Noninvasive multimodal imaging in diagnosing polypoidal choroidal vasculopathy
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Abstract

Purpose: To investigate the diagnostic accuracy of noninvasive multimodal imaging methods in diagnosing polypoidal choroidal vasculopathy (PCV) and distinguishing PCV from typical neovascular age-related macular degeneration (nvAMD).

Methods: Retrospective study. Imaging features of noninvasive multimodal imaging methods, including fundus photography (FP), B-scan optical coherence tomography (OCT), en face OCT, OCT angiography, and autofluorescence, of 103 eyes with PCV or typical nvAMD were reviewed. Diagnostic strategy was established based on imaging features and was validated in other 105 eyes with PCV or typical nvAMD.

Results: Features of subretinal orange nodule on FP, thumb-like PED on OCT, notched PED on OCT, bubble sign on OCT, and Bruch’s membrane depression under serosanguinous PED on OCT were more common. When the diagnostic strategy of using at least 2 of 5 features was performed, there is 0.88 sensitivity and 0.92 specificity for diagnosing PCV. The results of the validation test further confirmed the diagnostic strategy with 0.94 sensitivity and 0.93 specificity.

Conclusions: Noninvasive multimodal imaging, especially FP and B-scan OCT, provide high sensitivity and specificity for diagnosing PCV and distinguishing PCV from typical nvAMD, when at least 2 of 5 suggestive imaging features are present.
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Background

Polypoidal choroidal vasculopathy (PCV) is an important cause of visual loss in elderly, which is characterized with the presence of polypoidal or aneurysmal hyperfluorescent with or with branching vascular network (BVN) on indocyanine green angiography (ICGA) [1]. Although it is regarded as a subtype of neovascular age-related macular degeneration (nvAMD), PCV has differences on the natural history, treatment regimens, and prognosis with typical nvAMD [1–6]. Therefore, to differentiate PCV from typical nvAMD can determine the recommendations for patients regarding management and prognosis in clinical practice. Although ICGA is the gold standard to diagnose PCV [1, 7], it is an invasive imaging method, and it is contraindicated in patients with a history of allergy to iodine-based dye [8]. What’s more, in real world ICGA is not always available to perform, especially in many areas in the developing countries. Therefore, to diagnose PCV using noninvasive imaging methods might help in clinical practice. Multimodal imaging criteria has been regarded as the aim and direction of future PCV diagnostic criteria [1].

Previous studies have reported the high sensitivity and specificity of noninvasive imaging methods in detecting PCV, including optical coherence tomography [9–11]. However, ophthalmologists are pretend to get information from complicated examinations of fundus rather than optical coherence tomography angiography (OCT) alone in clinical practice. Chaikitmongkol et al. reported...
multimodal imaging methods to diagnose PCV, in which
an invasive imaging method of fluorescent angiography
(FA) was used [12, 13]. In clinical practice, ophthalmolo-
gists can obtain clues suggesting the diagnosis of PCV
using noninvasive imaging methods, including the
presence of subretinal orange nodules on fundus photo-
graphy (FP) and the presence of hyper-reflectivity ring on
OCT B-scans and en face OCT. Therefore, a provisional
diagnosis of PCV might be made based on noninvasive
imaging methods without ICGA.

This study aims to investigate sensitivity, specificity,
and predictive accuracy of noninvasive multimodal im-
ing methods, including FP, B-scan OCT, en face OCT,
optical coherence tomography angiography (OCTA),
and autofluorescence (AF), to diagnose PCV without
using ICGA and to differentiate PCV from typical
nvAMD.

