

1 **Detection of obstetric anal sphincter injuries using machine learning-assisted**
2 **impedance spectroscopy: a prospective, comparative, multicentre clinical**
3 **study**

4
5 Katarzyna Borycka^{1,2}, Marcel Młyńczak^{1,3}, Maciej Rosol^{1,3}, Kacper Korzeniewski^{1,3},
6 Piotr Iwanowski¹, Hynek Heřman^{4,5}, Petr Janku^{6,7}, Małgorzata Uchman-Musielak⁸,
7 Erik Dosedla⁹, Enrique Gonzalez Diaz¹⁰, Iwona Sudoł-Szopińska^{11,12}, Michał Mik¹³,
8 Carlo Ratto¹⁴, Antonino Spinelli^{15,16}

9
10 ¹ OASIS Diagnostics, R&D of Medical Technology, Warsaw, Poland

11 ² Centre of Postgraduate Medical Education, Warsaw, Poland

12 ³ Warsaw University of Technology, Faculty of Mechatronics, Institute of Metrology and
13 Biomedical Engineering, Warsaw, Poland

14 ⁴ Institute for the Care of Mother and Child, Prague, Czech Republic

15 ⁵ 3rd Medical Faculty, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

16 ⁶ Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University Hospital Brno and Medical Faculty,
17 Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

18 ⁷ Department of Health Sciences, Medical Faculty, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

19 ⁸ Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Solec Hospital, Warsaw, Poland

20 ⁹ Department of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, Faculty of Medicine, Univerzita Pavla Jozefa
21 Šafárika, Košice, Slovakia

22 ¹⁰ Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Complejo Asistencial Universitario de Leon,
23 Spain

24 ¹¹ Department of Radiology, National Institute of Geriatrics, Rheumatology and Rehabilitation,
25 Warsaw, Poland

26 ¹² Ultrasound Department, Warsaw Medical University, Poland

27 ¹³ Department of General and Colorectal Surgery, Medical University of Lodz, Poland

28 ¹⁴ Proctology and Pelvic Floor Surgery Unit, Isola Tiberina Hospital, Gemelli Isola, Catholic
29 University, Rome, Italy

30 ¹⁵ Department of Biomedical Sciences, Humanitas University, Via Rita Levi Montalcini 4, 20072
31 Pieve Emanuele, Milan, Italy

32 ¹⁶ IRCCS Humanitas Research Hospital, via Manzoni 56, 20089 Rozzano, Milan, Italy

33
34
35 **Short Title**

36 Detection of OASI using machine learning-assisted impedance spectroscopy

37
38
39 **Abstract**

40
41 **Objective:** To evaluate the clinical performance and safety of the ONIRY system for
42 obstetric anal sphincter injuries (OASI) detection versus three-dimensional endoanal
43 ultrasound (EAUS).

44 **Design:** A prospective, comparative, multicentre, international study.

45 **Setting:** Poland, Czechia, Slovakia, and Spain.

46 Population: 152 women between the first moments up to 8 weeks after vaginal
47 delivery.

48 Methods: Participants underwent EAUS and were allocated to groups based on
49 OASIS classification: A (no perineal tear), B (1st or 2nd degree tear), or C (3rd or 4th
50 degree, anal sphincters affected). Electric impedance was measured in the anal
51 canal using the ONIRY system. The primary endpoint was the diagnostic outcome of
52 impedance spectroscopy versus EAUS. Adverse events were collected. Part II
53 involved in silico modelling and 10-time 10-fold cross-validation for automated
54 analysis.

55 Main Outcome Measures: Accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity.

56 Results: 30 women were allocated to group A, 61 to group B, and 61 to group C. The
57 diagnostic outcome was determined for 147 participants. The accuracy, sensitivity,
58 and specificity of the ML-assisted impedance spectroscopy were $87.0 \pm 0.5\%$, $90.6 \pm$
59 2.0% , and $84.6 \pm 1.9\%$, respectively, compared with EAUS. After data cleaning, the
60 performance metrics of the proposed final ML model for ONIRY were: $90.0 \pm 0.4\%$,
61 $90.0 \pm 1.2\%$, and $90.0 \pm 0.7\%$, respectively. No adverse device effects or deficiencies
62 were observed.

63 Conclusion: The ML-assisted impedance spectroscopy appears to be a high-
64 performance and safe method for rapid OASI detection, complementing digital rectal
65 examination in obstetric settings.

66 Funding: The study was financed by the Polish National Centre for Research and
67 Development (POIR.01.01.01-00-0726/18).

68

69

70 **Keywords**

71 obstetric anal sphincter injury (OASI), anal sphincter, perineal tear, faecal
72 incontinence, rapid diagnostics, clinical study, impedance spectroscopy, machine
73 learning

74

75 1. Introduction

76

77 Obstetric anal sphincter injuries (OASIs) represent a frequent complication of vaginal
78 delivery, directly implicated in various degrees of continence impairment or frank
79 faecal incontinence (FI). It is estimated that every fourth woman having given vaginal
80 delivery suffers from some level of OASI¹⁻⁹, translating to a 50-60% risk of developing
81 FI either immediately following delivery¹⁰ or later in her life¹¹⁻¹². FI has been reported
82 to have a destructive impact on women's quality of life, affecting their social
83 interactions, professional activities, family dynamics, and intimate relationships¹³⁻¹⁴.

84 There is still not acceptably available diagnostic and screening tool worldwide for
85 detection of OASI in the early postpartum period. So far, obstetricians must consider
86 this challenging diagnosis by performing the digital rectal examination as the only
87 available diagnostic option in practice as a rule. This can be though troublesome,
88 especially for inexperienced obstetricians and midwives. This is why the rate of
89 primarily undetected OASIs still reaches as much as 80%¹⁵⁻¹⁷.

90 The relatively high prevalence of FI observed in women with undetected OASI
91 following vaginal delivery^{12,18-19} prompts clinicians to revise the algorithms of obstetric
92 care. Still, the gold standard for advanced diagnostics of anal sphincters lesions is
93 the endoanal ultrasound (EAUS), a well-established and well tolerated technique with
94 almost 100% sensitivity in identifying structural abnormalities of the anal sphincters²⁰.
95 As found out in a Cochrane Library review, the use of EAUS prior to obstetric
96 perineal repair is associated with a reduction in the rate of severe FI at 6 months²¹.
97 However, EAUS is of limited availability at maternity care facilities, which, admittedly,
98 may be further confined by the lack of experienced diagnosticians available there²².
99 As the interpretation of the EAUS imaging requires expertise, its actual performance
100 does not reach 100% so a proportion of women is misdiagnosed with OASI even with
101 the use of this method^{12,23-24}.

102 Several studies on transperineal ultrasound (TPUS) have been reported over the last
103 decade as a variation of ultrasound imaging of the anal sphincter that demonstrate a
104 good correlation with EAUS results for the diagnosis of OASI²⁵⁻²⁷. A study in which
105 TPUS was performed immediately after delivery and prior to sphincter suturing (if
106 OASI detected) showed that more OASIs were identified on TPUS compared with
107 digital rectal examination²⁸. TPUS is not, however, recognised as a reference method
108 for OASI detection.

