


Graphical Abstract

SoK: Intelligent Detection for Polycystic Ovary Syndrome(PCOS)

Meng Li, Zanxiang He, Liming Nie, Liyun Shi, Mengyuan Lin, Minge Li, Yanjun Cheng, Hongwei Liu, Lei Xue



Highlights

SoK: Intelligent Detection for Polycystic Ovary Syndrome(PCOS)

Meng Li, Zanxiang He, Liming Nie, Liyun Shi, Mengyuan Lin, Minge Li, Yanjun Cheng, Hongwei Liu, Lei Xue

- Conducted a systematic review of the existing literature, focusing on Polycystic Ovary Syndrome intelligent detection, and constructed the comprehensive taxonomy for PCOS detection features to date, providing a standardized reference for future research.
- Systematically evaluated the capabilities and limitations of current intelligent PCOS detection tools, offering valuable guidance for the development of more efficient and accurate tools.
- Thoroughly analyzed the current status of 12 publicly available datasets used for PCOS detection, providing clear directions for future dataset development in this field.
- Made the analysis results publicly available, providing data resources and references for researchers, with the aim of advancing the field of intelligent PCOS detection.

SoK: Intelligent Detection for Polycystic Ovary Syndrome(PCOS)

Meng Li^{a,1}, Zanxiang He^{a,1}, Liming Nie^{a,*}, Liyun Shi^b, Mengyuan Lin^b,
Minge Li^b, Yanjun Cheng^b, Hongwei Liu^a, Lei Xue^c

^a*Shenzhen Technology University, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China*

^b*Shenzhen People's Hospital, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China*

^c*Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China*

Abstract

Recent research in the field of Polycystic Ovary Syndrome (PCOS) detection has increasingly utilized intelligent algorithms for automated diagnosis. These intelligent PCOS detection methods can assist doctors in diagnosing patients earlier and more efficiently, thereby improving the accuracy of diagnosis. However, there are notable barriers in the field of intelligent PCOS detection, including the lack of a standardized taxonomy for features, inadequate research on the current status of available datasets, and insufficient understanding of the capabilities of existing intelligent detection tools. To overcome these barriers, we propose for the first time an analytical framework for the current status of PCOS diagnostic research and construct a comprehensive taxonomy of detection features, encompassing 110 features across eight categories. This taxonomy has been recognized by industry experts. Based on this taxonomy, we analyze the capabilities of current intelligent detection tools and assess the status of available datasets. The results indicate that 12 publicly available datasets, the overall coverage rate is only 52% compared to the known 110 features, with a lack of multimodal datasets, outdated updates and unclear license information. These issues directly impact the detection capabilities of the tools. Furthermore, among the 45 detection tools require substantial computational resources, lack multimodal data processing capabilities, and have not undergone clinical validation. Based

*Corresponding author.

Email address: nieliming@sztu.edu.cn (Liming Nie)

¹The two authors contribute equally to this work.

on these findings, we highlight future challenges in this domain. This study provides critical insights and directions for PCOS intelligent detection field.

Keywords: Feature, Dataset, Detection Tool, Polycystic Ovary Syndrome, Taxonomy

1. Introduction

Polycystic Ovary Syndrome (PCOS) is one of the most common gynecological endocrine disorders. Its clinical characteristics primarily include clinical or biochemical hyperandrogenism, chronic anovulation, and polycystic ovarian morphology, often accompanied by insulin resistance and obesity [1, 2]. In recent years, the prevalence of PCOS has been increasing. Globally, using the Rotterdam criteria, the prevalence of PCOS is estimated to be between 10% and 13%, significantly affecting women’s quality of life and becoming a major public health issue worldwide [3]. Moreover, PCOS is associated with metabolic syndrome, type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, psychological disorders, and other metabolic disturbances. These issues highlight the critical need for early diagnosis and long-term management [4, 5, 6, 7].

Currently, the most widely adopted diagnostic criteria for PCOS are the Rotterdam criteria. These define PCOS as the presence of two out of the following three conditions, excluding other causes of hyperandrogenism: oligo- or anovulation, clinical or biochemical signs of hyperandrogenism, and polycystic ovarian morphology [1, 8, 9]. However, traditional medical approaches to diagnosing PCOS still face significant challenges. They are often subjective, heavily reliant on clinicians’ expertise, and can be invasive and uncomfortable for patients. Additionally, the heterogeneity and individual variability of symptoms may result in misdiagnosis or delayed diagnosis [10].

To address these challenges, researchers have increasingly explored the use of intelligent technologies, including machine learning and deep learning, to enhance the accuracy and efficiency of PCOS diagnosis. Various methods have emerged to detect PCOS using intelligent techniques. For instance, in 2011, Mehrotra et al. [11] proposed an automated PCOS detection method based on a Bayesian classifier utilizing clinical and metabolic parameters. In 2019, Denny et al. [12] developed a system using Random Forest Classifier with minimal yet promising clinical and metabolic parameters for early detection and prediction of PCOS. Similarly, in 2020, Bharati et al. [13] presented a tool based on hybrid Random Forest and Logistic Regression (RFLR) for




Figure 1: Polycystic Ovary and Normal Ovary Illustration

reliable classification of PCOS patients. Most recently, in 2023, Alamoudi et al. [14] proposed a fusion model incorporating ultrasound images and clinical data to diagnose PCOS, along with a basic categorization of the features used in their study. Despite these advances, current research exhibits several barriers: lack of comprehensive investigations into PCOS detection features and their interrelationships; insufficient exploration of the state of datasets used for detection; and lack of in-depth studies on the capabilities of existing intelligent PCOS detection tools.

In this paper, we propose an analytical framework for the current status of PCOS diagnostic research, which is a novel multi-stage approach designed to address these barriers. In the first stage, we conducted a rigorous literature analysis to identify the most relevant studies related to PCOS intelligent detection. In the second stage, based on the features mentioned in these selected studies and supplemented by diagnostic checklists provided by medical specialists, we constructed the comprehensive taxonomy of PCOS detection features to date. Additionally, we provided detailed annotations for each feature, including the acquisition methods and difficulty levels. In the third and fourth stages, based on the taxonomy, we analyzed the current status of datasets used for PCOS detection and conducted an in-depth evaluation of the capabilities of existing intelligent detection tools. Based on this research framework, we answer three key research questions (RQs):

- **RQ1:** What are the features used to detect PCOS so far, and what is their relevance?

Through the systematic literature review, we identified 93 of the most relevant studies. Through the analysis of these studies, we constructed a comprehensive taxonomy of PCOS detection features, encompassing 110 features across eight categories.

- **RQ2:** What is the current status of datasets used for PCOS detection?

We analyzed 12 publicly available datasets. These datasets collectively cover 58 features, with an overall coverage rate of 52% compared to our taxonomy. Additionally, we observed that none of the publicly available datasets are multi-modal, some have not been updated for years, and most lack clear license information.

- **RQ3:** What are the capabilities of current intelligent PCOS detection tools?

Our analysis of 45 intelligent detection tools filtered from the relevant studies revealed that, while many perform well on test datasets, they still have the following limitations: high training costs, limited multi-modal processing capabilities, and lack of clinical validation.

In light of these findings, our research deepens the understanding of PCOS feature taxonomy and intelligent detection tools, offering valuable insights for future studies.

2. Background and Related work

This section introduces the background of PCOS detection and related work in three aspects: Machine Learning-based Detection Tools, Deep Learning-based Detection Tools, Reviews of PCOS detection.

2.1. Background of PCOS Detection

PCOS is a complex endocrine disorder with an unclear etiology, but it is widely believed to be associated with genetic factors, insulin resistance, and elevated levels of androgens in the body. Figure 1 shows normal ovaries and polycystic ovaries. The symptoms of PCOS are varied and may include irregular menstruation, infertility, hirsutism, acne, and weight gain. Additionally, many patients with PCOS also exhibit characteristics of metabolic syndrome, such as hypertension and dyslipidemia [8]. The detection of PCOS typically relies on the Rotterdam criteria, which require the presence of at




Figure 2: Stakeholders and processes related to PCOS intelligent detection

least two of the following three conditions: oligo-ovulation or anovulation, clinical or biochemical signs of hyperandrogenism, and ultrasound findings of polycystic ovaries [9]. There have been previous studies aimed at applying intelligent algorithms to PCOS detection[12, 13, 14].

Figure 2 shows the stakeholders and overall process related to the use of intelligent algorithms in PCOS detection. The stakeholders include patients seeking treatment, researchers employing artificial intelligence for diagnosis, and physicians making comprehensive diagnostic decisions. In the diagnostic process, when patients initially visit the hospital, doctors conduct preliminary diagnoses through medical history collection and physical examinations. The collected physical information is then processed using artificial intelligence, which grades features such as the severity of hair loss, acne, and hirsutism. Based on these preliminary findings, doctors may request further examinations, including ultrasound and biochemical tests. All data obtained during the examinations are recorded in electronic medical records, and researchers utilize this data through AI-assisted diagnostic tools for intelligent PCOS diagnosis. Physicians integrate all information to make comprehensive diagnostic decisions. Finally, the results of the diagnosis are communicated back to the patients. It is worth noting that current PCOS intelligent detection tools have not yet been applied in clinical practice, as discussed in Section 4.3.3.

Our focus in this process is particularly on the stage of intelligent PCOS

detection, where feature information is input into AI for assisted detection, as highlighted in the light green part of the diagram. This paper provides a systematic literature review of the PCOS intelligent detection field and establishes a taxonomy of PCOS features involved in the detection process.

2.2. Machine Learning-based Detection Tools

In PCOS intelligent detection, machine learning techniques are primarily applied in classification and feature selection.

The main machine learning classification techniques used for PCOS detection include support vector machines (SVM), decision trees, and ensemble methods. Specifically, Deshpandei et al. [15] employed the SVM algorithm to classify clinical, biochemical, and imaging data for PCOS diagnosis. Chauhan et al. [16] compared several machine learning algorithms and found that decision tree classifiers (DT) were among the most accurate models for predicting PCOS. Based on this, they developed a mobile app to help users predict PCOS in its early stages. Denny et al. [12] proposed a method with a minimal yet effective set of clinical and metabolic parameters. Zhang et al. [17] used a stacking classifier model based on k-nearest neighbors, random forests, and extreme gradient boosting to analyze Raman spectra of follicular fluid and plasma for PCOS screening.

In addition to classification algorithms, researchers have also delved into feature selection in PCOS detection to optimize performance. For instance, Zigarelli et al. [18] used principal component analysis (PCA) to extract features from highly correlated variables, achieving dimensionality reduction. Subha et al. [19] employed three traditional methods (i.e., correlation ranking, chi-square test (Chi²), and recursive feature elimination) along with two swarm intelligence methods (i.e., particle swarm optimization and firefly algorithm) for feature selection to identify significant PCOS features. Syed et al. [20] combined RF feature importance and highest correlation (HC) methods to select 10 features and used AdaBoost to achieve the highest detection accuracy for PCOS.

In summary, machine learning techniques in PCOS detection primarily focus on classification and feature selection, by combining classification algorithms and feature selection methods, these techniques improve diagnostic accuracy and efficiency. In contrast, this paper reviews and compiles the features used by various tools, constructs a taxonomy comprising 110 detection features, and provides a deeper analysis of the capabilities and limitations of existing machine learning-based detection tools.

2.3. Deep Learning-based Detection Tools

Deep learning techniques have shown significant potential in PCOS detection, particularly in image and data processing. Convolutional neural networks (CNN) have been widely applied to PCOS ultrasound image feature extraction and automatic detection due to their outstanding performance in handling image data. Specifically, Srivastav et al.[21] used a pre-trained VGG16 model to extract key features with CNN for PCOS detection. CNNs have also been applied to scleral image processing, where Lv et al. [22] proposed a deep learning-based method for screening PCOS through scleral image analysis.

In addition to image processing, deep learning techniques are also suitable for handling clinical, biochemical, and other types of one-dimensional data for automatic PCOS diagnosis. For example, Abouhawwash et al. [23] processed a dataset containing 39 features using deep learning models, including CNN, multilayer perceptron (MLP), recurrent neural networks (RNN), and bidirectional long short-term memory networks (Bi-LSTM). Additionally, Kumar [24] introduced a novel chaotic red deer optimization algorithm (CRDODL-BDADC) combined with big data analysis techniques based on deep learning, applying it to PCOS detection. Thomas et al. [25] proposed a deep learning method using CNN and the Adam optimization algorithm to classify PCOS-related terms in ultrasound text reports, enabling PCOS prediction and diagnosis. By analyzing textual data, this study highlights the versatility of deep learning applications in PCOS detection.

In summary, deep learning techniques in PCOS detection mainly focus on processing and analyzing images and One-dimensional data, enhancing the accuracy and efficiency of PCOS detection. Based on this, this paper reviewed deep learning-based PCOS detection tools and conducted a comprehensive evaluation of their capabilities and limitations.

2.4. Existing Reviews of PCOS Detection

In addition to the above-mentioned studies on PCOS detection based on intelligent algorithms, there are also reviews focusing on PCOS detection. Specifically, Modi [26] conducted a comprehensive analysis of AI applications in predicting lifestyle diseases, including PCOS, highlighting models, symptoms and risk factors, dataset selection, and research challenges that contribute significantly to healthcare research. In comparison, Suha [27] focused on computer-aided approaches for PCOS detection, achieving five main objectives: analyzing research aims and history, evaluating data sources

and algorithms, summarizing research gaps, and proposing future directions. Barrera et al. [28] systematically reviewed studies applying machine learning and artificial intelligence (AI/ML) techniques for diagnosing and classifying PCOS, showcasing high diagnostic accuracy, and recommending future efforts to enhance standardization and methodological improvements for better clinical applications.

