

Section	Details
Progress Overview (inkl. Reasons for Deviations of the Plan)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Adapted timetable based on feedback and initial progress</li> <li>✓ Integrated new HSLU LaTeX template</li> <li>✍ Finalized problem statement (assignment described)</li> <li>✍ Getting familiar with PASSION dataset <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– awaiting answers from Philippe</li> </ul> </li> <li>✍ Literature review (biases, fairness and mitigation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✍ generally in ML <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* found a survey with a broad list of biases and fairness metrics</li> </ul> </li> <li>✍ generally related to demographics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* lacking a general overview, most sources focus on AI and face recognition</li> <li>* research lead to sources with insights in demographic biases in dermatology</li> </ul> </li> <li>✗ generally related to dermatology biases <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* ML survey took more time to read than expected</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Accomplishments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Documented overview of the PASSION dataset</li> <li>✓ Literature review became engaging</li> <li>✓ First methodology ideas formed</li> </ul>
Risks and Measures	<p>Struggling to filter the most relevant information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• before diving into a paper, revisit the goal of the review</li> <li>• categorize insights into Scope BAA, Scope Outlook, Out Of Scope</li> </ul> <p>Difficulty identifying key demographic bias factors (most research focuses on gender and skin type, leading to gaps)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resort to statistic biases</li> <li>• Research specific ideas instead (such as relevant risk factors in dermatology)</li> </ul> <p>Deciding on wrong biases or fairness metrics to focus on.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrow down the options, justifying the choices</li> <li>• Validate with Ludovic</li> </ul>
Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue literature review</li> <li>• Categorize already found biases, fairness metrics and mitigation methods - Scope BAA, Scope Outlook, Out Of Scope</li> <li>• Craft methodology to use during this thesis</li> </ul>
Discussion Points / Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When citing meta-studies, should I reference the original studies instead?</li> <li>• Should I document out-of-scope but seemingly relevant findings? To what extent?</li> </ul>
Additional Notes	The hints regarding how to literature review were very helpful advise
Attachments	-

Protocol	<p>Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Presented ideas are just very first ideas, need for sure to do more research on mitigation methods</li><li>• Mitigation for 3rd risk is ok</li></ul> <p>PASSION dataset</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Send reminder to Philippe, if he doesn't respond, Ludovic could ask some questions during the meeting on Friday, 14.3.25</li><li>• PASSION didn't use the labels during training, or would've stated in in the paper otherwise (double check it)</li></ul> <p>Demographic biases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• for training only relevant when the diseases present themselves differently in patients, e.g. depending on gender / age. Otherwise they are 'just' a risk factor for the patients and not directly relevant for the PASSION dataset (e.g. profession)</li><li>• focus on them in context of dermatology instead</li><li>• if some topics are later still relevant, research specific questions then</li></ul> <p>Writing and Citations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Write in iterations, first what comes to mind and improve it later</li><li>• Reference original study, unless info was derived in the meta study</li><li>• Document out of scope but seemingly relevant findings. Focus on mentioning them, what differentiate them from the others and stating why they are not pursued in more detail. Work with families<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– write something and show Ludovic</li></ul></li><li>• Scoping for the first risk makes sense, define criteria for the categories more tangible, divide BAA further in regards of ML and dermatology</li></ul>
----------	--