medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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

Katarzyna Borycka[1,2], Marcel Młyńczak[1,3], Maciej Rosoł[1,3], Kacper Korzeniewski[1,3], Piotr Iwanowski[1], Hynek Heřman[4,5], Petr Janku[6,7], Małgorzata Uchman-Musielak[8], Erik Dosedla[9], Enrique Gonzalez Diaz[10], Iwona Sudoł-Szopińska[11,12], Michał Mik[13], Carlo Ratto[14], Antonino Spinelli[15,16]

[1] OASIS Diagnostics, R&D of Medical Technology, Warsaw, Poland
[2] Centre of Postgraduate Medical Education, Warsaw, Poland
[3] Warsaw University of Technology, Faculty of Mechatronics, Institute of Metrology and Biomedical Engineering, Warsaw, Poland
[4] Institute for the Care of Mother and Child, Prague, Czech Republic
[5] 3rd Medical Faculty, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic
[6] Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University Hospital Brno and Medical Faculty, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic
[7] Department of Health Sciences, Medical Faculty, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic
[8] Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Solec Hospital, Warsaw, Poland
[9] Department of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, Faculty of Medicine, Univerzita Pavla Jozefa Šafárika, Košice, Slovakia
[10] Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Complejo Asistencial Universitario de Leon, Spain
[11] Department of Radiology, National Institute of Geriatrics, Rheumatology and Rehabilitation, Warsaw, Poland
[12] Ultrasound Department, Warsaw Medical University, Poland
[13] Department of General and Colorectal Surgery, Medical University of Lodz, Poland
[14] Proctology and Pelvic Floor Surgery Unit, Isola Tiberina Hospital, Gemelli Isola, Catholic University, Rome, Italy
[15] Department of Biomedical Sciences, Humanitas University, Via Rita Levi Montalcini 4, 20072 Pieve Emanuele, Milan, Italy
[16] IRCCS Humanitas Research Hospital, via Manzoni 56, 20089 Rozzano, Milan, Italy

Conflict of Interest statement

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

M.M., M.R., K.K., and P.I. are researchers at OASIS Diagnostics.

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

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

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

H.H., C.R., and A.S. are independent consultants and members of the OASIS Diagnostics' Scientific Advisory Board.

Others declare no conflicts of interest.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Funding

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

Abstract

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

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

Setting: Poland, Czechia, Slovakia, and Spain.

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

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

Main Outcome Measures: Accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity.

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

Conclusion: ML-assisted impedance spectroscopy offers a safe and accurate method for rapid OASI detection. This approach could effectively complement digital rectal examination in obstetric settings, supporting timely postpartum care.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Funding information

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

Keywords

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

Abbreviations

AE - Adverse Events

EAUS - Endoanal Ultrasound

FI - Faecal Incontinence

MCC - Matthew's Correlation Coefficient

ML - Machine Learning

OASIs - Obstetric Anal Sphincter Injuries

Key Message

With 90% accuracy, the ONIRY system's ML-assisted impedance spectroscopy offers a reliable, non-invasive method for detecting obstetric anal sphincter injuries, supporting timely postpartum diagnosis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

1. Introduction

Obstetric anal sphincter injuries (OASIs) are common complication of vaginal delivery, directly implicated in various degrees of continence issues, including frank faecal incontinence (FI). It is estimated that one in four women who undergo vaginal delivery experience some form of OASI[1-4], placing them at a 25-50% risk of developing FI, either shortly after delivery[5,6] or later in life[7-10]. FI has a profoundly negative impact on quality of life, affecting women's social interactions, professional activities, family dynamics, and intimate relationships[11-13].

Despite this significant risk, there is no widely accessible diagnostic tool for early postpartum detection of OASI. Currently, obstetricians rely on digital rectal examination (DRE), the only option in maternity settings, which is highly dependent on the examiner's experience and skills. As a subjective assessment tool, it is inherently imperfect, with primary detection failure rates for OASI as high as 80%[10].

The high prevalence of FI among women with undiagnosed OASI[9,10] underscores the need to revise maternity care protocols. While endoanal ultrasound (EAUS) is the gold standard in the specialise diagnosis of anal sphincter injuries[14,15], with near-perfect sensitivity in identifying structural abnormalities, it remains limited in terms of availability and usefulness in obstetric facilities. This limitation stems from both a scarcity of qualified staff available in maternity settings to interpret perianal imaging, and the challenging nature of accurate image interpretation in the immediate hours after birth, when the area is often swollen, blood-filled, and secreting fluids[16], further complicating accurate assessment.

Nonetheless, as highlighted in a Cochrane review[17], EAUS shows value in the obstetric setting; when used immediately after childbirth, before perineal repair, it can reduce the rate of severe FI at 6-month follow-up. Over the past decade, transperineal ultrasound (TPUS) has shown promise as an alternative to EAUS for identifying OASI, demonstrating good correlation with EAUS results[18,19]. Studies indicate that TPUS, when used immediately postpartum and prior to sphincter repair (if OASI is detected), can identify more OASIs than digital rectal examination alone[20]. However, EAUS still remains the most precise imaging modality available[19].

To address these clinical gaps, the challenge of developing a novel device - using electric impedance spectroscopy technique has been taken up as the latter is an established physical marker of biostructure/tissue condition[21,22], already successfully

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

used in other medical applications[23-26]. This technique applies a sinusoidal electrical current below the sensation threshold to the body at various frequencies, measuring the impedance response to infer tissue condition. To date, no known experience exists using impedance spectroscopy for perianal diagnostics. A proof-of-concept study involving 22 patients, followed by two pilot clinical studies using prototype devices on a total of 69 postpartum women, demonstrated the validity of this method[27-30]. Due to subtle differences in impedance values between normal and injured tissue, high sensitivity and specificity were achieved only through the application of nonlinear machine learning (ML) algorithms for test interpretation.

