Benchmarking Dependence Measures to Prevent Shortcut Learning in Medical Imaging

Sarah Müller^{1(\boxtimes)}, Louisa Fay^{2,3}, Lisa M. Koch^{1,4}, Sergios Gatidis^{2,5}, Thomas Küstner², and Philipp Berens^{1($\text{\textcircled{a}}$)}

¹ Hertie Institute for AI in Brain Health, University of Tübingen, Germany ² Medical Image and Data Analysis, University Hospital of Tübingen, Germany 3 Institute of Signal Processing and System Theory, University of Stuttgart, Germany ⁴ Department of Diabetes, Endocrinology, Nutritional Medicine and Metabolism UDEM, Inselspital, Bern University Hospital, University of Bern, Switzerland ⁵ Stanford University, Department of Radiology, Stanford, USA {sar.mueller,philipp.berens}@uni-tuebingen.de

Abstract. Medical imaging cohorts are often confounded by factors such as acquisition devices, hospital sites, patient backgrounds, and many more. As a result, deep learning models tend to learn spurious correlations instead of causally related features, limiting their generalizability to new and unseen data. This problem can be addressed by minimizing dependence measures between intermediate representations of task-related and non-task-related variables. These measures include mutual information, distance correlation, and the performance of adversarial classifiers. Here, we benchmark such dependence measures for the task of preventing shortcut learning. We study a simplified setting using Morpho-MNIST and a medical imaging task with CheXpert chest radiographs. Our results provide insights into how to mitigate confounding factors in medical imaging. The project's code is publicly available^{[1](#page-0-0)}.

Keywords: Shortcut Learning, Domain Shift, Disentanglement

1 Introduction

Medical imaging cohorts are typically heterogeneous and can be confounded by technical factors, including acquisition devices, hospital sites, different patient backgrounds, or study selection bias. These factors may be correlated, and deep learning models run the risk of learning shortcuts based on spurious correlations rather than features causally related to the downstream task [\[7,](#page-9-0)[17\]](#page-9-1) (Fig. [1a](#page-1-0)). This means that the models may perform well only within the same data distribution as the training data, but will have reduced performance on a dataset with a different distribution [\[14\]](#page-9-2) (Fig. [1c](#page-1-0)). For example, the task of disease prediction may be correlated with patient sex for biological reasons or due to selection bias, making it easier in some cases for a deep learning model to infer the disease via

 $^{\rm 1}$ <https://github.com/berenslab/dependence-measures-medical-imaging>

image characteristics specific to a patient's sex rather than understanding the hidden causal relationship between the disease and the image features [\[3\]](#page-8-0).

This problem can be addressed as a representation learning problem with intermediate representations of the data that are independent of known confounding factors. To this end, one can minimize the dependency between the primary task y_1 and a spuriously correlated factor y_2 , which are learned by the classifiers C_{ψ_1} and C_{ψ_2} , respectively, from an image encoder latent space z (Fig. [1b](#page-1-0)). Subspace disentanglement solves this task by minimizing dependence measures d_m such as mutual information (MI) [\[1\]](#page-8-1) or distance correlation (dCor) [\[18](#page-9-3)[,20\]](#page-9-4) between latent subspaces (Fig. [1b](#page-1-0)1). Adversarial classifiers [\[6\]](#page-9-5) (Fig. [1b](#page-1-0)2), on the other hand, maximize for primary task y_1 performance and at the same time minimize the performance of the correlated factor y_2 from a shared latent space, e.g., with a gradient reversal layer (GRL) [\[6\]](#page-9-5). Both method categories have been applied to medical imaging problems [\[5,](#page-8-2)[19,](#page-9-6)[11,](#page-9-7)[16,](#page-9-8)[15\]](#page-9-9), with adversarial classifiers being well-known for domain adaptation tasks [\[13,](#page-9-10)[10\]](#page-9-11). However, existing studies mostly use one individual method, leaving the comparative advantages and disadvantages of different approaches unclear. In our work, we compared different methods regarding their potential to prevent shortcut learning. We first analyzed a toy example using data from Morpho-MNIST [\[2\]](#page-8-3), and later extended our analysis to a medical task using chest radiographs from CheXpert [\[12\]](#page-9-12).

