
ETHICAL FRAMEWORK FOR RESPONSIBLE FOUNDATIONAL MODELS IN MEDICAL IMAGING

**Abhijit Das, Debesh Jha, Jasmer Sanjotra, Onkar Susladkar, Suramyaa Sarkar,
Ashish Rauniyar, Nikhil Tomar, Vanshali Sharma, Ulas Bagci**

Machine & Hybrid Intelligence Lab, Department of Radiology, Northwestern University

ABSTRACT

Foundational models (FMs) have tremendous potential to revolutionize medical imaging. However, their deployment in real-world clinical settings demands extensive ethical considerations. This paper aims to highlight the ethical concerns related to FMs and propose a framework to guide their responsible development and implementation within medicine. We meticulously examine ethical issues such as privacy of patient data, bias mitigation, algorithmic transparency, explainability and accountability. The proposed framework is designed to prioritize patient welfare, mitigate potential risks, and foster trust in AI-assisted healthcare.

Keywords Foundational model · Generative AI · Fairness · Privacy

1 Introduction

Foundational models (FMs), characterized by large deep neural networks (DNNs) trained on extensive data and substantial parameters, represent a form of generative AI with remarkable generalization across diverse downstream tasks [1]. Recent advancements in FMs can be attributed to improved computer hardware, such as GPUs and memory, alongside the development of the transformer model architecture [2], which maximizes hardware parallelism and the abundance of training data. At the technical level, transfer learning [3] and unsupervised learning have been responsible for fueling this growth [4]. A key trait of FMs is their adeptness at various downstream tasks, frequently surpassing dedicated pipelines with better generalization [5, 6]. For example, Clark et al. [7] illustrated how a fine-tuned FM exhibits superior performance attributing to their large-scale training and diverse learned representations, even with $10\times$ less data [8]. Deep learning models for medical imaging have been traditionally built using vision-only models, including convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and vision transformers [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. These models utilize a classic fully-supervised approach, which is expensive and time-consuming and requires large amounts of annotated data. Moreover, a single model is traditionally suited only for a single type of task, like segmentation and classification. These models are also typically uni-modal. In contrast, healthcare workflows are typically multi-modal, with clinicians leveraging diverse inputs (e.g., clinical notes, reports, investigations) during diagnosis and treatment planning [15, 16, 17]. FMs for computer-aided diagnosis (CAD) are designed to address these shortcomings while maintaining privacy, transparency, and ethics.

In the literature, FMs, especially large vision models (LVMS), have demonstrated promising success [18, 19]. These models have the potential to improve CAD outcomes further. However, the massive demand for data during the training of FMs raises concerns about confidentiality. Patient data often includes sensitive information like medical history and even genetic information. Moreover, biases can be present in the data itself, leading to models that perpetuate discrimination based on factors like race, gender, or socioeconomic status. This results in inaccurate diagnosis and poor generalization in downstream tasks. Accountability is one of the major concerns in case of such malfunctions. Generative AI-based FMs are scrutinized because of the misuse and legality concerns. The complex “black-box” models require explainable techniques to build trustworthy CAD systems. These issues necessitate a deeper understanding of ethical concerns with potential solutions and tools that can form the basis of reliable FMs for medical assistance. In this paper we highlight the ethical concerns and societal impacts. To mitigate these risks, we propose an end-to-end framework that includes federated learning, bias auditing, fairness-aware methods, and regulatory protocols as tools for responsible and reliable medical FMs. To this end, the key contributions of this work are as follows:




Figure 1: **Comprehensive workflow of a foundational model in medical imaging:** From multi-modal data acquisition and curation to deployment and iterative model update, incorporating ethical considerations and downstream tasks for higher order skills and vision tasks.

- Ethical framework proposal:** We delved into ethical approaches to steer the conscientious development and deployment of Foundation Models (FMs) in medicine, crafting a road map that underscores responsibility, integrity, and patient-centered innovation.
- Addressing ethical challenges in medical foundational model:** We spotlight critical ethical concerns linked to FMs in medicine, such as safeguarding data privacy, diversity of data, addressing biases, regulatory compliances and ensuring algorithmic transparency. This solution ensures that novel FM provides fair and unbiased outcomes to all patients.

