**Human-centered Evaluation of AI and ML Projects**

Yury Rusinovich[1], Alexander Vareiko[1], Nikita Shestak[1]

**Keywords:** Evaluation of AI, Human-centered AI

With this editorial, we inaugurate the next issue of our journal, which is dedicated to showcasing AI, ML and E-Health models within real healthcare environments. We cordially invite authors to submit their works for publication. Each submission will undergo a rigorous peer review, with a special focus on the human-centered aspects of the proposed original project. The evaluation process will adhere to evidence-based guidelines continuously refined by our ongoing web research and the insights published in our foundational issue, "Why ML in Health Science." Published original projects will be recognized with our Blockchain Token, MLHS, and added to the repository "Web3 Certificate: Human-Centered Project"[1].

It's important to clarify that our recommendations are not intended to replace the guidance of official regulatory bodies. Rather, they are designed to enhance the integration of human-centered considerations in AI and ML projects, thereby promoting sustainable human-AI collaboration.

Within this editorial, you will find our current recommendations, each substantiated by research or endorsements from official regulatory authorities. These recommendations will be utilized for the peer-review process:

**1.** Maintain human oversight in machine-to-machine interactions, ensuring that critical decisions involve human judgment and accountability[2–7].

**2.** Provide transparent information about the developer team, such as profiles on social networks (LinkedIn, X, etc.)[6,8,9].

**3.** Ensure transparency regarding the algorithms of the models[6,8–12].

**4.** Build your model on existing and proven data[13–15].

**5.** Regularly consult an independent human expert to validate the stability of your AI/ML system. Employ robust validation methods to compare human and machine decisions, ensuring continuous accuracy and fairness[3–5,8,9,11,12,16,17].

**6.** Inform the end-users of your model, such as patients or clients, about the utilization of AI/ML in communication, including diagnostics and treatment processes[7,8,10,18–22].

**7.** Inform the users of your model, such as patients or clients, about the utilization of their data for training of your model, if such training is performed[10,18–22].

[1]ML in Health Science, Germany, Poland. Europe

Corresponding author: Yury Rusinovich

Email: info@mlhs.ink

8. Implement a feedback system to collect insights from your end users, such as patients or clients, regarding the performance and impact of your model[8,10,21,22].

9. Guarantee that your project adheres to the prevailing guidelines and standards in Health Science and Healthcare, ensuring compliance, safety, and efficacy in all applications[3,10].

10. Avoid using confounders that could lead to social scoring and categorization of humans, such as nationality, race, immigration status, or religion[3,4,8,23–37].

11. Provide Diamond Open Access to at least the beta version of your project, meaning no fees are charged[38].

12. Incorporate team members with medical backgrounds who have regular interactions with real patients into your project[3,7,10].

13. Prominently highlight a "Human-centered" approach in your White Paper, website, and social media posts, underscoring the commitment to prioritizing human well-being and ethical standards in your projects[39].

14. Engage in charitable activities or make donations (e.g., to organizations like UNICEF, Water.org, etc.)[40–43].

**Conflict of Interest:** no conflict of interest exists.

### References

1    ML in Health Science. Repository "Web3 Certificate: Human-Centered Project". https://mlhs.ink/Certificate/. Accessed March 31, 2024.

2    European Parliamentary Research Service. Metaverse. Opportunities, risks and policy implications. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/cms-data/268589/eprs-briefing-metaverse_EN.pdf. Accessed March 10, 2024.

3    World Health Organisation, ed. *Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health. Guidance on large multi-modal models*; 2024.

4    European Parliamentary Research Service. Artificial intelligence act. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2021/698792/EPRS_BRI(2021)698792_EN.pdf.

5    Nichol AA, Sankar PL, Halley MC, Federico CA, Cho MK. Developer Perspectives on Potential Harms of Machine Learning Predictive Analytics in Health Care: Qualitative Analysis. *J Med Internet Res*. 2023;25:e47609. doi:10.2196/47609.

6    Sartor G. *The impact of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) on artificial intelligence: Study*. Brussels: European Parliament; 2020.

7    Rusinovich Y, Rusinovich A, Rusinovich V. Do You Agree with AI Making Decisions About Your Treatment? A Comparative Survey of IT and Healthcare Practitioners. *Web3MLHS*. 2024;1(1). doi:10.62487/m67cnn54.

8    National Telecommunications and Information Administration. AI Accountability Policy Report. https://www.ntia.gov/sites/default/files/publications/ntia-ai-report-final.pdf. Accessed April 12, 2024.

9    Collins GS, Reitsma JB, Altman DG, Moons KGM. Transparent reporting of a multivariable prediction model for individual prognosis or diagnosis (TRIPOD): the TRIPOD statement. *BMJ*. 2015;350:g7594. doi:10.1136/bmj.g7594.

10   Lekadir K, Osuala R, Gallin C, et al. *FUTURE-AI: Guiding Principles and Consensus Recommendations for Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence in Medical Imaging*; 2021.

11   Liu X, Cruz Rivera S, Moher D, Calvert MJ, Denniston AK. Reporting guidelines for clinical trial reports for interventions involving artificial intelligence: the CONSORT-AI extension. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(9):1364-1374. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-1034-x.

12   Mongan J, Moy L, Kahn CE. Checklist for Artificial Intelligence in Medical Imaging (CLAIM): A Guide for Authors and Reviewers. *Radiol Artif Intell*. 2020;2(2):e200029. doi:10.1148/ryai.2020200029.

13    Wagner MW, Ertl-Wagner BB. Accuracy of Information and References Using ChatGPT-3 for Retrieval of Clinical Radiological Information. *Can Assoc Radiol J*. 2024;75(1):69-73. doi:10.1177/08465371231171125.

14    Sharun K, Banu SA, Pawde AM, et al. ChatGPT and artificial hallucinations in stem cell research: assessing the accuracy of generated references - a preliminary study. *Ann Med Surg (Lond)*. 2023;85(10):5275-5278. doi:10.1097/MS9.0000000000001228.

15    Athaluri SA, Manthena SV, Kesapragada VSRKM, Yarlagadda V, Dave T, Duddumpudi RTS. Exploring the Boundaries of Reality: Investigating the Phenomenon of Artificial Intelligence Hallucination in Scientific Writing Through ChatGPT References. *Cureus*. 2023;15(4):e37432. doi:10.7759/cureus.37432.

16    Kwong JCC, Khondker A, Lajkosz K, et al. APPRAISE-AI Tool for Quantitative Evaluation of AI Studies for Clinical Decision Support. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023;6(9):e2335377. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.35377.

17    Antoniou T, Mamdani M. Evaluation of machine learning solutions in medicine. *CMAJ*. 2021;193(36):E1425-E1429. doi:10.1503/cmaj.210036.

18    Rusinovich Y, Rusinovich V. Do You Consent to the Use of Your Biological Data for Training ML and AI Models? Online Survey Targeting Clinicians and Researchers. *Web3MLHS*. 2024;1(1). doi:10.62487/yyx99243.

19    Aggarwal R, Farag S, Martin G, Ashrafian H, Darzi A. Patient Perceptions on Data Sharing and Applying Artificial Intelligence to Health Care Data: Cross-sectional Survey. *J Med Internet Res*. 2021;23(8):e26162. doi:10.2196/26162.

20    Moorcraft SY, Marriott C, Peckitt C, et al. Patients' willingness to participate in clinical trials and their views on aspects of cancer research: results of a prospective patient survey. *Trials*. 2016;17:17. doi:10.1186/s13063-015-1105-3.

21    Parry MW, Markowitz JS, Nordberg CM, Patel A, Bronson WH, DelSole EM. Patient Perspectives on Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare Decision Making: A Multi-Center Comparative Study. *Indian J Orthop*. 2023;57(5):653-665. doi:10.1007/s43465-023-00845-2.

22    Richardson JP, Smith C, Curtis S, et al. Patient apprehensions about the use of artificial intelligence in healthcare. *NPJ Digit Med*. 2021;4(1):140. doi:10.1038/s41746-021-00509-1.

23    Rusinovich Y, Rusinovich V. Confounders in Predictive Medical Models: The Role of Religion. *Web3MLHS*. 2024;1(1). doi:10.62487/2rm68r13.

24    Rusinovich Y, Rusinovich V. Confounders in Predictive Medical Models: Roles of Nationality and Immigrant Status. *Web3MLHS*. 2024;1(1). doi:10.62487/vc54ms96.

25    Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Impact of Healthcare Algorithms on Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health and Healthcare. https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/sites/default/files/related_files/cer-268-racial-disparities-health-healthcare.pdf.