Previous reviews have mainly focused on models used in prior research. In contrast, this paper systematically reviews relevant literature, to construct a comprehensive taxonomy of PCOS detection features. Based on the taxonomy, we analyze the capabilities and limitations of current diagnostic tools and assess the state of datasets.

3. Research Design

In this section, we begin by presenting three research questions along with the motivations behind them. Subsequently, we introduce the overall framework of the empirical study and provide a detailed description of each module and step within it.

3.1. Research Questions (RQs)

- RQ1: What are the features used to detect PCOS so far, and what is their relevance? PCOS detection research is currently fragmented, lacking a comprehensive understanding of the features used. A thorough taxonomy of PCOS detection features would help us better understand the existing features and their relationships. The motivation behind establishing such a taxonomy is to provide a structured overview, facilitating clearer communication between researchers and clinicians and identifying the most relevant features for effective diagnosis. Currently, no such taxonomy exists, making this a critical gap in the field.
- RQ2: What is the current status of datasets used for PCOS detection? A major obstacle in PCOS detection research is the unclear status of the datasets. There is a lack of in-depth analysis regarding the current datasets, particularly concerning their openness, scale, licensing, and maintenance status. The purpose of conducting a comprehensive analysis of the current datasets is to identify their limitations, assess their availability, and guide future data collection efforts to improve the quality and accessibility of datasets for detection research.




Figure 3: The framework of our study

- RQ3: What are the capabilities of current intelligent PCOS detection tools? While PCOS intelligent detection tools have demonstrated certain detection performance in their respective datasets, their capabilities are not fully investigated. The aim of understanding these tools' capabilities is to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses, thus enabling the selection of the most appropriate tools and guiding the development of more accurate and efficient detection methods.

3.2. Research Framework

To address the three research questions outlined above, we propose an analytical framework for the current status of PCOS diagnostic research, based on the taxonomy construction method employed by Ladisa et al.[29]. As illustrated in Figure 3, the framework consists of four modules.

First, in the systematic literature review module, we obtained candidate literature through our constructed search query, then filtered it and conducted snowballing to identify the final selection of literature most relevant to intelligent PCOS detection. Subsequently, we extracted relevant information from these papers and explored grey literature. Second, in the taxonomy construction module, based on the features we collected and the diagnostic checklist provided by experts, we constructed a preliminary taxonomy for PCOS detection features. We then conducted a survey inviting experts to evaluate and provide feedback on the preliminary taxonomy's rationality, completeness, and practical utility. Feedback indicated a high level of endorsement for the taxonomy's rationality, completeness, and practical

utility. Finally, based on this feedback, we finalized the preliminary taxonomy and formed the final taxonomy for PCOS detection features, thereby addressing RQ1. Third, in datasets status making module and tools capability making module, based on our taxonomy, we filtered the eligible datasets and representative tools, and assessed the current status of datasets and the capabilities of existing tools used for detection, answering RQ2 and RQ3.

3.3. Systematic Literature Review

This section provides a systematic review of scientific literature and grey literature related to PCOS intelligent detection, corresponding to the first module in Figure 3. To achieve this, we followed a structured approach for literature searching, which included multiple stages [30, 31].

3.3.1. Scientific Literature Review

Scientific literature review consists of three stages: candidate literature searching, literature filtering and information extraction.

Candidate Literature Searching: The systematic literature review on PCOS detection research began by designing effective search queries [32, 33]. First, to ensure a comprehensive search, we conducted an exploratory search on Google Scholar using the keyword “PCOS detection.” This preliminary search found four relevant studies [19, 34, 35, 36], providing initial information on the topic and helping us identify relevant keywords. Subsequently, based on these initial studies, we carefully analyzed their keywords and created a search query string to retrieve articles most relevant to PCOS intelligent detection. Let the keyword sets be $K_1, K_2, K_3, \dots, K_n$, the keywords within each set are synonymous or closely related terms, representing similar concepts or phrases used in the context of PCOS detection, where:

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= \{\text{PCOS, “polycystic ovary syndrome”}\} \\ K_2 &= \{\text{detection, screening, diagnosis, identification, predicting, classification}\} \\ K_3 &= \{\text{“deep learning”, “machine learning”, AI, “artificial intelligence”, algorithm}\} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The search query string Q can be expressed as:

$$Q = (K_1) \text{ AND } (K_2) \text{ AND } (K_3) \quad (2)$$

Using this carefully designed search query, we conducted extensive literature searches across six authoritative databases: IEEE Xplore, Scopus, Google

Scholar, ACM Digital Library, PubMed and Web of Science. The search was limited to titles, abstracts, and author keywords, including only English publications, covering journals, conference proceedings, and book chapters. For each database $D \in \{\text{Google Scholar, Scopus, IEEE Xplore, } \dots\}$, we define the number of papers retrieved from each database as $n(D)$. The total number of papers retrieved is:

$$\text{Total Papers} = \sum_{D \in \text{Databases}} n(D) \quad (3)$$

The specific numbers are:

$$\begin{aligned} n(\text{Web of Science}) &= 231, n(\text{Scopus}) = 500, n(\text{ACM Digital Library}) = 2 \\ n(\text{IEEE Xplore}) &= 200, n(\text{PubMed}) = 0, n(\text{Google Scholar}) = 187 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Therefore:

$$\text{Total Papers} = 187 + 500 + 200 + 2 + 231 = 1120 \quad (5)$$

It should be noted that results from the PubMed medical database were excluded because they were not highly relevant to intelligent PCOS detection. This search process was completed by April 7, 2024.

Literature Filtering: The literature filtering process was conducted in four steps to identify the most relevant papers on PCOS intelligent detection.

First, since there are duplicate entries, we carefully removed duplicate entries from the initial 1,120 candidate papers. After this step, 386 papers proceeded to the next round of screening. Second, to ensure that the selected literature was directly related to PCOS intelligent detection, we filtered the papers further. We examined the metadata of each paper, such as the type of publication, title, and abstract, to filter out papers unrelated to the topic. After this step, 246 papers remained. Third, to ensure sufficient information for our review, we obtained the full texts of all articles and focused on the introduction, methods, and results sections. Articles had to describe a PCOS detection tool and dataset, be over four pages, and in English; those not meeting these criteria were excluded. To maintain accuracy, all articles were independently reviewed by at least two authors, with final inclusion based on consensus, resulting in 87 relevant articles. Finally, to ensure comprehensive coverage, we applied a bidirectional snowball strategy, tracing forward and backward references from the 87 selected articles. Only references directly cited by or citing the selected papers were included, with a one-layer depth to




Figure 4: Annual Trends in PCOS Intelligent Detection Research Publications

maintain focus. This process added six papers, resulting in a final selection of 93 relevant papers for our study on PCOS intelligent detection.

Figure 4 shows the annual publication trend of the 93 selected papers. As depicted by the blue trend line, the number of publications has been steadily increasing. This trend indicates that research in the field of intelligent PCOS detection has been growing, reflecting the growing attention from both academia and the research community. This growth can likely be attributed to technological advancements and the increasing demand for early diagnosis and precise treatment of PCOS. It is worth noting that the number of selected papers for 2024 has decreased, as our paper collection cutoff date was April 7, 2024, and only papers published before that date were included.

Information Extraction: At this stage, we designed a structured extraction table to extract information from the papers. The extracted information includes the features used for detecting PCOS, the techniques employed, and the datasets utilized. Each paper was independently annotated by at least two authors to ensure data accuracy and consistency. Any discrepancies were resolved through discussion and review, resulting in consistent and high-quality data. This data serves as a critical foundation for answering the research questions.

3.3.2. Grey Literature Exploration

In addition to scientific literature, we explored grey literature sources, such as blog posts, technical forums, and GitHub, the largest open source software website [29]. This stage aimed to comprehensively cover intelligent

PCOS detection tools, enhancing the depth of our research. We regularly reviewed various repositories and blogs, using the same search query in Google as for scientific literature. The preliminary query revealed that grey literature related to PCOS detection was mainly concentrated on the open-source platform GitHub. We applied the same criteria used for scientific literature to filter these sources and used a snowball sampling strategy to expand the literature pool, ensuring thorough coverage. From the initial grey literature search, we identified 24 relevant entries. After further filtering, projects without a star were excluded. Ultimately, we identified 6 valuable open-source projects.

3.4. Taxonomy Construction

This section outlines the approach used to develop a taxonomy for PCOS detection features, as illustrated in the second module of Figure 3. Although previous studies have used feature selection methods to identify the features most relevant to PCOS [34],[36],[37], a systematic feature taxonomy has not yet been established. The goal was to construct a comprehensive taxonomy. The construction process consists of two consecutive steps: developing the preliminary taxonomy and expert survey.

3.4.1. Preliminary Taxonomy Construction

We adopted a multi-step approach to constructing the preliminary taxonomy, which included three main steps: processing features extracted from the literature, systematically classifying these features, and annotating features.

First, to eliminate redundancy, we refined the data on PCOS detection features extracted in Section 3.3.1 by merging similar features. Two types of similarity were considered: textual similarity, where features had identical definitions, synonymous terms, or referred to the same characteristic; and conceptual similarity, where features used different terminology but shared clinical or pathological significance. For merged features, we recorded both the original features and the unified name, detailed information is available on our website [38]. Each feature was manually verified, with two authors independently reviewing each category based on textual descriptions, examples, and attributions. Disagreements were resolved through the arbitration of a third author.

Second, building on the collected information, we classified the PCOS diagnostic features. We began by consulting with a hospital physician (third author) to obtain diagnostic checklists used in clinical practice. We matched

the collected features against this checklists and, in consultation with the doctors, categorize these features into the corresponding categories on the checklists. Additionally, based on the physician's extensive clinical experience, features used in actual diagnosis but not found in prior research were added to the taxonomy. These newly added features from clinical practice are marked with an asterisk to distinguish them from those documented in the literature.

Third, we annotated the acquisition methods and difficulty levels for each feature. We consulted with a specialized clinician(fourth author) to first identify how each feature is obtained during hospital visits. Then, based on the standard methods of acquisition in clinical testing, resource consumption, and the complexity of detection, we categorized the PCOS detection features into three levels:

- Level 1 (Easily Acquirable): These features are acquired through non-invasive and routine methods without requiring complex detection techniques or equipment. They typically involve self-reported information, simple physical measurements, or standard physical examinations.
- Level 2 (Moderately Acquirable): These features require specialized tests or equipment, often involving complex measurements or lab tests. While not highly invasive, the acquisition process may be time-consuming or require trained medical personnel to perform.
- Level 3 (Difficult to Acquire): These features necessitate highly complex detection methods or specialized equipment, potentially involving invasive procedures or advanced laboratory techniques, and are not part of routine testing. The acquisition process may be technically challenging and costly. In addition, some characteristics involve subjective assessments, and the accuracy of the assessment may be affected by individual self-reporting bias or different assessment criteria.

Through these steps, we constructed a preliminary taxonomy for PCOS detection features.

3.4.2. Expert Survey

Following the development of the preliminary taxonomy, we conducted an expert survey to seek evaluation from industry professionals, including

Table 1: Demographic Information of Experts

Demographic Information	Measure	Number	Percentage
Age	18-25	6	7%
	26-30	15	17%
	31-40	30	34%
	41-50	26	30%
	51-60	10	12%
Years of work experience	0-2	8	9%
	3-5	9	10%
	6-10	21	24%
	11-15	18	21%
	Over 16	31	36%
Occupation	Medical professionals	83	95%
	Researcher	1	1%
	Other	3	4%
Familiarity with PCOS	5 (Familiar)	30	35%
	4	41	47%
	3	11	13%
	2	3	3%
	1 (Unfamiliar)	2	2%

medical experts and researchers. The survey consisted of two parts: an online survey and expert interviews.

The online survey aimed to assess (a) the taxonomy’s rationality, completeness, and practical utility; and (b) the reasonableness of the annotations for acquisition methods and difficulty levels. It included 13 questions with specific evaluation objectives. Six questions used a Likert scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high) to assess various dimensions of the taxonomy [39]. Two questions were binary (yes/no), evaluating the use of the taxonomy and AI tools in PCOS detection. Additionally, four questions were used to collect demographic information such as age, work experience, and professional background of the participants. One question verified whether participants had read the taxonomy documents and background materials before rating, ensuring data quality. The online survey was conducted on the Wjx.cn platform from August 7 to August 21, 2024, and collected 87 responses. Anonymity was ensured through privacy measures, with no personal identification information collected. Detailed information about the survey can be found on our website [38].

Table 1 shows detailed demographic information of the 87 participating experts. This information includes age, years of professional experience, occupational background, familiarity with the concept and implications of PCOS. Results showed that 80% of the experts had over six years of experience, with 31 having more than 16 years. More than 95% of the experts are senior doctors and nurses, and 81% of the experts rated their understanding of PCOS as 4 or 5 points, whose expertise in disease diagnosis provides a solid guarantee for the validity of the taxonomy.

The expert interviews aimed to assess the practical utility, relevance, and applicability of the taxonomy in real-world clinical and research settings. One open-ended question aims to gather experts' thoughts on the taxonomy and their insights on how it could improve clinical workflows and integrate with existing diagnostic tools. The question posed was: "In your clinical practice or research, how do you view integrating our PCOS taxonomy into existing diagnostic workflows or AI tools? Do you have any suggestions for adapting the taxonomy to different healthcare settings or detection tools?" The interviews, held between November 10 and 30, 2024, involved four experts. All data was anonymized, and privacy measures ensured confidentiality. Insights from these interviews were qualitatively analyzed to assess the taxonomy's potential for clinical adoption.

