Here's the instantiated assurance case for the DeepMind system in a hierarchical tree format using dashes to denote different levels:

```

- G1: Interpretability Claim. The "DeepMind system" is sufficiently "interpretable" in the intended "clinical pathway for retinal diagnosis"

- C1: "DeepMind system"

- C2: "Interpretable"

- C3: "Context: clinical pathway for retinal diagnosis, timing, and retinal clinicians"

- S1: Argument based on the "essential aspects of interpretability"

- C4: "Essential aspects of interpretability"

- G2: Right Method. The right "interpretability methods" are implemented, i.e. the correct information is faithfully being explained

- C5: "Interpretability methods"

- S2: Argument over "interpretability methods"

- G8: "Segmentation map" is right type e.g. local/global (i.e. the correct thing is being explained) (undeveloped and uninstantiated)

- G9: "Segmentation map" is suitably faithful to "DeepMind system" process (undeveloped and uninstantiated)

- G3: Right Context. "Interpretations" produced in the "clinical pathway for retinal diagnosis"

- C6: "Format of interpretations"

- G5: Right Time "Interpretations" produced at the "appropriate time" (undeveloped and uninstantiated)

- G6: Right Setting "Interpretations" are available in the "right setting" (undeveloped and uninstantiated)

- G7: Right Audience "Interpretations" produced for the "right audience" (undeveloped and uninstantiated)

- G4: Right Format "Interpretability methods" are presented in the right "format" for the "retinal clinicians" (undeveloped and uninstantiated)

```

Context and interpretability details have been tailored specifically to the DeepMind system. Labels and placeholders have been instantiated with system-specific information, and undeveloped and uninstantiated elements are clearly marked. This structure enables a comprehensive and transparent assurance case for verifying the interpretability of the DeepMind system in its intended clinical context.