Prototypes of such device, called the ONIRY system, with the ML module gradually trained with the clinical data collected, were designed and developed[27,28]. The overall concept for this system was to serve as a rapid detection method for OASI that could be applied in early postpartum period.

This study aims to evaluate the clinical performance and safety of the ONIRY system—a rapid OASI detection device incorporating impedance spectroscopy and ML—against EAUS as the reference diagnostic method, following re-training of the ML model on a larger, balanced postpartum population.

2. Materials and Methods

A prospective, comparative, multicenter, international clinical study was designed, composed of two parts: the clinical conduct (Part I) and modelling and ML (Part II). Part I of the study was conducted from 2021 to 2022 at five European centers in Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland, and Spain. The study design and conduct were in line with the Good Clinical Practice guidelines for medical device studies (ISO 14155:2020). All approvals by the national regulatory authorities as well as positive opinions by the ethics committees, per local regulations, were obtained prior to study initiation. Written informed consent was collected from each study participant before enrolment. The study was registered at ClinicalTrials.gov under NCT04903977.

Study design

The study was designed to enroll a total of approximately 150 women between 18 and 49 years old, primiparous, or multiparous, from the first moments up to 8 weeks after vaginal (spontaneous or assisted) delivery of a singleton, live fetus, in any

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

presentation, in gestational week 34 or higher. All inclusion and exclusion criteria are listed in **Supporting Information S1**, along with the detailed study plan.

Three study groups were pre-defined, with fixed numbers of participants enrolled as to ensure generation of balanced data from women with and without OASI. Participants were initially enrolled in these groups based on the evaluation made immediately after delivery according to the 4-degree perineal tears scale[31]: approximately 30 women were planned for group A (no visible perineal tear), approximately 60 for group B (clinically detectable first- or second-degree perineal tear, including episiotomy), and approximately 60 for group C (clinically detectable third- or fourth-degree perineal tear, involving anal sphincters, regardless of primary repair. Specifically, including women with pre-existing primary repairs in Group C was intentional and considered necessary for ML training purposes, as muscle tissue that has been approximated by sutures differs from healthy tissue and should be distinguishable. Furthermore, even after initial sphincter repair, the sphincters' integrity may remain compromised (in 40-71% of cases) if their continuity is not fully restored[32,33].

The study duration for each participant was from 2 days up to 5 weeks and included 3 study visits. The first visit, occurring anytime from the immediate postpartum period up to 8 weeks post-delivery, involved the collection of medical history, including pregnancy and birth details, a comprehensive physical examination with proctological and gynaecological assessment, a 12-lead electrocardiogram (ECG) recording, and an evaluation of clinical FI symptoms using the Wexner score. At this initial visit, three dimensional (3-D) EAUS was also performed, serving as the reference diagnostic method and as the final tool for study group allocation.

Following such allocation (per EAUS-based OASIS classification[34,35]), participants underwent impedance spectroscopy using the ONIRY system at the second visit, which took place on the same day as the first visit or up to 7 days later. A web-based application was utilized to provide preliminary test interpretation, allowing the operator to experience an immediate OASI detection result from the ONIRY system (indicating either OASI detected or not detected). These preliminary interpretations were generated from an ML model trained on data from previous pilot studies, which could differ from the final interpretation based on the refined ML model trained during Part II of this study.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

To explore the reproducibility of impedance measurements, two consecutive measurement runs were conducted per participant. An arbitrary reproducibility criterion was applied, whereby any difference greater than 1 kΩ at the frequency of 1 kHz between the first and second runs was noted as a discrepancy.

A 12-lead ECG was repeated immediately after impedance measurement with the ONIRY system. Faecal calprotectin levels and blood morphology parameters were also measured to assess any correlation with tissue electrical impedance results. At the third study visit, which occurred between 0 and 28 days after the second visit, anal sphincter function was evaluated using high-resolution anorectal manometry. This procedure was optional, depending on availability at each study site. Vital signs were assessed at each study visit to monitor participant safety throughout. The sequence of study procedures is summarized in Figure 1.

Due to the nature of the study design, no blinding was deemed feasible. However, it was not considered essential for maintaining objectivity of study outcomes, as the preliminary interpretation of impedance measurements displayed by the ONIRY system was generated independently based on the ML model trained in prior pilot studies. This interpretation was thus uninfluenced by the test operator and unaffected by knowledge of the EAUS results at study entry. To further minimize any potential bias associated with using EAUS as the primary reference method, a specific technical control measure ensured that the ONIRY examination could only proceed once the EAUS results and interpretation were finalized and entered into the electronic Case Report Form.

Study endpoints

The diagnostic outcome of the ONIRY examination compared to 3-D EAUS assessed using the OASIS classification was set as primary endpoint and used for the conclusion on the diagnostic performance of the ONIRY system (following the application of the ML algorithms re-trained in Part II of the study). For the EAUS-based Diagnostic Outcome, OASI was considered detected as long as any depth, length, or circumference range of either anal sphincter (external or internal) was captured (score >2 by OASIS classification). OASI was considered detected if any depth, length, or circumferential involvement of either the external or internal anal sphincter was observed (OASIS classification score >2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Secondary endpoints related to diagnostic performance assessed in this study, including Diagnostic Outcomes using other reference methods such as digital rectal examination and high-resolution anorectal manometry, were used for respective ML models construction but are not included in this report.

Adverse Events (AE) were recorded for each participant from the time of enrolment until the last study visit.

Impedance spectroscopy system

Impedance spectroscopy was performed on each study participant using the ONIRY system, which consists of three components: the impedance spectrometer, the endoanal probe, and the ML module. Note that ONIRY is a proprietary name, not an abbreviation. The spectrometer generates a sinusoidal current in the 1-100 kHz frequency range with an amplitude below sensation and pain thresholds, enabling tissue impedance measurement.