Fig. 1. Overview of the causal graph (a) and how the compared methods address the shortcut connection (b). Robust inference performance of task y_1 on a shifted data distribution is only possible if the latent space is independent of the confounder y_2 (c).

2 Methods

We addressed the problem of shortcut learning by disentangling two highly correlated attributes. We implemented and evaluated three different methods to learn representations invariant to a spuriously correlated factor.

2.1 Learning Invariant Latent Spaces

The methods compared in this study differ in how they disentangle the spuriously correlated factor from the task-related variable. However, they can be categorized into two groups: (1) subspace disentanglement, which minimizes a dependence measures between latent subspaces, and (2) adversarial classifiers, which maximize the classification performance of the primary task and minimize the classification performance of the confounding factor on a shared latent space.

Subspace disentanglement requires a divided latent space into subspaces, where z_1 encodes the primary task y_1 and z_2 the spuriously correlated variable y_2 . Hence, the objective is to find a mapping $f_{\theta}(x) = z = (z_1, z_2)$ such that each task can be recovered from the corresponding latent subspaces by a linear mapping $\hat{y}_i = C_{\psi_i} z_i$, but not from the other latent subspaces z_j for $j \neq i$. Optimizing the encoder to map to attribute subspaces is thus equivalent to optimizing the cross-entropy loss for each subspace:

$$
(\theta^*, \psi^*) = \underset{\theta, \psi}{\text{arg min}} L_{\text{CE,sub}}(\theta, \psi), \tag{1}
$$

$$
L_{\text{CE,sub}}(\theta, \psi) = \frac{1}{2} \left(y_1^T \log C_{\psi_1}(z_1) + y_2^T \log C_{\psi_2}(z_2) \right). \tag{2}
$$

To make the subspaces statistically independent, the optimization problem is additionally penalized by minimizing a dependence measure d_m between the latent subspaces:

$$
(\theta^*, \psi^*) = \underset{\theta, \psi}{\arg \min} L_{\text{CE,sub}}(\theta, \psi) + \lambda \cdot d_m(z_1, z_2). \tag{3}
$$

Here, we worked with Mutual Information Neural Estimator (MINE) and the empirical distance correlation (dCor) as dependence measure estimates.

Mutual Information Neural Estimator (MINE) [\[1\]](#page-8-1) is a lower bound estimator for mutual information. Mutual information (MI) measures the dependence between two variables

$$
MI(z_1, z_2) = D_{KL}(P_{z_1, z_2} || P_{z_1} P_{z_2})
$$
\n(4)

with P_{z_1,z_2} as the joint probability mass function and $P_{z_1}P_{z_2}$ the product of the marginals. z_1 and z_2 are independent iff $MI(z_1, z_2) = 0$. [\[1\]](#page-8-1) lower bounds MI

$$
D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P} \| \mathbb{Q}) \le \sup_{T \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[T] - \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[e^T] \tag{5}
$$

where F is a family of functions $T_{\theta} : Z_1 \times Z_2 \to \mathbb{R}$, parameterized by a deep neural network with parameters $\theta \in \Theta$. Hence, the dependence measure for MINE is defined as

$$
d_{m,\mathrm{MI}}(z_1, z_2) = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{P_{z_1, z_2}}[T_{\theta}] - \log \mathbb{E}_{P_{z_1} P_{z_2}}[e^{T_{\theta}}].
$$
\n(6)

