genome reconstruction attacks against genomic data-sharing beacons," in *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies. Privacy Enhancing Technologies Symposium*, NIH Public Access, 2021.
- [118] Y. Zheng, Y.-J. Zhang, and H. Larochelle, "A deep and autoregressive approach for topic modeling of multimodal data," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 2015.

- [119] G. Bhatnagar, Q. J. Wu, and Z. Liu, "A new contrast based multimodal medical image fusion framework," *Neurocomputing*, 2015.
- [120] S. Liu *et al.*, "Multimodal neuroimaging feature learning for multiclass diagnosis of alzheimer's disease," *IEEE transactions on biomedical engineering*, 2014.
- [121] W. Lyu, X. Dong, R. Wong, S. Zheng, K. Abell-Hart, F. Wang, and C. Chen, "A multimodal transformer: Fusing clinical notes with structured ehr data for interpretable in-hospital mortality prediction," in *AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings*, vol. 2022, p. 719, American Medical Informatics Association, 2022.
- [122] S. Ding, Z. Li, X. Liu, H. Huang, and S. Yang, "Diabetic complication prediction using a similarity-enhanced latent dirichlet allocation model," *Information Sciences*, 2019.
- [123] Y. Zhang, M. Qiu, C.-W. Tsai, M. M. Hassan, and A. Alamri, "Health-cps: Healthcare cyber-physical system assisted by cloud and big data," *IEEE Systems Journal*, 2015.
- [124] I. Kavakiotis *et al.*, "Machine learning and data mining methods in diabetes research," *Computational and structural biotechnology journal*, 2017.
- [125] G. S. Collins, J. B. Reitsma, D. G. Altman, and K. G. M. Moons, "Transparent reporting of a multivariable prediction model for individual prognosis or diagnosis (tripod): the tripod statement," *European Journal of Clinical Investigation*, 2015.
- [126] X. Liu, S. C. Rivera, D. Moher, M. J. Calvert, A. K. Denniston, T. SPIRIT-AI, and C.-A. W. Group, "Reporting guidelines for clinical trial reports for interventions involving artificial intelligence: the consort-ai extension," *Nature Medicine*, 2020.
- [127] S. Zhang and N. Elhadad, "Unsupervised biomedical named entity recognition: Experiments with clinical and biological texts," *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 2013.
- [128] G. Soğancıoglu, H. Öztürk, and A. Özgür, "Biosses: a semantic sentence similarity estimation system for the biomedical domain," *Bioinformatics*, 2017.
- [129] Y. Zhang, H. Lin, Z. Yang, J. Wang, S. Zhang, Y. Sun, and L. Yang, "A hybrid model based on neural networks for biomedical relation extraction," *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 2018.
- [130] A. Arora and A. Arora, "The promise of large language models in health care," *The Lancet*, 2023.
- [131] S. B. Patel and K. Lam, "Chatgpt: the future of discharge summaries?," *The Lancet Digital Health*, 2023.
- [132] E. Coiera, *Guide to health informatics*. CRC press, 2015.
- [133] H. Dong, M. Falis, W. Whiteley, B. Alex, J. Matterson, S. Ji, J. Chen, and H. Wu, "Automated clinical coding: what, why, and where we are?," *NPJ digital medicine*, 2022.
- [134] S. Ji, W. Sun, H. Dong, H. Wu, and P. Marttinen, "A unified review of deep learning for automated medical coding," *arXiv preprint*, 2022.
- [135] H. Xu, P. D. Stetson, and C. Friedman, "A study of abbreviations in clinical notes," in *AMIA annual symposium proceedings*, American Medical Informatics Association, 2007.
- [136] K. H. Lai, M. Topaz, F. R. Goss, and L. Zhou, "Automated misspelling detection and correction in clinical free-text records," *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 2015.
- [137] X.-Y. Zhou, Y. Guo, M. Shen, and G.-Z. Yang, "Application of artificial intelligence in surgery," *Frontiers of medicine*, 2020.
