
FAIRNESS EVOLUTION IN CONTINUAL LEARNING FOR MEDICAL IMAGING

Marina Ceccon

Università degli studi di Padova
Padova
marina.ceccon@phd.unipd.it

Davide Dalle Pezze

Università degli studi di Padova
Padova
davide.dallepezze@unipd.it

Alessandro Fabris

Max Planck Institute
for Security and Privacy
Bochum
alessandro.fabris@mpi-sp.org

Gian Antonio Susto

Università degli studi di Padova
Padova
gianantonio.susto@unipd.it

ABSTRACT

Deep Learning (DL) has made significant strides in various medical applications in recent years, achieving remarkable results. In the field of medical imaging, DL models can assist doctors in disease diagnosis by classifying pathologies in Chest X-ray images. However, training on new data to expand model capabilities and adapt to distribution shifts is a notable challenge these models face. Continual Learning (CL) has emerged as a solution to this challenge, enabling models to adapt to new data while retaining knowledge gained from previous experiences. Previous studies have analyzed the behavior of CL strategies in medical imaging regarding classification performance. However, when considering models that interact with sensitive information, such as in the medical domain, it is imperative to disaggregate the performance of socially salient groups. Indeed, DL algorithms can exhibit biases against certain sub-populations, leading to discrepancies in predictive performance across different groups identified by sensitive attributes such as age, race/ethnicity, sex/gender, and socioeconomic status. In this study, we go beyond the typical assessment of classification performance in CL and study bias evolution over successive tasks with domain-specific fairness metrics. Furthermore, we investigate how different CL strategies influence this bias evolution. Specifically, we evaluate the CL strategies using the well-known CheXpert (CXP) and ChestX-ray14 (NIH) datasets. We consider a class incremental scenario of five tasks with 12 pathologies. We evaluate the Replay, Learning without Forgetting (LwF), LwF Replay, and Pseudo-Label strategies. LwF and Pseudo-Label exhibit optimal classification performance, but when including fairness metrics in the evaluation, it is clear that Pseudo-Label is less biased. For this reason, this strategy should be preferred when considering real-world scenarios in which it is crucial to consider the fairness of the model.

Keywords Fairness · Continual Learning · Medical Imaging

1 Introduction

In recent years, Deep Learning (DL) models have been successfully applied to various domains in the medical field, including pathology classification, anatomical segmentation, lesion delineation, image reconstruction, synthesis, registration, and super-resolution ([1]), exhibiting impressive performance ([2]).

Despite these advancements, DL models encounter significant challenges when trained on real-world data, especially when considering dynamic settings such as the medical imaging domain. Indeed, changes in the environment can cause distributional shifts within the data, requiring the model to adapt to the new distribution. For instance, modifications in equipment could lead to variations in image quality, while demographic changes might impact the population under

screening, thus altering the distribution of input data. On the other hand, there may be instances where the model needs to classify additional classes beyond those it was initially trained on. For example, in the case of pathology classification, new diseases may arise after training the model, or technological advancements may make it possible for new pathologies to be detected.

In other words, it is necessary to adapt when new data appears. However, it is also essential to have DL models that can expand their capabilities while preserving the knowledge gleaned from past experiences. A common practice to update the model is Fine-Tuning, which trains the model on new data. However, Fine-Tuning suffers from the Catastrophic Forgetting phenomenon, which causes the model to lose all the previously learned knowledge. On the other hand, retraining the whole model from scratch is not always feasible, due to computational costs and privacy concerns. Medical data is extremely sensitive and governed by strict data protection laws. Therefore, in realistic medical applications, when updating a model with new data, the original training data is often inaccessible. Continual Learning has emerged as a promising solution to this challenge, offering a framework that enables models to update to new data streams while retaining previously acquired knowledge. Previous works considered the application of CL strategies in the medical imaging domain on a stream of data to maintain high classification accuracy on previously seen data while learning new distributions or classes. However, when evaluating models that handle sensitive information, such as in the medical domain, accuracy metrics alone do not suffice to assess performance comprehensively: it is also essential to consider Fairness metrics. Indeed, these models may exhibit performance discrepancies across groups defined by protected attributes such as age, ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status, resulting in poorer performance in minority groups. Assessing the bias of such models is crucial to evaluating their employability in real-world scenarios.




Figure 1: An example of the Continual Learning setting studied to evaluate Fairness in the medical domain. In this setting, the model needs to adapt to the evolving medical knowledge by incorporating newly labeled diseases that appear over time.

For these reasons, we go beyond the typical classification performance assessment in this study by studying the bias evolution over successive tasks, considering Fairness metrics. Furthermore, we investigate how different CL strategies influence the evolution of bias. Specifically, we consider a class incremental scenario using CheXpert (CXP) [3] and ChestX-ray14 (NIH) [4] two well-known Chest X-ray image classification datasets. In both cases we consider a task stream of five tasks, each containing information on two or three pathologies, for a total of 12 pathologies for CXP and 14 for NIH.

Our contributions can be outlined as follows:

- Introduction of the analysis of Fairness metrics in a CL setting for medical imaging.
- Analysis of the bias evolution on the task stream, based on the commonly used datasets CXP and NIH in the Class Incremental scenario.
- Comparison of the different behaviors regarding Fairness metrics of different CL strategies considered for the analysis.

In Section 2, we review the current literature on Continual Learning, Fairness, and their intersections within the Medical domain. We begin by exploring the concept of Fairness and its relevance to medical imaging in Section 2.1.

Following this, we introduce the Continual Learning framework and a series of employed methods in Section 2.2. Subsequently, Section 2.3 presents an overview of studies conducted in medical imaging for the Continual Learning setting. Transitioning to Section 3, we describe the considered scenario alongside the metrics and methodologies employed. We present the results of the experiments in Section 4. Here, we first analyze the classification performance of various CL approaches in Section 4.1, followed by examining Fairness metrics in Sections 4.2 and 4.3. Finally, we conclude with Section 5, by discussing the obtained results in our study and delineating potential future research directions.

2 Related Work

2.1 Fairness

As mentioned in the previous sections, Machine Learning and Deep Learning models trained for automatic decision-making and employed in real-world scenarios, in which sensitive attributes about people are handled, may sometimes exhibit an undesirable bias in their performance [5]. This bias, if not correctly identified and mitigated, may lead to unwanted discriminatory behavior towards minority groups.

For these reasons, Fairness has emerged in recent years as the field of Artificial Intelligence, in which methods are developed to identify and mitigate such bias, aiming to create fair models. In particular, the bias may arise for several reasons. Hence, different types of bias exist. For instance, the ML or DL models may learn spurious correlations between the sensitive attributes of the input data and the outcome, a phenomenon sometimes referred to as *shortcut learning* [6]. For example, a model trained on a college admission problem may learn that people of a certain ethnicity should be admitted with a lower probability with respect to the others because, in the input data, they are admitted with said probability. This type of bias is called prediction outcome discrimination [7].

In the situation above, it is desirable to have similar acceptance rates across different groups; for this reason, the fairness metric utilized in this case is demographic parity [5], which measures the difference in acceptance rates across different groups. On the other hand, there are situations where it is not desirable to have similar acceptance rates across groups [8].

For example, considering the problem of pathology classification in the medical field, groups may have a different target condition prevalence. For this reason, enforcing similar acceptance rates across groups is generally unsuitable in disease prediction [9]. Instead, in these situations, the type of bias that may arise is called prediction quality disparity: the model’s performance quality may differ across different demographic groups. The reasons for this phenomenon may be related to the difference in the prevalence of each group in the input dataset, which may lead the model to overfit the majority population, penalizing minority groups [7]. In this situation, Fairness metrics measuring the disparity of the model’s performance on different groups are preferable; these include AUC disparity, F1 disparity, and TPR disparity.

The study of Fairness in medical AI is rather recent [10]. [9] discuss the importance of choosing the most appropriate definition of Fairness in the medical field. It explores the root causes of bias in this domain, addressing the issue of the lack of diversity and accurate representation of the target population in the training datasets. Moreover, the authors analyze the issues that arise when bias mitigation techniques are applied in the medical field, often leading to poorer performance in all groups. The study [11] analyzes the bias of state-of-the-art pathology classifiers trained on Chest X-ray images. In particular, the authors train models on the three most common Chest X-ray datasets: MIMIC-CXR [12], Chest-Xray14 [4], and CheXpert [3], together with a combination of all three, and analyze the performance of the trained models concerning these protected attributes: sex, age, race, and the insurance type as a proxy of socioeconomic status. Their main finding is that in state-of-the-art classifiers, there’s a systematic bias that penalizes these minority groups: females, Hispanic people, people with Medicaid insurance, which is a proxy for low socioeconomic status, and people younger than 20. In [13], the authors train binary models on the datasets MIMIC-CXR and CheXpert to predict the following targets: No Finding, Pneumothorax, Fracture, and evaluate the performance of different groups based on ethnicity, sex, and age. Their main finding is that methods that achieve group fairness do so by worsening the performance of all groups. For this reason, these methods are not considered fair because they violate the non-maleficence bioethics principle. Lastly, the study [14] performs an in-depth analysis of the causes of bias in Deep Learning models in the medical field. In particular, the authors explore the hypothesis that breast tissue leads to underexposure of the lungs and causes lower model performance and test different sampling methods on both CXP and NIH, finding that only keeping one image per patient in the training set improves the Fairness of the models without significantly impacting the performance accuracy.

2.2 Continual Learning

In the traditional Machine Learning setting, models are trained on fixed datasets, and their performance may degrade when presented with new or unseen data that differs significantly from the training distribution. However, when considering real-world applications, it is easy to assume that the environments where the model is deployed could see new data in the future with a different data distribution than that observed in training. Continual Learning addresses this limitation by allowing models to adapt and learn from new data without forgetting what they have already learned. Indeed, one of the main challenges CL tries to solve is the effect known as catastrophic forgetting, where the model’s performance on previous tasks deteriorates as it learns new tasks.

Typically, the majority of literature explores three Continual Learning scenarios. The first scenario, called Task-Incremental, involves training a model on a sequence of tasks and then assessing its performance during testing on all tasks [15]. In this scenario, during testing, the model receives assistance by being provided with both the input sample and the corresponding task identification, making the prediction process easier. Moreover, in the Domain-Incremental scenario, it is assumed to have a sequence of tasks where each task differs because of a shift in the input data distribution while the set of classes remains common for all tasks. Concerning the previous scenario, only the input is provided without additional information during testing, which makes the problems more challenging [15]. Similarly, Class-Incremental cannot access the task provenience during the test. The difference with the previous scenario is that, in this case, each task contains new classes; in other words, the set of classes is not constant among the tasks. Hence, in this scenario, during the testing phase, the model must be able to internally deduce to which task the given sample belongs and then perform the prediction on the sample.

The methods in the CL literature can be grouped into three big families of strategies known as rehearsal-based, regularization-based, and architecture-based approaches.

Rehearsal-based techniques assume storing and reusing past data samples during training. Within this category, various approaches exist, but one of the most renowned methods is referred to as Experience Replay [16], also known as Replay. In this method, the old data is combined with the data of the new task to maintain knowledge during the training of the current task. The model can retain information about earlier tasks by periodically revisiting previous data while learning new ones. This method has demonstrated remarkable performance in multi-class classification problems, consistently demonstrating its efficacy in all three CL scenarios (DIL, CIL, TIL).

Regularization-based approaches consider additional constraints or penalties during training to maintain memory of old tasks. Two well-known methods belonging to this category are Elastic Weight Consolidation (EWC) [17] and Learning without Forgetting (LwF) [18]. The rationale behind EWC is to assign higher penalties to changes in parameters that are important for previously learned tasks, thus protecting them from significant updates during the training of the next tasks. However, while the literature confirms the effectiveness of this approach in the Domain Incremental Learning scenario, it was also found that EWC does not perform well in the Class Incremental Learning scenario [15].

LwF is based on the idea of Knowledge Distillation proposed originally by [19]. In distillation, the knowledge learned by a model on previous tasks is distilled into a compact form (e.g., soft target probabilities) and used during the training of the new task to retain the old knowledge. Therefore, during training, the loss function includes terms for the current task’s classification error and a distillation loss. This additional loss encourages the model to produce similar outputs for old and new tasks, using the previous model output as soft labels for previous tasks.

This method proved to be very effective when dealing with the problem of Object Detection, where old classes are not shown in the new tasks [20].

Pseudo-Label has also emerged recently as a successful approach in Continual Object Detection [21]. In this method, as in LwF, the model trained on the previous task is saved in memory and used while training on a new task. More specifically, while visiting the data of task i , since there is no information available on the labels of previous tasks, the ground truth for the old labels is derived using the old model. The method derives this information by passing the new inputs to the old model and attaching the corresponding output labels for the old classes after applying a threshold to binarize them to the ground truth targets.

Architecture-based approaches, as the name suggests, are methods that focus on changing the original model’s architecture to help maintain the old knowledge, and the methods to perform this differentiate significantly among them [22, 23, 24].

Moreover, in CL literature, some methods propose combining different strategies families to obtain better and more robust performance [25]. For example, in [26], samples from previous tasks are periodically replayed to the current model, and an adaptive distillation loss is used. Similarly [27] combines a distillation-based approach with Replay for the Semantic Segmentation problem in the CL setting.

2.3 Continual Learning in the Medical domain

Deep Learning (DL) has recently made significant advancements in various fields, like Computer Vision and Audio, achieving remarkable results. For example, in the medical imaging field, DL models can assist doctors in disease diagnosis using Chest X-ray images [28].

Despite these advancements, DL models encounter a significant challenge when deployed after training in the real world. The data passed to the model can change distribution because of changes in the environment. For example, new diseases could not be labeled before since it was time-consuming to label them, or patients with new diseases appeared after the initial model was trained. Another change could be due to changes in the equipment used, which could result in variations in image quality, thereby requiring adjustments in the input data distribution. In other words, it is necessary to adapt when new data appears. However, it is also essential to have DL models that can expand their capabilities while preserving the knowledge gleaned from past experiences. Therefore, Continual Learning has emerged as a promising solution to this challenge, offering a framework that enables models to update the model to new data streams while retaining previously acquired knowledge [29, 30].

Several works are proposed for the medical domain in the CL setting [30, 31, 32, 33, 34]. When considering multi-label classification in the CL setting [35, 36], an important application is the medical domain, where it is possible to perform disease diagnosis using chest x-ray images.

Recently, a series of works about multi-label image classification in the medical domain using chest x-ray images have been proposed in literature. Specifically, both DIL and CIL scenarios have been explored within this context. For the DIL scenario, in [28], a study is conducted based on two tasks based on ChestX-ray14 and MIMIC-CXR datasets, while in [37], similar challenges are addressed considering a replay-based approach. In the realm of CIL scenarios, [38] considers three tasks encompassing 12 classes, with new classes gradually introduced over time using mainly replay-based approaches. Similarly, [39] studies a CIL scenario with five tasks, each with only one class, for a total of 5 classes considered. To solve the problem, they propose the use of the LwF approach.

Previous studies demonstrated impressive results in training Deep Learning models on Chest X-ray images through Continual Learning strategies [28, 39]. However, the analysis has typically focused solely on classification performance, while Fairness metrics are not considered. Nevertheless, in domains like medical imaging, where model outcomes can profoundly impact individuals' lives, it is imperative to not only evaluate model performance quality but also assess potential discrimination towards minority groups. Additionally, within a Continual Learning framework, it is crucial to examine how the incorporation of new data and inevitable forgetting of old data influence model bias. Currently, two studies about Fairness in the Continual Learning framework have been conducted to the best of our knowledge. The study [40] considered the problems of Facial Expression Recognition and Action Unit Detection. In the second study, [41] evaluated the Fairness of the BIOS and Biased MNIST datasets.

Therefore, this study evaluates and analyzes the Fairness of models in a Continual Learning scenario for the medical imaging domain that was not considered previously, although of extreme practical impact.

3 Experimental Setting

3.1 Considered scenario

We model a medical imaging scenario where a computer-aided diagnosis system assists specialist diagnoses from X-ray scans. The model is updated over time to support a growing number of pathologies. At each iteration, the system is enriched with information about additional pathologies; model developers receive images with annotations for new classes and bundle them into tasks to continually update the model. Therefore, we consider a Class Incremental setting defined on the CXP dataset [3] and one defined on the NIH dataset [4]. As happens in multi-label Continual Learning settings, the information about the old classes is not shown in the new tasks, even though they may be present in the images. Therefore, the model may see similar images in different tasks but with different associated ground truth targets. This setting resembles in spirit the same challenge faced for the problems of Object Detection and Semantic Segmentation in the Continual Learning framework.

The detailed sequence of labels considered in the CL setting for each dataset is described in Appendix.

Following the Continual Learning setting for Object Detection [20], each task considers all and only the images in which at least one of the corresponding pathologies appears. Therefore, there is some intersection between tasks, which depends on the correlation of the corresponding pathologies. Moreover, the images with the label "No Finding", hence the ones with no diseases associated, are not considered since they belong to no task. Additionally, we only considered

one image per patient since previous works ([14]) showed that this step could improve the Fairness of the model without significantly affecting the performance accuracy.

3.2 Evaluated methods

As discussed before, several CL strategies are proposed in the literature to solve the catastrophic forgetting problem in a stream of data. We are going to consider and evaluate the following strategies:

- **Fine-Tuning:** The model is trained sequentially using the new incoming data. This approach is usually considered a lower bound of the performance for the results obtained by CL approaches. Indeed, since no specific technique is employed to maintain old knowledge, we can expect the worst results regarding forgetting for this approach.
- **Replay:** Here, we indicate the Experience Replay approach described previously in Section 2.2. In this approach, a subset of samples belonging to old data is stored and used during the training of the new batch to maintain the old knowledge.
- **LwF:** This method based on distillation is commonly employed to address the challenge of missing labels for old classes when encountering new tasks in Object Detection problems. This strategy based on distillation is commonly used to solve the issue of missing labels for old classes in the new tasks in the Object Detection problem.
- **Pseudo-Label:** Similar to LwF, Pseudo-Labeling has shown promise in resolving this issue in Object Detection. Therefore, here we assess its effectiveness in the context of multi-label image classification.
- **LwF Replay:** This method combines the Replay approach, in which samples from previous tasks are shown to the model while training on the current task, with LwF, in which a distillation loss term is added to the loss.
- **Joint Training:** The model is trained on all tasks simultaneously, which is usually considered as an upper baseline for the CL strategies since they are not affected by the phenomenon of Catastrophic Forgetting.

3.3 Evaluation metrics

To assess the performance of the models resulting from training using the various strategies, we considered the ROC AUC, hence the Receiver Operating Characteristic Area Under the Curve, a metric that is commonly used when evaluating this kind of classification problem. In particular, the AUC represents the probability of randomly chosen positive instance being ranked higher than a randomly chosen negative instance by the model, and it's computed by plotting the True Positive Rate (TPR) on the y-axis against the False Positive Rate (FPR) on the x-axis for various threshold values, and computing the area under this curve.

Since the considered setting includes a stream of tasks, to evaluate the performance at some point, we consider the average AUC over all the pathologies of all tasks seen so far, as usually done in CL. Therefore, we evaluate the final performance after the model was trained on the entire stream using the average AUC on all the classes. When evaluating the Fairness of a model, it is possible to consider various metrics depending on the considered context [42]. In the medical field, an impactful consequence of the use of biased models is the underdiagnosis of minority groups [43]. Therefore, verifying whether the true positive rates (TPR) are consistent across different groups is essential. We report groupwise differences in TPR as a fairness measure. This metric is very close to patient interests, since TPR is of utmost importance to correctly diagnose a disease, and it is relevant, since we ensure a reasonable model performance, quantified by AUC. Specifically, our attention is drawn to measuring the disparities between the model performance of females and males, and of different age groups, defined as: 0-20, 20-40, 40-60 and 60-80. In other words, we will examine how the TPR varies between the different groups, shedding light on any potential biases or inequalities in the model's predictions. As discussed before, for the classification performance, to evaluate the Fairness in the CL setting, we calculate the TPR gap based on all the diseases seen so far. This metric is computed considering the difference in the TPR between one group (the most favored) and another (the least favored), for each label i , as shown in the formula 1. In the formula, S_j represents the most favored group and S_k the least favored. The gap is then averaged over all pathologies seen so far. In our case, for the gender, we consider the male patients as the most favored group, hence females represent the unfavored group, while in terms of age people younger than 20 are considered as the advantaged group, while patients older than 60 represent the disadvantaged group.

$$Gap_i = TPR_{S_j,i} - TPR_{S_k,i} \quad (1)$$

4 Results

In this section, we present the plots from the experiments conducted on the CXP dataset. The outcomes for the NIH dataset can be found in Table 1, with corresponding plots provided in the Appendix. The findings presented here pertain to the CXP results but are also applicable to the NIH dataset due to the similarities in their results.

4.1 Analysis on the classification performance




Figure 2: AUC metric, evaluated on each strategy, averaged on all the pathologies seen so far (CXP).

As is notable from figure 2, the average AUC on the model trained in the Joint Training on CXP is 0.781. This value is similar to the state-of-the-art result [11], only slightly lower since the images with the label "No Finding" were removed from the dataset, and only one image per patient was considered. When examining the Fine-Tuning approach, it is clear that it cannot maintain the previously seen knowledge. Indeed, when considering a new task, the AUC of pathologies of past tasks gets corrupted, affecting the overall average AUC. Similarly, we can observe that Replay cannot work in this Class Incremental multi-label setting. The reason is the same as that encountered for the object detection problem [20]. For this setting, it can happen that the same (or similar) images are seen in different tasks, each with different labels, causing interference in the learning of the model. For example, if an image is labeled as "dog" in one task and as "animal" in another task, the model might struggle to consistently associate the correct label with the image. The evidence supporting this is illustrated in Figure 2, where the performance of the Replay method only marginally outperforms that of the Fine-Tuning approach.

Specifically, the replay method achieves a final ROC AUC of 0.60, compared to the 0.55 achieved by the Fine-Tuning approach.


On the other hand, both the LwF [20] and Pseudo-Label [21] strategies can solve the challenge of predicting correctly the previously seen classes while accumulating knowledge on new classes. Indeed, we can observe that both can perform much better than Replay, achieving an average AUC of 0.68 and 0.69. While this is a significant improvement concerning the Replay approach, there is still a notable gap between the optimal performance represented by the Joint Training strategy and the best CL strategy, i.e., Pseudo-Label. Indeed, the optimal setting reaches 0.78 while the best method, Pseudo-Label, reaches 0.7.

Lastly, the results of the LwF Replay approach are suboptimal: the strategy performs slightly worse than both LwF and Pseudo-Label. The reasons for these results can be found in the interference issue that affects the Replay approach in this multi-label scenario: while certain replayed samples benefit the model and aid the LwF approach, others affect the model negatively, providing it with information that contradicts the data from the current task samples.


4.2 Analysis on the Fairness evolution on the gender attribute

As discussed in previous sections, while performance analysis is crucial to guarantee that the model can operate on a data stream, other metrics are likewise relevant. After ensuring overall model accuracy, disaggregated analyses across protected attributes should be conducted to ensure fairness.

It is imperative to note that among the range of CL methods examined, our focus will primarily be on those demonstrating a respectable level of performance in terms of Area Under the Curve (AUC). This choice is justified by the principle that assessing fairness metrics becomes meaningful only when the model exhibits satisfactory performance in accuracy



(a) Sex TPR gap on CXP of all the considered CL strategies.



(b) Male and female TPR evolution over the task stream of the three best CL strategies.

Figure 3: Fairness metric results on CXP.

and avoids satisfactorily the catastrophic forgetting phenomenon. Indeed, if a CL model fails to mitigate forgetting and lacks accuracy, the fairness metrics derived from such a model would be of limited utility.

In the case of the Joint Training on the whole dataset, previous work had found that the models trained on CXP and on NIH were biased [11], favoring the performance of males. In our case, we find that, in the case of CXP, even though the average TPR on all pathologies is higher for males, the gap is smaller, achieving a value of only 0.008.

This difference with the state-of-the-art may be due to the choice of only keeping one image per patient, which was already proved to improve the gap [14]; moreover, an additional cause for this improvement may be the removal of the images with the label "No Finding". However, even though the gap is not significant in the static setting, it's important to assess whether this statement holds for the models trained on the Continual Learning scenario as well.

In figure 3a, we display the plots of the gap disparity between males and females for all strategies. The results regarding the Fine-Tuning and the Replay approach are highly influenced by the poor performance of the resulting models on the old tasks. Therefore, analyzing bias in the performance of the previous and current tasks of models that have significantly forgotten past tasks is not relevant. For this reason, these two approaches will not be considered any further in the analysis of the gender bias evolution in the CL setting.

On the other hand, since the LwF, Pseudo-Label and LwF Replay strategy exhibit good classification performance, it is interesting to analyze the results obtained regarding Fairness. For this reason, we additionally report the plot of the TPR for males and females relative to these strategies in Figure 3b.