The endoanal probe, made from biocompatible, rigid plastic, measures 12 mm in diameter at the electrode site (with a head diameter of up to 19 mm) and contains 8 stainless steel electrodes. These electrodes allow the measurement of impedance modulus, phase shift, resistance, and reactance within the perianal area. The probe also features a handle with a positioning marker to ensure correct placement in the anal canal (see Figure 2).

During examination, the probe is inserted into the anal canal for approximately one minute, remaining stationary throughout the measurement. The examination is performed with the patient in a supine position or lying on her left side with knees flexed, depending on operator preference (see Figure 3).

The spectrometer captures raw impedance data through the endoanal probe, which are then processed to determine statistical parameters for various frequency sub-compartments. These processed parameters serve as an input vector for the ML model, which is trained to analyze subtle differences in impedance patterns that distinguish injured tissue from healthy (or repaired) tissue. The ML model processes these patterns across a complex multi-dimensional dataset, refining its analysis with each frequency parameter to classify tissue integrity accurately.

Following the impedance measurement, the ONIRY system, supported by the ML model, determines whether OASI is present and outputs either “PASS” (no OASI detected) or “REFER” (OASI detected). The ML algorithm is also equipped with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

control protocols that prevent measurement if improper probe placement is detected, including misalignment or incomplete insertion. The complete ONIRY system setup is illustrated in Figure 4.

Endoanal ultrasound

3-D EAUS, although not typically performed immediately postpartum, remains the only objective, high-precision method for detecting OASI and is thus the gold standard for OASI diagnosis. Despite practical limitations, EAUS was selected as the optimal reference standard for obstetric care in this study to train the ML model and achieve the highest possible diagnostic efficiency for the ONIRY system.

All EAUS examinations were conducted by experts with at least 20 years of experience in perianal imaging. Imaging included assessments of the external and internal anal sphincters as well as the puborectalis muscle. To ensure consistency, the 3-D EAUS procedures followed a standardized study-specific protocol (detailed in a study manual implemented across all centres). The 3-D EAUS results were interpreted according to the OASIS classification[32,33] for the primary endpoint.

In addition to the OASIS classification, each EAUS examination was assessed using the Starck scale[36] and the Norderval scale[37], well-regarded semi-quantitative scoring systems established for EAUS. These alternative assessments allowed for exploratory analyses to determine whether substituting these scores for the OASIS classification could enhance the ONIRY system's diagnostic performance. Corresponding ML models were also constructed based on these additional scores, allowing for further evaluation in exploratory studies.

Statistical analysis

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

For the primary endpoint, 3-D EAUS result (by OASIS classification) served as the reference method. Evaluation of the exploratory endpoints (diagnostic outcome with 3-D EAUS evaluated with Starck[36] or Norderval[37] scales) was performed accordingly. Accuracies were defined as Diagnostic Successes/Total, sensitivities as True Positives/(True positives + False Negatives), and specificities as True Negatives/(True Negatives + False Positives). Also, the F1 score, and Matthew's Correlation Coefficient (MCC)[38] were calculated.

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

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

Details of the algorithm used to interpret impedance examination results in Part I of the study, based on the preliminary ML model trained with data from two prior pilot clinical studies, are provided in Supporting Information S2. In Part II, in silico analyses included exploratory data analysis, dimensionality reduction, ML modeling, and final performance evaluation with 10-fold cross-validation; full methodological details are available in Supporting Information S3.

For the per-patient reproducibility analysis, if a significant discrepancy was found between the two impedance measurement runs from the same participant, the second measurement run was excluded from the analysis dataset used to develop the final algorithm (note: in real-world application, a single measurement run will be performed per patient).

3. Results

Study population

Of one hundred fifty-three participants screened, 152 were enrolled (1 screening failure). Following 3-D EAUS with OASIS classification, participants were allocated as follows: 30 in Group A (no visible perineal tear and no OASI), 61 in Group B (clinically detectable first- or second-degree perineal tear but no OASI), and 61 in Group C (clinically detectable third- or fourth-degree perineal tear with OASI).

Table 1 presents the key characteristics of the study population by group and overall.

Fifteen participants discontinued the study prematurely: 3 in Group A (10.0%; 3/10), 10 in Group B (16.4%; 10/61), and 2 in Group C (3.3%; 2/61), with all

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

discontinuations occurring between the second and last visits. Thus, as all these participants had undergone both EAUS and impedance examinations, they were included in the Clinically Evaluated Population.

Part I (Clinical conduct)

All enrolled participants were evaluable for the primary endpoint as well as safety outcomes. Diagnostic Success or Failure was determined for 147 participants. For the remaining 5 participants (enrolled at 3 study sites), the Diagnostic Outcome was Indeterminate due to electric impedance measurements falling outside the spectrometer's expected range, unrelated to the anal canal tissue impedance profile. Thus, the primary endpoint was assessed in 60 participants with OASI (Group C) and 87 participants without OASI (Groups A and B).

Using the preliminary ML model trained on data from prior pilot studies, diagnostic performance metrics were observed as follows: sensitivity of 66.7%, specificity of 57.5%, accuracy of 61.2%, F1 score of 0.58, and MCC of 0.24 (see **Supporting Information S4** for detailed metrics).

No significant correlation was found between faecal calprotectin levels and the results of wither EAUS or ONIRY examinations.

Part II (*In silico* Machine Learning modelling)

The ultimate performance analysis was conducted with an ML model trained on data generated in Part I of this study, incorporating both raw impedance data from ONIRY and OASI detection results from EAUS as a reference standard. A total of 298 impedance measurements meeting quality requirements (see **Supporting Information S5**) were included: 122 from participants with OASI (group C) and 176 from participants without OASI (group A and B). Following exploratory data analysis, dimensionality reduction, and modelling using artificial neural networks, diagnostic metrics showed marked improvement, achieving sensitivity slightly above 90% and specificity slightly below 85%, as presented in Table 2 (with individual cross-validation statistics available in **Supporting Information S6**).

