Title: Artificial Intelligence based breast thermography using radiomic feature extraction versus conventional manual interpretation of breast thermograms in the prediction of breast cancer: a multi-reader study

Authors Sathiakar Collison

Author affiliations

Corresponding author

Dr Sathiakar Collison, Head, Clinical Affairs, Niramai Health Analytix, Bangalore, india

Email: sathiakar.collison@niramai.com

Phone: 91-9810823838

Article Type: Original Research

Article Word Count

Keywords:

Abbreviations:

ABSTRACT

Objective: In recent years artificial intelligence-enhanced breast thermography is increasingly being evaluated as an ancillary modality in the evaluation of breast disease. The objective of this study was to evaluate the performance of Thermalytix, a CE-marked system that analyzes thermal images using advanced thermal radiomics against unaided manual interpretation of thermographic images by trained thermologists.

Methods: In this retrospective, multi-reader study, thermal imaging data of 258 women who participated in a previously published clinical trial were used. These images were read manually by 3 trained thermologists independent of each other, using the approved scoring system of the American Association of Thermologists. None of the readers were involved in the collection of the images in the study cases. The images were then evaluated by the Thermalytix system, which is a commercially available software that automatically extracts hotspot, areolar and nipple radiomic parameters with a total of 64 individual radiomic features being analyzed using 3 random forest classifiers configured for 200 decision trees to generate a score predictive of the presence of breast cancer in the region of interest. The manual interpretation and Thermalytix interpretation were compared for sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, and negative predictive value and receiver operating characteristic curves were created to estimate prediction accuracy.

Results: Automated Thermalytix had sensitivity and specificity of 95.2% and 66.7% respectively while AUROC of 0.85 (13.7% greater) than manual interpretation. Further, hotspot and vascular scores derived in the automated Thermalytix are the strongest predictors of breast cancer lesions (AUROC: 0.84 and 0.83, respectively).

Conclusions: Overall this suggests that automated AI-based Thermalytix has higher accuracy in the prediction of breast cancer lesions and must be further investigated in the wider women population to validate its use in hospital settings as a screening modality for breast cancer.

INTRODUCTION

Infrared thermal imaging technology has been used in medicine since the early 1960s (1). Since then, it has undergone three generations of advancements (2). Early imaging systems were large with limited display and temperature measurement, used single-element detectors in an optical mechanical scanning process and were cooled with liquid nitrogen. The next generation cameras had built-in two scanning mirrors with small 2-D arrays as detectors, used time delay integration algorithms for image enhancement and electronic cooling systems were introduced, which improved the camera performance. The latest generation of cameras do not have mirrors, instead they use a microelectromechanical system (MEMS) with large 2D focal plane array detectors, Vanadium microbolometers and on-chip image processing to increase the reliability and sensitivity of the system (3). These cameras do not require cooling, hence making it almost a maintenance-free technology. Their thermal sensitivity is about 0.01 to 0.05 °C with spatial resolution less than 2 mm over a range of distances and fields of view range from 200 × 200 mm to 500 × 500 mm at a distance of 1 m (Figure 1A). Lastly, these cameras are compact, portable, light weight, manufactured by silicon wafer technology and are inexpensive in comparison to the previous versions (4).

These advances in sensor technology combined with an increasing awareness of using non-invasive and non-ionizing medical imaging techniques has led to a resurgence in the use of thermography in many different medical specialties. These include but not limited to diabetic neuropathy (5), peripheral vascular assessment (6), thermoregulation study, fever screening (7), dentistry, dermatology (8), muscular pain and shoulder impingement syndrome study [9], diagnosis of rheumatologic diseases (9), detection of metastatic liver disease (9), assessment of

bowel ischemia, vascular perfusion in renal transplantation and assessment of plastic surgical flaps (10).

Globally, breast cancer is a major cause of morbidity and mortality (11). In 2020, there were estimated 1,78,361 (26.3%) new cases and 90,408 (21.9%) deaths in India (12). Mammography screening in combination with appropriate treatment can significantly decrease cancer mortality (13). However, in many low and middle countries, access to mammography is limited, due to issues of cost, socio-cultural barriers, limited health personnel and medical infrastructure in the rural regions of these countries, leading to geographic and socio-economic disparities in access to breast screening (14). Further, there is a variation in age-specific incidence of breast cancer, such that there is higher incidence in the 40 – 50 year age range in Asian countries as compared to 60 -70 year age range in western populations (15). Consecutively, in this age group, mammographic screening has a lower sensitivity due to high proportion of dense breasts found in younger patients (16).

