Dear Dr. Naylor and Professor Andersson-Engels,

Thank you for reviewing and providing comments for my PhD thesis titled “Detection of joint inflammation in rheumatoid arthritis using multispectral diffuse optical imaging”. I would like to thank both reviewers for taking the time to review the work and thank them for their highly constructive comments. I have addressed these specific queries below and made the appropriate changes within the revised document, with any substantial changes highlighted in red below. I have also made a number of spelling / grammatical corrections throughout the revised version, including those highlighted either in part 4 or annotated in the provided thesis copies.

* List of acronyms and abbreviations is needed (list of figures and tables exists, but not acronyms)

*This has been included with the corresponding acronyms updated throughout for clarity to the reader.*

* Consider removing all acronyms from the abstract and from the conclusion chapter to make the thesis easier to browse.

*Thank you, these sections have been altered accordingly.*

* It would be great if you could give a few sentences about the contributions in developing the Lambert-Bouguer Law and Beer-Lambert Law

*I have adjusted my description as follows to properly attribute the works of these Physicists in contributing to these laws.*

“In a non-scattering medium, the probability of absorption events occurring means incident light intensity (*I0*) decays exponentially with pathlength *L* through the medium, a relationship commonly described as the Lambert-Bouguer law. This behaviour was first observed in essays by French Physicist Pierre Bouguer in 1729 and later outlined in *Photometria* by Johann Heinrich Lambert, and can be summarised by the following equation,”

“In 1852, August Beer expanded this relationship to a more general description commonly described as the Beer-Lambert law that considers the dependence of on the mediums individual constituent chromophores, which can be expressed according to the equation,”

* Please clarify that you mean elastic scattering when you talk about Rayleigh-type scattering

“As light travels through biological tissue, photons may also change direction due to either an inelastic scattering, which is the theoretical basis of Raman spectroscopy and occurs around once in every 106 interactions [65], or an elastic scattering interaction, which can be either with particles smaller than λ (Rayleigh scattering) or atoms / molecules larger than λ (Mie scattering), the second of which is predominantly of interest in DOI.”

* Provide a short discussion that your reconstruction is objective in terms of algorithm and initial conditions.

*The following has been added to highlight this point. Chosen the same for consistency during recontruction.*

“These initial conditions and reconstruction parameters we the same for all participants, making the algorithm objective in the sense that all processing was carried out in an automated fashion to produce quantitative image maps that if repeated by multiple users would produce identical outcomes.” Data filtering?

Elements of acquisition were subjective including the joint positioning, image mask definition.

* In the discussion of optical imaging, provide a short paragraph comparing the different optical techniques and the strength of DOT in comparison

*The following has been added to Section 2.8*

“A number of distinct optical-based techniques were presented as potential candidates for imaging RA patients. Despite PAT and FOI both demonstrating the capability to detect inflammation with a high spatial resolution, DOT provided a unique combination of strengths that made it the most desirable approach in the context of diagnostics and monitoring. DOT is a more economically viable solution for widespread clinical implementation in comparison to PAT, with additional, expensive hardware needed in the latter for US measurement, whilst the ability to provide contrast to endogenous pathophysiological properties of DOT is highly preferable when compared to the reliance on intravenous contrast agents for FOI, particularly given the regularity of which patients are monitored for disease progression.”

* Correct Figure 3.4(b)

*This figure has been removed, as the data was not correctly calibrated for at the time and its removal is not significantly detrimental to the work.*

* Please explain Eq.5.1 better

*This has been corrected to include the subtraction of the mean, to allow the variance to be accounted for.*

* In the patient chapter you tested many ways to analyse the data in a relatively small data set. I would have preferred you tested all techniques on one dataset and then evaluated on a completely independent set. Please add a small discussion on this.

*The reviewer is correctly identifying the risk of over-fitting for a large number of parameters with the relatively small data set*

“AUC values from ROC analysis provided a degree of inference about the discriminatory values over a range of . Due to the relatively , in future work with this larger cohort of patients, the data should be partitioned appropriately in a machine learning framework, such that a training data set is used to establish optimum thresholds, an independent testing sample partition used and validation sets, with t, to more rigorously test the generalisation of the reported diagnostic accuracies.”

to ensure these optimal values were not suffering from over-fitting

* In the patient chapter you tested many ways to analyse the data in a relatively small data set. I would have preferred you tested all techniques on one dataset and then evaluated on a completely independent set. Please add a small discussion on this.

*The reviewer is correctly identifying the risk of over-fitting for a large number of parameters with the relatively small data set*

“AUC values from ROC analysis provided a degree of inference about the discriminatory values over a range of . Due to the relatively , in future work with this larger cohort of patients, the data should be partitioned appropriately in a machine learning framework, such that a training data set is used to establish optimum thresholds, an independent testing sample partition used and validation sets, with t, to more rigorously test the generalisation of the reported diagnostic accuracies.”

to ensure these optimal values were not suffering from over-fitting

* Keep the order of StO2, tHb, SA and H2O the same in all figures e.g. Fig 5.22

*This has been rearranged for all figures.*

* Standardise the reference style throughout the reference list

*This has been done, with all references having been standardised to have initials only.*

Comments written from internal examiner

* On request, a number of Figure 1.3 has been reorientated to be made more clear, and a number of Figure captions have been expanded upon in more detail, including Figures 1.1, 1.3, 1.6, 2.7 and Table 1.2
* Format of all references have been standardised to initials only.

Comments written from external examiner

* Pg 20 with decay constant µa known as the absorption coefficient having units mm-1, commonly chosen as such within the literature in place of their SI unit equivalent as they provide a sensible numerical scaling of values.
* Pg 23 Importantly, when bound to oxygen molecules at up to four potential binding sites,
* Pg 26 The later has been commonly implemented in joint imaging, presumably as it should provide a better dynamic range for this application as a result of a smaller variation in the pathlength when considering source-detector pairs for an array of detectors on an opposing boundary of a cylindrical-like object when compared to reflectance mode, when sources and detectors are placed on a common boundary.
* Pg 29 Discuss limits of DA
* Pg 34 Through optimising a wavelength set selecting a combination that simultaneously minimise $\kappa$ and maximumise \textit{R},

To DO:

Comments from Amy Fig 2.12

Expand Fig3.7

Explain 5.6 better

Correct table 5.1

Label 6.16

We hope we have addressed all issues raised by the reviewers and we would like to thank them again for their constructive comments.

Yours faithfully,

Daniel Lighter (on behalf of all authors)