From figure 3b, we can see that, in the case of the LwF strategy, from the second task, the model performs better for males in terms of TPR, resulting in a more significant gap concerning the one noticed in the model resulted from the Joint Training. In other words, we can observe a disparity between the groups that should be considered and that, if used in an application, could result in the underdiagnosis of women. When examining the TPR on Pseudo-Label showed in 3b, we can observe that, in general, the TPR disparity oscillates between tasks and converges to almost zero. Similarly, the final gap resulting from training using the LwF Replay strategy is almost null.

4.3 Analysis on the Fairness evolution on the age attribute

Additionally, we analyzed the performance of the various strategies on the different age groups defined in Section 3.3. The results on the joint training on the CXP dataset show that the age group with the highest TPR is 0-20, while the group with the lowest TPR is 60+, and the gap is of 0.148. In figure 4, the gap between these two groups is plotted over the whole task stream for all strategies. Similarly to the gender TPR gap, the results of the Fine-Tuning and Replay strategy in terms of TPR gap are not relevant due to their poor performance in terms of AUC. Instead, the results on the TPR for all age groups relative to the three best methods (LwF, Pseudo-Label and LwF Replay) are displayed in Figure 5.

From the plots we can notice that, considering the LwF and Pseudo-Label approaches, after training on all tasks, the TPR is the highest on people younger than 20 and the lowest on people older than 60. Moreover, the two strategies





Figure 4: Age TPR gap on CXP of all the considered CL strategies.



(a) TPR of each age group considering the LwF approach.

(b) TPR of each age group considering the Pseudo-Label approach.

(c) TPR of each age group considering the LwF Replay approach.

Figure 5: TPR evolution relative to each age group, of the three best CL strategies.

display very similar gaps: in the case of CXP the difference between the highest TPR exhibited by LwF and the lowest is 0.059, while considering Pseudo-Label it's 0.061.

When considering the LwF Replay approach, we observe that the final gap is very small, taking the value of 0.023.

In table 1 the results of all strategies on both datasets are reported. Overall, the LwF Replay approach seems to be the best in terms of age gap; however, its suboptimality in terms of classification performance, on both datasets, and the gender gap on the NIH dataset limit its employability. On the other hand, Pseudo-Label performs better in terms of AUC and sex TPR, exhibiting a slightly higher gap in terms of age TPR. In other words, Pseudo-Label exhibits the best combination of results considering both classification and Fairness metrics.

It's worth mentioning that, in the case of the LwF Replay approach, the most favored and disfavored age groups do not correspond to the age TPR results of the models resulted from the joint training. Moreover, the sex TPR gap favoring males observed in the results of the LwF strategy is not present in the static setting in which the joint model was trained. This further emphasizes the unpredictability of Fairness results when considering a CL scenario, hence the need of considering Fairness metrics in these settings.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this study, we used Continual Learning strategies to address the medical image diagnosis problem. More in detail, we explored the Class Incremental Learning scenario where new diseases are incrementally introduced. Moreover, we assessed how biases evolve as the model adapts to new tasks, providing a novel analysis of bias behavior for the CL setting in the medical imaging domain. In this scenario, we assessed that traditional approaches like Replay struggle to retain past knowledge. The paper explores three alternative CL approaches to address this challenge: Learning without Forgetting, Pseudo-Label and LwF Replay. Experimental results demonstrate that both LwF and Pseudo-Labeling outperform the Replay and LwF Replay methods, with Pseudo-Labeling showing slightly better performance in retaining past knowledge.

Dataset Strategy\Metric	CXP Dataset			NIH Dataset		
	AUC	Sex TPR Gap	Age TPR gap	AUC	Sex TPR Gap	Age TPR gap
Joint Training	0.78	0.008	0.148	0.78	-0.010	-0.024
Fine-Tuning	0.55	0.002	0.014	0.57	0.016	-0.115
Replay	0.60	-0.013	0.065	0.60	-0.022	-0.005
LwF	0.68	0.028	0.059	0.65	0.013	0.046
Pseudo-Label	0.69	0.001	0.061	0.68	0.003	0.043
Replay LwF	0.67	-0.002	0.023	0.65	-0.021	-0.002

Table 1: Results of the CL strategies on both datasets (CXP and NIH), considering both classification performance and Fairness metrics. In **bold** is highlighted the best method for each metric in each dataset and for each sensible attribute.

Moreover, we evaluate the Fairness of CL strategies by analyzing True Positive Rates (TPR) between male and female groups, and among different age groups. The results obtained show that Pseudo-Label exhibits the best Fairness in terms of gender, and the best classification performance while maintaining a reasonable gap in terms of age. On the other hand, LwF and LwF Replay exhibit a bigger bias in terms of gender in at least one dataset, and have slightly lower values of AUC. This highlights the importance of considering Fairness metrics alongside classification performance, especially in medical applications where biases could lead to underdiagnosis in certain demographic groups.

Therefore, Pseudo-Label emerges as a promising CL strategy for medical image diagnosis, striking a balance between classification performance and Fairness considerations. By effectively retaining past knowledge while adapting to new tasks and maintaining Fairness across demographic groups, Pseudo-Label offers a robust solution for Continual Learning in medical imaging applications.

While our initial findings are significant, further research is needed to understand and address biases in CL applications fully. Moreover, although our analysis focuses on a Class Incremental Learning (CIL) setting, which introduces new diseases gradually, we acknowledge that more complex scenarios may exist in real-world medical applications worth studying. Therefore, our study may serve as a foundational exploration, prompting further investigation into diverse and intricate CL scenarios to establish robust benchmarks for Fairness evolution analysis. In addition, while methods like LwF and Pseudo-Label proved to help in avoiding forgetting, there is still a notable gap in terms of performance between these methods and the optimal performance obtained in the static scenario. Therefore, additional novel methods should be evaluated to improve the final performance further while ensuring Fairness.

