An observational study to assess if automated diabetic retinopathy image assessment software can replace one or more steps of manual imaging grading and to determine their cost-effectiveness

Adnan Tufail,¹* Venediktos V Kapetanakis,² Sebastian Salas-Vega,³ Catherine Egan,¹ Caroline Rudisill,³ Christopher G Owen,² Aaron Lee,¹ Vern Louw,¹ John Anderson,⁴ Gerald Liew,¹ Louis Bolter,⁴ Clare Bailey,⁵ SriniVas Sadda,⁶ Paul Taylor⁷ and Alicja R Rudnicka²

- ¹National Institute for Health Research Moorfields Biomedical Research Centre, Moorfields Eye Hospital, London, UK
- ²Population Health Research Institute, St George's, University of London, London, UK
- ³Department of Social Policy, LSE Health, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK
- ⁴Homerton University Hospital Foundation Trust, London, UK
- ⁵Bristol Eye Hospital, Bristol, UK
- ⁶Doheny Eye Institute, Los Angeles, CA, USA
- ⁷Centre for Health Informatics & Multiprofessional Education (CHIME), Institute of Health Informatics, University College London, London, UK

*Corresponding author

Declared competing interests of authors: SriniVas Sadda received grants and personal fees from Optos and Carl Zeiss Meditec during the duration of the study.

Published December 2016 DOI: 10.3310/hta20920

Plain English summary

Automated diabetic retinopathy image softwares

Health Technology Assessment 2016; Vol. 20: No. 92 DOI: 10.3310/hta20920

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Plain English summary

nnual diabetic retinopathy screening using digital photographs of the retina assessed by human graders is recognised as the best way to detect vision-threatening disease and reduce visual loss in patients with diabetes mellitus. Vision-threatening disease is referred to hospital eye services for review and possible treatment. With more than 3 million people in England diagnosed with diabetes mellitus, there has been increasing interest in automated systems that detect diabetic retinopathy on digital pictures [so-called automated retinal image analysis systems (ARIASs)] as a way of reducing the need for human graders and the cost of screening. This study compared commercially available ARIASs [IDx-DR (IDx, LLC, Iowa City, IA, USA), iGradingM (version 1.1; originally Medalytix Group Ltd, Manchester, UK, but purchased by Digital Healthcare, Cambridge, UK, at the initiation of the study, purchased in turn by EMIS UK, Leeds, UK, after conclusion of the study), Retmarker (version 0.8.2, Retmarker Ltd, Coimbra, Portugal) and EyeArt (Eyenuk Inc., Woodland Hills, CA, USA)] with human manual grading on retinal photographs from 20,258 consecutive patients seen in a NHS diabetic eye screening programme. IDx, LLC withdrew from the study, citing commercial reasons. The ability of the remaining three ARIASs to correctly identify patients with diabetic retinopathy was compared against trained human graders. Health-economic analyses were carried out to investigate whether or not it would save money if ARIASs replaced trained human graders in different parts of the screening pathway.

Two ARIASs, Retmarker and EyeArt, achieved an acceptable level of diabetic retinopathy detection in comparison with trained human graders. Retmarker and EyeArt had a modest rate of false alarms, where these ARIASs would identify that there was disease when no disease was actually present. The good detection rate and acceptable false-alarm rate make both ARIASs potentially cost-effective alternatives to human grading in NHS diabetic eye screening programmes.

[©] Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2016. This work was produced by Tufail *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Health Technology Assessment

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 4.058

Health Technology Assessment is indexed in MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, The Cochrane Library and the ISI Science Citation Index.

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Reports are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

HTA programme

The HTA programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), was set up in 1993. It produces high-quality research information on the effectiveness, costs and broader impact of health technologies for those who use, manage and provide care in the NHS. 'Health technologies' are broadly defined as all interventions used to promote health, prevent and treat disease, and improve rehabilitation and long-term care.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

For more information about the HTA programme please visit the website: http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hta

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as project number 11/21/02. The contractual start date was in December 2012. The draft report began editorial review in November 2015 and was accepted for publication in July 2016. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2016. This work was produced by Tufail *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

Health Technology Assessment Editor-in-Chief

Professor Hywel Williams Director, HTA Programme, UK and Foundation Professor and Co-Director of the Centre of Evidence-Based Dermatology, University of Nottingham, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Professor Tom Walley Director, NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies and Director of the EME Programme, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor Ken Stein Chair of HTA Editorial Board and Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Andree Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (EME, HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals)

Dr Martin Ashton-Key Consultant in Public Health Medicine/Consultant Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Matthias Beck Chair in Public Sector Management and Subject Leader (Management Group), Queen's University Management School, Queen's University Belfast, UK

Professor Aileen Clarke Professor of Public Health and Health Services Research, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Scientific Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Health Sciences Research, Health and Wellbeing Research Group, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie Chair in Medical Statistics, University of Edinburgh, UK

Professor John Powell Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Jim Thornton Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Professor Martin Underwood Director, Warwick Clinical Trials Unit, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Please visit the website for a list of members of the NIHR Journals Library Board: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk