Published in final edited form as:

Opt Lett. 2020 February 15; 45(4): 840–843. doi:10.1364/OL.382589.

Origin of Cell Contrast in Offset Aperture Adaptive Optics Ophthalmoscopy

A. Guevara-Torres^{1,2,*}, D. R. Williams^{1,2}, J.B. Schallek^{1,3,4}

¹Center for Visual Science, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, 14642, USA

²The Institute of Optics, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, 14620, USA

³Flaum Eye Institute, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, 14642, USA

⁴Department of Neuroscience, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, 14620, USA

Abstract

Offset aperture and split detector imaging are variants of adaptive optics scanning ophthalmoscopy recently introduced to improve the image contrast of retinal cells. Unlike conventional confocal scanning ophthalmoscopy, these approaches collect light laterally decentered from the optical axis. A complete explanation of how these methods enhance contrast has not been described. Here, we provide an optical model with supporting *in vivo* data that shows contrast is generated from spatial variations in refractive index as it is in phase contrast microscopy. A prediction of this model is supported by experimental data that shows contrast is optimized when the detector is placed conjugate with a deeper backscattering screen such as the retinal pigment epithelium and choroid, rather than with the layer being imaged as in conventional confocal imaging. This detection strategy provides a substantial improvement in the contrast these new methods can produce.

OCIS codes:

(170.4460) Ophthalmic optics and devices; (110.1080) Active or adaptive optics; (170.5810) Scanning microscopy; (170.3660) Light propagation in tissues

Offset aperture and split-detection are techniques recently introduced in ophthalmoscopy that have increased the image contrast of translucent retinal structures [1–7]. While the exact implementation varies, these methods have in common the fact that they detect light that is displaced laterally from the on-axis location where the detection pinhole is positioned in a conventional confocal microscope. Combined with adaptive optics that measure and correct for the aberrations of the eye, these nonconfocal methods can directly image red blood cells, horizontal cells, ganglion cells, as well as photoreceptor inner segments and somas without the need for contrast agents [1–7]. Examples of split detection images obtained in the living mouse retina are shown in Fig. 1.

*Corresponding author: rguevara@optics.rochester.edu.

Disclosures: Andres Guevara-Torres: University of Rochester (P), Hoffman-LaRoche (F), Jesse B. Schallek: University of Rochester (P), Hoffman-LaRoche (F), David R. Williams: University of Rochester (P), Hoffman-LaRoche (F).

Despite the utility of rendering translucent cells visible, explanations for the mechanism that provides cellular contrast with these approaches are incomplete. Elsner and Chui attribute the optical contrast to multiply scattered light [1,6]. In this model, illumination light that strikes the target object is scattered onto deeper retinal layers that then backscatter the light onto the detector. This model, which they attribute to forward and multiple scatter, is supported by evidence of improved contrast of blood vessels where they pass over the margin of the more highly reflective margin of the optic disc [1]. Here we build upon their model to explain a yet unaccounted for feature of such images: the asymmetric appearance of cells where one edge of the cell looks bright and the opposite edge appears dark. This is very similar to the appearance of differential interference contrast (DIC) [8] images, which begs the question whether offset aperture and split detection imaging are actually variants within the family of phase contrast methods.

In this report, we show how these methods convert refractive index gradients into intensity variations across cellular features in the image. We propose that, as the scanning beam encounters refractive index gradients within and between single cells, these gradients, depending on their size and sign, steer the beam in different directions and by different amounts away from the optical axis. When these deviated beams arrive at a deeper backscattering layer, they create decentered light distributions that when sampled by the detector pinhole, create the asymmetric light distributions that produce the contrast in single cells. Fig. 2 shows our model based on the mouse eye that captures this concept. Fig 2(a) explains the essential principle using simple geometric optics. In Fig 2(a), we assume that each cell body has a higher refractive index than the surrounding tissue, so that it acts as a weak positive lens (the negative lens condition is discussed later). Light passing through opposite sides of the cell body will be steered in opposite directions away from the optic axis. Consistent with the model of Chui and Burns [1], we assume that this redirected light propagates to a backscattering layer deeper in the retina, creating an intensity distribution on this screen that captures the deviation of the beam as it is scanned across the cell body. If the detection pinhole is offset from the optical axis, the deviations in the beam will result in either an increase or a decrease in the intensity depending on whether the cellular lensing has deviated the beam at each scanning location toward or away from a decentered detector.