Methods
Data collection
This study was approved by the Institutional Review
Boards of Peking Union Medical College Hospital (refer-
ence number S-K631). All patients provided written in-
formed consent when being performed the examinations
of FA and ICGA. Patients who presented to Peking
Union Medical College Hospital between January 1,
2016 and February 28, 2019, with newly diagnosed PCV
and typical nvAMD in unilateral or bilateral eyes. The
diagnosis of PCV or typical nvAMD based on these im-
ing methods was made according to current guidelines
by 2 expert retinal specialists (YC and SX) who were
masked to the results of other examinations [1]. Dis-
agreements were resolved by open adjudication between
the 2 authors. One hundred and three eyes of 82 pa-
tients were enrolled. The diagnosis of PCV was made
based on hyperfluorescent polypoidal or aneurysmal le-
sions with or without branching vascular network on
ICGA. The diagnosis of typical nvAMD was made based
on neovascular lesions on FA without polypoidal or
aneurysmal lesions on ICGA. These patients also under-
grew 5 noninvasive imaging examinations, including FP,
B-scan OCT, en face OCT, OCTA, AF within 3 days
after the examinations of FA and ICGA. OCT included
at least 25 cross-sectional B-scan images. Exclusion
criteria included: 1) a history of other ocular diseases,
including secondary choroidal neovascular diseases, dia-
betic retinopathy, pathological myopia, uveitis, etc.; 2)
poor image quality or loss of imaging details of lesions
because of cloudy refracting media and unstable fixation;
3) any systematic disorders that affect the eyes.

Evaluation of noninvasive imaging features
The diagnostic imaging features of noninvasive multi-
modal imaging, including FP, OCT, en face OCT,
OCTA, and AF, were evaluated by 2 independent retinal
specialist graders (JY and MY) who were masked to the
results of FA and ICGA. In cases with disagreement, a
third retinal specialist (EW) made the final decision.
Noninvasive diagnostic strategy for PCV was established
based on abovementioned noninvasive multimodal im-
ing. The diagnostic noninvasive imaging features were
defined according to the published literature. Diagnostic
features of clinical clues for PCV on FP included subre-
tinal orange nodules, hemorrhagic pigment epithelial de-
tachment (PED), multiple lesions, extensive hemorrhage
with area more than 4 disc areas, and absence of drusen
[7]; on OCT, multiple PED, thumb-like PED, notched
PED, double-layer sign, pachychoroid, and depression of
Bruch’s membrane under serosanguinous PED [14–16];
on en face OCT, dilated choroidal vessel, hyper-reflective
ring adjacent to and beneath retinal pigment epithelium
(RPE), hyper-reflective foci, and RPE ring [17, 18]; on
OCTA, abnormal vessel under RPE on en face OCTA,
and abnormal blood flow resembling polyp on both en
face OCTA and cross-sectional OCTA [19, 20]; on AF,
hyperfluorescent ring, and granular hypofluorescence
(Additional file 1: Figure S1) [21, 22]. No missing data
existed.

Evaluation of diagnostic ability of noninvasive imaging
features
The diagnostic ability of each noninvasive imaging feature
was evaluated, and the noninvasive imaging features with
high diagnostic ability were selected as major diagnostic
criteria. Various combinations of different amounts of
major diagnostic criteria were included in diagnostic test.
The combination of a certain amount of major diagnostic
criteria which has the best diagnostic ability was used as
the noninvasive diagnostic strategy for PCV.

To validate the efficacy of the diagnostic strategy, the
medical records of another 105 eyes from 85 patients with
PCV or typical nvAMD who presented from January 1,
2014 to December 31, 2015 were retrospectively reviewed.
All the enrolled eyes for validation have been performed
FA, ICGA, and the examinations which were used in the
diagnostic strategy. The diagnosis of PCV or typical
nvAMD was also made by 2 expert retinal specialists (YC
and SX) who were masked to the results of other exami-
nations. Two independent retinal specialist graders (JY
and MY) who were masked to the results of FA and ICGA
used the diagnostic strategy on the enrolled eyes to diag-
nose PCV, and a third retinal specialist (EW) also made
the final decision in cases with disagreement. The
diagnostic ability of the diagnostic strategy was validated.

Statistical analysis
To determine the intended sample size, the values of
sensitivity (0.95) and prevalence (0.5) was set according
to the most recent studies of Chinese population and previous diagnostic study on PCV [1, 13, 23, 24]. And the precision of estimate was set as 0.1. Therefore, the sample size should be no less than 36.5 [25]. Both diagnostic test and validation test meet the requirement of sample size.

Parameters of diagnostic ability, including sensitivity, specificity, and predictive accuracy using the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) of each feature on FP, OCT, en face OCT, OCTA, and AF to diagnose PCV were determined. Given that the perfect score of predictive accuracy of AUC is 1, and the evaluated potential diagnostic features with an AUC of 0.8 or more were regarded as major criteria with high accuracy for diagnosis of PCV using noninvasive imaging methods. The features regarded as major criteria were calculated to determine the optimal number of features to diagnose PCV.

Results
This study included 103 eyes of 82 Chinese patients, and the mean (standard deviation) age was 65.13 (7.50) years. Of the 103 eyes, the definitive diagnosis by the expert specialists was PCV in 52 eyes, and typical nvAMD in 51 eyes.

The sensitivity, specificity, and AUC for the potential diagnostic features detected in noninvasive multimodal imaging methods are shown in Table 1, and detailed information was summarized in Additional file 2: Table S2. On FP, the diagnostic feature of a subretinal orange nodule had high accuracy. Several diagnostic features of thumb-like PED, notched PED, bubble sign, and Bruch’s membrane depression under serosanguinous PED on OCT also had high accuracy. No features detected using en face OCT, OCTA, and AF showed an AUC of 0.8 or higher.

The sensitivity and specificity of various combinations of these 5 potential diagnostic features (Fig. 1) with AUC of 0.8 or higher were used for diagnosis of PCV can be seen in Table 2. When at least 2 of 5 major criteria were used for diagnosing PCV, the predictive accuracy (AUC) has the highest value of 0.90, with 0.88 sensitivity, 0.92 specificity, 0.92 positive predictive value, and 0.89 negative predictive value.

A total of 105 eyes, including 50 eyes with PCV and 55 eyes with typical nvAMD, were retrospectively enrolled for validating the diagnostic strategies of using various combinations of major criteria. The diagnostic strategy of using at least 2 of 5 major criteria still has the highest predictive accuracy (AUC) of 0.93 (95% CI 0.88–0.99), with 0.94 sensitivity (95% CI 0.82–0.98) and 0.93 specificity (95% CI 0.82–0.98) (Fig. 2).

Discussion
The present study finds diagnostic strategy for PCV using noninvasive multimodal imaging method rather than invasive ICGA. This study suggested that when at least 2 of 5 highly potential diagnostic features detected using FP and OCT were present, there was 0.88 sensitivity, 0.92 specificity, and 0.90 AUC of predictive accuracy for diagnosing PCV. The results of the validation test further confirmed the diagnostic criteria with 0.94 sensitivity and 0.93 specificity. The 5 highly potential diagnostic features included subretinal orange nodule on FP, thumb-like PED on OCT, notched PED on OCT, bubble sign on OCT, and Bruch’s membrane depression under serosanguinous PED on OCT, which was firstly noticed in the current study. These features suggested a diagnosis of PCV rather than typical nvAMD, which should be looked for when PCV was supposed to be differentiated from typical nvAMD. One benefit of considering these 5 major criteria to identify PCV without ICGA is that noninvasive multimodal imaging could be accessed quickly and easily in most clinics, and FP and OCT could be routinely performed in most areas in the world.

