

Explainable, Domain-Adaptive, and Federated Artificial Intelligence in Medicine

Ahmad Chaddad*, Qizong lu, Jiali Li, Yousef Katib, Reem Kateb, Camel Tanougast, Ahmed Bouridane, Ahmed Abdulkadir

Abstract—Artificial intelligence (AI) continues to transform data analysis in many domains. Progress in each domain is driven by a growing body of annotated data, increased computational resources, and technological innovations. In medicine, the sensitivity of the data, the complexity of the tasks, the potentially high stakes, and a requirement of accountability give rise to a particular set of challenges. In this review, we focus on three key methodological approaches that address some of the particular challenges in AI-driven medical decision making. (1) Explainable AI aims to produce a human-interpretable justification for each output. Such models increase confidence if the results appear plausible and match the clinicians expectations. However, the absence of a plausible explanation does not imply an inaccurate model. Especially in highly non-linear, complex models that are tuned to maximize accuracy, such interpretable representations only reflect a small portion of the justification. (2) Domain adaptation and transfer learning enable AI models to be trained and applied across multiple domains. For example, a classification task based on images acquired on different acquisition hardware. (3) Federated learning enables learning large-scale models without exposing sensitive personal health information. Unlike centralized AI learning, where the centralized learning machine has access to the entire training data, the federated learning process iteratively updates models across multiple sites by exchanging only parameter updates, not personal health data. This narrative review covers the basic concepts, highlights relevant corner-stone and state-of-the-art research in the field, and discusses perspectives.

Index Terms—Explainable artificial intelligence, domain adaptation, federated learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI)—understood here as the capability of computers to transform input data to elicit an appropriate response [1], has a huge potential to transform many aspects of our lives. The methodological advances that drive the progress generally focus on core issues like solving specific tasks more accurately [2], creating models that generalize to

A. Chaddad, Q. Lu, J. Li are with the School of Artificial intelligence, Guilin University of Electronic Technology, China. A. Chaddad is with The Laboratory for Imagery, Vision and Artificial Intelligence, Ecole de Technologie Supérieure, Montreal, Canada.

Y. Katib is with the college of medicine, Taibah University, Madinah, Saudi Arabia.

R. Kateb is with college of computer science and engineering, Taibah University, Madinah, Saudi Arabia.

C. Tanougast is with the Laboratory of Design, Optimization and Modeling Systems, University of Lorraine, Metz, France.

A. Bouridane is with the Center for Data Analytics and Cybersecurity (CDAC), University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates.

A. Abdulkadir is with the Laboratoire de recherche en neuroimagerie, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Vaudois, Lausanne, Switzerland.

*Corresponding author: Ahmad Chaddad,

Email: ahmad8chaddad@gmail.com, ahmadchaddad@guet.edu.cn

Manuscript received November , 2021; revised August -, 2022.

unseen data [3], or addressing fundamentally new tasks [4]. Within these innovation cycles, the application of medical data faces particular challenges. Personal health related information is sensitive and therefore not readily sharable. When it is shared, the data itself is highly complex and heterogeneous. There is not only a large variation between individuals, but there is also measurement noise and systematic effects due to acquisition instruments and protocols. This noise, uncertainty, and heterogeneity in the data and labels creates distinctly challenging sets of problems. The goal of AI in medicine is to support the clinical decision process. The decisions in clinical processes can have grave consequences, sometimes observed with a substantial delay and usually uncorrectable. Furthermore, state-of-the-art AI models tend to have a large number of parameters, which are necessary to learn complex interaction and generalize well. Thus, even when being deterministic, AI models do not behave intuitively and may fail or behave unexpectedly [5]. This perception of the *black-box* behavior leads to subjective mistrust and objectively limited reliability of an unknown extent.

With the growing availability of extensive medical data and the increase in computational power, AI has become more important in clinical practice for early disease detection, accurate diagnosis, predictions, and prognosis [6]. However, AI models—mostly instantiated as deep artificial neural networks, are sufficiently complicated to be non-intuitive. Thus, the computer models are perceived as a *black boxes* [7]. Then, the black-box nature leads to mistrust of predictive models by clinicians [8]. For this reason, explainable artificial intelligence (explainable AI) was proposed in order to make AI models more transparent and easier to understand and interpret [9]. Explainable AI can thus complement human perception of the naked data [10], [11] and will contribute to making AI models in medicine more trusted.

Computer-aided diagnosis is increasingly involved in clinical decision processes to advance the goal of personalized medicine [12]. However, some challenges limit its application in clinical practice, such as domain transfer [13]. Specifically, it assumes that the training and test set are independent and identically distributed (IID) using machine learning (ML) models. In reality, the distributions of the training and test set may not be identical. This leads to domain shift when we transfer the model [14]. Despite advanced deep learning models [15], the error increases proportionately with different distributions between the training data set and the test data set [13]. Therefore, how to solve the domain transfer problem is a key to applying AI to clinical tasks. Domain adaptation (DA) breaks the traditional assumption that the distribution

of the training and test data set must be consistent with ML [16]. The data set is divided into source and target data in this context. The source data is related to the task to be solved, and the target data (with no labels or only a few labels) is related to the task. Note that there are always domain shifts between two domains [16]. In medical imaging, there are significant differences within data sets of the same type/modality due to various equipment, sites, protocols, etc [17]. Domain adaptation techniques aim to reduce these differences.

More and more attention has been paid to data privacy in recent years [18]. In clinical topics, personalized models require protection of personal health information [19]. Federated learning (FL) can integrate data from private sources without sharing private data itself [20]. Specifically, FL protects users' privacy primarily by exchanging non-personal data such as updated models between agents (clients) of the learning federation [21].

This paper aims to provide a brief narrative review of explainable/interpretable, domain-adaptive, and federated AI for clinical applications. Fig. 1 illustrates a yearly growing number of publications in the field. These search results indicate a clear trend. However, it is worth noting that the search technique is not 100 percent sensitive because synonymous terms may be used for similar techniques; for instance, transfer learning is a type of DA. In addition, some research works may discuss one of the topics superficially yet being counted.




Fig. 1: Number of publications indexed on PubMed (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>) that matched the search queries related to the topics in this survey.

FL: \federated learning" AND ((medicine) OR (healthcare)), XAI: ((\explainable AI") OR (\explainable artificial intelligence")) AND ((medicine) OR (healthcare)), DA: (\domain adaptation") AND ((medicine) OR (healthcare)). The number for the year 2022 is a projection based on the assumption that publications appear at the same rate for the remaining two months of the year 2022.

This review provides a brief overview of XAI, DA and FL and categorizes techniques within each field. For each topic, we motivate its use in medical research and healthcare applications and discuss challenges and potentials for feature research.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section II consists of the fundamental concepts for the three methodological approaches. We discuss in Section III the application of XAI, DA, and FL to medical research and healthcare.

Finally, Section IV concludes by providing perspectives of challenges and untapped potential.

II. METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATION AND BACKGROUND

A. Explainable artificial intelligence

Human-centric medical decision processes are designed to be trustworthy because of the high stakes that are involved. Isolated outputs from AI models derived from deterministic, yet highly non-linear networks that consist of artificial neurons organized in many—up to a thousand and more, layers [22] leave no room for interpretation and provide no explanation of the prediction. AI models are therefore casually considered as black boxes because the "How?" and "Why?" a machine arrives at its conclusion is in general not understandable by humans [23]. The field has a rich and nuanced taxonomy that is not always used consistently. Explainability and interpretability—sometimes used interchangeably, relate to human-focused understanding [24]–[26]. A machine is understandable if their decisions are based on descriptive and relevant information that is recognizable by humans. In this context, *descriptive* means how well the interpretation method captures the learned relationships and *relevant* means how useful the interpretation is [27]. Explainable AI models strive for high causability—the extent to which a human can casually understand the decision making process of artificial intelligence [28]. Explainability and related research fields are elements of building reliable and trusted AI systems [10].

XAI elements are injected either into the model architecture or are external. The former leads to models that intrinsically increase transparency of the model, whereas the latter introduces explainability post-hoc [29]. Transparency is achieved by highlighting relevance of features, simplification, and visual data that is relevant and meaningful for the practitioners [30].

B. Domain-adaptive artificial intelligence

Generalizability is the implicit ability to use a trained predictive model from one or more source domains in a different, but related, target domain. In contrast, domain adaptation is achieved through explicit modelling of domain differences. Assume we train a classifier model using data from a source domain \mathcal{D}_s for some task \mathcal{T}_s , and to learn the same or similar task \mathcal{T}_t using target data \mathcal{D}_t . If the two domains have the same distribution ($\mathcal{D}_s \sim \mathcal{D}_t$) and the tasks are identical, then the model trained for task \mathcal{T}_s on \mathcal{D}_s can also be used for the task \mathcal{T}_t in \mathcal{D}_t . If the two domains are not from the same distribution ($\mathcal{D}_s \not\sim \mathcal{D}_t$), then the models trained on the source domain \mathcal{D}_s are likely to perform worse on \mathcal{D}_t . DA is utilized to exploit similarities of tasks and learn differences in data domains to produce models for task \mathcal{T}_t in \mathcal{D}_t [31]. Figure 2 shows an example of homogeneous domain adaptation, this is when the same task is applied to the same features that have a different distribution. Other types of DA methods are outlined in the taxonomy below.

a) *Supervised, semi-supervised, and unsupervised domain adaptation:* Depending on the availability of annotation, DA applications can be classified as supervised [32], semisupervised [33], and unsupervised [34]. In supervised




Fig. 2: Illustration of homogeneous domain adaptation in which the source and target distributions consist of the same features but have different distributions. Red and blue colors represent the source and target data, respectively. Circles and squares represent class labels. Domain adaptation aims to applying models (dashed line) to data from a target domain (blue) that were learned using data from a source domain (red). In the example shown, the domain adaptation consists of shifting and rotating the data points such that after the transformation, the source, and target domains overlap. The separating classification hyperplane, shown as grey dashed line, only accurately classifies the data points from the target data after domain adaptation.

DA models, labels of all training instances are available. On the other hand, in semi-supervised learning, only a part of the training data is annotated. Learning with no labels is considered unsupervised. Specifically, most studies focus on unsupervised DA models due to insufficient numbers of labeled samples. For example, a novel unsupervised DA algorithm proposes to eliminate the domain differences for reducing the label noise [35]. While, a deep domain adaptation method is proposed to transfer domain knowledge from a well-labeled source domain to a partially labeled target domain [36]. This method minimizes the differences in the domain that have an important clinical impact for disease diagnosis.

b) Single- and cross-modality: Medical image derived from many types of scanner (e.g., magnetic resonance imaging, CT, X-ray) that are related to texture differences between the source and target domains [37]. This phenomenon is called the modality difference. When based on acquisition, DA methods are categorized as either single- or cross-modality DA. In single-modality DA, the adaptations happen within a single type of data [38]. In clinical practice, medical images are acquired on hardware from different vendors and at different centers [39]. Because different modalities provide complementary information and vary in acquisition cost and expertise, a diagnosis can be established with different modalities. Cross-modal DA helps to make models applicable across modalities. For example, some models can be transferred between CT and MRI images [40]. In addition, bidirectional cross-modality DA between MRI and CT images has been applied using the synergistic image and feature alignment framework (SIFA) [41]. Despite the practicability of DA, there are always remaining risks of inherent biases in the data [42]

or unfairness in models [43].

c) Single- and multi-source domain adaptation: Depending on the number of source domains, it is possible to classify DA into single-source DA (SDA), multi-source DA (MDA) and source-free DA [44]. For example, trained models using single-source domains lack generalization. Multi-source DA collects labeled data from multiple sources with different distributions [45] and implicitly learn to be robust. For example, MDA learning can alleviate the difficulties caused by aligning multimodal characteristics between multiple domains [46]. Although MDA is advanced, MDA applications are challenging due to the heterogeneity of data between domains. For this reason, most existing studies are based on SDA [47]. Another issue could be related to the source domains, cause to data privacy or lack of storage space for small devices [48]. A generalized source-free domain adaptation (G-SFDA) was proposed to possess source domain features via transfer learning [49].

d) One- and multi-step DA: On the basis of the distance between the source and the target domain, domain adaptation methods can be roughly categorized into two types: one-step and multistep domain adaptation methods. The one-step DA methods often simply align the feature distributions of the two domains by minimizing their distances. But it is difficult for the network to minimize the huge domain discrepancy. Specifically, in remote domain transfer learning, when the distance between the source domain and the target domain is too long [50], it is impossible to achieve and can even affect the performance of the learning model in the target domain. This situation is called negative transfer [51]. In order to avoid this situation, it is necessary to find an “intermediate bridge” to connect the source and the target domain. That is called multistep DA. It can be transformed into one-step domain adaptation by choosing an appropriate intermediate domain. For example, through efficient instance selection, transfer features are successfully applied between remote domains and effectively solve the remote domain problem [52].

e) Shallow and deep DA: According to the type of model, we can divide the DA method into shallow and deep DA. Usually, shallow DA leverages feature engineering and is used with traditional machine learning. But few timely reviews the emerging deep learning based methods. Unlike the shallow DA, deep DA methods can leverage deep networks to learn more transferable representations by embedding DA in a deep learning pipeline [53]. In addition, deep DA integrates a feature into the learning model to improve performance metrics [13].