The exploratory per-patient reproducibility analysis from Part I revealed discrepancies between the two impedance measurement runs in 19 participants (12.8%). In exploratory analyses using alternative EAUS classification scores, performance metrics based on the Starck[36] and Norderval[37] classifications were

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

assessed. Using the Starck classification sensitivity was 83.8%, specificity 88.1%, accuracy 86.4 %, F1 score 0.83, and MCC 0.73. For the Norderval classification, sensitivity reached 84.3%, specificity 89.3 %, accuracy 87.4 %, F1 score 0.84, and MCC 0.74.

Safety results

No deaths, serious AE, or AE leading to premature withdrawal from the study were reported during the study conduct. A total of 22 AE were observed in 21 participants: 4 AE in group A, 5 in group B, and 13 in group C. All AE occurred after the ONIRY examinations. Four types of AE were reported by more than one participant, with the most common being nasopharyngitis (2.6%, 4/152) and COVID-19 (2.6%, 4/152).
None of AE were considered related to the ONIRY system, and no adverse device effect were reported.
No trends were observed in ECG parameters when comparing baseline recordings (pre-ONIRY examination) with post-ONIRY recordings. Additionally, no clinically significant cardiovascular abnormalities were recorded as an AE following ONIRY application.

Post-hoc analysis

Following exploratory analyses of per-patient reproducibility in impedance measurements, 19 measurement files (each from the second measurement per relevant patient) were excluded from the final ML model for the ONIRY system, resulting in a “limited dataset” comprising 93.6% (279/298) of the original dataset. The limited dataset included 279 impedance measurements: 117 corresponding to OASI and 162 with no OASI. A post-hoc performance analysis using cross-validations on this refined ML model demonstrated diagnostic metrics with both sensitivity and specificity of ONIRY system at 90.0%, as detailed in Table 3 (individual cross-validation statistics are provided in **Supporting Information S6**).

4. Discussion

Key Findings

The ML-supported impedance spectroscopy using ONIRY system demonstrated high diagnostic performance for detecting OASI when compared to EAUS (per OASIS

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

classification) in the study population enriched with OASI cases (40.1%, 61/152 of enrolled women). Following re-training of the ML model in Part II with data generated in Part I, the system achieved an accuracy of 87.0 ± 0.5%, with a sensitivity of 90.6 ± 2.0%, and specificity of 84.6% ± 1.9%.

After refining the dataset by excluding 6.4% (19/298) of impedance measurements due to measurement discrepancies, the optimized ML model intended for the final ONIRY system reached an accuracy of 90.0 ± 0.4%, with both sensitivity and specificity at 90% (sensitivity 90.0 ± 1.2%, specificity 90.0 ± 0.7%). This substantial diagnostic improvement highlights the benefit of ML-supported analysis of impedance data for OASI detection, achieved through re-training with a larger, well-balanced dataset (OASI vs. no OASI) compared to initial pilot studies.

The intermediary performance observed in Part I (accuracy of 61.2%), which used an ML model trained only on smaller, less balanced pilot datasets (with fewer OASI cases)[27-30], underscores the critical role of dataset size and balance in enhancing diagnostic accuracy. The improved performance of the final ML model in this study likely reflects the broader variability of raw impedance data collected and the higher representation of OASI cases, which better supported model optimization.

Exploratory analyses using alternative EAUS reference methods (Starck and Norderval classifications with corresponding alternative ML models) did not demonstrate additional diagnostic advantages over the primary performance metrics.

No safety concerns were identified in association with the ONIRY system.

Clinical Implications

Currently, no rapid easy-to-use diagnostic tool is available in maternity care settings for whole obstetric team, beyond digital rectal examination. Although DRE is a standard procedure, present in most obstetric guidelines[39-43], it has significant limitations due to its subjective nature with sensitivity for detecting OASI heavily dependent on the examiner's experience[44-46]. Hence the crucial importance of practical training and programmes dedicated to midwives and obstetricians aimed at increasing the OASI detection rate and the effectiveness of its management[47,48].

Although EAUS, as the gold standard for detecting OASI, is rarely feasible in the early postpartum period due to resource and operational constraints, as it requires expert handling and is challenging to interpret images in the immediate postpartum hours[49] - its value in accurately detecting even minor injuries is undeniable. Typically,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

EAUS is more suitable later in the postpartum period, around 6-8 weeks after delivery, when patients return with symptoms of incontinence or perineal wound healing issues, which are current indications for an EAUS assessment.

As demonstrated in this study, the ML-supported impedance spectroscopy, providing a straightforward interpretation of the perianal tissue impedance results, has shown high diagnostic accuracy, achieving approximately 90% sensitivity and specificity (compared with 3-D EAUS, per OASIS classification, the only available objective reference) during the whole postpartum period (from the first hours up to 8 weeks after delivery). This level of performance suggests that the impedance spectroscopy using ONIRY could serve as an effective adjunct to DRE, particularly in settings where EAUS is unavailable or limited for initial detection. Since a single measurement run of the impedance (including the automated analysis and presentation of the results) takes less than a minute, it may have an acceptance potential for obstetric practice. The use of such diagnostic tool within the first 24 hours after delivery, could provide the greatest clinical benefit by enabling timely primary repair of OASI, thereby reducing long-term complications.

A systematic review by Walsh et al.[17] suggests, that performing EAUS immediately after delivery, before any perineal repair, significantly increases OASI detection rates and consequently the rate of primary sphincter repair. Additionally, EAUS conducted prior to perineal repair may reduce the risk of developing severe faecal incontinence. This finding highlights a critical gap in routine obstetric practice, where the absence of efficient tools for OASI detection may prevent timely intervention.

Moreover, impedance spectroscopy could be valuable also in the following weeks postpartum. By bridging the gap until EAUS becomes feasible, the use of ONIRY could expand diagnostic capabilities to include asymptomatic and occult OASI cases that would otherwise go undetected until FI symptoms appear. Proper diagnosis within this time window, even if too late for primary repair, could allow for the identification of patients who require ongoing monitoring or targeted rehabilitation for promoting quicker recovery and minimizing the risk of FI.