2 Challenges of foundation models: Overview

FMs have the potential to revolutionize healthcare workflows, yet they face significant challenges, both domain-specific (related to Medical Imaging) and general [20]. *(i) Data scarcity.* One primary challenge is the bottleneck of data scarcity and the lack of high-quality annotated images for model training and testing. This scarcity hampers the ability to develop accurate and reliable models. *(ii) Variation.* Medical volumetric data is extremely high resolution and exhibits inter-person anatomical variability, making it challenging for models to generalize effectively [21]. *(iii) Heterogeneous data.* The heterogeneity of vision data, consisting of different modalities acquired from diverse devices and imaging protocols, further complicates model training and deployment. *(iv) Computational cost.* Another issue is the scalability of FMs in medical imaging. These models tend to be computationally expensive, resulting in longer inference times and higher cost requirements. *(v) Ethics and reliability.* The requirement for patient data raises concerns about privacy, security, and integrity. Whereas the output of FMs is often questioned about the explainability and reliability. *(vi) Susceptibility.* The accuracy of medical decisions is paramount, as they can have life-defining consequences. Therefore, the susceptibility of FMs to adversarial attacks is a major concern [22]. This not only compromises patient safety but also raises ethical concerns, as the leakage of highly sensitive patient data through adversarial attacks can lead to confidentiality breaches. We dive deep into the problems in the following sections.

3 Method

Social impact and the foundation models ecosystem in healthcare is largely attributed to the ethics of scale. The ethical aspects associated with training and adaptation of a large FM (as shown in Fig. 1) can be quantified and driven towards transparency, integrity and fairness. The following study and proposals are built towards establishing a basis of an ethical and responsible FM ecosystem in bio-medical AI.

3.1 Glass box FMs: Towards transparency

Glass-box machine learning models, also known as interpretable models, are gaining attention in healthcare due to their ability to provide insights into model's decision making [23]. **Medical Professional Trust:** Healthcare professionals are more likely to trust and adopt AI systems if they understand how decisions are made. Glass-box models provide the necessary transparency for clinicians to feel confident in their AI-assisted decisions. **Patient Trust:** Patients are more comfortable accepting AI-driven recommendations when the reasoning behind these suggestions is clear and

understandable. Using interpretable tools like CAMs [24, 25], principle component analysis aka. PCA (gradient independent approach) [26], SHAP [27], LIME [28] and visual reasoning can provide necessary explainability for the FMs, ensuring transparency and trust in medical assistance. Transparency is also crucial to identify and mitigate bias in AI models, and establishing ethical regulations.

3.2 Federated learning: Ensuring privacy

For superior performance during finetuning a FM on new tasks large training data is mandatory [29]. However, the scarcity of high-quality public datasets for training FMs remains a significant challenge. Private datasets containing sensitive patient information require a long time for data curation. Here, Federated learning leverages distributed data sources and can help provide the data for FMs while addressing privacy concerns at the same time, as the data never leaves the user's device. This also addresses the challenges associated with Non-IID (Identical Independent Distributed) [30] by granular control on data sharing. Federated FMs also enable distributed collaborative training that includes protecting principles and fairness within groups.

3.3 LLMs: Facilitating regulatory compliance

Large Language Models (LLMs) like LLaMa, Komodo-7b [31] are transforming the CAD systems significantly, leveraging their ability to understand and generate natural language captions and diagnostic reports. LLMs [32] assist healthcare professionals in converting unstructured texts to well-documented reports, constructing Electronic Health Records (EHRs), summarizing clinical trials, drug discovery, biomarker identification and Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) [33]. In meeting these regulatory requirements, LLMs assist healthcare units. These structured natural language records ensure that patient data is handled in compliance with privacy and security regulations, reducing the risk of non-compliance penalties. LLMs incorporate techniques such as differential privacy (adds noise to the training data) to ensure data security and confidentiality. With clinical trials underway, LLMs can validate effectiveness and compliance maintaining standards as per the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).

3.4 Generative AI: Generalization with privacy

Generative models [34], by providing synthetic anomalies and organs that mimic real data, provide solutions to data scarcity in FM training. It also eliminates the concerns regarding privacy and consent. Generative models can be trained to generate diverse and representative samples, helping reduce bias in datasets used to train downstream models. By generating data that covers a wide range of demographic and clinical characteristics, these models promote fairness and reduce the risk of biased decision-making in healthcare. Variational autoencoders (VAEs) [35] can predict missing values and clinical results, and generate synthetic patient trajectories [36] to felicitate robustness in FMs. Ghesu et al. [37] proposed a self-supervised contrastive and online feature clustering based method for dense feature learning in FMs. Following on the work of [38], they used self-supervision to learn feature representations and map them to cluster prototypes using a hybrid approach (supervised and self-supervised). Generative image molding using synthetic data for pertaining and inference on the real world data helps in better optimization of FMs [39, 40]. FM like MedSAM [19] has shown superior performance with generative AI based encoding decoding. These generative AI based approaches incorporate privacy-preserving data generation, bias reduction, fairness promotion, improved generalization, and ethical data augmentation that ensures training of FMs responsibly and ethically.

4 Fairness, biases, and risks with generative foundational models

The use of generative AI for the generation of text, music or images makes us question its risks when trained, deployed and used. These emerging potential ethical and social concerns need to be addressed [41]. One of the foremost negative impacts of generative AI models is the amplification of existing biases and inequality based on race, gender, ethnicity or physical appearance. This can result in unfair outcomes and hamper the jurisdiction and decision-making process in society. The text or image generation models can cause serious consequences like deepfakes. In recent times, misleading content, hate speech, fake news and unlawful data have created havoc in society. It has moulded the opinions, caused public hostility and made serious threats to privacy, causing issues about accountability and liability with the production of undesirable outputs and mitigation in healthcare industries as demonstrated by [42]. Addressing the fairness, biases, harms, risks, and socio-ethical failures of foundation AI systems requires a multi-faceted approach involving stakeholders from diverse backgrounds. The organizations with a huge amount of data and powerful equipment to analyze them will be favoured over small-scale industries, eventually creating a digital divide. Malicious practices should be avoided, and transparency should be followed. Auditing and rectification of biases are needed. Responsible AI usage should be promoted at an early level. The complexities of perpetuating socioeconomic-technical challenges should be addressed, and more focus should be laid on minimizing the risks rather than maximizing the outcomes. Taking care of these harms and risks may help to develop a trustworthy system of FMs in medical imaging.

5 Methods for measuring fairness, bias, privacy, and diversity of generations

Evaluation of the equality of results in generative FMs that produces identical results for individuals showing similar characteristics irrespective of a person's gender, race or other traits should be favoured. Fairness measures such as statistical tests or disparate impacts are used to confirm forecasts to match each other's actual results. The training data is checked carefully for biases using analytical techniques examining demographic data and determining connections between sensitive features and outputs from the model by utilizing algorithms. Algorithmic audits are used to identify possible bias in the model. To preserve privacy and prevent data breaches, noise is added to the training data while maintaining general patterns. Decentralized datasets stored on separate devices and federated learning is utilized for training, minimizing data sharing and privacy risks [43]. Model outputs using metrics like the *Gini coefficient* or *Shannon diversity* [44] are utilized. Higher diversity suggests a less homogeneous model. Implementing these techniques across all stages of the development life-cycle ensures fairness, bias, diversity and consistent evaluation. [4]. Ensuring diverse [45] representation in training and development makes the model accurate and inclusive, preventing performance disparities across different demographics and modalities. Actively mitigating biases rooted in historical and societal prejudices through bias auditing and debiasing techniques is crucial for fair outputs. Ethical considerations like privacy and societal impact require transparent development and regulatory oversight. Multidisciplinary collaboration among technologists, and sociologists [46] is essential to ensure equitable, accurate, and ethically sound AI that reflects societal values.

6 Copyright concerns

Copyright concerns in generative AI stem from its potential resemblance to existing work and the risk of infringing upon copyright holders' rights. To mitigate these concerns, developers and data analysts should refrain from training models on copyrighted material and acknowledge original sources. While some advocate for public access to AI-generated content, others call for new legal frameworks to address these challenges [47, 48]. It takes cooperation between technologists, members of parliament, and legal experts in order to develop frameworks that balance preserving intellectual property rights with driving innovation [49, 50]. In a nutshell, generative AI presents substantial problems with privacy and copyright despite its possibilities for creative expression. Addressing these issues requires comprehensive consideration of innovation, regulations, and politics [51]. Aggressive steps are necessary to ensure the legal and ethical execution of Generative AI for societal growth while safeguarding individual rights.

7 Balance between scaling and societal impact for foundational models

Addressing practical and ethical challenges in AI and machine learning development and deployment is vital to ensure these innovations serve the greater good while minimizing harm. Ensuring access to high-quality, diverse, and representative data [52] is a significant challenge. Developing scalable AI systems that seamlessly integrate into existing technological ecosystems poses operational challenges. Ensuring data security, safeguarding against breaches, and protecting user privacy are ongoing priorities. Mitigating bias in AI models to ensure fairness across demographic groups is a key ethical concern, demanding continuous innovation [53]. Transparency in decision-making and accountability are essential for trust and reliability. Addressing broader societal impacts like job displacement, surveillance, and social inequalities is imperative. Finding the right balance between technological efficacy and making sure people agree to how technology is used is crucial.

