

Online Research @ Cardiff

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/135337/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Pham, Tan Hung, Devalla, Sripad Krishna, Ang, Aloysius, Soh, Zhi-Da, Thiery, Alexandre H, Boote, Craig, Cheng, Ching-Yu, Girard, Michael J A and Koh, Victor 2020. Deep learning algorithms to isolate and quantify the structures of the anterior segment in optical coherence tomography images. British Journal of Ophthalmology 10.1136/bjophthalmol-2019-315723 file

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bjophthalmol-2019-315723>
<<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bjophthalmol-2019-315723>>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



1 **Deep Learning Algorithms to Isolate and Quantify the Structures of the Anterior**
2 **Segment in Optical Coherence Tomography Images**

3
4 Tan Hung Pham^{1,3}, Sripad Krishna Devalla¹, Aloysius Ang², Soh Zhi Da³, Alexandre
5 Thiery⁴, Craig Boote^{1,5,6}, Ching-Yu Cheng^{2,3,7*}, Michael J.A Girard^{1,3*}, Victor Koh^{8*}

- 6 1. Department of Biomedical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, National University of
7 Singapore, Singapore.
8 2. Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore.
9 3. Singapore Eye Research Institute, Singapore National Eye Centre, Singapore.
10 4. Department of Statistics and Applied Probability, National University of Singapore,
11 Singapore
12 5. School of Optometry and Vision Sciences, Cardiff University, UK.
13 6. Newcastle Research & Innovation Institute, Singapore.
14 7. Ophthalmology & Visual Sciences Academic Clinical Program (Eye ACP), Duke-NUS
15 Medical School, Singapore
16 8. Department of Ophthalmology, National University Hospital, Singapore.
17

18 * All three are corresponding authors. All of them contributed equally.

19 **Corresponding Author:**

20 Victor Koh, MD, Ph.D.
21 Department of Ophthalmology
22 National University Hospital
23 1E Kent Ridge Rd, Singapore 119228
24 victor_koh@nuhs.edu.sg

25 Cheng Ching Yu, MD, Ph.D.
26 Singapore Eye Research Institute
27 20 College Road, The Academia, Singapore 169856
28 chingyu.cheng@duke-nus.edu.sg

29
30 Michaël J. A. Girard, Ph.D.
31 Ophthalmic Engineering & Innovation Laboratory
32 Department of Bioengineering
33 National University of Singapore
34 4 Engineering Drive 3, E4-04-08
35 Singapore 117583
36 mgirard@nus.edu.sg
37 +65 6516 5549
38 <http://www.bioeng.nus.edu.sg/oeil/>
39

40 **Abstract word count: 240**

41 **Total word count: 3700**

42 **Total figure count: 5**

43 **Total table count: 3**
44

45 **Keywords:** deep learning; glaucoma; anterior segment optical coherence tomography; scleral spur
46

47 **Contributorship Statement:** Tan Hung Pham designed the experiments, algorithms and wrote the
48 paper. Sripad Krishna Devalla assisted in algorithm design. Aloysius Ang and Victor Koh assisted in
49 data labelling and experiment design. Sripad Krishna Devalla, Aloysius Ang, Soh Zhi Da, Alexandre
50 Thiery and Craig Boote edited the manuscript. Ching-Yu Cheng, Michael J.A Girard and Victor Koh
51 supervised the study and edited the manuscript.

52 **Synopsis**

53 Deep neural networks enable fast and accurate automated isolation and
54 quantification of important intraocular dimensions in anterior segment of the eye in
55 optical coherence tomography images.

56 **Abstract**

57 Background/Aims:

58 Accurate isolation and quantification of intraocular dimensions in the anterior segment
59 (AS) of the eye using optical coherence tomography (OCT) images is important in the
60 diagnosis and treatment of many eye diseases, especially angle closure glaucoma.

61 Methods:

62 In this study, we developed a deep convolutional neural network (DCNN) for the
63 localization of the scleral spur, moreover we introduced an information rich
64 segmentation approach for this localization problem. An ensemble of DCNNs for the
65 segmentation of anterior segment structures (iris, corneo-sclera shell, anterior
66 chamber) was developed. Based on the results of two previous processes, an
67 algorithm to automatically quantify clinically important measurements were created.
68 200 images from 58 patients (100 eyes) were used for testing.

69 Results:

70 With limited training data, the DCNN was able to detect the scleral spur on unseen
71 ASOCT images as accurately as an experienced ophthalmologist on the given test
72 dataset; and simultaneously isolated the anterior segment structures with a Dice
73 coefficient of 95.7%. We then automatically extracted eight clinically relevant ASOCT
74 measurements and proposed an automated quality check process that asserts the
75 reliability of these measurements. When combined with an OCT machine capable of
76 imaging multiple radial sections, the algorithms can provide a more complete objective
77 assessment. The total segmentation and measurement time for a single scan is less
78 than 2 seconds.

79 Conclusion:

80 This is an essential step toward providing a robust automated framework for reliable
81 quantification of ASOCT scans, for applications in the diagnosis and management of
82 angle closure glaucoma.

83

84 INTRODUCTION

85 Primary angle closure glaucoma (PACG) is a major type of glaucoma, in particular in
86 Asia [1]. By 2020, the number of people affected by primary angle closure glaucoma (PACG)
87 is estimated to be up to 23.4 million[1 2]. PACG is associated with a high rate of blindness [3
88 4] that is up to 5 times greater than primary open-angle glaucoma[5]. Therefore, an early
89 diagnosis followed by effective management strategies is essential to reduce the damage to
90 the optic nerve head tissues that could lead to irreversible vision loss [6]. Early diagnosis is
91 crucial in the Asian population, given the higher prevalence of PACG compared to European
92 and African populations [3 4 7].