These methods may reduce the differences in the domain that can have a positive impact in clinical research. Specifically, more effort is required to fully apply such methods in clinical topics to avoid bias.

C. Federated learning

Federated Learning (FL) is a way of distributed collaborative machine learning in which the training data is not shared. This concept of data-private collaborative learning [54], that initially was motivated in the context of mobile devices in

which each one has only a small fraction of the data, equally applies to medical application in which the data is distributed across hospitals [55].

This framework works by collaborating multiple devices to update a machine learning model without sharing their private data under the supervision of a central server. An example in medicine is the COVID-19 chest scan engine, which was built by many researchers and medical practitioners from different parts of the world. In the COVID-19 pandemic, along with increased privacy concerns, FL is mainly useful to support the diagnosis and detection of COVID-19. This was done by coordinating massive hospitals to build a common AI model [56].

We now give a general formal definition of FL. Let N be the number of data clients—for example hospitals, $\{\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \dots, \mathcal{H}_N\}$, all of whom wish to contribute to the training of a predictive model by combining their respective data $\{\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \dots, \mathcal{D}_N\}$. A traditional method is to combine all data and use $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_2, \dots \cup \mathcal{D}_N$ to train a model \mathcal{M}_{all} . A FL is a learning process in which the data clients collaboratively train a model \mathcal{M}_{FL} , in which process any data client \mathcal{H}_i does not share its data \mathcal{D}_i to others. In addition, the accuracy of \mathcal{M}_{FL} , denoted as \mathcal{V}_{FL} should approach the performance of \mathcal{M}_{all} , \mathcal{V}_{all} . Formally, let δ be a non-negative real number, if

$$|\mathcal{V}_{FL} - \mathcal{V}_{all}| < \delta \quad (1)$$

Then, the federated learning algorithm has an accuracy loss of δ .

FL is particularly attractive for smart healthcare, by coordinating multiple hospitals to perform an AI training without sharing raw data [57]. However, FL is an emerging research area and has not yet gained much trust in the medical community; therefore, it has required more research, particularly with respect to security and privacy aspects. Although this framework sounds ideal in theory, it is not immune to attacks. Moreover, its current development is not mature enough to be expected to solve all privacy issues by default. The most specific security threats facing the FL framework are communication bottlenecks, poisoning, backdoor attacks, and inference-based attacks, which can be considered the most critical to FL privacy [58]. In this context, FL is represented in three main groups 1) privacy protection [59], 2) Effective communication [60] and data heterogeneity [61].

a) *Privacy protection:* For generalization of the predictive model in medical data analysis, recent work focuses on considering multisite samples with multidimensionality. However, data sharing between institutions has been controlled by laws such as the United States Health Insurance Circulation and Accountability Act (HIPAA) [62] and the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [63]). FL demonstrates its feasibility in sharing and protecting the privacy of 20 medical institutions and centers [64]. FL is represented by models that are trained simultaneously at each site. These models are periodically aggregated and redistributed, requiring only the weight transfer of learned model between institutions. This step eliminates the requirement of sharing data directly

[65]. Although FL can efficiently protect the data privacy, their application still bares some security-related risks [66].

b) *Effective communication:* Communication is a critical bottleneck in federated networks [67]. FL network can consist of thousands of agents contributing model updates. To obtain high-performance models, the multi-participant situation is inevitable. In this context, network communication is slower than local computation by many orders of magnitude due to limited resources such as bandwidth, energy, and power. To solve this problem, two key aspects can be used: 1) reducing the total number of communication rounds and 2) reducing the size of the messages transmitted in each round [68]. It can perform client-side filtering, reduce the frequency of updates, and P2P (peer-to-peer) learning (e.g., compression) [69].

c) *Data heterogeneity:* Currently, data samples in hospitals are not independent and distributed identically (IID). It leads to an increase in the bias of the model [70]. A proposed initial shared model used for hospitals that can easily adapt it to the local dataset [71]. Through intelligently choosing the participant, it can reduce the times of communication in FL and counterbalance the bias introduced by IID data. However, the data are not always IID type. To systematically and intuitively understand the current FL method in different data distribution, new studies have been conducted a comprehensive experimental comparison between the new algorithms [72]. This means that FL can solve the problem of multisite data, such as in multiple clinical institutions [73].

Regardless of these advanced FL techniques, more efforts are needed to consider these models in healthcare field.

III. METHODS

Deep learning models are widely applied in medicine. However, these models require more interpretability to simplify the steps of the prediction process. Despite advances in XAI models, there is a huge need to consider XAI with DA and FL when the topics are related to medicine to achieve the goal of personalized medicine. For example, DA-based XAI models have the ability to improve the performance in computer aided diagnosis [74]. But the same model will not be able to provide a feasible performance using multi-institutional data. For this reason, FL is a good option for data sharing under the condition of protecting data privacy [75]. However, there is an additional issue related to intra- and inter-site difference of distributions. This leads to a domain shift between sites. Recent work proposes to integrate Unsupervised Domain Adaptation (UDA) into the FL framework [76]. For example, UDA guides the model to learn domain-agnostic features through adversarial learning or a specific type of batch normalization [50]. Furthermore, DA techniques such as mixture of experts (MoE) with adversarial domain alignment can be used to improve the accuracy of different sites in the FL learning setup [77]. These techniques will be presented below in three subsections related to DA, XAI and FL.

A. Current methods of explainable artificial intelligence

With high-performance deep learning models of increasing complexity, the way specific results were obtained are not

accessible to humans. A number of methods were proposed to increase explainability in recent years, 17 of which were discussed in a recent survey [78] and a selection of which is listed in Table I and discussed in following paragraphs. These techniques are mainly divided into two categories, 1) explainability in modeling and 2) explainability after modeling (see Figure 3).

a) Explainability in modeling: Explainability is derived from modifications of the model architecture. This process can be represented in simplification (and/or quantification) layers and loss function, or by adding an explainable network and visualization module. For example, CNN architectures consist of convolutions, pooling, and fully connected layers; To increase the explainability of CNN, layers could be quantified, modified, and combined with a visual model. Replacement of convolutional layers with max-pooling layers provide better visualization without losing performance metrics [79]. Another scenario related to CNN is represented by adding attention network and modifying the loss function [80]. Recent studies have been quantified the convolution layers by Gaussian mixture model and/or texture features for clinical classifications [81]–[86]. However, there are only a few studies focused on explainable hidden layers.

b) Explainability after modeling: It requires many experiments to balance model accuracy based on post-hoc interpretability (explainability after modeling). It is grouped into the following categories:

1) Feature relevance analysis: Measures the importance of features in the prediction model (e.g., Layer-wise Relevance Back Propagation (LRP)). LRP is an explainable AI model that explores the relation between output and input data by generating separate correlation maps for each individual image. LRP with explainability concept is also used to prune CNN. It finds the most relevant units (i.e., weights or filters) with their relevance scores [87]. Deep-LIFT is also a method to improve the effectiveness of feature learning and improve the interpretability of the model itself. It works by comparing the activation of each neuron to its reference activation and assigns scores according to the difference between the two [88], [89].

2) Visual explanation: To further improve model visualization, heat maps, saliency maps, or class activation methods are considered. Among these functions, Class Activation Mapping (CAM) is the most widely used. In CNN, it can improve explainable capabilities by replacing the fully connected layer with the global average pooling (GAP) layer [90].

However, CAM requires modifying the structure of the original model by retraining the model. For example, another version of CAM known as Grad-CAM that is a deep neural network [91]. It uses the gradient information that is related to the convolutional layer and decision of interest. Whether it is CAM or Grad-CAM, the visualization results they generate are not visually enough. In addition, a Score-CAM model proposes to manage the dependence on gradients by different ways for obtaining linear weights [92].

c) Explainability level: The explainability scale is divided into different categories in different situations. For example, XAI is divided into five scales according to ethology

in explaining animal intentionality [93]. According to the transparency of the model, XAI is divided into simulability, decomposability, and algorithmic transparency [26]. Furthermore, XAI with deep learning models could be grouped into 1) local and 2) global explanation. For local explanation, the model considers a local approximation of how the black box works. It mainly focuses on explanation of data instances. The global explanation describes the whole mechanism of the model. Generally, a group of data instances is needed to generate one or more explanation maps.

TableI summarizes XAI in deep learning models applied to clinical tasks. We note that CNNs are the most widely used deep learning models and gradient-based explainability is the most applied principle. The level of explainability is mostly *local*.

Agnostic model In addition to the previous XAI methods, Shapley Additive Explanations (SHAP) and Local explainable Model-agnostic Explanation (LIME) are agnostic to the deep learning models they are applied to. Specifically, LIME uses explainability models (such as linear models and decision trees) to approximate the target predictions from the black-box model. It detects the relationships between the output of the black-box model by slightly perturbing the input in the XAI model. For example, LIME demonstrated feasible explanations in artificial neural networks by altering the input feature and fitting it to a linear model [119]. The SHAP explains how each feature affects the predicted value (known as Shaply). It is computed based on the average of the marginal contributions of all permutations (permutations of each feature). It provides different explanations for a particular model (e.g., feature importance visualization, linear formulation). With SHAP [120], it illustrates how the design parameters affect performance using DNN features.

B. Domain adaptation with deep learning

We present the main steps in DA model by summarizing the existing literature. We grouped the existing methods into 1) DA-related data, 2) DA-related features, and 3) building and adversarial domain adaptation. In addition, we report these models in Table II. We note that the problem of domain bias occurs when the target domain is different from the source domain. This bias type limits the performance of transfer deep learning model that leads to disable the generalization of model.

a) Domain adaptation related data: It assumes that DA can solve the problem of domain shift. However, there is a bias due to different hospital equipment. Instance Re-weighting Adaptation is a method to solve this issue when the domain bias is small. It removes samples from the source domain that mismatch the similar distribution in the target domain. For example, samples with higher correlation with target samples are assigned larger weights [121]. The assigned data are then re-entered into the training model to reduce the problems arising from domain shifts [122]. This idea has been developed with a task of re-weighting mechanism that considers loss function with dynamically update weights [123]. Regardless of the advances algorithms and methods used in DA related




Fig. 3: Example of flowchart for the explainable artificial intelligence model, 1) data acquisition consists of images and clinical report for each of patients. 2) Example of four methods during modeling: it can modify layer (Layer modification) to simplify the structure or combined (Model combination) with other model to build a full explainable model. In addition, an attention network could be used for visualization and even to modify the loss function. 3) The two most used methods after modeling: feature relevance analysis and visual explanation.

TABLE I: Summary of the XAI models used for clinical applications.

