

# Estimating Bacterial and Cellular Load in FCFM Imaging

Sohan Seth


University of Edinburgh, School of Informatics, Edinburgh, EH8 9AB, UK

January 27, 2020



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

# Proteus: lighting up the lung, detecting disease




## Clinical Need

“diagnosing bacterial infections relies on a slow process of detection followed by biopsy and lab-based culture growth – procedures that are prone to contamination and can result in late treatment.”

## Vision

“a fully integrated system that will provide the necessary rapid and accurate diagnosis of bacterial infection”

# FCFM: How does it work?



## Fibred Confocal Fluorescence Microscopy

- Fiber optic imaging cable is inserted to the distal lung through a bronchoscope
- Imaging is performed by counting emitted photons through fibre optic
- Smartprobe (chemical compound) is delivered to make bacteria fluoresce

# FCFM: What do we see?

Before smartprobe

After smartprobe

# FCFM: What do we see?

Before smartprobe

After smartprobe

- Background composes of autofluorescent elastin (connective lung tissue)
- Autofluorescent cells appear as round objects
- Bacteria appear as 'blinking dots'.
- Our objective is to detect and count the bacteria and cell in each frame.

# Machine learning problem

**Task:** At each pixel, predict if there is an object (bacterium or cell)

# Machine learning problem

**Task:** At each pixel, predict if there is an object (bacterium or cell)

## Why is it interesting?

- 1 Noisy images: motion blur etc.
- 2 Limited annotations: time consuming etc.
- 3 Noisy annotations: manual error etc.
- 4 Imbalanced dataset: few objects per frame

# Machine learning problem

**Task:** At each pixel, predict if there is an object (bacterium or cell)

## Why is it interesting?

- 1 Noisy images: motion blur etc.
- 2 Limited annotations: time consuming etc.
- 3 Noisy annotations: manual error etc.
- 4 Imbalanced dataset: few objects per frame

## Overview of approach:

- 1 Create a set of annotated images with the help of a clinician
- 2 Represent each pixel by an appropriate feature vector
- 3 Use the annotated images to train a classifier
- 4 Use cross-validation to find the best feature representation and classifier
- 5 Use the best classifier and feature representation to count objects in test videos



# Machine learning problem

**Task:** At each pixel, predict if there is an object (bacterium or cell)

## Why is it interesting?

- 1 Noisy images: motion blur etc.
- 2 Limited annotations: time consuming etc.
- 3 Noisy annotations: manual error etc.
- 4 Imbalanced dataset: few objects per frame

## Overview of approach:

- 1 Create a set of annotated images with the help of a clinician
- 2 Represent each pixel by an appropriate feature vector
- 3 Use the annotated images to train a classifier
- 4 Use cross-validation to find the best feature representation and classifier
- 5 Use the best classifier and feature representation to count objects in test videos

Two same pipelines for cells and bacteria respectively.

# 1. Annotations

- We designed an interface for clinicians to annotate objects.
- To help the annotator capture the 'blinking effect', the present frame was annotated in the context of the past and future frames.
- We randomly chosen some frames to annotate.




Figure: FCFM image frame with bacteria annotated by a clinician in circles.

## 2. Standardized multi-resolution spatio-temporal feature extraction






Figure: Image patches around annotated (red) and non-annotated (green) pixel



## 2. Standardized multi-resolution spatio-temporal feature extraction






Figure: Image patches around annotated (red) and non-annotated (green) pixel



- Multiple resolutions provide context beside the object.

### 3. Supervised learning

**Task:** Predict output  $y \in \{0, 1\}$  from high dimensional feature vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$

**Classifier:** (nonlinear) template matching with radial basis functions (RBF)

$$p(y = 1) = \sigma \left( \sum_{i=1}^T \alpha_i \kappa(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{t}_i) + b \right)$$

- $\kappa$  is measures similarity, e.g., if  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{t}$  when  $\kappa = 1$ , and if  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{t}$  when  $\kappa = 0$ , and
- $\mathbf{t}_i$ s are feature **templates** learned using  $k$ -means.

### 3. Supervised learning

**Task:** Predict output  $y \in \{0, 1\}$  from high dimensional feature vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$

**Classifier:** (nonlinear) template matching with radial basis functions (RBF)

$$p(y = 1) = \sigma \left( \sum_{i=1}^T \alpha_i \kappa(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{t}_i) + b \right)$$

- $\kappa$  is measures similarity, e.g., if  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{t}$  when  $\kappa = 1$ , and if  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{t}$  when  $\kappa = 0$ , and
- $\mathbf{t}_i$ s are feature **templates** learned using  $k$ -means.

