

Autonomous Screening for Laser Photocoagulation in Fundus Images Using Deep Learning

Idan Bressler [1], Rachele Aviv [1], Danny Margalit [1], Yovel Rom [1], Sean Ianchulev [1, 2], Zack Dvey-Aharon [1]

[1] AEYE Health, Inc.

[2] New York Eye and Ear, Mount Sinai Hospital, NY

Abstract

Background: Diabetic retinopathy is a leading cause of blindness in adults worldwide. AI with autonomous deep learning algorithms has been increasingly used in the analysis of retinal images particularly for the screening of referable DR. An established treatment for proliferative DR is pan-retinal or focal laser photocoagulation. Training AI autonomous models to discern laser patterns can be important in disease management and follow-up.

Methods: A deep learning model was trained for laser treatment detection using the EyePACs dataset. Data was randomly assigned, by participant, into development (n= 18,945) and validation (n= 2,105) sets. Analysis was conducted at the single image, eye, and patient levels. The model was then used to filter input images for three independent AI models for various retinal indications, and changes in model efficacy were measured using AUC and MAE.

Findings: On the task of laser photocoagulation detection: AUC of 0.981 (CI 95% 0.971-0.87) was achieved at the patient level. AUC of 0.950 (CI 95% 0.943-0.956) was achieved at the image level. AUC of 0.979 (CI 95% 0.972-0.984) was achieved at the eye level.

When analyzing independent AI models, efficacy was shown to improve across the board on images of untreated eyes. DME detection on images with artifacts was AUC 0.932 (CI 95% 0.905-0.951) vs. AUC 0.955 (CI 95% 0.948-0.961) on those without. Participant sex detection on images with artifacts was AUC 0.872 (CI 95% 0.830-0.903) compared to AUC 0.922 (CI 95% 0.916-0.927) on those without. Participant age detection on images with artifacts was MAE 5.33 vs. MAE 3.81 on those without.

Interpretation: The proposed model for laser treatment detection achieved high performance on all analysis metrics and has been demonstrated to positively affect the efficacy of different AI models, suggesting that laser detection can generally improve AI powered applications for fundus images.

Funding: Provided by AEYE Health Inc.

Introduction

Laser photocoagulation is a common and established procedure, in which laser pulses are used to coagulate retinal tissue, used to treat multiple retinal diseases [1]–[3]. Ablative photocoagulation is mostly used to prevent leakage and ischemic neovascularization in vascular retinal conditions such as diabetic retinopathy (DR) [4], [5], diabetic macular edema (DME) [6]–[8], retinal vein occlusion (RVO) [9], [10] and neovascular age-related macular degeneration (AMD) [11], [12].

Laser photocoagulation is generally divided into pan-retinal and focal; the former is delivered in the peripheral retina with deep ablative burns to stem the neovascular process [13], [14], while the latter is a lighter photocoagulative treatment delivered in the central macula to treat macular conditions [15], [16]. There are well established laser treatment protocols depending on disease severity and individual patient disease state [12], [17]–[19]. While laser photocoagulation is an effective treatment, it causes retinal scarring and is destructive to the retinal tissue leaving long term defects in the anatomy. [20]–[22].

Artificial Intelligence (AI) using fundus imaging has been increasingly employed in various ophthalmological applications [23], [24]. These applications include extraction of basic patient data, such as age and sex [25], detection of retinal pathologies, [26]–[28] and pathology development prediction [29]–[31]. AI methods rely on image pattern recognition, especially in areas in which the pathology is present. As such, laser photocoagulation may disrupt general pattern recognition by adding new patterns or artifacts, such as burns and scars, which the model is less trained to deal with. This is specifically problematic given that laser treatment is often done on areas of interest, such as leaky blood vessels, which are often the very areas that are most crucial to recognize.

The effect laser photocoagulation has on AI systems suggests that a tool to identify images of eyes which have undergone photocoagulation may be beneficial for the autonomous retinal-based diagnosis and follow-up treatment of patients. While previous methods of laser photocoagulation detection exist [32]–[36], this work, to the best of our knowledge, presents the first laser treated image detection method based on a large, diverse, and widely accepted database - in this case, EyePACS (<https://www.eyepacs.org>); the database contains images from a variety of manufacturers and patient populations, of varying image qualities.