References

- [1] Sabina Umirzakova, Shabir Ahmad, Latif U Khan, and Taegkeun Whangbo. Medical image super-resolution for smart healthcare applications: A comprehensive survey. *Information Fusion*, page 102075, 2023.
- [2] Pedro Celard, EL Iglesias, JM Sorribes-Fdez, Rubén Romero, A Seara Vieira, and L Borrajo. A survey on deep learning applied to medical images: from simple artificial neural networks to generative models. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 35(3):2291–2323, 2023.
- [3] Jeremy Irvin, Pranav Rajpurkar, Michael Ko, Yifan Yu, Silvana Ciurea-Ilcus, Chris Chute, Henrik Marklund, Behzad Haghighi, Robyn Ball, Katie Shpanskaya, et al. Chexpert: A large chest radiograph dataset with uncertainty labels and expert comparison. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 33, pages 590–597, 2019.
- [4] Xiaosong Wang, Yifan Peng, Le Lu, Zhiyong Lu, Mohammadhadi Bagheri, and Ronald M. Summers. ChestX-ray8: Hospital-scale chest x-ray database and benchmarks on weakly-supervised classification and localization of common thorax diseases. In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. IEEE, jul 2017.
- [5] Solon Barocas, Moritz Hardt, and Arvind Narayanan. *Fairness and Machine Learning: Limitations and Opportunities*. fairmlbook.org, 2019. <http://www.fairmlbook.org>.
- [6] Alexander Brown, Nenad Tomasev, Jan Freyberg, Yuan Liu, Alan Karthikesalingam, and Jessica Schrouff. Detecting shortcut learning for fair medical ai using shortcut testing. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):4314, 2023.
- [7] Mengnan Du, Fan Yang, Na Zou, and Xia Hu. Fairness in deep learning: A computational perspective. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 36(4):25–34, 2021.
- [8] Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nati Srebro. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. In Daniel D. Lee, Masashi Sugiyama, Ulrike von Luxburg, Isabelle Guyon, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Infor-*

- mation Processing Systems 29: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2016, December 5-10, 2016, Barcelona, Spain*, pages 3315–3323, 2016.
- [9] María Agustina Ricci Lara, Rodrigo Echeveste, and Enzo Ferrante. Addressing fairness in artificial intelligence for medical imaging. *nature communications*, 2022.
 - [10] Richard J Chen, Judy J Wang, Drew FK Williamson, Tiffany Y Chen, Jana Lipkova, Ming Y Lu, Sharifa Sahai, and Faisal Mahmood. Algorithmic fairness in artificial intelligence for medicine and healthcare. *Nature biomedical engineering*, 7(6):719–742, 2023.
 - [11] Laleh Seyyed-Kalantari, Guanxiong Liu, Matthew McDermott, Irene Chen, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. Chexclusion: Fairness gaps in deep chest x-ray classifiers. pages 232–243, 11 2020.
 - [12] Alistair E. W. Johnson, Tom J. Pollard, Nathaniel R. Greenbaum, Matthew P. Lungren, Chih ying Deng, Yifan Peng, Zhiyong Lu, Roger G. Mark, Seth J. Berkowitz, and Steven Horng. Mimic-cxr-jpg, a large publicly available database of labeled chest radiographs, 2019.
 - [13] Haoran Zhang, Natalie Dullerud, Karsten Roth, Lauren Oakden-Rayner, Stephen Pfohl, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. Improving the fairness of chest x-ray classifiers. In *Conference on health, inference, and learning*, pages 204–233. PMLR, 2022.
 - [14] Nina Weng, Siavash Bigdeli, Eike Petersen, and Aasa Feragen. Are sex-based physiological differences the cause of gender bias for chest x-ray diagnosis?, 2023.
 - [15] Gido M. van de Ven and Andreas S. Tolias. Three scenarios for continual learning. *CoRR*, abs/1904.07734, 2019.
 - [16] David Rolnick, Arun Ahuja, Jonathan Schwarz, Timothy Lillicrap, and Gregory Wayne. Experience replay for continual learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
 - [17] James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, et al. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526, 2017.
 - [18] Zhizhong Li and Derek Hoiem. Learning without forgetting. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 40(12):2935–2947, 2017.
 - [19] Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015.
 - [20] Konstantin Shmelkov, Cordelia Schmid, and Karteek Alahari. Incremental learning of object detectors without catastrophic forgetting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 3400–3409, 2017.
 - [21] Linting Guan, Yan Wu, Junqiao Zhao, and Chen Ye. Learn to detect objects incrementally. In *2018 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 403–408. IEEE, 2018.
 - [22] Andrei A Rusu, Neil C Rabinowitz, Guillaume Desjardins, Hubert Soyer, James Kirkpatrick, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Razvan Pascanu, and Raia Hadsell. Progressive neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.04671*, 2016.
 - [23] Chrisantha Fernando, Dylan Banarse, Charles Blundell, Yori Zwols, David Ha, Andrei A Rusu, Alexander Pritzel, and Daan Wierstra. Pathnet: Evolution channels gradient descent in super neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.08734*, 2017.
 - [24] Arun Mallya and Svetlana Lazebnik. Packnet: Adding multiple tasks to a single network by iterative pruning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7765–7773, 2018.
 - [25] Albin Soutif-Cormerais, Antonio Carta, Andrea Cossu, Julio Hurtado, Vincenzo Lomonaco, Joost Van de Weijer, and Hamed Hemati. A comprehensive empirical evaluation on online continual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 3518–3528, 2023.
 - [26] Fei Mi, Xiaoyu Lin, and Boi Faltings. Ader: Adaptively distilled exemplar replay towards continual learning for session-based recommendation, 2020.
 - [27] Tobias Kalb, Masoud Roschani, Miriam Ruf, and Jürgen Beyerer. Continual learning for class- and domain-incremental semantic segmentation. In *2021 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 1345–1351, 2021.
 - [28] Matthias Lenga, Heinrich Schulz, and Axel Saalbach. Continual learning for domain adaptation in chest x-ray classification. In *Medical Imaging with Deep Learning*, pages 413–423. PMLR, 2020.
 - [29] Matthias Delange, Rahaf Aljundi, Marc Masana, Sarah Parisot, Xu Jia, Ales Leonardis, Greg Slabaugh, and Tinne Tuytelaars. A continual learning survey: Defying forgetting in classification tasks. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, page 1–1, 2021.