109 Driven by the clinical need, the challenge of inventing and developing a novel device
110 to detect anal sphincter injuries utilising electric impedance spectroscopy technique
111 was taken up as the latter is an established physical marker of biostructure/tissue
112 condition²⁹⁻³⁰, already successfully used in other medical domains³¹⁻³⁴. With this
113 technique, a sinusoidal electrical current, below the sensation threshold, is locally
114 applied to the human body at different frequencies and the voltage response is
115 measured from which impedance is calculated. So far, to the authors' knowledge,
116 there has been no experience with utilising this technique for diagnostics of the
117 perianal area. An investigator-initiated proof-of-concept research study with 22
118 patients, followed by two pilot clinical studies with prototype devices (see below) in a
119 total of 69 post-partum women, have been completed and previously reported
120 wherein the method validity was demonstrated³⁵⁻³⁸. However, it was found out that
121 due to subtlety of differences in raw impedance parameters between normal (non-
122 injured) and injured tissue structures, clinically useful sensitivity and specificity could
123 only be achieved by utilising nonlinear machine learning (ML) algorithms for ultimate
124 test outcome interpretation. Prototypes of such device, called the ONIRY system,
125 with the ML module gradually trained with the clinical data collected, were designed
126 and developed³⁵⁻³⁶. The overall concept for this system was to serve as a rapid
127 detection method for OASI that could be applied immediately after delivery.
128 This clinical study was aimed at evaluating clinical performance and safety of the
129 ONIRY system for rapid detection of OASI versus EAUS as the reference diagnostic
130 method following re-training of the ML model with data from a larger, balanced (with
131 and without OASI) population of post-partum women.

132

133

134 **2. Materials and Methods**

135

136 A prospective, comparative, multicenter, international clinical study was designed,
137 composed of two parts: the clinical conduct (Part I) and modelling and ML (Part II).
138 Part I of the study was conducted from 2021 to 2022 at five European centers in
139 Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland, and Spain. The study design and conduct were in
140 line with the Good Clinical Practice guidelines for medical device studies (ISO
141 14155:2020). All approvals by the national regulatory authorities as well as positive
142 opinions by the ethics committees, per local regulations, were obtained prior to study

143 initiation. Written informed consent was collected from each study participant before
144 enrolment. The study was registered at ClinicalTrials.gov under NCT04903977.

145

146 **Study design**

147 The study was designed to enroll a total of approximately 150 women between 18
148 and 49 years old, primiparous, or multiparous, from the first moments up to 8 weeks
149 after vaginal (spontaneous or assisted) delivery of a singleton, live fetus, in any
150 presentation, in gestational week 34 or higher. All inclusion and exclusion criteria are
151 listed in **Supplementary File S1**, along with the detailed study plan.

152 Three study groups were pre-defined, with fixed numbers of participants enrolled as
153 to ensure generation of balanced data from women with and without OASI.
154 Participants were initially enrolled in these groups based on the evaluation made
155 immediately after delivery according to the 4-degree perineal tears scale³⁹:
156 approximately 30 women were planned for group A (no visible perineal tear),
157 approximately 60 for group B (clinically detectable first- or second-degree perineal
158 tear, including episiotomy), and approximately 60 for group C (clinically detectable
159 third- or fourth-degree perineal tear, affecting anal sphincters, regardless of primary
160 repair).

161 The study duration for each participant was from 2 days up to 5 weeks and included
162 3 study visits. At the first visit, performed from the first moments up to 8 weeks after
163 delivery, collection of medical history, including pregnancies and births, a physical
164 examination, including proctological and gynaecological assessment, a 12-lead
165 electrocardiogram (ECG) recording, and clinical signs of FI using the Wexner score
166 were carried out. At the same visit, three-dimensional (3-D) EAUS, used as the
167 reference diagnostic method and a tool for the ultimate study group allocation, was
168 performed. Following such allocation (per EAUS-based OASIS classification⁴⁰⁻⁴¹), the
169 impedance spectroscopy by ONIRY system was performed at the second study visit
170 (on the same day as the first study visit of up to 7 days after it). A web-based
171 application was utilised for providing the preliminary test interpretation (only to give
172 the operator an experience of getting the ONIRY examination result of OASI detected
173 or not detected); since this interpretation was generated based on the ML model
174 trained on data from the previous, small pilot clinical studies, it could differ from the
175 ultimate interpretation obtained using the ultimate ML model trained within Part II of
176 this study. For the exploratory analysis of reproducibility of impedance

177 measurements, two consecutive measurement runs were performed per patient and
178 an arbitrary criterion for discrepancy was applied, i.e., a difference between the first
179 and second measurement runs greater than 1 k Ω for the frequency equal to 1 kHz.

180 A 12-lead ECG was repeated immediately after impedance measurement with
181 ONIRY system.

182 Faecal calprotectin levels were also measured as to assess any correlation with the
183 results of tissue electrical impedance. At the third study visit, from 0 up to 28 days
184 after the second visit, anal sphincter function was evaluated using a high-resolution
185 anorectal manometry (an optional procedure, subject to actual availability at the
186 given study site). Vital signs were assessed at each study visit.

187 No blinding of the study was deemed feasible. However, it was not considered as
188 required for securing objectivity of the study outcomes as the preliminary
189 interpretation of the impedance measurement displayed by the ONIRY system
190 immediately after the impedance measurement (generated based on the ML model
191 established from the previous, small pilot clinical studies) was independent from the
192 test operator and thus not impacted by the EAUS result knowledge at study entry.
193 Furthermore, as to minimise any bias related to the EAUS evaluation as the primary
194 reference method, a specific technical control measure was in place that allowed for
195 performance of the ONIRY examination only after the EAUS result and interpretation
196 were fixed (entered in the electronic Case Report Form).

197

198 Study endpoints

199 The diagnostic outcome of ONIRY examination versus 3-D EAUS assessed per the
200 OASIS classification was set as primary endpoint and used for the conclusion on the
201 diagnostic performance of the ONIRY system (following the application of the ML
202 algorithms re-trained in Part II of the study).

203 For the EAUS-based Diagnostic Outcome, OASI was considered detected as long as
204 any depth, length, or circumference range of either anal sphincter (external or
205 internal) was captured (score >2 by OASIS classification).

206 For the exploratory analysis of reproducibility of impedance measurements, the
207 discrepancies were considered significant if the impedance difference between the
208 first and second ONIRY measurement runs were greater than 1 k Ω for the frequency
209 equal to 1 kHz.

210 Results obtained for secondary endpoints related to diagnostic performance
211 assessed in this study, i.e., the Diagnostic Outcomes with other diagnostic measures
212 utilised as reference methods for construction of the respective ML models, i.e., the
213 digital rectal examination and high-resolution anorectal manometry, are not included
214 in this report.