Application	XAI / Explainability level	Prediction model	Reference
Preclinical relevance assessment	Model combination / G	GNN, FNN	[94]
Detection and prediction for Alzheimer's disease	SHAP / L & G	RF	[95]
Deterioration risk prediction of hepatitis	SHAP, LIME, PDP / L & G	RF	[96]
Non-communicable diseases prediction	DeepSHAP / L & G	DNN	[97]
Spinal posture classification	LIME / L	SVM	[98]
Classification of estrogen receptor status	SmoothGrad / L	DCNN	[99]
Differential diagnosis of COVID-19	Grad-CAM / G	CNN	[100]
Prediction of mortality	Shapley additive / L	RNN	[101]
Medical image segmentation	Combination / L & G	CNN, Attention Mechanism	[102]
Early detection of Parkinson's disease	LIME / L	VGG-16	[103]
COVID-19 diagnosis	Grad-CAM ++, LRP / L	DNN	[104]
Evaluation of cancer in Barrett's esophagus	5 XAI methods / L	AlexNet, SqueezeNet, ResNet50, VGG16	[105]
Heart anomaly detection	SHAP and Occlusion maps / L	CNN, MLP	[106]
Distinguish VTE patients	DeepLIFT / L	ANN	[107]
Detection of ductal carcinoma in situ	LRP / L	Resnet-50 CNN	[108]
Lesion prediction	Activation Maps, Saliency Maps / L	U-net	[109]
Early detection of COVID-19	Saliency Maps / L	Fuzzy-enhanced CNN	[110]
EEG emotion recognition	SmoothGrad, saliency maps / L	CNN	[111]
Cerebral hemorrhage detection and localization	Grad-CAM / L	ResNet	[112]
Macular disease classification	t-SNE, model simplification / L	CNN	[113]
Automated diagnosis and grading of ulcerative colitis	Grad-CAM / L	CNN	[114]
Diagnostic for breast cancer	Causal-TabNet / G	GNN	[115]
Prediction of depressive symptoms	LIME / L	RNN	[116]
Early prediction of antimicrobial multidrug resistance	SHAP / L & G	LSTM	[117]
Predictions of clinical time series	CAM / Local	FCN	[118]

L: Local; G:Global; ANN: Artificial Neural Network; GNN: Graph Neural Networks; FNN: Fuzzy Neural Network; DNN: Deep Neural Networks; RNN: Recurrent Neural Network; FCN: Fully Convolutional Network; DCNN: Deep Convolutional Neural Network; VGG-16: GG-Very-Deep-16 CNN; VGG-19: GG-Very-Deep-19 CNN; Fuzzy-enhanced CNN: Fuzzy-enhanced Convolutional Neural Network; RF: Random forest; SVM: Support Vector Machine; MLP: Muti-Layer Perceptron; LSTM: Long Short-Term Memory network; PDP: Partial Dependence Plot; t-SNE: t-distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding. Seven Network: SqueezeNet, Inception, ResNet, ResNeXt, Xception, ShuffleNet, DenseNet; Five XAI methods: Saliency, guided backpropagation, integrated gradients, input gradients, and DeepLIFT;

data, these models are able to only solve the problem of small domain bias.

b) *Domain adaptation related features:* It is based on the feature similarity between the source and the target domain. For example, the feature transformation strategy can solve the

bias problem by transferring the source and target samples from the original feature space to the new feature representation space [124]. A novel feature-based transfer learning algorithm for remote domains requires only a small portion of labeled target samples from a different domain [125].

However, transfer features can only reduce the distribution variance from a single perspective, and it is a challenge to find an optimal transfer learning method for a given dataset. For this reason, the distribution variance was reduced from multiple perspectives by applying multi-feature-based transfer learning methods [126].

c) Building an adversarial domain adaptation: Data-and feature-based DA aims to align a labeled source domain and an unlabeled target domain, which requires accessing the source data. It will raise concerns about data privacy, portability, and transmission efficiency. Therefore, a method that can adapt source-trained models towards target distributions without accessing source data will be promising. To adapt a model, samples from the source and target domains can share similar representations to provide similar predictions [127]. These models need to be pre-trained using the source domain data and re-trained by the target domain [127], which will increase the processing time. Therefore, these types of predictive models are not preferred. Another scenario based on adversarial domain adaptation is currently one of the mainstream methods. It is known that deep models (e.g., adversarial domain adaptation) can use the transformed features for domain adaptation [128]. For example, an unsupervised method based DA used for predicting glaucoma fundus [129]. Specifically, they designed a loss function that learns the source region features and possesses the original labels unchanged. An improved adversarial domain adaptation network has been considered for tumor image diagnosis with few and/or no labels [130].

TABLE II: Summary of recent domain adaptation models used for clinical topics.

Application	Method	Cross-domain	Topics	Reference
Gastric epithelial tumor	GAN	N	Y	[130]
Multiple sclerosis lesions	CNN	N	N	[127]
Arrhythmia heartbeat	CNN	N	N	[131]
Bio-metric identification	CycleGAN	Y	S and N	[132]
Medical image	DDA-Net	Y	N	[133]
Cardiac	PnP-AdaNet	Y	N	[134]
Brain dementia identification	SVM	Y	Y	[135]
Brain dementia identification	AD2A	N	N	[136]
Autism spectrum disorder	MSDA/MVSR	N	Y	[137]
Cardiac	CycleGAN	Y	N	[138]
Lung	ADDA	N	N	[139]
Histopathological	HisNet-SSDA	Y	S	[140]
Breast cancer	DADA	N	Y	[141]
Pancreatic cancer	GCN	N	N	[142]
Atrial fibrillation	3DU-Net	N	Y	[143]

Y: Yes; N: No; S: Semi-supervised; GAN: Generative Adversarial Network; CNN: Convolutional Neural Network; CycleGAN: Cycle-Consistent Generative Adversarial Networks; DDA-Net: Dual Domain Adaptation Network; DASC-Net: Domain Adaptation based Self-Correction model; PnP-AdaNet: Plug-and-Play Adversarial Domain Adaptation; SVM:Support Vector Machine; AD2A: Attention-guided Deep Domain Adaptation; MSDA: Multi-Source Domain Adaptation; MVSR: Multi-View Sparse Representation; ADDA: Adversarial Discriminative Domain Adaptation; HisNet-SSDA: a deep transferred semi-supervised domain adaptation; DADA: Depth-Aware Domain Adaptation; GCN: Graph Convolutional Networks; 3D U-Net: three dimension U-net.

Table II reports the DA methods used for clinical applications. We find that the dominant research approaches in recent years are related to adversarial networks, with a lower dominant for DA methods based on features and data. It observes that the most of these approaches based on unsu-

pervised DA. This is due to the limitation of medical data. These contributions provide a solid foundation for future DA methods applied in medicine.

C. Federated learning modeling

FL updates the models to achieve high performance by considering co-modeling step between different data sources (or client). FL is divided into the following categories:

a) Horizontal federate learning: Horizontal federated learning (HFL) is a system in which all the parties share the same feature space. It does the training process as follows: 1) Participants first download the latest model from the server individually and train the model based on the local data, 2) The trained model with its parameters (i.e., cryptographic gradients) are uploaded to the server, and 3) The server aggregates the gradients of each user and returns the updated model to each participant to update local models [160]. With this advantage, HFL is widely used in clinical topics [161].

b) Vertical federated learning: Vertical Federated Learning (VFL) lets multiple parties that possess different attributes (e.g., features and/or labels) of the same data entity (e.g., a person) to jointly train a model. Its learning process consists of 1) encrypted sample alignment and 2) an encryption training model. 1) encrypted sample alignment: Using encryption-based user ID alignment technology to align common users. These common users data are then considered for 2) encryption training model. However, in learning process, VFL requires multiple communications between all participants that need a high processing time. For this reason, many studies have developed an asynchronous training algorithm based on vertically partitioned data [162]. We note that many existing methods focus on HFL when all feature sets and labels are available.

c) Federated transfer learning: Federated transfer learning (FTL) generalizes the concept of federated learning and emphasizes that collaborative modeling learning can be performed on any data distribution and entity [163]. For example, participants first compute and encrypt their intermediate results with their gradients and losses. The gradients and losses are then collected and decrypted by a collaborator. Finally, the participants receive the aggregated results that are used to update the respective models. We note that FTL uses homomorphic encryption for security and the polynomial difference approximation for 1) privacy and 2) avoid data leakage [160]. Unlike HFL that possess the original data and models locally, FTL makes the participants encrypt the gradients before data transmission, and adding random masks to avoid the participants from getting information of each other's. In healthcare applications, FTL can not only provide a standard framework, but can also achieve efficient classifications and avoid the problem of unbalanced classes [164].

d) Federated optimization: Compared with traditional machine learning, FL focuses on significant variability of system features on each device in the network (systems heterogeneity), and non-identically distributed data across the network (statistical heterogeneity) [165]. Furthermore, aggregation FL requires defining an aggregation strategy, such as a




Fig. 4: Example of federated learning based on a) horizontally and b) vertically technique; In horizontally federated learning, multiple clients (Hospitals) with the same data structure collaborate to train a predictive/classifier model with the help from server. In vertically federated learning: First, align the common users in different participants. Then, it performed the encrypted training model based on these common users.

TABLE III: Summary of federate learning models used for clinical topics.

Application	Model / Learning / optimization	n	Performance (Local / Central / FL models)	Reference
Predicting clinical outcomes	EXAM / HFL / —	20	AUC: 0.79/ - / 0.92	[144]
Precision medicine	RETAIN / HFL / FedAvg	42	AUC: - / 0.73 / 0.62	[145]
Spinal cord gray matter segmentation	DNN / HFL / FedAvg / FedProx	4	Sensitivity: - / 0.76 / 0.78	[146]
Prostate cancer diagnosis	3D AH-Net / HFL / —	3	Dice: 0.812–0.872/ - / 0.89	[147]
Detection diabetic retinopathy	AlexNet / FTL / FedAvg / FedProx	5	Acc: 0.81–0.92/ - / 0.65–0.90	[148]
Prediction in COVID-19 patients	LASSO, MLP / HFL / —	5	AUC: - / 0.719–0.822 / 0.786–0.836	[149]
Image reconstruction	U-net / HFL / FedAvg	4	SSIM: 0.94/ - / 0.93	[150]
Computational pathology	CNN / HFL / —	3	AUC: - / 0.985±0.004 / 0.976±0.007	[151]
Predicting outcomes in patients	ResNet-34 / HFL / FedAvg	20	AUC: 0.79 / - / 0.92	[152]
Multimodal melanoma detection	EfficientNet / HFL / FedAvg	5	Acc: - / 0.83 / 0.83	[153]
Arrhythmia detection of Non-IID ECG	— / HFL / EWC	100	F1-score: - / — / 0.80	[154]
Joint training	— / HFL / FedACS	3	Acc: - / — / 0.70	[155]
MultiView training	CNN / VFL/ —	2	Acc: 0.62/ - / 0.71	[156]
Prognostic prediction	ELM / HFL / —	4	Acc: - / 0.89 / 0.8899	[157]
Designing ECG monitoring healthcare system	CNN / FTL / —	3	Acc: - / 0.94 / 0.92	[75]
Multi-center imaging diagnostics	3D-CNN, ResNet-18 / HFL / —	4	AUC: - / 0.85 / 0.86	[158]
COVID-19 detection	ResNet / HFL / FedMoCo	3	Acc: - / 0.96 / 91.56	[159]

Local model: training alone in client; Central model: use all client data for training; FL model: model under FL training methods; n : number of institutions; EXAM: Electronic Medical Record (EMR) chest X-ray AI model; HFL: Horizontally Federate Learning; VFL: Vertically Federated Learning; FTL: Federated Transfer Learning; DNN: Deep Neural Networks; CNN: Convolutional Neural Network; 3D-CNN: three-Dimensional Convolutional Neural Network; AlexNet, EfficientNetB7, ResNet, ResNet-34, ResNet-18, U-net: a class in CNN; AUC: Area Under Curve; Acc: Accuracy; 3D AH-Net: 3D Anisotropic Hybrid Network; LASSO: Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator; MLP: Multilayer Perceptron; Dice: Dice coefficient range; Kaapa score: is a measure of classification accuracy; SSIM: Structural Similarity Index Measure; PNSR: Peak-Signal-to-Noise Ratio; ELM: Extreme Learning Machine; RETAIN: has two parallel RNN branches merged at a final logistic layer; EWC: elastic weight consolidation; FedAvg: Federated Averaging; FedACS: FedAvg with adaptive client sampling; FedMoCo: a robust federated contrastive learning framework; FedProx: A optimal method to tackle heterogeneity in federated networks.

method to combine the local models coming from the clients into a global one. For example, the standard and simplest aggregation strategy is federated averaging (known as FedAvg, [166]). Another strategy is called FedProx [167] is a generalization of FedAvg with some modifications to address data and the heterogeneity of the system. In addition, the FedProx is considered to explore the interactions between statistical and systematic heterogeneity [165]. In addition, there is a new version of FedAvg called FedAvg+ based on personalization and cluster FL [168]. Also, FedEM model is based on the mixed distribution assumption with the expectation maximum algorithm [169]. Unfortunately, these optimization algorithms are still rarely applied in healthcare topics.

Table III reports FL techniques used recently for healthcare data. It observed that the accuracy of FL model under the optimization algorithm is close to the central model, which demonstrates the potential of federated learning. However, the number of clients studied is still limited to 100 [154]. Moreover, most of the data from these clients are derived from private datasets or multi-site datasets, which will limit the development of FL in practical medical applications [170]. So far, FL for healthcare is still in its early stages. The preliminary investigations provide a good foundation for future work, regardless of whether they involved replicating FL environments or doing limited experiments across hospitals [171].

D. Overview of methods and datasets used for XAI, DA, and FL

Table IV compares methods of XAI, DA and FL based on key strengths and weaknesses and lists code and datasets within each topic. To overcome the limited availability of medical datasets, many of the XAI, DA and FL based on deep learning techniques employ transfer learning from a large dataset such as ImageNet [172]. Thus, we include the original datasets and code used for the recent and popular techniques. For example, Grad-CAM is one of the common XAI methods used for multitask in medical topics like grading of ulcerative colitis [114], detecting cerebral hemorrhage [173], and predicting COVID-19 [72], [174] with a high degree of image interpretation. LIME also shows a feasible rate in multitask such as spinal posture classification [98], detection of Parkinson's disease [103], and predicting depressive symptoms [116]. Many other techniques used recently (e.g., Shapley Additive Explanations, Graph LIME, etc.) are almost based on deep learning models that need high power and performance computers.