For these reasons, the Breast Health Global Initiative of the World Health Organisation has suggested that low and middle income countries should embark on clinical breast examination (CBE) as the first modality of breast screening (17). However, the coverage rate of CBE cancer screening remains low (18) and its efficacy in detection of early breast cancer, down-staging disease, and reducing mortality remains uncertain (19). As a result, there is a need for development of techniques other than mammography to bridge this gap and reduce the health inequities currently present (20).

The US-FDA had approved thermography as an adjunct to mammography in 1982. As noted above, previous usages had lower resolution due to the use of earlier generations of thermal

cameras and thermal images were represented using false color palettes, which required the interpreter to identify the malignancy visually from these false color images. The evaluation of the breast thermal image was qualitative and not quantitative. Hence, the thermal interpretation results were highly subjective with unacceptably low sensitivity and specificity.

Modern high-resolution thermal cameras can detect minute temperature differences and when combined with computer algorithms for thermal analysis may reduce subjectivity and enable automated quantitative interpretation thereby making the interpretation process more factual [21]. Scores are generated using machine learning algorithms over medically interpretable parameters that describe the metabolic activity inside the breast tissue and indicate the presence of a possible malignancy (22). This mirrors the trend in the field of digital mammography, wherein the use of machine learning algorithms for extracting, detecting, characterizing and classifying radiomics features of mammograms has shown clinical benefit and are extensively used [23]. AI-enhanced breast thermography uses similar principles and is currently being re-evaluated at various centers as an ancillary modality in the screening and diagnosis of breast disease (24,25). In this paper, we have compared the performance of an automated breast thermography interpretation tool called Thermalytix that uses a combination of domain knowledge and data analytics for interpretation of thermal images, with the manual interpretation of the thermal images by an expert thermologist in the detection of breast cancers.

METHODOLOGY

Study Population

We retrospectively examined data and images that had been collected from the Institutional Review Board-approved prospective multicentric clinical trial (CTRI/2017/10/010115)

conducted from September 2017 to July 2018 at the following two clinical sites: Narayana Hrudayalaya (NH) and Health Care Global (HCG), Bangalore, Karnataka, India (26). During this study, all the participants had undergone both thermography and mammography/ ultrasound and suspicious findings were confirmed by histopathology. Thermal imaging was performed before other imaging modalities to avoid the unwanted effect of compression and gel application on thermal images obtained.

Out of 326 women who were initially recruited, 68 women were excluded due to incomplete data. The remaining 258 women were included in the study analysis, of which 204 (79.1%) women were recruited from one site (NH) and 54 (20.9%) women from the other site.

Study Design

In this multi-reader study, thermal images obtained at the two study sites were uploaded to the Thermalytix software system which automatically analyzes and interprets the thermal image generating a report. This is the Thermalytix test group. Subsequently, the thermal images alone (without computer aid) were read by 3 senior board-certified radiologists. One of them was a certified manual thermologist who had experience in breast thermography and the other two (who completed a standard thermography reading training program) were trained in thermography. This is the manual thermography test group. None of the readers were involved in the collection of the images in the study cases. Further, the readers were blinded to all diagnostic reports and Thermalytix imaging reports (Figure 1B).

Thermal Imaging Protocol

The room temperature was stable at approximately 22°C using an air-cooler when necessary. Patients were asked to remove their clothes from their waist upwards and were left to equilibrate with ambient conditions for 10–15 min. The thermographic imaging was carried out by having the patient sit at a 1.0 m distance from the camera. The patients raised their arms above the head and five thermal images were captured at the following positions --frontal (0°), left oblique (45°), left lateral (90°), right oblique (-45°), and right lateral (-90°), in order to obtain images of complete breast skin area (27).