To generate quantitative predictions about the asymmetry expected from geometrical optics, we also developed a wave optics model. We modelled the soma of a single photoreceptor as a 5 μm sphere with a uniform refractive index corresponding to the mean refractive index of 1.4 taken from [11] immersed in a lower refractive index medium, assumed to be 1.36 [11]. We model the illumination to be an Airy pattern. Pattern phase but not amplitude is modified by a 2D matrix of complex numbers. The absolute value of these complex numbers is 1. The phase is the optical path length (in waves) calculated along the direction of propagation of a 3D model of the cell. The illumination point spread function (PSF) is 1.9 μm in diameter and is calculated by the Fourier transform of the pupil function [12] estimated from a pupil of the eye of 2 mm in diameter, an eye focal length of 2.6 mm [13] and a light source of 796 nm. The light continues forward using Fraunhofer propagation [12] towards a deeper screen.

The return path of light was modeled as the intensity light distribution at the deeper screen convolved with a geometrical PSF (a disk of uniform intensity). The return PSF was

determined by the NA angle of the eye and the defocus distance between the screen and the virtual position of the detector. The geometrical PSF is used because defocus range across layers in the retina is large (60 diopters) [12]. Based on optical coherence tomography (OCT) evidence captured with a Spectralis HRA + OCT (Heidelberg Engineering, spectrum centered at 870 nm), we assume that the cell lies 100 μm microns in front of a backscattering layer corresponding in the mouse to a layer approximately 30 μm thick that corresponds to the retinal pigment epithelium (RPE) and choroid [14]. The thick layer was simulated as 5 discrete retinal reflective layers. At the detection plane, the simulations for each of the 5 discrete layers were averaged as intensities [15] and then we consider an offset detector with the characteristics of the pinhole we use in the experiments. Finally, this process is repeated for multiple scan positions.

Fig. 2(b) shows the calculated light distribution at the backscattering layer when the left and right sides of the cell are illuminated. The areas in red show the light intensity detected in each case. Fig. 2(c) shows the calculated intensity distribution as the beam is scanned across the entire cell, which captures qualitatively the asymmetry observed in offset aperture imaging.

An unexpected prediction of this model shown in Fig. 2(d) is that the maximum contrast of this asymmetry should occur when the detector is conjugate with a plane amid the backscattering layers rather than the layer conjugate to the object; the convention in current split-detection and offset aperture imaging. If the detector is positioned axially either in front of or behind the backscattering layer, it will capture light from a defocused image of the light distribution illustrated in Fig. 2(b). This will inevitably blur the intensity variations that convey the phase variations in the original plane to be imaged.

To test the model prediction, we use an adaptive optics scanning light ophthalmoscope (AOSLO) designed specifically to image the mouse retina [9]. In brief, we used a 904 nm (8 μW) laser for wavefront sensing and 796 nm light with 17 nm bandwidth (480 μW , Superlum, Ireland) for imaging. A membrane based deformable mirror (ALPAO, France) provided aberration correction. This scanning instrument has a frame rate of 25 Hz. To correct for small residual motion within the mouse eye, a second 640 nm visible laser (30 μW , Toptica, Germany) was used to simultaneously image the retina in confocal mode using a separate, visible light PMT. This provided simultaneous, dual-channel image registration without impacting the measurements performed in the near infrared [16].

We imaged two classes of retinal structures because they provide strong contrast in the offset and split detection configurations [3,4] and lie at different distances from the deeper backscattering layer hypothesized to be key to capturing the refracted light.

The diameter of the detector aperture was 200 μm (equal to 8.6 airy disc diameters (ADD)). Similar to the offset aperture approaches of Sulai, Chui, Rossi and Guevara [1,3,5,7], we displaced the detector pinhole laterally in the *en face* plane. We chose displacements of 10 ADD for vessels, 22 and 35 ADD for experiments imaging horizontal cells. These values were kept constant throughout the experiment.

With the axial position of the illumination kept focused on the retinal structure of interest, we collected images at each of a number of axial locations of the detector by sliding the photomultiplier tube (PMT) together with a circular pinhole in the axial dimension. Maxwell's elongation formula provided the relationship between an axial displacement of the detector and its corresponding displacement at the retina [17]. For our system, an axial displacement of 1 mm at the detector corresponded to an axial displacement of 9.8 μm in the retina. The detector was translated by up to 215 μm (38 diopters) in retinal distance from the position where it was conjugate with the illumination plane, as is the case in conventional confocal imaging.