- [138] X.-Y. Zhou, G.-Z. Yang, and S.-L. Lee, "A real-time and registration-free framework for dynamic shape instantiation," *Medical image analysis*, 2018.
- [139] J. Sganga, D. Eng, C. Graetz, and D. Camarillo, "Offsetnet: Deep learning for localization in the lung using rendered images," in *ICRA*, IEEE, 2019.
- [140] F. Mahmood and N. J. Durr, "Deep learning and conditional random fields-based depth estimation and topographical reconstruction from conventional endoscopy," *Medical image analysis*, 2018.
- [141] R. Wang, M. Zhang, X. Meng, Z. Geng, and F.-Y. Wang, "3-d tracking for augmented reality using combined region and dense cues in endoscopic surgery," *IEEE journal of biomedical and health informatics*, 2017.
- [142] X. Zhang, J. Wang, T. Wang, X. Ji, Y. Shen, Z. Sun, and X. Zhang, "A markerless automatic deformable registration framework for augmented reality navigation of laparoscopy partial nephrectomy," *International journal of computer assisted radiology and surgery*, 2019.
- [143] D. Liu and T. Jiang, "Deep reinforcement learning for surgical gesture segmentation and classification," in *MICCAI*, Springer, 2018.
- [144] E. De Momi, L. Kranendonk, M. Valenti, N. Enayati, and G. Ferrieno, "A neural network-based approach for trajectory planning in robot-human handover tasks," *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, 2016.
- [145] T. Kurmann, P. Marquez Neila, X. Du, P. Fua, D. Stoyanov, S. Wolf, and R. Sznitman, "Simultaneous recognition and pose estimation of instruments in minimally invasive surgery," in *MICCAI*, Springer, 2017.
- [146] A. Marban, V. Srinivasan, W. Samek, J. Fernández, and A. Casals, "Estimation of interaction forces in robotic surgery using a semi-supervised deep neural network model," in *IEEE/RSJ IROS*, IEEE, 2018.
- [147] K. Fujii, G. Gras, A. Salerno, and G.-Z. Yang, "Gaze gesture based human robot interaction for laparoscopic surgery," *Medical image analysis*, 2018.
- [148] L. Zhang, P.-Y. Bouchet, E. Lamine, F. Fontanili, C. Bortolaso, M. Derras, and H. Pingaud, "Home health care daily planning considering the satisfaction of all the stakeholders," in *IESM*, IEEE, 2019.
- [149] X. Zhou and M. R. Kosorok, "Causal nearest neighbor rules for optimal treatment regimes," *arXiv preprint*, 2017.
- [150] X. Su, A. T. Peña, L. Liu, and R. A. Levine, "Random forests of interaction trees for estimating individualized treatment effects in randomized trials," *Statistics in medicine*, 2018.
- [151] F. S. van Royen, K. G. Moons, G.-J. Geersing, and M. van Smeden, "Developing, validating, updating and judging the impact of prognostic models for respiratory diseases," *European Respiratory Journal*, 2022.
- [152] C. Taylor, E. Harris, and M. Brown, "Advances in explainable artificial intelligence in healthcare: Applications, challenges, and opportunities," *Sensors (Basel)*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 178–197, 2023.
- [153] E. Mountjoy *et al.*, "An open approach to systematically prioritize causal variants and genes at all published human gwas trait-associated loci," *Nature genetics*, 2021.
- [154] M. Nayal and B. Honig, "On the nature of cavities on protein surfaces: application to the identification of drug-binding sites," *Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics*, 2006.
- [155] A. Jha, M. R. Gazzara, and Y. Barash, "Integrative deep models for alternative splicing," *Bioinformatics*, 2017.
- [156] Q. Wang, Y. Feng, J. Huang, T. Wang, and G. Cheng, "A novel framework for the identification of drug target proteins: Combining stacked auto-encoders with a biased support vector machine," *PloS one*, 2017.