Technical specifications of the thermographic system

Thermographic imaging was performed using the following digital infrared cameras, namely, FLIR T650SC and FLIR A315 (FLIR Systems, Wilsonville, OR, USA) and Meditherm IRIS 2000 camera (Meditherm, Cheyenne, WY, USA). The technical specifications of these cameras are similar and use an uncooled focal plane array detector (micro bolometer) with geometric resolution of 76.800 pixels per picture (320 X 240). The spectral range is from 8 µm to 14 µm and the temperature range lies between – 40°C and 120°C. The thermal sensitivity of FLIR T650C, FLIR A315 and Meditherm IRIS 2000 are 0.02°C, 0.05°C and 0.5°C respectively. The spatial resolution is 0.48 mm at 30 cm (IFOV 1.58 mrad)

Manual Thermographic Assessment

The five thermal images per participant were made available to the readers who classified each participant as suspicious for malignancy or not. They assessed the images visually without computer aid using Ville Marie and Thermobiological grading system as per the guidelines given

by the American Academy of Thermology (27) that is a combination of certain quantitative and qualitative thermographic signs. The thermologists graded the thermal images of each participant on a scale of 0 to 5 with grades 0, 3, 4, and 5 as test-positive for manual interpretation.

Thermalytix image processing and analysis

Thermalytix is a supervised machine learning tool that extracts relevant thermal radiomic features from breast thermograms to generate the overall likelihood of malignancy, and generates annotated markings of suspicious thermal patterns.

In the first step, the software automatically performs image quality checks to ascertain if the uploaded thermal images are focused and in the correct position using pre-trained machine learning models (28). Then preprocessing of thermal images is done using foreground/ background separation using Otsu segmentation [29] and contrast enhancement of breast area by automatically selecting the maximum and minimum temperature limits for the color palette such that more than 70% of body pixels are above green in the Rainbow color palette.

Hotspot radiomics correspond to features that characterize regions of high thermal activity in the breast. These are detected from thermal images using a fusion of multiple histogram-based thresholds discussed in our earlier work [30). Two histogram based temperature thresholds are computed, and the maximum of both thresholds is considered as the hotspot threshold. From these detected hotspots and warm spots, 34 features are extracted to characterize the shape, size, symmetry, and temperature of these thermal activities

Areolar Radiomics. Hotspots that overlap with the areolar region are segregated among all the hotspots as areolar hotspots. From these areolar hotspots, features such as symmetry, coverage, shape, and boundary of hotspots are extracted to characterize the changes near the areolar region. Additionally, we also extract mean nipple temperature difference and maximum nipple temperature difference. Overall, 16 features are extracted.

Vascular Radiomics. Vessel changes occur during the onset of cancer. Manual thermography protocols such as Ville Marie emphasize the importance of vascular criteria in determining the malignant lesion. Unlike hotspot and areolar segmentation where there are distinct boundaries, thermal signatures of breast vessels are diffuse, representing transmitted heat from vessels beneath the skin surface. This results in spurious results when traditional vessel detection techniques are applied directly. To address this issue, a three level gaussian enhancement of vessel structures is performed followed by passage through shape and temperature filters to segment the vessel structures (31). From the detected vessel structures, 17 features such as number of vessels, number of branches, mean caliber, symmetry, relative temperatures etc. are extracted to characterize the vascular structures.

Three random forest classifiers configured for 200 decision trees over independent sets of vascular, thermal and areolar features are used to obtain the three Thermalytix scores, namely, the vascular, thermobiological and areolar scores with the confidence of malignancy (range: 0 to 1). The three individual scores are combined to get an ensemble score (32). If any of these scores is greater than a threshold (such as 0.5), it calls for the user/clinician's attention so that subsequent diagnostic tests can be prescribed.

Definition of disease positive: The radiologists' conclusion from standard-of-care modalities, ultrasound, mammography, and histopathology, was considered as the final ground truth.

Statistical analysis

Data analysis was performed using SPSS (IBM SPSS v26.0.0.0) and the parameters of sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, and negative predictive value were calculated. The receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve was plotted for both tests to compare their performance at different operating points. The area under ROC (AUROC) was calculated to predict accuracy and it is known to be related to the Wilcoxon rank-sum test statistic for the comparison of two groups. The kappa statistic was calculated using the Fleiss Multirater kappa test for assessing the inter-observer agreement between the three thermologists.

