Assisted documentation as a new focus for artificial intelligence in endoscopy: the precedent of reliable withdrawal time and image reporting
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Data selection

For training of the AI algorithm, 10,557 individual frames were collected from 1300 distinct colonoscopies in nine centers using four different processors (Olympus CV-170 and Evis Exera III CV-190, Olympus Europa SE & Co. KG, Hamburg, Germany; Pentax EPK-I7000, Pentax Europe GmbH, Hamburg, Germany; and Karl Storz Image1 S, Karl Storz SE & Co. KG, Tuttingen, Germany). For each examination, a maximum of five images were selected per label to avoid data clustering. Table 1s and Fig. 2s summarize the number of annotated images per label, as well as the distribution between the training and in-training validation datasets. For testing of the video segmentation, full-length colonoscopy videos, with and without endoscopic intervention, were prospectively collected (five centers, four processors). The recorded examinations were screened chronologically (n = 100; 10 per group per center). Incomplete or corrupted videos (n = 76), and examinations of an already fully recruited test group (n = 97) were excluded. Examinations without a report (n = 69), with insufficient bowel preparation (Boston Bowel Preparation Scale [BBPS] < 6; n = 43), no cecal intubation (n = 5), inflammatory bowel disease, previously performed bowel surgery or radiation therapy were also excluded (n = 44). Furthermore, we excluded examinations in which a resection instrument was permanently visible during withdrawal (n = 42). The data collection process is summarized in Fig. 3s.

Artificial intelligence model development

The annotated images were split examination-wise into training (80%), in-training validation (10%), and after-training validation (10%) datasets. With these images, a pretrained RegNetX800MF model from the torchvision library was fine-tuned for multilabel prediction [10, 11]. The model training is described in detail in Appendix 1s. Performance measures on the validation dataset are summarized in Table 2s.

Withdrawal time

The ESGE defines the withdrawal time as “time spent on withdrawal of the endoscope from cecum to anal canal and inspection of the entire bowel mucosa [...]” [5]. No statement regarding inspection of cecal mucosa and cleaning of the intestines exists.

We determined the “reported withdrawal time” via the report, if it was stated. Otherwise, timestamps of the last documented cecal and rectal images were used to calculate the reported time. Video-based “measurement of the withdrawal time” was determined by manually annotating the following video segments (shown in Fig. 4s):

1. ts insertion = t first cecum – t enter body
2. t cecum inspection = t last cecum – t first cecum
3. t withdrawal = t exit body – t last cecum
4. t intervention = Σ t intervention start
5. t cecum inspection corrected = t cecum inspection – t intervention in cecum
6. t withdrawal corrected = t withdrawal – t intervention during withdrawal

Note: times were calculated separately for insertion, cecum inspection, and withdrawal.

The “AI-predicted withdrawal time” was determined by post-processing the frame-by-frame predictions for each video resulting in a video segmentation corresponding to the annotations of the manual measurement (Appendix 1s).

Image report generation

Images of each detected cecal region (ileum, ileocecal valve, and appendiceal orifice) and representative images of each detected polyp sequence were selected by the algorithm if available. Representative polyp images were defined as: (i) a white-light image, (ii) a digital chromoendoscopy image, and (iii) an image including the polyp and the resection instrument. Each selected image represented the frame with the highest confidence prediction value without prediction of an uninformative label (“low quality” or “outside”).

Evaluation of generated image reports

Three board-certified gastroenterologists were randomly presented with either the examiner-created or AI-generated image report for 100 examinations. Examiners were blinded to the test group. The number of distinct polyps and each polyp’s resection method were annotated. Following a washout period of 6 weeks, the remaining images were presented to the examiners. Polyps and polypectomies described by less than two of the three examiners were disregarded.

\[ \Delta \text{Report} = \text{Report Intervention} - \text{Report No intervention} \]

\[ \Delta \text{Prediction} = \text{AI-predicted withdrawal time} - \text{measured withdrawal time} \]

Fig. 1 Comparison of the reported and AI-predicted withdrawal time difference from the measured withdrawal time. Withdrawal time difference (\( \Delta \)) was calculated by subtraction of the measured time from either the reported time (blue) or AI-predicted time (red). Each curve represents a density plot of the data and is accompanied by a box plot of the data distribution. The dashed line within the density plot represents the mean; the solid line represents the median. Stars represent individual measurements (\( \Delta \) Report No intervention, one measurement not shown as the value was > 8 minutes; \( \Delta \) Report Intervention, five measurements not shown as the values were > 8 minutes).
Implementation of real-time application

For real-time application, the previously described EndoMind framework [12] was extended with the newly developed algorithm for multilabel classification and consecutive post-processing of the predictions. Real-time prediction is performed at a rate of 10 frames per second.

Ethical considerations

The study was approved by the local ethics committee responsible for each study center (Ethik-Kommission Landesärztekammer Baden-Württemberg [F-2021–047. F-2020–158], Ethik-Kommission Landesärztekammer Hessen [2021–2531], Ethik-Kommission der Landesärztekammer Rheinland-Pfalz [2021–15,955], and Ethik-Kommission University Hospital Würzburg [12/20, 20200114 04]). All procedures were in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration of 1964 and later versions. Signed informed consent was obtained from each patient prior to participation.