Methods

Data

The data consisted of a subsample of the EyePACS dataset, which contains 45° angle fundus photography images and expert readings of said images. All images and data were de-identified according to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act “Safe Harbor” before they were transferred to the researchers. Institutional Review Board exemption was obtained.

The dataset contained up to 6 images per patient visit: one macula centered image, one disc centered image, and one centered image, per eye. Each eye underwent expert reading, including but not limited to panretinal laser treatment presence, focal laser treatment presence, and image quality. All images of the subsample deemed readable by expert annotations were used.

The resulting dataset consisted of 21,050 images from 9,212 patients, of which 9,484 images (45%) had artifacts of panretinal laser treatment, 1,888 (9%) had artifacts of focal laser treatment, and 847 (4%) had both. This work combined focal and panretinal laser treatments into one category of laser treatment, resulting in an overall 10,525 (50%) images with laser treatment artifacts (**table 1**). Of these, roughly 77% of patients required dilation, where 54% of all patients received 1 gtt. tropicamide 1%, 17% received 1 gtt. tropicamide 0.5%, and 5% received other dilation agents.

The average age of patients with laser treatment artifacts was 59.5 (10.0 SD) and 55% were female, compared to the patients who had not undergone laser treatment, for which the average age was 55.6 (11.3 SD) and 61% of which were female (**table 2**). The distribution of laser treatment images across DR levels is given in **table 3**; all laser treatment images were from patients with more than mild DR, and the majority were from patients with grade 4 DR.

Quality assessment

A tool for image quality assessment was developed based on detecting visibility of fundus-specific characteristics. The given quality score for an image is an aggregation of the visibility from multiple areas within the fundus image. **Figure 2** demonstrates a few examples of images and their respective scores, showing the correlation between score and visual image quality. This was done in order to remove low-quality images from the dataset, as the quality scores assigned by EyePACs are assigned to patients and not to individual images.

Pre-Processing

Image pre-processing was performed in two steps for both datasets. Firstly, image backgrounds were cut along the convex hull, which contains the circular border between the image and the background. **Figure 1** shows an example of this process. Secondly, images were resized to 512X512 pixels. Lastly, using the aforementioned quality assessment tool, bad quality images were filtered out before training. The image quality threshold was set at the point at which model performances were not improved by filtering additional images, resulting in 1,373 images filtered, approximately 6.5% of the data.

Model training

The data was then divided into training, validation, and test datasets at a ratio of 80%, 10%, and 10% respectively. A binary classification neural network was trained. The model architecture was automatically fitted to best balance the model performance vs. model complexity tradeoff. Hyperparameter tuning was done on the validation set.

Statistical analysis

The metrics used for model assessment were accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, and area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC). For each metric the bias corrected and accelerated bootstrap method [37] was used to produce a 95% confidence interval.

Analysis levels

Laser detection was done on three different levels. The first, detection on the individual image level, was the basic task for which the model was trained. The second, detection on the eye level, used all images from a given eye and the image for which the model had the highest degree of confidence was selected for analysis. For the third, detection on the patient level, the results from both eyes were compared and the eye with the higher model confidence was selected to produce a patient-level result.

Effect on imaging tasks

The effect that laser treatment has on imaging tasks was measured by applying the laser detection model as a preprocessing step for a model for the detection of DME, which was developed based on the EyePACs dataset [38], and a model for age detection, also developed based on the EyePACs dataset.

The performance on these tasks was measured in AUC on a separate validation set containing images both with and without laser treatment artifacts. The 95% confidence interval was calculated using the accelerated bootstrap method for each population and compared for significance.

A regression model was additionally trained for age detection, and the mean absolute error (MAE) between the patient's age and predicted age was calculated on a separate validation set. The validation set was separated into patients with and without laser treatment artifacts, such that the mean age between these populations was the same. Significance in mean absolute error between the two populations was calculated using a student's T-test. Detailed patient statistics of these experiments are given in **supplementary table 1**.

Results

The results for the different analysis methods of laser artifact detection were as follows (**table 4**): on the image level, sensitivity of 0.883 (CI 95% 0.868, 0.897) and specificity of 0.880 (CI 95% 0.864, 0.894) were achieved. On the eye level, sensitivity of 0.925 (CI 95% 0.900, 0.945) and specificity of 0.931 (CI 95% 0.916, 0.944) were achieved. On the patient level, sensitivity of 0.929 (CI 95% 0.881, 0.947) and specificity of 0.926 (CI 95% 0.911, 0.944) were achieved.

The results of laser artifact detection for each DR level are displayed in **table 5**: the model achieved 0.910 AUC (CI 95% 0.866, 0.941) for DR level 2, 0.887 AUC (CI 95% 0.758, 0.954) for DR level 3, 0.929 AUC (CI 95% 0.918, 0.938) for DR level 4 and 0.772 AUC (CI 95% 0.904, 0.968) for ungradable DR level. DR levels 0 and 1 did not have any laser treated examples, thus most metrics are not defined for these groups.

Table 6 shows the difference in results in laser artifact detection between patients with and without DME. The model achieved 0.955 AUC (0.948, 0.962) for non DME patients vs. 0.908 AUC (0.884, 0.927) for DME patients, demonstrating that these conditions do affect results, but the model achieves high performance irrespective of them.

Table 7 displays the results of laser artifact detection for images which passed (high quality) and didn't pass (low quality) the quality filter, showing a significant difference between the populations. The results for low quality images, which were filtered out, were 0.787 sensitivity (CI 95% 0.710, 0.849), 0.793 specificity (CI 95% 0.709, 0.860), and 0.857 AUC (CI 95% 0.803, 0.898); compared to 0.854 sensitivity (CI 95% 0.838, 0.869), 0.904 specificity (CI 95% 0.890, 0.917), and 0.948 AUC (CI 95% 0.941, 0.955) for high quality images which passed the filter.

The effect of laser detection and subsequent filtration on the aforementioned three tasks of DME detection, age prediction, and sex detection, were as follows: DME detection results for images with no laser artifacts were 0.955 AUC (CI 95% 0.948, 0.961), compared to images with laser artifacts, on which the model achieved 0.932 AUC (CI 95% 0.905, 0.951). Age prediction results for images with no laser artifacts, after age adjustment, were 3.81 mean absolute error (MAE), compared to images with laser artifacts, on which the model achieved 5.33 MAE. T-test analysis shows a significance of $p < 1e-4$. Sex detection results for images with no laser artifacts were 0.922 AUC (CI 95% 0.916, 927), compared to images with laser artifacts for which the model achieved 0.872 AUC (CI 95% 0.830, 0.903).

The aggregation of these results is shown in **table 8**.

Discussion

This work proposed a method for the automatic detection of laser treatment artifacts in fundus images, which may also serve as a component in the future development of AI systems for different diagnoses based on retinal imaging. Such tasks may need to consider images of laser-treated eyes differently from non-treated eyes according to their design needs; some may choose to discard these images, while others may analyze them in a manner differently to images of untreated eyes. Accordingly, and in accordance with the degree to which laser treatment affects the task in question, the proposed system may be used at different operating points with different sensitivity-specificity balances. Discarding laser-treated images is a viable option for most automated retinal screening applications, as these patients should already have an awareness of the need for regular screening.

Previous studies on the autonomous detection of laser burns from fundus images have been on a smaller scale (roughly 2 orders of magnitude) [32]–[36]. The importance of scale is in the better representation of real-life conditions; specifically, this study allows better representation of various image qualities, camera manufacturers, and populations. Additionally, a wider range of clinical conditions, such as DR and DME, are represented in this study both with and without laser treatment, and the proposed system shows high performance across these conditions.

The effect laser treatment has on imaging tasks, and the model's ability to detect relevant images, were validated by checking the model's effect on different AI tasks involving retinal images. A significant difference was found for all three tasks, showing the relevance of the proposed method for future AI tasks.

A limitation of this work is the lack of differentiation between focal and panretinal laser treatments that were grouped as one in this work. Future works may differentiate between the two, given increased data. Furthermore, even though the base characteristics of laser

photocoagulation remain similar across conditions, the addition of AMD-specific databases to the training set may improve results.

In addition, and in the same vein of the presented work, machine learning methods to detect patients with DME who will require future laser treatment may be developed. This would require training a model, similar to the one presented, on a dataset generated from a longitudinal study tracking the progression of patients with diabetes.