Distance correlation $(dCor)$ [\[18\]](#page-9-3) measures the linear and nonlinear dependence between two random vectors of arbitrary dimension and is bounded in the range $[0, 1]$, where a value of zero means that vectors are independent. In practice, the empirical distance correlation can be estimated from batch samples. Consider N samples of subspace vectors $z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d_1}$ and $z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d_2}$, the distance correlation is defined as

$$
d_{m,\text{dCor}}(z_1, z_2) = \frac{\text{dCov}(z_1, z_2)}{\sqrt{\text{dCov}(z_1, z_1) \text{dCov}(z_2, z_2)}}, \text{dCov}(z_1, z_2) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{A_{i,j} B_{i,j}}{N^2}}
$$
(7)

where A and B are the distance matrices. In particular, each element $a_{i,j}$ of the distance matrix A is the Euclidean distance between two samples $||z_1^{(i)} - z_1^{(j)}||_2$, after subtracting the mean of row i and column j , as well as the matrix mean.

Adversarial (Adv.) Classifiers address the dependence problem between two variables with a minimax problem: maximizing the primary task performance y_1 and minimizing the performance of the spuriously correlated factor y_2 . In [\[6\]](#page-9-5), they employ two classifiers on a shared latent space z (Fig. [1b](#page-1-0)2) and enforce invariance of y_2 by optimizing

$$
L(\theta, \psi_1, \psi_2) = L_{\text{CE}}(\theta, \psi_1) - \lambda L_{\text{CE}}(\theta, \psi_2)
$$
\n(8)

$$
L_{\text{CE}}(\theta, \psi_i) = -y_i^T \log C_{\psi_i}(\hat{y}_i)
$$
\n(9)

as an adversarial game

$$
(\theta^*, \psi_1^*) = \underset{\theta, \psi_1}{\arg \min} L(\theta, \psi_1, \psi_2^*)
$$
\n⁽¹⁰⁾

$$
\psi_2^* = \underset{\psi_2}{\arg \max} L(\theta^*, \psi_1^*, \psi_2). \tag{11}
$$

In practice, this adversarial game cannot be implemented directly with stochastic gradient descent, but it can be optimized with two different optimizers for Eq. [10](#page-3-0) and Eq. [11](#page-3-1) like for generative adversarial networks [\[8\]](#page-9-13). In [\[6\]](#page-9-5), however, they propose a gradient reversal layer (GRL) for optimizing the minimax problem (Fig. [1b](#page-1-0)2). The GRL has no parameters, acts as an identity function in the forward pass and inverts the gradient $\frac{\partial L_{CE}(\theta, \psi_2)}{\partial \theta}$ during backpropagation.

2.2 Datasets

We worked with two datasets: (1) the publicly available 28×28 grayscale im-ages from Morpho-MNIST^{[2](#page-3-2)} [\[2\]](#page-8-3), where we selected the thinned and thickened digits of the "global" dataset with 39,980 as training and 6,693 test samples. As the primary task y_1 , we predicted binary digit classes (0-4 versus 5-9) and as

 2 <https://github.com/dccastro/Morpho-MNIST>

the spuriously correlated factor y_2 we chose the writing style (thin versus thick) (Tab. [1\)](#page-4-0). (2) the publicly available $CheXper³$ $CheXper³$ $CheXper³$ [\[12\]](#page-9-12) dataset of chest radiographs, which we filtered for frontal images, resulting in 39,979 patients (100,014 images) as training and 827 patients (2,183 images) as test data. Images were first bilinearly resized to a height of 320 pixels and then cropped to a width of 320 pixels from the center. Pleural effusion was the binary primary task and patient's sex was the correlated factor (Tab. [1\)](#page-4-0).

Experiment	Dataset	Primary task y_1	Correlated factor y_2
#1	Morpho-MNIST [2]	digits small/high digits	writing style thin/thick
#2	$CheXpert$ [12]	lung disease healthy/pleural effusion	sex female/male

Table 1. Summary of the experiments.