Fig. 3 shows the contrast improvement realized from the axial displacement of the detector toward a deeper plane for both horizontal cells and capillaries. The Michelson contrast of the light and dark asymmetry in horizontal cells was not highest when the detector was conjugate with the illumination plane. Yet consistent with the predictions of the model, the contrast increased to a local maximum with a detection 117 μm deeper, corresponding to the location of the backscattering screen consistent with OCT images. The contrast in the optimized detection plane was 1.9 times higher when calculating Michelson contrast in the average frame. The improvement in contrast was observed in all 6 cells across 3 mice (Fig. 3, black trace) and is anatomically consistent with the distance between horizontal cells and the photoreceptor/RPE boundary (102 μm [18]).

To test that this was not a special case, true only for one type of structure in the retina, we also tested the model prediction for capillaries. When imaging capillaries at the outer plexiform layer (OPL, Fig. 3(b) red data) we observed a broad contrast maximum at roughly the same axial location in the retina as was found for horizontal cells (Visualization 1). Though the contrast of capillaries was relatively lower, the contrast benefit of shifting the axial position of the detector to the backscattering plane was similar to that found for horizontal cells, about 1.9 times.

Given that capillaries reside in three discrete axial locations within the mouse retina [19], we repeated the experiment with capillaries at the ganglion cell layer (GCL), which are ~100 μm vitread to those in the OPL. While limited z-stroke of the detector (25 mm) precluded measurements of a local contrast maxima of GCL capillaries the data follow a similar trend to those obtained at the OPL throughout the extent of overlap of the two data sets (Fig. 3, blue data). Difference in absolute contrast were less than those predicted likely due to the scatter from the complex anatomy of the retina. Moreover, the contrast benefit was at least 2.7-fold, similar to the 1.9x improvement of the OPL capillaries.

These results are consistent with the model proposed here and are counterintuitive in the context of the conventional practice in confocal imaging in which the illumination and detection planes coincide. We found that retinal structures could be imaged with the highest contrast despite moving the detector plane as much as 38 diopters (215 μm in retinal distance) away from the illumination plane which was >20x larger than the axial resolution of (~9 μm). If backscatter from the object was the sole source of image contrast, any target object 38 diopters away would be virtually unrecognizable due to blur. In the preferred configuration proposed here in which the illumination and detection planes are axially

displaced, the illumination focus provides optical resolution and axial sectioning for the target object while the detector displacement optimizes contrast.

For these experiments, there are several advantages to use the living mouse eye, which has a numerical aperture of 0.49 [13], twice that of the human, providing a two-fold increase in lateral resolution and a four-fold increase in axial resolution [9]. Lateral resolution is ~700 nm, consistent with theoretical predictions [9]. The axial point spread function (PSF) is theoretically 9 μm [17], comparable to the size of many retinal cell bodies. In addition to providing superior resolution to that of a human eye, the high numerical aperture of the mouse eye entails a narrower depth-of-field, increasing the sensitivity with which we can identify the focal plane optimizing image contrast. In addition to the optical benefits of the mouse eye, the use of anesthesia reduces the eye motion and pupil decentration that can reduce the quality of human high-resolution retinal images. The advantages of the mouse for these experiments notwithstanding, the qualitative effects observed here in the mouse should accrue in the human eye, though the benefit of displacing the detector is expected to be smaller due to the larger axial PSF in the human retina (67 μm for a 6 mm pupil [17]).

Photoreceptor somas and red blood cells have a polarity expected of a positive lens. In blood cells, this is consistent with the higher index of refraction inside a red blood cell relative to plasma [20]. However, despite identical experimental conditions, we find that remarkably, horizontal cells have the polarity of a negative lens (Fig. 4). The signal polarity is dictated by the index of refraction inside/outside the cell and the convex or concave nature of their geometry.

Spatial variation in refractive index is apparently the origin the asymmetries characteristic of split-detection and offset aperture images in ophthalmoscopy. This model implies that these approaches are ways to perform phase imaging in the living eye and the mechanism to generate contrast is analogous to Schlieren imaging, oblique illumination, or differential phase contrast [21–23] where optical pathlength changes across the plane of focus deviate light in different directions.

Future work may build upon this model to design a detection mask that combines an optimized pattern, size, lateral and axial offset to image specific cell types optimally in the retina. For example, the model predicts that the contrast of cells more vitread from the backscattering layer should benefit from larger lateral offsets than cells closer to the layer. Sapoznik et al. [24] have developed a detection mask that can be easily reconfigured and that could provide a convenient method for optimizing the detector configuration for each cell class, guided by the predictions of the wave optics model. While we have modeled the contrast benefit for the mouse in this study, the model also provides a prediction of improvement in human eye which has a lower NA (0.18). With equivalent parameters and adjusted NA, the model predicts a 1.7x improvement for translucent human cells.