RESULTS

Out of the 258 women included in the analysis, 63 (24.4%) women had a breast malignancy, of which 33 malignancies are from clinical site 1 and 30 malignancies are from clinical site 2. The remaining 195 (75.6%) women were considered negative based on radiologist conclusions based on one or combination of mammography, USG and Biopsy reports. Using this information as the ground truth, the results of the Thermalytix were compared with manual thermography interpreted by 3 expert thermologists. There was a substantial strength of agreement between the three thermologists, $\kappa = 0.808$ (95% CI, 0.78 to 0.84), $p<0.001$.

Thermalytix had a sensitivity of 95.2% (90.0%, 100.5%), specificity of 66.7% (60.0%, 73.3%), a PPV of 48.0% (39.2%, 56.8%) and NPV of 97.7% (95.2%, 100.3%). Whereas based on the scoring system, manual interpretation of thermography showed an average of sensitivity 68.8% (57.5%, 80.1%), specificity of 65.1% (58.7%, 71.5%), positive predictive value of 40.9%

(31.6%, 50.2%) and negative predictive value 86.6% (80.9%, 92.2%) (Table 1). The data for the manual interpretation is presented separately for each thermologist in Table 3.

The AUROC derived for the automated Thermalytix using the B-score was 0.85 that was higher by 12% (AUROC = 0.73) than Thermologist 1, 14% (AUROC = 0.69) than Thermologist 2 and 13% (AUROC = 0.72) than Thermologist 3 (Figure 6). The individual classifier AUC performance was also estimated suggesting greater predicting accuracy using the hotspot score (AUROC = 0.83) and vascular score (AUROC = 0.84) than areolar score (AUROC = 0.58) in deriving and predicting breast cancer lesions using Ensemble score (AUROC = 0.91) as shown in Figure 7.

DISCUSSION

In this comparative study of investigating the accuracy of automated Thermalytix in comparison with the manual interpretation of thermography scans by expert thermologists, Thermalytix had a sensitivity of 95.2%, specificity of 66.7%, positive predictive value (PPV) of 48.0% and negative predictive value (NPV) of 97.7% whereas manual interpretation of thermography showed an average of sensitivity 68.8% , specificity of 65.1%, PPV of 40.9% and NPN of 86.6%. The area under ROC for Thermalytix was 13.7% higher than the average AUROC by manual interpretation.

Modern infra-red thermal cameras, in addition to having excellent thermal sensitivity and resolution and not only measure the skin's temperature, but also rearrange these values into an "image", creating a heat map of the breast's region of interest, where each "pixel" express an equivalent temperature value. Computational algorithms are capable of identifying patterns in almost any type of data and augment human visual accuracy in analyzing medical images. There

are six main steps in the process: loading of images, preprocessing, segmentation, feature extraction, selection, and classification. The first three steps are responsible for removing any pixels unrelated to the abnormality. Features extraction and selection are responsible for converting the images to statistical features and reducing their size by selecting the most relevant ones. The algorithm then classifies the datasets and obtains a final result. The combination of modern cameras and advanced algorithms is the basis for the renewed interest in thermography to detect breast cancer (24,25).

Other investigators too, have attempted to combine thermographic images with computational analysis. In 1977, Negin et al (33) implemented a basic software tool whose results demonstrated that the automatic interpreter out performed from 4 to 7% the classification results produced by a human interpreter with respect to both thermographic impression and biopsy, considering the same test images. In 1999, Wiecek et al (34) described a tool developed in MATLAB that implements thermal signature calculations to detect pathological cases using first and second order statistical parameters computed from 2D wavelet transform of the image. The FDA-approved Sentinel Breastscan too uses thermal imaging with computer analysis to detect breast cancer. Wishart et al (35) analysed infrared scans four different ways: Sentinel screening report, Sentinel artificial intelligence (neural network), expert manual review and NoTouch BreastScan a novel artificial intelligence programme. They found that the sensitivity of Sentinel screening (53%) and Sentinel neural network (48%) was low but analysis with computer software (70%) was much closer to expert manual review (78%). Sensitivity (78%) and specificity (75%) using computer software were higher in women under 50. Arora et al (36) studied 92 women suspicious breast lesions identified on prior mammogram or ultrasound and found that Sentinel Breastscan could detect breast pathology with sensitivity up to 97% and a

negative predictive value of 82%. Another FDA-approved device is the NoTouch Breastscan. Nair et al (37) studied 180 breasts by both digital thermal analysis and mammography with abnormalities having pathological confirmation. The sensitivity and specificity of computer analysis was 88.24% and 70.52% respectively with NPV of 87.01% and PPV of 72.82%. While for mammography the sensitivity and specificity were 96.25% and 96.7% with NPV of 96.7% and PPV of 96.25%. Umadevi et al. (38) developed the software called ITBIC for breast thermal image interpretation. Their system captures three thermal images for each female subject screened (i.e., frontal, left and right views) and then extracts highest temperature area of the thermograms and creates a simplified image for its interpretation. The authors reported the following results on 50 female breast thermal images: positive predictive value of 80%, negative predictive value of 95.6%, sensitivity of 66.7%, and specificity of 97.7%.