2.3 Experimental Design

To evaluate each method, we sub-sampled the training data to create strong correlations between the primary task and the spuriously correlated factor [\[5\]](#page-8-2). For the training distribution, 95% of the data was selected from the same category of both labels, resulting in a co-occurrence matrix with 95% of the data on the main diagonals and 5% on the off-diagonals (Tab. [2\)](#page-4-2). For example, for Morpho-MNIST, 95% of the training images were thin, small digits (label category 0) and thick, high digits (label category 1), with the remaining 5% from other label combinations. Example images from the four resulting subgroups of Morpho-MNIST and CheXpert are shown in Fig. [2a](#page-4-3) and b, respectively.

Fig. 2. Sample images from the four label subgroups of the training sets.

 3 <https://stanfordmlgroup.github.io/competitions/chexpert/>

We trained all methods with 5-fold cross-validation on the strongly correlated training set. For each fold we selected the best model based on the validation loss and for each method we evaluated the mean performance over the 5-folds on three different data sets:

- Validation: Hold-out validation set with the same strong correlations as the training data.
- Inverted: Subset of the test data with inverted correlation to the training set, where 95% of the data are from different label categories.
- Balanced: Subset of the test data with no correlation between labels.

We expected that methods that prevent shortcut learning would not show a performance drop on the inverted test data compared to the validation data. As a baseline, we compared to an encoder trained with linear classification heads on subspaces, but without any dependence measure minimization ("Baseline"). Additionally, we trained an encoder with classification heads on a balanced version of the correlated training set by oversampling underrepresented subgroups (offdiagonals in the co-occurrence matrix, Tab. [2\)](#page-4-2) with replacement ("Rebalance").

2.4 Implementation Details

Training was conducted using NVIDIA TITAN Xp and the PyTorch Lightning framework [\[4\]](#page-8-4). A detailed description of all grid searches can be found in the supplementary material. On Morpho-MNIST, we trained the same encoder as in [\[5\]](#page-8-2) with three convolutional layers and a batch size of 900 samples with an Adam optimizer for 1,000 epochs, mapping to a 4-dimensional latent space (with two 2 dimensional subspaces). For MINE, we trained the encoder for one batch followed by $N_B - 1$ batch updates for the MI estimator network, resulting in $N_B \cdot 1,000$ epochs. On CheXpert, we trained a ResNet50 also with a 4-dimensional latent space with batch size 64 for 30 epochs (MINE: $N_B \cdot 30$ epochs) and AdamW.

3 Results

3.1 Morpho-MNIST

For each method, we report the mean accuracy over the 5-fold cross-validation on different data distributions (Sec. [2.3\)](#page-4-4). If z_1 is not invariant to the spuriously correlated factor, the writing style should still affect digit prediction on shifted distributions. Therefore, we expected methods that prevent shortcut learning to perform better on shifted test distributions, especially for the primary task of digit classification. For the digit classification y_1 , all methods performed better than the baselines on both the inverted and the balanced distribution (Tab[.3\)](#page-6-0). MINE had the highest accuracy on the inverted distribution, while the adversarial classifier was best on the balanced distribution. We do not report z_2 performance for the adversarial classifier, as it only operates on one shared latent

	$z_1 \rightarrow y_1$ (small/high digits)			$z_2 \rightarrow y_2$ (thin/thick)			
Method				Validation Inverted Balanced Validation Inverted Balanced			
Baseline	98.2	79.3	86.4	99.9	98.8	99.5	
Rebalance		88.4	91.5	$\overline{}$	99.1	99.6	
MINE	93.5	94.2	91.6	99.7	99.6	99.7	
dCor	98.4	87.1	91.2	99.9	99.0	99.5	
Adv. Classifier	97.6	89.7	92.5				

Table 3. Morpho-MNIST: Usage of spurious correlation as shortcut. Comparison of classification accuracy on different dataset distributions.

Table 4. MorphoMNIST: Confusion matrix for disentanglement perfor**mance.** Confusion matrix of kNN accuracy $(k=30)$ on the *balanced* dataset.