215 Adverse Events (AE) were recorded in each participant from enrolment to the last
216 study visit.

217

218 **ONIRY system**

219 The impedance spectroscopy examination was performed in each study participant
220 using the ONIRY system composed of 3 elements: the impedance spectrometer, the
221 anal probe (ONIRY Probe), and the ML module. The spectrometer generates the
222 sinusoidal application current in the frequency range of 1-100 kHz with an amplitude
223 below the threshold of sensation and pain.

224 The ONIRY Probe, made of a biocompatible, rigid, plastic material, has a diameter of
225 12 mm (at the electrodes site; the head has a diameter of 19 mm at the highest), and
226 is composed of 8 stainless steel electrodes allowing for the measurement of the
227 impedance module, phase shift, resistance, and reactance in perianal area. The
228 ONIRY Probe has a handle with a marker indicating the position to be placed in the
229 anal canal (see Figure 1).

230 The ONIRY Probe is inserted into the anal canal for approximately 1 minute. It should
231 not be rotated or moved during the measurement. The examination is carried out in
232 supine position (or in the patient lying on her left side with knees flexed, as per
233 operator preference) as presented in Figure 2.

234 Based on raw electric impedance data collected by the anal probe and read by the
235 ONIRY Spectrometer, the statistical parameters for the frequency sub-compartments
236 are determined and used as the input vector for the ML model. Following the
237 impedance measurement, with such ML support, the ONIRY system determines
238 whether the patient has OASI and returns “PASS” (no OASI detected) or “REFER”
239 (OASI detected). The algorithm also prevents from conducting the measurements in
240 case abnormal use of the ONIRY Probe is detected (impedance data compatible with
241 an improper insertion in the anal canal or no insertion at all).

242

243 **Endoanal ultrasound**

244 The imaging of the external and internal anal sphincters, as well as the puborectalis
245 muscle, was performed. The 3-D EAUS examination conditions were standardized (a
246 study-specific EAUS manual was implemented at all study centres). The 3-D EAUS
247 findings were interpreted according to the OASIS classification⁴¹⁻⁴² for the primary
248 endpoint. In order to evaluate if evaluation according to other semiquantitative scores
249 established for EAUS, the Starck scale⁴² or the Norderval scale⁴³, could positively
250 impact the diagnostic performance of ONIRY system once such scores are used
251 instead of OASIS classification, each EAUS examination was additionally rated by its
252 operator using these two scores (and respective ML models were constructed for
253 further evaluation within exploratory analyses).

254

255 **Statistical analysis**

256 For calculation of diagnostic performance metrics for ONIRY, the Diagnostic
257 Outcome was determined separately for each performance endpoint, as:

- 258 1. Diagnostic Success: presence (True Positive) or absence (True Negative) of
259 OASI consistently detected by the ONIRY examination and the reference
260 diagnostic method, or
- 261 2. Diagnostic Failure: mismatch (False Positive or False Negative) of the OASI
262 detection by the ONIRY examination and the reference diagnostic method, or
- 263 3. Diagnostic Indeterminate: no ONIRY or reference diagnostic method result
264 available or interpretable.

265 For the primary endpoint, 3-D EAUS result (by OASIS classification) served as the
266 reference method. Evaluation of the exploratory endpoints (diagnostic outcome with
267 3-D EAUS evaluated with Norderval⁴⁴ or Starck⁴³ scales) was performed accordingly.
268 Accuracies were defined as Diagnostic Successes/Total, sensitivities as True
269 Positives/(True positives + False Negatives), and specificities as True
270 Negatives/(True Negatives + False Positives). Also, the F1 score, and Matthew's
271 Correlation Coefficient (MCC)⁴⁴ were calculated.

272 The safety profile of ONIRY system was evaluated using descriptive statistics.

273

274 **Data analysis (Part I) and Machine Learning modelling (Part II)**

275 Details for the algorithm utilised for interpretation of the ONIRY examination results
276 presented by ONIRY in Part I of the study, with the preliminary ML model based on

277 data from the two previously completed pilot clinical studies, are included in
278 **Supplementary File S2.**

279 Details of the *in silico* analyses conducted within Part II of the study, with exploratory
280 data analysis dimensionality reduction, ML modelling, and ultimate performance
281 analysis with 10-fold cross-validations, are included in **Supplementary File S3.**

282 Within the per-patient reproducibility analysis, in case of a significant discrepancy
283 between the two ONIRY measurement runs recorded from the same participant, the
284 second measurement run was removed from the analysis dataset for the final
285 algorithm for the ONIRY system (of note, in the real-world use, just one ONIRY
286 measurement run will be conducted).

287

288 **3. Results**

289

290 **Study population**

291 One hundred fifty-three participants were screened and 152 enrolled (1 screening
292 failure). Following performance of the 3-D EAUS with OASIS classification, the
293 ultimate allocation was: 30 in group A (no visible perineal tear and no OASI), 61 in
294 group B (clinically detectable first- or second-degree perineal tear but no OASI), and
295 61 in group C (clinically detectable third- or fourth-degree perineal tear with OASI).

296 The key characteristics of the study population, per study group and in total, are
297 presented in Table 1.

298 Fifteen participants prematurely discontinued the study: 3 (10.0% (3/10)) in group A,
299 10 (16.4% (10/61)) in group B, and 2 (3.3% (2/61)) in group C; all discontinuations
300 occurred between the second and last visits.

301

302 **Part I (Clinical conduct)**

303 All participants enrolled were evaluable for the primary endpoint as well as safety.
304 Diagnostic Success or Failure could be determined for 147 participants for the
305 primary endpoint. For the remaining 5 participants (enrolled at 3 clinical sites), the
306 Diagnostic Outcome was Indeterminate due to electric impedance measurements
307 highly outlying from the measurement range of the ONIRY Spectrometer, not
308 corresponding with the impedance of the tissues measured in the anal canal.
309 Consequently, the Diagnostic Success or Failure were assessable for 60 participants

310 with OASI (group C) and 87 participants with no OASI (groups A and B) for the
311 primary endpoint.

312 Using the limited ML model trained based on data from previous small (pilot) clinical
313 studies with ONIRY, the diagnostic performance metrics were of 66.7% for
314 sensitivity, 57.5% for specificity, 61.2% for accuracy, 0.58 for F1 score, and 0.24 for
315 MCC (see **Supplementary File S4** for details).

316 No significant correlations between faecal calprotectin levels and results of EAUS or
317 ONIRY examinations were found.

318

319 **Part II (*In silico* Machine Learning modelling)**

320 The ultimate performance analysis was performed using the ML model trained with
321 data generated in Part I of this study (raw electric impedance data by ONIRY and
322 data on OASI detection by EAUS as the reference). A total of 298 impedance
323 measurements (meeting quality requirements, see **Supplementary File S5**) were
324 included, i.e., 122 corresponding with OASI (group C participants) and 176 with no
325 OASI (group A and B participants). Following the exploratory data analysis,
326 dimensionality reduction, and modelling with the artificial neural networks, markedly
327 improved diagnostic metrics (with sensitivity slightly above 90% and specificity
328 slightly below 85%) were observed, as presented in Table 2 (see **Supplementary**
329 **File S6** for individual statistics for each single 10-fold cross-validation).