Differentiating PCV from typical nvAMD is desirable since the diagnosis of PCV is essential for patients regarding management and prognosis. PCV was regarded as a subtype of nvAMD characterized by aneurysmal type 1 choroidal neovascularization. Recently the feature of pachychoroid in PCV eyes led some investigators to recommend PCV falls within the pachychoroid spectrum, which might have a different cause of AMD [26]. As the pathogenesis and clinical features of PCV are distinct from those of nvAMD, the management of PCV consist a wide spectrum of treatment options, including verteporfin photodynamic therapy (PDT), anti-vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) therapy, focal laser photocoagulation, and various combinations of these therapies. On the contrary, intravitreal anti-VEGF therapy was the mainstay of treatment for typical nvAMD. When compared with typical nvAMD, the prognosis of PCV varies with various clinical and imaging features and the choice of treatment regimens in clinical practice [1, 26, 27]. Therefore, it is crucial to distinguish PCV from typical nvAMD accurately.

Diagnosis of PCV using noninvasive imaging methods is needed in clinical practice. Although there is no universally accepted definition of PCV currently, the presence of subretinal focal hyperfluorescence on ICGA was believed to be essential to diagnose PCV [1, 28]. However, the clinical application of ICGA is limited because of its invasiveness and possibility of allergy [8]. Besides, PCV may be underdiagnosed in people whose ancestry is not Asian or African because ICGA might not be routinely performed. What’s more, ICGA is not accessible or available in some areas, especially in less developed areas where a majority of individuals are Asian and
African. It might be helpful if noninvasive diagnostic criteria were supplemented to the invasively diagnostic criteria of PCV using ICGA. Therefore, previous studies have investigated noninvasive diagnostic criteria for PCV using OCT alone. De Salvo et al. reviewed 51 eyes with PED attributable to either PCV or occult choroidal neovascularization, and reported 0.946 sensitivity and 0.929 specificity of diagnosing PCV using spectral-domain OCT. [9] Liu et al. reported 0.875 sensitivity and 0.862 specificity on distinguishing PCV from typical nvAMD using OCT in a prospective study, and the OCT features, included PED, double-layer sign, and thumb-

![Fig. 1](image-url) Fig. 1 Typical potential diagnostic features detected using fundus photography (FP) and B-scan optical coherence tomography (OCT) that suggest the diagnosis of polypoidal choroidal vasculopathy. These 5 features (green arrowhead), including subretinal orange nodule on FP (a), thumb-like pigment epithelial detachment (PED) on OCT (b), notched PED on OCT (c), bubble sign on OCT (d), and Bruch’s membrane depression under serosanguinous PED on OCT (e), were used as major criteria in the study

### Table 1 Sensitivity, specificity, and predictive accuracy of prespecified potential diagnostic features detected using noninvasive multimodal imaging methods