It is likely that our technology would out-perform these previous attempts. Our system uses the highest resolution thermal cameras to obtain images; from these images, as described in the methods section, a total of 64 individual radiomic features are extracted and the analysis uses three random forest classifiers configured for 200 decision trees. We have had encouraging results in clinical studies too. In a prospective multicenter study of 258 symptomatic women, an earlier version of the Thermalytix had a sensitivity of 82.5% and specificity of 80.5% with respect to the diagnostic mammogram, which had a sensitivity of 92% and specificity of 45.9%. Subsequently, in a multisite observational study of 470 symptomatic and asymptomatic women, Thermalytix obtained a sensitivity of 91.0%, specificity of 82.39% and with negative predictive value of 98%. The overall area under the ROC curve was 0.90 (39). More recently, we conducted a prospective study to evaluate the performance of Thermalytix as compared to mammography in 459 women at a tertiary care hospital. The Thermalytix system demonstrated

an overall sensitivity of 95.24% and specificity of 88.58%, results that compare favorably with performance benchmarks for mammography across the world (40).

Thermalytix with portable infrared camera technology potentially offers several advantages in the scenario of breast cancer screening. It is a non-contact, non-invasive, non-breast compression test that is privacy aware, uses no radiation, and is an affordable, portable and light small screening device. As a portable device, it improves access to care. It is affordable and hence is available for all socio-economic groups. The test can be made available at very remote health centres, thereby bridging geographical distances. It can also be conducted by low-skilled health care workers. We have evaluated the suitability of its use both in primary health centres and in a community setting in more geographically remote and under-developed regions in India.

The results of this study strongly suggest that recent improvements in digital image capture and artificial intelligence software have led to better performance than when using manual interpretation alone for breast cancer detection. However, good results in further clinical studies conducted on larger number and diverse patient population from different geographical regions will ensure adequate validation of the results.

References

REFERENCES

1. Ring EF. The historical development of thermometry and thermal imaging in medicine. J Med Eng Technol. 2006 Jul-Aug;30(4):192-8. doi: 10.1080/03091900600711332. Erratum in: J Med Eng Technol. 2006 Nov-Dec;30(6):412. PMID: 16864230.

2. Villa E, Arteaga-Marrero N, Ruiz-Alzola J. Performance Assessment of Low-Cost Thermal Cameras for Medical Applications. Sensors (Basel). 2020 Feb 28;20(5):1321. doi: 10.3390/s20051321. PMID: 32121299; PMCID: PMC7085792.

3. Yu L, Guo Y, Zhu H, Luo M, Han P, Ji X. Low-Cost Microbolometer Type Infrared Detectors. Micromachines (Basel). 2020 Aug 24;11(9):800. doi: 10.3390/mi11090800. PMID: 32847091; PMCID: PMC7570331.

4. Kirimtat A, Krejcar O, Selamat A, Herrera-Viedma E. FLIR vs SEEK thermal cameras in biomedicine: comparative diagnosis through infrared thermography. BMC Bioinformatics. 2020 Mar 11;21(Suppl 2):88. doi: 10.1186/s12859-020-3355-7. PMID: 32164529; PMCID: PMC7069161.

5. Balbinot LF, Canani LH, Robinson CC, Achaval M, Zaro MA. Plantar thermography is useful in the early diagnosis of diabetic neuropathy. Clinics (Sao Paulo). 2012 Dec;67(12):1419-25. doi: 10.6061/clinics/2012(12)12. PMID: 23295596; PMCID: PMC3521805.

6. Ilo A, Romsi P, Mäkelä J. Infrared Thermography and Vascular Disorders in Diabetic Feet. J Diabetes Sci Technol. 2020 Jan;14(1):28-36. doi: 10.1177/1932296819871270. Epub 2019 Aug 27. PMID: 31452395; PMCID: PMC7189167.