- [30] Mohammad Mahdi Derakhshani, Ivona Najdenkoska, Tom van Sonsbeek, Xiantong Zhen, Dwarikanath Mahapatra, Marcel Worring, and Cees GM Snoek. Lifelong: A benchmark for continual disease classification. In *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, pages 314–324. Springer, 2022.
- [31] Camila González, Amin Ranem, Daniel Pinto dos Santos, Ahmed Othman, and Anirban Mukhopadhyay. Lifelong nnu-net: a framework for standardized medical continual learning. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):9381, 2023.
- [32] Zhanghexuan Ji, Dazhou Guo, Puyang Wang, Ke Yan, Le Lu, Minfeng Xu, Qifeng Wang, Jia Ge, Mingchen Gao, Xianghua Ye, et al. Continual segment: Towards a single, unified and non-forgetting continual segmentation model of 143 whole-body organs in ct scans. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 21140–21151, 2023.
- [33] Pratibha Kumari, Joochi Chauhan, Afshin Bozorgpour, Reza Azad, and Dorit Merhof. Continual learning in medical imaging analysis: A comprehensive review of recent advancements and future prospects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.17004*, 2023.
- [34] Camila Gonzalez, Nick Lemke, Georgios Sakas, and Anirban Mukhopadhyay. What is wrong with continual learning in medical image segmentation? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11008*, 2020.
- [35] Chris Dongjoo Kim, Jinseo Jeong, and Gunhee Kim. Imbalanced continual learning with partitioning reservoir sampling. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XIII 16*, pages 411–428. Springer, 2020.
- [36] Yan-Shuo Liang and Wu-Jun Li. Optimizing class distribution in memory for multi-label continual learning. 2021.
- [37] Shikhar Srivastava, Mohammad Yaqub, Karthik Nandakumar, Zongyuan Ge, and Dwarikanath Mahapatra. Continual domain incremental learning for chest x-ray classification in low-resource clinical settings. In *MICCAI Workshop on Domain Adaptation and Representation Transfer*, pages 226–238. Springer, 2021.
- [38] Amritpal Singh, Mustafa Burak Gurbuz, Shiva Souhith Gantha, and Prahlad Jasti. Class-incremental continual learning for general purpose healthcare models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.04301*, 2023.
- [39] Prathyusha Akundi and Jayanthi Sivaswamy. Incremental learning for a flexible cad system design. In *2022 IEEE 19th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI)*, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2022.
- [40] Ozgur Kara, Nikhil Churamani, and Hatice Gunes. Towards fair affective robotics: Continual learning for mitigating bias in facial expression and action unit recognition, 2021.
- [41] Somnath Basu Roy Chowdhury and Snigdha Chaturvedi. Sustaining fairness via incremental learning, 2023.
- [42] Yongshuo Zong, Yongxin Yang, and Timothy M. Hospedales. MEDFAIR: benchmarking fairness for medical imaging. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023.
- [43] Laleh Seyyed-Kalantari, Haoran Zhang, Matthew BA McDermott, Irene Y Chen, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. Underdiagnosis bias of artificial intelligence algorithms applied to chest radiographs in under-served patient populations. *Nature medicine*, 27(12):2176–2182, 2021.

6 Appendix

6.1 Label distribution for CXP and NIH dataset

Here we present the visual representation of the frequency of each pathology in each task for CXP and NIH datasets respectively. The blue bars correspond to the pathologies associated with the current task, while the light blue bars correspond to the other pathologies, and the blue contour represents the frequency of each disease in the original dataset. During each task, we keep all the images in the dataset containing at least one of the pathologies associated to the task; however, other diseases may be present even though the information on the presence of such pathologies is not available, hence they're hidden pathologies.




Figure 6: Visual representation of the frequency of each pathology in each task on CXP.




Figure 7: Visual representation of the frequency of each pathology in each task on NIH.

In the case of CXP, Task 0 contains information on the classes Consolidation, Pneumonia, and Pneumothorax, Task 1 involves Lung Opacity, Enlarged Cardiomeastinum, and Fracture, Task 2 considers Lung Lesion and Pleural Other, while Task 3 includes Atelectasis and Cardiomegaly and finally Task 4 revolves around Edema and Effusion.

Instead, concerning the NIH dataset, Task 0 contains information on the classes Consolidation, Pneumonia, and Pneumothorax, Task 1 involves Atelectasis, Cardiomegaly, Edema, Task 2 considers Effusion, Emphysema and Fibrosis, while Task 3 includes Hernia and Infiltration and finally Task 4 revolves around Mass, Nodule and Pleural Thickening.

6.2 female/male frequency for each task




Figure 8: Visual representation of the frequency of the two genders in the whole dataset (on the top) and in all tasks (on the bottom), considering the CXP dataset.




Figure 9: Visual representation of the frequency of the two genders in the whole dataset (on the top) and in all tasks (on the bottom), considering the NIH dataset.

Here we present the visual representation of the frequency of the two genders in the whole dataset (on the top) and in all tasks (on the bottom), considering both the CXP and NIH datasets.

6.3 Age groups frequency for each task

Here we present the visual representation of the frequency of the four age groups in the whole dataset (on the top) and in all tasks (on the bottom), considering the CXP and NIH datasets.




Figure 10: Visual representation of the frequency of the four age groups in the whole dataset (on the top) and in all tasks (on the bottom), considering the CXP dataset.




Figure 11: Visual representation of the frequency of the four age groups in the whole dataset (on the top) and in all tasks (on the bottom), considering the NIH dataset.

6.4 PseudoCode of Lwf and Pseudo-Label

6.4.1 LwF

LwF is a technique that uses knowledge distillation to transfer knowledge from previous tasks to new ones. During training on a new task, the model is trained to mimic its own predictions on the previous task, in addition to making predictions on the new task. This helps the model retain knowledge about the previous task while learning the new one.

Algorithm 1 Learning without forgetting

Require: Current task dataset D_{new} , previous model parameters θ_{old}

Ensure: Updated model parameters θ_{new} for the current task

```
1: Initialize model parameters  $\theta_{\text{new}}$ 
2: for  $(X_{\text{new}}, Y_{\text{new}})$  in  $D_{\text{new}}$  do
3:    $Y_{\text{old}} \leftarrow f_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(X_{\text{new}})$ 
4:    $\hat{Y}_{\text{old}}, \hat{Y}_{\text{new}} \leftarrow f_{\theta_{\text{new}}}(X_{\text{new}})$ 
5:    $L = L(Y_{\text{new}}, \hat{Y}_{\text{new}}) + \lambda \cdot L_{\text{KD}}(Y_{\text{old}}, \hat{Y}_{\text{old}})$  ▷ Compute total loss
6:   Update model parameters:  $\theta_{\text{new}} \leftarrow \theta_{\text{new}} - \eta \cdot \nabla_{\theta_{\text{new}}} L$  ▷ Update model parameters
7: end for
8: return  $\theta_{\text{new}}$ 
```

6.4.2 Pseudo-Label

Initially, we start by initializing the model parameters. These parameters will be updated throughout the training process to adapt to the current task. After training on previous tasks, it uses the previous model to make predictions on new data encountered in the current task. To filter out unreliable predictions, a confidence threshold τ is applied to the model's predictions. This threshold τ determines the level of confidence required for a prediction to be considered reliable. Predictions with confidence scores below this threshold are discarded. Then this pseudo-predictions are incorporated in the ground-truth labels of the data from the current task. At this point, the loss for the mini-batch is computed and the model is updated accordingly. By iteratively repeating these steps for each mini-batch in the current task dataset, the model learns not only from the labeled data of the current task but also from the pseudo-labeled data generated from the previous model. This allows the model to retain knowledge from previous tasks while adapting to new tasks, thus addressing the challenge of catastrophic forgetting in CL scenarios.