What favours EAUS as the diagnostic method is the possibility to separately visualise both external and internal anal sphincters. This enables targeted repairs of the external sphincter alone or combined repair of both sphincters, making EAUS an essential tool for elective diagnosis before any delayed sphincter repair.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Therefore, there is an unmet need for establishing an effective, noninvasive or minimally invasive method of detecting OASI for maternity care facilities and midwifery practices, where reliable diagnostic tools are often unavailable. Ideally, such a method would function as a screening tool with clear criteria for extended diagnosis, tailored to the specific needs and resources of the facility. If impedance spectroscopy proves successful in clinical practice, it could not only enhance postpartum management in maternity care settings but also facilitate timely referrals to specialist surgical units, ultimately improving long-term outcomes for women affected by OASI. Because ONIRY provides automated, rapid interpretation of impedance data in a simple binary output (PASS/REFER), it has potential for routine use by a wider range of maternity care staff, even those with minimal specialized training.

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

This study represents the first evaluation of impedance spectroscopy for OASI detection in a broader postpartum population. Future studies are planned, focusing on the critical time window within the first few hours postpartum, to further refine the ML model's efficacy at a point when early OASI detection offers the most benefit—allowing for timely primary repair.

Limitations and research implications

This study has several limitations.

Firstly, the study population was selectively enriched with OASI cases (Group C, n=61) to improve the dataset's internal balance and increase the robustness of the ML model. This approach, common in AI and ML tool development[50], ensures higher internal data coherence, enhancing the model's effectiveness within a controlled dataset structure.

Secondly, the primary endpoint focused on OASI detection rather than a clinically meaningful outcome, such as faecal incontinence (FI) or quality of life measures. The surrogate endpoint was chosen to facilitate a clear comparison between the ONIRY

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

system and 3-D EAUS, the gold standard, within a manageable timeframe. Establishing a clinically meaningful benefit for the ONIRY system would require extended, long-term follow-up studies, spanning years to account for the gradual development of FI in women with OASI. The potential benefit of rapid OASI detection hinges on the availability and prompt implementation of therapeutic measures, notably primary sphincter repair within the optimal 8–12 hour window after delivery[34,35, 39-43].

Another limitation arises from the high proportion of participants in Group C (52 out of 61) who had already undergone primary sphincter repair before study enrolment. This factor may have influenced impedance spectroscopy results toward readings typical of non-injured cases. However, given that the ML models were trained with this dataset, it is plausible that the ONIRY system's performance could be even greater in real-world use, where OASI detection would ideally occur before repair. Newly injured, unrepaired sphincters are likely to present a clearer contrast in impedance measurements compared to tissues that have already undergone repair.

The difference in median time between delivery and ONIRY examination across groups (28 days in Group C, versus 2 and 11 days in Groups A and B, respectively) reflects challenges encountered in recruiting cases of 3rd and 4th degree perineal tears (Group C) in this challenging study design. This delay also mirrors the lengthy diagnostic and therapeutic pathway typically experienced by OASI patients in current practice.

In addition, the inclusion of participants with previously repaired OASI in Group C captures clinical scenarios where underdiagnosed or inadequately repaired OASIs persist despite initial repair. Literature indicates that primary repair is incomplete in over 30% of cases, often due to the limited experience of the operator or the emergency nature of the procedure itself, usually performed during on-call hours[51-53]. Thus, classifying cases with recent repairs in the "injured" group is methodologically sound and aligns with real-world conditions.

Finally, no detailed data were captured for multiparous women on potentially undetected OASIs from prior deliveries. This could theoretically result in normal impedance readings due to tissue healing, despite persistent EAUS abnormalities. Conversely, abnormal impedance with normal EAUS could indicate fibrosis from a prior injury.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

5. Conclusions

The ML-assisted impedance spectroscopy demonstrated safety and high diagnostic accuracy, achieving approximately 90% sensitivity and specificity in detecting obstetric anal sphincter injuries in women after vaginal birth. This approach could effectively complement digital rectal examination in obstetric settings, supporting timely postpartum care.

Ethics Statement

The study was approved by the ethics committees respective for each study site: on 19 March 2021 by Ethics Committee of the Institute for Maternal and Child Care (no. 1/19.03.2021), on 27 April 2021 by Ethics Committee for Research with Medicines of the Health Areas of León and Bierzo (no. 2186), on 9 June 2021 by Ethics Committee of the University Hospital of Brno (no. 47/21Zdrav.), on 14 October 2021 by Ethics Committee at the Regional Medical Chamber in Warsaw (no. KB/1362/21) and on 25 July 2022 by Ethics Committee at AGEL Hospital Košice-Šaca (no. ONIRY 3/2/2020).

Author contributions

Conceptualization: KB, MM, PI
Data curation: KB, MM, MR, KK, PI
Formal analysis: MM, MR, KK
Funding acquisition: KB, MM
Investigation: HH, PJ, MUM, ED, EGD
Methodology: KB, MM, MR, KK, PI
Project administration: KB, MM
Resources: HH, PJ, MUM, ED, EGD
Software: MM, MR, KK
Supervision: KB, MM, PI, CR, AS
Validation: MM, PI
Visualization: MR, KK
Writing - original draft: KB, MM, MR, KK, PI
Writing - review & editing: All co-authors

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

References

[1] Sideris M, McCaughey T, Hanrahan JG, Arroyo-Manzano D, Zamora J, Jha S et al. Risk of obstetric anal sphincter injuries (OASIS) and anal incontinence: a meta-analysis. European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology 2020;252,303-312. Doi: 10.1016/j.ejogrb.2020.06.048

[2] Gurol-Urganci I, Cromwell DA, Edozien LC, Mahmood TA, Adams EJ, Richmond DH et al. Third- and fourth-degree perineal tears among primiparous women in England between 2000 and 2012: time trends and risk factors. BJOG 2013;120(12):1516-25. doi: 10.1111/1471-0528.12363

[3] Dudding TC, Vaizey CJ, Kamm MA. Obstetric anal sphincter injury: incidence, risk factors, and management. Ann Surg 2008;247(2):224-37. doi:10.1097/SLA.0b013e318142cdf4

[4] Orlando A., Thomas G., Murphy J. i wsp. A systematic review and a meta-analysis on the incidence of obstetric anal sphincter injuries during vaginal delivery. Colorectal. Dis. 2024; 26: 227–242.