| Feature                                      | Sensitivity (95% CI) | Specificity (95% CI) | AUC (95% CI) |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| **Fundus photograph**                        |                      |                      |              |
| Subretinal orange nodule                     | 0.78 (0.65–0.88)     | 0.96 (0.85–0.99)     | 0.88 (0.80–0.95) |
| Hemorrhagic PED                              | 0.54 (0.40–0.68)     | 0.98 (0.88–1.00)     | 0.76 (0.66–0.86) |
| Multifocal lesions                           | 0.12 (0.05–0.24)     | 1.00 (0.91–1.00)     | 0.56 (0.45–0.67) |
| Extensive hemorrhage                         | 0.27 (0.16–0.41)     | 1.00 (0.91–1.00)     | 0.64 (0.53–0.74) |
| Absence of drusen                            | 0.67 (0.53–0.79)     | 0.84 (0.71–0.93)     | 0.76 (0.66–0.85) |
| **Optical coherence tomography**             |                      |                      |              |
| Multiple PED                                 | 0.81 (0.67–0.90)     | 0.64 (0.50–0.77)     | 0.73 (0.63–0.83) |
| Thumb-like PED                               | 0.73 (0.59–0.84)     | 0.90 (0.78–0.96)     | 0.82 (0.73–0.90) |
| Notched PED                                  | 0.75 (0.61–0.86)     | 0.88 (0.75–0.95)     | 0.82 (0.73–0.90) |
| Double-layer sign                            | 0.83 (0.69–0.91)     | 0.55 (0.40–0.69)     | 0.69 (0.58–0.79) |
| Bubble sign                                  | 0.73 (0.59–0.84)     | 0.94 (0.83–0.98)     | 0.84 (0.75–0.92) |
| Pachychoroid                                 | 0.63 (0.49–0.76)     | 0.92 (0.80–0.97)     | 0.78 (0.69–0.87) |
| Bruch’s membrane depression                  | 0.77 (0.63–0.87)     | 0.92 (0.80–0.97)     | 0.85 (0.77–0.93) |
| **En face optical coherence tomography**     |                      |                      |              |
| Dilated choroidal vessel                     | 0.37 (0.24–0.51)     | 0.88 (0.75–0.95)     | 0.62 (0.52–0.73) |
| Hyper-reflective ring adjacent to and beneath RPE | 0.67 (0.53–0.79)     | 0.78 (0.64–0.88)     | 0.73 (0.63–0.83) |
| Hyper-reflective foci                        | 0.40 (0.27–0.55)     | 0.73 (0.58–0.84)     | 0.57 (0.45–0.68) |
| RPE ring                                     | 0.90 (0.78–0.96)     | 0.47 (0.33–0.61)     | 0.69 (0.58–0.79) |
| **Optical coherence tomography angiography** |                      |                      |              |
| Abnormal vessel under RPE                    | 0.96 (0.86–0.99)     | 0.10 (0.04–0.22)     | 0.53 (0.42–0.64) |
| Abnormal blood flow resembling polyp         | 0.52 (0.38–0.66)     | 0.86 (0.73–0.94)     | 0.69 (0.59–0.79) |
| **Autofluorescence**                         |                      |                      |              |
| Hyperfluorescent ring                        | 0.42 (0.29–0.57)     | 0.92 (0.80–0.97)     | 0.67 (0.57–0.78) |
| Granular hypofluorescence                    | 1.00 (0.91–1.00)     | 0 (0–0.09)           | 0.50 (0.39–0.61) |

AUC area under curve, CI confidence interval, PED pigment epithelial detachment, RPE retinal pigment epithelium
like PED, suggested a diagnosis of PCV [10]. However, these studies did not consider the potential prognostic information provided by other noninvasive imaging methods. Although additional en face OCT, OCTA, and AF information did not help improve the predictive accuracy, they still provide several imaging features of PCV, which might suggest potential PCV diagnosis.

Noninvasive multimodal imaging methods were used in the present study. On the contrary, Chaikitmongkol et al. reported a hybrid diagnostic strategy of noninvasive FP and OCT, and invasive FA. They reported diagnostic criteria with 0.95 sensitivity and 0.95 specificity, which used at least 2 of 4 signs, included hemorrhagic PED on FP, notched PED on OCT, sharply peaked PED (also known as thumb-like PED in the current study) on OCT, and hyperreflective ring (also known as bubble sign in the current study) on OCT [12, 13]. They did not consider potential diagnostic value of other imaging methods as well, although they also chose FP and OCT in their diagnostic criteria, which was same as our diagnostic strategy. Compared with the current study, the diagnostic feature of subretinal orange nodules in their study had a low sensitivity of 0.39, which was totally different from the sensitivity value of 0.78 in the current study. The orange-red elevated lesions on FP was regarded a major diagnostic criterion by the proposed guidelines by the Japanese Study Group of Polypoidal Choroidal Vasculopathy [29]. PCV has different clinical features in various ethnic groups [30]. One of possible explanations is that Chinese PCV patients might share more common clinical presentations with Japanese patients than patients in Thailand. Besides, because the color of subretinal orange nodules is similar to the orange-reddish appearance of fundus with pachychoroid