Acknowledgment.

We thank Aby Joseph for scientific discussions and critical review of the manuscript

Funding. NIH National Eye Institute (NEI) R01 EY028293 (JBS, AGT), P30 EY001319 (JBS, DRW), The Dana Foundation David Mahoney Neuroimaging award (JBS, AGT), Research to Prevent Blindness Career Development

Award and Unrestricted grant to the University of Rochester department of Ophthalmology (JBS, AGT), Research to Prevent Blindness Stein Innovation Award (DRW, AGT), F. Hoffmann-La Roche pRED (JBS, AGT, DRW), Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología (AGT)

Full References

1. Chui TYP, VanNasdale DA, and Burns SA, "The use of forward scatter to improve retinal vascular imaging with an adaptive optics scanning laser ophthalmoscope," *Biomed Opt Express* 3, 2537–2549 (2012). [PubMed: 23082294]
2. Scoles D, Sulai YN, Langlo CS, Fishman GA, Curcio CA, Carroll J, and Dubra A, "In Vivo Imaging of Human Cone Photoreceptor Inner Segments," *Invest. Ophthalmol. Vis. Sci* 55, 4244–4251 (2014). [PubMed: 24906859]
3. Guevara-Torres A, Williams DR, and Schallek JB, "Imaging translucent cell bodies in the living mouse retina without contrast agents," *Biomed Opt Express* 6, 2106–2119 (2015). [PubMed: 26114032]
4. Guevara-Torres A, Joseph A, and Schallek JB, "Label free measurement of retinal blood cell flux, velocity, hematocrit and capillary width in the living mouse eye," *Biomed. Opt. Express* 7, 4228–4249 (2016). [PubMed: 27867728]
5. Rossi EA, Granger CE, Sharma R, Yang Q, Saito K, Schwarz C, Walters S, Nozato K, Zhang J, Kawakami T, Fischer W, Latchney LR, Hunter JJ, Chung MM, and Williams DR, "Imaging individual neurons in the retinal ganglion cell layer of the living eye," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci* 114, 586–591 (2017). [PubMed: 28049835]
6. Elsner A, Miura M, Burns S, Beausencourt E, Kunze C, Kelley L, Walker J, Wing G, Raskauskas P, Fletcher D, Zhou Q, and Dreher A, "Multiply scattered light tomography and confocal imaging: detecting neovascularization in age-related macular degeneration," *Opt. Express* 7, 95–106 (2000). [PubMed: 19404374]
7. Sulai YN, Scoles D, Harvey Z, and Dubra A, "Visualization of retinal vascular structure and perfusion with a nonconfocal adaptive optics scanning light ophthalmoscope," *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A* 31, 569–579 (2014).
8. Nomarski M, "Microinterferometre Differentiel a Ondes Polarisees," *J. Phys. Radium* 16, S9–S13 (1955).
9. Geng Y, Dubra A, Yin L, Merigan WH, Sharma R, Libby RT, and Williams DR, "Adaptive optics retinal imaging in the living mouse eye," *Biomed. Opt. Express* 3, 715–734 (2012). [PubMed: 22574260]
10. Feng G, Mellor RH, Bernstein M, Keller-Peck C, Nguyen QT, Wallace M, Nerbonne JM, Lichtman JW, and Sanes JR, "Imaging Neuronal Subsets in Transgenic Mice Expressing Multiple Spectral Variants of GFP," *Neuron* 28, 41–51 (2000). [PubMed: 11086982]
11. Solovei I, Kreysing M, Lanctôt C, Kösem S, Peichl L, Cremer T, Guck J, and Joffe B, "Nuclear Architecture of Rod Photoreceptor Cells Adapts to Vision in Mammalian Evolution," *Cell* 137, 356–368 (2009). [PubMed: 19379699]
12. Goodman JW, *Introduction to Fourier Optics*, 3rd ed. (Roberts & Company, 2005).
13. Geng Y, Schery LA, Sharma R, Dubra A, Ahmad K, Libby RT, and Williams DR, "Optical properties of the mouse eye," *Biomed. Opt. Express* 2, 717–738 (2011). [PubMed: 21483598]
14. Webb RH, Hughes GW, and Delori FC, "Confocal scanning laser ophthalmoscope," *Appl. Opt* 26, 1492–1499 (1987). [PubMed: 20454349]
15. Van Blokland GJ and Van Norren D, "Intensity and polarization of light scattered at small angles from the human fovea," *Vision Res.* 26, 485–494 (1986). [PubMed: 3727413]
16. Dubra A and Harvey Z, "Registration of 2D Images from Fast Scanning Ophthalmic Instruments," in *Biomedical Image Registration, Lecture Notes in Computer Science No. 6204* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010), pp. 60–71.
17. Born M and Wolf E, *Principles of Optics: Electromagnetic Theory of Propagation, Interference and Diffraction of Light*, 7th (expanded) edition (Cambridge University Press, 2002).