[5] Everist R, Burrell M, Mallitt KA, Parkin K, Patton V, Karantanis E Postpartum anal incontinence in women with and without obstetric anal sphincter injuries. Int Urogynecol J. 2020 Nov;31(11):2269-2275. doi: 10.1007/s00192-020-04267-8. Epub 2020 Mar 10.

[6] Richter HE, Nager CW, Burgio KL, Whitworth R, Weidner AC, Schaffer J, Zyczynski HM, Norton P, Jelovsek JE, Meikle SF, Spino C, Gantz M, Graziano S, Brubaker L; NICHD Pelvic Floor Disorders Network. Incidence and Predictors of Anal Incontinence After Obstetric Anal Sphincter Injury in Primiparous Women. Female Pelvic Med Reconstr Surg. 2015;21(4):182-9. doi: 10.1097/SPV.0000000000000160

[7] Pollack J, Nordenstam J, Brismar S, Lopez A, Altman D, Zetterstrom J. Anal incontinence after vaginal delivery: a five-year prospective cohort study. Obstet Gynecol. 2004;104(6):1397-402. doi: 10.1097/01.AOG.0000147597.45349.e8.

[8] Jangö H, Langhoff-Roos J, Rosthøj S, Sakse A Recurrent obstetric anal sphincter injury and the risk of long-term anal incontinence Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2017 Jun;216(6):610.e1-610.e8. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2017.02.010. Epub 2017 Feb 13.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

[9] Nilsson IE, Åkervall S, Molin M, Milsom I, Gyhagen M. Symptoms of fecal incontinence two decades after no, one, or two obstetrical anal sphincter injuries. American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 2021;224(3), 276-e1.

[10] Guzmán Rojas RA, Salvesen K Å, Volløyhaug I. Anal sphincter defects and fecal incontinence 15–24 years after first delivery: a cross-sectional study. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2018; 51(5): 677-683. doi: 10.1002/uog.18827

[11] Meyer I, Richter HE. Impact of fecal incontinence and its treatment on quality of life in women. Women's Health (London), 2015; 11(2): 225-238. doi: 10.2217/WHE.14.66

[12] Jangö H, Langhoff-Roos J, Rosthøj S, et al. Wexner score and quality of life in women with obstetric anal sphincter injury. International Urogynecology Journal, 2020; 31(6): 1115-1121. doi: 10.1007/s00192-019-04134-1

[13] Lo J, Osterweil P, Li H, Mori T, Eden KB, Guise JM. Quality of life in women with postpartum anal incontinence. Obstet Gynecol. 2010;115(4):809-814. doi: 10.1097/AOG.0b013e3181d4160d.

[14] Santoro GA, Wieczorek AP, Dietz HP, Mellgren A, Sultan AH, Shobeiri SA, Stankiewicz A, Bartram C. State of the art: an integrated approach to pelvic floor ultrasonography. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2011; 37: 381–396.

[15] Albuquerque A. Endoanal ultrasonography in fecal incontinence: Current and future perspectives. World J Gastrointest Endosc 2015;7(6):575-581. doi: 10.4253/wjge.v7.i6.575.

[16] Sioutis D, Thakar R, Sultan AH. Overdiagnosis and rising rate of obstetric anal sphincter injuries (OASIS): time for reappraisal. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2017;50:642-647. doi: 10.1002/uog.17306

[17] Walsh KA and Grivell RM. Use of endoanal ultrasound for reducing the risk of complications related to anal sphincter injury after vaginal birth. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2015;(10):CD010826. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD010826.pub2

[18] Ignell C, Örnö AK, Stuart A Correlations of obstetric anal sphincter injury (OASIS) grade, specific symptoms of anal incontinence, and measurements by endoanal and transperineal ultrasound. J Ultrasound 2021;24(3):261-267. doi: 10.1007/s40477-020-00485-4.

[19] Taithongchai A, van Gruting IMA, Volløyhaug I, Arendsen LP, Sultan AH, Thakar R. Comparing the diagnostic accuracy of 3 ultrasound modalities for diagnosing obstetric anal sphincter injuries. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2019 Aug;221(2):134.e1-134.e9. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2019.04.009.

[20] Wong KW, Thakar R, Sultan AH, Andrews V. Can transperineal ultrasound improve the diagnosis of obstetric anal sphincter injuries? Int Urogynecol J. 2022 Aug 2. doi: 10.1007/s00192-022-05290-7.