Additionally, 'jailbreaking' generative AI models, including those utilized in medical imaging, involve unauthorized modifications that can lead to misuse and detrimental outcomes [54]. This practice jeopardizes patient safety by introducing errors or biases, potentially resulting in incorrect diagnoses or treatments. Furthermore, it poses legal and regulatory risks by potentially violating data privacy and quality standards. Ethically, jailbreaking challenges principles such as patient autonomy and justice [55], undermining the credibility and acceptance of AI in healthcare. Ensuring AI integrity and prioritizing patient welfare is crucial for maintaining trust in AI-driven medical solutions. Developers and users must uphold ethical principles and prioritize patient welfare above other interests [56].

8 Towards ethical and responsible use

Promoting transparency, fairness, and bias avoidance involves clearly documenting how data is collected, preprocessed, and customized to train a model. It's important to identify and rectify biases in the dataset. Regularly monitoring the model's performance and ensuring it works well for all users is crucial. Involving diverse stakeholders with different viewpoints is essential. Techniques like data augmentation and debiasing can help mitigate biases during training [57]. Prioritizing privacy and security measures is essential in handling information. Adhering to data protection regulations is crucial. Techniques like differential privacy and federated learning help minimize counter-attacks and safely manage risk-prone user data. Regular auditing to identify security loopholes in the model and implementing measures to protect data from breaches and threats are important practices to follow. Accountability for decisions made by FMs and their

consequences, openness to feedback, and responsible development and deployment for external entities are crucial. Engaging with communities, ordinary people, and stakeholders to address feedback and concerns raised by marginalized groups is crucial.

9 Conclusion

In conclusion, foundational models are set to transform medical imaging, enhancing accuracy and treatment strategies. However, their clinical integration presents significant ethical challenges, from data privacy concerns to the risks of bias and the demands for transparency and accountability. We studied a comprehensive ethical framework to guide the responsible development and use of these models, emphasizing a balanced approach that combines technology with ethical principles. This paper highlights the importance of a collaborative, multidisciplinary effort to address these ethical considerations, ensuring foundational models advance healthcare with the utmost integrity and a steadfast focus on patient well-being.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Acknowledgments

The project is supported by the NIH funding: R01-CA246704, R01-CA240639, U01-DK127384-02S1, and U01-CA268808.

References

- [1] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [2] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [3] Sebastian Thrun. Lifelong learning algorithms. In *Learning to learn*, pages 181–209. 1998.
- [4] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021.
- [5] Andrew Wong, Erkin Otles, John P Donnelly, Andrew Krumm, Jeffrey McCullough, Olivia DeTroyer-Cooley, Justin Pestrue, Marie Phillips, Judy Konye, Carleen Penoza, et al. External validation of a widely implemented proprietary sepsis prediction model in hospitalized patients. *JAMA internal medicine*, 181(8):1065–1070, 2021.
- [6] STAT News. Epic overhauls sepsis algorithm after finding biases in its training data. <https://www.statnews.com/2022/10/03/epic-sepsis-algorithm-revamp-training/>, October 2022. Accessed: 2024-03-24.
- [7] Peter Clark, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Daniel Khashabi, Bhavana Mishra, Kyle Richardson, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, Oyvind Tafjord, Niket Tandon, et al. From ‘f’ to ‘a’ on the ny regents science exams: An overview of the aristo project. *Ai Magazine*, 41(4):39–53, 2020.
- [8] Laila Rasmy, Yang Xiang, Ziqian Xie, Cui Tao, and Degui Zhi. Med-bert: pretrained contextualized embeddings on large-scale structured electronic health records for disease prediction. *NPJ digital medicine*, 4(1):86, 2021.
- [9] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [10] Jieneng Chen, Yongyi Lu, Qihang Yu, Xiangde Luo, Ehsan Adeli, Yan Wang, Le Lu, Alan L Yuille, and Yuyin Zhou. Transunet: Transformers make strong encoders for medical image segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04306*, 2021.
- [11] Fahad Shamshad, Salman Khan, Syed Waqas Zamir, Muhammad Haris Khan, Munawar Hayat, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Huazhu Fu. Transformers in medical imaging: A survey. *Medical Image Analysis*, page 102802, 2023.
- [12] Ali Hatamizadeh, Yucheng Tang, Vishwesh Nath, Dong Yang, Andriy Myronenko, Bennett Landman, Holger R Roth, and Daguang Xu. Unetr: Transformers for 3d medical image segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, pages 574–584, 2022.