Method						Baseline Rebalance MINE dCor Adv. Classifier
Subspaces Labels	z ₁		z_2 z_1 z_2 z_1 z_2 z_1 z_2 z_1			z_{2}
y_1			86.5 50.5 90.9 50.2 91.4 50.1 91.0 52.3 92.4			
y_2			69.8 99.5 70.6 99.5 48.9 99.7 57.8 99.5 55.3			

space (Sec.[,2\)](#page-1-1). Additionally, we do not report validation performance for rebalancing, since the data was rebalanced before splitting it into folds, making it not comparable with the other methods.

We evaluated the disentanglement performance based on the the predictive subspace performance using a kNN classifier, resulting in a confusion matrix of mean accuracies for each subspace-label-combination (Tab. [4\)](#page-6-1). Since we evaluated the classifiers on the balanced test data, a method with good disentanglement performance should have accuracies on the off-diagonals that are close to random guessing (50%). Although data rebalancing showed good performance for the shifted test distributions (Tab. [3\)](#page-6-0), the disentanglement performance was comparable to the baseline method, since one of the off-diagonals is 20.6% from random guessing. MINE achieved the best overall performance, followed by the adversarial classifier and dCor. These findings were supported by a qualitative evaluation of the writing style encoding in the latent space z_1 (Fig. [3\)](#page-6-2).

Fig. 3. Latent subspace z_1 trained on Morpho-MNIST, colored by writing style y_2 .

3.2 CheXpert

For our CheXpert experiments, we report mean area under the receiver operating characteristic (AUROC) over the 5-fold cross-validation of each method. We expected methods that prevent shortcut learning to perform better on inverted and balanced test distributions for the disease classification. Here, we saw that for pleural effusion classification all methods except dCor outperformed the baseline on the shifted test distributions, with MINE performing best (Tab[.5\)](#page-7-0). Compared to the experiments with Morpho-MNIST, both dCor and the adversarial classifier showed a drop in performance, with dCor only improving in balanced performance.

Table 5. CheXpert: Usage of spurious correlation as shortcut. Comparison of classification AUROC on different dataset distributions

			$z_1 \rightarrow y_1$ (healthy/disease)	$z_2 \rightarrow y_2$ (female/male)			
Method	Validation Inverted Balanced Validation Inverted Balanced						
Baseline	98.5	45.8	80.5	99.5	96.8	97.9	
Rebalance		79.8	90.0		96.2	96.8	
MINE	93.8	87.7	92.4	98.5	97.6	96.4	
dCor	98.3	53.4	83.0	99.5	94.7	97.2	
Adv. Classifier	95.5	67.4	84.9				

To evaluate subspace disentanglement with CheXpert, we again computed the confusion matrix of kNN mean accuracies for all subspace-label-combinations. Here, data rebalancing outperformed the baseline, with off-diagonals dropping by 2.5% and 12.5%. MINE had the best overall performance, followed by rebalancing and the adversarial classifier. dCor showed no disentanglement effect, with off-diagonals comparable to the baseline, which was also visible in the qualitative evaluation of the disease encodings in Fig. [4.](#page-8-5)

Table 6. CheXpert: Confusion matrix for disentanglement performance. Confusion matrix of kNN accuracy (k=30) on the balanced dataset.

Method					Baseline Rebalance MINE dCor Adv. Classifier
Subspaces Labels		z_1 z_2 z_1 z_2 z_1 z_2 z_1 z_2 z_1			z_2
y_1		71.8 56.3 81.4 53.8 85.4 48.0 73.7 59.8 78.5			
y_2		76.5 92.8 64.0 89.9 56.4 92.4 75.7 91.5 67.6			

4 Discussion

In our quantitative benchmark, MINE was the best method at preventing shortcut learning and improving disentanglement between the primary task and a

Fig. 4. Latent subspace z_1 trained on CheXpert, colored by sex y_2 .

spuriously correlated variable. However, MINE's training duration is longer due to the asynchronous training of the MI estimator network and the encoder. Dataset rebalancing was surprisingly effective, especially for primary task performance on the inverted test distribution, but its disentanglement performance was sub-optimal for Morpho-MNIST. Both dCor and the adversarial classifier, although fast to evaluate, showed lower performance on the medical task, indicating limited robustness across domains. A key limitation for all methods is the need for supervision to encode attributes into latent subspaces. In future work we want to study additional medical datasets, explore the role of correlation strength, and evaluate other measures such as Maximum Mean Discrepancy [\[9\]](#page-9-14).