The expert survey feedback recognized the preliminary taxonomy's rationality, completeness, and practical utility, and leading to the adoption of the preliminary taxonomy as the final taxonomy.

3.5. Analysis of Datasets

In order to comprehensively understand the current status of PCOS detection datasets, we conducted a filtering and analysis of datasets relevant to PCOS detection.

3.5.1. Filtering

We selected datasets from the 93 PCOS detection-related articles, focusing on whether these datasets meet the task's relevance requirements. To this end, we established two core criteria:

- **Criterion #1 (Presence of PCOS Detection Instances):** The dataset must clearly include feature data for PCOS detection, ensuring researchers can extract instances for analysis and modeling.

- **Criterion #2 (Accessibility of the Dataset):** The dataset must be documented in the relevant publications and clearly indicate its availability to ensure practical support for research.

Applying these criteria, we selected 36 datasets for PCOS detection from the literature, numbered with the prefix “D” based on the review order.

3.5.2. Analysis

We systematically analyzed the current status of these datasets across seven aspects: openness, instance types, scale, usage count, license information, maintenance status, and coverage.

First, to assess openness, we reviewed the availability of each dataset, categorizing them into open access, restricted access, and not publicly available, and documented access links and conditions for the accessible datasets. Second, we examined the “Methods” sections of relevant literature to classify the types of data present in each dataset, noting whether they comprised image data, numerical data, or other types. Similarly, to understand licensing terms, we reviewed the “Methods” sections of papers and visited dataset websites to confirm license types, identifying any restrictions on research and commercial use. The scale of each dataset was evaluated by counting the number of instances, and for datasets with the same scale, we further examined their similarities and differences by comparing the features contained in them. We analyzed usage frequency by counting how often each dataset was referenced in academic publications. Maintenance status was assessed by recording the last update date for each dataset to determine their current applicability in research. Finally, we evaluated the coverage of features included in the open source datasets compared to the 110 features we collected. Specifically, Column 6 of Table 2 lists the datasets that include this feature, indicating that the dataset “covers” the corresponding feature. This comprehensive approach provided a detailed understanding of the current landscape of PCOS datasets, highlighting areas for improvement in data availability and utility for research.

3.6. Analysis of Intelligent Detection Tools

Based on the 93 selected articles (see Section 3.3), we filtered out the representative tools according to established criteria and conducted an in-depth analysis of these intelligent PCOS detection tools.

3.6.1. Filtering

We established the following criteria to ensure targeted analysis. Only tools meeting these criteria were selected:

- **Criterion #1 (Applicability to PCOS Detection):** To ensure that the tool is directly related to the PCOS detection task. The tool description should include terms such as “identification,” “detection,” or “classification,” and the output must be binary (PCOS or non-PCOS).
- **Criterion #2 (Automation):** Given the drawbacks of manual detection, such as inconsistent standards and inefficiency, we focused on tools with automated functions.
- **Criterion #3 (Industry Validation):** To ensure reliability, the tool must have been compared in other studies or its associated research must be indexed by SCIE.
- **Criterion #4 (Performance Metrics):** To facilitate valid comparison of tool performance in PCOS detection. The tool should record performance metrics such as accuracy, precision, and recall and disclose them transparently.

Following these criteria, we selected 39 eligible tools from the 93 articles, supplemented by six open-source PCOS detection tools from grey literature, resulting in a total of 45 representative tools. Since most tools lacked specific names, we assigned identifiers using the prefix “T” based on the review order.

3.6.2. Analysis

We conducted a comprehensive analysis of these tools, covering aspects such as employed techniques, input data types, performance metrics, tool comparison and availability status. It should be noted that we did not run these tools ourselves; instead, we relied on the reported capabilities from their performance on the respective datasets.

First, we reviewed the techniques employed by each tool by examining the “Methods” sections of relevant papers. We extracted details about classification and feature selection algorithms, prioritizing combinations that achieved the highest accuracy as noted in the “Results” sections. These techniques were recorded using abbreviations, and we counted their usage frequency to identify the most commonly used techniques across the tools. Second, we

identified the types of input data processed by each tool by documenting information from the "Methods" section of each paper. This allowed us to categorize tools based on the data types they handle, such as image, numerical, or text data. Third, we thoroughly assessed the performance metrics of each tool, focusing on the indicators reported in the "Results" sections. We recorded the performance achieved by the representative techniques of each tool and compiled the types of performance metrics reported. From this, we selected the four most commonly used metrics—accuracy, precision, F1 score, and recall—as the evaluation criteria. Tools were then categorized based on the data types they processed, and their performance metrics were analyzed to identify which tools demonstrated the best performance across different data types. Lastly, we reviewed the comparisons of representative tools documented in the selected papers, counting the number of times each tool was compared with others. We also documented their availability status, providing access links for open-source tools. This comprehensive analysis allowed us to evaluate the tools' capabilities and influence within the research community based on the recorded information.

4. Results

Building on the framework outlined in section 3.2, this section provides responses to the three research questions.

4.1. Taxonomy

For RQ1, we constructed the taxonomy of features for PCOS detection based on 93 selected studies using the method described in Section 3.4.

Table 2 shows our taxonomy and the specific features of each category along with our annotated information. The taxonomy includes 8 categories and 32 subcategories, encompassing a total of 110 features relevant to PCOS detection. Figure 5 visually illustrates our taxonomy. We present the detailed results in three aspects: the categories, the methods and difficulty levels of feature acquisition, and the results of the survey.

4.1.1. Categories

Regarding specific categories, figure 6 shows the number of features contained in each category. The first category, "Demographic and Basic Health Data," includes 3 subcategories and 12 features, mostly collected through questionnaires. BMI is the most commonly used feature in this category,

Table 2: Taxonomy of PCOS detection features

Categories	Sub-categories	Feature	Acquisition methods	Acquisition difficulty levels	Datasets	Papers using this feature	
Demographic and Basic Health Data	Standard items	Age	Questionnaires	1	D1,D2,D4,D6,D7	[40, 41, 42, 43, 34, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 14, 50, 51, 18, 52, 53, 16, 54, 55, 56, 57]	
		Height	Questionnaires	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 42, 46, 47, 48, 14, 50, 58, 52, 53, 55, 57, 36]	
		Weight	Questionnaires	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[44, 42, 24, 43, 44, 59, 46, 47, 48, 14, 50, 60, 51, 61, 52, 53, 54, 57, 36, 62, 63]	
	Education Level	BMI	Calculation	1	D1,D2,D4,D6,D7	[40, 42, 20, 64, 34, 44, 59, 45, 46, 65, 48, 14, 66, 50, 60, 51, 67, 52, 53, 54, 13, 12, 15, 11, 56, 55, 57, 68, 69, 36, 62, 63]	
		Blood Group	Laboratory testing	2	D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 42, 64, 63, 46, 47, 70, 58, 53]	
	Race	Marriage Status	Questionnaires	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[40, 41, 42, 64, 24, 43, 44, 46, 47, 71, 14, 50, 23, 51, 18, 53, 54, 57, 69, 36, 72, 63]	
		Age of menarche	Questionnaires	1	D9	[72]	
		Family history of diabetes and hypertension	Questionnaires	1			
		Postgraduate	Questionnaires	2			
		Senior College/Technical/Vocational School	Questionnaires	2			
	Vital Signs	Cardiovascular Parameters	Hypertic/Latina	Questionnaires	1		
			Bleak/African American	Questionnaires	1		
			RR (breaths/min)	Measurement	2	D1,D2,D4,D7	[40, 41, 42, 64, 24, 43, 58, 74]
			Pulse rate (bpm)	Measurement	2	D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 75, 42, 46, 47, 58, 52, 53, 54, 36]
			BP Systolic (mmHg)	Measurement	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[24, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 58, 36, 76]
BP Diastolic (mmHg)			Measurement	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[24, 45, 46, 58, 55, 36, 63]	
Restbps			Measurement	1	D10	[65, 56]	
High BP (Y/N)			Measurement	1		[34, 57]	
Normal BP			Measurement	1		[34]	
Menstrual cycle			Questionnaires	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 42, 20, 44, 45, 46, 77, 47, 48, 49, 50, 23, 60, 51, 78, 18, 74, 67, 73, 53, 16, 54, 55, 13, 15, 11, 35, 79, 68, 69, 36, 80]	
Menstrual and Reproductive Health	Menstrual Characteristics	Cycle (R/I)	Questionnaires	1	D1,D2,D4,D7,D9	[41, 75, 42, 20, 37, 19, 44, 59, 46, 77, 47, 71, 48, 49, 14, 81, 50, 51, 82, 18, 67, 73, 52, 16, 54, 55, 13, 12, 83, 79, 57, 68, 36, 84, 62]	
		Intermenstrual bleeding*	Questionnaires	1		[35]	
		Dysmenorrhea	Questionnaires	1			
		Menstrual period time*	Questionnaires	1			
		Menorrhagia*	Questionnaires	1			
	Ultrasound features	Hypomenorrhea*	Questionnaires	1			
		Amenorrhea*	Questionnaires	1			
		Ultra sound textual reports	Questionnaires	1			
		Polycystic Ovary Morphology	Ultrasound	1			
		Follicle No. (L)	Ultrasound	1			
	Pregnancy History	Ultrasound	Follicle No. (R)	Ultrasound	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[42, 20, 37, 64, 24, 44, 59, 45, 46, 77, 47, 71, 48, 49, 81, 85, 50, 60, 51, 82, 78, 61, 18, 86, 67, 52, 54, 55, 13, 12, 83, 79, 68, 69, 36, 62]
			No. of ovarian follicles	Ultrasound	1		[60, 51, 82, 78, 61, 18, 74, 52, 53, 54, 55, 13, 12, 83, 79, 68, 69, 36, 72, 62, 76, 80]
			Avg. F size (L) (mm)	Ultrasound	1		[15]
			Avg. F size (R) (mm)	Ultrasound	1		[14]
			Size of follicles (La and Ro.) (mm)	Ultrasound	2		[62, 80]
Pregnancy History		Right ovarian volume*	Ultrasound	2	D1,D2,D4,D7	[42, 64, 24, 43, 46, 47, 71, 48, 60, 58, 86, 54, 55, 12, 68]	
		Left ovarian volume*	Ultrasound	2		[12]	
		Endometrial (mm)	Ultrasound	1			
		Uterine size*	Ultrasound	2			
		Pregnant (Y/N)	Questionnaires	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[40, 42, 64, 43, 46, 47, 48, 50, 60, 58, 53, 54, 69, 36]	
Biochemical Indicators		Hormonal Levels	Presence of children	Questionnaires	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[40, 41, 42, 46, 58, 35, 57, 36]
			No. of abortions	Questionnaires	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[75]
			Grovtivity	Questionnaires	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 75, 42, 46, 58, 55, 68, 36, 72]
			Months of conception tried	Questionnaires	2		[34]
			TSH (mIU/mL)	Laboratory testing	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 42, 34, 46, 47, 14, 85, 50, 23, 60, 61, 67, 13, 15, 11, 68, 69, 63]
Features labeled with a ** denote newly added features from clinical practice.	Standard items	FSH (mIU/mL)	Laboratory testing	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 42, 34, 46, 47, 14, 85, 50, 23, 60, 61, 67, 13, 15, 11, 68, 69, 63]	
		LH (mIU/mL)	Laboratory testing	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 42, 34, 46, 47, 14, 85, 50, 23, 60, 61, 67, 13, 15, 11, 68, 69, 63]	
		TSH (mIU/L)	Laboratory testing	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 42, 34, 46, 47, 14, 85, 50, 23, 60, 61, 67, 13, 15, 11, 68, 69, 63]	
		AMH (ng/mL)	Laboratory testing	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 42, 34, 46, 47, 14, 85, 50, 23, 60, 61, 67, 13, 15, 11, 68, 69, 63]	
		AMH (ng/mL)	Laboratory testing	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[75, 42, 20, 37, 64, 24, 46, 77, 47, 48, 49, 85, 50, 60, 51, 82, 61, 18, 67, 52, 54, 13, 12, 83, 79, 68, 69, 36, 80]	
		PRL (ng/mL)	Laboratory testing	1	D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 20, 47, 69, 14, 50, 60, 58, 86, 67, 53, 55, 69, 36]	
		Prog (ng/mL)	Laboratory testing	2	D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 42, 64, 46, 47, 48, 85, 50, 23, 61, 67, 54, 55]	
		Prog (ng/mL)	Laboratory testing	2	D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 42, 64, 46, 47, 48, 85, 50, 23, 67, 53, 55, 79]	
		Prog (ng/mL)	Laboratory testing	2	D1,D2	[41, 42, 43, 34, 46, 47, 85, 50, 61, 55, 36]	

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Categories	Sub-categories	Feature	Acquisition methods	Acquisition difficulty levels	Datasets	Papers using this feature	
Biochemical Indicators	Hormonal Levels	T testosterone	Laboratory testing	1		[14]	
		Estimated levels	Laboratory testing	1		[94]	
		Sex hormone binding globulin	Laboratory testing	1		[94]	
		Free testosterone*	Laboratory testing	1		[94]	
		T ₄ (O)HP*	Laboratory testing	2		[94]	
		Levothyroxine sodium sulfate*	Laboratory testing	1			
		Free testosterone index*	Laboratory testing	1			
		HOMA-IR*	Laboratory testing	2			
		Hemoglobin (Hgb) (cbc)	Laboratory testing	1		D1,D2,D4,D7	[40, 41, 42, 24, 46, 47, 71, 48, 14, 60, 58, 53, 54, 55, 36]
		Ferritin	Laboratory testing	3		D10	[14, 56]
		Cholesterol	Laboratory testing	1			[14]
		Triglycerides (TG)	Laboratory testing	1			[94, 14]
		High-density lipoprotein (HDL)	Laboratory testing	1			[14]
		Low-density lipoprotein (LDL)	Laboratory testing	1			[65, 56]
		Glucose Levels	Fasting glucose	Laboratory testing	1		[45, 65, 14, 56]
	RES (Random blood sugar)	Laboratory testing	3		D1,D2,D4,D7	[40, 41, 42, 24, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 23, 60, 58, 53, 55, 69, 36]	
	Insulin level	Laboratory testing	1		D4	[64]	
	Hemoglobin (Hgb) A1c	Laboratory testing	1		[14]		
	Free acid*	Laboratory testing	1				
	Blood Urea Nitrogen*	Laboratory testing	1				
	Liver function*	Laboratory testing	1				
	Aspartate transaminase*	Laboratory testing	1				
	Alkaline transaminase*	Laboratory testing	1				
Physical Characteristics	Anthropometric Measurements	Waist (inch)	Measurement	1		D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 42, 24, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 58, 53, 54, 36, 62]
		Hip (inch)	Measurement	1		D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 42, 64, 46, 47, 48, 50, 58, 53, 54, 55, 36, 62, 76, 63]
		Waist:Hip Ratio	Measurement	1		D1,D2,D4,D7	[41, 64, 24, 50, 70, 60, 58, 36]
		Acne or Skin tags	Physical examination	1		D1,D2,D4,D7,D9	[40, 42, 37, 64, 43, 44, 59, 46, 77, 48, 49, 50, 70, 51, 82, 18, 74, 53, 16, 54, 55, 83, 68, 36, 72, 62, 76, 87]
		Hair loss (Y/N)	Physical examination	1		D1,D2,D4,D7,D9	[40, 42, 64, 24, 43, 44, 46, 48, 50, 70, 60, 73, 53, 16, 54, 55, 72, 62, 87]
		Hirsutism	Physical examination	1		D1,D2,D4,D7,D9	[41, 20, 37, 64, 24, 43, 19, 44, 59, 46, 77, 47, 71, 48, 49, 81, 85, 50, 70, 60, 51, 82, 78, 61, 18, 74, 86, 52, 53, 54, 55, 53, 57, 68, 69, 36, 72, 84, 62, 87, 89]
		Weight gain (Y/N)	Measurement	1		D1,D2,D4,D7,D9	[42, 43, 64, 24, 19, 44, 59, 46, 77, 47, 71, 48, 49, 81, 50, 70, 60, 51, 82, 78, 61, 18, 74, 86, 52, 53, 54, 55, 13, 12, 83, 79, 57, 68, 36, 72, 84, 62, 87, 89]
		BODY Weight Maintenance	Measurement	1		D1,D2,D4,D7,D9	[40, 42, 20, 37, 64, 24, 19, 44, 59, 46, 77, 47, 71, 49, 81, 85, 50, 60, 51, 82, 78, 61, 18, 52, 16, 54, 55, 83, 79, 57, 36, 84, 62, 76, 63, 87, 89]
		Skin darkening (Y/N)	Physical examination	1		D9	[87]
		Oily skin	Physical examination	3		D9	[87]
		Obesity	Measurement	1		D9	[94, 16]
		Breast distension	Measurement	2		D10	[16, 56, 35]
		Fast food (Y/N)	Questionnaires	3		D1,D2,D4,D7,D9	[42, 20, 37, 44, 59, 46, 77, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 82, 61, 18, 74, 53, 54, 55, 83, 88, 72, 84, 62, 63, 80]
		Reg-Exercise (Y/N)	Questionnaires	2		D1,D2,D4,D7,D9	[42, 46, 58, 53, 16]
		Eating and sleeping habits	Questionnaires	2		D1,D2,D4,D7,D9	[73]
Sleep Disorders	Questionnaires	2		D9	[59]		
Smoker	Questionnaires	1		D9	[54]		
Psychological and Emotional Health	Psychological Symptoms	Anxiety (Y/N)	Questionnaires	1		D9	[73, 37, 87]
		Depression	Questionnaires	1		D9	[73, 87]
		Nervousness	Questionnaires	1		D9	[14, 35, 87]
		Social Phobia	Questionnaires	3		D9	[73]
		Body image dissatisfaction	Questionnaires	3		D9	[73]
		Mental stress due to new admission in hostel (Y/N)	Questionnaires	3		D9	[87]
		Mental stress due to personal problems (Y/N)	Questionnaires	3		D9	[87]
		Mental stress due to peer pressure (Y/N)	Questionnaires	3		D9	[87]
		Mental stress due to change in dietary habits (Y/N)	Questionnaires	3		D9	[87]
		Ovarian ultrasound image	Ultrasound	2		D3,D8,D11	[89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 21, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 15, 108, 109, 88, 110, 111, 112]
		Raman spectroscopy of follicular fluid and plasma	Research	3		D10	[17]
		The number of major vessels colored by fluoresceopy	Research	3		D10	[56]
		Acne Symptoms Images	Physical examination	2		D36	[113, 114, 115]
		Hair Loss Symptoms Images	Physical examination	2		D5	[116, 117, 118]
		Hirsutism Symptoms Images	Physical examination	3			

Features labeled with a '*' denote newly added features from clinical practice.




Figure 5: Features Illustrated in PCOS Detection Taxonomy

appearing in 32 studies as an input for PCOS detection. The second category, “Vital Signs,” comprises 2 subcategories and 7 features, primarily obtained through medical measurements. Among these, systolic blood pressure (SBP) is cited in 10 studies, reflects the correlation between blood pressure and PCOS. The third category, “Menstrual and Reproductive Health,” is divided into 3 subcategories with 25 features, acquired via questionnaires and ultrasound. The Follicle No. (R) is frequently used, appearing in 40 studies, highlighting its role in evaluating ovarian function. The fourth category, “Biochemical Indicators,” is the largest, with 34 features spread across 8 subcategories, mainly derived from laboratory tests. Anti-Müllerian hormone (AMH) is used as a feature in 30 studies.

The fifth category, “Physical Characteristics,” comprises 12 features obtained through physical examination or medical measurements, with hirsutism and weight gain being cited in 43 studies, reflecting their significance as common PCOS symptoms. The sixth category, “Lifestyle,” includes 5 features collected via questionnaires. Fast food (Y/N) appeared in 26 studies, although features in this category are less frequently used, they offer valuable information about patient behavior. The seventh category, “Psychological




Figure 6: The number of features in each category

and Emotional Health,” has 2 subcategories and 9 features, primarily gathered through questionnaires. The eighth category, “Imaging and Symptom Analysis,” includes 6 features such as image of acne, hair loss, and hirsutism, which are crucial in clinical diagnosis according to the *2023 international evidence-based guideline for the assessment and management of polycystic ovary syndrome* [3], although these surface image features have not been directly used to detect PCOS in existing intelligent tools.

In comparison, the biochemical indicators category contained the most features among the eight categories, while the lifestyle category contained the fewest features; hirsutism was the most frequently mentioned feature among the 110 features.

4.1.2. Features acquisition methods and difficulty levels

Regarding feature acquisition methods, the taxonomy identifies seven methods of feature acquisition: questionnaires, calculations, laboratory tests, medical measurements, ultrasound, physical examination, and research data collection. Among these, 38 features are obtained through questionnaires, while BMI is the only feature derived from calculations.

In terms of acquisition difficulty levels, features are classified as easy, moderate, or difficult to obtain. The majority (74) are easy to acquire, with 23

Table 3: Feedback Results of Online Survey

# Feedback	# Valid Feedback	Structural Rationality	Classification Validity
87	82	91%	94%
Completeness	Practical Utility	Acquisition Methods Annotation	Difficulty Levels Annotation
96%	92%	95%	94%

moderately difficult and 13 difficult features. This classification aims to help researchers better understand and utilize these features, thereby selecting appropriate features and developing a more accurate and efficient detection tool while minimizing the cost and effort required for rapid diagnosis.

4.1.3. Survey Results

Table 3 shows the results of the online survey. Table 4 shows the responses from the expert interviews. The taxonomy received strong support from industry experts.

Specifically, in the online survey section, 91% of the 82 valid survey respondents rated the taxonomy as having structural rationality, classification validity, completeness, and practical utility, with high scores of 4 or 5. Over 94% of the participants Recognized our annotations regarding feature acquisition methods and difficulty levels. Additionally, the survey highlighted a gap in clinical practice, where only 48% of participants had used any PCOS-related taxonomy, and just 22% had experience with AI-based detection tools. This reveals the low popularity of artificial intelligence technology in the detection of PCOS in clinical practice, indicating a potential demand for promoting intelligent detection tools in the future. In the expert interview section, four experts expressed strong support for the taxonomy, highlighting its potential to standardize PCOS diagnosis across clinical, endocrinological, gynecological, and research perspectives, improving both clinical practice and the development of intelligent diagnostic tools.

Answer to RQ1: Through the review of 93 scientific publications, we have proposed a comprehensive taxonomy of PCOS detection features. This taxonomy is divided into eight categories, encompassing 110 detection features, and annotates the methods and difficulty levels of acquiring these features in clinical practice. The taxonomy was highly rated by 82 domain experts and researchers, including senior doctors and nurses.

Table 4: Responses of Expert Interview

Expert 1: “As a clinician, I am very interested in your classification system. The diagnosis of PCOS in clinical practice often relies on a comprehensive analysis of multiple symptoms and signs, but existing classification systems often lack standardization, leading to inconsistencies and misdiagnoses in clinical work. I believe your classification system can help clarify and unify the characteristics of different types of PCOS, providing doctors with a clearer framework for diagnosis.”

Expert 2: “From an endocrinological perspective, the diagnosis of PCOS not only depends on ultrasound and clinical manifestations, but also involves hormone level testing. Your classification system covers multiple dimensions and takes into account the diversity of different features from a clinical perspective, which is highly commendable.”

Expert 3: “From a gynecological perspective, the classification system you have developed helps bridge the gap between clinical practice and research. The multidimensional approach helps us better understand the different manifestations of PCOS, especially the differences across various patient groups.”

Expert 4: “As a researcher in intelligent detection, I believe your classification system holds great potential, especially in advancing the development of intelligent diagnostic tools. The standardization of the classification system can provide a unified input framework for machine learning models, which is crucial for improving the accuracy and consistency of PCOS detection tools. Additionally, the system can facilitate interdisciplinary collaboration by offering a common framework for experts across fields like endocrinology, gynecology, and AI.”

4.2. Dataset Status

In analyzing RQ2, we aim to assess the current status of the selected datasets in seven aspects: openness, instance types, scale, usage count, license information, maintenance status, and coverage. Following the methodology outlined in Section 3.5, we identified 36 datasets containing instances of PCOS features.

As shown in Table 5, only the publicly accessible datasets and restricted datasets for PCOS detection are listed here; a complete list of all 36 datasets is available on our website [38]. In the following section, we present the specific analysis results.

Table 5: Datasets List for PCOS Detection

Dataset	Type	Scale	Usages	Openness	License	Year
D36	image	1457	3	Yes,[120]	-	2019
D5	image	4492	2	Yes,[121]	-	2021
D11	image	1639	1	Yes,[122]	-	2022
D3	image	3856	16	Yes,[123]	-	2022
D8	image	-	1	No,[119](Restricted)	-	-
D6	numerical	768	2	Yes,[124]	CC0: Public Domain	2016
D9	numerical	119	1	Yes,[125]	-	2017
D10	numerical	1273	2	Yes,[126]	-	2019
D12	numerical	100	1	Yes,[17]	-	2020
D2	numerical	541	40	Yes,[127]	CC BY-NC-SA 4.0	2020
D4	numerical	541	1	Yes,[128]	-	2020
D7	numerical	541	2	Yes,[129]	Data files © Original Authors	2021
D1	numerical	541	3	Yes,[130]	-	2022

4.2.1. Openness

Regarding dataset openness, as shown in Figure 7a, among the 36 selected PCOS feature datasets, 23 are not publicly available, only 12 are open for access, and there is 1 restricted-access dataset. This indicates that most datasets used in research are not accessible to the public. The restricted dataset D8 [119] requires membership for access, and the specific number of instances it contains is unclear. Therefore, in subsequent statistics, any data involving instance counts will exclude this dataset. This quasi-open status effectively restricts researchers' direct access to the data and impacts the usability and broad application of the datasets.

Insight: 67% of the PCOS datasets have restricted access, which significantly limits the research potential and hinders broader application.

4.2.2. Instance Type

Concerning instance type, as shown in Figure 7b, the selected 36 datasets encompass image data, numerical data and text data. Specifically, 14 datasets consist of image data, 18 contain numerical data, 3 include both image and numerical data, and only 1 dataset is text-based. The lack of multimodal datasets (combining two or more instance types) hinders support for diverse diagnostic needs, limiting the generalization ability of existing tools.

Insight: The dominance of single-type datasets limits diagnostic versatility and tool adaptability in complex clinical scenarios.




Figure 7: The Openness and Instance Type of the 36 Datasets

4.2.3. Scale

In terms of dataset scale, results indicate that image dataset D5 [113] contains the most instances (4492), significantly outpacing other image datasets. Among numerical datasets, D10 [126] with 1273 instances, is the largest. Notably, D1 [130], D2 [127], D4 [128], and D7 [129] share identical instance counts, and further examination indicates a high degree of overlap in features, suggesting these datasets may originate from the same primary dataset. Among them, D4[128] contains an additional insulin level feature compared to the other three datasets.

4.2.4. Usage Count

D2 [127] and D3 [123] have the highest usage frequencies, referenced in 40 and 16 papers, respectively, containing 541 and 3856 instances. This suggests their widespread application in PCOS-related research, particularly D2 [127], which, due to its comprehensive numerical data, is frequently used for algorithm training and evaluation.

4.2.5. License

Regarding license, among the 12 open-source datasets, only a few explicitly state their licensing information. Specifically, dataset D6 [124] operates under the CC0: Public Domain license, allowing unrestricted use without special permission, suitable for both public research and commercial applications. D2 [127] uses the CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 license, permitting researchers to share and modify the data for non-commercial purposes, provided they adhere to attribution, non-commercial use, and share-alike requirements [131].

This has contributed to D2’s prominence in academic citations. Additionally, dataset D7 [129] only states that the data file copyrights belong to the original authors, lacking further usage terms, which may impose limitations on public use.

Insight: Only three datasets have clear usage licenses, while most lack explicit licensing information, leading to uncertainty in their use and potentially preventing researchers from using them due to legal issues.

4.2.6. *Maintenance Status*

Concerning maintenance status, among the 12 open-source datasets, the most recently updated include D11 [122], D3 [123], and D1 [130], all last updated in 2022. D6 [124] has not been updated since 2016, and D9 [125] last update was in 2017. Without sustained maintenance, affecting the applicability of models built on them, which is particularly problematic in fast-evolving fields like PCOS detection.

Insight: The lack of regular updates in datasets poses the risk of obsolescence, which can undermine the accuracy and reliability of models in PCOS detection research.

4.2.7. *Coverage*

Regarding dataset coverage, as shown in Table 2, these publicly available datasets collectively encompass 58 of the PCOS features identified in our classification system, yielding an overall coverage rate of 52% (58/110) compared to the known 110 features. Furthermore, a single dataset covers a maximum of 39 features and a minimum of 1 feature. Some datasets exhibit limited feature coverage, hindering comprehensive support for future developments and applications of PCOS detection tools. It is noteworthy that the coverage rate is merely a numerical value, and when combined with the performance metrics of detection tools discussed in Section 4.3, we found no significant correlation between the feature coverage of the datasets and the performance of the tools.

Answer to RQ2: Among the 36 PCOS datasets, 12 are publicly accessible, covering 58 features, which corresponds to an overall coverage rate of 52% compared to the known 110 features. At the same time, the current state of these datasets raises concerns due to the lack of multimodal datasets, many datasets have remained unupdated for years, and most lacking clear licensing information.

4.3. Capabilities of Intelligent Detection Tools

Addressing RQ3, this section aims to explore the capabilities of PCOS detection tools collected from scientific and grey literature. Following the process outlined in Section 3.6, we identified 45 representative PCOS intelligent detection tools.

Table 6 provides detailed information about these tools. In the following section, we present the analysis results from four aspects: the technologies used, the types of input data, the performance metrics of the tools, tool comparison and availability status.

4.3.1. Technology

In terms of technology employed, as shown in Figure 8a, we found that the vast majority (86%) utilize machine learning techniques, while only 13% employ deep learning. This indicates that machine learning remains the predominant approach for PCOS detection tools. Figure 8b shows the frequency of use of classification techniques, SM is the most widely used, with eight tools implementing this method. For feature selection methods, as shown in Figure 8c, PCA and Chi2 are the most frequently used, each employed by four tools. Tools using deep learning primarily employ CNN and MobileNet architectures for tasks involving ultrasound images or classification tasks that combine images with numerical data. The training of these ML and DL algorithms typically requires substantial computational resources and time, potentially leads to high training costs and may also extend the model development cycle.

Insight: The computational requirements of complex models may limit their popularization in resource-limited medical institutions, further hindering the widespread application of advanced detection technologies.

4.3.2. Input Data Types

Regarding input data types, as shown in Figure 8d, among the 45 detection tools, 7 utilize image data, while 37 rely on numerical data. Only tool T5[14] combines image and numerical data as input. Only one tool uses multimodal data. The dominance of single data-type tools suggests that current PCOS detection tools may not fully capture the complexity of clinical cases.

Insight: The limited integration of multimodal data in current tools underutilizes the potential for enhanced diagnostic accuracy.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Table 6: Tools List for PCOS Detection

Tools	Year	Venue	Technique	Input Type	Accuracy	Precision	F1-Score	Recall	Clinical Validation	Compared by	Count	Availability
T1[107]	2021	Frontiers in Public Health	KNN	image	97.00%	-	-	-	No	[93]	1	No
T1[105]	2022	ICEET	PCONet	image	98.12%	96.00%	97.00%	97.00%	No	[89], [95], [111]	3	No
T20[106]	2022	Scientific Reports	SM	image	99.00%	99.00%	100.00%	100.00%	No	[45]	1	No
T17[103]	2023	ICEARS	CNN	image	95.00%	91.00%	95.00%	91.12%	No	[95], [111]	2	No
T18[112]	2023	INDIACom	CNN	image	97.01%	97.06%	96.52%	97.31%	No	[95], [111]	2	No
T32[132]	2023	GtHub	MobileNet	image	100.00%	-	-	-	No	-	0	Yes,[132]
T36[94]	2024	Expert Systems	SM	image	98.12%	97.88%	96.89%	97.16%	No	-	0	No
T5[14]	2011	Appl. Comput. Intrcl. Soft Comput.	MobileNet	image-numerical	82.46%	84.62%	81.00%	78.57%	No	[21], [95], [111]	3	No
T19[11]	2011	INDICON	Bayesian and T-Test	numerical	93.93%	82.50%	-	-	No	[45], [53], [54], [57]	4	No
T27[15]	2014	ICACCCCT	SVM	numerical	95.00%	-	-	-	No	[73]	1	No
T26[87]	2018	Int. J Comput Eng Manag	NB	numerical	97.65%	95.00%	-	95.00%	No	[73, 53]	2	No
T2[12]	2019	TENCON	RF and PCA	numerical	89.02%	95.83%	42.00%	-	No	[37, 19, 45, 84, 47, 23, 78, 74, 73, 53, 54, 57]	12	No
T34[133]	2019	GtHub	LR and CF	numerical	88.30%	88.90%	84.20%	80.00%	No	[43, 78, 74, 57]	0	Yes,[133]
T17[62]	2020	LIMITES	LR and FM	numerical	92.00%	93.00%	92.00%	93.00%	No	[19, 45, 100, 84, 47, 51, 78, 58, 74, 54]	4	No
T11[13]	2020	TENSAMP	RF and SelectKBest	numerical	90.01%	89.90%	-	90.00%	No	-	10	No
T12[63]	2020	AMCI	RF	numerical	90.83%	91.33%	-	90.82%	No	[19, 73, 36]	3	No
T28[80]	2020	ISIR	ET and GA	numerical	88.00%	88.00%	86.00%	83.00%	No	[36]	1	No
T3[55]	2021	Biosci Biotechnol Res Commun	RF and Chi2	numerical	90.90%	89.10%	80.00%	73.00%	No	[68, 43, 47, 78, 74, 57]	6	No
T6[53]	2021	ICABME	LinearSVC and SFFS	numerical	91.60%	93.66%	-	80.66%	No	[43, 46, 47, 23, 51]	5	No
T13[54]	2021	CCWC	XGBoost and PCA	numerical	95.83%	97.50%	95.12%	92.86%	No	[19], [100]	2	No
T14[17]	2021	Molecular and Cellular Endocrinology	SM and GA	numerical	89.32%	-	-	88.89%	No	[19]	1	No
T22[16]	2021	ICOCCT	DT and GI	numerical	81.00%	70.00%	52.00%	41.00%	No	[47]	1	No
T45[73]	2021	Frontiers in Public Health	Fuzzy TOPSIS	numerical	98.26%	-	-	-	No	-	0	No
T33[134]	2021	GtHub	CardBoost and CF	numerical	87.73%	82.93%	77.27%	72.34%	No	-	0	Yes,[134]
T9[61]	2022	TENSAMP	CardBoost and SelectKBest	numerical	96.34%	88.88%	94.11%	100.00%	No	[43]	1	No
T10[82]	2022	Expert Systems with Applications	RF and CC	numerical	92.40%	-	-	-	No	[43, 21, 45, 47, 49]	5	No
T21[86]	2022	AICDS	SVM and PC	numerical	93.00%	96.00%	-	96.00%	No	[47], [49]	2	No
T24[18]	2022	JMIR Formative Research	CardBoost and PCA	numerical	90.10%	95.00%	92.80%	90.90%	No	[49], [51]	2	No
T25[67]	2022	ISDA	SV and SelectKBest, Chi2	numerical	91.12%	90.00%	90.00%	91.00%	No	[49]	1	No
T44[58]	2022	IEEE Access	GNB and CS-PCOS	numerical	100.00%	100.00%	-	100.00%	No	-	0	No
T15[49]	2023	Applied Systems Innovation	SM and SSA	numerical	98.00%	97.00%	98.00%	98.00%	No	[19]	1	No
T16[47]	2023	Diagnostics	SM and RFE	numerical	98.87%	98.00%	98.89%	98.87%	No	[19]	1	No
T23[49]	2023	Applied Systems Innovation	SM and MI	numerical	98.00%	97.00%	98.00%	98.00%	No	[47]	1	No
T39[36]	2023	Expert Systems with Applications	SM and BFE	numerical	90.24%	90.00%	89.82%	89.93%	No	-	0	No
T40[48]	2023	Heliyon	SM and PCA	numerical	95.70%	95.20%	95.20%	95.20%	No	-	0	No
T41[66]	2023	Digital health	SVM and LASSO	numerical	94.40%	-	-	-	No	-	0	No
T42[35]	2023	EuJIM	SVM and RFECV	numerical	83.70%	-	-	87.80%	No	-	0	No
T43[65]	2023	Expert Systems with Applications	GB and Chi2	numerical	98.90%	-	-	-	No	-	0	No
T8[76]	2023	Research Square	RF and PSO	numerical	93.87%	92.31%	90.57%	88.89%	No	[43, 21]	2	No
T35[19]	2024	EAAI	RF and PSO	numerical	92.64%	95.24%	86.96%	80.00%	No	-	0	No
T37[43]	2024	Multimedia Tools and Applications	XGBoost and SCA	numerical	98.78%	95.56%	96.69%	93.56%	No	-	0	No
T38[24]	2024	Multimedia Tools and Applications	CRDODL-BDADC	numerical	96.93%	96.64%	96.37%	96.12%	No	-	0	No
T29[135]	2024	GtHub	KNN and LR	numerical	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	No	-	0	Yes[135]
T30[136]	2024	GtHub	XGBoost and Chi2	numerical	94.79%	95.12%	93.98%	92.86%	No	-	0	Yes,[136]
T31[137]	2024	GtHub	RF and CF	numerical	91.00%	93.00%	76.00%	84.00%	No	-	0	Yes,[137]

Abbreviation of technology: KNN, K-Nearest-Neighbours; SFFS, Sequential Forward Floating Selection wrapper; PSO, Particle Swarm; RFLR, Optimization Hybrid; Random Forest Logistic Regression; RFE, Recursive Feature Elimination; KNN, K-NearestNeighbor; SCA, Sine Cosine Algorithm; BFE, Backward Feature Elimination; LASSO, Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator Regression; RFECV, Recursive Feature Elimination with Cross-Validation; LR, Logistic Regression; GA:Genetic Algorithm; SSA,Salp Swarm Optimization; MI, Mutual Information; CF, Correlation Factor; FM, Filter Method; CC, Correlation coefficient; SM, Stacking Model; GI, Gini Importance; SV, Soft Voting; PC, Pearson Correlation; GB, Gradient Boosting; ET,Extra Trees; NB, Naive Bayes; GNB, Gaussian Naive Bayes.

discrepancy between precision and F1 score suggests that while Tool T2 excels at identifying true positives (high precision), it struggles with capturing enough of the true positives in the overall dataset (low F1 score). This highlights a potential issue in balancing sensitivity and specificity, suggesting that the tool may miss a considerable number of positive cases despite its high precision. Furthermore, as shown in column 10 of Table 6, although many tools demonstrate promising results on test datasets, they lack validation in real-world clinical settings.

Insight: Some tools demonstrate high accuracy on test datasets, but real-world validation remains crucial for PCOS tools.

4.3.4. Tool Comparison and Availability Status

In analyzing the comparison frequency and availability of tools, T2 [12] and T11 [13] stand out as they are frequently compared, being used by 12 and 10 other tools, respectively. This highlights their significant influence in the academic community. Interestingly, the tools that are most frequently compared are not open-source. Among all the tools, only those derived from grey literature are open-source, and these open-source tools have not been subject to comparison by other tools. This trend suggests that while open-source tools may have a lower influence in academic circles, they nonetheless contribute to expanding our understanding of intelligent detection tools.

Insight: The dominance of closed-source tools in academic comparisons limits transparency and broader adoption, while open-source tools, though underrepresented, offer key benefits for scalability and collaboration.

Answer to RQ3: The selected 45 representative PCOS detection tools are all based on machine learning and deep learning technologies and demonstrate good detection performance on their test datasets. The detection accuracy of some tools even reached 100%. However, these tools still have the following limitations: (1) they require a lot of computing resources and take a long time to train; (2) they are insufficient in multimodal data processing; and (3) they lack clinical validation.

5. Discussion

This section discusses three key aspects: takeaway, limitations of our study, and challenges for future research.

5.1. Takeaway

Our research has constructed a comprehensive taxonomy of PCOS detection features, offering significant insights for both academia and industry.

- *Standardization*: As Expert 1 mentioned in Table 4. Researchers and medical professionals will benefit from the taxonomy, which offers a standardized framework for PCOS detection features. The taxonomy eliminates ambiguities and facilitates clear communication between researchers and industry experts, ultimately enhancing their understanding of detection features.
- *Data Evaluation*: Data scientists will find valuable insights for future data collection and usage strategies. We conducted a detailed analysis of the datasets used for PCOS detection, evaluating aspects such as openness, size, maintenance status, and coverage. This process uncovered deficiencies in feature coverage and the availability of multimodal data, providing a clear direction for future dataset improvements.
- *Tool Evaluation*: Researchers in the field can utilize the results of the tool evaluation to refine existing tools or develop new methodologies that enhance diagnostic accuracy. By assessing the capabilities of existing PCOS detection tools, we identified their limitations, guiding the development of more efficient detection algorithms.
- *Interdisciplinary Collaboration*: As Expert 4 mentioned in Table 4. The taxonomy offers a common language and toolset for researchers across different fields, promoting interdisciplinary collaboration and supporting the integration of various diagnostic methods to enhance the comprehensiveness of PCOS detection. This fosters teamwork among medical researchers, data scientists, and healthcare practitioners, ultimately improving patient outcomes.

5.2. Limitations

This study has several limitations that may affect the generalizability and accuracy of the findings.

First, our taxonomy is based on PCOS detection features extracted from existing literature and publicly available datasets. Due to factors such as access limitations, language barriers, or database restrictions, some relevant

studies or datasets may not have been included, potentially leading to selection bias. This may affect the completeness and accuracy of the taxonomy.

Second, while we incorporated expert feedback during the feature labeling process, the subjective nature of manual annotations could introduce some degree of inconsistency or inaccuracies in the feature classification. Additionally, due to time and resource constraints, we were unable to empirically validate all of the PCOS detection algorithms discussed in the literature, which means there could be discrepancies between reported and actual tool performance.

Third, our study relies on currently available public datasets, which may not fully represent the diversity and complexity of PCOS patients, especially in the absence of multimodal data, limiting the generalizability and applicability of our conclusions in different clinical settings.

Finally, as PCOS detection technologies and related algorithms rapidly evolve, our research, which is based on existing techniques and literature, may face challenges regarding the validity of the current taxonomy and conclusions as new technologies and methods emerge. Continuous updates will be necessary to maintain relevance and accuracy.

5.3. Challenges

This study identifies three major challenges in the detection of PCOS: the timeliness of taxonomy, limitations in existing datasets, and deficiencies in detection tools. Addressing these challenges is essential for effectively advancing future developments.

First, not all features included in the current taxonomy are used in actual clinical diagnosis. Our taxonomy encompasses 110 features, which, based on discussions with medical professionals, can be classified into three categories: features actively used in diagnosis, features considered with some uncertainty, and features primarily used in research contexts that have yet to be adopted clinically. Moreover, the lack of mechanisms for real-time updates limits the taxonomy's adaptability to emerging diagnostic trends, biomarkers, and technologies. Future research should prioritize developing a dynamic and scalable taxonomy that integrates automated updates from new literature and datasets. Such advancements would ensure the taxonomy remains relevant, flexible, and capable of supporting evolving clinical needs, thereby enhancing its applicability in practical diagnostics.

Second, inadequacies in datasets and their associated limitations pose significant barriers. Many datasets suffer from restricted access, delayed up-

dates, insufficient instances, or a lack of multimodal data. Many datasets are not publicly available or have restricted access, which limits their use. Although some datasets are widely used, the scarcity of datasets combining multiple data types hinders diagnostic accuracy and limits the generalization capabilities of detection tools. Furthermore, datasets that are publicly available often lack relevance to current clinical practices, further diminishing their utility. Addressing these issues requires constructing open, comprehensive, and diverse datasets that support the training of robust PCOS detection models, particularly those designed to integrate and process multimodal data effectively. This approach will better accommodate the growing complexity and diversity of real-world clinical diagnostic needs.

Finally, current intelligent detection tools face challenges related to computational complexity, resource demands, limited multimodal processing, and insufficient clinical validation. Tools primarily rely on machine learning and deep learning methods, such as CNNs, which, while powerful, demand substantial computational resources and time, increasing costs and lengthening development cycles. Additionally, most tools are constrained to single data types, which restricts their adaptability to complex clinical scenarios. Moreover, a lack of rigorous clinical validation limits confidence in their real-world diagnostic effectiveness and safety. Future research should emphasize developing efficient, multimodal detection models capable of processing diverse data types and ensuring robust clinical validation to establish their practicality in real healthcare settings.

In summary, addressing these challenges will lay a robust foundation for advancing PCOS detection. Priorities for future research include creating a dynamic taxonomy, constructing open and comprehensive multimodal datasets, and developing clinically validated, efficient detection tools. These efforts will collectively improve diagnostic accuracy, scalability, and real-world impact.

6. Conclusion

This study addresses critical barriers in PCOS detection research, specifically concerning the taxonomy of detection features, intelligent detection tools, and available datasets. We successfully constructed a comprehensive taxonomy of PCOS detection features to date based on 93 relevant papers. This taxonomy includes the types and sources of features, a list of relevant studies that utilize these features, and annotates the acquisition methods

and difficulty levels for each. Based on this taxonomy, we conducted a review of existing intelligent detection tools, revealing their capabilities and limitations, and conducted an in-depth analysis of the datasets used for detection and evaluated the current status of the datasets. In future work, based on the development of a unified dataset, we will compare the capabilities of these tools and, building on this comparison, develop more efficient PCOS detection algorithms.

References

- [1] Helena J Teede, Marie L Misso, Michael F Costello, Anuja Dokras, Joop Laven, Lisa Moran, Terhi Piltonen, and Robert J Norman. Recommendations from the international evidence-based guideline for the assessment and management of polycystic ovary syndrome. *Human reproduction*, 33(9):1602–1618, 2018.
- [2] Ricardo Azziz, Enrico Carmina, ZiJiang Chen, Andrea Dunaif, Joop SE Laven, Richard S Legro, Daria Lizneva, Barbara Natterson-Horowitz, Helena J Teede, and Bulent O Yildiz. Polycystic ovary syndrome. *Nature reviews Disease primers*, 2(1):1–18, 2016.
- [3] Helena J Teede, Chau Thien Tay, Joop Laven, Anuja Dokras, Lisa Moran, Terhi Piltonen, Michael Costello, Jacky Boivin, Leanne Redman, Jacqueline Boyle, et al. International evidence-based guideline for the assessment and management of polycystic ovary syndrome 2023. 2023.
- [4] Wendy A March, Vivienne M Moore, Kristyn J Willson, David IW Phillips, Robert J Norman, and Michael J Davies. The prevalence of polycystic ovary syndrome in a community sample assessed under contrasting diagnostic criteria. *Human reproduction*, 25(2):544–551, 2010.
- [5] Gurkan Bozdog, Sezcan Mumusoglu, Dila Zengin, Erdem Karabulut, and Bulent Okan Yildiz. The prevalence and phenotypic features of polycystic ovary syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Human reproduction*, 31(12):2841–2855, 2016.
- [6] Siew S Lim, MJ Davies, Robert J Norman, and LJ Moran. Overweight, obesity and central obesity in women with polycystic ovary syndrome:

- a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Human reproduction update*, 18(6):618–637, 2012.
- [7] Ricardo Azziz, Enrico Carmina, Didier Dewailly, Evanthia Diamanti-Kandarakis, Héctor F Escobar-Morreale, Walter Futterweit, Onno E Janssen, Richard S Legro, Robert J Norman, Ann E Taylor, et al. The androgen excess and pcos society criteria for the polycystic ovary syndrome: the complete task force report. *Fertility and sterility*, 91(2):456–488, 2009.
 - [8] Robert J Norman, Didier Dewailly, Richard S Legro, and Theresa E Hickey. Polycystic ovary syndrome. *The Lancet*, 370(9588):685–697, 2007.
 - [9] The Rotterdam ESHRE, ASRM-Sponsored PCOS Consensus Workshop Group, et al. Revised 2003 consensus on diagnostic criteria and long-term health risks related to polycystic ovary syndrome. *Fertility and sterility*, 81(1):19–25, 2004.
 - [10] Ricardo Azziz, Keslie S Woods, Rosario Reyna, Timothy J Key, Eric S Knochenhauer, and Bulent O Yildiz. The prevalence and features of the polycystic ovary syndrome in an unselected population. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*, 89(6):2745–2749, 2004.
 - [11] Palak Mehrotra, Jyotirmoy Chatterjee, Chandan Chakraborty, Biswanath Ghoshdastidar, and Sudarshan Ghoshdastidar. Automated screening of polycystic ovary syndrome using machine learning techniques. In *2011 Annual IEEE India Conference*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2011.
 - [12] Amsy Denny, Anita Raj, Ashi Ashok, C Maneesh Ram, and Remya George. i-hope: Detection and prediction system for polycystic ovary syndrome (pcos) using machine learning techniques. In *TENCON 2019-2019 IEEE Region 10 Conference (TENCON)*, pages 673–678. IEEE, 2019.
 - [13] Subrato Bharati, Prajoy Podder, and M Rubaiyat Hossain Mondal. Diagnosis of polycystic ovary syndrome using machine learning algorithms. In *2020 IEEE region 10 symposium (TENSYP)*, pages 1486–1489. IEEE, 2020.

- [14] Abrar Alamoudi, Irfan Ullah Khan, Nida Aslam, Nourah Alqahtani, Hind S Alsaif, Omran Al Dandan, Mohammed Al Gadeeb, and Ridha Al Bahrani. A deep learning fusion approach to diagnosis the polycystic ovary syndrome (pcos). *Applied Computational Intelligence and Soft Computing*, 2023(1):9686697, 2023.
- [15] Sharvari S Deshpande and Asmita Wakankar. Automated detection of polycystic ovarian syndrome using follicle recognition. In *2014 IEEE international conference on advanced communications, control and computing technologies*, pages 1341–1346. IEEE, 2014.
- [16] Preeti Chauhan, Pooja Patil, Neha Rane, Pooja Raundale, and Harshil Kanakia. Comparative analysis of machine learning algorithms for prediction of pcos. In *2021 international conference on communication information and computing technology (ICCICT)*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2021.
- [17] Xinyi Zhang, Bo Liang, Jun Zhang, Xinyao Hao, Xiaoyan Xu, Hsun-Ming Chang, Peter CK Leung, and Jichun Tan. Raman spectroscopy of follicular fluid and plasma with machine-learning algorithms for polycystic ovary syndrome screening. *Molecular and cellular endocrinology*, 523:111139, 2021.
- [18] Angela Zigarelli, Ziyang Jia, and Hyunsun Lee. Machine-aided self-diagnostic prediction models for polycystic ovary syndrome: observational study. *JMIR Formative Research*, 6(3):e29967, 2022.
- [19] R Subha, BR Nayana, Rekha Radhakrishnan, and P Sumalatha. Computational intelligence for early detection of infertility in women. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 127:107400, 2024.
- [20] Md Asif Bin Syed, Md Ekramul Islam, Tanpia Tasnim, et al. Investigation of polycystic ovary syndrome (pcos) diagnosis using machine learning approaches. In *2023 5th International Conference on Sustainable Technologies for Industry 5.0 (STI)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2023.
- [21] Somya Srivastav, Kalpna Guleria, and Shagun Sharma. A transfer learning-based fine tuned vgg16 model for pcos classification. In *2024 2nd International Conference on Intelligent Data Communication Technologies and Internet of Things (IDCIoT)*, pages 1074–1079. IEEE, 2024.

- [22] Wenqi Lv, Ying Song, Rongxin Fu, Xue Lin, Ya Su, Xiangyu Jin, Han Yang, Xiaohui Shan, Wenli Du, Qin Huang, et al. Deep learning algorithm for automated detection of polycystic ovary syndrome using scleral images. *Frontiers in Endocrinology*, 12:789878, 2022.
- [23] Mohamed Abouhawwash, S Sridevi, Suma Christal Mary Sundararajan, Rohit Pachlor, Faten Khalid Karim, and Doaa Sami Khafaga. Automatic diagnosis of polycystic ovarian syndrome using wrapper methodology with deep learning techniques. *Computer Systems Science & Engineering*, 47(1), 2023.
- [24] R Hendra Kumar and Gurram Sunitha. Big data analytics in healthcare environment using chaotic red deer optimizer with deep learning for disease classification model. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, pages 1–19, 2024.
- [25] Neetha Thomas, Bosco Paul Alapatt, Kr Resmi, and Mahesh Jose. A deep learning methodology cnn-adam for the prediction of pcos from text report. In *2023 7th International Conference on Computer Applications in Electrical Engineering-Recent Advances (CERA)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2023.
- [26] Krishna Modi, Ishbir Singh, and Yogesh Kumar. A comprehensive analysis of artificial intelligence techniques for the prediction and prognosis of lifestyle diseases. *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering*, 30(8):4733–4756, 2023.
- [27] Sayma Alam Suha and Muhammad Nazrul Islam. A systematic review and future research agenda on detection of polycystic ovary syndrome (pcos) with computer-aided techniques. *Heliyon*, 2023.
- [28] Francisco J Barrera, Ethan DL Brown, Amanda Rojo, Javier Obeso, Hiram Plata, Eddy P Lincango, Nancy Terry, René Rodríguez-Gutiérrez, Janet E Hall, and Skand Shekhar. Application of machine learning and artificial intelligence in the diagnosis and classification of polycystic ovarian syndrome: a systematic review. *Frontiers in Endocrinology*, 14:1106625, 2023.
- [29] Piergiorgio Ladisa, Henrik Plate, Matias Martinez, and Olivier Barais. Sok: Taxonomy of attacks on open-source software supply chains. In

2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), pages 1509–1526. IEEE, 2023.

- [30] Barbara Kitchenham, O Pearl Brereton, David Budgen, Mark Turner, John Bailey, and Stephen Linkman. Systematic literature reviews in software engineering—a systematic literature review. *Information and software technology*, 51(1):7–15, 2009.
- [31] Liming Nie, Kabir Sulaiman Said, Lingfei Ma, Yaowen Zheng, and Yangyang Zhao. A systematic mapping study for graphical user interface testing on mobile apps. *IET Software*, 17(3):249–267, 2023.
- [32] Barbara Kitchenham, O Pearl Brereton, David Budgen, Mark Turner, John Bailey, and Stephen Linkman. Systematic literature reviews in software engineering—a systematic literature review. *Information and software technology*, 51(1):7–15, 2009.
- [33] Liming Nie, Yangyang Zhao, Chenglin Li, Xuqiong Luo, and Yang Liu. Shadows in the interface: A comprehensive study on dark patterns. *Proceedings of the ACM on Software Engineering*, 1(FSE):204–225, 2024.
- [34] Zahra Zad, Victoria S Jiang, Amber T Wolf, Taiyao Wang, J Jojo Cheng, Ioannis Ch Paschalidis, and Shruthi Mahalingaiah. Predicting polycystic ovary syndrome with machine learning algorithms from electronic health records. *Frontiers in Endocrinology*, 15:1298628, 2024.
- [35] Jiekee Lim, Jieyun Li, Xiao Feng, Lu Feng, Xinang Xiao, Yumo Xia, Yiqin Wang, Lin Qian, Hong Yang, and Zhaoxia Xu. Machine learning-based evaluation of application value of traditional chinese medicine clinical index and pulse wave parameters in the diagnosis of polycystic ovary syndrome. *European Journal of Integrative Medicine*, 64:102311, 2023.
- [36] Ritika Kumari, Jaspreeti Singh, and Anjana Gosain. Sms: Smote-stacked hybrid model for diagnosis of polycystic ovary syndrome using feature selection method. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 225:120102, 2023.
- [37] Tamanna Hossain Mou, Oishi Jyoti, Tamal Ahmed, and MD Rafi Imam. A comparative study for detecting polycystic ovary syndrome

- using a machine learning framework. In *2023 26th International Conference on Computer and Information Technology (ICCIT)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2023.
- [38] Zanxiang He. Web, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://sites.google.com/view/sok-pcos/>.
- [39] Gerald Albaum. The likert scale revisited: An alternate version. *International Journal of Market Research*, 39:331–348, 01 1997.
- [40] M Priyadharshini, A Srimathi, C Sanjay, and K Ramprakash. Pcos disease prediction using machine learning algorithms. *International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)*, 2(03):651–655, 2024.
- [41] Shivam Krishana, Sparsh Sharma, Saurabh Singh, and Byungun Yoon. Early diagnosis of polycystic ovarian syndrome (pcos) using machine learning: an ensemble learning approach. In *2023 International Conference on Modeling, Simulation & Intelligent Computing (MoSICom)*, pages 307–312. IEEE, 2023.
- [42] Caroline Chan. Polycystic ovarian syndrome (pcos) detection using gradient boosted decision tree. *Authorea Preprints*, 2023.
- [43] Ishwari Singh Rajput, Sonam Tyagi, Aditya Gupta, and Vibha Jain. Sine cosine algorithm-based feature selection for improved machine learning models in polycystic ovary syndrome diagnosis. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, pages 1–25, 2024.
- [44] Madasu Deepika, S Nachiyappan, M Braveen, K Anusha, KV Pradeep, GS Gayathri, et al. Machine learning-driven polycystic ovary syndrome detection with feature selection. In *2023 6th International Conference on Recent Trends in Advance Computing (ICRTAC)*, pages 523–529. IEEE, 2023.
- [45] Rithwick Sethi, Dinesh Kumar Vishwakarma, Sreetam Ganguly, and Raj Ray. A comparative study on different machine learning algorithms to detect pcos. In *2023 14th International Conference on Computing Communication and Networking Technologies (ICCCNT)*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2023.

- [46] Amjed Al-Mousa, Badr Mansour, Hamsa Al-Dabbagh, and Mohammad Radi. Diagnosis of polycystic ovary syndrome using random forest with bagging technique. In *2023 IEEE Jordan International Joint Conference on Electrical Engineering and Information Technology (JEEIT)*, pages 187–192. IEEE, 2023.
- [47] Hela Elmannai, Nora El-Rashidy, Ibrahim Mashal, Manal Abdullah Alohali, Sara Farag, Shaker El-Sappagh, and Hager Saleh. Polycystic ovary syndrome detection machine learning model based on optimized feature selection and explainable artificial intelligence. *Diagnostics*, 13(8):1506, 2023.
- [48] Sayma Alam Suha and Muhammad Nazrul Islam. Exploring the dominant features and data-driven detection of polycystic ovary syndrome through modified stacking ensemble machine learning technique. *Helvion*, 9(3), 2023.
- [49] Varada Vivek Khanna, Krishnaraj Chadaga, Niranajana Sampathila, Srikanth Prabhu, Venkatesh Bhandage, and Govardhan K Hegde. A distinctive explainable machine learning framework for detection of polycystic ovary syndrome. *Applied System Innovation*, 6(2):32, 2023.
- [50] Shivangi Raghav, Muskan Rathore, Aastha Suri, Rachna Jain, Preeti Nagrath, and Ashish Kumar. Prediction and analysis of polycystic ovary syndrome using machine learning. In *Computational Intelligence for Engineering and Management Applications: Select Proceedings of CIEMA 2022*, pages 167–178. Springer, 2023.
- [51] Sara Alshakrani, Sawsan Hilal, and Ahmed M Zeki. Hybrid machine learning algorithms for polycystic ovary syndrome detection. In *2022 International Conference on Data Analytics for Business and Industry (ICDABI)*, pages 160–164. IEEE, 2022.
- [52] Shivani Aggarwal and Kavita Pandey. An analysis of pcos disease prediction model using machine learning classification algorithms. *Recent Patents on Engineering*, 15(6):53–63, 2021.
- [53] Yasmine A Abu Adla, Dalia G Raydan, Mohammad-Zafer J Charaf, Roua A Saad, Jad Nasreddine, and Mohammad O Diab. Automated

- detection of polycystic ovary syndrome using machine learning techniques. In *2021 Sixth international conference on advances in biomedical engineering (ICABME)*, pages 208–212. IEEE, 2021.
- [54] Muhammad Sakib Khan Inan, Rubaiath E Ulfath, Fahim Irfan Alam, Fateha Khanam Bappee, and Rizwan Hasan. Improved sampling and feature selection to support extreme gradient boosting for pcos diagnosis. In *2021 IEEE 11th annual computing and communication workshop and conference (CCWC)*, pages 1046–1050. IEEE, 2021.
- [55] Vaidehi Thakre, Shreyas Vedpathak, Kalpana Thakre, and Shilpa Sonawani. Pcocare: Pcos detection and prediction using machine learning algorithms. *Biosci Biotechnol Res Commun*, 13(14):240–244, 2020.
- [56] Shivani Aggarwal and Kavita Pandey. Pcos diagnosis with commonly known diseases using hybrid machine learning algorithms. In *2023 6th International Conference on Contemporary Computing and Informatics (IC3I)*, volume 6, pages 1658–1662. IEEE, 2023.
- [57] Fariha Jannat Ananna, Afsana Khan, MD Sadi Ashraf, Fatema Tuz Zohora, Md Tanzim Reza, and Md Mizanur Rahman. Evaluating machine learning model performance in predicting polycystic ovarian syndrome. In *2023 IEEE 9th International Women in Engineering (WIE) Conference on Electrical and Computer Engineering (WIECON-ECE)*, pages 339–344. IEEE, 2023.
- [58] Shazia Nasim, Mubarak Saad Almutairi, Kashif Munir, Ali Raza, and Faizan Younas. A novel approach for polycystic ovary syndrome prediction using machine learning in bioinformatics. *IEEE Access*, 10:97610–97624, 2022.
- [59] Neha Nayak, Disha Sriram, Lavanya Sanjay, Ashwini Kodipalli, Trupthi Rao, and V Pushpalatha. Analysis and prediction of polycystic ovarian syndrome using ml classifiers. In *2023 International Conference on Computational Intelligence for Information, Security and Communication Applications (CIISCA)*, pages 218–223. IEEE, 2023.
- [60] S Sreejith, H Khanna Nehemiah, and A Kannan. A clinical decision support system for polycystic ovarian syndrome using red deer algorithm and random forest classifier. *Healthcare Analytics*, 2:100102, 2022.

- [61] Yash Rathod, Aryan Komare, Ruchita Ajgaonkar, Shruti Chindarkar, Gajanan Nagare, Neelam Punjabi, and Yogesh Karpate. Predictive analysis of polycystic ovarian syndrome using catboost algorithm. In *2022 IEEE region 10 symposium (TENSYMP)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2022.
- [62] Namrata Tanwani. Detecting pcos using machine learning. *Int J Modern Trends Eng Sci (IJMTES)*, 7(1):1–20, 2020.
- [63] Satish CR Nandipati and Chew Xin Ying. Polycystic ovarian syndrome (pcos) classification and feature selection by machine learning techniques. *Applied Mathematics and Computational Intelligence (AMCI)*, 9:65–74, 2020.
- [64] Priyanka Jain, Rohit Kumar Mishra, Aakash Deep, and NK Jain. Xplainable ai for deep learning model on pcod analysis. In *XAI Based Intelligent Systems for Society 5.0*, pages 131–152. Elsevier, 2024.
- [65] Shivani Aggarwal and Kavita Pandey. Early identification of pcos with commonly known diseases: Obesity, diabetes, high blood pressure and heart disease using machine learning techniques. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 217:119532, 2023.
- [66] Weiyang Wang, Weiwei Zeng, Shunli He, Yulin Shi, Xinmin Chen, Liping Tu, Bingyi Yang, Jiatio Xu, and Xiuqi Yin. A new model for predicting the occurrence of polycystic ovary syndrome: Based on data of tongue and pulse. *Digital health*, 9:20552076231160323, 2023.
- [67] Subrato Bharati, Prajoy Podder, M Rubaiyat Hossain Mondal, VB Surya Prasath, and Niketa Gandhi. Ensemble learning for data-driven diagnosis of polycystic ovary syndrome. In *International conference on intelligent systems design and applications*, pages 1250–1259. Springer, 2021.
- [68] P Chitra, K Srilatha, M Sumathi, C Ishwarya, and Mandala Jagadesh. Automated detection of polycystic ovaries using pretrained deep learning models. In *2023 Annual International Conference on Emerging Research Areas: International Conference on Intelligent Systems (AICERA/ICIS)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2023.
- [69] A Ajil, Anooja Ali, HV Ramachandra, TousifAhamed Allabksha Nadaf, et al. Enhancing the healthcare by an automated detection method for

- pcos using supervised machine learning algorithm. In *2023 International Conference on Recent Advances in Information Technology for Sustainable Development (ICRAIS)*, pages 166–170. IEEE, 2023.
- [70] Sakthipriya Dhinakaran, Chandrakumar Thangavel, S Shivayavashilaxmipriya, and VS Harinee. Pcos perception analysis prediction using machine learning algorithms. In *2022 IEEE 7th International Conference on Recent Advances and Innovations in Engineering (ICRAIE)*, volume 7, pages 260–265. IEEE, 2022.
- [71] K Gencer and G Gencer. Machine learning assisted decision making in patients with polycystic ovary syndrome. In *9th International Congress on Life, Engineering, and Applied Sciences in a Changing World*, 2023.
- [72] Selvaraj Santhi and Sundaradhas Nidhyananthan. Optimized feature selection for pcos disease prediction. In *Proceedings of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences*, volume 76, pages 1430–1439, 2023.
- [73] Ashwini Kodipalli and Susheela Devi. Prediction of pcos and mental health using fuzzy inference and svm. *Frontiers in public health*, 9:789569, 2021.
- [74] Najlaa Nasralaa Faris and Firsas Saber Miften. Detection of pcos based on genetic algorithm coupled with svm. *Journal of Education for Pure Science-University of Thi-Qar*, 12(2):73–84, 2022.
- [75] Navkaran Singh, Mantej Singh, Teoh Teik Toe, Mahesh Choolani, and Tan Thiam Chye. A patient-centric machine learning-based phone application for predicting the risk of polycystic ovarian syndrome. In *IEEE EUROCON 2023-20th International Conference on Smart Technologies*, pages 153–157. IEEE, 2023.
- [76] R Subha, BR Nayana, Rekha Radhakrishnan, and P Sumalatha. Computerized diagnosis of polycystic ovary syndrome using machine learning and swarm intelligence techniques. 2023.
- [77] Harsita Batra, Kamal Saluja, Sunil Gupta, Rajesh Kaushal, Neha Sharma, and Pardeep Singh. Machine learning techniques for data-driven computer-aided diagnostic method of polycystic ovary syndrome (pcos) resulting from functional ovarian hyperandrogenism (foh). In

2023 International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Sustainable Engineering Solutions (CISES), pages 195–201. IEEE, 2023.

- [78] Najlaa Nsrulaah Faris and Firsas Saber Miften. An intelligence model for detection of pcOS based on k-means coupled with ls-svm. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, 34(21):e7139, 2022.
- [79] Moesha Danielle Genola Moore, Kevin Baboolal, and Patrick Hosein. On the prediction of polycystic ovarian syndrome. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Technology Management, Operations and Decisions (ICTMOD)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2023.
- [80] Ashok Munjal, Rekha Khandia, and Brijraj Gautam. A machine learning approach for selection of polycystic ovarian syndrome (pcos) attributes and comparing different classifier performance with the help of weka and pycaret. *Int. J. Sci. Res.*, (2277):59–63, 2020.
- [81] Khushi Vora, Arya Shah, Nishant Shah, and Priyanka Verma. Prediction of polycystic ovary syndrome (pcos) using optimized machine learning classifiers. In *Proceedings of 3rd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence: Advances and Applications: ICAIAA 2022*, pages 1–12. Springer, 2023.
- [82] Shamik Tiwari, Lalit Kane, Deepika Koundal, Anurag Jain, Adi Alhudaif, Kemal Polat, Atef Zaguia, Fayadh Alenezi, and Sara A Althubiti. Sposds: A smart polycystic ovary syndrome diagnostic system using machine learning. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 203:117592, 2022.
- [83] Madyala Chandana, Ramesh Ponnala, and B Indira. Hybrid models for pcOS prediction using machine learning algorithms to address class imbalance. In *2023 International Conference on Advances in Computation, Communication and Information Technology (ICAICCIT)*, pages 275–280. IEEE, 2023.
- [84] Akanksha Tanwar, Anima Jain, and Anamika Chauhan. Accessible polycystic ovarian syndrome diagnosis using machine learning. In *2022 3rd international conference for emerging technology (INCET)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2022.

- [85] Kavita Pandey and Budesh Kanwer. A prediction model for poly-cystic ovary syndrome problem using computational intelligence. *Journal of Information and Optimization Sciences*, 44:553–563, 01 2023.
- [86] Piyush Bhardwaj and Parul Tiwari. Manoeuvre of machine learning algorithms in healthcare sector with application to polycystic ovarian syndrome diagnosis. In *Proceedings of academia-industry consortium for data science: AICDS 2020*, pages 71–84. Springer, 2022.
- [87] B Vikas, BS Anuhya, Manaswini Chilla, and Sipra Sarangi. A critical study of polycystic ovarian syndrome (pcos) classification techniques. *Int J Comput Eng Manag*, 4:1–7, 2018.
- [88] Charvi Bansal, Palak Handa, and Nidhi Goel. Comparing different models for polycystic ovary syndrome diagnosis: An empirical investigation on a large clinical dataset. In *2023 IEEE Women in Technology Conference (WINTeCHCON)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2023.
- [89] Saroj Kr Biswas, Debasmita Saha, Dalton Meitei Thounaojam, Barsha Abhisheka, Soumen Das, Biswajit Purkayastha, et al. Estdpcos: Effectiveness of combined cnn and handcrafted features for ovarian cyst detection in pcos patients using ultrasound images. In *2023 10th IEEE Uttar Pradesh Section International Conference on Electrical, Electronics and Computer Engineering (UPCON)*, volume 10, pages 846–851. IEEE, 2023.
- [90] Shamik Tiwari and Piyush Maheshwari. Polycystic ovarian syndrome identification through self-attention guided convolutional neural network. In *2023 24th International Arab Conference on Information Technology (ACIT)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2023.
- [91] Rakib Ahammed Diptho, Nusrat Jahan, Tahsin Istiyaq, Fairuz Anika, Muhammad Iqbal Hossain, et al. Pcos diagnosis with confluence cnn: A revolution in women’s health. In *2023 26th International Conference on Computer and Information Technology (ICCIT)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- [92] Sivakannan Subramani, Aleena Rarichan, and SH Chaithra. Utilizing deep learning techniques for detection of polycystic ovarian syndrome using ovarian ultrasound image. In *2023 International Conference on*

Innovative Computing, Intelligent Communication and Smart Electrical Systems (ICSES), pages 1–7. IEEE, 2023.

- [93] Pradeep Bedi, SB Goyal, Anand Singh Rajawat, and Manoj Kumar. An integrated adaptive bilateral filter-based framework and attention residual u-net for detecting polycystic ovary syndrome. *Decision Analytics Journal*, 10:100366, 2024.
- [94] Ashwini Kodipalli, Susheela Devi, and Santosh Dasar. Semantic segmentation and classification of polycystic ovarian disease using attention unet, pyspark, and ensemble learning model. *Expert Systems*, 41(3):e13498, 2024.
- [95] Geet Sahu, Mohan Karnati, Ayush Singh Rajput, Mayank Chaudhary, Ritesh Maurya, and Malay Kishore Dutta. Attention-based transfer learning approach using spatial pyramid pooling for diagnosis of polycystic ovary syndrome. In *2023 9th International Conference on Signal Processing and Communication (ICSC)*, pages 238–243. IEEE, 2023.
- [96] A Suresh Kumar, S Annamalai, M Kumaresan, P Manikandan, Ramesh Sekaran, and H Aditya Pai. Cnn-based analysis of ultrasound images for pcos diagnosis. In *2023 3rd International Conference on Technological Advancements in Computational Sciences (ICTACS)*, pages 347–350. IEEE, 2023.
- [97] S Reka, Praba T Suriya, and Karthik Mohan. Expeditious prognosis of pcos with ultrasonography images-a convolutional neural network approach. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence of Things*, pages 367–376. Springer, 2023.
- [98] P Sherubha, R Madhumitha, SP Sasi Rekha, et al. Prediction of ovarian syndrome using deep feature representation and learning approaches. In *2023 International Conference on Research Methodologies in Knowledge Management, Artificial Intelligence and Telecommunication Engineering (RMKMATE)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2023.
- [99] Jojo James, Sabeen Govind, and Jijo Francis. Ultrasound image classification and follicle segmentation for the diagnosis of polycystic ovary syndrome. In *International Conference on Power Engineering and Intelligent Systems (PEIS)*, pages 145–154. Springer, 2023.

- [100] M Sumathi, P Chitra, S Sheela, and C Ishwarya. Study and implementation of automated system for detection of pcos from ultrasound scan images using artificial intelligence. *The Imaging Science Journal*, 72(7):828–839, 2024.
- [101] Shamik Tiwari and Piyush Maheshwari. Pcos-waveconvnet: A wavelet convolutional neural network for polycystic ovary syndrome detection using ultrasound images. In *2023 9th International Conference on Information Technology Trends (ITT)*, pages 117–122. IEEE, 2023.
- [102] P Gokila Brindha and RR Rajalaxmi. Comparative study of cnn and transfer learning techniques in the classification of pco ultra sound images. In *2023 International Conference on Networking and Communications (ICNWC)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2023.
- [103] P Chitra, K Srilatha, M Sumathi, FV Jayasudha, T Bernatin, and Mandala Jagadeesh. Classification of ultrasound pcos image using deep learning based hybrid models. In *2023 Second International Conference on Electronics and Renewable Systems (ICEARS)*, pages 1389–1394. IEEE, 2023.
- [104] Banuki Nagodavithana and Abrar Ullah. Diagnosis of polycystic ovarian syndrome (pcos) using deep learning. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Information Technology and Applications: ICITA 2022*, pages 47–61. Springer, 2023.
- [105] AKM Salman Hosain, Md Humaion Kabir Mehedi, and Irteza Enan Kabir. Pconet: A convolutional neural network architecture to detect polycystic ovary syndrome (pcos) from ovarian ultrasound images. In *2022 International Conference on Engineering and Emerging Technologies (ICEET)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2022.
- [106] Sayma Alam Suha and Muhammad Nazrul Islam. An extended machine learning technique for polycystic ovary syndrome detection using ovary ultrasound image. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):17123, 2022.
- [107] B Rachana, T Priyanka, KN Sahana, TR Supritha, BD Parame-shachari, and R Sunitha. Detection of polycystic ovarian syndrome using follicle recognition technique. *Global Transitions Proceedings*, 2(2):304–308, 2021.

- [108] Karen Castelino, Sachin Bagoriya, Pankaj Gaikwad, Swapnali Kurhade, and Prasenjit Bhavathankar. Detection of polycystic ovary syndrome using vgg-16 and inception-v3. In *2023 International Conference on Communication, Security and Artificial Intelligence (ICCSAI)*, pages 286–291. IEEE, 2023.
- [109] Narinder Kaur, Ganesh Gupta, and Paramjot Kaur. Transfer-based deep learning technique for pcOS detection using ultrasound images. In *2023 International Conference on Network, Multimedia and Information Technology (NMITCON)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2023.
- [110] NR Gladiss Merlin, S Sangeetha, G Anitha, et al. An experimental analysis based on automated detection of polycystic ovary syndrome on ultrasound image using deep learning models. In *2023 First International Conference on Advances in Electrical, Electronics and Computational Intelligence (ICAEECI)*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2023.
- [111] Suzain Rashid, Mohan Karnati, Garmia Aggarwal, Malay Kishore Dutta, Pavel Sikora, and Radim Burget. Attention-based multiscale deep neural network for diagnosis of polycystic ovary syndrome using ovarian ultrasound images. In *2023 15th International Congress on Ultra Modern Telecommunications and Control Systems and Workshops (ICUMT)*, pages 44–49. IEEE, 2023.
- [112] Shikha Prasher and Leema Nelson. Follicle prediction for polycystic ovary syndrome diagnosis from ovarian ultrasound images using cnn. In *2023 10th International Conference on Computing for Sustainable Global Development (INDIACom)*, pages 789–793. IEEE, 2023.
- [113] Xiaoping Wu, Ni Wen, Jie Liang, Yu-Kun Lai, Dongyu She, Ming-Ming Cheng, and Jufeng Yang. Joint acne image grading and counting via label distribution learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 10642–10651, 2019.
- [114] Yi Lin, Yi Guan, Zhaoyang Ma, Haiyan You, Xue Cheng, and Jingchi Jiang. An acne grading framework on face images via skin attention and sfnet. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*, pages 2407–2414. IEEE, 2021.

- [115] Yi Lin, Jingchi Jiang, Dongxin Chen, Zhaoyang Ma, Yi Guan, Xiguang Liu, Haiyan You, Jing Yang, and Xue Cheng. Acne severity grading on face images via extraction and guidance of prior knowledge. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*, pages 1639–1643. IEEE, 2022.
- [116] Minki Kim, Sunwon Kang, and Byoung-Dai Lee. Evaluation of automated measurement of hair density using deep neural networks. *Sensors*, 22(2):650, 2022.
- [117] Halim Benhabiles, Karim Hammoudi, Ziheng Yang, Feryal Windal, Mahmoud Melkemi, Fadi Dornaika, and Ignacio Arganda-Carreras. Deep learning based detection of hair loss levels from facial images. In *2019 Ninth International Conference on Image Processing Theory, Tools and Applications (IPTA)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2019.
- [118] Jong-Hwan Kim, Segi Kwon, Jirui Fu, and Joon-Hyuk Park. Hair follicle classification and hair loss severity estimation using mask r-cnn. *Journal of Imaging*, 8(10):283, 2022.
- [119] Radiologykey. Ovarian reserve and ovarian cysts. [Online]. Available: <https://radiologykey.com/ovarian-reserve-and-ovarian-cysts/>.
- [120] Xiaoping Wu, Ni Wen, Jie Liang, Yu-Kun Lai, Dongyu She, Ming-Ming Cheng, and Jufeng Yang. Acne04, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/18yJcHXhzOv7H89t-Lda6phheAicLqMuZ>.
- [121] AIHub. Hair loss dataset, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://aihub.or.kr>.
- [122] Qi Zhao, Shuchang Lyu, Wenpei Bai, Linghan Cai, Binghao Liu, Meijing Wu, Xiubo Sang, Min Yang, and Lijiang Chen. A multi-modality ovarian tumor ultrasound image dataset for unsupervised cross-domain semantic segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.06799*, 2022.
- [123] Choudhari Anagha and KORDE AISHWARYA. Pcos detection using ultrasound images, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/anaghachoudhari/pcos-detection-using-ultrasound-images>.

- [124] UCI-Machine-Learning. Pima indians diabetes database, 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/uciml/pima-indians-diabetes-database>.
- [125] PCOS-Survey. Pcosdata, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/PCOS-Survey/PCOSData/>.
- [126] Lapp David. Heart disease dataset, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/johnsmith88/heart-disease-dataset>.
- [127] Kottarathil Prasoon. Polycystic ovary syndrome (pcos), 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/prasoonkottarathil/polycystic-ovary-syndrome-pcos>.
- [128] Sanya Rai. Pcod-info, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/sanyarai/pcodinfo>.
- [129] Vedpathak Shreyas and Thakre Vaidehi. Pcos dataset, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/shreyasvedpathak/pcos-dataset>.
- [130] Moheddine Aya. Pcos dataset, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/ayamoheddine/pcos-dataset>.
- [131] Creative Commons. Creative commons, n.d. Accessed: 2024-12-15.
- [132] Karunanidhi Ganeshkumar. Pcos-detection, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/GaneshkumarKarunanidhi/PCOS-Detection>.
- [133] Seelam Lalitha. Polycystic ovary syndrome pcos prediction, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/SLR1999/Polycystic-ovary-syndrome-PCOS-Prediction>.
- [134] Gupta Smriti. Pcos diagnosis system, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://github.com/smritig19/PCOS_Diagnosis_System.
- [135] Farrukh Fayyez. Pcos-detection-model, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/Fayyez/PCOS-Detection-Model>.
- [136] Nayak Shreya. Pcos detection final year project, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/ShreyaNayak04>.

- [137] Adlina Afiqah. Polycystic ovary syndrome (pcos) diagnosis using machine learning, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/afiqahadlina/WMU102—Assignment>.