330 The exploratory analysis of per-patient reproducibility of impedance measurements
331 recorded in Part I of the study showed discrepancies between the two impedance
332 measurement runs in 19 participants (12.8%).

333 The exploratory analysis of performance assessment in reference to 3-D EAUS with
334 the use of the classifications of anal sphincter injuries according to Starck⁴³ and
335 Norderval⁴⁴(also utilised to train alternative artificial network ML models, respectively)
336 resulted in 83.8 % for sensitivity, 88.1 % for specificity, 86.4 % for accuracy, 0.83 for
337 F1 score, and 0.73 for MCC for Starck scoring and 84.3 % for sensitivity, 89.3 % for
338 specificity, 87.4 % for accuracy, 0.84 for F1 score, and 0.74 for MCC for Norderval
339 scoring.

340

341 **Safety results**

342 No deaths, serious AEs, or AEs leading to premature withdrawal from the study were
343 reported during the study conduct. A total of 22 AEs were observed in 21 participants

344 (4 AEs in group A, 5 in group B, and 13 in group C); all these AEs were reported
345 posteriorly to the ONIRY examinations. Four AEs occurred more than in one
346 participant, of which the most frequent were nasopharyngitis (2.6%, 4/152) and
347 COVID-19 (2.6%, 4/152).

348 No AE was considered related to the use of the ONIRY system (i.e., no adverse
349 device effect was reported).

350 No trend was observed in ECG for any parameter when comparing the baseline
351 (recordings prior to the ONIRY examination) with post-ONIRY application recordings.

352 No post-ONIRY application clinically significant abnormality recorded as an AE within
353 the cardiovascular system, either.

354

355 **Post-hoc analysis**

356 Following the exploratory analyses of per-patient reproducibility of impedance
357 measurements 19 measurement files (those generated from the second
358 measurement in each case) were eliminated for the production version of the ultimate
359 ML model for the ONIRY system, leaving 93.6% (279/298) of the dataset for the
360 analysis (“limited dataset”). The limited dataset included 279 impedance
361 measurements, i.e., 117 corresponding with OASI and 162 with no OASI. A post-hoc
362 performance analysis with cross-validations performed for this ML model showed the
363 diagnostic metrics with either sensitivity and specificity of ONIRY system at 90.0%,
364 as presented in Table 3 (see **Supplementary File S6** for individual statistics for each
365 single 10-fold cross-validation).

366

367 **4. Discussion**

368

369 **Key Findings**

370 The ONIRY system showed high diagnostic performance in detection of OASI versus
371 EAUS results as the reference method (per OASIS classification) in the study
372 population of women after vaginal delivery, enriched for the cases with OASI (40.1%,
373 61/152 of all women enrolled). As a result of Part II of the study, following the *in silico*
374 ML model re-training with the data generated in Part I of the study, an accuracy of
375 $87.0 \pm 0.5\%$, sensitivity of $90.6 \pm 2.0\%$, and specificity of $84.6\% \pm 1.9\%$ were
376 observed for ONIRY. After limiting the dataset (by 6.4%, 19/298) based on the
377 discrepancies in the consecutive impedance measurements, the next ML model, to

378 be utilised for the final ONIRY system, reached an accuracy of $90.0 \pm 0.4\%$, with a
379 sensitivity of $90.0 \pm 1.2\%$ and a specificity of $90.0 \pm 0.7\%$. This demonstrates the
380 diagnostic benefit of the ML support for analysis of electric impedance data for OASI
381 detection achieved thanks to re-training the ML model (models) with a relatively large
382 and well-balanced (OASI vs. no OASI) dataset. This is in contrast with the
383 intermediary moderate performance (accuracy of 61.2%) of the ML-assisted
384 impedance spectroscopy method observed in Part I of the study for the same setting
385 (same diagnostic reference method and study participants) but utilising the ML model
386 constructed solely with the data from the smaller (pilot), poorly balanced (OASI cases
387 underrepresented) previous clinical studies. The performance improvement of the
388 ultimate ML model constructed for the ONIRY system appears to be due to a higher
389 variability of raw impedance data collected in this clinical study compared with the
390 data from the previous (pilot) clinical studies with ONIRY as well as the dataset
391 balance (OASI cases highly represented).

392 The alternative performance metrics obtained when utilising the exploratory
393 reference methods (OASI evaluated by EAUS using Starck and Norderval scores,
394 including alternative ML models constructed) did not demonstrate apparent benefits
395 over the primary performance measure as presented above.

396 No safety concern has been identified with the use of the ONIRY system.

397

398 **Clinical Implications**

399 Currently, no rapid, easy-to-use, reliable diagnostic tool is available in maternity care
400 settings that could be used immediately or shortly (within hours) after a vaginal
401 delivery and operated by all personnel within the obstetric team. As demonstrated in
402 this study, the ONIRY system, providing a straightforward interpretation of the electric
403 impedance results in the anal canal, can detect OASI with high accuracy, at a level of
404 approximately 90% (compared with 3-D EAUS, per OASIS classification, utilised as
405 the reference method). With such metrics, this method has the potential to be
406 adopted as a method for detection of OASI effectively complementing the digital
407 rectal examination, especially where the 3-D EAUS is not or scarcely available for
408 such primary detection. Since a single measurement run of the ONIRY system
409 (including the automated analysis and presentation of the results) takes less than a
410 minute, it may have an acceptance potential for medical (obstetric) practice.

411 As found out by a Cochrane Library systematic review, EAUS performed immediately
412 after delivery, before any perineal repair, allows for an increase in OASI detection
413 and thus the primary sphincter repair rate. Also, EAUS completed prior to the
414 perineal repair may be associated with a reduced risk of developing severe FI²¹. This
415 observation indicates that obstetricians, frequently having no efficient tool for OASI
416 detection in their routine practice, may not be able to timely initiate the optimal
417 treatment. As evidenced in literature, training in perineal anatomy and detection of
418 pelvic floor injuries is still insufficient among obstetricians and midwives⁴⁵⁻⁴⁸.

419 What favours EAUS as the diagnostic method is the possibility to separately visualise
420 both external and internal anal sphincters. This allows for a targeted repair of the
421 external or both internal and external sphincter. Anyway, EAUS examination is not
422 sufficiently available, as a rule, in the obstetric settings. It is one of the main factors
423 contributing to the underdiagnosis of OASI (missing OASI). Even if the EAUS
424 advantages are undeniable, this procedure remains challenging from both
425 operational and economical standpoints, depending primarily on the availability of
426 experienced operators, as well as equipment. Therefore, there is an unmet need for
427 establishing an effective, non- or lowly invasive method for OASI detection for
428 maternity care facilities and midwife practices that have no reliable diagnostic tool in
429 place. Optimally, such a method should allow for its application as a screening test
430 with clearly defined criteria for extended diagnostics as required and available. In
431 case the impedance spectroscopy proves to perform in clinical practice, it might also
432 help guide the overall postpartum management of women in the maternity care
433 facilities and streamline early referrals to specialised surgery units.