Table 2  Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, negative predictive value, and diagnostic accuracy of multiple major criteria

| Major criteria | Sensitivity (95% CI) | Specificity (95% CI) | PPV (95% CI) | NPV (95% CI) | AUC (95% CI) |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| ≥ 1 of 5 major criteria | 0.92 (0.81–0.98) | 0.75 (0.60–0.85) | 0.79 (0.66–0.88) | 0.90 (0.76–0.97) | 0.83 (0.75–0.92) |
| ≥ 2 of 5 major criteria | 0.88 (0.76–0.95) | 0.92 (0.80–0.97) | 0.92 (0.80–0.97) | 0.89 (0.76–0.95) | 0.90 (0.84–0.97) |
| ≥ 3 of 5 major criteria | 0.81 (0.67–0.90) | 0.96 (0.85–0.99) | 0.95 (0.83–0.99) | 0.83 (0.71–0.91) | 0.88 (0.81–0.96) |
| ≥ 4 of 5 major criteria | 0.69 (0.55–0.81) | 0.98 (0.88–1.00) | 0.97 (0.84–1.00) | 0.76 (0.63–0.85) | 0.84 (0.75–0.92) |
| 5 of 5 major criteria | 0.46 (0.32–0.60) | 1.00 (0.91–1.00) | 1.00 (0.83–1.00) | 0.65 (0.53–0.75) | 0.73 (0.63–0.83) |

AUC area under curve, CI confidence interval, NPV negative predictive value, PPV positive predictive value

Fig. 2 Examples of noninvasive multimodal imaging in diagnosing polypoidal choroidal vasculopathy (PCV). Top row: An elderly man had peripapillary hemorrhage in his left eye (a). Optical coherence tomography (OCT) shows notched PED (yellow arrowhead in b), Bruch’s membrane under serosanguinous PED (between red arrowheads in b), and thumb-like PED (between blue arrowheads in c). Indocyanine green angiography (ICGA) confirms the diagnosis of PCV (d). Bottom row: An elderly woman had orange nodules (between green arrowheads in e), notched PED (yellow arrowhead in f), and suspected bubble sign (between white arrowheads in g). ICGA confirms the diagnosis of PCV (h)
The presence of at least 2 of 5 signs of subretinal orange nodule in Chinese individuals with typical nvAMD and PCV imaging methods, especially using FP and OCT, on diagnostic features detected using noninvasive multimodal imaging criteria on treated eyes with PCV and more ethnic groups are needed.
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**Additional file 1: Figure S1.** Examples of noninvasive multimodal imaging features of polypoidal choroidal vasculopathy (PCV). A: Subretinal orange nodule (green arrowheads) on fundus photograph (FP). B: Extensive hemorrhagic pigment epithelial detachment (PED) on FP. C: Multifocal lesions (green arrowheads) without presence of drusen on FP. D: Multiple thumb-like PEDs on optical coherence tomography (OCT). E: Notched PED (green arrowhead) on OCT. F: Double-layer sign (between green arrowheads) on OCT. G: Bubble sign (between green arrowheads) on OCT. H: Pachychoroid (above green arrowheads) on OCT. I: Bruch’s membrane depression under serosanguinous PED (between green arrowheads) on OCT. J: Dilated choroidal vessel (green arrowhead) on en face OCT which was centered on the foveola. K: Multiple hyper-reflective rings adjacent to and beneath retinal pigment epithelium (RPE) (green arrowheads) on en face OCT. L: Multiple hyper-reflective foci (green arrowheads) on en face OCT. M: RPE ring (green arrowhead) on en face OCT. N: Abnormal vascular signal under RPE (green arrowhead) on OCT angiography (OCTA). O: Abnormal blood flow signal resembling polyps (green arrowheads) on OCTA. P: Hyperfluorescent ring (green arrowhead) on autofluorescence (AF). Q: Granular hypofluorescence (green arrowheads) on AF.

**Additional file 2: Table S2.** Presence of prespecified potential diagnostic features in PCV and nvAMD.

**Abbreviations**
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