DA in high-dimensional complex data like medical imaging relies on deep learning to implicitly model nonlinear transformations [175]. For example, the difference of the feature distribution between source and target domains is narrowed by the deep domain confusion model for cross subject recognition [176]. Recent algorithms like Deep CORAL [177], Deep Adaptation Networks [178], Deep Subdomain Associate Adaptation Network (DSAAN) [179] and Emotional Domain Adversarial Neural Network (EDANN) [180] are recommended to reduce domain differences. Despite the advances in DA models, few algorithms were applied to medical data [175]. An example in medical imaging is the explicit harmonization of uni-modal brain imaging data across multiple sites with varying acquisition hardware [181].

Recent studies of FL provide promising results in healthcare applications. For example, data from 20 institutes across the globe to train a model (EXAM: electronic medical record (EMR) chest X-ray AI model), for predicting COVID-19 [144]. This model is based on HFL that considers differential privacy to mitigate risk of data ‘interception’ during site-server communication. In [148], three main models using standard transfer learning, FedAvg, and Federated Proximal frameworks, respectively, are considered to diagnose diabetic retinopathy. In [182], a new study proposes federated disentangled representation learning for unsupervised brain anomaly detection using MR scans from four different institutions. To solve the problems of security and trustworthiness, densely connected CNN based on FedAvg proposed and used for COVID-19 [183]. Due to the limitations of sharing the data across hospitals and countries, more collaborations will improve the feasibility of FL in medical applications.

IV. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVE

The rate at which the complexity and volume of digital patient data is acquired, far exceeds the rate at which expert clinicians can be trained to analyze it. Therefore, it is necessary to employ artificial intelligence to keep up with

the growth of the data. Deep learning based image analysis reached the performance of expert clinicians in making referral recommendations based on widespread available optical coherence tomography [201]. In many scenarios, however, artificial intelligence is not yet readily able to replace expert clinicians because the applicable AI methods are not plug-in replacements for human decision-making. In neuroimaging, for example, the transition to the clinics did not take place despite many successes in research studies [202]. Application of AI with a human in the loop relieve the clinician from some—typically tedious, work. Atri-U, for example, is an application of AI in the clinical routine in which the AI back-end proposes a segmentation, two landmarks, and a time point to compute the volume of the left atrium [203]. The clinician that bears the responsibility can either accept, modify, or ignore the proposals. The latter scenario introduces a non-disruptive innovation into an existing diagnostic process with a substantially reduced average process time without compromising quality. Further developments of such AI tools for clinical practice will depend on the key technologies discussed previously, and for each of which we will conclude with a summary.

a) Explainable AI: We found that the most XAI with deep learning addresses post-hoc interpretability to increase face value, like the CNN-CAM. We also found that the explainability levels are limited local explainability. This means that the model understanding can only explain the model output rather than the internal decision-making. Global explainability is desirable in clinical tasks to achieve trust. More specifically, the practical XAI application is inevitable to consider people who do not have the relevant AI background. Additional explanations such as manual instructions will be greatly recommended.

b) Domain adaptation: Domain adaptation can effectively promote the transfer of models between different domains. However, data heterogeneity and label validity are still a critical challenge. Many DA methods can eliminate the domain bias and the difference in data distribution, such as data-based methods and feature-based methods. Unfortunately, these methods are too rigid and require a lot of processing time. Unlike adversarial DA, which shows strong performance, it can effectively reduce domain differences and improve generalization performance.

c) Federated learning: Federate learning is not well applied to healthcare data, and most studies focus on horizontal federated learning, which does not fully exploit the potential of federated learning. Only few optimization algorithms can achieve performance similar to the central model. We note that FL faces the challenges of poor data quality and insufficient model accuracy. This is due to the absence of standard and uniform data collection among institutions. Therefore, it mentions that the standard unified data with model security protection mechanism is the key to improving the deep learning model for clinical tasks.

d) Outlook to further challenges: In the past decade, many methods originating in computer vision and other non-medical fields found applications in medical research healthcare with some delay and minor adaptations. If this trend

TABLE IV: The strengths and weaknesses of common XAI, DA, and FL techniques.

Technique	Strengths	Weaknesses	Code	Data	Reference
Explainable Artificial Intelligence					
Gradient-weighted Class Activation Mapping	- Simple to use - No need to change the network structure - Efficient to compute - High degree of image explanation	- The weight of saliency map depends on the model and data set - Sometimes prominent areas cannot be correctly labeled - Poor robustness	C1	D1,D2	[72], [114], [173], [174], [184]
Local Explainable Model-agnostic Explanation	- Uses a simple model for local explanation	- Poor robustness - Inefficient calculation	C2	D3	[98], [103], [116], [185]
Graph LIME	- Simple to use - Trustworthy	- Inefficient calculation - instable	*C3	D4	[96], [186]
Shapley Additive Explanations	- Useful for interpretation - Repeatability	- Inefficient computation	C4	D5,D6	[101], [187]
Domain Adaptation					
Deep Domain Confusion	- Reduce the distribution difference between the source and target domains	- Only adapts to one layer of network - A single fixed kernel may not be the optimal kernel	C5	D7	[176], [188]
Deep Adaptation Networks	- Reduce domain differences	- Domain difference problem cannot be solved by semi-supervised learning	C5	D7	[189], [190]
Deep Subdomain Adaptation Network	- The weight could be defined flexible	- The weight value of network maybe could not be the best	C5	D8	[191], [192]
Dynamic Adversarial Adaptation Networks	- Solve the dynamic distribution adaptation problem in adversarial networks	- Can not handle regression problems	C5	D7	[193], [194]
Federated Learning					
EXAM / HFL	- Can use large, and heterogeneous data-sets - Robust and generalizable	- Bias may occur due to limitations in data quality.	C6	D9	[144]
AlexNet / FTL / FedAvg & FedProx	- Prediction rate is high	- Sub-optimal security - Data accuracy pitfalls	-	D10-D12	[148]
CNN / HFL / FedDis	- Mitigate the statistical heterogeneity - Good generalizability with clinical applications - Flexibility	- Privacy concerns	C7	D13-D17	[182]
3D-CNN / HFL / FedAvg	- High performance metrics - Provided visual explanations - Suitable for transfer learning	- Weak federated training process for the unstable internet connection. - Inefficient computation	C8	D18	[183]

FedDis: Federated Disentangled representation learning for unsupervised brain operatory segmentation; EXAM: Electronic Medical Record (EMR) chest X-ray AI model, “-” not available, “*” not official, C: code, D: data.

C1 <https://github.com/zhoubolei/CAM>, <https://github.com/Cloud-CV/Grad-CAM>

C2 <https://github.com/marcotcr/lime>

C3 <https://github.com/WilliamCCHuang/GraphLIME>

C4 <https://github.com/slundberg/shap>

C5 <https://github.com/jindongwang/transferlearning/tree/master/code/DeepDA/>, <https://github.com/ting2696/Deep-Symmetric-Adaptation-Network>.

C6 https://ngc.nvidia.com/catalog/models/nvidia:med:clara_train_covid19_exam_ehr_xray

C7 <https://github.com/albarqounilab/>

C8 <https://github.com/HUST-EIC-AI-LAB/UCADI>

D1 <http://host.robots.ox.ac.uk/pascal/VOC/voc2007>

D2 ImageNet Object Localization Challenge [172]

D3 <https://github.com/marcotcr/lime-experiments>

D4 Datasets are from Cora and Pubmed.

D5 [195]

D6 <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist>

D7 [196]–[200], [ultrasoundcases.info](http://www.ultrasoundcases.info)

D8 <https://github.com/jindongwang/transferlearning/blob/master/data/dataset.md>, [193]

D9 <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/mariaherrerot/eyepacspreprocess>

D10 <https://www.adcis.net/en/third-party/messidor>

D11 <https://ieeegroups.org/open-access/indian-diabetic-retinopathy-image-dataset-idrid>

D12 <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/mariaherrerot/uptos2019>

D13 <https://www.oasis-brains.org>

D14 <http://adni.loni.usc.edu/data-553samples/access-data/>

D15 <http://lit.fe.uni-lj.si/tools.php?lang=eng>

D16 <https://smart-stats-tools.org/lesion-challenge-5562015>

D17 <https://www.med.upenn.edu/sbia/brats2018/data.html>

D18 <https://www.nhsx.nhs.uk/covid-19-response/data-and-covid-19-national-covid-19-chest-imaging-database-nccid/>

continues, we expect to see more of the emerging XAI, DA, and FL methods in medicine for tasks that are similarly structured as in non-medical fields. We note, however, that healthcare processes often incorporate irregularly sampled,

longitudinal, multi-modal data for decision-making. The imputation of missing data can lead to inaccurate prediction that may result in biased estimations [204], [205]. With strong assumptions and simplified models, clinical decision processes

can be modeled and optimized using mixed linear models that naturally handle missing data, as long as the input data is low-dimensional and in a homogeneous domain [206]. To train deep learning models with similar flexibility but more complex data, much larger training data sets are required. Combined, FA may contribute to leverage massive pools of private data that will be transformed into a common reference domain with DA to train interpretable and thus more trustworthy AI models using XAI.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (82260360) and the Foreign Young Talent Program (QN2021033002L).