7. Aggarwal N, Garg M, Dwarakanathan V, Gautam N, Kumar SS, Jadon RS, Gupta M, Ray A. Diagnostic accuracy of non-contact infrared thermometers and thermal scanners: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Travel Med. 2020 Dec 23;27(8):taaa193. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa193. PMID: 33043363; PMCID: PMC7665626.

8. Magalhaes C, Vardasca R, Mendes J. Recent use of medical infrared thermography in skin neoplasms. Skin Res Technol. 2018 Nov;24(4):587-591. doi: 10.1111/srt.12469. Epub 2018 Mar 25. PMID: 29575378.

9. Lahiri BB, Bagavathiappan S, Jayakumar T, Philip J. Medical applications of infrared thermography: A review. Infrared Phys Technol. 2012 Jul;55(4):221-235. doi: 10.1016/j.infrared.2012.03.007. Epub 2012 Apr 13. PMID: 32288544; PMCID: PMC7110787.

10. John HE, Niumsawatt V, Rozen WM, Whitaker IS. Clinical applications of dynamic infrared thermography in plastic surgery: a systematic review. Gland Surg. 2016 Apr;5(2):122-32. doi: 10.3978/j.issn.2227-684X.2015.11.07. PMID: 27047781; PMCID: PMC4791361.

11. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians. 2021 May;71(3):209–49.

12. Malvia S, Bagadi SA, Dubey US, Saxena S. Epidemiology of breast cancer in Indian women. Asia Pac J Clin Oncol. 2017 Aug;13(4):289-295. doi: 10.1111/ajco.12661. Epub 2017 Feb 9.

13. Massat NJ, Dibden A, Parmar D, Cuzick J, Sasieni PD, Duffy SW. Impact of Screening on Breast Cancer Mortality: The UK Program 20 Years On. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2016 Mar;25(3):455-62. doi: 10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-15-0803. Epub 2015 Dec 8. PMID: 26646362.

14. Negi, J., Nambiar, D. Intersectional social-economic inequalities in breast cancer screening in India: analysis of the National Family Health Survey. BMC Women's Health 21, 324 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-021-01464-5

15. Mariapun S, Li J, Yip CH, Taib NA, Teo SH. Ethnic differences in mammographic densities: an Asian cross-sectional study. PLoS One. 2015 Feb 6;10(2):e0117568. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0117568. PMID: 25659139; PMCID: PMC4320072.

16. Bae JM, Kim EH. Breast Density and Risk of Breast Cancer in Asian Women: A Meta-analysis of Observational Studies. J Prev Med Public Health. 2016 Nov;49(6):367-375. doi: 10.3961/jpmph.16.054. Epub 2016 Oct 21. PMID: 27951629; PMCID: PMC5160133.

17. El Saghir NS, Adebamowo CA, Anderson BO, Carlson RW, Bird PA, Corbex M, Badwe RA, Bushnaq MA, Eniu A, Gralow JR, Harness JK, Masetti R, Perry F, Samiei M, Thomas DB, Wiafe-Addai B, Cazap E. Breast cancer management in low resource countries (LRCs): consensus statement from the Breast Health Global Initiative. Breast. 2011 Apr;20 Suppl 2:S3-11. doi: 10.1016/j.breast.2011.02.006. PMID: 21392996.

18. da Costa Vieira RA, Biller G, Uemura G, Ruiz CA, Curado MP. Breast cancer screening in developing countries. Clinics (Sao Paulo). 2017 Apr;72(4):244-253. doi: 10.6061/clinics/2017(04)09. PMID: 28492725; PMCID: PMC5401614.

19. Ngan TT, Nguyen NTQ, Van Minh H, Donnelly M, O'Neill C. Effectiveness of clinical breast examination as a 'stand-alone' screening modality: an overview of systematic reviews. BMC Cancer. 2020 Nov 9;20(1):1070. doi: 10.1186/s12885-020-07521-w. PMID: 33167942; PMCID: PMC7653771.

20. Harford, J. B. (2011). Breast-cancer early detection in low-income and middle-income countries: do what you can versus one size fits all. The lancet oncology, 12(3), 306-312

21. Hakim A, Awale RN. Thermal Imaging - An Emerging Modality for Breast Cancer Detection: A Comprehensive Review. J Med Syst. 2020 Jul 1;44(8):136. doi: 10.1007/s10916-020-01581-y. PMID: 32613403.

22. Basurto-Hurtado JA, Cruz-Albarran IA, Toledano-Ayala M, Ibarra-Manzano MA, Morales-Hernandez LA, Perez-Ramirez CA. Diagnostic Strategies for Breast Cancer Detection: From Image Generation to Classification Strategies Using Artificial Intelligence Algorithms. Cancers (Basel). 2022 Jul 15;14(14):3442. doi: 10.3390/cancers14143442. PMID: 35884503; PMCID: PMC9322973.

23. Dang LA, Chazard E, Poncelet E, Serb T, Rusu A, Pauwels X, Parsy C, Poclet T, Cauliez H, Engelaere C, Ramette G, Brienne C, Dujardin S, Laurent N. Impact of artificial intelligence in breast cancer screening with mammography. Breast Cancer. 2022 Nov;29(6):967-977. doi: 10.1007/s12282-022-01375-9. Epub 2022 Jun 28. PMID: 35763243; PMCID: PMC9587927.

24. Singh D, Singh AK. Role of image thermography in early breast cancer detection- Past, present and future. Comput Methods Programs Biomed. 2020 Jan;183:105074. doi: 10.1016/j.cmpb.2019.105074. Epub 2019 Sep 7. PMID: 31525547.

25. Rakhunde MB, Gotarkar S, Choudhari SG. Thermography as a Breast Cancer Screening Technique: A Review Article. Cureus. 2022 Nov 8;14(11):e31251. doi: 10.7759/cureus.31251. PMID: 36505165; PMCID: PMC9731505.

26. Kakileti ST, Madhu HJ, Krishnan L, Manjunath G, Sampangi S, Ramprakash HV. Observational Study to Evaluate the Clinical Efficacy of Thermalytix for Detecting Breast Cancer in Symptomatic and Asymptomatic Women. JCO Glob Oncol. 2020 Oct;6:1472-1480. doi: 10.1200/GO.20.00168. PMID: 33001739; PMCID: PMC7605380.

27. Schwartz RG, Brioschi M, Pittman J, et al. J. American Academy of Thermology – AAT, Pan American Journal of Medical Thermology, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.18073/2358-4696/pajmt.v2n1p26-34

28. Kakileti ST, Madhu HJ, Manjunath G, Wee L, Dekker A, Sampangi S. Personalized risk prediction for breast cancer pre-screening using artificial intelligence and thermal radiomics. Artif Intell Med. 2020 May;105:101854. doi: 10.1016/j.artmed.2020.101854. Epub 2020 Apr 7. PMID: 32505418.

29. Madhu H, Kakileti ST, Venkataramani K, Jabbireddy S. Extraction of medically interpretable features for classification of malignancy in breast thermography. Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc. 2016 Aug 2016:1062-1065. doi: 10.1109/EMBC.2016.7590886. PMID: 28268508.

30. Kakileti ST, Manjunath G, Madhu HJ, Ramprakash HV. Advances in breast thermography. In New Perspectives in Breast Imaging, InTech.2017:91. doi:10.5772/intechopen.69198

31. S. T. Kakileti and K. Venkataramani, "Automated blood vessel extraction in two-dimensional breast thermography," 2016 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP), 2016, pp. 380-384, doi: 10.1109/ICIP.2016.7532383.

32. Shrivastava, R., Kakileti, S.T., Manjunath, G. (2022). Thermal Radiomics for Improving the Interpretability of Breast Cancer Detection from Thermal Images. In: , et al. Artificial Intelligence over Infrared Images for Medical Applications and Medical Image Assisted Biomarker Discovery. MIABID AIIIMA 2022 2022. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 13602. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19660-7_1

33. Negin, M., Ziskin, M. C., Piner, C., & Lapayowker, M. S. (1977). A computerized breast thermographic interpreter. IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering, BME-24(4), 347–352. https://doi.org/10.1109/tbme.1977.326141

34. Wiecek, B., Zwolenik, S., Jung, A., & Zuber, J. (1999). Advanced thermal, visual and radiological image processing for Clinical Diagnostics. Proceedings of the First Joint BMES/EMBS Conference. 1999 IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology 21st Annual Conference and the 1999 Annual Fall Meeting of the Biomedical Engineering Society (Cat. No.99CH37015). https://doi.org/10.1109/iembs.1999.804270