93 The diagnosis of PACG is based on the status of the anterior chamber angle (ACA) [8-
94 10]. While the gold standard for ACA assessment is dark-room indentation gonioscopy [11],
95 the procedure requires direct contact with the eye and is highly dependent on the physician's
96 expertise and the background illumination [11 12]. This can result in poor reproducibility and
97 diagnostic accuracy. In contrast, anterior segment optical coherence tomography (ASOCT)
98 imaging allows for an objective, fast and non-contact assessment of the ACA in a standardized
99 dark-room environment [12 13]. However, current technology typically requires the manual
100 identification and marking of the scleral spur location (SSL) (**Supplement Figure 1**) by a human
101 grader before ACA measurements such as trabecular iris space area (TISA) and angle opening
102 distance (AOD) can be measured to quantify the anterior chamber angle [14]. The
103 introduction of this subjective human factor has been shown to introduce significant intra-
104 and inter-observer variability [12-14]. The inconsistent labelling of SSL compromises the
105 diagnosis and the monitoring of treatment effectiveness/disease severity in PACG [14]. In
106 addition, with swept-source ASOCT imaging, there are up to 128 cross-sectional scans
107 obtained per eye. To manually label each individual section in a timely manner would not be
108 clinically viable, and therefore automated image processing algorithms are required.

109 Deep convolutional neural networks (DCNNs) have been shown to perform well with
110 many medical imaging modalities [15-19], but their applications in ASOCT imaging are
111 nascent. From the perspective of the current study, there are two relevant applications that
112 can benefit from DCNNs, namely: object localization (for SSL detection) and segmentation (for
113 classifying tissues such as the cornea and the iris). Traditional object detection and
114 localization approaches in DCNNs are mainly based on classification and regression [20].
115 However, this approach requires a large number of labelled images to achieve robust
116 automation [21]. Moreover, accurate landmark localization is critical for the diagnosis and
117 management of PACG. Hence with limited training data, a traditional regression approach is
118 not ideal in providing a high accuracy prediction. Frequently, in the medical context, it might
119 not be feasible to obtain a large number of labelled images due to limited resources and time.
120 This problem is exacerbated in certain ocular conditions that are relatively less common
121 which may benefit from mass screening such as PACG. In addition, the reduced availability of

122 ASOCT images for eyes with PACG can be attributed to the lack of accessible equipment, cost,
123 and clinical expertise.

124 In this study, we developed a custom hybrid DCNN inspired from widely used U-Net
125 and full-resolution residual network (FRRnet) [22] for the localization of scleral spur, and the
126 segmentation of the anterior segment structures (iris, corneo-sclera shell, anterior chamber).
127 The hybrid DCNN leveraged the U-Net architecture to simultaneously exploit the local (i.e.
128 tissue texture) and contextual (i.e. tissue spatial arrangement) information and exploited the
129 FRRnet pathway to achieve precise localization. Further, we automatically extracted eight
130 clinically relevant ASOCT measurements from the segmented structures. The aim of the work
131 is to offer a robust and automated framework for the accurate localization of the scleral spur
132 and quantification of the ASOCT structures for enhancing the diagnosis and management of
133 PACG.

134 **METHODS**

135 **ASOCT imaging**

136 We included ASOCT images from patients examined at the Eye Surgery Centre,
137 National University Hospital, Singapore. Prior informed consent was obtained for all patients.
138 The study was conducted in accordance with the tenets of the World Medical Association's
139 Declaration of Helsinki and had ethics approval from the National Healthcare Group Domain
140 Specific Review Board (NHG 292015/00788). In total, ASOCT images from 100 patients (175
141 eyes) were included for analysis. The scans were obtained from the swept-source Casia SS-
142 1000 ASOCT (Tomey Corporation, Nagoya, Japan). All the eyes in this study was part of a
143 prospective cohort study which included only eyes with primary angle closure suspects and
144 so all the eyes were phakic. For each eye, a 360-degree scan yielded up to 128 cross-sections
145 of the anterior segment. We used 620 images from 42 patients (75 eyes) for training and
146 another 200 images from 58 patients (100 eyes) for testing. Since each image contained two
147 scleral spur instances, we further divided the images in half for scleral spur localization
148 (**Supplementary Figure 2**). All the images used for testing were out-of-sample validation,
149 meaning training and model tuning were being done entirely on training images. All results
150 reported are from testing images.

151 **Small landmark localization and ASOCT segmentation**

152 The accurate localization of small landmark points using neural networks has always
153 been challenging [23]. In the current study, we adopted a segmentation approach for both
154 the landmark localization and the ASOCT segmentation. A MATLAB (R2018a, MathWorks Inc.,
155 Natick, MA) script was prepared to assist in labelling the SSL (landmark localization). Three
156 definitions were used to locate the scleral spur: **1)** A change in curvature in the corneo-scleral
157 interface; **2)** The posterior end of the trabecular meshwork; and **3)** The posterior end of a
158 protruding structure along the cornea and sclera [14 24]. In each image, the following classes

159 were identified (**Supplementary Figure 2**): focus region; attention region and the background.
160 Out of the 620 training images, 420 were used for training and 200 were used for validation.
161 The full 200 test images were used for testing.

162 FIJI[25] was used to obtain the manual segmentations of the ASOCT tissues. In each
163 image, the following classes were identified (**Supplementary Figure 3**): **(1)** the iris; **(2)** the
164 corneo-sclera shell; **(3)** the anterior chamber; and the background. Due to limited human
165 resource and the complicated procedure of tissue segmentation, we only had 126 training,
166 18 validation and 84 testing images.