[21] Shiffman CA, Aaron R. Low-impedance localized measurements using standard bioelectrical impedance analysis instruments. Ann NY Acad Sci 2000;904:214–217. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.2000.tb06453.x

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

[22] Aaron R, Shiffman CA. Using localized impedance measurements to study muscle changes in injury and disease. Ann NY Acad Sci 2000;904:171–180. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.2000.tb06443.x

[23] Seward B, Rutkove MD, Aaron R, Shiffman CA. Localized bioimpedance analysis in the evaluation of neuromuscular disease. Muscle Nerve 2002;25:390–397. doi: 10.1002/mus.10048

[24] Młyńczak M, Cybulski G. Decomposition of the cardiac and respiratory components from impedance pneumography signals. Proc. of the 10th Int. Joint Conf. on Biomedical Engineering Systems and Technologies – Biodevices 2017;4:26-33. doi: 10.5220/0006107200260033

[25] Kushner RF, Schoeller DA. Estimation of total body water by bioelectrical impedance analysis. Am J Clin Nutr 1986;44(3):417-424. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/44.3.417

[26] Tidy JA, Brown BH, Healey TJ, Daayana S, Martin M, Prendiville W et al. Accuracy of detection of high-grade cervical intraepithelial neoplasia using electrical impedance spectroscopy with colposcopy. BJOG 2013;120(4):400-10; discussion 410-1. doi: 10.1111/1471-0528.12096

[27] Młyńczak M, Borycka-Kiciak K, Uchman-Musielak M, Dziki A. Impedance Spectroscopy Method to Detect Pelvic Floor Muscle Damage - A Feasibility Study. In: World Congress on Medical Physics and Biomedical Engineering, Springer, Singapore, 2018;875–878. doi: 10.1007/978-981-10-9038-7_161.

[28] Borycka-Kiciak K, Młyńczak M, Kiciak A, Pietrzak P, Dziki A. Non-invasive obstetric anal sphincter injury diagnostics using impedance spectroscopy. Scientific Reports 2019;9(7097):1–9. doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-43637-1.

[29] Młyńczak M, Rosoł M, Spinelli A, Dziki A, Wlazlak E, Surkont G, et al. Obstetric Anal Sphincter Injury Detection Using Impedance Spectroscopy with the ONIRY Probe; Appl Sci.; 2021; 11: 637; doi: 10.3390/app11020637.

[30] Borycka K, Młyńczak M, Rosoł M, Iwanowski P, Uchman-Musielak M, Mik M, Sudoł-Szopińska I, Herman H, Ratto C, Dziki A, Wlaźlak E, Surkont G, Krzycka M, Pająk P, Spinelli A. Impedance spectroscopy for the diagnosis of obstetric anal sphincter injuries: the pilot experience; In: 15 Congress of the European Society of Gynecology, 2023.

[31] Cunningham FG, Leveno KJ, Bloom SL, Hauth J, Rouse D, Spong C. Williams obstetrics (23rd Edition), 2011. New York: McGraw-Hill Medical.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

[32] Shek KL, Guzman-Rojas R, Dietz HP. Residual defects of the external anal sphincter following primary repair: an observational study using transperineal ultrasound. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2014;44(6):704-9. doi: 10.1002/uog.13368.

[33] Gold S, Paquette J, Sobel M, Alarab M. Residual Defects of the Anal Sphincter Complex Following Primary Repair of Obstetrical Anal Sphincter Injuries at a Large Canadian Obstetrical Centre. J Obstet Gynaecol Can. 2021 May;43(5):596-600. doi: 10.1016/j.jogc.2021.01.011.

[34] The Management of Third- and Fourth-Degree Perineal Tears: a Green-top Guideline No 29; Royal College of Obstetrician and Gynaecologists, London; 2015

[35] Prevention and Management of Obstetric Lacerations at Vaginal Delivery. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 165: American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists' Committee on Practice Bulletins—Obstetrics. Obstet Gynecol 2016;128(1):e1-e15. doi: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000001523

[36] Starck M, Bohe, M, Valentin L. Results of endosonographic imaging of the anal sphincter 2–7 days after primary repair of third or fourth-degree obstetric sphincter tears. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2003;22:609–615. doi: 10.1002/uog.920

[37] Norderval S, Markskog A, Rossaak K, Vonen B. Correlation between anal sphincter defects and anal incontinence following obstetric sphincter tears: Assessment using scoring systems for sonographic classification of defects. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2008;31: 78–84. doi: 10.1002/uog.5155

[38] Chicco D, Jurman G. The advantages of the Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC) over F1 score and accuracy in binary classification evaluation. BMC genomics, 2020:21, 1-13.

[39] Harvey MA, Pierce M, Walter JE, et al. Obstetrical Anal Sphincter Injuries (OASIS): Prevention, Recognition, and Repair. Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Canada. 2015;37(12):1131-1148. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S1701-2163(16)30081-0

[40] Kropshofer S, T Aigmüller, Beilecke K, et al. Management of Third and Fourth-Degree Perineal Tears After Vaginal Birth. Guideline of the DGGG, OEGGG and SGGG (S2k-Level, AWMF Registry No. 015/079, December 2020). Geburtshilfe Und Frauenheilkunde. 2022;83(02):165-183. doi:https://doi.org/10.1055/a-1933-2647

[41] Department for Health and Wellbeing. South Australian Perinatal Practice Guideline - Third and fourth degree tear management 2018. Available from:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/1faf87004eedec4db635b76a7ac0d6e4/Third+and+Fourth+Degree+Tear+Management_PPG_v5_1.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=ROOTWORKSPACE-1faf87004eedec4db635b76a7ac0d6e4-oc-RC8a

[42] Queensland Clinical Guidelines. Queensland clinical guidelines: Perineal Care 2023. Available from: https://www.health.qld.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0022/142384/g-pericare.pdf

[43] Danish Association of Obstetrics and Gynaecology. Guideline for obstetric anal sphincter injury (OASIS) 2019. Available from: https://nfog.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/190313-obstetric-anal-sphincter-injury.pdf

[44] Jeppson, P. C., Paraiso, M. F. R., Jelovsek, J. E., & Barber, M. D. (2012). Accuracy of the digital anal examination in women with fecal incontinence. International urogynecology journal, 23, 765-768.

[45] Roper, J. C., Sultan, A. H., & Thakar, R. (2020). Diagnosis of perineal trauma: getting it right first time. British Journal of Midwifery, 28(10), 710-717.

[46] Krissi H., Aviram A., Hiersch L. i wsp. Structured hands-on workshop decreases the over-detection rate of obstetrical anal sphincter injuries. Int. J. Colorectal Dis. 2016; 31: 45–50.