Algorithm 2 Pseudo-Label Algorithm

Require: Current task dataset D_{new} , previous model parameters θ_{old} , set of old classes L_{old} , threshold τ

Ensure: Updated model parameters θ_{new} for the current task

```
1: Initialize model parameters  $\theta_{\text{new}}$ 
2: for  $(X_{\text{new}}, Y_{\text{new}})$  in  $D_{\text{new}}$  do
3:    $\hat{Y}_{\text{old}} \leftarrow f_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(X_{\text{new}})$ 
4:    $Y_{\text{old}} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
5:   for do  $(x_{\text{new}}, \hat{y}_{\text{old}})$  in  $(X_{\text{new}}, \hat{Y}_{\text{old}})$ 
6:      $y_{\text{old}} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
7:     for do  $l$  in  $L_{\text{old}}$ 
8:       if then  $\hat{y}_{\text{old}}^l \geq \tau$ 
9:          $y_{\text{old}}^l \leftarrow 1$ 
10:      else
11:         $y_{\text{old}}^l \leftarrow 0$ 
12:      end if
13:    end for
14:     $Y_{\text{old}} \leftarrow Y_{\text{old}} \cup y_{\text{old}}$ 
15:  end for
16:   $Y \leftarrow Y_{\text{old}} \cup Y_{\text{new}}$ 
17:   $\hat{Y} \leftarrow f_{\theta_{\text{new}}}(X_{\text{new}})$ 
18:   $L = L(Y, \hat{Y})$ 
19:   $\theta_{\text{new}} \leftarrow \theta_{\text{new}} - \eta \cdot \nabla_{\theta_{\text{new}}} L$ 
20: end for
21: return  $\theta_{\text{new}}$ 
```

6.5 Results on NIH






Figure 12: AUC metric, evaluated on each strategy, averaged on all the pathologies seen so far.

As is notable from figure 12, the average AUC on the model trained in the Joint Training on NIH is 0.782.

As it was observed in the case of the CXP dataset, the Fine-Tuning approach fails at maintaining the knowledge of previous tasks. Indeed, the trend on the overall average AUC is strongly decreasing. Similarly, Replay performs poorly on this dataset, in this scenario, exhibiting only a small improvement with respect to the Fine-Tuning approach.

In particular, the replay method achieves a final ROC AUC of 0.60, compared to the 0.57 achieved by the Fine-Tuning approach.

On the other hand, the LwF, Pseudo-Label and LwF Replay strategies perform well on this dataset. The main difference with respect to the results on the CXP dataset is that LwF Replay performs very similarly to LwF, and both exhibit a slightly lower AUC with respect to Pseudo-Label. Indeed, the final value of AUC of both LwF Replay and LwF is 0.65, while the final value of the Pseudo-Label strategy is 0.68. As it was for the CXP dataset, there is a notable gap between the optimal performance represented by the Joint Training strategy, which achieves a final value of 0.78, and the optimal CL strategy, i.e., Pseudo-Label.



(a) Sex TPR gap on NIH of all the considered CL strategies.

(b) Male and female TPR of the three best CL strategies.

Figure 13: Fairness metric results on NIH.

Concerning the gender TPR gap, as mentioned in the previous sections, previous works had found that the models trained on NIH were biased toward males ([11]). In the case of the NIH dataset, we find that the TPR is slightly higher for females, and it takes the value of -0.010 , where the minus indicates that females are the advantaged group.

As previously stated, there are many factors that may contribute to the difference in results with respect to the SOTA, for example the choice of only keeping one image per patient and of not considering "No Finding" images.

In figure 13a, we display the plots of the gap disparity between males and females for all strategies. As done in the case of the CXP dataset, we decide to focus on the TPR of the three best methods: LwF, Pseudo-Label and LwF Replay. The plots relative to the male and female TPR of these approaches are reported in Figure 13b.

From the Figure we can notice that, as it was for the CXP dataset, the model resulting from training on all tasks using the Pseudo-Label strategy displays an almost null gap, while instead the LwF approach slightly favours the performance on males. However, the gap of the LwF approach is smaller with respect to the one observed on the CXP dataset. On the other hand, the use of the LwF Replay approach results in a gap favoring the performance on females.






Figure 14: Age TPR gap on NIH of all the considered CL strategies.

Additionally, we report the results of TPR and TPR disparity relative to each age group. The results on the joint training show that the group with the highest TPR is patients between 40 and 60, while the most unfavored group is patients younger than 20, and the gap is of 0.053.


As depicted in the previous sections, we define the gap as the difference between the TPR of the youngest and the oldest group, and we plot it in Figure 14, for each strategy, after training on each task. Instead, the results on the TPR for all age groups relative to the three best methods (LwF, Pseudo-Label and LwF Replay) are displayed in Figure 15.



(a) TPR of each age group considering the LwF approach.



(b) TPR of each age group considering the Pseudo-Label approach.



(c) TPR of each age group considering the LwF Replay approach.

Figure 15: TPR evolution relative to each age group, of the three best CL strategies.

From the plots we can notice that, considering the LwF and Pseudo-Label approaches, after training on all tasks, the TPR is the highest on people younger than 20 and the lowest on people older than 60. Moreover, the two strategies display very similar gaps: in the case of LwF the gap is 0.046, while considering Pseudo-Label it's 0.043. The two gaps are slightly smaller with respect to the ones noticed in the CXP dataset.

When considering the LwF Replay approach, we observe that the disparity between the most and the least advantaged groups is marginally smaller: it takes the value of 0.032, favoring patients older than 60 and disfavoring patients between 20 and 40. On the other hand, the TPRs on the youngest and oldest groups are very similar, hence the TPR gap in this case is -0.002 .