167 The SSL labelling and the manual segmentations used for training the DCNNs were
168 prepared by two trainers: a trained medical student (AA), and a trained observer (THP), both
169 with more than two years of experience in ASOCT imaging.

170 The landmark localization and segmentation performance of the DCNNs on unseen
171 ASOCT images were evaluated by three graders: the aforementioned trained observer
172 (observer A; THP) and medical student (Observer B; AA), and a glaucoma fellowship trained
173 ophthalmologist (Observer C; VK) with eight years of experience in in the management of
174 PACG.

175 **Quantification of ASOCT measurements**

176 The ASOCT measurements could be automatically quantified once the scleral spur was
177 defined and the anterior segment intraocular tissues segmented. The key structural
178 measurements, including ACA, anterior chamber and iris-based measurements were
179 automatically computed based on their definitions (**Table 1**).

180 **Table 1. Definitions of important anterior segment optical coherence tomography**
181 **measurements**

Measurement	Definition
Anterior Chamber Depth (ACD)	Axial distance between corneal endothelium to anterior lens surface [26]
Lens Vault (LV)	Perpendicular distance from middle of the line connecting the scleral spurs to the anterior pole of the lens [27]
Anterior Chamber Width (ACW)	Distance between two scleral spurs [28]
Anterior Chamber Area (ACA)	Area bordered by posterior surface of the cornea, anterior surface of iris and anterior surface of the lens [29]
Angle Opening Distance (AOD)	Distance between the anterior iris surface and posterior corneal surface on a line perpendicular to the trabecular meshwork, a distance from the scleral spur (500 μ m, 750 μ m etc.) [30]

Trabecular Iris Space Area (TISA)	Area of a trapezoid created by the following boundaries: AOD of a distance from scleral spur (500 μ m, 750 μ m etc.), line from scleral spur perpendicular to plane of inner scleral wall to the iris, inner corneoscleral wall, iris surface [30]
Iris thickness (IT)	IT at a distance from the scleral spur or a relative distance in the iris (e.g.: middle of iris) [31]
Iris Curvature (ICurve)	Distance from iris greatest convexity point to the line between most central and most peripheral iris pigment epithelium [31]

182

183 **Network training and architecture**

184 In recent years, several research groups have successfully used U-Net and its variants
185 [17 19 32 33] in medical image segmentation. The sequential downsampling and upsampling
186 of images combined with skip connections [34] help in simultaneously extracting both the
187 local (i.e., tissue texture) and contextual (i.e., tissue spatial arrangement) information. This
188 allows U-Net style architectures to achieve very high levels of segmentation accuracy even
189 when trained with limited training data [16 17 19]. Another promising but less explored DCNN
190 in medical imaging applications is the FRRnet [22]. The network has two pathways: a full
191 resolution path that helps in identifying precise boundaries and a multi-scale feature
192 extraction pathway that is responsible for robust feature recognition. Also, the residual
193 connections improve the gradient flow through the network [35]. By combining the
194 information from both the pathways, the FRRnet was able achieve precise localization and
195 robust feature recognition [22].

196 Many studies have demonstrated that an ensemble network that learned to combine
197 the predictions of multiple DCNNs into a single predictive model offered a better accuracy
198 than each of the networks separately [36 37]. When trained on the same training data as the
199 individual DCNNs (weights of the individual DCNNs were frozen), the ensemble network
200 learned to reduce the variance for each network, thus dramatically increasing the predictive
201 power.

202 In this study, we developed FRRUnet (full resolution residual U-Net), a hybrid DCNN
203 that exploited the inherent advantages of both the U-Net and the FRRnet. For the detection
204 of the SSL, the FRRUnet was used, while an ensemble of the U-Net, FRRnet, and the FRRUnet
205 was used for the segmentation of the ASOCT structures **[Supplementary Figure 4,5,6,7]**.

206 All three networks were trained end to end using an Adam optimizer [38] with a
207 learning rate of 5e-5 without any scheduler, β_1 of 0.9 and β_2 of 0.999, and categorical cross
208 entropy loss function [39]. All the convolution layers were activated with a leaky rectifier
209 linear unit (ReLU) [40] activation function. A dropout layer with a probability of 0.5 was used
210 after every building block to reduce the overfitting [41]. Given the limited size of the training
211 dataset, the DCNNs' variance was increased through data augmentation techniques such as

212 rotation, width shift, height shift, shear, zoom, flip, brightness and contrast shift. The final U-
213 Net, FRRnet, FRRUnet, and the ensemble network consisted of 7.80 million, 4.2 million, 4.2
214 million, and 1.7 thousand trainable parameters respectively. All networks were trained and
215 tested on an NVIDIA GTX 1080 founder's edition GPU with CUDA v8.0 and cuDNN v5.1
216 acceleration. Using the given hardware configuration, for each ASOCT image the network was
217 able to detect the SSL in 0.108 ± 0.0035 seconds and segment the ASOCT tissues in $0.324 \pm$
218 0.0018 seconds. The measurements were then automatically computed on a CPU (Intel Xeon
219 at 2.1 GHz) in under 1.723 ± 0.287 seconds. It should be noted that measurement
220 quantification can be accelerated by parallelism since each scan is independent.