35. Wishart, G. C., Campisi, M., Boswell, M., Chapman, D., Shackleton, V., Iddles, S., Hallett, A., & Britton, P. D. (2010). The accuracy of digital infrared imaging for breast cancer

detection in women undergoing breast biopsy. European Journal of Surgical Oncology (EJSO), 36(6), 535–540. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejso.2010.04.003

36. Arora, N., Martins, D., Ruggerio, D., Tousimis, E., Swistel, A. J., Osborne, M. P., & Simmons, R. M. (2008). Effectiveness of a noninvasive digital infrared thermal imaging system in the detection of breast cancer. The American Journal of Surgery, 196(4), 523–526. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjsurg.2008.06.015

37. Nair N, Thakur M, Hawaldar R, NadkarniM, Parmar V, Badwe1 R. A Prospective Study of Computerized Digital Infrared Image Analysis (NoTouch BreastScanTM) in Biopsy Proven Breast Cancers. Cancer Research: December 15, 2009; Volume 69, Issue 24, Supplement 3 doi: 10.1158/0008-5472.SABCS-09-5028

38. Umadevi, V., Raghavan, S. V., & Jaipurkar, S. (2010). Interpreter for breast thermogram characterization. 2010 IEEE EMBS Conference on Biomedical Engineering and Sciences (IECBES). https://doi.org/10.1109/iecbes.2010.5742218

39. Singh, A., Bhat, V., Sudhakar, S., Namachivayam, A. K., Gangadharan, C., Pulchan, C., & Sigamani, A. (2021). Multicentric study to evaluate the effectiveness of Thermalytix as compared with standard screening modalities in subjects who show possible symptoms of suspected breast cancer. BMJ Open, 11(10). https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-052098

40. Bansal, R., Collison, S., Krishnan, L., Aggarwal, B., Vidyasagar, M., Kakileti, S. T., & Manjunath, G. (2023). A prospective evaluation of breast thermography enhanced by a novel machine learning technique for screening breast abnormalities in a general population of women

presenting to a secondary care hospital. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 5.

https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2022.1050803

Age Group	Definition of Thermalytix Positive
Women aged below 65 years	Thermo-biological score >= 0.5, Areolar score >= 0.5, Ensemble score >= 0.6, Vascular score>= 0.5 and presence of lump, Ensemble score >=0.48 and lump
Women aged 65 and above	Thermo-biological score >= 0.35, Areolar score >= 0.35, Ensemble score >= 0.5, Vascular score>=0.5 and presence of lump, Ensemble score >=0.48 and lump

Table 1. Logical rules to obtain the final classification of women positive on Thermalytix

Test Name	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV
Thermalytix B-score	95.2% (90.0%, 100.5%)	66.7% (60.1%, 73.3%)	48.0% (39.2%, 56.8%)	97.7% (95.2%, 100.3%)
Thermalytix Ensemble Score	88.9% (81.1%, 96.6%)	79.5% (73.8%, 85.2%)	58.3% (48.5%, 68.2%)	95.7% (92.5%, 98.8%)
Manual Thermography				
Thermologist 1	60.3% (48.2%, 72.3%)	81.5% (76.0%, 86.1%)	51.4% (41.8%, 60.9%)	86.4% (82.2%, 90.6%)
Thermologist 2	74.6% (63.8%, 85.4%)	50.8% (43.8%, 57.8%)	32.9% (25.2%, 41.0%)	86.1% (79.8%, 92.4%)
Thermologist 3	71.4% (60.8%, 82.8%)	63.8% (56.3%, 69.8%)	38.5% (29.6%, 47.3%)	87.2% (81.7%, 92.7%)

Table 2. Sensitivity, Specificity, Positive predictive value (PPV)and Negative predictive value (NPV) of Thermalytix and Manual Thermography. (*, *) represents lower and upper limits of 90% confidence interval



Figure 4A. ROC curve illustrating the individual classifier AUC performance using hotspot score, vascular score and areolar score and the calculated Ensemble score.



Figure4B. ROC curve demonstrating the separation in performance between Thermalytix and manual interpretation of thermography