medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

PARTIAL DEPENDENCE OF ULTRASONICALLY ESTIMATED FETAL WEIGHT ON BIOMETRIC PARAMETERS

A PREPRINT

Vasiliki Bitsouni [*] [1], Nikolaos Gialelis [†] [2,3], and Vasilis Tsilidis [‡] [1]

[1]Department of Mathematics, University of Patras, GR-26504 Rio Patras, Greece
[2]Department of Mathematics, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, GR-15784 Athens, Greece
[3]School of Medicine, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, GR-11527 Athens, Greece

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To assess the contribution of each sonographically measured parameter on fetal weight formulas.

Methods: Multiple datasets and datasets extracted from existing literature are employed in this study. The Sobol' method is then implemented on each of these datasets. Following this, bootstrapping is carried out using the indices from individual weeks as sample points. The mean value for each resulting sample is calculated. Finally, the median, along with a 95% confidence interval, is estimated based on the empirical distribution. This methodology is repeated for all formulas examined.

Results: The median, along with a 95% CI, for the estimate of the mean of the Sobol' sensitivity indices for the parameters of 29 known formulas are presented.

Conclusions: Depending on the formula, the values of some parameters show substantial fluctuations or are insignificant to the fetal weight estimation.

1 Introduction

Estimating the weight of a fetus is a critical aspect of prenatal care, primarily conducted through ultrasound imaging. This method allows healthcare providers to measure various fetal parameters, such as biparietal diameter (BPD), abdominal circumference (AC), head circumference (HC), and femur length (FL). These measurements are then used as parameters in established mathematical formulas to calculate the estimated fetal weight (EFW) (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: The biometric characteristics of a fetus, such as the circumference of its head and abdomen, the length of its femur, or its biparietal diameter are measured using ultrasound. The measurements are then entered into various mathematical formulas to estimate the weight of the fetus.

The parameters of a mathematical function do not necessarily contribute equally to its output. In many mathematical models, particularly nonlinear ones, certain parameters can have a more significant impact on the result than others. Statistical techniques can reveal the varying degrees of influence each parameter has, illustrating that the overall result is

[*] *Email:* vbitsouni[@]math.upatras.gr - *URL:* upatras.gr/en/people/vbitsouni
[†] *Email:* ngialelis[@]med.uoa.gr - *URL:* users.uoa.gr/∼ngialelis
[‡] *Email:* vtsilidis[@]upatras.gr - *URL:* tsilidisv.github.io

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/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2: The current study employs a multi-step process involving the utilization of numerous datasets sourced from existing literature. The Sobol' method is then applied to each of these datasets, for all the studied formulas. Following this, bootstrapping is conducted using the indices from each individual week as the sample points. The mean value is then calculated for each of the resulting samples. Finally, the median, along with a 95% confidence interval, are estimated using the empirical distribution.

often a product of both individual and interactive effects among the parameters involved. This complexity underscores the importance of analyzing parameter contributions rather than assuming uniform influence across all inputs.

There exist many studies comparing the accuracy of different formulas for the calculation of EFW [22;40;23;5;18;15;39;48;53]. They often involve retrospective and prospective analysis, comparing predicted weights to actual birth weights to assess accuracy, bias, and reproducibility. Such articles underscore the ongoing quest for more reliable fetal weight estimation techniques that can enhance obstetric care by improving predictions related to delivery management and neonatal outcomes. However, a study that systematically assess the contribution of the involved parameters of each formula to the EFW does not exist.

The scope of the present study is to evaluate the effect of the biometric parameters of various formulas on the EFW. The utilized approach relies on an unbiased global sensitivity analysis scheme, known as the Sobol' method.

2 Methods

An overview of the methods employed in the present study can be found in Figure 2. Subsequently, a detailed description of the methods is presented.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

2.1 Sensitivity analysis

The Sobol' method, a global sensitivity analysis technique, is a variance-based approach employed to evaluate how changes in parameter inputs influence the outputs of a mathematical model. The method operates by partitioning the variance of the outputs generated by the model into distinct contributions from individual input parameters and their respective interactions. Assuming that f is the mathematical formula used for fetal weight estimation and $\mathbf{X}$ is the vector of the parameters of f, then by the Hoeffding decomposition, the total variance of the formula can be written as:

$$\mathrm{Var}[f(\mathbf{X})] = \sum_{i=1}^{d} V_i + \sum_{i<j}^{d} V_{i,j} + \cdots + V_{1,2\ldots,d}$$

where V_i represents the variance due to the main effect of parameter i, V_{ij} represents the variance due to the interaction between parameters i and j, and so on.

Sobol' sensitivity indices are normalized metrics that correspond to the aforementioned representations. The first-order sensitivity indices are defined as

$$S_i = \frac{V_i}{\mathrm{Var}\left[f(\mathbf{X})\right]}$$

A high first-order index indicates that the parameter has a significant direct influence on the output.

The second-order sensitivity indices are defined as

$$S_{i,j} = \frac{V_{i,j}}{\mathrm{Var}\left[f(\mathbf{X})\right]}$$

A high second-order index indicates that the combined effects of the two parameters are not merely additive. Both the first- and second-order indices range from 0 to 1.

The Julia package GlobalSensitivity.jl[12] was employed for the calculation of the Sobol' indices.

2.2 Sampling

In order to eliminate bias from the dataset and at the same time investigate the whole parameter space uniformly (i.e., more evenly), low-discrepancy synthetic data were generated. A quasi-random low-discrepancy sequence of numbers was generated in the interval between the 10th and the 90th percentile of each parameter, utilizing the Sobol' sampling method, which is described in Sobol[49]. The Julia package QuasiMonteCarlo.jl was employed to generate a Sobol' sequence of 10^6 numbers for each parameter.

2.3 Data

A rundown of the utilized datasets can be seen in Table 1. In all the studies presented in Table 1, a number of measurements, regarding the parameters of interest, were taken from pregnant women of various ethnicities at various gestational ages. Furthermore, 10th and 90th percentile charts were calculated for all parameters. In the present study, the 10th and 90th percentiles are considered as the lower and upper bounds, respectively, for each parameter.

2.4 Formulas

The formulas under investigation, which take into account more than one independent parameter, are presented in Table 2.

2.5 Estimation of the mean of indices with bootstrapping

The mean values of the indices of each formula are estimated using non-parametric bootstrapping, which is described in Casella and Berger[6]. This method is chosen due to its no distributional assumptions, robustness to outliers, and usefulness in small samples.

To obtain the median, along with a 95% confidence interval (CI) for the estimation of the mean of the Sobol' indices, the methodology outlined below is employed.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Source	Year	Country	Number of fetuses	Weeks
Araujo Júnior *et al.* [1]	2014	Brazil	31476	18–38
Brons *et al.* [2]	1990	Netherlands	63	12–40
Browne *et al.* [3]	1992	USA	8285	10–44
Buck Louis *et al.* [4] (Asian)	2015	USA	460	10–40
Buck Louis *et al.* [4] (Black)	2015	USA	611	10–40
Buck Louis *et al.* [4] (Hispanic)	2015	USA	649	10–40
Buck Louis *et al.* [4] (White)	2015	USA	614	10–40
Chitty *et al.* [8;7;9]	1994	UK	594–649	12–42
de la Vega *et al.* [11]	2008	Puerto Rico	548	14–38
Dubiel *et al.* [13]	2008	Poland	959	20–42
Dulger *et al.* [14]	2024	Turkey	1132	15–40
Fouad *et al.* [17]	2021	Egypt	540	14–40
Giorlandino *et al.* [19]	2009	Italy	4896	14–41
Johnsen *et al.* [25]	2006	Norway	650	10–42
Jung *et al.* [27]	2007	South Korea	10455	12–40
Kiserud *et al.* [28]	2017	Multinational	1387	14–40
Kwon *et al.* [29]	2014	South Korea	986	15–40
Lai and Yeo [30]	1992	Singapore	6374	14–41
Lessoway *et al.* [31]	1998	Canada	1396	11–42
Lindström *et al.* [32]	2020	Sweden	583	12–42
Munim *et al.* [35]	2012	Pakistan	1228	20–39
Paladini *et al.* [37]	2005	Italy	626	16–40
Papageorghiou *et al.* [38]	2014	Multinational	13108	14–40
Saksiriwuttho *et al.* [43]	2007	Thailand	628	14–41
Stampalija *et al.* [50]	2020	Italy	7347	15–40
Verburg *et al.* [54]	2008	Netherlands	8313	12–40

Table 1: Rundown of the utilized datasets.

1. The Sobol' indices are calculated for every combination of formula and dataset for each week in which data are available.

2. The calculated Sobol' indices are grouped together by formula and gestation age (excluding weeks 43 and 44 due to scarcity of available data).

3. 10^6 bootstrap samples are created for each aforementioned group

4. The average is calculated for each bootstrap sample, resulting in samples of size 10^6 for the respective mean value of each group.

5. The median, along with a 95% CI, is estimated for each mean-value sample, using the empirical distribution function.

3 Results

Figures 3 to 31 present an estimate of the first-order Sobol's indices for each parameter of every formula of Table 2, based on the datasets of Table 1. Each figure consists of an error bar for each parameter and for each gestation week. The median of the mean value of the indices is represented by a dot, while the whiskers represent a 95% CI. In addition, each figure displays the indices for each individual dataset as a scatter plot with a low alpha value.