- [157] M. Olivecrona, T. Blaschke, O. Engkvist, and H. Chen, "Molecular de-novo design through deep reinforcement learning," *Journal of cheminformatics*, 2017.
- [158] M. H. Segler, M. Preuss, and M. P. Waller, "Planning chemical syntheses with deep neural networks and symbolic ai," *Nature*, 2018.
- [159] J. Ma, R. P. Sheridan, A. Liaw, G. E. Dahl, and V. Svetnik, "Deep neural nets as a method for quantitative structure-activity relationships," *Journal of chemical information and modeling*, 2015.

- [160] K. Baxter and C. L. Preston, *Stockley's drug interactions*. Pharmaceutical Press London, 2010.
- [161] Y. Shen, K. Yuan, Y. Li, B. Tang, M. Yang, N. Du, and K. Lei, "Drug2vec: Knowledge-aware feature-driven method for drug representation learning," in *2018 IEEE BIBM*, IEEE, 2018.
- [162] B. Xu, X. Shi, Z. Zhao, W. Zheng, H. Lin, Z. Yang, J. Wang, and F. Xia, "Full-attention based drug drug interaction extraction exploiting user-generated content," in *2018 IEEE BIBM*, IEEE, 2018.
- [163] Y.-H. Feng, S.-W. Zhang, and J.-Y. Shi, "Dpddi: a deep predictor for drug-drug interactions," *BMC bioinformatics*, 2020.
- [164] J.-Y. Shi, H. Huang, J.-X. Li, P. Lei, Y.-N. Zhang, K. Dong, and S.-M. Yiu, "Tmfuf: a triple matrix factorization-based unified framework for predicting comprehensive drug-drug interactions of new drugs," *BMC bioinformatics*, 2018.
- [165] C. Yan, G. Duan, Y. Zhang, F.-X. Wu, Y. Pan, and J. Wang, "Idnddi: An integrated drug similarity network method for predicting drug-drug interactions," in *Bioinformatics Research and Applications*. Springer, 2019.
- [166] J. H. Yang, S. N. Wright, M. Hamblin, D. McCloskey, M. A. Alcantar, L. Schrubbbers, A. J. Lopatkin, S. Satish, A. Nili, B. O. Palsson, *et al.*, "A white-box machine learning approach for revealing antibiotic mechanisms of action," *Cell*, vol. 177, no. 6, pp. 1649–1661, 2019.
- [167] Y. Qiu, Y. Zhang, Y. Deng, S. Liu, and W. Zhang, "A comprehensive review of computational methods for drug-drug interaction detection," *IEEE/ACM transactions on computational biology and bioinformatics*, 2021.
- [168] G. Richtig, M. Berger, B. Lange-Asschenfeldt, W. Aberer, and E. Richtig, "Problems and challenges of predatory journals," *Journal of the European Academy of Dermatology and Venereology*, 2018.
- [169] A. J. Sundermann *et al.*, "Automated data mining of the electronic health record for investigation of healthcare-associated outbreaks," *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology*, 2019.
- [170] J. S. Brownstein, B. Rader, C. M. Astley, and H. Tian, "Advances in artificial intelligence for infectious-disease surveillance," *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2023.
- [171] C. C. Freifeld, K. D. Mandl, B. Y. Reis, and J. S. Brownstein, "Healthmap: global infectious disease monitoring through automated classification and visualization of internet media reports," *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 2008.
- [172] S. Bhatia *et al.*, "Using digital surveillance tools for near real-time mapping of the risk of infectious disease spread," *NPJ digital medicine*, 2021.
- [173] V. L. Yu and L. C. Madoff, "Promed-mail: an early warning system for emerging diseases," *Clinical infectious diseases*, 2004.
- [174] A. Alavi *et al.*, "Real-time alerting system for covid-19 and other stress events using wearable data," *Nature medicine*, 2022.