REFERENCES

- [1] Stuart C Shapiro. *Encyclopedia of artificial intelligence second edition*. 1992.
- [2] Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael Bernstein, Alexander C. Berg, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 115(3):211–252, 2015.
- [3] Haidong Li, Jiongcheng Li, Xiaoming Guan, Binghao Liang, Yuting Lai, and Xinglong Luo. Research on overfitting of deep learning. In *2019 15th International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Security (CIS)*, pages 78–81, 2019.
- [4] Oriol Vinyals, Igor Babuschkin, Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Michaël Mathieu, Andrew Dudzik, Junyoung Chung, David H. Choi, Richard Powell, Timo Ewalds, Petko Georgiev, Junhyuk Oh, Dan Horgan, Manuel Kroiss, Ivo Danihelka, Aja Huang, Laurent Sifre, Trevor Cai, John P. Agapiou, Max Jaderberg, Alexander S. Vezhnevets, Rémi Leblond, Tobias Pohlen, Valentin Dalibard, David Budden, Yury Sulsky, James Molloy, Tom L. Paine, Caglar Gulcehre, Ziyu Wang, Tobias Pfaff, Yuhuai Wu, Roman Ring, Dani Yogatama, Dario Wünsch, Katrina McKinney, Oliver Smith, Tom Schaul, Timothy Lillicrap, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Demis Hassabis, Chris Apps, and David Silver. Grandmaster level in starcraft ii using multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 575(7782):350–354, 2019.
- [5] Anh Nguyen, Jason Yosinski, and Jeff Clune. Deep neural networks are easily fooled: High confidence predictions for unrecognizable images. In *2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. IEEE, 2015.
- [6] Gaël Varoquaux and Veronika Cheplygina. Machine learning for medical imaging: methodological failures and recommendations for the future. *NPJ digital medicine*, 5(1):1–8, 2022.
- [7] Manas Gaur, Keyur Faldu, and Amit Sheth. Semantics of the black box: Can knowledge graphs help make deep learning systems more interpretable and explainable? *IEEE Internet Computing*, 25(1):51–59, 2021.
- [8] Amina Adadi and Mohammed Berrada. Explainable ai for healthcare: from black box to interpretable models. In *Embedded Systems and Artificial Intelligence*, pages 327–337. Springer, 2020.
- [9] Guang Yang, Qinghao Ye, and Jun Xia. Unbox the black-box for the medical explainable ai via multi-modal and multi-centre data fusion: A mini-review, two showcases and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.01998*, 2021.
- [10] Andreas Holzinger. The next frontier: Ai we can really trust. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 427–440. Springer, 2021.
- [11] Andreas Holzinger, Matthias Dehmer, Frank Emmert-Streib, Rita Cucchiara, Isabelle Augenstein, Javier Del Ser, Wojciech Samek, Igor Jurisica, and Natalia Díaz-Rodríguez. Information fusion as an integrative cross-cutting enabler to achieve robust, explainable, and trustworthy medical artificial intelligence. *Information Fusion*, 79:263–278, 2022.
- [12] Heang-Ping Chan, Lubomir M Hadjiiski, and Ravi K Samala. Computer-aided diagnosis in the era of deep learning. *Medical physics*, 47(5):e218–e227, 2020.
- [13] Hao Guan and Mingxia Liu. Domain adaptation for medical image analysis: a survey. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 69(3):1173–1185, 2021.
- [14] Gerrit Bode, Simon Thul, Marc Baranski, and Dirk Müller. Real-world application of machine-learning-based fault detection trained with experimental data. *Energy*, 198:117323, 2020.
- [15] Yaguo Lei, Bin Yang, Xinwei Jiang, Feng Jia, Naipeng Li, and Asoke K Nandi. Applications of machine learning to machine fault diagnosis: A review and roadmap. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 138:106587, 2020.
- [16] Changchun Zhang and Qingjie Zhao. Deep discriminative domain adaptation. *Information Sciences*, 575:599–610, 2021.
- [17] Yifan Zhang, Ying Wei, Qingyao Wu, Peilin Zhao, Shuaicheng Niu, Junzhou Huang, and Mingkui Tan. Collaborative unsupervised domain adaptation for medical image diagnosis. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 29:7834–7844, 2020.
- [18] Pan Yang, Naixue Xiong, and Jingli Ren. Data security and privacy protection for cloud storage: A survey. *IEEE Access*, 8:131723–131740, 2020.
- [19] Chen Zhang, Yu Xie, Hang Bai, Bin Yu, Weihong Li, and Yuan Gao. A survey on federated learning. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 216:106775, 2021.
- [20] Viraaji Mothukuri, Reza M Parizi, Seyedamin Pouriyeh, Yan Huang, Ali Dehghantanha, and Gautam Srivastava. A survey on security and privacy of federated learning. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 115:619–640, 2021.
- [21] Viraj Kulkarni, Milind Kulkarni, and Aniruddha Pant. Survey of personalization techniques for federated learning. In *2020 Fourth World Conference on Smart Trends in Systems, Security and Sustainability (WorldS4)*, pages 794–797. IEEE, 2020.
- [22] Sina Rashidi, Mohammad Mehrad, Hamzeh Ghorbani, David A Wood, Nima Mohamadian, Jamshid Moghadasi, and Shadfar Davoodi. Determination of bubble point pressure and oil formation volume factor of crude oils applying multiple hidden layers extreme learning machine algorithms. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering*, 202:108425, 2021.
- [23] Guang Yang, Qinghao Ye, and Jun Xia. Unbox the black-box for the medical explainable ai via multi-modal and multi-centre data fusion: A mini-review, two showcases and beyond. *Information Fusion*, 77:29–52, 2022.
- [24] Giulia Vilone and Luca Longo. Notions of explainability and evaluation approaches for explainable artificial intelligence. *Information Fusion*, 76:89–106, 2021.
- [25] W James Murdoch, Chandan Singh, Karl Kumbier, Reza Abbasi-Asl, and Bin Yu. Definitions, methods, and applications in interpretable machine learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(44):22071–22080, 2019.
- [26] Alejandro Barredo Arrieta, Natalia Diaz-Rodriguez, Javier Del Ser, Adrien Bennetot, Siham Tabik, Alberto Barbado, Salvador Garcia, Sergio Gil-Lopez, Daniel Molina, Richard Benjamins, et al. Explainable artificial intelligence (xai): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible ai. *Information fusion*, 58:82–115, 2020.
- [27] Andreas Holzinger and Heimo Müller. Toward human–ai interfaces to support explainability and causability in medical ai. *Computer*, 54(10):78–86, 2021.
- [28] Andreas Holzinger and Heimo Müller. Toward human–ai interfaces to support explainability and causability in medical ai. *Computer*, 54(10):78–86, 2021.
- [29] Riccardo Guidotti, Anna Monreale, Salvatore Ruggieri, Franco Turini, Fosca Giannotti, and Dino Pedreschi. A survey of methods for explaining black box models. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)*, 51(5):1–42, 2018.
- [30] Aryan Mohanty and Sushruta Mishra. A comprehensive study of explainable artificial intelligence in healthcare. In *Augmented Intelligence in Healthcare: A Pragmatic and Integrated Analysis*, pages 475–502. Springer, 2022.
- [31] Gabriela Csurka. Domain adaptation for visual applications: A comprehensive survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.05374*, 2017.
- [32] Piotr Koniusz, Yusuf Tas, Hongguang Zhang, Mehrtash Harandi, Fatih Porikli, and Rui Zhang. Museum exhibit identification challenge for the supervised domain adaptation and beyond. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 788–804, 2018.
- [33] R Gnana Praveen, Eric Granger, and Patrick Cardinal. Deep weakly supervised domain adaptation for pain localization in videos. In *2020 15th IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition (FG 2020)*, pages 473–480. IEEE, 2020.
- [34] Lin Lawrence Guo, Stephen R Pfahl, Jason Fries, Alistair EW Johnson, Jose Posada, Catherine Aftandilian, Nigam Shah, and Lillian Sung. Evaluation of domain generalization and adaptation on improving

- model robustness to temporal dataset shift in clinical medicine. *Scientific reports*, 12(1):1–10, 2022.
- [35] Yifan Zhang, Ying Wei, Qingyao Wu, Peilin Zhao, Shuaicheng Niu, Junzhou Huang, and Mingkui Tan. Collaborative unsupervised domain adaptation for medical image diagnosis. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 29:7834–7844, 2020.
- [36] Yifan Zhang, Shuaicheng Niu, Zhen Qiu, Ying Wei, Peilin Zhao, Jianhua Yao, Junzhou Huang, Qingyao Wu, and Mingkui Tan. Covid-da: Deep domain adaptation from typical pneumonia to covid-19. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.01577*, 2020.
- [37] Myeongjin Kim and Hyeran Byun. Learning texture invariant representation for domain adaptation of semantic segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 12975–12984, 2020.
- [38] Wenjun Yan, Yuan Yuan Wang, Shengjia Gu, Lu Huang, Fuhua Yan, Liming Xia, and Qian Tao. The domain shift problem of medical image segmentation and vendor-adaptation by unet-gan. In *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, pages 623–631. Springer, 2019.
- [39] Ricard Argelaguet, Damien Arnol, Danila Bredikhin, Yonatan Deloro, Britta Velten, John C Marioni, and Oliver Stegle. Mofa+: a statistical framework for comprehensive integration of multi-modal single-cell data. *Genome biology*, 21(1):1–17, 2020.
- [40] Junlin Yang, Nicha C Dvornek, Fan Zhang, Julius Chapiro, MingDe Lin, and James S Duncan. Unsupervised domain adaptation via disentangled representations: Application to cross-modality liver segmentation. In *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, pages 255–263. Springer, 2019.
- [41] Cheng Chen, Qi Dou, Hao Chen, Jing Qin, and Pheng Ann Heng. Unsupervised bidirectional cross-modality adaptation via deeply synergistic image and feature alignment for medical image segmentation. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, 39(7):2494–2505, 2020.
- [42] Agostina J. Larrazabal, Nicolás Nieto, Victoria Peterson, Diego H. Milone, and Enzo Ferrante. Gender imbalance in medical imaging datasets produces biased classifiers for computer-aided diagnosis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(23):12592–12594, 2020.
- [43] Mengnan Du, Fan Yang, Na Zou, and Xia Hu. Fairness in deep learning: A computational perspective. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 36(4):25–34, 2021.
- [44] Youngeun Kim, Donghyeon Cho, Kyeongtak Han, Priyadarshini Panda, and Sungeun Hong. Domain adaptation without source data. *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence*, 2(6):508–518, 2021.
- [45] Sicheng Zhao, Bo Li, Pengfei Xu, and Kurt Keutzer. Multi-source domain adaptation in the deep learning era: A systematic survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.12169*, 2020.
- [46] Hang Wang, Minghao Xu, Bingbing Ni, and Wenjun Zhang. Learning to combine: Knowledge aggregation for multi-source domain adaptation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 727–744. Springer, 2020.
- [47] Sicheng Zhao, Xiangyu Yue, Shanghang Zhang, Bo Li, Han Zhao, Bichen Wu, Ravi Krishna, Joseph E Gonzalez, Alberto L Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, Sanjit A Seshia, et al. A review of single-source deep unsupervised visual domain adaptation. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2020.
- [48] Jogendra Nath Kundu, Naveen Venkat, R Venkatesh Babu, et al. Universal source-free domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4544–4553, 2020.
- [49] Yuang Liu, Wei Zhang, and Jun Wang. Source-free domain adaptation for semantic segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1215–1224, 2021.
- [50] Amelia Jiménez-Sánchez, Mickael Tardy, Miguel A González Ballester, Diana Mateus, and Gemma Piella. Memory-aware curriculum federated learning for breast cancer classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02504*, 2021.
- [51] Magdiel Jiménez-Guarneros and Pilar Gomez-Gil. A study of the effects of negative transfer on deep unsupervised domain adaptation methods. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 167:114088, 2021.
- [52] Lingtian Feng, Feng Qian, Xin He, Yuqi Fan, Hanpeng Cai, and Guangmin Hu. Transitive transfer sparse coding for distant domain. In *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 3165–3169. IEEE, 2021.
- [53] Mei Wang and Weihong Deng. Deep visual domain adaptation: A survey. *Neurocomputing*, 312:135–153, 2018.
- [54] Micah J Sheller, Brandon Edwards, G Anthony Reina, Jason Martin, Sarthak Pati, Aikaterini Kotrotsou, Mikhail Milchenko, Weilin Xu, Daniel Marcus, Rivka R Colen, et al. Federated learning in medicine: facilitating multi-institutional collaborations without sharing patient data. *Scientific reports*, 10(1):1–12, 2020.
- [55] Karthik V Sarma, Stephanie Harmon, Thomas Sanford, Holger R Roth, Ziyue Xu, Jesse Tetreault, Daguang Xu, Mona G Flores, Alex G Raman, Rushikesh Kulkarni, et al. Federated learning improves site performance in multicenter deep learning without data sharing. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 28(6):1259–1264, 2021.
- [56] Rajesh Kumar, Abdullah Aman Khan, Jay Kumar, Noorbakhsh Amiri Golilarz, Simin Zhang, Yang Ting, Chengyu Zheng, Wenyong Wang, et al. Blockchain-federated-learning and deep learning models for covid-19 detection using ct imaging. *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 21(14):16301–16314, 2021.
- [57] Matthew G Crowson, Dana Moukheiber, Aldo Robles Arévalo, Barbara D Lam, Sreekar Mantena, Aakanksha Rana, Deborah Goss, David W Bates, and Leo Anthony Celi. A systematic review of federated learning applications for biomedical data. *PLOS Digital Health*, 1(5):e0000033, 2022.
- [58] Viraaj Mothukuri, Reza M Parizi, Seyedamin Pouriyeh, Yan Huang, Ali Dehghantanha, and Gautam Srivastava. A survey on security and privacy of federated learning. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 115:619–640, 2021.
- [59] Deven McGraw and Kenneth D Mandl. Privacy protections to encourage use of health-relevant digital data in a learning health system. *NPJ digital medicine*, 4(1):1–11, 2021.
- [60] Chuhan Wu, Fangzhao Wu, Lingjuan Lyu, Yongfeng Huang, and Xing Xie. Communication-efficient federated learning via knowledge distillation. *Nature communications*, 13(1):1–8, 2022.
- [61] Liangqiong Qu, Yuyin Zhou, Paul Pu Liang, Yingda Xia, Feifei Wang, Ehsan Adeli, Li Fei-Fei, and Daniel Rubin. Rethinking architecture design for tackling data heterogeneity in federated learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10061–10071, 2022.
- [62] George J Annas. Hipaa regulations: a new era of medical-record privacy? *New England Journal of Medicine*, 348:1486, 2003.
- [63] Paul Voigt and Axel Von dem Bussche. The eu general data protection regulation (gdpr). *A Practical Guide, 1st Ed., Cham: Springer International Publishing*, 10:3152676, 2017.
- [64] Suraj Rajendran, Jihad S Obeid, Hamidullah Binol, Kristie Foley, Wei Zhang, Philip Austin, Joey Brakefield, Metin N Gurcan, and Umit Topaloglu. Cloud-based federated learning implementation across medical centers. *JCO Clinical Cancer Informatics*, 5:1–11, 2021.
- [65] Karthik V Sarma, Stephanie Harmon, Thomas Sanford, Holger R Roth, Ziyue Xu, Jesse Tetreault, Daguang Xu, Mona G Flores, Alex G Raman, Rushikesh Kulkarni, et al. Federated learning improves site performance in multicenter deep learning without data sharing. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 28(6):1259–1264, 2021.
- [66] Jiawen Kang, Zehui Xiong, Dusit Niyato, Yuze Zou, Yang Zhang, and Mohsen Guizani. Reliable federated learning for mobile networks. *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 27(2):72–80, 2020.
- [67] Keith Bonawitz, Hubert Eichner, Wolfgang Grieskamp, Dzmitry Huba, Alex Ingerman, Vladimir Ivanov, Chloe Kiddon, Jakub Konečný, Stefano Mazzocchi, Brendan McMahan, et al. Towards federated learning at scale: System design. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 1:374–388, 2019.
- [68] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 37(3):50–60, 2020.
- [69] Jie Xu, Benjamin S Glicksberg, Chang Su, Peter Walker, Jiang Bian, and Fei Wang. Federated learning for healthcare informatics. *Journal of Healthcare Informatics Research*, 5(1):1–19, 2021.
- [70] 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.
- [71] Alireza Fallah, Aryan Mokhtari, and Asuman Ozdaglar. Personalized federated learning: A meta-learning approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07948*, 2020.
- [72] Geun Hyeong Lee and Soo-Yong Shin. Federated learning on clinical benchmark data: Performance assessment. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 22(10):e20891, 2020.
- [73] Holger R Roth, Ken Chang, Praveer Singh, Nir Neumark, Wenqi Li, Vikash Gupta, Sharut Gupta, Liangqiong Qu, Alvin Ihsani, Bernardo C Bizzo, et al. Federated learning for breast density classification: A