221 **Inter- and intra- observer tests**

222 We performed an inter-observer agreement test to assess the reproducibility when
223 identifying the scleral spur between three human observers: A – Trained non-expert, B –
224 Trained medical student; C – Fellowship-trained glaucoma expert well-versed in ASOCT
225 analysis and the software algorithm. The intra-observer agreement test assessed the extent
226 of repeatability among the human observers and their comparison with the software
227 algorithm. The time interval between image grading by the same observer was between 3
228 and 7 days. A paired t-test was used to measure the extent of agreement on-average and
229 Bland-Altman plots were used to depict the limit of agreement (± 1.96 SD) and the distribution
230 of discrepancy between individual measurements. The intra-correlation coefficient (ICC),
231 assessed by a single grader (absolute agreement, two-way random effect model) was used to
232 reflect the degree of agreement and correlation between measurements. ICCs of <0.50 , $0.50-$
233 0.75 , $0.75-0.90$; >0.90 were taken as poor, moderate, good and excellent measures of
234 reliability, respectively [42]. All p-values presented were 2-sided and statistically significant if
235 <0.05 .

236 **Quality check**

237 Poor quality scans (low signal strength, presence of motion/blink artefact, improper
238 head positioning etc.) can affect the localization and segmentation performance of the
239 DCNNs, thus resulting in incorrect automated measurements. In this study, we performed a
240 two-step automated quality check based on the predictions obtained to eliminate poor
241 quality ASOCT images. First, upon the detection of the SSL a square region surrounding the
242 center of the predicted region was obtained as the reference. A confidence index was
243 computed as the intersection over union (IoU; between 0-1) between the predicted and
244 reference regions. Scans that yielded a confidence index greater than or equal to 0.85 were
245 considered good, while lower values were designated as poor quality. Second, for the
246 segmentation the number of closed and continuous contours representing each class were
247 used to assess the quality of a scan, i.e., the iris should have two contours, while the corneo-
248 sclera shell and the anterior chamber should have only a single contour each. Scans with
249 predictions that did not satisfy these criteria were considered as poor quality. Finally, the

250 automatically extracted measurements were considered reliable only if the ASOCT scan
251 satisfied both the aforementioned quality check criteria. The test images are made sure to be
252 of usable quality clinically.

253 **RESULTS**

254 All results in this section are from 4 observers: A – Trained non-expert, B – Trained medical
255 student, C – Fellowship-trained glaucoma expert well-versed in ASOCT analysis, M – Trained
256 machine. The same denotation is used throughout. For the whole study, the mean age \pm
257 standard deviation of the patients was 62.20 ± 8.35 , the median was 62, the interquartile range
258 was 11 (Q3 = 68, Q1 = 57) and 31.91% of them were males. The percentage for Chinese,
259 Malay, Indian and other races was 77.86%, 11.42%, 7.86% and 2.86% respectively. For testing
260 dataset, the mean age \pm standard deviation was 62.00 ± 8.93 , the median was 62, the
261 interquartile range was 10 (Q3 = 68, Q1 = 58) and 32.8% of them were males. The percentage
262 for Chinese, Malay, Indian and other races was 75.86%, 15.52%, 8.62% and 0.00%
263 respectively.

264 **Scleral spur localization**

265 First, our proposed segmentation approach was compared against a regression
266 approach, both utilizing DCNNs. The final models were trained for 1,000 iterations and then
267 tested against 3 human observers. The segmentation approach was closer to human
268 observers for all cases. The next test showed that our segmentation approach could reach
269 human level detection with a much smaller training dataset (~200 samples or ~100 images)
270 (**Supplementary Figure 8**).

271 Inter-observer tests showed that human grader differences were not significantly
272 different from human and machine differences in most cases (**Figure 1A**). Moreover,
273 intraclass correlation [42] (ICC) was done for each observer pair for the X and Y coordinates
274 of the scleral spur location (**Table 2**). It was shown that the machine's scleral spur marking
275 was in high agreement with human graders. Bland-Altman plots for Machine – Human pair
276 was further provided in **Supplementary Figure 9**.

277 The machine neural network was deterministic once training was complete, meaning
278 that a given input always resulted in the same output. Hence, to do intra-observer tests,
279 another model was trained from scratch and used to compare with the first model. RMS
280 difference for the machine intra-observer test was significantly smaller than most human
281 intra-observer tests (except for observer A, whose intra-observer result was similar to the
282 machine) (**Figure 1B**). This means that machine SSL prediction generally had lower variability
283 than that of human grader.

284 **Table 2. ICC results for Inter Observer Test**

Two-way, Single Score, Absolute Agreement ICC										
X Coordinate	A	B	C	M		Y Coordinate	A	B	C	M
A	1	0.978	0.985	0.984		A	1	0.993	0.995	0.994
B		1	0.983	0.979		B		1	0.994	0.993
C			1	0.984		C			1	0.994
M				1		M				1

285

286

287 **Figure 1.** Observer Test results. A: Inter-observer Test. B: Intra-observer Test

288 ASOCT segmentation

289 The ASOCT segmentation performance of the trained network was validated using the
 290 Dice coefficient, sensitivity and specificity (**Figure 2**), as described below. The Dice coefficient
 291 was used to assess the similarity between the manual segmentation and DCNN segmentation.

292 The coefficient was defined between 0 and 1 (0: no overlap; 1: perfect overlap), and was
 293 calculated for each class as follows:

$$294 \quad \text{Dice score} = \frac{2 \times |D \cap M|}{2 \times |D \cap M| + |D \setminus M| + |M \setminus D|} \quad [1]$$

295 where D and M are the set of pixels representing the particular class in the DCNN
 296 and manual segmentation, respectively.

297 Specificity and sensitivity were used to obtain the true negative (assess false
 298 predictions) and true positive rates (assess correct predictions) respectively. They were
 299 defined for each class as follows:

$$300 \quad \text{Specificity} = \frac{|\bar{D} \cap \bar{M}|}{|\bar{M}|} \quad [2]$$

$$301 \quad \text{Sensitivity} = \frac{|D \cap M|}{|M|} \quad [3]$$

302 Both specificity and sensitivity were defined between 0 and 1.

303

304 **Figure 2.** Validation scores for ASOCT segmentation. Machine segmentation result examples
 305 can be found in **Supplementary Figure 10**.