434 With the ML implemented in the ONIRY system, the raw impedance data is
435 automatically interpreted, and the ultimate test result presented in a simple binary
436 (injured/non-injured or pass/refer) form. Such a feature of the ONIRY examination
437 would presumably enable its routine performance even by an operator with limited
438 experience.

439 No risks or safety concerns have been identified for the electric impedance-based
440 method for OASI detection, in particular with the use of the ONIRY system. From the
441 performance standpoint, the following contraindications for ONIRY examination could
442 be considered: any implants in the pelvic area, major malformations of the perianal
443 area, or coincident connection with any electronic medical or surgical equipment or
444 device generating alternating current above 1 kHz.

445

446 **Limitations and research implications**

447 There are several limitations of this study.

448 The study population was specifically selected, i.e., enriched with OASI cases (group
449 C, n=61). Such imbalance was deemed necessary to improve the internal balance of
450 the dataset as to increase the robustness of the ML model (models) constructed due
451 to expectedly higher internal data coherence. In fact, it is a common approach in the
452 development and training of artificial intelligence/ML tools, applicable not only in the
453 medical field but also beyond⁴⁹.

454 Moreover, the primary endpoint set was surrogate (OASI detection) and not
455 ultimately clinically meaningful (which could be the FI or a quality of life-based
456 endpoint). This surrogate endpoint was set to facilitate a comparison of the ONIRY
457 system with the 3-D EAUS as the gold diagnostic standard, feasible within a
458 relatively short time span. Establishing a clinically meaningful benefit for the ONIRY
459 system would require further long-term follow-up studies spanning rather years than
460 months or weeks considering the dynamics of FI development over time in women
461 with OASI. Such putative benefit of rapid detections of OASI would be, however,
462 highly dependent on the actual therapeutic measures that are feasible and actually
463 performed in the given obstetric settings. Of paramount importance will be the ability
464 to quickly perform the primary repair of the anal sphincter in women with OASI
465 detected, considering the narrow time window for such procedure, up to just 8 to 12
466 hours following delivery⁵⁰⁻⁵¹.

467 Furthermore, for the majority (52 out of 61) of participants in group C with the
468 sphincter primary repair made, such repair had been performed prior to enrolment in
469 the study. This may have altered the impedance spectroscopy readouts towards non-
470 injured (no OASI) cases. However, since the ML models, particularly the ultimate ML
471 model, were trained on such data, it can be speculated that the real-world
472 performance of the ONIRY system in the target population (i.e., prior to performing
473 the primary repair) would be even greater. This is because the biostructure and
474 geometry of the anal sphincter muscle injured and newly repaired (primary repair) is
475 basically closer to normal than for the muscle newly injured and unrepaired (not yet
476 repaired).

477 This high proportion of OASI cases with primary repair already made prior to ONIRY
478 (and 3-D EAUS) evaluations corresponds with the difference between the study

479 group characteristics for the time elapsed between the index delivery and ONIRY
480 examination (median time of 28 days in group C versus 2 and 11 days in groups A
481 and B, respectively). This imbalance reflects the enrolment difficulty the investigators
482 and study sites had with enriching the study population with participants with 3rd and
483 4th degree perineal tears (i.e., the study group C), and the long diagnostic and
484 therapeutic pathway currently being experienced by patients with OASI.

485 On the other hand, the inclusion of a considerable proportion of women with OASI
486 only after the primary repair in group C allows to address, as described in the
487 literature, clinical situations where under-classified OASIs remain unattended or
488 ineffectively attended, despite primary repair being performed (incomplete repair)^{52,53}.

489 Literature data shows that the primary repair itself is performed ineffectively in over
490 30% of cases, mainly due to limited experience of the operator but also to the
491 emergency nature of the repair procedure itself, usually performed during on-call
492 hours⁵⁴. It is therefore postulated that the classification of cases with the repair made
493 shortly prior to study enrolment to the 'injured' group is methodologically acceptable.

494 Finally, for multiparous women, no detailed data was captured (in particular, no
495 active diagnostics was performed) on potential undetected OASIs that would have
496 possibly occurred at previous delivery/deliveries. In such a case, theoretically, the
497 impedance parameters might appear normal (as the tissue had likely healed)
498 whereas EAUS might still show some abnormality. However, an alternative
499 diagnostic scenario might also be speculated for multiparas: an abnormal impedance
500 spectroscopy with normal EAUS, compatible with fibrosis following an old injury.

501

502 **5. Conclusions**

503

504 This study demonstrated that the ONIRY system utilising ML-assisted impedance
505 spectroscopy with a dedicated anal probe is a safe and effective method for rapid
506 detection of OASI in women having given vaginal delivery.

507

508 **Disclosure of interests**

509 K.B. is a founder and management board member at OASIS Diagnostics, an author
510 of the related patent and R&D strategy, independent consultant, and trainer of
511 Takeda.

512 M.M., M.R., K.K., and P.I. are staff of OASIS Diagnostics.

513 A.S. is an independent consultant of Ethicon, Takeda, Pfizer, Sofar.

514 M.UM. is an independent consultant of Regen Lab.

515 H.H., P.J., M.UM., E.D., and E.GD. received remuneration as a study investigator.

516 H.H., C.R., and A.S. are independent consultants and members of the OASIS

517 Diagnostics' Scientific Advisory Board.

518 Others declare no conflicts of interest.

519

520 **Author contributions**

521 Conceptualization: KB, MM, PI

522 Data curation: KB, MM, MR, KK, PI

523 Formal analysis: MM, MR, KK

524 Funding acquisition: KB, MM

525 Investigation: HH, PJ, MUM, ED, EGD

526 Methodology: KB, MM, MR, KK, PI

527 Project administration: KB, MM

528 Resources: HH, PJ, MUM, ED, EGD

529 Software: MM, MR, KK

530 Supervision: KB, MM, PI, CR, AS

531 Validation: MM, PI

532 Visualization: MR, KK

533 Writing - original draft: KB, MM, MR, KK, PI

534 Writing - review & editing: All co-authors

535

536 **Details of ethics approval**

537 The study was approved by the ethics committees respective for each study site: on

538 19 March 2021 by Ethics Committee of the Institute for Maternal and Child Care (no.

539 1/19.03.2021), on 27 April 2021 by Ethics Committee for Research with Medicines of

540 the Health Areas of León and Bierzo (no. 2186), on 9 June 2021 by Ethics

541 Committee of the University Hospital of Brno (no. 47/21Zdrav.), on 14 October 2021

542 by Ethics Committee at the Regional Medical Chamber in Warsaw (no. KB/1362/21)

543 and on 25 July 2022 by Ethics Committee at AGEL Hospital Košice-Šaca (no. ONIRY

544 3/2/2020).