- real-world implementation. In *Domain Adaptation and Representation Transfer, and Distributed and Collaborative Learning*, pages 181–191. Springer, 2020.
- [74] Rahee Walambe, Ananya Srivastava, Bhargav Yagnik, Mohammed Hasan, Zainuddin Saiyed, Gargi Joshi, and Ketan Kotecha. Explainable misinformation detection across multiple social media platforms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11724*, 2022.
- [75] Ali Raza, Kim Phuc Tran, Ludovic Koehl, and Shujun Li. Designing ecg monitoring healthcare system with federated transfer learning and explainable ai. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 236:107763, 2022.
- [76] Xingchao Peng, Zijun Huang, Yizhe Zhu, and Kate Saenko. Federated adversarial domain adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.02054*, 2019.
- [77] Xiaoxiao Li, Yufeng Gu, Nicha Dvornek, Lawrence H Staib, Pamela Ventola, and James S Duncan. Multi-site fmri analysis using privacy-preserving federated learning and domain adaptation: Abide results. *Medical Image Analysis*, 65:101765, 2020.
- [78] Andreas Holzinger, Anna Saranti, Christoph Molnar, Przemyslaw Biecek, and Wojciech Samek. Explainable ai methods-a brief overview. In *International Workshop on Extending Explainable AI Beyond Deep Models and Classifiers*, pages 13–38. Springer, 2022.
- [79] Jost Tobias Springenberg, Alexey Dosovitskiy, Thomas Brox, and Martin Riedmiller. Striving for simplicity: The all convolutional net. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6806*, 2014.
- [80] Shahin Heidarian, Parnian Afshar, Nastaran Enshaei, Farnoosh Naderkhani, Moezeddin Javad Rafsee, Faranak Babaki Fard, Kaveh Samimi, S Farokh Atashzar, Anastasia Oikonomou, Konstantinos N Plataniotis, et al. Covid-fact: A fully-automated capsule network-based framework for identification of covid-19 cases from chest ct scans. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 4, 2021.
- [81] Ahmad Chaddad, Mingli Zhang, Christian Desrosiers, and Tamim Niazi. Deep radiomic features from mri scans predict survival outcome of recurrent glioblastoma. In *International Workshop on Radiomics and Radiogenomics in Neuro-oncology*, pages 36–43. Springer, 2019.
- [82] Ahmad Chaddad, Christian Desrosiers, Bassam Abdulkarim, and Tamim Niazi. Predicting the gene status and survival outcome of lower grade glioma patients with multimodal mri features. *IEEE Access*, 7:75976–75984, 2019.
- [83] Ahmad Chaddad, Paul Sargas, and Christian Desrosiers. Modeling texture in deep 3d cnn for survival analysis. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 25(7):2454–2462, 2020.
- [84] Ahmad Chaddad, Mingli Zhang, Lama Hassan, and Tamim Niazi. Modeling of textures to predict immune cell status and survival of brain tumour patients. In *2021 IEEE 18th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI)*, pages 1067–1071. IEEE, 2021.
- [85] Ahmad Chaddad, Lama Hassan, and Christian Desrosiers. Deep radiomic analysis for predicting coronavirus disease 2019 in computerized tomography and x-ray images. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 33(1):3–11, 2021.
- [86] Ahmad Chaddad, Paul Daniel, Mingli Zhang, Saima Rathore, Paul Sargas, Christian Desrosiers, and Tamim Niazi. Deep radiomic signature with immune cell markers predicts the survival of glioma patients. *Neurocomputing*, 469:366–375, 2022.
- [87] Seul-Ki Yeom, Philipp Seegerer, Sebastian Lapuschkin, Alexander Binder, Simon Wiedemann, Klaus-Robert Müller, and Wojciech Samek. Pruning by explaining: A novel criterion for deep neural network pruning. *Pattern Recognition*, 115:107899, 2021.
- [88] Junbing Li, Changqing Zhang, Joey Tianyi Zhou, Huazhu Fu, Shuyin Xia, and Qinghua Hu. Deep-lift: deep label-specific feature learning for image annotation. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 2021.
- [89] Avanti Shrikumar, Peyton Greenside, and Anshul Kundaje. Learning important features through propagating activation differences. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 3145–3153. PMLR, 2017.
- [90] Min Lin, Qiang Chen, and Shuicheng Yan. Network in network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.4400*, 2013.
- [91] 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.
- [92] Haofan Wang, Zifan Wang, Mengnan Du, Fan Yang, Zijian Zhang, Sirui Ding, Piotr Mardziel, and Xia Hu. Score-cam: Score-weighted visual explanations for convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 24–25, 2020.
- [93] Richard Dazeley, Peter Vamplew, Cameron Foale, Charlotte Young, Sunil Aryal, and Francisco Cruz. Levels of explainable artificial intelligence for human-aligned conversational explanations. *Artificial Intelligence*, 299:103525, 2021.
- [94] José Jiménez-Luna, Miha Skalic, Nils Weskamp, and Gisbert Schneider. Coloring molecules with explainable artificial intelligence for preclinical relevance assessment. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 61(3):1083–1094, 2021.
- [95] Shaker El-Sappagh, Jose M Alonso, SM Islam, Ahmad M Sultan, and Kyung Sup Kwak. A multilayer multimodal detection and prediction model based on explainable artificial intelligence for alzheimer’s disease. *Scientific reports*, 11(1):1–26, 2021.
- [96] Junfeng Peng, Kaiqiang Zou, Mi Zhou, Yi Teng, Xiongyong Zhu, Feifei Zhang, and Jun Xu. An explainable artificial intelligence framework for the deterioration risk prediction of hepatitis patients. *Journal of Medical Systems*, 45(5):1–9, 2021.
- [97] Khishigsuren Davagdorj, Jang-Whan Bae, Van-Huy Pham, Nipon Theera-Umporn, and Keun Ho Ryu. Explainable artificial intelligence based framework for non-communicable diseases prediction. *IEEE Access*, 9:123672–123688, 2021.
- [98] Carlo Dindorf, Jurgen Konradi, Claudia Wolf, Bertram Taetz, Gabriele Bleser, Janine Huthwelker, Friederike Werthmann, Eva Bartaguz, Johanna Kniepert, Philipp Drees, et al. Classification and automated interpretation of spinal posture data using a pathology-independent classifier and explainable artificial intelligence (xai). *Sensors*, 21(18):6323, 2021.
- [99] Zachary Papanastasopoulos, Ravi K Samala, Heang-Ping Chan, Lubomir Hadjiiski, Chintana Paramagul, Mark A Helvie, and Colleen H Neal. Explainable ai for medical imaging: deep-learning cnn ensemble for classification of estrogen receptor status from breast mri. In *Medical imaging 2020: Computer-aided diagnosis*, volume 11314, page 113140Z. International Society for Optics and Photonics, 2020.
- [100] Rajeev Kumar Singh, Rohan Pandey, and Rishie Nandhan Babu. Covid-screen: explainable deep learning framework for differential diagnosis of covid-19 using chest x-rays. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 33(14):8871–8892, 2021.
- [101] Hans-Christian Thorsen-Meyer, Annelaura B Nielsen, Anna P Nielsen, Benjamin Skov Kaas-Hansen, Palle Toft, Jens Schierbeck, Thomas Strøm, Piotr J Chmura, Marc Heimann, Lars Dybdahl, et al. Dynamic and explainable machine learning prediction of mortality in patients in the intensive care unit: a retrospective study of high-frequency data in electronic patient records. *The Lancet Digital Health*, 2(4):e179–e191, 2020.
- [102] Ran Gu, Guotai Wang, Tao Song, Rui Huang, Michael Aertsen, Jan Deprest, Sébastien Ourselin, Tom Vercauteren, and Shaoting Zhang. Ca-net: Comprehensive attention convolutional neural networks for explainable medical image segmentation. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, 40(2):699–711, 2020.
- [103] Pavan Rajkumar Magesh, Richard Delwin Myloth, and Rijo Jackson Tom. An explainable machine learning model for early detection of parkinson’s disease using lime on datscan imagery. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 126:104041, 2020.
- [104] Md Rezaul Karim, Till Döhmen, Michael Cochez, Oya Beyan, Dietrich Rebholz-Schuhmann, and Stefan Decker. Deepcovidexplainer: explainable covid-19 diagnosis from chest x-ray images. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*, pages 1034–1037. IEEE, 2020.
- [105] Luis A de Souza Jr, Robert Mendel, Sophia Strasser, Alanna Ebigbo, Andreas Probst, Helmut Messmann, João P Papa, and Christoph Palm. Convolutional neural networks for the evaluation of cancer in barrett’s esophagus: Explainable ai to lighten up the black-box. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 135:104578, 2021.
- [106] Theekshana Dissanayake, Tharindu Fernando, Simon Denman, Sridha Sridharan, Houman Ghaemmaghami, and Clinton Fookes. A robust interpretable deep learning classifier for heart anomaly detection without segmentation. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 25(6):2162–2171, 2020.
- [107] Misbah Razzaq, Louisa Goumidi, Maria-Jesus Iglesias, Gaëlle Munsch, Maria Bruzelius, Manal Ibrahim-Kosta, Lynn Butler, Jacob Odeberg, Pierre-Emmanuel Morange, and David Alexandre Tregouet. Explainable artificial neural network for recurrent venous thromboembolism based on plasma proteomics. In *International Conference on Computational Methods in Systems Biology*, pages 108–121. Springer, 2021.
- [108] Michele La Ferla, Matthew Montebello, and Dylan Seychell. An xai approach to deep learning models in the detection of ductal carcinoma in situ. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.14186*, 2021.
- [109] Christina Gillmann, Lucas Peter, Carlo Schmidt, Dorothee Saur, and Gerik Scheuermann. Visualizing multimodal deep learning for lesion prediction. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*, 41(5):90–98, 2021.