306 Measurement quantification

307 Measurement quantification was a crucial step to help validate the scleral spur
 308 localization. The segmentation used in this step was fully automated, based on the

309 assumption that the accuracy of automated ASOCT segmentation is already high. **Figure 3**
 310 defined the measured ACA measurements. **Table 3** shows ICC results for inter- and intra-
 311 observer test agreement. Inter-observer test results showed good to excellent agreement
 312 between observers, especially between machine and human. Moreover, for measurements
 313 with relatively lower ICC between machine and human, the human-human counterpart
 314 results were similar. Intra-observer test ICC for machine was higher than human, indicating
 315 that the machine was more consistent and stable.

316
 317

318 **Figure 3.** ASOCT Measurement Quantification and Definitions. Anterior Chamber Depth
 319 (ACD): axial distance between corneal endothelium to anterior lens surface[26]. Lens Vault
 320 (LV) : perpendicular distance from the middle of the line connecting the scleral spurs to the
 321 anterior pole of the lens[27]. Anterior Chamber Width (ACW): distance between the two
 322 scleral spurs[28]. Anterior Chamber Area (ACA): the area bordered by posterior surface of the
 323 cornea, anterior surface of iris and anterior surface of the lens[29]. Angle Opening Distance
 324 (AOD): distance between the anterior iris surface and posterior corneal surface on a line
 325 perpendicular to the trabecular meshwork, at a specific distance from the scleral spur
 326 (500µm, 750µm etc.) [30]. Trabecular Iris Space Area (TISA): area of a trapezoid created by
 327 the following boundaries: AOD of a distance from scleral spur (500µm, 750µm etc.), line from
 328 scleral spur perpendicular to plane of inner scleral wall to the iris, inner corneoscleral wall,
 329 iris surface[30]. Iris thickness (IT): IT at a distance from the scleral spur or a relative distance
 330 in the iris (e.g.: middle of iris) [31]. Iris Curvature (ICurve): distance from iris greatest convexity
 331 point to the line between most central and most peripheral iris pigment epithelium[31].
 332

333 **Table 3. ICC results for Inter and Intra Observer Tests for ASOCT measurement**
 334 **quantification for ACW, TISA and AOD**

Inter Observer Test (Two-way, single score, absolute agreement ICC)				
	A vs M	B vs M	C vs M	A vs B vs C
ACW	0.941	0.931	0.949	0.937
TISA500	0.784	0.722	0.710	0.759
TISA750	0.822	0.728	0.761	0.793
AOD500	0.910	0.902	0.927	0.926
AOD750	0.880	0.863	0.898	0.903
Intra Observer Test (Two-way, single score, absolute agreement ICC)				
	M	A	B	C

ACW	0.979	0.951	0.953	0.954
TISA500	0.847	0.845	0.728	0.646
TISA750	0.884	0.887	0.738	0.702
AOD500	0.959	0.958	0.923	0.881
AOD750	0.948	0.956	0.874	0.901

335

336 Results visualization and quality check

337 This was assessed visually by exporting the software prediction into an image format. The
 338 machine was able to visualize the per-scan results (**Figure 4A**). Moreover, fully automated
 339 measurement enables 360° analysis, for example of AOD and TISA (**Figures 4B and 4C**). The
 340 gonioscopic image showed that the inferior quadrant's angle is narrower than other quadrants of
 341 that specific patient's eye (**Figures 4B and 4C**). Indicating that a global assessment would
 342 provide a more accurate diagnosis.

343 For image quality check, the ASOCT scans need to pass both the SSL confidence and
 344 ASOCT segmentation quality assessment. The SSL confidence can be visualized in 360° as
 345 shown in **Figure 5A**. Visually comparison of good (**Figure 4A**) and failed (**Figure 5B and 5C**)
 346 cases determined that, if the image quality is good, the SSL confidence should be above 0.85.
 347 Detailed analysis to justify confidence threshold to be 0.85 can be found in Appendix A.
 348 Moreover, this threshold can be manually adjusted. A failed SSL detection can be seen in
 349 **Figure 5B** on the left scleral spur, where SSL confidence is accordingly very low. For ASOCT
 350 segmentation, the exclusion criteria are for iris, anterior chamber, corneo-sclera, a number
 351 of contours larger than 5, 6 and 10, respectively. Ideally, the number of contours for the said
 352 areas of interest should be 2, 1 and 1 respectively. However, for narrow angle cases and many
 353 other noisy cases, there might be insignificant wrong small contours. Hence, we increased the
 354 threshold. All of these are hyper-parameters and can be tuned. A future systematic study of
 355 hyper-parameter tuning is planned. A failed ASOCT segmentation can be seen in **Figure 5C**.
 356 All failed scans were excluded from the final measurement quantification.

357

358

359 **Figure 4.** Example of automated results. (A) Example measurement quantification of a single
 360 scan. (B) Example of 360° analysis for AOD. (C) Example 360° analysis for TISA. The measured
 361 value for each scan in the whole volume is denoted by the radius, while the angle corresponds
 362 to the scan position in the ASOCT volume.

363

364

365

366 **Figure 5.** Example of quality check results. (A) Visualization of SSL confidence 360°. Greens
367 are passed scans. Reds are failed scans. Blue circle is 0.8 SSL confidence threshold. Red dots
368 above the thresholds are scans that failed the ASOCT segmentation check. In this example
369 4/128 scans are disqualified. (B) Excluded scan due to low SSL confidence on the left side. (C)
370 Excluded scan due to bad segmentation quality.