545

546 **Funding**

547 The study was funded by the European Union as part of the Fast Track program,
548 conducted in Poland by the National Centre for Research and Development
549 (POIR.01.00.01-00-0726/18).

550

551 **References**

- 552 [1] Sideris M, McCaughey T, Hanrahan JG, Arroyo-Manzano D, Zamora J, Jha S et
553 al. Risk of obstetric anal sphincter injuries (OASIS) and anal incontinence: a
554 meta-analysis. *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive*
555 *Biology* 2020;252,303-312. Doi: 10.1016/j.ejogrb.2020.06.048
- 556 [2] Aigmueller T, Bader W, Beilecke K, Elenskaia K, Frudinger A, Hanzal E et al.
557 Management of 3rd and 4th degree perineal tears after vaginal birth. *German*
558 *Guideline of the German Society of Gynecology and Obstetrics (AWMF*
559 *Registry No. 015/079, October 2014). Geburtshilfe Frauenheilkd*
560 *2015;75(2):137-44. doi:10.1055/s-0034-1396323*
- 561 [3] Gurol-Urganci I, Cromwell DA, Edozien LC, Mahmood TA, Adams EJ,
562 Richmond DH et al. Third- and fourth-degree perineal tears among primiparous
563 women in England between 2000 and 2012: time trends and risk factors. *BJOG*
564 *2013;120(12):1516-25. doi: 10.1111/1471-0528.12363*
- 565 [4] Dudding TC, Vaizey CJ, Kamm MA. Obstetric anal sphincter injury: incidence,
566 risk factors, and management. *Ann Surg* 2008;247(2):224-37.
567 doi:10.1097/SLA.0b013e318142cdf4
- 568 [5] Sultan AH, Kamm MA, Bartram CI, Hudson CN. Anal sphincter trauma during
569 instrumental delivery. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 1993;43:263-70. doi:111/1471-
570 0528.12363
- 571 [6] Tejedor P, Plaza J, Bodega-Quiroga I, Ortega-López M, García-Olmo D, Pastor
572 C. The Role of Three-Dimensional Endoanal Ultrasound on Diagnosis and
573 Classification of Sphincter Defects After Childbirth. *J Surg Res.* 2019;244:382-
574 388. doi: 10.1016/j.jss.2019.06.080
- 575 [7] Tejedor P, Bodega-Quiroga I, Plaza J, Ortega López M, Gutierrez C, García
576 Olmo D et al. Quality of life and 3D-EUS assessment for anal incontinence after
577 childbirth. *Rev Esp Enferm Dig.* 2019;111(6):453-459. doi:
578 10.17235/reed.2019.6040/2018
- 579 [8] Samarasekera DN, Bekhit MT, Wright Y, Lowndes RH, Stanley KP, Preston JP
580 et al. Long-term anal continence and quality of life following postpartum anal

- 581 sphincter injury. *Colorectal Dis* 2008;10(8):793–9. doi: 10.1111/j.1463-
582 1318.2007.01445.x.
- 583 [9] Mous M, Muller SA, de Leeuw JW. Long-term effects of anal sphincter rupture
584 during vaginal delivery: faecal incontinence and sexual complaints. *BJOG*.
585 2008;115(2):234–8. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0528.2007.01502.
- 586 [10] Everist R, Burrell M, Mallitt KA, Parkin K, Patton V, Karantanis E Postpartum
587 anal incontinence in women with and without obstetric anal sphincter injuries.
588 *Int Urogynecol J*. 2020 Nov;31(11):2269-2275. doi: 10.1007/s00192-020-04267-
589 8. Epub 2020 Mar 10.
- 590 [11] Jangö H, Langhoff-Roos J, Rosthøj S, Sakse A Recurrent obstetric anal
591 sphincter injury and the risk of long-term anal incontinence *Am J Obstet*
592 *Gynecol*. 2017 Jun;216(6):610.e1-610.e8. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2017.02.010.
593 Epub 2017 Feb 13.
- 594 [12] Guzmán Rojas RA, Salvesen K Å, Volløyhaug I. Anal sphincter defects and
595 fecal incontinence 15–24 years after first delivery: a cross-sectional study.
596 *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol* 2018; 51(5): 677-683. doi: 10.1002/uog.18827
- 597 [13] Meyer I, Richter HE. Impact of fecal incontinence and its treatment on quality of
598 life in women. *Women's Health (London)*, 2015; 11(2): 225-238. doi:
599 10.2217/WHE.14.66
- 600 [14] Jangö H, Langhoff-Roos J, Rosthøj S, et al. Wexner score and quality of life in
601 women with obstetric anal sphincter injury. *International Urogynecology Journal*,
602 2020; 31(6): 1115-1121. doi: 10.1007/s00192-019-04134-1
- 603 [15] Zimmo K, Laine K, Vikanes Å, Fosse E, Zimmo M, Ali H et al. Diagnosis and
604 repair of perineal injuries: knowledge before and after expert training-a
605 multicentre observational study among Palestinian physicians and midwives.
606 *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(4):e014183. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014183.
- 607 [16] Andrews V, Thakar R, Sultan AH. Outcome of obstetric anal sphincter injuries
608 (OASIS)-role of structured management. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct*
609 2009;20(8):973-8. doi: 10.1007/s00192-009-0883-0.
- 610 [17] Ramage L, Yen C, Qiu S, Simillis C, Kontovounisios C, Tan E, Tekkis P. Does a
611 missed obstetric anal sphincter injury at time of delivery affect short-term
612 functional outcome? *Ann R Coll Surg Engl*. 2018;100(1):26–32.