- [110] Cosimo Ieracitano, Nadia Mammone, Mario Versaci, Giuseppe Varone, Abderrahman Ali, Antonio Armentano, Grazia Calabrese, Anna Ferrelli, Lorena Turano, Carmela Tebala, et al. A fuzzy-enhanced deep learning approach for early detection of covid-19 pneumonia from portable chest x-ray images. *Neurocomputing*, 2022.
- [111] Juan Manuel Mayor-Torres, Sara Medina-DeVilliers, Tessa Clarkson, Matthew D Lerner, and Giuseppe Riccardi. Evaluation of interpretability for deep learning algorithms in eeg emotion recognition: A case study in autism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.13208*, 2021.
- [112] Kwang Hyeon Kim, Hae-Won Koo, Byung-Jou Lee, Sang-Won Yoon, and Moon-Jun Sohn. Cerebral hemorrhage detection and localization with medical imaging for cerebrovascular disease diagnosis and treatment using explainable deep learning. *Journal of the Korean Physical Society*, 79(3):321–327, 2021.
- [113] Raisul Arefin, Manar D Samad, Furkan A Akyelken, and Arash Davanian. Non-transfer deep learning of optical coherence tomography for post-hoc explanation of macular disease classification. In *2021 IEEE 9th International Conference on Healthcare Informatics (ICHI)*, pages 48–52. IEEE, 2021.
- [114] Reed T Sutton, Osmar R Zaiane, Randolph Goebel, and Daniel C Baumgart. Artificial intelligence enabled automated diagnosis and grading of ulcerative colitis endoscopy images. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):1–10, 2022.
- [115] Dehua Chen, Hongjin Zhao, Jianrong He, Qiao Pan, and Weiliang Zhao. An causal xai diagnostic model for breast cancer based on mammography reports. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*, pages 3341–3349. IEEE, 2021.
- [116] Md Zia Uddin, Kim Kristoffer Dysthe, Asbjørn Følstad, and Petter Bæ Brandtzæg. Deep learning for prediction of depressive symptoms in a large textual dataset. *Neural Computing and Applications*, pages 1–24, 2021.
- [117] Sergio Martínez-Agüero, Cristina Soguero-Ruiz, Jose M Alonso-Moral, Inmaculada Mora-Jiménez, Joaquín Álvarez-Rodríguez, and Antonio G Marques. Interpretable clinical time-series modeling with intelligent feature selection for early prediction of antimicrobial multidrug resistance. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 2022.
- [118] Kristoffer Wickstrøm, Karl Øyvind Mikalsen, Michael Kampffmeyer, Arthur Revhaug, and Robert Jenssen. Uncertainty-aware deep ensembles for reliable and explainable predictions of clinical time series. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 25(7):2435–2444, 2020.
- [119] Ching-Yu Wang, Tsung-Shun Ko, and Cheng-Che Hsu. Machine learning with explainable artificial intelligence vision for characterization of solution conductivity using optical emission spectroscopy of plasma in aqueous solution. *Plasma Processes and Polymers*, 18(12):2100096, 2021.
- [120] Yousef Golizadeh Akhlaghi, Koorosh Aslanefat, Xudong Zhao, Saba Sadati, Ali Badiee, Xin Xiao, Samson Shittu, Yi Fan, and Xiaoli Ma. Hourly performance forecast of a dew point cooler using explainable artificial intelligence and evolutionary optimisations by 2050. *Applied Energy*, 281:116062, 2021.
- [121] Juan Miguel Valverde, Vandan Imani, Ali Abdollahzadeh, Riccardo De Feo, Mithilesh Prakash, Robert Ciszek, and Jussi Tohka. Transfer learning in magnetic resonance brain imaging: A systematic review. *Journal of imaging*, 7(4):66, 2021.
- [122] Abolfazl Farahani, Sahar Vogheli, Khaled Rasheed, and Hamid R Arbabnia. A brief review of domain adaptation. *Advances in Data Science and Information Engineering*, pages 877–894, 2021.
- [123] Dongnan Liu, Donghao Zhang, Yang Song, Fan Zhang, Lauren O'Donnell, Heng Huang, Mei Chen, and Weidong Cai. Unsupervised instance segmentation in microscopy images via panoptic domain adaptation and task re-weighting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4243–4252, 2020.
- [124] Anirudh Choudhary, Li Tong, Yuanda Zhu, and May D Wang. Advancing medical imaging informatics by deep learning-based domain adaptation. *Yearbook of medical informatics*, 29(01):129–138, 2020.
- [125] Shuteng Niu, Yihao Hu, Jian Wang, Yongxin Liu, and Houbing Song. Feature-based distant domain transfer learning. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, pages 5164–5171. IEEE, 2020.
- [126] Yun Yang, Jing Guo, Qiongwei Ye, Yuelong Xia, Po Yang, Amin Ullah, and Khan Muhammad. A weighted multi-feature transfer learning framework for intelligent medical decision making. *Applied Soft Computing*, 105:107242, 2021.
- [127] Antoine Ackaouy, Nicolas Courty, Emmanuel Vallée, Olivier Cormowick, Christian Barillot, and Francesca Galassi. Unsupervised domain adaptation with optimal transport in multi-site segmentation of multiple sclerosis lesions from mri data. *Frontiers in computational neuroscience*, 14:19, 2020.
- [128] Xingjun Ma, Yuhao Niu, Lin Gu, Yisen Wang, Yitian Zhao, James Bailey, and Feng Lu. Understanding adversarial attacks on deep learning based medical image analysis systems. *Pattern Recognition*, 110:107332, 2021.
- [129] Yunzhe Sun, Gang Yang, Dayong Ding, Gangwei Cheng, Jieping Xu, and Xirong Li. A gan-based domain adaptation method for glaucoma diagnosis. In *2020 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2020.
- [130] Chunmei He, Shunmin Wang, Hongyu Kang, Lanqing Zheng, Taifeng Tan, and Xianjun Fan. Adversarial domain adaptation network for tumor image diagnosis. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 135:38–52, 2021.
- [131] Guijin Wang, Ming Chen, Zijian Ding, Jiawei Li, Huazhong Yang, and Ping Zhang. Inter-patient ecg arrhythmia heartbeat classification based on unsupervised domain adaptation. *Neurocomputing*, 454:339–349, 2021.
- [132] Eugene Lee, Annie Ho, Yi-Ting Wang, Cheng-Han Huang, and Chen-Yi Lee. Cross-domain adaptation for biometric identification using photoplethysmogram. In *ICASSP 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1289–1293, 2020.
- [133] Xuesheng Bian, Xiongbiao Luo, Cheng Wang, Weiquan Liu, and Xiuhong Lin. Dda-net: Unsupervised cross-modality medical image segmentation via dual domain adaptation. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, 213:106531, 2022.
- [134] Qi Dou, Cheng Ouyang, Cheng Chen, Hao Chen, Ben Glocker, Xiahai Zhuang, and Pheng-Ann Heng. Pnp-adanet: Plug-and-play adversarial domain adaptation network at unpaired cross-modality cardiac segmentation. *IEEE Access*, 7:99065–99076, 2019.
- [135] Hao Guan, Li Wang, and Mingxia Liu. Multi-source domain adaptation via optimal transport for brain dementia identification. In *2021 IEEE 18th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI)*, pages 1514–1517, 2021.
- [136] Hao Guan, Yunbi Liu, Erkun Yang, Pew-Thian Yap, Dinggang Shen, and Mingxia Liu. Multi-site mri harmonization via attention-guided deep domain adaptation for brain disorder identification. *Medical Image Analysis*, 71:102076, 2021.
- [137] Jun Wang, Lichi Zhang, Qian Wang, Lei Chen, Jun Shi, Xiaobo Chen, Zuoyong Li, and Dinggang Shen. Multi-class asd classification based on functional connectivity and functional correlation tensor via multi-source domain adaptation and multi-view sparse representation. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 39(10):3137–3147, 2020.
- [138] Hengfei Cui, Chang Yuwen, Lei Jiang, Yong Xia, and Yanning Zhang. Bidirectional cross-modality unsupervised domain adaptation using generative adversarial networks for cardiac image segmentation. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 136:104726, 2021.
- [139] Rui Xu, Zhen Cong, Xincheng Ye, Shoji Kido, and Noriyuki Tomiyama. Unsupervised content-preserved adaptation network for classification of pulmonary textures from different ct scanners. In *ICASSP 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1060–1064, 2020.
- [140] Pin Wang, Pufei Li, Yongming Li, Jin Xu, and Mingfeng Jiang. Classification of histopathological whole slide images based on multiple weighted semi-supervised domain adaptation. *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, 73:103400, 2022.
- [141] Yan Wang, Yangqin Feng, Lei Zhang, Zizhou Wang, Qing Lv, and Zhang Yi. Deep adversarial domain adaptation for breast cancer screening from mammograms. *Medical image analysis*, 73:102147, 2021.
- [142] Jun Li, Chaolu Feng, Xiaozhu Lin, and Xiaohua Qian. Utilizing gcn and meta-learning strategy in unsupervised domain adaptation for pancreatic cancer segmentation. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 26(1):79–89, 2022.
- [143] Marta Saiz-Vivó, Adrián Colomer, Carles Fonfría, Luis Martí-Bonmatí, and Valery Naranjo. Supervised domain adaptation for automated semantic segmentation of the atrial cavity. *Entropy*, 23(7):898, 2021.
- [144] Ittai Dayan, Holger R Roth, Aoxiao Zhong, Ahmed Harouni, Amilcare Gentili, Anas Z Abidin, Andrew Liu, Anthony Beardsworth Costa, Bradford J Wood, Chien-Sung Tsai, et al. Federated learning for predicting clinical outcomes in patients with covid-19. *Nature medicine*, 27(10):1735–1743, 2021.

- [145] Sabri Boughorbel, Fethi Jarray, Neethu Venugopal, Shabir Moosa, Haitham Elhadi, and Michel Makhlof. Federated uncertainty-aware learning for distributed hospital ehr data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.12191*, 2019.
- [146] Chris Xing Tian, Haoliang Li, Yufei Wang, and Shiqi Wang. Privacy-preserving constrained domain generalization for medical image classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.08511*, 2021.
- [147] Karthik V Sarma, Stephanie Harmon, Thomas Sanford, Holger R Roth, Ziyue Xu, Jesse Tetreault, Daguang Xu, Mona G Flores, Alex G Raman, Rushikesh Kulkarni, et al. Federated learning improves site performance in multicenter deep learning without data sharing. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 28(6):1259–1264, 2021.
- [148] Mohammad Nasajpour, Mahmut Karakaya, Seyedamin Pouriyeh, and Reza M Parizi. Federated transfer learning for diabetic retinopathy detection using cnn architectures. In *SoutheastCon 2022*, pages 655–660. IEEE, 2022.
- [149] Akhil Vaid, Suraj K Jaladanki, Jie Xu, Shelly Teng, Arvind Kumar, Samuel Lee, Sulaiman Somani, Ishan Paranjpe, Jessica K De Freitas, Tingyi Wanyan, et al. Federated learning of electronic health records to improve mortality prediction in hospitalized patients with covid-19: Machine learning approach. *JMIR medical informatics*, 9(1):e24207, 2021.
- [150] Pengfei Guo, Puyang Wang, Jinyuan Zhou, Shanshan Jiang, and Vishal M Patel. Multi-institutional collaborations for improving deep learning-based magnetic resonance image reconstruction using federated learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2423–2432, 2021.
- [151] Ming Y Lu, Richard J Chen, Dehan Kong, Jana Lipkova, Rajendra Singh, Drew FK Williamson, Tiffany Y Chen, and Faisal Mahmood. Federated learning for computational pathology on gigapixel whole slide images. *Medical image analysis*, 76:102298, 2022.
- [152] Mona Flores, Ittai Dayan, Holger Roth, Aoxiao Zhong, Ahmed Harouni, Amilcare Gentili, Anas Abidin, Andrew Liu, Anthony Costa, Bradford Wood, et al. Federated learning used for predicting outcomes in sars-cov-2 patients. *Research Square*, 2021.
- [153] Bless Lord Y Agbley, Jianping Li, Amin Ul Haq, Edem Kwedzo Bankas, Sultan Ahmad, Isaac Osei Agyemang, Delanyo Kulevome, Waldiodio David Ndiaye, Bernard Cobbinah, and Shoistamo Latipova. Multimodal melanoma detection with federated learning. In *2021 18th International Computer Conference on Wavelet Active Media Technology and Information Processing (ICCWAMTIP)*, pages 238–244. IEEE, 2021.
- [154] Mufeng Zhang, Yining Wang, and Tao Luo. Federated learning for arrhythmia detection of non-iid ecg. In *2020 IEEE 6th International Conference on Computer and Communications (ICCC)*, pages 1176–1180. IEEE, 2020.
- [155] Yunchao Gu, Quanquan Hu, Xinliang Wang, Zhong Zhou, and Sixu Lu. Fedacs: an efficient federated learning method among multiple medical institutions with adaptive client sampling. In *2021 14th International Congress on Image and Signal Processing, BioMedical Engineering and Informatics (CISP-BMEI)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2021.
- [156] Yan Kang, Yang Liu, and Tianjian Chen. Fedmvt: Semi-supervised vertical federated learning with multiview training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.10838*, 2020.
- [157] Weihao Sun, Yiqiang Chen, Xiaodong Yang, Jiangbei Cao, and Yuxiang Song. Fedio: Bridge inner-and outer-hospital information for perioperative complications prognostic prediction via federated learning. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*, pages 3215–3221. IEEE, 2021.
- [158] Akis Linardos, Kaisar Kushibar, Sean Walsh, Polyxeni Gkontra, and Karim Lekadir. Federated learning for multi-center imaging diagnostics: a simulation study in cardiovascular disease. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):1–12, 2022.
- [159] Nanqing Dong and Irina Voiculescu. Federated contrastive learning for decentralized unlabeled medical images. In *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, pages 378–387. Springer, 2021.
- [160] Qiang Yang, Yang Liu, Tianjian Chen, and Yongxin Tong. Federated machine learning: Concept and applications. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 10(2):1–19, 2019.
- [161] Julian Lo, T Yu Timothy, Da Ma, Pengxiao Zang, Julia P Owen, Qinquin Zhang, Ruihang K Wang, Mirza Faisal Beg, Aaron Y Lee, Yali Jia, et al. Federated learning for microvasculature segmentation and diabetic retinopathy classification of oct data. *Ophthalmology Science*, 1(4):100069, 2021.
- [162] Bin Gu, An Xu, Zhouyuan Huo, Cheng Deng, and Heng Huang. Privacy-preserving asynchronous federated learning algorithms for multi-party vertically collaborative learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.06233*, 2020.
- [163] Yang Liu, Yan Kang, Chaoping Xing, Tianjian Chen, and Qiang Yang. A secure federated transfer learning framework. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 35(4):70–82, 2020.
- [164] Sai Li, Tianxi Cai, and Rui Duan. Targeting underrepresented populations in precision medicine: A federated transfer learning approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.12112*, 2021.
- [165] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Manzil Zaheer, Maziar Sanjabi, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 2:429–450, 2020.
- [166] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
- [167] Sebastian U Stich. Local sgd converges fast and communicates little. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.09767*, 2018.
- [168] Felix Sattler, Klaus-Robert Müller, and Wojciech Samek. Clustered federated learning: Model-agnostic distributed multitask optimization under privacy constraints. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 32(8):3710–3722, 2020.
- [169] Othmane Marfoq, Giovanni Neglia, Aurélien Bellet, Laetitia Kameni, and Richard Vidal. Federated multi-task learning under a mixture of distributions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
- [170] Anne-Christin Hauschild, Marta Lemanczyk, Julian Matschinske, Tobias Frisch, Olga Zolotareva, Andreas Holzinger, Jan Baumbach, and Dominik Heider. Federated random forests can improve local performance of predictive models for various healthcare applications. *Bioinformatics*, 38(8):2278–2286, 2022.
- [171] Alexander Chowdhury, Hasan Kassem, Nicolas Padoy, Renato Umeton, and Alexandros Karargyris. A review of medical federated learning: Applications in oncology and cancer research. In *International MICCAI Brainlesion Workshop*, pages 3–24. Springer, 2022.
- [172] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 248–255, 2009.
- [173] Yuka Otaki, Ananya Singh, Paul Kavanagh, Robert JH Miller, Tejas Parekh, Balaji K Tamarappoo, Tali Sharir, Andrew J Einstein, Mathews B Fish, Terrence D Ruddy, et al. Clinical deployment of explainable artificial intelligence of spect for diagnosis of coronary artery disease. *JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging*, 2021.
- [174] Wei Yang Bryan Lim, Nguyen Cong Luong, Dinh Thai Hoang, Yutao Jiao, Ying-Chang Liang, Qiang Yang, Dusit Niyato, and Chunyan Miao. Federated learning in mobile edge networks: A comprehensive survey. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 22(3):2031–2063, 2020.
- [175] Hao Guan and Mingxia Liu. Domain adaptation for medical image analysis: a survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.09508*, 2021.
- [176] Weiwei Zhang, Fei Wang, Yang Jiang, Zongfeng Xu, Shichao Wu, and Yahui Zhang. Cross-subject eeg-based emotion recognition with deep domain confusion. In *International conference on intelligent robotics and applications*, pages 558–570. Springer, 2019.
- [177] Shuteng Niu, Meryl Liu, Yongxin Liu, Jian Wang, and Houbing Song. Distant domain transfer learning for medical imaging. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 25(10):3784–3793, 2021.
- [178] Cheng Chen, Qi Dou, Hao Chen, Jing Qin, and Pheng-Ann Heng. Synergistic image and feature adaptation: Towards cross-modality domain adaptation for medical image segmentation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 33, pages 865–872, 2019.
- [179] Ming Meng, Jiahao Hu, Yunyuan Gao, Wanzeng Kong, and Zhizeng Luo. A deep subdomain associate adaptation network for cross-session and cross-subject eeg emotion recognition. *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, 78:103873, 2022.
- [180] Zekun Tian, Dahua Li, Yi Yang, Fazheng Hou, Zhiyi Yang, Yu Song, and Qiang Gao. A novel domain adversarial networks based on 3d-lstm and local domain discriminator for hearing-impaired emotion recognition. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 2022.
- [181] Vishnu M. Bashyam, Jimit Doshi, Guray Erus, Dhivya Srinivasan, Ahmed Abdulkadir, Ashish Singh, Mohamad Habes, Yong Fan, Colin L. Masters, Paul Maruff, Chuanjun Zhuo, Henry Völzke, Sterling C. Johnson, Jurgen Fripp, Nikolaos Koutsouleris, Theodore D. Satterthwaite, Daniel H. Wolf, Raquel E. Gur, Ruben C. Gur, John C.