[47] De Meutter L, van Heesewijk AD, van der Woerdt-Eltink I, de Leeuw JW. Implementation of a perineal support programme for reduction of the incidence of obstetric anal sphincter injuries and the effect of non-compliance. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol 2018;230:119-123. doi: 10.1016/j.ejogrb.2018.09.021

[48] Bidwell P, Thakar R, Sevdalis N, Silverton L, Novis V, Hellyer A et al. A multi-centre quality improvement project to reduce the incidence of obstetric anal sphincter injury (OASI): study protocol. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth 2018 Aug 13;18(1):331. doi: 10.1186/s12884-018-1965-0

[49] Huber M, Larsson C, Harrysson M, et al. Use of endoanal ultrasound in detecting obstetric anal sphincter injury immediately after birth. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2023; 102: 389-395. doi:10.1111/aogs.14514

[50] Batista GEAPA, Prati RC, Monard MC. A study of the behavior of several methods for balancing machine learning training data. ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter. 2004;6(1):20-29. doi:https://doi.org/10.1145/1007730.1007735

[51] Roper JC, Thakar R, Sultan AH. Under-classified obstetric anal sphincter injuries. Int Urogynecol J. 2022 Jun;33(6):1473-1479. doi: 10.1007/s00192-021-05051-y. Epub 2022 Feb 12

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

[52] O'Leary BD, Kelly L, Fitzpatrick M, Keane DP. Underdiagnosis of internal anal sphincter trauma following vaginal delivery. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2023 Feb;61(2):251-256. doi: 10.1002/uog.26049

[53] Kirss J, Pinta T, Böckelman C, Victorzon M. Factors predicting a failed primary repair of obstetric anal sphincter injury. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2016 Sep;95(9):1063-9. doi: 10.1111/aogs.12909. Epub 2016 May 18.

	Group A	Group B	Group C	Total
	(N=30)	(N=61)	(N=61)	(N=152)
Age (years)				
Mean ± SD	31.3 ± 5.4	31.9 ± 4.3	30.7 ± 4.6	31.3 ± 4.6
Range (Min/Max)	22 (18/40)	18 (21/39)	20 (22/42)	24 (18/42)
Age categorised (n, %)				
<26 years	5 (16.7)	4 (6.6)	7 (11.5)	16 (10.5)
26<35 years	15 (50.0)	38 (62.3)	41 (67.2)	94 (61.8)
≥35 years	10 (33.3)	19 (31.2)	13 (21.3)	42 (27.6)
Race (n, %)				
Asian	0 (0.0)	1 (1.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.7)
Caucasian	30 (100.0)	60 (98.4)	61 (100.0)	151 (99.3)
Weight (kg)				
Mean ± SD	73.3 ± 12.5	70.9 ± 11.4	68.1 ± 9.6	70.2 ± 11.0
Range (Min/Max)	42 (54/96)	56 (49/105)	60 (48/108)	60 (48/108)
BMI (kg/m^2)				
Mean ± SD	25.8 ± 4.2	25.3 ± 3.3	24.3 ± 3.4	25.0 ± 3.6
Range (Min/Max)	16.2 (18.8/35.0)	18.9 (17.4/36.3)	15.6 (17.7/33.3)	18.9 (17.4/36.3)
Number of pregnancies (including the index one) (n)				
Median	2	1	1	1
Range (Min/Max)	5 (1/6)	3 (1/4)	3 (1/4)	5 (1/6)
Primipara/Multipara	7/23	42/19	46/15	95/57
Risk factors for Obstetric Anal Sphincter Injury from the index delivery (n, %)				
Prolonged second phase of delivery	0 (0.0)	6 (9.8)	10 (16.4)	16 (10.5)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Foetal shoulder dystocia	0 (0.0)	1 (1.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.7)
Birth weight of the neonate >4kg	4 (13.3)	5 (8.2)	6 (9.8)	15 (9.9)
Induction of delivery with oxytocin	1 (3.3)	14 (23.0)	9 (14.8)	24 (15.8)
Head circumference of the neonate ≥34 cm	17 (56.7)	39 (63.9)	49 (80.3)	105 (69.1)
Time between the index delivery and ONIRY examination (days)				
Median	2	11	28	14
Range (Min/Max)	53 (1/54)	58 (0/58)	55 (1/56)	58 (0/58)
Time between the index delivery and EAUS examination (days)				
Median	2	11	28	14
Range (Min/Max)	53 (1/54)	58 (0/58)	55 (1/56)	58 (0/58)

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

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

Table 1. Characteristics of the study population.

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

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

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

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

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. The diagram outlining the individual steps of the study.

Figure 2. ONIRY Probe with the marker location.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. The participant's position during the ONIRY examination (a) along with position of the probe marker (b).

Figure 4. ONIRY system comprising ONIRY Spectrometer and ONIRY Probe.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.03.24308379; this version posted November 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Supporting information

S1 – Schedule of assessments of the pivotal study (Part I – clinical conduct) valid at the time of the study completion (following Amendment no. 2 of the study protocol).

S2 - The description of the heuristics used for Part I of the study

S3 - Details of the in silico analyses conducted within Part II of the study.

S4 - Performance metrics of the ONIRY model trained based on data from the previous (pilot) clinical studies, depending on the heuristics chosen, with the 3-D Endoanal Ultrasound and the OASIS classification (>2 vs. ≤2) used as the reference method.

S5 - The quality requirements for the impedance measurements.

S6 - Performance metrics of the ONIRY system using the models trained based on all correct measurements from the clinical study, in the assessment relative to 3-D Endoanal Ultrasound and OASIS classification (each row shows the statistics for a single 10-fold cross-validation).

S7 - Performance metrics of the ONIRY system using the model trained based on the limited clinical study dataset (discrepant measurements, considered based on the arbitrary criterion set in Statistical Analysis Plan, were ignored), in the assessment relative to 3-D Endoanal Ultrasound and OASIS classification (each row shows the statistics for a single 10-fold cross-validation).