- 613 [18] Turel FD, Langer S, Shek KL, Dietz HP. Medium- to Long-term Follow-up of
614 Obstetric Anal Sphincter Injury. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2019;62(3):348-356.
615 doi:10.1097/DCR.0000000000001297.
- 616 [19] Nilsson IE, Åkervall S, Molin M, Milsom I, Gyhagen M. Symptoms of fecal
617 incontinence two decades after no, one, or two obstetrical anal sphincter
618 injuries. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 2021;224(3), 276-e1.
- 619 [20] Albuquerque A. Endoanal ultrasonography in fecal incontinence: Current and
620 future perspectives. *World J Gastrointest Endosc* 2015;7(6):575-581. doi:
621 10.4253/wjge.v7.i6.575.
- 622 [21] Walsh KA and Grivell RM. Use of endoanal ultrasound for reducing the risk of
623 complications related to anal sphincter injury after vaginal birth. *Cochrane*
624 *Database of Systematic Reviews* 2015;(10):CD010826. doi:
625 10.1002/14651858.CD010826.pub2
- 626 [22] Dietz HP. Exoanal imaging of the anal sphincters; *J Ultrasound Med*;
627 2018;37(1):263-280. doi: 10.1002/jum.14246
- 628 [23] Sioutis D, Thakar R, Sultan AH. Overdiagnosis and rising rate of obstetric anal
629 sphincter injuries (OASIS): time for reappraisal. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*
630 2017;50:642-647. doi: 10.1002/uog.17306
- 631 [24] Thomas GP, Gould LE, Casunuran F, Kumar DA. A retrospective review of
632 1495 patients with obstetric anal sphincter injuries referred for assessment of
633 function and endoanal ultrasonography. *Int J Colorectal Dis.* 2017
634 Sep;32(9):1321-1325. doi: 10.1007/s00384-017-2851-3.
- 635 [25] Stuart A, Ignell C, Örnö AC. Comparison of transperineal and endoanal
636 ultrasound in detecting residual obstetric anal sphincter injury. *Acta Obstet*
637 *Gynecol Scand.* 2019;98(12):1624-1631. doi: 10.1111/aogs.13701.
- 638 [26] Ros C, Martínez-Franco E, Wozniak MM, Cassado J, Santoro GA, Elías N,
639 López M, Palacio M, Wiczorek AP, Espuña-Pons M. Postpartum two- and
640 three-dimensional ultrasound evaluation of anal sphincter complex in women
641 with obstetric anal sphincter injury. *Comparative Study Ultrasound Obstet*
642 *Gynecol.* 2017 Apr;49(4):508-514. doi: 10.1002/uog.15924.
- 643 [27] Ignell C, Örnö AK, Stuart A Correlations of obstetric anal sphincter injury
644 (OASIS) grade, specific symptoms of anal incontinence, and measurements by
645 endoanal and transperineal ultrasound. *J Ultrasound* 2021;24(3):261-267. doi:
646 10.1007/s40477-020-00485-4.

- 647 [28] Wong KW, Thakar R, Sultan AH, Andrews V. Can transperineal ultrasound
648 improve the diagnosis of obstetric anal sphincter injuries? *Int Urogynecol J.*
649 2022 Aug 2. doi: 10.1007/s00192-022-05290-7.
- 650 [29] Shiffman CA, Aaron R. Low-impedance localized measurements using standard
651 bioelectrical impedance analysis instruments. *Ann NY Acad Sci* 2000;904:214–
652 217. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.2000.tb06453.x
- 653 [30] Aaron R, Shiffman CA. Using localized impedance measurements to study
654 muscle changes in injury and disease. *Ann NY Acad Sci* 2000;904:171–180.
655 doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.2000.tb06443.x
- 656 [31] Seward B, Rutkove MD, Aaron R, Shiffman CA. Localized bioimpedance
657 analysis in the evaluation of neuromuscular disease. *Muscle Nerve*
658 2002;25:390–397. doi: 10.1002/mus.10048
- 659 [32] Młyńczak M, Cybulski G. Decomposition of the cardiac and respiratory
660 components from impedance pneumography signals. *Proc. of the 10th Int. Joint*
661 *Conf. on Biomedical Engineering Systems and Technologies – Biodevices*
662 2017;4:26-33. doi: 10.5220/0006107200260033
- 663 [33] Kushner RF, Schoeller DA. Estimation of total body water by bioelectrical
664 impedance analysis. *Am J Clin Nutr* 1986;44(3):417-424. doi:
665 10.1093/ajcn/44.3.417
- 666 [34] Tidy JA, Brown BH, Healey TJ, Daayana S, Martin M, Prendiville W et al.
667 Accuracy of detection of high-grade cervical intraepithelial neoplasia using
668 electrical impedance spectroscopy with colposcopy. *BJOG* 2013;120(4):400-10;
669 discussion 410-1. doi: 10.1111/1471-0528.12096
- 670 [35] Młyńczak M, Borycka-Kiciak K, Uchman-Musielak M, Dziki A. Impedance
671 Spectroscopy Method to Detect Pelvic Floor Muscle Damage - A Feasibility
672 Study. In: *World Congress on Medical Physics and Biomedical Engineering,*
673 *Springer, Singapore, 2018;875–878.* doi: 10.1007/978-981-10-9038-7_161.
- 674 [36] Borycka-Kiciak K, Młyńczak M, Kiciak A, Pietrzak P, Dziki A. Non-invasive
675 obstetric anal sphincter injury diagnostics using impedance spectroscopy.
676 *Scientific Reports* 2019;9(7097):1–9. doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-43637-1.
- 677 [37] Młyńczak M, Rosoł M, Spinelli A, Dziki A, Wlzlak E, Surkont G, et al. Obstetric
678 Anal Sphincter Injury Detection Using Impedance Spectroscopy with the ONIRY
679 Probe; *Appl Sci.*; 2021; 11: 637; doi: 10.3390/app11020637.

- 680 [38] Borycka K, Młyńczak M, Rosoł M, Iwanowski P, Uchman-Musielak M, Mik M,
681 Sudoł-Szopińska I, Herman H, Ratto C, Dziki A, Właźlak E, Surkont G, Krzycka
682 M, Pająk P, Spinelli A. Impedance spectroscopy for the diagnosis of obstetric
683 anal sphincter injuries: the pilot experience; In: 15 Congress of the European
684 Society of Gynecology, 2023.
- 685 [39] Cunningham FG, Leveno KJ, Bloom SL, Hauth J, Rouse D, Spong C. Williams
686 obstetrics (23rd Edition), 2011. New York: McGraw-Hill Medical.
- 687 [40] The Management of Third- and Fourth-Degree Perineal Tears: a Green-top
688 Guideline No 29; Royal College of Obstetrician and Gynaecologists, London;
689 2015
- 690 [41] Prevention and Management of Obstetric Lacerations at Vaginal Delivery.
691 ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 165: American College of Obstetricians and
692 Gynecologists' Committee on Practice Bulletins—Obstetrics. *Obstet Gynecol*
693 2016;128(1):e1-e15. doi: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000001523
- 694 [42] Starck M, Bohe, M, Valentin L. Results of endosonographic imaging of the anal
695 sphincter 2–7 days after primary repair of third or fourth-degree obstetric
696 sphincter tears. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol.* 2003;22:609–615. doi:
697 10.1002/uog.920
- 698 [43] Norderval S, Markskog A, Rossaak K, Vonen B. Correlation between anal
699 sphincter defects and anal incontinence following obstetric sphincter tears:
700 Assessment using scoring systems for sonographic classification of defects.
701 *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol* 2008;31: 78–84. doi: 10.1002/uog.5155
- 702 [44] Chicco D, Jurman G. The advantages of the Matthews correlation coefficient
703 (MCC) over F1 score and accuracy in binary classification evaluation. *BMC*
704 *genomics*, 2020;21, 1-13.
- 705 [45] De Meutter L, van Heesewijk AD, van der Woerd-Elting I, de Leeuw JW.
706 Implementation of a perineal support programme for reduction of the incidence
707 of obstetric anal sphincter injuries and the effect of non-compliance. *Eur J*
708 *Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol* 2018;230:119-123. doi:
709 10.1016/j.ejogrb.2018.09.021
- 710 [46] New joint initiative to prevent severe tearing during childbirth. Royal College of
711 Obstetricians & Gynaecologists, Royal College of Midwives: London; 2016.
712 ([https://www.rcog.org.uk/en/news/rcog-statement-new-joint-initiative-to-prevent-](https://www.rcog.org.uk/en/news/rcog-statement-new-joint-initiative-to-prevent-severe-tearing-during-childbirth/)
713 [severe-tearing-during-childbirth/](https://www.rcog.org.uk/en/news/rcog-statement-new-joint-initiative-to-prevent-severe-tearing-during-childbirth/)). (Accessed on 25th of January, 2022)