- [13] Foivos I Diakogiannis, François Waldner, Peter Caccetta, and Chen Wu. Resunet-a: A deep learning framework for semantic segmentation of remotely sensed data. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, 162:94–114, 2020.
- [14] Debesh Jha, Pia H Smedsrud, Michael A Riegler, Dag Johansen, Thomas De Lange, Pål Halvorsen, and Håvard D Johansen. ResUNet++: An Advanced Architecture for Medical Image Segmentation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE International Symposium on Multimedia (ISM)*, pages 225–230, 2019.
- [15] Pranav Rajpurkar, Emma Chen, Oishi Banerjee, and Eric J Topol. Ai in health and medicine. *Nature medicine*, 28(1):31–38, 2022.
- [16] Gavin E Duggan, Joshua J Reicher, Yun Liu, Daniel Tse, and Shravya Shetty. Improving reference standards for validation of ai-based radiography. *The British Journal of Radiology*, 94:20210435, 2021.
- [17] Stanford Human-Centered AI Institute. How foundation models can advance AI healthcare, 2024.
- [18] Wenhui Lei, Xu Wei, Xiaofan Zhang, Kang Li, and Shaoting Zhang. Medlsam: Localize and segment anything model for 3d medical images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14752*, 2023.
- [19] Jun Ma, Yuting He, Feifei Li, Lin Han, Chenyu You, and Bo Wang. Segment anything in medical images. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):654, 2024.
- [20] Bobby Azad, Reza Azad, Sania Eskandari, Afshin Bozorgpour, Amirhossein Kazerouni, Islem Rekik, and Dorit Merhof. Foundational models in medical imaging: A comprehensive survey and future vision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18689*, 2023.
- [21] NVIDIA Developer Blog. Visual foundation models for medical image analysis. <https://developer.nvidia.com/blog/visual-foundation-models-for-medical-image-analysis/>, 2024.
- [22] Natalie Maus, Patrick Chao, Eric Wong, and Jacob Gardner. Black box adversarial prompting for foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04237*, 2023.
- [23] Valentina Franzoni. From black box to glass box: advancing transparency in artificial intelligence systems for ethical and trustworthy ai. In *International Conference on Computational Science and Its Applications*, pages 118–130, 2023.
- [24] Ramprasaath R Selvaraju, Michael Cogswell, Abhishek Das, Ramakrishna Vedantam, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 618–626, 2017.
- [25] Aditya Chattpadhyay, Anirban Sarkar, Prantik Howlader, and Vineeth N Balasubramanian. Grad-cam++: Generalized gradient-based visual explanations for deep convolutional networks. In *2018 IEEE winter conference on applications of computer vision (WACV)*, pages 839–847. IEEE, 2018.
- [26] Ian T Jolliffe and Jorge Cadima. Principal component analysis: a review and recent developments. *Philosophical transactions of the royal society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 374(2065):20150202, 2016.
- [27] Scott M Lundberg and Su-In Lee. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [28] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. " why should i trust you?" explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 1135–1144, 2016.
- [29] Weiming Zhuang, Chen Chen, and Lingjuan Lyu. When foundation model meets federated learning: Motivations, challenges, and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15546*, 2023.
- [30] Yue Zhao, Meng Li, Liangzhen Lai, Naveen Suda, Damon Civin, and Vikas Chandra. Federated learning with non-iid data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.00582*, 2018.
- [31] Louis Owen, Vishesh Tripathi, Abhay Kumar, and Biddwan Ahmed. Komodo: A linguistic expedition into indonesia's regional languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09362*, 2024.
- [32] Xiaoming Shi, Jie Xu, Jinru Ding, Jiali Pang, Sichen Liu, Shuqing Luo, Xingwei Peng, Lu Lu, Haihong Yang, Mingtao Hu, et al. Llm-mini-cex: Automatic evaluation of large language model for diagnostic conversation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07635*, 2023.