Figures and tables

	No laser treatment	Focal laser	Panretinal laser	Both
Count	10525	1888	9484	847

Table 1. Laser treatment prevalence in the EyePACs dataset

	Count	Age (S.D)	Gender (% female)	Ethnicity (fraction)
With laser	10525	59.5 (10.0)	51	White = 0.59 (Hispanic = 0.95 non-Hispanic = 0.05) Indian subcontinent origin = 0.11 African Descent = 0.07 Asian = 0.02 Not specified = 0.13 Other = 0.08
No laser	10525	54.7 (10.8)	52	White = 0.51 (Hispanic = 0.90 non-Hispanic = 0.10) African Descent = 0.13 Indian subcontinent origin = 0.12 Asian = 0.03 Not specified = 0.14 Other = 0.07

Table 2. Patient demographics for patients who did and did not have laser treatment artifacts

DR grade	0	1	2	3	4	ungradable
Total count	558,451	52,928	106,377	16,909	19,470	25,718
With laser	0	0	365	175	9,607	136
No laser	558,451	52,928	105,742	16,734	9,863	25,582

Table 3. Distribution of laser treatment prevalence across different diabetic retinopathy grades

	Accuracy (C.I)	Sensitivity (C.I)	Specificity (C.I)	AUC (C.I)
Image level	0.882 (0.870, 0.892)	0.883 (0.868, 0.897)	0.880 (0.864, 0.894)	0.950 (0.943, 0.956)
Eye level	0.929 (0.916, 0.940)	0.925 (0.900, 0.945)	0.931 (0.916, 0.944)	0.979 (0.972, 0.984)
Patient level	0.927 (0.910, 0.940)	0.929 (0.881, 0.947)	0.926 (0.911, 0.944)	0.981 (0.971, 0.987)

Table 4. Laser treatment detection results on the EyePACs dataset for the three analysis levels performed, given in accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, and AUC with a 95% confidence interval. CI noted in parentheses.

DR grade	2	3	4	Ungradable
Sensitivity (C.I)	0.680 (0.591, 0.756)	0.667 (0.472, 0.806)	0.869 (0.853, 0.884)	0.846 (0.652, 0.957)
Specificity (C.I)	0.958 (0.906, 0.984)	0.960 (0.791, 1)	0.845 (0.821, 0.866)	0.688 (0.400, 0.882)
AUC (C.I)	0.910 (0.866, 0.941)	0.887 (0.758, 0.954)	0.929 (0.918, 0.938)	0.772 (0.904, 0.968)

Table 5. Results on the EyePACs dataset across DR grades, given in accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, and AUC with a 95% confidence interval. CI noted in parentheses.

DME	No	Yes
Sensitivity (C.I)	0.873 (0.856, 0.889)	0.770 (0.727, 0.811)
Specificity (C.I)	0.906 (0.890, 0.919)	0.897 (0.962, 0.925)
AUC (C.I)	0.955 (0.948, 0.962)	0.908 (0.884, 0.927)

Table 6. Results on the EyePACs dataset for patients with and without DME, given in accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, and AUC with a 95% confidence interval. CI noted in parentheses.

	Sensitivity (C.I)	Specificity (C.I)	AUC (C.I)
Filtered out	0.787 (0.710, 0.849)	0.793 (0.709, 0.860)	0.857 (0.803, 0.898)
Remained	0.854 (0.838, 0.869)	0.904 (0.890, 0.917)	0.948 (0.941, 0.955)

Table 7. Results for images who were filtered out and not filtered out by the image quality tool, given in accuracy, sensitivity, specificity and AUC with a 95% confidence interval

	Metric for laser images	Metric for no laser images	% Laser treated
DME	0.932 (CI 95% 0.905, 0.951) AUC	0.955 (CI 95% 0.948, 0.961) AUC	12.5%
Sex	0.872 (CI 95% 0.830, 0.903) AUC	0.922 (CI 95% 0.916, 927) AUC	3%
Age	3.81 MAE	5.33 MAE	5%

Table 8. Results for the three experiments conducted for the effect of laser treatment, showing the results in terms of AUC for sex and DME detection and mean average error for age detection. The percentage of filtered images is shown.