371 **DISCUSSION**

372 The use of ASOCT for the assessment of the ACA in angle closure glaucoma is increasingly
373 popular in the clinical setting. However, the practicality and efficiency of its assessment
374 remains challenging for the ophthalmologists. In the absence of an absolute ground truth for
375 SSL, any prediction, including that of experienced human graders, may be expected to contain
376 errors and show variability in performance. The errors consist of bias, variance and irreducible
377 error (noise) [43 44]. Thus, when a machine learns from human graders, it also learns the
378 human's error. However, with more trainers and data, the errors would be centered around
379 zero [44 45]. In addition, if the algorithm is developed using expert trainers' inputs, these
380 errors would stabilize faster. In clinical practice, errors and variability in SSL on ASOCT scans
381 have huge impact in the diagnosis of angle closure glaucoma because incorrect identification
382 of SSL can result in misdiagnosis and management of patients with PACG. ASOCT imaging has
383 been shown to be more objective and quantifiable compared to gonioscopic techniques [9 13
384 46 47]. The ACA measurements from ASOCT scans are heavily dependent on the SSL and
385 ophthalmologists gauge treatment effectiveness based on ASOCT measurements before and
386 after treatment.

387 One of the strengths of the presented method is that it utilizes 3 different approaches to
388 identify the SSL, allowing the machine to be more robust and, thus, be able to more accurately
389 locate the SSL on a variety of ASOCT scans. For ASOCT segmentation, beside a high Dice
390 coefficient, the network also had high sensitivity and specificity, making it a reliable tool in
391 quantifying ASOCT measurements. A comparable algorithm is the STAR Program available on
392 the Casia 2 swept-source ASOCT (Tomey Corporation, Nagoya, Japan), which is capable of
393 automated identification of SSL and ACA measurements [48]. However, this program is a
394 semi-automated software which uses simple edge detection to detect the scleral spur-uvea
395 edge line and, from that, detect the scleral spur location [48]. Moreover, it also depends on
396 the assumption that SSL lies in a perfect circle. In cases of narrow angle, there will be
397 iridotrabecular contact and the scleral spur-uvea edge line will not be visible. In our approach,
398 the machine is trying to learn from human expertise, hence it can detect the scleral spur
399 without the edge line and it also has the potential to expand its definition of scleral spur
400 implicitly by learning from the expert human grader.

401 The two main limitations in our study were firstly the lack of an absolute ground truth in
402 labelling of the ASOCT images and secondly the size of the dataset. The labelled data was
403 being prepared by human trainers. This is compounded by crowding of the ACA in eyes with

404 angle closure. The compressed ocular tissues, namely the cornea, peripheral iris and
405 trabecular meshwork, make accurate identification of the scleral spur challenging. Hence, one
406 of the limitations of the paper is the lack of trainers. To validate the machine's performance
407 without a true ground truth, we used the inter- and intra-observer test and ICC, with the
408 exception of the ASOCT segmentation where we only had one trainer and observer. Through
409 the validation tests conducted, it was shown that the machine performance was in good
410 agreement with human performance, while the former was more consistent.

411 One of the limitations of the study was the relatively small test set, which included a
412 predominantly Chinese population and only one type of ASOCT scan. As such, the
413 generalizability of the results of our study needs to be interpreted with caution outside these
414 circumstances.

415 As mentioned before, the lack of a generalized population of trainers caused the
416 machine's performance to be biased towards the trainers' errors. As shown in our inter-
417 observer test, since observer A was a trainer for the network, the distance between machine
418 and observer A was lower than the machine with observer B or C. This limitation could be
419 resolved simply by having more trainers. The second limitation was the presence of only one
420 expert. Again, this could be resolved by having more experts.

421 One technical limitation of our approach was that the resolution depends on the Focus
422 region. The landmarks could not lie too close to the border. The distance should be larger
423 than half of the focus region length, since the point of interest lay in the center of the region.
424 This could be resolved partially with padding (introduce non-meaningful features) or
425 decreasing the size of focus region (susceptible to class imbalances [49]). In this study, the
426 majority of our patients were of Chinese ethnicity (77.86%). It was therefore not possible to
427 perform robust structural comparisons across ethnic groups.

428 The impact of our method of accurate and automated identification of the scleral spur
429 in ASOCT scans would be in the diagnosis and monitoring of angle closure glaucoma eyes. The
430 diagnosis of angle closure on ASOCT images is dependent on accurate localization of the
431 scleral spur. Angle closure is defined by contact between the peripheral iris and the trabecular
432 meshwork anterior to the scleral spur [9]. As such, the accurate localization of the scleral spur
433 can potentially make screening of angle closure glaucoma on ASOCT imaging easier and more
434 automated. This is especially useful for modern swept-source ASOCT which provides a 360-
435 degree scan of the eye and as many as 64 cross-section cuts of the ACA per eye. The
436 automated identification of the scleral spur reduces variability of human graders and speeds
437 up image analysis to provide a more comprehensive evaluation of the ACA. In the monitoring
438 of angle closure glaucoma eyes, the ACA characteristics should be tracked over time and this
439 paper demonstrates how these measurements can be quantified in a reproducible manner,
440 as most ACA measurements use the scleral spur as the reference. These ACA measurements
441 are important in determining the mechanisms of angle closure, guiding clinical management

442 and measuring efficacy of treatment modalities [50 51]. In future, the proposed algorithm
443 might make ASOCT scans more clinician-friendly but more studies would be required to
444 determine its diagnostic performance and how it compares to clinical assessments without
445 AI.