- [33] Rebecca G Mishuris, Jeffrey A Linder, David W Bates, and Asaf Bitton. Using electronic health record clinical decision support is associated with improved quality of care. *Am J Manag Care*, 20(10):e445–e452, 2014.
- [34] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27, 2014.
- [35] Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- [36] Marzieh Esmaeili, Amirhosein Toosi, Arash Roshanpoor, Vahid Changizi, Marjan Ghazisaeedi, Arman Rahmim, and Mohammad Sabokrou. Generative adversarial networks for anomaly detection in biomedical imaging: A study on seven medical image datasets. *IEEE Access*, 11:17906–17921, 2023.
- [37] FC Ghesu, B Georgescu, A Mansoor, Y Yoo, D Neumann, P Patel, RS Vishwanath, JM Balter, Y Cao, S Grbic, et al. Self-supervised learning from 100 million medical images. *arxiv* 2022. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.01283*.
- [38] Mathilde Caron, Ishan Misra, Julien Mairal, Priya Goyal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Unsupervised learning of visual features by contrasting cluster assignments. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:9912–9924, 2020.
- [39] Onkar Susladkar, Dhruv Makwana, Gayatri Deshmukh, Sparsh Mittal, R Sai Chandra Teja, and Rekha Singhal. Tpfnet: A novel text in-painting transformer for text removal. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition*, pages 155–172, 2023.
- [40] Gayatri Deshmukh, Onkar Susladkar, Dhruv Makwana, Sparsh Mittal, et al. Textual alchemy: Coformer for scene text understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 2931–2941, 2024.
- [41] Wenjuan Zhu, Lei Huang, Xinni Zhou, Xiaoya Li, Gaojun Shi, Jingxin Ying, and Chaoyue Wang. Could ai ethical anxiety, perceived ethical risks and ethical awareness about ai influence university students' use of generative ai products? an ethical perspective. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, pages 1–23, 2024.
- [42] Momina Masood, Mariam Nawaz, Khalid Mahmood Malik, Ali Javed, Aun Irtaza, and Hafiz Malik. Deep-fakes generation and detection: State-of-the-art, open challenges, countermeasures, and way forward. *Applied intelligence*, 53(4):3974–4026, 2023.
- [43] Ninareh Mehrabi, Fred Morstatter, Nripsuta Saxena, Kristina Lerman, and Aram Galstyan. A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)*, 54(6):1–35, 2021.
- [44] Udit Ojha. *Towards fairness AI: A data-centric approach*. PhD thesis, Politecnico di Torino, 2022.
- [45] Caitlin Kuhlman, Latifa Jackson, and Rumi Chunara. No computation without representation: Avoiding data and algorithm biases through diversity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.11836*, 2020.
- [46] Sreedhar Reddy Konda. Ethical considerations in the development and deployment of ai-driven software systems. *International Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, 6(3):86–101, 2022.
- [47] Nicola Lucchi. ChatGPT: A Case Study on Copyright Challenges for Generative Artificial Intelligence Systems. *European Journal of Risk Regulation*, pages 1–23, 2023.
- [48] Yan Chen and Pouyan Esmaeilzadeh. Generative ai in medical practice: In-depth exploration of privacy and security challenges. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 26:e53008, 2024.
- [49] Matthew Sag. Copyright safety for generative ai. *Forthcoming in the Houston Law Review*, 2023.
- [50] Joshua S Gans. Copyright policy options for generative artificial intelligence. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2024.
- [51] Apoorva Verma. The copyright problem with emerging generative ai. Available at SSRN 4537389, 2023.
- [52] Julius Sim and Jackie Waterfield. Focus group methodology: some ethical challenges. *Quality & quantity*, 53(6):3003–3022, 2019.
- [53] Nancy M Baum, Sarah E Gollust, Susan D Goold, and Peter D Jacobson. Looking ahead: addressing ethical challenges in public health practice. *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 35(4):657–667, 2007.
- [54] Raz Lapid, Ron Langberg, and Moshe Sipper. Open sesame! universal black box jailbreaking of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01446*, 2023.

- [55] Lichao Sun, Yue Huang, Haoran Wang, Siyuan Wu, Qihui Zhang, Chujie Gao, Yixin Huang, Wenhan Lyu, Yixuan Zhang, Xiner Li, et al. Trustllm: Trustworthiness in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05561*, 2024.
- [56] Brendan Hannon, Yulia Kumar, Dejaun Gayle, J Jenny Li, and Patricia Morreale. Robust testing of ai language model resiliency with novel adversarial prompts. *Electronics*, 13(5):842, 2024.
- [57] Di Jin, Luzhi Wang, He Zhang, Yizhen Zheng, Weiping Ding, Feng Xia, and Shirui Pan. A survey on fairness-aware recommender systems. *Information Fusion*, 100:101906, 2023.