Results

Examination characteristics

We analyzed 10 examinations with endoscopic intervention and 10 without from each of the five centers with one endoscopist per center. All participating endoscopists have at least 10 years of experience. Overall, 75% of the examinations were screening or surveillance colonoscopies (Table 3s). In the 50 examinations with endoscopic intervention, a total of 104 polyps were detected and resected (Table 4s). The majority (58%) were sized 5–10 mm and were in the sigmoid (19%) or ascending colon (18%). Histopathology confirmed 70 polyps (67%) to be adenomas or sessile serrated lesions.

Withdrawal time measurement

The algorithm could not determine a withdrawal time for two of the 100 examinations as no cecal landmark was detected. The reported withdrawal time diverged more than 20% from the measurement in 33 of 50 examinations without endoscopic intervention and 44 of 50 examinations with intervention. For the AI predictions, this was the case in six of 50 and 18 of 48 of the examinations. The absolute time difference between the AI-predicted and measured withdrawal times was smaller than the difference between the reported and measured times in 44 of 50 cases in both groups. The median absolute differences between AI prediction and measurement were 0.25 minutes (no intervention) and 0.9 minutes (intervention), respectively, compared with 1.3 minutes and 3.9 minutes for the reported times. Fig. 1 demonstrates withdrawal time difference as a violin plot with individual measurements depicted as stars. The center-wise subanalysis is shown in Fig. 5s.

Table 1 Specificity of artificial intelligence-selected report images.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Images containing label</th>
<th>AI-predicted images</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendiceal orifice</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biopsy forceps</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromoendoscopy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ileocecal valve</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ileum</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyp</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snare</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Annotation by a gastroenterologist revealed an overall specificity of > 91% for the automatically selected images.
Evaluation of the AI-generated photodocumentation

The AI-selected report images contained an identifiable image of the cecum in 98 examinations (98%). Specifically, an image of the ileocecal valve was supplied from 85 examinations (85%), of the appendiceal orifice in 79%, and of the ileum in 49%. Additionally, images of polyps, resection instruments (biopsy forceps or snare), and chromoendoscopy were included in the image reports. ▶ Table 1 details the specificity per label for images included in the generated photodocumentation.

The reports of 50 examinations with endoscopic intervention described a total of 104 polypectomies. Annotators identified 63/80 snare polypectomies (78.8%) and 5/24 biopsy forceps polypectomies (20.8%) in the AI-generated photodocumentation. In contrast, the endoscopists’ image series represented only 34/80 (42.5%) and 5/24 polypectomies (20.8%), respectively. ▶ Fig. 2 illustrates the AI- and examiner-selected image report of one examination.

Real-time application

Lastly, the algorithm was successfully integrated into our previously described real-time polyp detection framework [12]. ▶ Fig. 3 shows the resulting video segmentation and photodocumentation generated after each examination. In all 10 colonoscopies, the system correctly identified a cecal landmark and the mean absolute difference between the measured and AI-calculated withdrawal times was 37 seconds (range 13–75 seconds).

Discussion

Withdrawal time is an established performance parameter in clinical practice and research, yet its measurement is not standardized, with methods ranging from calculation by timestamps to manual stopwatch measurement. Furthermore, a prospective study revealed a drastic increase in withdrawal time and adenoma detection rate (ADR; 21.4% to 36.0%) when examiners knew that withdrawal time was being monitored [13].

Based on these considerations, we developed a prototype to reliably determine withdrawal time and provide a backup image report to prevent documentation gaps. A novel feature is that our system processes the video signal to identify cecal intubation, polypectomies, and withdrawal time. In contrast, a previously published study relied on examiner-documented images for analysis [14]. Despite promising results in a research setting, a mean of 44.7 documented images per report were evaluated, which raises the question of whether clinical application would actually be feasible, given that the examiners in
our study documented a mean of 8.6 images per examination (our AI system 5.5) during clinical routine. Other related works have monitored withdrawal speed [15] or quantified mucosal inspection [16,17] to enhance endoscopists’ intraprocedural performance.

While AI has recently progressed rapidly, the most researched applications in endoscopy aim to influence diagnostics or therapy; however, even in radiology, where experience with such systems is much greater than in gastroenterology, only a few reach clinical practice [18]. In this study, we demonstrate how AI may benefit clinical practice by measuring withdrawal time and providing “backup” photodocumentation. Instead of suggesting diagnoses or giving therapeutic advice, the system relieves endoscopists of the task of “measuring” withdrawal time and simultaneously lowers the risk of incomplete photodocumentation. We hypothesize that this could not only improve acceptance of structured reporting and application of AI, but also increase the report quality. While the prototype demonstrates functionality for four different processor signals, its generalizability should not be readily assumed, which is a limitation of our study. In particular, the recognition of instruments may vary if new instruments are used. Continuous performance monitoring and center-specific fine-tuning are however a necessity for all applied AI models as modalities can always change. In addition, we are not able to re-identify polyps.

In conclusion, this work proposes a paradigm-shift in medically applied AI: instead of competing with physicians, AI systems should first address the recommended comprehensive documentation of basic findings. In future, the skeleton of a colonoscopy report could be pre-generated, with the examiner then validating the content. Future research should continue to evaluate this approach and extend it to more report modalities, such as polyp classification or quantification of other pathologies.
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