**How to address class imbalance?**

- $k$ -means is done with all feature vector (about 1% with bacteria or cells)
- classifier is learned using balanced samples by subsampling 1% of the features without bacteria or cells.

### 3. Supervised learning

**Task:** Predict output  $y \in \{0, 1\}$  from high dimensional feature vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$

**Classifier:** (nonlinear) template matching with radial basis functions (RBF)

$$p(y = 1) = \sigma \left( \sum_{i=1}^T \alpha_i \kappa(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{t}_i) + b \right)$$

- $\kappa$  is measures similarity, e.g., if  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{t}$  when  $\kappa = 1$ , and if  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{t}$  when  $\kappa = 0$ , and
- $\mathbf{t}_i$ s are feature **templates** learned using  $k$ -means.

**How to address class imbalance?**




- $k$ -means is done with all feature vector (about 1% with bacteria or cells)
- classifier is learned using balanced samples by subsampling 1% of the features without bacteria or cells.

**Consecutive pixels have high probabilities.**

- The probability values at each pixel were thresholded
- Non-maximum suppression was applied to avoid multiple detections.

## 4. Cross validation using area under precision-recall curve

+ are ground truth, • are detections



$$P = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}, \quad R = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}.$$



## 4. Cross validation using area under precision-recall curve

+ are ground truth, • are detections






Figure: Ground truth vs. detections: Bacteria

$$P = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}, \quad R = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}.$$

## 4. Cross validation using area under precision-recall curve

+ are ground truth, • are detections



$$P = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}, \quad R = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}$$





Figure: Precision recall curves for different methods

- Temporal information helps.
- Performs better than unsupervised approach.

## 4. Cross validation using area under precision-recall curve

+ are ground truth, • are detections



$$P = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}, \quad R = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}.$$





Figure: Ground truth vs. detections: Cells

## 4. Cross validation using area under precision-recall curve

+ are ground truth, • are detections



$$P = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}, \quad R = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}$$




Figure: Precision recall curves for different methods

- Temporal information does not help.
- Larger spatial frame needed.

## 5. Bacterial load: FCFM videos

Before smartprobe

After smartprobe

## 5. Bacterial load: Case vs. control: pre- vs. post-substance: 1st cohort

**Summary:** 12 videos with  $\sim 500$  frames each, 3 videos (post-substance cases) with bacteria and 9 videos (pre-substance or control) without bacteria

	control	control	control	case	case	case
pre-substance	-	-	-	-	-	-
post-substance	-	-	-	+	+	+




Figure: Change of bacterial load in 6 patients, pre- and post-substance

- We detect a statistically significant change in cases but not in controls.
- A fraction of frames were used for training.

## 5. Bacterial load: Case vs. control: pre- vs. post-substance: 2nd cohort

**Summary:** 10 videos with  $\sim 500$  frames each, 2 videos (post-substance cases) with bacteria and 8 videos (pre-substance or control) without bacteria

	control	control	control	case	case
pre-substance	-	-	-	-	-
post-substance	-	-	-	+	+




Figure: Change of bacterial load in 6 patients, pre- and post-substance

- We detect a statistically significant change in cases but not in controls.
- A fraction of frames from first cohort were used for training.

## 5. Cellular load: FCFM videos

Some cells

Very cellular





## 5. Cellular load: Comparison with clinical assessment

- 206 FCFM videos from 102 patients who have undergone bronchoscopy
- A fraction of frames were used for training
- A clinician annotated the videos according to their level of cellularity




Figure: Comparison of median cell count against visual assessment of cellularity.

- The estimated cellular load agrees with the visual assessment of the clinician
- A fraction of frames were used for training.

- We address the task of estimating bacterial and cellular load in FCFM images.
- We create a database of annotated image frames.
- We observe significant fold change in the case videos before and after introducing smartprobe, which is not observed in the control group.
- We show that the estimated cellular load agrees with the clinician's assessment

# What is next?

More data is becoming available

- 59 patients imaged in Edinburgh till date
- 19 in ICU: all mechanically ventilated
- Average duration of procedure: 8 minutes, 3-5 passes
- No significant adverse events

# What is next?

More data is becoming available

- 59 patients imaged in Edinburgh till date
- 19 in ICU: all mechanically ventilated
- Average duration of procedure: 8 minutes, 3-5 passes
- No significant adverse events
  
- Distal lung is a “black hole”, we are developing approaches to understanding it
- Our system should be immediate, bedside, cheap, safe, accurate, and add to decision making, so it can become part of routine care.
- It should potentially be automated: i.e., self guided to different regions of the lung with clear sampling and external registration

Thank you!