446 **Acknowledgements**

447 This work was supported by Singapore Ministry of Education Academic Research Funds Tier
448 1 (R-397-000-294-114 [MJAG]); Singapore Ministry of Education Tier 2 (R-397-000-280-112,
449 R-397-000-308-112 [MJAG]); National Medical Research Council (NMRC/1442/2016,
450 NMRC/CSA-SI/0012/2017 [C-YC]); National Medical Research Council
451 (NMRC/CNIG/1135/2015 [VK]).

452 **Declaration of Interest**

453 Dr. Michaël J. A. Girard and Dr. Alexandre H. Thiéry are co-founders of Abyss Processing Pte
454 Ltd.

455 **References**

- 456 1. Tham Y-C, Li X, Wong TY, Quigley HA, Aung T, Cheng C-Y. Global prevalence of glaucoma and
457 projections of glaucoma burden through 2040: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
458 *Ophthalmology* 2014;**121**(11):2081
- 459 2. Quigley HA, Broman AT. The number of people with glaucoma worldwide in 2010 and 2020. *The*
460 *British journal of ophthalmology* 2006;**90**(3):262-67 doi: 10.1136/bjo.2005.081224[published
461 Online First: Epub Date]].
- 462 3. Cheng J-W, Zong Y, Zeng Y-Y, Wei R-L. The prevalence of primary angle closure glaucoma in adult
463 Asians: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS one* 2014;**9**(7):e103222
- 464 4. Friedman DS. Epidemiology of angle-closure glaucoma. *J Curr Glaucoma Pract* 2007;**1**(1):1-3
- 465 5. Pan Y, Varma R. Natural history of glaucoma. *Indian journal of ophthalmology*
466 2011;**59**(Suppl1):S19
- 467 6. See JL, Aquino MCD, Aduan J, Chew PT. Management of angle closure glaucoma. *Indian journal of*
468 *ophthalmology* 2011;**59**(Suppl1):S82
- 469 7. Casson R, Newland H, Muecke J, et al. Gonioscopy findings and prevalence of occludable angles in
470 a Burmese population: the Meiktila Eye Study. *British journal of ophthalmology*
471 2007;**91**(7):856-59
- 472 8. Seager FE, Wang J, Arora KS, Quigley HA. The effect of scleral spur identification methods on
473 structural measurements by anterior segment optical coherence tomography. *Journal of*
474 *glaucoma* 2014;**23**(1):e29-38 doi: 10.1097/IJG.0b013e31829e55ae[published Online First:
475 Epub Date]].
- 476 9. Nolan WP, See JL, Chew PTK, et al. Detection of Primary Angle Closure Using Anterior Segment
477 Optical Coherence Tomography in Asian Eyes. *Ophthalmology* 2007;**114**(1):33-39 doi:
478 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.opthta.2006.05.073>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 479 10. Sakata LM, Lavanya R, Friedman DS, et al. Comparison of Gonioscopy and Anterior Segment
480 Ocular Coherence Tomography in Detecting Angle Closure in Different Quadrants of the
481 Anterior Chamber Angle. *Ophthalmology* 2008;**115**(5):769-74 doi:
482 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.opthta.2007.06.030>[published Online First: Epub Date]].

- 483 11. Quek DT, Nongpiur ME, Perera SA, Aung T. Angle imaging: advances and challenges. *Indian*
484 *journal of ophthalmology* 2011;**59**(Suppl1):S69
- 485 12. Tan AN, Sauren LDC, de Brabander J, et al. Reproducibility of anterior chamber angle
486 measurements with anterior segment optical coherence tomography. *Investigative*
487 *Ophthalmology & Visual Science* 2011;**52**(5):2095-99 doi: 10.1167/iovs.10-5872[published
488 Online First: Epub Date]].
- 489 13. Maslin JS, Barkana Y, Dorairaj SK. Anterior segment imaging in glaucoma: an updated review.
490 *Indian journal of ophthalmology* 2015;**63**(8):630
- 491 14. Cumba RJ, Radhakrishnan S, Bell NP, et al. Reproducibility of Scleral Spur Identification and Angle
492 Measurements Using Fourier Domain Anterior Segment Optical Coherence Tomography.
493 *Journal of Ophthalmology* 2012;**2012**:1-14 doi: 10.1155/2012/487309[published Online
494 First: Epub Date]].
- 495 15. Devalla SK, Chin KS, Mari J-M, et al. A deep learning approach to digitally stain optical coherence
496 tomography images of the optic nerve head. *Investigative ophthalmology & visual science*
497 2018;**59**(1):63-74
- 498 16. Devalla SK, Renukanand PK, Sreedhar BK, et al. DRUNET: a dilated-residual U-Net deep learning
499 network to segment optic nerve head tissues in optical coherence tomography images.
500 *Biomedical optics express* 2018;**9**(7):3244-65
- 501 17. U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. *International Conference on*
502 *Medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention*; 2015. Springer.
- 503 18. Havaei M, Davy A, Warde-Farley D, et al. Brain tumor segmentation with deep neural networks.
504 *Medical image analysis* 2017;**35**:18-31
- 505 19. Li X, Chen H, Qi X, Dou Q, Fu C-W, Heng PA. H-DenseUNet: Hybrid densely connected UNet for
506 liver and liver tumor segmentation from CT volumes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.07330* 2017
- 507 20. Sermanet P, Eigen D, Zhang X, Mathieu M, Fergus R, LeCun Y. Overfeat: Integrated recognition,
508 localization and detection using convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6229*
509 2013
- 510 21. Deep neural networks for object detection. *Advances in neural information processing systems*;
511 2013.
- 512 22. Pohlen T, Hermans A, Mathias M, Leibe B. Fullresolution residual networks for semantic
513 segmentation in street scenes. *arXiv preprint* 2017
- 514 23. Zhang J, Liu M, Shen D. Detecting anatomical landmarks from limited medical imaging data using
515 two-stage task-oriented deep neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*
516 2017;**26**(10):4753-64
- 517 24. Sakata LM, Lavanya R, Friedman DS, et al. Assessment of the scleral spur in anterior segment
518 optical coherence tomography images. *Archives of Ophthalmology* 2008;**126**(2):181-85
- 519 25. Schindelin J, Arganda-Carreras I, Frise E, et al. Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image
520 analysis. *Nature methods* 2012;**9**(7):676
- 521 26. Eslami Y, Latifi G, Moghimi S, et al. Effect of adjunctive viscosurgery on drainage angle status
522 in cataract surgery: a randomized clinical trial. *Clinical & experimental ophthalmology*
523 2013;**41**(4):368-78
- 524 27. Nongpiur ME, He M, Amerasinghe N, et al. Lens vault, thickness, and position in Chinese subjects
525 with angle closure. *Ophthalmology* 2011;**118**(3):474-79
- 526 28. Nongpiur ME, Sakata LM, Friedman DS, et al. Novel association of smaller anterior chamber
527 width with angle closure in Singaporeans. *Ophthalmology* 2010;**117**(10):1967-73
- 528 29. Wu R-Y, Nongpiur ME, He M-G, et al. Association of narrow angles with anterior chamber area
529 and volume measured with anterior-segment optical coherence tomography. *Archives of*
530 *ophthalmology* 2011;**129**(5):569-74
- 531 30. Wang D, Qi M, He M, Wu L, Lin S. Ethnic difference of the anterior chamber area and volume and
532 its association with angle width. *Investigative ophthalmology & visual science*
533 2012;**53**(6):3139-44

- 534 31. Sng CC, Allen JC, Nongpiur ME, et al. Associations of iris structural measurements in a Chinese
535 population: the Singapore Chinese Eye Study. *Investigative ophthalmology & visual science*
536 2013;**54**(4):2829-35
- 537 32. Han Y, Ye JC. Framing U-Net via deep convolutional framelets: Application to sparse-view CT.
538 *IEEE transactions on medical imaging* 2018;**37**(6):1418-29
- 539 33. 3D U-Net: learning dense volumetric segmentation from sparse annotation. *International*
540 *Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*; 2016.
541 Springer.
- 542 34. Drozdal M, Vorontsov E, Chartrand G, Kadoury S, Pal C. The importance of skip connections in
543 biomedical image segmentation. *Deep Learning and Data Labeling for Medical Applications*:
544 Springer, 2016:179-87.
- 545 35. Deep residual learning for image recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer*
546 *vision and pattern recognition*; 2016.
- 547 36. Hansen LK, Salamon P. Neural network ensembles. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis &*
548 *Machine Intelligence* 1990(10):993-1001
- 549 37. Marmanis D, Wegner JD, Galliani S, Schindler K, Datcu M, Stilla U. Semantic segmentation of
550 aerial images with an ensemble of CNNs. *ISPRS Annals of the Photogrammetry, Remote*
551 *Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences* 2016;**3**:473
- 552 38. Kingma DP, Ba J. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*
553 2014
- 554 39. Generalized cross entropy loss for training deep neural networks with noisy labels. *Advances in*
555 *Neural Information Processing Systems*; 2018.
- 556 40. Xu B, Wang N, Chen T, Li M. Empirical evaluation of rectified activations in convolutional
557 network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.00853* 2015
- 558 41. Srivastava N, Hinton G, Krizhevsky A, Sutskever I, Salakhutdinov R. Dropout: a simple way to
559 prevent neural networks from overfitting. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*
560 2014;**15**(1):1929-58
- 561 42. Koo TK, Li MY. A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass correlation coefficients for
562 reliability research. *Journal of chiropractic medicine* 2016;**15**(2):155-63
- 563 43. Geman S, Bienenstock E, Doursat R. Neural Networks and the Bias/Variance Dilemma. *Neural*
564 *Computation* 1992;**4**(1):1-58 doi: 10.1162/neco.1992.4.1.1[published Online First: Epub
565 Date].
- 566 44. Shalev-Shwartz S, Ben-David S. *Understanding machine learning: From theory to algorithms*:
567 Cambridge university press, 2014.
- 568 45. Barber D. *Bayesian Reasoning and Machine Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
569 2012.
- 570 46. Chansangpetch S, Rojanapongpun P, Lin SC. Anterior segment imaging for angle closure.
571 *American journal of ophthalmology* 2018;**188**:xvi-xxix
- 572 47. Porporato N, Baskaran M, Aung T. Role of anterior segment optical coherence tomography in
573 angle-closure disease: a review. *Clinical & experimental ophthalmology* 2018;**46**(2):147-57
- 574 48. Okamoto K, Higashita R. 2017.
- 575 49. Ling CX, Sheng VS. Class imbalance problem. *Encyclopedia of machine learning*: Springer,
576 2011:171-71.
- 577 50. Moghimi S, Chen R, Hamzeh N, Khatibi N, Lin SC. Qualitative evaluation of anterior segment in
578 angle closure disease using anterior segment optical coherence tomography. *Journal of*
579 *current ophthalmology* 2016;**28**(4):170-75
- 580 51. Koh V, Keshtkaran MR, Hernstadt D, Aquino MCD, Chew PT, Sng C. Predicting the outcome of
581 laser peripheral iridotomy for primary angle closure suspect eyes using anterior segment
582 optical coherence tomography. *Acta ophthalmologica* 2019;**97**(1):e57-e63

583