- [175] A. J. Sundermann *et al.*, "Whole-genome sequencing surveillance and machine learning of the electronic health record for enhanced healthcare outbreak detection," *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 2022.
- [176] D. Leslie, A. Mazumder, A. Peppin, M. K. Wolters, and A. Hagerty, "Does 'ai' stand for augmenting inequality in the era of covid-19 healthcare?," *bmj*, 2021.
- [177] M. Chowkwanyun and A. L. Reed Jr, "Racial health disparities and covid-19—caution and context," *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2020.
- [178] A. Parab, P. Gholap, and V. Patankar, "Diseaselens: A lifestyle related disease predictor," in *ICAST*, IEEE, 2022.
- [179] C. Ming, V. Viassolo, N. Probst-Hensch, I. D. Dinov, P. O. Chappuis, and M. C. Katapodi, "Machine learning-based lifetime breast cancer risk reclassification compared with the boadicea model: impact on screening recommendations," *British journal of cancer*, 2020.
- [180] X. Dai, J. H. Park, S. Yoo, N. D'Imperio, B. H. McMahon, C. T. Rentsch, J. P. Tate, and A. C. Justice, "Survival analysis of localized prostate cancer with deep learning," *Scientific Reports*, 2022.
- [181] D. Placido *et al.*, "A deep learning algorithm to predict risk of pancreatic cancer from disease trajectories," *Nature Medicine*, 2023.
- [182] H. Wang, Y. Li, S. A. Khan, and Y. Luo, "Prediction of breast cancer distant recurrence using natural language processing and knowledge-guided convolutional neural network," *Artificial intelligence in medicine*, 2020.
- [183] X. Dong, R. Wong, W. Lyu, K. Abell-Hart, J. Deng, Y. Liu, J. G. Hajagos, R. N. Rosenthal, C. Chen, and F. Wang, "An integrated lstm-heterognn model for interpretable opioid overdose risk prediction," *Artificial intelligence in medicine*, vol. 135, p. 102439, 2023.
- [184] Y. Liu, X. Dong, W. Lyu, R. N. Rosenthal, R. Wong, T. Ma, J. Kong, and F. Wang, "Enhancing clinical predictive modeling through model complexity-driven class proportion tuning for class imbalanced data: An empirical study on opioid overdose prediction," *AMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings*, vol. 2024, p. 334, 2024.
- [185] A. S. Kucukkaya *et al.*, "Predicting tumor recurrence on baseline mr imaging in patients with early-stage hepatocellular carcinoma using deep machine learning," *Scientific Reports*, 2023.
- [186] A. S. Mondol, I. A. Emi, and J. A. Stankovic, "Medrem: An interactive medication reminder and tracking system on wrist devices," in *IEEE Wireless Health*, IEEE, 2016.
- [187] A. Allam, S. Feuerriegel, M. Rebhan, and M. Krauthammer, "Analyzing patient trajectories with artificial intelligence," *Journal of medical internet research*, 2021.
- [188] S. Yeom, I. Giacomelli, M. Fredrikson, and S. Jha, "Privacy risk in machine learning: Analyzing the connection to overfitting," in *IEEE CSF*, IEEE, 2018.
- [189] L. Song and P. Mittal, "Systematic evaluation of privacy risks of machine learning models.,," in *USENIX Security 21*, 2021.
- [190] A. Salem, Y. Zhang, M. Humbert, P. Berrang, M. Fritz, and M. Backes, "ML-leaks: Model and data independent membership inference attacks and defenses on machine learning models," *arXiv preprint*, 2018.
- [191] R. Shokri, M. Stronati, C. Song, and V. Shmatikov, "Membership inference attacks against machine learning models," in *IEEE S&P*, IEEE, 2017.
- [192] M. Zhang, Z. Ren, Z. Wang, P. Ren, Z. Chen, P. Hu, and Y. Zhang, "Membership inference attacks against recommender systems," in *ACM SIGSAC CCS*, 2021.