Acknowledgments. This project was supported by the Hertie Foundation and by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft under Germany's Excellence Strategy with the Excellence Cluster 2064 "Machine Learning — New Perspectives for Science", project number 390727645. This research utilized compute resources at the Tübingen Machine Learning Cloud, INST 37/1057-1 FUGG. PB is a member of the Else Kröner Medical Scientist Kolleg "ClinbrAIn: Artificial Intelligence for Clinical Brain Research". The authors thank the International Max Planck Research School for Intelligent Systems (IMPRS-IS) for supporting SM.

References

- 1. Belghazi, M.I., Baratin, A., Rajeshwar, S., Ozair, S., Bengio, Y., Courville, A., Hjelm, D.: Mutual Information Neural Estimation. In: Dy, J., Krause, A. (eds.) Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 80, pp. 531–540. PMLR (10–15 Jul 2018)
- 2. Castro, D.C., Tan, J., Kainz, B., Konukoglu, E., Glocker, B.: Morpho-mnist: Quantitative Assessment and Diagnostics for Representation Learning. Journal of Machine Learning Research 20(178), 1–29 (2019)
- 3. Castro, D.C., Walker, I., Glocker, B.: Causality matters in medical imaging. Nature Communications 11(1) (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17478-w>
- 4. Falcon, W., The PyTorch Lightning team: PyTorch Lightning (Mar 2019). [https:](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3828935) [//doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3828935](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3828935)
- 5. Fay, L., Cobos, E., Yang, B., Gatidis, S., Küstner, T.: Avoiding Shortcut-Learning by Mutual Information Minimization in Deep Learning-Based Image Processing. IEEE Access 11, 64070–64086 (2023). [https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.](https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3289397) [3289397](https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3289397)
- 10 S. Müller et al.
- 6. Ganin, Y., Lempitsky, V.: Unsupervised domain adaptation by backpropagation. In: Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 37. pp. 1180–1189 (2015)
- 7. Geirhos, R., Jacobsen, J.H., Michaelis, C., Zemel, R., Brendel, W., Bethge, M., Wichmann, F.A.: Shortcut learning in deep neural networks. Nature Machine Intelligence 2(11) (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-020-00257-z>
- 8. Goodfellow, I., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., Xu, B., Warde-Farley, D., Ozair, S., Courville, A., Bengio, Y.: Generative adversarial nets. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. vol. 27 (2014)
- 9. Gretton, A., Borgwardt, K.M., Rasch, M.J., Schölkopf, B., Smola, A.: A Kernel Two-Sample Test. Journal of Machine Learning Research (2012)
- 10. He, C., Wang, S., Kang, H., Zheng, L., Tan, T., Fan, X.: Adversarial domain adaptation network for tumor image diagnosis. International Journal of Approximate Reasoning 135, 38–52 (2021). [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2021.04.010) [ijar.2021.04.010](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2021.04.010)
- 11. Hu, Q., Wei, Y., Pang, J., Liang, M.: Unsupervised domain adaptation for brain structure segmentation via mutual information maximization alignment. Biomedical Signal Processing and Control 90, 105784 (2024). [https://doi.org/https:](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bspc.2023.105784) [//doi.org/10.1016/j.bspc.2023.105784](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bspc.2023.105784)
- 12. Irvin, J., Rajpurkar, P., Ko, M., Yu, Y., Ciurea-Ilcus, S., Chute, C., Marklund, H., Haghgoo, B., Ball, R., Shpanskaya, K., Seekins, J., Mong, D.A., Halabi, S.S., Sandberg, J.K., Jones, R., Larson, D.B., Langlotz, C.P., Patel, B.N., Lungren, M.P., Ng, A.Y.: Chexpert: A Large Chest Radiograph Dataset with Uncertainty Labels and Expert Comparison (2019)
- 13. Kamnitsas, K., Baumgartner, C., Ledig, C., Newcombe, V., Simpson, J., Kane, A., Menon, D., Nori, A., Criminisi, A., Rueckert, D., et al.: Unsupervised domain adaptation in brain lesion segmentation with adversarial networks. In: Information Processing in Medical Imaging: 25th International Conference, IPMI 2017, Boone, NC, USA, June 25-30, 2017, Proceedings 25. pp. 597–609. Springer (2017)
- 14. Koch, L.M., Baumgartner, C.F., Berens, P.: Distribution shift detection for the postmarket surveillance of medical ai algorithms: a retrospective simulation study. npj Digital Medicine (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-024-01085-w>
- 15. Liu, X., Thermos, S., Valvano, G., Chartsias, A., O'Neil, A., Tsaftaris, S.A.: Measuring the Biases and Effectiveness of Content-Style Disentanglement. In: Proc. of the British Machine Vision Conference (BMVC) (2021)
- 16. Müller, S., Koch, L.M., Lensch, H.P.A., Berens, P.: Disentangling representations of retinal images with generative models (2024)
- 17. Sun, S., Koch, L.M., Baumgartner, C.F.: Right for the Wrong Reason: Can Interpretable ML Techniques Detect Spurious Correlations? In: Proc. International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention (MIC-CAI). vol. 14221 LNCS, pp. 425–434 (2023)
- 18. Székely, G.J., Rizzo, M.L., Bakirov, N.K.: Measuring and testing dependence by correlation of distances. The Annals of Statistics 35(6) (2007). [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1214/009053607000000505) [10.1214/009053607000000505](https://doi.org/10.1214/009053607000000505)
- 19. Xie, X., Chen, J., Li, Y., Shen, L., Ma, K., Zheng, Y.: Mi2gan: Generative Adversarial Network for Medical Image Domain Adaptation using Mutual Information Constraint. In: International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention. pp. 516–525. Springer (2020)
- 20. Zhen, X., Meng, Z., Chakraborty, R., Singh, V.: On the versatile uses of partial distance correlation in deep learning. In: European Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 327–346. Springer (2022)