- Morris, Marilyn S. Albert, Hans J. Grabe, Susan M. Resnick, Nick R. Bryan, Katharina Wittfeld, Robin Bülow, David A. Wolk, Haochang Shou, Ilya M. Nasrallah, Christos Davatzikos, and The iSTAGING and PHENOM consortia . Deep generative medical image harmonization for improving cross-site generalization in deep learning predictors. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging*, 55(3):908–916, 2022.
- [182] Cosmin I Bercea, Benedikt Wiestler, Daniel Rueckert, and Shadi Albarqouni. Federated disentangled representation learning for unsupervised brain anomaly detection. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 4(8):685–695, 2022.
- [183] Xiang Bai, Hanchen Wang, Liya Ma, Yongchao Xu, Jiefeng Gan, Ziwei Fan, Fan Yang, Ke Ma, Jiehua Yang, Song Bai, et al. Advancing covid-19 diagnosis with privacy-preserving collaboration in artificial intelligence. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 3(12):1081–1089, 2021.
- [184] 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.
- [185] 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.
- [186] Qiang Huang, Makoto Yamada, Yuan Tian, Dinesh Singh, and Yi Chang. Graphlime: Local interpretable model explanations for graph neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2022.
- [187] Scott M Lundberg and Su-In Lee. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [188] Eric Tzeng, Judy Hoffman, Ning Zhang, Kate Saenko, and Trevor Darrell. Deep domain confusion: Maximizing for domain invariance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.3474*, 2014.
- [189] Mingsheng Long, Yue Cao, Jianmin Wang, and Michael Jordan. Learning transferable features with deep adaptation networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 97–105. PMLR, 2015.
- [190] Xiaoting Han, Lei Qi, Qian Yu, Ziqi Zhou, Yefeng Zheng, Yinghuan Shi, and Yang Gao. Deep symmetric adaptation network for cross-modality medical image segmentation. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 41(1):121–132, 2022.
- [191] Yongchun Zhu, Fuzhen Zhuang, Jindong Wang, Guolin Ke, Jingwu Chen, Jiang Bian, Hui Xiong, and Qing He. Deep subdomain adaptation network for image classification. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 32(4):1713–1722, 2020.
- [192] YanRui Jin, ZhiYuan Li, YunQing Liu, JinLei Liu, ChengJin Qin, LiQun Zhao, and ChengLiang Liu. Multi-class 12-lead ecg automatic diagnosis based on a novel subdomain adaptive deep network. *Science China Technological Sciences*, pages 1–14, 2022.
- [193] Jindong Wang, Yiqiang Chen, Wenjie Feng, Han Yu, Meiyu Huang, and Qiang Yang. Transfer learning with dynamic distribution adaptation. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 11(1):1–25, 2020.
- [194] Bo Xu, Kaiwen Wu, Ying Wu, Jie He, and Chaoyi Chen. Dynamic adversarial domain adaptation based on multikernel maximum mean discrepancy for breast ultrasound image classification. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 207:117978, 2022.
- [195] Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747*, 2017.
- [196] Kate Saenko, Brian Kulis, Mario Fritz, and Trevor Darrell. Adapting visual category models to new domains. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 213–226. Springer, 2010.
- [197] Bjoern H. Menze, Andras Jakab, Stefan Bauer, Jayashree Kalpathy-Cramer, Keyvan Farahani, Justin Kirby, Yuliya Burren, Nicole Porz, Johannes Slotboom, Roland Wiest, Levente Lanczi, Elizabeth Gerstner, Marc-André Weber, Tal Arbel, Brian B. Avants, Nicholas Ayache, Patricia Buendia, D. Louis Collins, Nicolas Cordier, Jason J. Corso, Antonio Criminisi, Tilak Das, Hervé Delingette, Çağatay Demiralp, Christopher R. Durst, Michel Dojat, Senan Doyle, Joana Festa, Florence Forbes, Ezequiel Geremia, Ben Glocker, Polina Golland, Xiaotao Guo, Andac Hamamci, Khan M. Iftekharuddin, Raj Jena, Nigel M. John, Ender Konukoglu, Danial Lashkari, José António Mariz, Raphael Meier, Sérgio Pereira, Doina Precup, Stephen J. Price, Tammy Riklin Raviv, Syed M. S. Reza, Michael Ryan, Duygu Sarikaya, Lawrence Schwartz, Hoo-Chang Shin, Jamie Shotton, Carlos A. Silva, Nuno Sousa, Nagesh K. Subbanna, Gabor Szekely, Thomas J. Taylor, Owen M. Thomas, Nicholas J. Tustison, Gozde Unal, Flor Vasseur, Max Wintermark, Dong Hye Ye, Liang Zhao, Binsheng Zhao, Darko Zikic, Marcel Prastawa, Mauricio Reyes, and Koen Van Leemput. The multimodal brain tumor image segmentation benchmark (brats). *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 34(10):1993–2024, 2015.
- [198] Xiahai Zhuang and Juan Shen. Multi-scale patch and multi-modality atlases for whole heart segmentation of mri. *Medical Image Analysis*, 31:77–87, 2016.
- [199] A. Emre Kavur, N. Sinem Gezer, Mustafa Barış, Sinem Aslan, Pierre-Henri Conze, Vladimir Groza, Duc Duy Pham, Soumick Chatterjee, Philipp Ernst, Savaş Özkan, Bora Baydar, Dmitry Lachinov, Shuo Han, Josef Pauli, Fabian Isensee, Matthias Perkonigg, Rachana Sathish, Ronnie Rajan, Debdoot Sheet, Gurbandurdy Dovletov, Oliver Speck, Andreas Nürnberg, Klaus H. Maier-Hein, Gözde Bozdagi Akar, Gözde Ünal, Oğuz Dicle, and M. Alper Selver. Chaos challenge - combined (ct-mr) healthy abdominal organ segmentation. *Medical Image Analysis*, 69:101950, 2021.
- [200] Moi Hoon Yap, Gerard Pons, Joan Martí, Sergi Ganau, Melcior Sentis, Reyer Zwiggelaar, Adrian K Davison, and Robert Martí. Automated breast ultrasound lesions detection using convolutional neural networks. *IEEE journal of biomedical and health informatics*, 22(4):1218–1226, 2017.
- [201] Jeffrey De Fauw, Joseph R Ledsam, Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Stanislav Nikolov, Nenad Tomasev, Sam Blackwell, Harry Askham, Xavier Glorot, Brendan O'Donoghue, Daniel Visentin, et al. Clinically applicable deep learning for diagnosis and referral in retinal disease. *Nature medicine*, 24(9):1342–1350, 2018.
- [202] Klaas E Stephan, Florian Schlagenhauft, Quentin JM Huys, Sudhir Raman, Eduardo A Aponte, Kay Henning Brodersen, Lionel Rigoux, Rosalyn J Moran, Jean Daunizeau, Raymond J Dolan, et al. Computational neuroimaging strategies for single patient predictions. *Neuroimage*, 145:180–199, 2017.
- [203] Constantine Anastasopoulos, Shan Yang, Maurice Pradella, Tugba Akinci D'Antonoli, Sven Knecht, Joshy Cyriac, Marco Reisert, Elias Kellner, Rita Achermann, Philip Haaf, et al. Atri-u: assisted image analysis in routine cardiovascular magnetic resonance volumetry of the left atrium. *Journal of cardiovascular magnetic resonance*, 23(1):1–10, 2021.
- [204] Yuanli Zhu and Xiaowei Duan. Predictive nursing helps improve treatment efficacy, treatment compliance, and quality of life in unstable angina pectoris patients. *American Journal of Translational Research*, 13(4):3473, 2021.
- [205] Mohd Pauzi, Nurul Azifah, Yap Bee Wah, Sayang Mohd Deni, Nor Abdul Rahim, Siti Khatijah, et al. Comparison of single and mice imputation methods for missing values: A simulation study. *Pertanika Journal of Science & Technology*, 29(2), 2021.
- [206] Patric Wyss, David Ginsbourger, Haochang Shou, Christos Davatzikos, Stefan Klöppel, Ahmed Abdulkadir, iSTAGING Consortium, Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative, et al. Adaptive data-driven selection of sequences of biological and cognitive markers in clinical diagnosis of dementia. *medRxiv*, 2021.