Bibliography

- [1] J. M. Krauss and C. A. Puliafito, "Lasers in ophthalmology," *Lasers Surg. Med.*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 102–159, 1995.
- [2] I. Kozak and J. K. Luttrull, "Modern retinal laser therapy," *Saudi J. Ophthalmol.*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 137–146, 2015.
- [3] J. H. Lock and K. C. Fong, "Retinal laser photocoagulation.," *Med. J. Malaysia*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 88–94, 2010.
- [4] A. S. Neubauer and M. W. Ulbig, "Laser treatment in diabetic retinopathy," *Ophthalmologica*, vol. 221, no. 2, pp. 95–102, 2007.
- [5] J. R. Evans, M. Michelessi, and G. Virgili, "Laser photocoagulation for proliferative diabetic retinopathy," *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.*, no. 11, 2014.
- [6] P. Romero-Aroca, J. Reyes-Torres, M. Baget-Bernaldiz, and C. Blasco-Suñe, "Laser treatment for diabetic macular edema in the 21st century," *Curr. Diabetes Rev.*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 100–112, 2014.
- [7] P. Mitchell, T. Y. Wong, and D. M. E. T. G. W. Group, "Management paradigms for diabetic macular edema," *Am. J. Ophthalmol.*, vol. 157, no. 3, pp. 505–513, 2014.
- [8] E. C. Jorge, E. N. Jorge, M. Botelho, J. G. Farat, G. Virgili, and R. El Dib, "Monotherapy laser photocoagulation for diabetic macular oedema," *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.*, no. 10, 2018.
- [9] T. Y. Wong and I. U. Scott, "Retinal-vein occlusion," *N. Engl. J. Med.*, vol. 363, no. 22, pp. 2135–2144, 2010.
- [10] M. Rehak and P. Wiedemann, "Retinal vein thrombosis: pathogenesis and management," *J. Thromb. Haemost.*, vol. 8, no. 9, pp. 1886–1894, 2010.
- [11] L. S. Lim, P. Mitchell, J. M. Seddon, F. G. Holz, and T. Y. Wong, "Age-related macular degeneration," *The Lancet*, vol. 379, no. 9827, pp. 1728–1738, 2012.
- [12] G. Querques *et al.*, "Laser photocoagulation as treatment of non-exudative age-related macular degeneration: state-of-the-art and future perspectives," *Graefes Arch. Clin. Exp. Ophthalmol.*, vol. 256, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2018.
- [13] N. M. Bressler, R. W. Beck, and F. L. Ferris III, "Panretinal photocoagulation for proliferative diabetic retinopathy," *N. Engl. J. Med.*, vol. 365, no. 16, pp. 1520–1526, 2011.
- [14] P. Royle *et al.*, "Pan-retinal photocoagulation and other forms of laser treatment and drug therapies for non-proliferative diabetic retinopathy: systematic review and economic evaluation.," *Health Technol. Assess. Winch. Engl.*, vol. 19, no. 51, pp. v–xxviii, 2015.
- [15] D. R. C. R. Network, "Three-year follow-up of a randomized trial comparing focal/grid photocoagulation and intravitreal triamcinolone for diabetic macular edema," *Arch. Ophthalmol.*, vol. 127, no. 3, pp. 245–251, 2009.
- [16] E. T. D. R. S. R. Group, "Treatment techniques and clinical guidelines for photocoagulation of diabetic macular edema: Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study Report Number 2," *Ophthalmology*, vol. 94, no. 7, pp. 761–774, 1987.
- [17] E. T. D. R. S. R. Group, "Early photocoagulation for diabetic retinopathy: ETDRS report number 9," *Ophthalmology*, vol. 98, no. 5, pp. 766–785, 1991.

- [18] “Focal photocoagulation treatment of diabetic macular edema. Relationship of treatment effect to fluorescein angiographic and other retinal characteristics at baseline: ETDRS report no. 19. Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study Research Group,” *Arch. Ophthalmol. Chic. Ill* 1960, vol. 113, no. 9, pp. 1144–1155, Sep. 1995.
- [19] Q. Mohamed, R. L. McIntosh, S. M. Saw, and T. Y. Wong, “Interventions for Central Retinal Vein Occlusion: An Evidence-Based Systematic Review,” *Ophthalmology*, vol. 114, no. 3, pp. 507–519, Mar. 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2006.11.011.
- [20] K. Maeshima, N. Utsugi-Sutoh, T. Otani, and S. Kishi, “Progressive enlargement of scattered photocoagulation scars in diabetic retinopathy,” *Retina*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 507–511, 2004.
- [21] H. Schatz, D. Madeira, H. R. McDonald, and R. N. Johnson, “Progressive enlargement of laser scars following grid laser photocoagulation for diffuse diabetic macular edema,” *Arch. Ophthalmol.*, vol. 109, no. 11, pp. 1549–1551, 1991.
- [22] V. C. Greenstein, H. Chen, D. C. Hood, K. Holopigian, W. Seiple, and R. E. Carr, “Retinal function in diabetic macular edema after focal laser photocoagulation,” *Invest. Ophthalmol. Vis. Sci.*, vol. 41, no. 11, pp. 3655–3664, 2000.
- [23] T. Li *et al.*, “Applications of deep learning in fundus images: A review,” *Med. Image Anal.*, vol. 69, p. 101971, 2021.
- [24] Y. Jeong, Y.-J. Hong, and J.-H. Han, “Review of Machine Learning Applications Using Retinal Fundus Images,” *Diagnostics*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 134, 2022.
- [25] R. Poplin *et al.*, “Prediction of cardiovascular risk factors from retinal fundus photographs via deep learning,” *Nat. Biomed. Eng.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 158–164, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.1038/s41551-018-0195-0.
- [26] P. Burlina, D. E. Freund, N. Joshi, Y. Wolfson, and N. M. Bressler, “Detection of age-related macular degeneration via deep learning,” in *2016 IEEE 13th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI)*, 2016, pp. 184–188.
- [27] V. Gulshan *et al.*, “Development and Validation of a Deep Learning Algorithm for Detection of Diabetic Retinopathy in Retinal Fundus Photographs,” *JAMA*, vol. 316, no. 22, pp. 2402–2410, Dec. 2016, doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.17216.
- [28] X. Chen, Y. Xu, D. W. K. Wong, T. Y. Wong, and J. Liu, “Glaucoma detection based on deep convolutional neural network,” in *2015 37th annual international conference of the IEEE engineering in medicine and biology society (EMBC)*, 2015, pp. 715–718.
- [29] J. Yim *et al.*, “Predicting conversion to wet age-related macular degeneration using deep learning,” *Nat. Med.*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 892–899, 2020.
- [30] A. Bora *et al.*, “Predicting the risk of developing diabetic retinopathy using deep learning,” *Lancet Digit. Health*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. e10–e19, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1016/S2589-7500(20)30250-8.
- [31] Y. Rom, R. Aviv, T. Ianchulev, and Z. Dvey-Aharon, “Predicting the future development of diabetic retinopathy using a deep learning algorithm for the analysis of non-invasive retinal imaging,” *BMJ Open Ophthalmol.*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. e001140, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.1136/bmjophth-2022-001140.
- [32] J. M. P. Dias, C. M. Oliveira, and L. A. da Silva Cruz, “Detection of laser marks in retinal images,” in *Proceedings of the 26th IEEE International Symposium on Computer-Based Medical Systems*, 2013, pp. 532–533.

- [33] J. G. A. e Sousa, C. M. Oliveira, and L. A. da Silva Cruz, "Automatic detection of laser marks in retinal digital fundus images," in *2016 24th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, 2016, pp. 1313–1317.
- [34] F. Tahir, M. U. Akram, M. Abbass, and A. A. Khan, "Laser marks detection from fundus images," in *2014 14th International Conference on Hybrid Intelligent Systems*, 2014, pp. 147–151.
- [35] C. Lam, C. Yu, L. Huang, and D. Rubin, "Retinal lesion detection with deep learning using image patches," *Invest. Ophthalmol. Vis. Sci.*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 590–596, 2018.
- [36] X. Pan *et al.*, "Multi-label classification of retinal lesions in diabetic retinopathy for automatic analysis of fundus fluorescein angiography based on deep learning," *Graefes Arch. Clin. Exp. Ophthalmol.*, vol. 258, no. 4, pp. 779–785, 2020.
- [37] B. Efron and R. J. Tibshirani, "An introduction to the bootstrap: CRC press," *Ekman P Friesen WV 1978 Man. Facial Action Coding Syst.*, 1994.
- [38] I. Bressler, R. Aviv, D. Margalit, S. Ianchulev, and Z. Dvey-Aharon, "Autonomous screening for Diabetic Macular Edema using deep learning processing of retinal images."



