

1 **Obstetric anal sphincter injuries detection by digital rectal examination and**  
2 **impedance spectroscopy: post-hoc analysis of the results from a prospective,**  
3 **comparative, multicentre clinical study**

4

5 Stefano Salvatore<sup>1</sup>, Katarzyna Borycka<sup>2,3</sup>, Alessandro Ruffolo<sup>1,4</sup>, Marcel Młyńczak<sup>2,5</sup>,  
6 Maciej Rosol<sup>2,5</sup>, Kacper Korzeniewski<sup>2,5</sup>, Piotr Iwanowski<sup>2</sup>, Antonino Spinelli<sup>6,7</sup>, Renaud de  
7 Tayrac<sup>8</sup>, Carlo Ratto<sup>9</sup>, Stavros Athanasiou<sup>10</sup>, Diaa Essameldin Ali Rizk<sup>11</sup>, Andrea Stuart<sup>12</sup>,  
8 Jan Baekelandt<sup>13</sup>, Hynek Heřman<sup>14,15</sup>, Petr Janku<sup>16,17</sup>, Peter Rosenblat<sup>18</sup>, Rita Franco<sup>19</sup>,  
9 Mariusz Grzesiak<sup>20</sup>, Adam Dzikowski<sup>21</sup>, Ruwan Fernando<sup>22</sup>

10

11 1 Obstetrics and Gynecology Unit, Vita-Salute San Raffaele University Milan, Italy IRCCS San Raffaele  
12 Scientific Institute, Milan, Italy  
13 2 OASIS Diagnostics, R&D of Medical Technology, Warsaw, Poland  
14 3 Centre of Postgraduate Medical Education, Warsaw, Poland  
15 4 Department of Gynecology, Jeanne de Flandre University Hospital, Lille, France  
16 5 Warsaw University of Technology, Faculty of Mechatronics, Institute of Metrology and Biomedical  
17 Engineering, Warsaw, Poland  
18 6 Department of Biomedical Sciences, Humanitas University, Via Rita Levi Montalcini 4, 20072 Pieve  
19 Emanuele, Milan, Italy  
20 7 IRCCS Humanitas Research Hospital, via Manzoni 56, 20089 Rozzano, Milan, Italy  
21 8 Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Nimes University Hospital, Montpellier University, Nîmes,  
22 France  
23 9 Proctology and Pelvic Floor Surgery Unit, Isola Tiberina Hospital, Gemelli Isola, Catholic University, Rome,  
24 Italy  
25 10 Urogynecology Unit, Alexandra Hospital, Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece  
26 11 Clinical Research Centre, Arabian Gulf University, Bahrain  
27 12 Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Helsingborg Central Hospital, Helsingborg, Sweden  
28 13 Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Imelda Hospital, Bonheiden, Belgium  
29 14 3rd Medical Faculty, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic  
30 15 Institute for the Care of Mother and Child, Prague, Czech Republic  
31 16 Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University Hospital Brno and Medical Faculty, Masaryk  
32 University, Brno, Czech Republic  
33 17 Department of Health Sciences, □Medical Faculty, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic  
34 18 Division of Urogynecology and Reconstructive Pelvic Surgery, Cambridge Department of Obstetrics and  
35 Gynecology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA  
36 19 Division of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Isola Tiberina Hospital, Gemelli Isola, Catholic University, Rome,  
37 Italy  
38 20 Institute of Polish Mother's Health Centre, Łódź, Poland  
39 21 Department of General and Colorectal Surgery, Medical University of Lodz, Poland  
40 22 Department of Urogynaecology, St Mary's Hospital, Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, London, UK  
41

42 **Short Title**

## 43 Finger versus impedance spectroscopy in OASI detection

44 **Abstract**

45 **Objective:** To evaluate the clinical performance of digital rectal examination (DRE) and  
46 machine learning-assisted impedance spectroscopy (ONIRY) for detecting obstetric anal  
47 sphincter injuries (OASI) compared to three-dimensional endoanal ultrasound (EAUS).

48 **Design:** A post-hoc analysis of data from a prospective, comparative, multicentre,  
49 international study (NCT04903977).

50 **Setting:** Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Spain.

51 **Population:** 152 vaginally delivered women to 8 weeks post-partum.

52 **Methods:** Participants were divided into two groups based on EAUS results: Group I (no  
53 OASI, including 1st and 2nd degree perineal tears per OASIS classification) and Group II  
54 (OASI, including 3rd and 4th-degree tears per OASIS classification). DRE and impedance  
55 measurements using the ONIRY system were performed. The machine learning (ML)  
56 model for ONIRY was trained and validated. The diagnostic outcomes of ONIRY and DRE  
57 were compared to EAUS.

58 **Main Outcome Measures:** Accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity.

59 **Results:** DRE's performance versus EAUS was 67.8% for accuracy, 44.3% for sensitivity,  
60 and 83.5% for specificity. After completion of ML model training, impedance spectroscopy's  
61 accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity were 87.0%, 90.6%, and 84.6%, respectively,  
62 compared with EAUS.

63 **Conclusion:** DRE is insufficient for OASI detection. The ML-assisted impedance  
64 spectroscopy demonstrated higher accuracy and could facilitate rapid OASI detection post-  
65 delivery.

66 **Funding:** The study was financed by the European Union's Fast Track program through  
67 the Polish National Centre for Research and Development (POIR.01.01.01-00-0726/18)

68 **Keywords:** Obstetric anal sphincter injury (OASI), anal sphincter, perineal tear, faecal

69 incontinence, rapid diagnostics, impedance spectroscopy, machine learning, endoanal  
70 ultrasound

71

## 72 **Introduction**

73 Obstetric anal sphincter injuries (OASIs) present a significant diagnostic challenge within  
74 maternal care [1-10]. The dynamic nature of childbirth, combined with the need to  
75 simultaneously care for both mother and infant and the variable experience of obstetric  
76 staff at delivery rooms, complicates the accurate diagnosis of OASIs. Reported incidences  
77 of OASIs vary, with typical clinical settings reporting rates between 0.1% and 6% [3-5],  
78 while a recent meta-analysis involving over 4,000 women in more than 30 studies suggests  
79 a higher prevalence of approximately 26% [11]. Current clinical guidelines [12-24]  
80 recommend that primary repair of these injuries should ideally be performed within 8-12  
81 hours post-delivery to maximize therapeutic outcomes.

82 Although endoanal ultrasonography (EAUS) is considered the gold standard for detecting  
83 these injuries, due to its high accuracy in skilled hands, it is not widely available in all  
84 healthcare settings. In contrast, digital rectal examination (DRE) is widely used due to its  
85 immediate availability in maternity wards. However, the efficacy of DRE is compromised by  
86 its subjective nature, heavily reliant on the examiner's expertise and experience [2 8, 9,  
87 10]. Guidelines emphasise the proper conduct of the DRE [12, 14, 16, 19, 24], instructing  
88 exactly how to perform it and strongly stressing the value of training and expertise in  
89 OASIs to mitigate variability in diagnostic accuracy [14, 20, 22, 19, 24]. The literature  
90 reports significant rates of underdiagnosis of internal anal sphincter injuries when relying  
91 solely on DRE [25] and challenges in identifying residual injuries post-repair [26]. Given  
92 that up to 80% of OASIs remain undetected [27], this underdiagnosis highlights the need  
93 for more effective diagnostic tools.

94 To address this gap, the ONIRY system, a machine learning-assisted (ML) impedance  
95 spectroscopy tool, has been developed. This system offers a rapid and minimally invasive  
96 complement to palpation diagnosis that could potentially enhance the detection of OASIs  
97 directly within labour wards. The performance and safety of the ONIRY device have been  
98 investigated in several early studies [28-31], as well as a prospective, multicentre pivotal  
99 study using EAUS as a reference. The paper presents a post-hoc analysis of this pivotal  
100 study comparing the clinical performance of the traditional DRE and the ONIRY method in  
101 detecting OASIs, using EAUS as the reference standard. Our analysis aims to evaluate  
102 whether ONIRY can offer a significant improvement over DRE in routine obstetric practice.

103

## 104 **Materials and Methods**

### 105 **Study design and population**

106 This work analyses data from a prospective, comparative, multicentre, international study  
107 registered on ClinicalTrials.gov under NCT04903977. The study was designed to validate  
108 the clinical performance and safety of the ONIRY device, an impedance spectroscopy tool,  
109 for detecting OASIs when compared with DRE, considering EAUS as the reference  
110 diagnostic method. This study followed the clinical phase of the trial with modelling and  
111 analysis using ML techniques.

112 In the clinical phase, 152 women within eight weeks postpartum were enrolled in five  
113 European centres from May 2021 to December 2022. Eligible participants included both  
114 primiparous and multiparous women aged 18 to 49 who had undergone vaginal delivery  
115 (spontaneous or assisted) of a live, singleton foetus at a gestational age of 34 weeks or  
116 greater. Exclusion criteria included uncontrolled acute or chronic diseases (excluding  
117 stable hemorrhoidal disease), faecal incontinence (FI) symptoms from causes other than  
118 OASI, history of perineal or anal surgery, exacerbations of inflammatory bowel disease,

119 and the presence of cardiac devices or arrhythmias.

120 In the first study visit, participants underwent an EAUS examination to classify perineal  
121 tears based on the OASIS classification [20, 21]. They were then categorized into two  
122 groups: Group I included women with either no perineal tear or first- or second-degree  
123 tears (no OASI detected), and Group II comprised those with third- or fourth-degree tears  
124 (OASI detected). Following this classification, each subject was assessed using DRE and  
125 the impedance test with the ONIRY system.

126 No blinding of the study was deemed feasible. However, it was not considered as required  
127 for securing objectivity of the study outcomes as the preliminary interpretation of the  
128 impedance measurement displayed by the ONIRY system immediately after the  
129 impedance measurement was independent of the test operator and thus not impacted by  
130 the EAUS result knowledge at study entry. Furthermore, to minimize any bias related to the  
131 EAUS evaluation as the primary reference method, a specific technical control measure  
132 was in place that allowed for the performance of the ONIRY examination only after the  
133 EAUS result and interpretation were fixed.

134 Machine learning-assisted impedance spectroscopy was evaluated using the collected  
135 impedance data with EAUS as a reference across 10 iterations of 10-fold cross-validation.  
136 In each iteration, every patient was compared with the reference only once.

### 137 **ONIRY System Description**

138 The ONIRY system consists of an impedance spectrometer and an endoanal probe, which  
139 performs measurements in the supine gynaecological patient's position in approximately  
140 one minute. It analyses the electrical impedance of perineal tissues under current  
141 excitation, using an ML model for parameters deep analysis and assessment. The system  
142 outputs a "PASS" for no OASI detection or "REFER" for suspected OASI, also indicating  
143 the probable position of the injury.

## 144 **Diagnostic Outcome and Statistical Analysis**

145 The diagnostic accuracy of the ONIRY system and DRE, using the EAUS as a reference  
146 method, was evaluated for each participant. Success (True Positive or True Negative) and  
147 Failure (False Positive or False Negative) rates were analysed to assess the performance  
148 (accuracy, specificity, sensitivity) of each diagnostic approach.

149 The study adhered to the ISO 14155:2020 guidelines for clinical practice in medical device  
150 trials and the Declaration of Helsinki. Informed consent was obtained from each participant  
151 prior to enrolment.

152

## 153 **Results**

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

156

157 The performance of DRE in identifying OASIs was assessed. The findings indicated an  
158 accuracy of 67.8%, reflecting the proportion of total diagnoses (both positive and negative)  
159 that were correctly identified. Sensitivity, which measured the ability of DRE to correctly  
160 identify those with the OASI presence (true positive rate), was relatively low at 44.3%. On  
161 the other hand, specificity, measuring the ability to correctly identify those without the  
162 condition (true negative rate), was higher at 83.5%.

163 The machine learning-assisted impedance spectroscopy was evaluated by comparing the  
164 trained ML models' output with EAUS results. The system achieved an accuracy of 87.0%  
165  $\pm$  0.5%, which represents a significant enhancement in the overall ability to diagnose  
166 OASIs correctly. The sensitivity of the ONIRY system was 90.6%  $\pm$  2.0%, indicating its  
167 strong capability to identify true positive cases of OASIs effectively. Specificity was robust

168 at 84.6%  $\pm$  1.9%, suggesting that the ONIRY system maintains a high level of accuracy in  
169 confirming the absence of injuries, similar to DRE.

170 Table 2 gathers the ONIRY performance metrics for each iteration of 10-fold cross-  
171 validation and the overall statistics.

172

173 The accuracy of the two compared methods in detecting OASI in each OASIS classification  
174 grades 3a, 3b, 3c, and 4 is shown in Table 3.

175

176 The comparison of receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves for ONIRY and DRE,  
177 along with their respective area under the curve (AUC) values, is presented in Figure 1.

178

## 179 **Discussion**

180 The findings of this study highlight the diagnostic superiority of the ONIRY method over  
181 traditional DRE in detecting OASIs. While DRE demonstrated limited sensitivity (44.3%),  
182 failing to detect a significant number of true OASI cases, the ONIRY system achieved  
183 significantly higher parameters of sensitivity (90.6%) and accuracy (87.0%).

184 The DRE was more effective in confirming the absence of injury than detecting its  
185 presence. It had the poorest accuracy in assessing the extent of external sphincter injury  
186 (24% and 53.8% in OASIS grades 3a and 3b, respectively). This is what is most  
187 challenging for clinicians in obstetric practice: differentiating between perineal injury grade  
188 2, which can be addressed by a midwife, and perineal injury grade 3, when the external  
189 sphincter is injured and an obstetrician (or colorectal surgeon) with expertise in OASIs is  
190 required for repair.



191 This superiority showed by the ONIRY method can be crucial given the potential  
192 consequences of undiagnosed or misclassified and improperly repaired OASI, which can  
193 lead to severe conditions, including anal incontinence and a significantly impaired quality of  
194 life.

195 Undiagnosed OASIs significantly worsen outcomes. For instance, women with  
196 symptomatic, missed OASIs exhibit worse anal and urinary incontinence symptoms and  
197 require additional colorectal consultations compared to OASIs that are timely diagnosed  
198 and repaired, as demonstrated by Taithongchai et al. ([32]). Moreover, improperly  
199 classified injuries at the time of delivery often result in inadequate repairs, leaving a  
200 persistent sphincter defect, which Roper et al. have found to be associated with higher  
201 rates of incontinence [33]. This highlights the need for accurate diagnosis and repair,  
202 particularly in cases of down-staged OASI.

203 Recent meta-analyses by Okeahialam et al. [34, 35] have indicated an overall incidence of  
204 anal incontinence following OASI of 18.1%, with the incidence varying by the grade of  
205 perineal tear: 15.6% for 3a, 18.3% for 3b, 20.6% for 3c, and 28.4% for 4th-degree tears.  
206 This data highlights the necessity of accurate diagnosis and appropriate repair, particularly  
207 for the most frequent OASI group, the 3a tears, which show the best clinical outcomes  
208 when adequately managed.

209 Furthermore, Andrews et al. [36] demonstrated that primary repair outcomes are good, with  
210 only 10% of patients showing defects on ultrasound in early postoperative observation and  
211 no significant deterioration in symptoms of faecal urgency, incontinence, or quality of life  
212 one year after delivery. These results are supported by the observation of Norderval et al.  
213 [37], who reported a low rate of faecal incontinence (7%, with an additive 24% rate of mild  
214 gas incontinence symptoms) after an anatomically correct primary repair. In contrast, as  
215 demonstrated by Ramage et al. [38], patients with missed OASI had significantly worse

216 outcomes in terms of faecal incontinence, as well as poorer overall physical functioning. In  
217 such initially unrecognized OASI cases, delayed sphincteroplasty becomes necessary due  
218 to increased faecal incontinence symptoms. Unfortunately, the results of late treatment are  
219 no longer as encouraging as the ones of primary repair. After delayed sphincteroplasty,  
220 only 40% of patients retain continence [39], and the effect deteriorates with time. In the 10-  
221 year follow-up after sphincteroplasty by Zutshi et al., no patients were fully continent [40].

222 The economic analysis by Tan et al. provides insight into the cost-effectiveness of primary  
223 versus delayed sphincter repair. They found that primary repair not only offers a higher  
224 quality of life but also is more cost-effective over a 10-year period [41]. This is a further  
225 argument for considering the widespread implementation of effective early diagnosis to  
226 enable primary sphincter repair to be carried out within the optimal 24-hour therapeutic  
227 window. The ONIRY system's independence from the operator skill and its rapid  
228 application could improve OASI detection, particularly in labour settings where advanced  
229 imaging technologies (like EAUS) are unavailable, which would be especially appreciated  
230 in the “critical window,” where the timely and accurate diagnosis is paramount.

231 The early detection of OASI is critical not only for initiating appropriate repair but also for  
232 managing potential postpartum complications, including wound breakdown, infection, and  
233 more severe outcomes like necrotizing fasciitis [7]. Early diagnosis could lead to better  
234 management of these risks through targeted care and appropriate use of prophylactic  
235 antibiotics.

236 This study is distinctive in its use of a machine learning model within the ONIRY system,  
237 marking a significant advancement in the field of obstetric diagnostics. The ability of  
238 machine learning to accurately detect anatomical changes in impedance values shows  
239 significant promise for enhancing clinical settings, marking a major advancement in the  
240 management and treatment of OASI.

241 Driven by the study findings, it seems that the decision to perform the ONIRY test should  
242 be made at the time of DRE. As DRE is an integral part of the physical examination and  
243 every postpartum woman should be examined by palpation, ONIRY testing would be  
244 particularly beneficial in cases where, after performing a DRE, the examiner cannot  
245 exclude the presence of OASI. The indication for diagnosis with ONIRY would then be all  
246 cases of 'uncertain' DRE diagnoses (when confirming the absence of injury is impossible).  
247 With this approach, ONIRY would perfectly complement the current standard of practice,  
248 bridging the gap between DRE and specialised, elective diagnostics such as enodanal  
249 ultrasound.

## 250 **Limitations and Future Directions**

251 Despite these promising results, the study's limitations must be acknowledged. The  
252 potential alteration of impedance parameters due to a prior primary repair, in a few cases,  
253 may affect the ONIRY system accuracy, a factor that necessitates further investigation.  
254 Future studies should aim to confirm these findings in broader clinical settings and evaluate  
255 the impact displayed by the ONIRY system on long-term postpartum outcomes, including  
256 the reduction of complication rates and improvement in the quality of life.

257 Moreover, the potential for operator bias in DRE performance, given that operators were  
258 possibly more experienced than average, was not controlled in this study. This factor could  
259 artificially enhance the perceived performance of DRE.

260

## 261 **Conclusion**

262 The performance of DRE in detecting OASI is insufficient. ML-assisted impedance  
263 spectroscopy appeared to be a more precise method for rapid detection of OASIs  
264 immediately post-delivery. With its higher accuracy and simple application, it holds the

265 promise of becoming an essential tool in obstetric care, potentially reducing the incidence  
266 of long-term complications associated with OASI.

267

## 268 **Acknowledgments**

269 The authors would like to thank all the other investigators and co-investigators involved in  
270 the clinical trial from centres in the Czech Republic (Brno and Prague), Slovakia (Kosice),  
271 Poland (Warsaw), and Spain (Leon) for their invaluable contributions to patient recruitment,  
272 the clinical trials conduct, and the help they provided in developing the results.

273

## 274 **Disclosure of interests**

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

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

278 A.S. is an independent Ethicon, Takeda, Pfizer, and Sofar consultant.

279 H.H. and P.J. received remuneration as study investigators.

280 S.S., R.DT., A.S., H.H., C.R., S.A., DE.A.R., A.St., J.B., R.Fr., M.G., A.D., and R.F. are  
281 independent consultants and OASIS Diagnostics' Scientific Advisory Board members.

282

## 283 **Contribution to Authorship**

284 Conceptualization: S.S., R.F. K.B., M.M., P.I.

285 Data curation: S.S., M.M., M.R., K.K., P.I.

286 Formal analysis: M.M., M.R., K.K.

287 Funding acquisition: K.B., M.M.

288 Investigation: H.H., P.J.

289 Methodology: S.S., R.DT., A.S., H.H., C.R., S.A., DE.A.R., A.St., J.B., R.Fr., M.G., A.D.,  
290 and R.F.

291 Project administration: K.B., M.M.

292 Resources: H.H., P.J.

293 Software: M.R., K.K.

294 Supervision: R.DT., A.S., H.H., C.R., S.A., DE.A.R., A.St., J.B., R.Fr., M.G., A.D., and R.F.

295 Validation: M.M., P.I.

296 Visualization: M.R., K.K.

297 Writing - original draft: S.S., K.B., A.R., A.S. M.M., M.R., K.K.

298

## 299 **Details of Ethics Approval**

300 The study received approval from the ethics committees of the respective study sites on  
301 the following dates: 19 March 2021 by the Ethics Committee of the Institute for Maternal  
302 and Child Care (approval no. 1/19.03.2021), 27 April 2021 by the Ethics Committee for  
303 Research with Medicines of the Health Areas of León and Bierzo (approval no. 2186), 9  
304 June 2021 by the Ethics Committee of the University Hospital of Brno (approval no.  
305 47/21Zdrav.), 14 October 2021 by the Ethics Committee at the Regional Medical Chamber  
306 in Warsaw (approval no. KB/1362/21), and 25 July 2022 by the Ethics Committee at AGEL  
307 Hospital Košice-Šaca (approval no. ONIRY 3/2/2020).

## 308 **Funding**

309 The study was financed by the European Union as part of the Fast Track program,

310 conducted in Poland by the Polish National Centre for Research and Development  
311 (POIR.01.01.01-00-0726/18).

312

### 313 **References**

- 314 1. Sultan AH, Kamm MA, Hudson CN, Thomas JM, Bartram CI. Anal sphincter  
315 disruption during vaginal delivery. *N Engl J Med* 1993; 329:1905-11.
- 316 2. Groom KM, Paterson-Brown S. Can we improve on the diagnosis of third degree  
317 tears? *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol* 2002;101:19-21.
- 318 3. Thiagamoorthy G, Johnson A, Thakar R, Sultan AH. A national survey of perineal  
319 trauma and its subsequent management in the United Kingdom. *Int Urogynecol J*  
320 2014;25:1621-7.
- 321 4. Gurol-Urganci I, Cromwell DA, Edozien LC, et al. Third- and fourth-degree perineal  
322 tears among primiparous women in England between 2000 and 2012: time trends  
323 and risk factors. *BJOG* 2013;120:1516-25
- 324 5. Baghestan E, Irgens LM, Bordahl PE, Rasmussen S. Trends in risk factors for  
325 obstetric anal sphincter injuries in Norway. *Obstet Gynecol* 2010;116:25-34.
- 326 6. Zetterström J, López A, Anzén B, Norman M, Holmström B, Mellgren A. Anal  
327 sphincter tears at vaginal delivery: risk factors and clinical outcome of primary  
328 repair. *Obstet Gynecol*. 1999 Jul;94(1):21-8. PMID: 10389712.
- 329 7. Lewicky-Gaupp C, Leader-Cramer A, Johnson LL, Kenton K, Gossett DR. Wound  
330 complications after obstetric anal sphincter injuries. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2015  
331 May;125(5):1088-1093. doi: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000000833. PMID: 25932836.
- 332 8. Andrews V, Sultan AH, Thakar R, Jones PW. Occult anal sphincter injuries--myth or  
333 reality? *BJOG*. 2006;113:195-200.
- 334 9. Serati M, Ruffolo AF, Scancarello C, Braga A, Salvatore S, Ghezzi F. When does

- 335 oasis cause de novo pelvic floor dysfunction? role of the surgeon's skills. Int  
336 Urogynecol J. 2023 Feb;34(2):493-498. doi: 10.1007/s00192-022-05205-6. Epub  
337 2022 Apr 25. PMID: 35467138; PMCID: PMC9036836.
- 338 10. Zimmo K, Laine K, Vikanes A, Foss E, Zimmo M, Ali H, et al. Diagnosis and repair  
339 of perineal injuries: knowledge before and after expert training multicentre  
340 observational study among Palestinian physicians and midwives. BMJ Open  
341 2017;7(4):e014183, 2017.
- 342 11. Sideris, M., McCaughey T, Hanrahan JG, Arroyo-Manzano D, Zamora J, Jha S,  
343 Knowles CH, Thakar R, Chaliha C, Thangaratinam S. Risk of obstetric anal  
344 sphincter injuries (OASIS) and anal incontinence: a meta-analysis. (2020).  
345 European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology, 252, 303-  
346 312.
- 347 12. Department for Health and Wellbeing. South Australian Perinatal Practice Guideline  
348 - Third and fourth degree tear management 2018. Available from:  
349 [www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/1faf87004eedec4db635b76a7ac0d6e4/T  
350 hird+and+Fourth+Degree+Tear+Management\\_PPG\\_v5\\_1.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&a  
351 mp;CACHEID=ROOTWORKSPACE-1faf87004eedec4db635b76a7ac0d6e4-oc-  
352 RC8a](http://www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/1faf87004eedec4db635b76a7ac0d6e4/T hird+and+Fourth+Degree+Tear+Management_PPG_v5_1.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&am p;CACHEID=ROOTWORKSPACE-1faf87004eedec4db635b76a7ac0d6e4-oc- RC8a)
- 353 13. Queensland Clinical Guidelines. Queensland clinical guidelines: Perineal Care  
354 2023. Available from:  
355 [https://www.health.qld.gov.au/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0022/142384/g-pericare.pdf](https://www.health.qld.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0022/142384/g-pericare.pdf)
- 356 14. Harvey MA, Pierce M, Alter JE, Chou Q, Diamond P, Epp A, et al. Obstetrical Anal  
357 Sphincter Injuries (OASIS): Prevention, Recognition, and Repair. J Obstet Gynaecol  
358 Can. 2015;37(12):1131-48.
- 359 15. Danish Association of Obstetrics and Gynaecology. Guideline for obstetric anal  
360 sphincter injury (OASIS) 2019. Available from: <https://nfog.org/wp->

- 361 <content/uploads/2019/03/190313-obstetric-anal-sphincter-injury.pdf>
- 362 16. Kropshofer A, Aigmüller T, Beilecke K, et al. Management of Third and Fourth-  
363 Degree Perineal Tears After Vaginal Birth. Guideline of the DGGG, OEGGG, and  
364 SGGG (S2k-Level, AWMF Registry No. 015/079, December 2020). Geburtshilfe  
365 Frauenheilkd. 2022 Dec 7;83(2):165-183. doi: 10.1055/a-1933-2647.
- 366 17. Royal College of Physicians of Ireland. Institute of obstetricians and gynaecologists  
367 and, directorate of clinical strategy and programmes, health service executive.  
368 Management of obstetric anal sphincter injuries (2012).
- 369 18. Ministry of Health Mexico. Prevención, diagnóstico y tratamiento de episiotomía  
370 complicada. 2015. Available from: [https://www.cenetec-difusion.com/CMGPC/IMSS-](https://www.cenetec-difusion.com/CMGPC/IMSS-608-13/ER.pdf)  
371 [608-13/ER.pdf](https://www.cenetec-difusion.com/CMGPC/IMSS-608-13/ER.pdf)
- 372 19. Netherlands Society of Obstetrics and Gynaecology. Total rupture during childbirth  
373 2013-2024.
- 374 20. Royal College of Obstetrics and Gynaecology. Management of third and fourth  
375 degree perineal tears. Greentop guideline number 29 2015. Available from:  
376 <https://www.rcog.org.uk/media/5jeb5hzu/gtg-29.pdf>
- 377 21. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Practice bulletin no. 198  
378 Prevention and Management of Obstetric Lacerations at vaginal delivery. Obstet  
379 Gynecol. 2018;132:e87–102 . <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30134424/>
- 380 22. Ducarme G, Pizzoferrato AC, de Tayrac R, Schantz C, Thubert T, Le Ray C,  
381 Riethmuller D, Verspyck E, Gachon B, Pierre F, Artzner F, Jacquetin B, Fritel X.  
382 Perineal prevention and protection in obstetrics: CNGOF clinical practice guidelines.  
383 J Gynecol Obstet Hum Reprod. 2019 Sep;48(7):455-460. doi:  
384 10.1016/j.jogoh.2018.12.002. Epub 2018 Dec 12.
- 385 23. Marty N, Verspyck E. Perineal tears and episiotomy: Surgical procedure - CNGOF  
386 perineal prevention and protection in obstetrics guidelines. Gynecol Obstet Fertil



- 387 Senol. 2018
- 388 24. Flemish Society of Obstetrics and Gynecology (VVOG). CLINICAL GUIDANCE  
389 PAPER VVOG. Obstetrical Anal Sphincter Injuries – OASIS. 2024
- 390 25. O'Leary BD, Kelly L, Fitzpatrick M, Keane DP. Underdiagnosis of internal anal  
391 sphincter trauma following vaginal delivery. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol.* 2023  
392 Feb;61(2):251-256. doi: 10.1002/uog.26049
- 393 26. Shek KL, Atan IK, Dietz HP. Can Anal Sphincter Defects Be Identified by Palpation?  
394 *Female Pelvic Med Reconstr Surg.* 2016 Nov/Dec;22(6):472-475
- 395 27. Guzmán Rojas RA, Salvesen KA, Volløyhaug I. Anal sphincter defects and fecal  
396 incontinence 15–24 years after first delivery: a cross-sectional study. *Ultrasound*  
397 *Obstet Gynecol* 2018;51(5): 677-683, 2018.
- 398 28. Młyńczak M, Borycka-Kiciak K, Uchman-Musielak M, Dziki A. Impedance  
399 Spectroscopy Method to Detect Pelvic Floor Muscle Damage – A Feasibility Study,”  
400 In *World Congress on Medical Physics and Biomedical Engineering*, Springer,  
401 Singapore, pp. 875–878, 2018.
- 402 29. Borycka-Kiciak K, Młyńczak M, Kiciak A, Pietrzak P, Dziki A. Noninvasive obstetric  
403 anal sphincter injury diagnostics using impedance spectroscopy. *Scientific Reports*  
404 2019;9(7097):1–9.
- 405 30. Młyńczak M, Rosoł M, Spinelli A, Dziki A, Wlazlak E, Surkont G, et al. Obstetric Anal  
406 Sphincter Injury Detection Using Impedance Spectroscopy with the ONIRY Probe.  
407 *Appl Sci* 2021;11:637, 2021.
- 408 31. Borycka K, Młyńczak M, Rosoł M, Iwanowski P, Uchman Musielak M, Mik M, Sudoł-  
409 Szopińska I, Herman H, Ratto C, Dziki A, Wlazlak E, Surkont G, Krzycka M, Pająk  
410 P, Spinelli A. Impedance spectroscopy for the diagnosis of obstetric anal sphincter  
411 injuries: the pilot experience,” In: *15 Congress of the European Society of*  
412 *Gynecology*, 2023.

- 413 32. Taithongchai A, Veiga SI, Sultan AH, Thakar R. The consequences of undiagnosed  
414 obstetric anal sphincter injuries (OASIS) following vaginal delivery. *Int Urogynecol J*  
415 2020;31:635–41
- 416 33. Roper JC, Thakar R, Sultan AH. Underclassified obstetric anal sphincter injuries. *Int*  
417 *Urogynecol J* 2022;33:1473–9.
- 418 34. Okeahialam NA, Taithongchai A, Thakar R, Sultan AH. The incidence of anal  
419 incontinence following obstetric anal sphincter injury graded using the Sultan  
420 classification: a network meta-analysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2023. PMID:  
421 36379266 Review.
- 422 35. Corrigendum to 'The incidence of anal incontinence following obstetric anal  
423 sphincter injury graded using the Sultan classification: A network meta-analysis'  
424 [American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology 228/6 (2023) 675-688] *Am J*  
425 *Obstet Gynecol* 2024
- 426 36. Andrews V, Thakar R, Sultan AH. Outcome of obstetric anal sphincter injuries  
427 (OASIS)-role of structured management", *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct*  
428 2009; 20(8):973-8.
- 429 37. Norderval S, Öian P, Revhaug A, Vonen B. Anal Incontinence After Obstetric  
430 Sphincter Tears: Outcome of Anatomic Primary Repairs. *Diseases of the Colon &*  
431 *Rectum* 2005; 48(5):p 1055-1061.
- 432 38. Ramage L, Yen C, Qiu S, Simillis C, Kontovounisios C, Tan E, Tekkis P. Does a  
433 missed obstetric anal sphincter injury at time of delivery affect short-term functional  
434 outcome? *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2008;100(1):26–32, 2008.
- 435 39. Gutierrez AB, Madoff RD, Lowry AC, Parker S, Congilosi MD, Buie DW, Baxter NN.  
436 Long-Term Results of Anterior Sphincteroplasty. *Diseases of the Colon & Rectum*  
437 2004; 47(5):p 727-732.
- 438 40. Zutshi M, Hull T, Bast J, Halverson A, Na J. Ten-year outcome after anal sphincter

439 repair for fecal incontinence. Dis Colon Rectum 2009 Jun;52(6):1089-94.

440 41.Tan EK, Jacovides M, Khullar V, Teoh TG, Fernando RJ, Tekkis PP. A

441 cost-effectiveness analysis of delayed sphincteroplasty for anal sphincter injury.

442 Colorectal Disease 2008; 10(7):653-662.

443

444 **Table/Figure Caption List**

445 Table 1. Characteristics of the study population.

	Group I	Group II	Total
	(N=91)	(N=61)	(N=152)
Age (years)			
Mean ± SD	31.7 ± 4.6	30.7 ± 4.6	31.3 ± 4.6
Range (Min/Max)	22 (18/40)	20 (22/42)	24 (18/42)
Age categorized (n, %)			
<26 years	9 (9.9)	7 (11.5)	16 (10.5)
26<35 years	53 (58.2)	41 (67.2)	94 (61.8)
≥35 years	29 (31.9)	13 (21.3)	42 (27.6)
Weight (kg)			
Mean ± SD	71.7 ± 11.8	68.1 ± 9.6	70.2 ± 11.0
Range (Min/Max)	56 (49/105)	60 (48/108)	60 (48/108)
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )			
Mean ± SD	25.4 ± 3.6	24.3 ± 3.4	25.0 ± 3.6
Range (Min/Max)	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
Range (Min/Max)	5 (1/6)	3 (1/4)	5 (1/6)
Primipara/Multipara	49/42	46/15	95/57
Risk factors for Obstetric Anal Sphincter Injury from the index delivery (n, %)			

Prolonged second phase of delivery	6 (6.6)	10 (16.4)	16 (10.5)
Fetal shoulder dystocia	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.7)
Birth weight of the neonate >4kg	9 (9.9)	6 (9.8)	15 (9.9)
Induction of delivery with oxytocin	15 (16.5)	9 (14.8)	24 (15.8)
Head circumference of the neonate ≥34 cm	56 (61.53)	49 (80.3)	105 (69.1)
Time between the index delivery and ONIRY examination (days)			
Median	4	28	14
Range (Min/Max)	57 (0/57)	55 (1/56)	57 (0/57)
Time between the index delivery and EAUS examination (days)			
Median	4	28	14
Range (Min/Max)	57 (0/57)	55 (1/56)	57 (0/57)

446

447

448 Table 2. Performance metrics of the ONIRY device in the assessment relative to 3-D

449 Endoanal Ultrasound and OASIS classification (each row shows the statistics for a single

450 10-fold cross-validation each performed with different random seed).

Seed	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity
1	87.2%	90.9%	84.6%
2	86.6%	92.6%	82.3%
3	87.9%	86.7%	88.6%
4	86.9%	87.7%	86.4%
5	87.6%	92.7%	84.2%
6	87.6%	89.4%	86.2%
7	86.9%	91.9%	83.5%
8	86.2%	91.0%	82.9%
9	86.9%	91.9%	83.5%
10	86.6%	91.2%	83.6%
Mean ±SD	87.0% ± 0.5%	90.6% ± 2.0%	84.6% ± 1.9%

451


452

453 Table 3. Performance metrics of DRE and ONIRY device in the assessment in reference to  
454 EAUS under OASIS classification.

Grade	N	Accuracy of DRE	Accuracy of ONIRY
Grade 3a	25	24.0%	81.2%
Grade 3b	26	53.8%	90.8%
Grade 3c	9	77.8%	95.6%
Grade 4	1	0.0%	60%

455

456



457

458 Figure 1. ROC curves for the ONIRY system and DRE are presented as blue and red lines,

459 respectively, with the identity line depicted as a black dashed line.

# ROC Curves