26    Schlundt DG, Franklin MD, Patel K, et al. Religious affiliation, health behaviors and outcomes: Nashville REACH 2010. *Am J Health Behav*. 2008;32(6):714-724. doi:10.5555/ajhb.2008.32.6.714.

27    Cary MP, Zink A, Wei S, et al. Mitigating Racial And Ethnic Bias And Advancing Health Equity In Clinical Algorithms: A Scoping Review. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2023;42(10):1359-1368. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2023.00553.

28    Shanklin R, Samorani M, Harris S, Santoro MA. Ethical Redress of Racial Inequities in AI: Lessons from Decoupling Machine Learning from Optimization in Medical Appointment Scheduling. *Philos Technol*. 2022;35(4):96. doi:10.1007/s13347-022-00590-8.

29  Allen A, Mataraso S, Siefkas A, et al. A Racially Unbi-ased, Machine Learning Approach to Prediction of Mortality: Algorithm Development Study. *JMIR Public Health Surveill*. 2020;6(4):e22400. doi:10.2196/22400.

30  Andrade C. Confounding. *Indian J Psychiatry*. 2007;49(2):129-131. doi:10.4103/0019-5545.33263.

31  Alsubaie MK, Dolezal M, Sheikh IS, et al. Religious cop-ing, perceived discrimination, and posttraumatic growth in an international sample of forcibly dis-placed Muslims. *Ment Health Relig Cult*. 2021;24(9):976-992. doi:10.1080/13674676.2021.1973978.

32  Scheitle CP, Frost J, Ecklund EH. The Association be-tween Religious Discrimination and Health: Disaggre-gating by Types of Discrimination Experiences, Reli-gious Tradition, and Forms of Health. *Scientific Study of Religion*. 2023;62(4):845-868. doi:10.1111/jssr.12871.

33  Jordanova V, Crawford MJ, McManus S, Bebbington P, Brugha T. Religious discrimination and common men-tal disorders in England: a nationally representative population-based study. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epi-demiol*. 2015;50(11):1723-1729. doi:10.1007/s00127-015-1110-6.

34  Baqai B, Azam L, Davila O, Murrar S, Padela AI. Reli-gious Identity Discrimination in the Physician Work-force: Insights from Two National Studies of Muslim Clinicians in the US. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2023;38(5):1167-1174. doi:10.1007/s11606-022-07923-5.

35  Bender M, van Osch Y, He J, Güngör D, Eldja A. The role of perceived discrimination in linking religious prac-tices and well-being: A study among Muslim Afghan refugees in the Netherlands. *Int J Psychol*. 2022;57(4):445-455. doi:10.1002/ijop.12854.

36  Wu Z, Schimmele CM. Perceived religious discrimina-tion and mental health. *Ethn Health*. 2021;26(7):963-980. doi:10.1080/13557858.2019.1620176.

37  Sharif MZ, Truong M, Alam O, et al. The association be-tween experiences of religious discrimination, social-emotional and sleep outcomes among youth in Aus-tralia. *SSM Popul Health*. 2021;15:100883. doi:10.1016/j.ssmph.2021.100883.

38  *An introduction to the UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science*; 2022.

39  Shneiderman B. *Human-Centered AI:* Oxford University PressOxford; 2022.

40  Gholamzadeh Nikjoo R, Partovi Y, Joudyian N. Involve-ment of charities in Iran's health care system: a quali-tative study on problems and executive/legal/sup-portive requirements. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2021;21(1):181. doi:10.1186/s12913-021-06187-9.

41  Tu HT, Reschovsky JD. Assessments of medical care by enrollees in for-profit and nonprofit health mainte-nance organizations. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;346(17):1288-1293. doi:10.1056/NEJMsa011250.

42  Schlesinger M, Quon N, Wynia M, Cummins D, Gray B. Profit-seeking, corporate control, and the trustworthi-ness of health care organizations: assessments of health plan performance by their affiliated physicians. *Health Serv Res*. 2005;40(3):605-645. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2005.00377.x.

43  Zare H, Eisenberg M, Anderson G. Charity Care and Community Benefit in Non-Profit Hospitals: Definition and Requirements. *Inquiry*. 2021;58:469580211028180. doi:10.1177/00469580211028180.