- 714 [47] NMPA Project Team: National Maternity and perinatal audit: Clinical report
 715 2017. In. Royal College of Obstetricians & Gynaecologists. London: NHS
 716 Ligation Authority 2017.
- 717 [48] Bidwell P, Thakar R, Sevdalis N, Silverton L, Novis V, Hellyer A et al. A multi-
 718 centre quality improvement project to reduce the incidence of obstetric anal
 719 sphincter injury (OASI): study protocol. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth 2018 Aug
 720 13;18(1):331. doi: 10.1186/s12884-018-1965-0
- 721 [49] Batista GEAPA, Prati RC, Monard MC. A study of the behavior of several
 722 methods for balancing machine learning training data. ACM SIGKDD
 723 Explorations Newsletter. 2004;6(1):20-29.
 724 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1145/1007730.1007735>
- 725 [50] Harvey MA, Pierce M, Walter JE, et al. Obstetrical Anal Sphincter Injuries
 726 (OASIS): Prevention, Recognition, and Repair. Journal of Obstetrics and
 727 Gynaecology Canada. 2015;37(12):1131-1148.
 728 doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1701-2163\(16\)30081-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1701-2163(16)30081-0)
- 729 [51] Kropshofer S, T Aigmüller, Beilecke K, et al. Management of Third and Fourth-
 730 Degree Perineal Tears After Vaginal Birth. Guideline of the DGGG, OEGGG
 731 and SGGG (S2k-Level, AWMF Registry No. 015/079, December 2020).
 732 Geburtshilfe Und Frauenheilkunde. 2022;83(02):165-183.
 733 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1055/a-1933-2647>,
- 734 [52] Roper JC, Thakar R, Sultan AH. Under-classified obstetric anal sphincter
 735 injuries. Int Urogynecol J. 2022 Jun;33(6):1473-1479. doi: 10.1007/s00192-021-
 736 05051-y. Epub 2022 Feb 12
- 737 [53] O'Leary BD, Kelly L, Fitzpatrick M, Keane DP.. Underdiagnosis of internal anal
 738 sphincter trauma following vaginal delivery. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2023
 739 Feb;61(2):251-256. doi: 10.1002/uog.26049
- 740 [54] Kirss J, Pinta T, Böckelman C, Victorzon M. Factors predicting a failed primary
 741 repair of obstetric anal sphincter injury. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2016
 742 Sep;95(9):1063-9. doi: 10.1111/aogs.12909. Epub 2016 May 18.

743
 744

Table 1. Characteristics of the study population.

	Group A	Group B	Group C	Total
	(N=30)	(N=61)	(N=61)	(N=152)
Age (years)				

Mean ± SD	31.3 ± 5.4	31.9 ± 4.3	30.7 ± 4.6	31.3 ± 4.6
Range (Min/Max)	22 (18/40)	18 (21/39)	20 (22/42)	24 (18/42)
Age categorised (n, %)				
<26 years	5 (16.7)	4 (6.6)	7 (11.5)	16 (10.5)
26<35 years	15 (50.0)	38 (62.3)	41 (67.2)	94 (61.8)
≥35 years	10 (33.3)	19 (31.2)	13 (21.3)	42 (27.6)
Race (n, %)				
Asian	0 (0.0)	1 (1.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.7)
Caucasian	30 (100.0)	60 (98.4)	61 (100.0)	151 (99.3)
Weight (kg)				
Mean ± SD	73.3 ± 12.5	70.9 ± 11.4	68.1 ± 9.6	70.2 ± 11.0
Range (Min/Max)	42 (54/96)	56 (49/105)	60 (48/108)	60 (48/108)
BMI (kg/m²)				
Mean ± SD	25.8 ± 4.2	25.3 ± 3.3	24.3 ± 3.4	25.0 ± 3.6
Range (Min/Max)	16.2 (18.8/35.0)	18.9 (17.4/36.3)	15.6 (17.7/33.3)	18.9 (17.4/36.3)
Number of pregnancies (including the index one) (n)				
Median	2	1	1	1
Range (Min/Max)	5 (1/6)	3 (1/4)	3 (1/4)	5 (1/6)
Primipara/Multipara	7/23	42/19	46/15	95/57
Risk factors for Obstetric Anal Sphincter Injury from the index delivery (n, %)				
Prolonged second phase of delivery	0 (0.0)	6 (9.8)	10 (16.4)	16 (10.5)
Foetal shoulder dystocia	0 (0.0)	1 (1.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.7)
Birth weight of the neonate >4kg	4 (13.3)	5 (8.2)	6 (9.8)	15 (9.9)
Induction of delivery with oxytocin	1 (3.3)	14 (23.0)	9 (14.8)	24 (15.8)
Head circumference of the neonate ≥34 cm	17 (56.7)	39 (63.9)	49 (80.3)	105 (69.1)
Time between the index delivery and ONIRY examination (days)				
Median	2	11	28	14
Range (Min/Max)	53 (1/54)	58 (0/58)	55 (1/56)	58 (0/58)
Time between the index delivery and EAUS examination (days)				
Median	2	11	28	14
Range (Min/Max)	53 (1/54)	58 (0/58)	55 (1/56)	58 (0/58)

745 BMI=Body Mass Index; N=number of participants in the population specified; SD = Standard Deviation

746 Percentages are calculated based on the numbers of participants with nonmissing values.

747

748 Table 2. Mean performance metrics of the ONIRY system using the models trained
749 on data from Part I of the study, in the assessment relative to 3-D Endoanal
750 Ultrasound and OASIS classification.

	Accuracy [%]	Sensitivity [%]	Specificity [%]	F1	MCC
Mean ± SD	87.0 ± 0.5	90.6 ± 2.0	84.6 ± 1.9	0.85 ± 0.004	0.75 ± 0.01

751 MCC = Matthew's Correlation Coefficient; SD = Standard Deviation

752

753 Table 3. Mean performance metrics of the ONIRY system using the Machine
754 Learning model trained based on the limited clinical study dataset in the assessment
755 relative to 3-D Endoanal Ultrasound and OASIS classification.


	Accuracy [%]	Sensitivity [%]	Specificity [%]	F1	MCC
Mean ± SD	90.0 ± 0.4	90.0 ± 1.2	90.0 ± 0.7	0.88 ± 0.01	0.80 ± 0.01

756 MCC = Matthew's Correlation Coefficient; SD = Standard Deviation



757

758 Figure 1. ONIRY Probe with the marker location.



759

760 Figure 2. The participant's position during the ONIRY examination (a) along with
761 position of the probe marker (b).

762