18. Kim KH, Puoris'haag M, Maguluri GN, Umino Y, Cusato K, Barlow RB, and de Boer JF, "Monitoring mouse retinal degeneration with high-resolution spectral-domain optical coherence tomography," *J. Vis* 8, 17 (2008).
19. Cuthbertson RA and Mandel TE, "Anatomy of the mouse retina. Endothelial cell-pericyte ratio and capillary distribution.," *Invest. Ophthalmol. Vis. Sci* 27, 1659–1664 (1986). [PubMed: 3771146]
20. Borovoi AG, Naats EI, and Oppel UG, "Scattering of Light by a Red Blood Cell," *J. Biomed. Opt* 3, 364–372 (1998). [PubMed: 23015091]
21. Ford TN, Chu KK, and Mertz J, "Phase-gradient microscopy in thick tissue with oblique back-illumination," *Nat. Methods* 9, 1195–1197 (2012). [PubMed: 23103879]
22. Joannes L, Dubois F, and Legros J-C, "Phase-shifting schlieren: high-resolution quantitative schlieren that uses the phase-shifting technique principle," *Appl. Opt* 42, 5046–5053 (2003). [PubMed: 12962380]
23. Hamilton DK and Sheppard CJR, "Differential phase contrast in scanning optical microscopy," *J. Microsc* 133, 27–39 (1984).
24. Sapoznik KA, Luo T, de Castro A, Sawides L, Warner RL, and Burns SA, "Enhanced retinal vasculature imaging with a rapidly configurable aperture," *Biomed. Opt. Express* 9, 1323–1333 (2018). [PubMed: 29541524]

Fig. 1. Retinal structures captured with split-detection in the living mouse eye. (a) Photoreceptor distal processes. (b) Horizontal cells. (c) Photoreceptor somas. (d) Red blood cells. (e) Ganglion cell identified by simultaneously captured Thy-1 YFP fluorescence [9,10] shown in (f) and axonal imaging. Images (a) through (d) adapted from [3,4].

Fig. 2.

Wave optics model of offset aperture. (a) Geometrical model for offset aperture. When the beam is focused into the edge of a cell, the beam will be deviated into a direction that can match the detector offset detector (b) Wave optics model of the light distribution at the detection plane is deviated to either the right or the left as the beam is scanned across the cell (c) The simulated lens profile of a spherical cell as detected with a simulated offset aperture detector with a 20 airy disc diameters (ADD) displacement and a pinhole diameter of 8.6 ADD. The vertical lines show the boundary of the cell (d) By simulating the effect of the detector displacement, we obtain that the optimum detection plane is when the detector is conjugate to the deeper reflective thick layer. We find that with the axial displacement the contrast increases by a factor of 1.8. The arrow shows the axial location of the illuminated cell. The shaded area shows the location of the thick backscattering layer (e) Retinal OCT profile captured in the living mouse eye.

Fig. 3.

Experimental data shows an increase in the contrast by moving the detector towards a deeper reflective layer show agreement with the simulations. (a) Increase in contrast of horizontal cells by axially displacing the detector from $z = 100 \mu\text{m}$ (Conjugate to the illuminated cell, left image) to $z = 237 \mu\text{m}$ (right image). Horizontal cell images are normalized to the mean intensity and displayed with the same contrast range (b) Horizontal cells (black curve) show a local maximum when the detector was displaced $117 \mu\text{m}$ in retinal coordinates. We observe a very similar behavior with capillaries in the OPL (red curve), they also show a maximum in the contrast at a layer coincident with the deeper backscattering layer. This data is also shown in Visualization 1. In the experiments with capillaries at the ganglion cell layer (blue curve), we observe a increase in the contrast in a direction consistent to where a deeper thicker reflective screen is expected to be. Blue curve does not show a maxima due to the limits of detector stroke in the axial dimension. Vertical arrows show the position of

illumination focus for each condition. The shaded region corresponds to the thick backscattering layer (Fig. 2(e)). Error bars represent standard error of the mean.

Fig. 4. Polarity change between (a) horizontal cell and (b) photoreceptor soma. (c) Intensity profile plot of the horizontal cell (HC) in (a) and the photoreceptor soma (PR) in (b).