- [193] L. Song, R. Shokri, and P. Mittal, "Privacy risks of securing machine learning models against adversarial examples," in *ACM SIGSAC CCS*, 2019.
- [194] Z. Li and Y. Zhang, "Membership leakage in label-only exposures," in *ACM SIGSAC CCS*, 2021.
- [195] Y. Liu, R. Wen, X. He, A. Salem, Z. Zhang, M. Backes, E. De Cristofaro, M. Fritz, and Y. Zhang, "[ML-Doctor]: Holistic risk assessment of inference attacks against machine learning models," in *USENIX Security 22*, 2022.
- [196] S. D. Goodfellow, A. Goodwin, R. Greer, P. C. Laussen, M. Mazwi, and D. Eytan, "Towards understanding ecg rhythm classification using convolutional neural networks and attention mappings," in *Machine learning for healthcare conference*, PMLR, 2018.
- [197] N. Carlini, S. Chien, M. Nasr, S. Song, A. Terzis, and F. Tramer, "Membership inference attacks from first principles," in *IEEE S&P*, IEEE, 2022.
- [198] Y. Jiang, X. Ma, S. M. Erfani, and J. Bailey, "Backdoor attacks on time series: A generative approach," in *IEEE SaTML*, IEEE, 2023.
- [199] A. E. Johnson *et al.*, "Data descriptor: MIMIC-III, a freely accessible critical care database," *Scientific data*, 2016.

- [200] H. Harutyunyan, H. Khachatrian, D. C. Kale, G. Ver Steeg, and A. Galstyan, “Multitask learning and benchmarking with clinical time series data,” *Scientific data*, 2019.
- [201] P. Christ, “Lits – liver tumor segmentation challenge (lits17),”
- [202] Ö. Çiçek, A. Abdulkadir, S. S. Lienkamp, T. Brox, and O. Ronneberger, “3d u-net: learning dense volumetric segmentation from sparse annotation,” in *MICCAI*, Springer, 2016.
- [203] Z. Tian, L. Cui, J. Liang, and S. Yu, “A comprehensive survey on poisoning attacks and countermeasures in machine learning,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, 2022.
- [204] B. Biggio, B. Nelson, and P. Laskov, “Support vector machines under adversarial label noise,” in *Asian conference on machine learning*, PMLR, 2011.
- [205] N. Rose, “Personalized medicine: promises, problems and perils of a new paradigm for healthcare,” *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2013.
- [206] L. A. Celi *et al.*, “Sources of bias in artificial intelligence that perpetuate healthcare disparities—a global review,” *PLOS Digital Health*, 2022.
- [207] Z. Obermeyer, B. Powers, C. Vogeli, and S. Mullainathan, “Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations,” *Science*, 2019.
- [208] R. J. Chen, J. J. Wang, D. F. Williamson, T. Y. Chen, J. Lipkova, M. Y. Lu, S. Sahai, and F. Mahmood, “Algorithmic fairness in artificial intelligence for medicine and healthcare,” *Nature biomedical engineering*, 2023.
- [209] B. Richardson and J. E. Gilbert, “A framework for fairness: A systematic review of existing fair ai solutions,” *arXiv preprint*, 2021.
- [210] H. Rasaee and H. Rivaz, “Explainable ai and susceptibility to adversarial attacks: a case study in classification of breast ultrasound images,” in *IEEE IUS*, IEEE, 2021.
- [211] E. J. De Aguiar, M. V. Costa, C. Traina, and A. J. Traina, “Assessing vulnerabilities of deep learning explainability in medical image analysis under adversarial settings,” in *IEEE CBMS*, IEEE, 2023.
- [212] F. Razmi, J. Lou, Y. Hong, and L. Xiong, “Interpretation attacks and defenses on predictive models using electronic health records,” in *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, Springer, 2023.
- [213] H. Zhang, J. Gao, and L. Su, “Data poisoning attacks against outcome interpretations of predictive models,” in *ACM SIGKDD*, 2021.