Appendix

Hyperparameters and Grid Searches

Morpho-MNIST: For MINE, we took the hyperparameters $N_B = 3$ and $\lambda = 0.55$ from [\[5\]](#page-8-2). For dCor, we performed a hyperparameter grid search for $\lambda \in \{0.1n|n \in$ $\mathcal{Z}, 1 \leq n \leq 10$ (best performance for $\lambda = 0.5$). For the adversarial classifier, we used all the hyperparameters described in [\[6\]](#page-9-5), including SGD optimizer with 0.9 momentum, a start learning rate of 0.01, a learning rate annealing, and a schedule for

$$
\lambda = \alpha \cdot \left(\frac{2}{1+\exp(-\gamma \cdot p)}-1\right)
$$

where p is the training progress linearly changing from 0 to 1. For the rest of the methods, we used the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.001, except for MINE, where the learning rate was 0.0001 for both the encoder and the MI estimator network.

CheXpert: We trained all methods with an AdamW optimizer with a learning rate of 0.001, except for the adversarial classifier where used the SGD optimizer with parameters as in [\[6\]](#page-9-5) and a start learning rate of 0.002. For MINE, we performed a grid search for $N_B \in [3, 5]$ and $\lambda \in [0.3, 0.5]$ (best model for $N_B =$ $5, \lambda = 0.5$ and set the epochs to $N_B \cdot 30$. For the adversarial classifier, we searched in $\alpha \in \{0.2n | 1 \le n \le 5\}$ and $\gamma \in \{n | 4 \le n \le 7\}$ (best model for $\alpha = 0.4, \gamma = 4$) and for dCor we performed the same grid search as for the Morpho-MNIST experiments (best model for $\lambda = 0.1$).