The second-order Sobol' indices for all the tested formulas were found to be small (< 0.01). Hence, they are not presented.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Source	Formula
Combs (1993)[10]	$0.23718\,(\mathrm{AC})^2\,(\mathrm{FL}) + 0.03312\,(\mathrm{HC})^3$
Ferrero (1994)[16]	$10^{0.77125+0.13244(\mathrm{AC})-0.12996(\mathrm{FL})-1.73588(\mathrm{AC})^2/1000+3.09212(\mathrm{AC})(\mathrm{FL})/1000+2.18984(\mathrm{FL})/(\mathrm{AC})}$
Hadlock I (1985)[20]	$10^{1.304+0.05281(\mathrm{AC})+0.1938(\mathrm{FL})-0.004(\mathrm{AC})(\mathrm{FL})}$
Hadlock II (1985)[20]	$10^{1.335-0.0034(\mathrm{AC})(\mathrm{FL})+0.0316(\mathrm{BPD})+0.0457(\mathrm{AC})+0.1623(\mathrm{FL})}$
Hadlock III (1985)[20]	$10^{1.326-0.00326(\mathrm{AC})(\mathrm{FL})+0.0107(\mathrm{HC})+0.0438(\mathrm{AC})+0.158(\mathrm{FL})}$
Hadlock IV (1985)[20]	$10^{1.3596+0.00061(\mathrm{BPD})(\mathrm{AC})+0.424(\mathrm{AC})+0.174(\mathrm{FL})+0.0064(\mathrm{HC})-0.00386(\mathrm{AC})(\mathrm{FL})}$
Halaska (2006)[21]	$10^{0.64041(\mathrm{BPD})-0.03257(\mathrm{BPD})^2+0.00154(\mathrm{AC})(\mathrm{FL})}$
Hsieh (1987)[24]	$10^{2.1315+0.0056541(\mathrm{BPD})(\mathrm{AC})-0.00015515(\mathrm{BPD})(\mathrm{AC})^2+0.000019782(\mathrm{AC})^3+0.052594(\mathrm{BPD})}$
INTERGROWTH-21 (2017)[51]	$e^{5.084820-54.06633((\mathrm{AC})/100)^3-95.80076((\mathrm{AC})/100)^3\ln((\mathrm{AC})/100)+3.136370(\mathrm{HC})/100}$
Jordaan I (1983)[26]	$10^{-1.1683+0.0377(\mathrm{AC})+0.095(\mathrm{BPD})-0.0015(\mathrm{BPD})(\mathrm{AC})}$
Jordaan II (1983)[26]	$10^{0.9119+0.0488(\mathrm{HC})+0.0824(\mathrm{AC})+0.001599(\mathrm{AC})(\mathrm{HC})}$
Merz (1988)[33]	$3200.40479 + 157.07186\,(\mathrm{AC}) + 15.90391\,(\mathrm{BPD})^2$
Ott (1986)[36]	$10^{-2.0661+0.04355(\mathrm{HC})+0.05394(\mathrm{AC})-0.0008582(\mathrm{AC})(\mathrm{HC})+1.2594(\mathrm{AC})(\mathrm{FL})(\mathrm{AC})}$
Roberts (1985)[42]	$10^{1.6758+0.01707(\mathrm{AC})+0.042478(\mathrm{BPD})+0.05216(\mathrm{FL})+0.01604(\mathrm{HC})}$
Schild (2004)[45]	$5381.193 + 150.324\,(\mathrm{HC}) + 2.069\,(\mathrm{FL})^3 + 0.0232\,(\mathrm{AC})^3 - 6235.478\log(\mathrm{HC})$
Shepard I (1982)[47]	$10^{-1.599+0.144(\mathrm{BPD})+0.032(\mathrm{AC})-0.000111(\mathrm{AC})(\mathrm{BPD})^2}$
Shepard II (1982)[47]	$10^{-1.7492+0.166(\mathrm{BPD})+0.046(\mathrm{AC})-0.002646(\mathrm{BPD})(\mathrm{AC})}$
Thurnau (1983)[52]	$9.337\,(\mathrm{BPD})\,(\mathrm{AC}) - 229$
Vintzileos I (1987)[55]	$10^{1.879+0.084(\mathrm{BPD})+0.026(\mathrm{AC})}$
Vintzileos II (1987)[55]	$10^{2.082+0.004(\mathrm{HC})(\mathrm{FL})+0.0018(\mathrm{AC})-0.00000001509((\mathrm{HC})(\mathrm{FL}))^3}$
Warsof (1977)[56]	$10^{-1.599+0.144(\mathrm{BPD})+0.032(\mathrm{AC})-0.000111(\mathrm{BPD})^2(\mathrm{AC})}$
Weiner I (1985)[57]	$10^{1.6961+0.02253(\mathrm{HC})+0.01645(\mathrm{AC})+0.06439(\mathrm{FL})}$
Weiner II (1985)[57]	$10^{1.6575+0.04035(\mathrm{HC})+0.01285(\mathrm{AC})}$
Woo (1986)[58]	$1.4\,(\mathrm{BPD})\,(\mathrm{AC})\,(\mathrm{HC}) - 200$
Woo I (1985)[59]	$10^{1.54+0.15(\mathrm{BPD})+0.00111(\mathrm{AC})^2-0.0000764(\mathrm{BPD})(\mathrm{AC})^2+0.05(\mathrm{FL})-0.000992(\mathrm{AC})(\mathrm{FL})}$
Woo II (1985)[59]	$10^{1.14+0.16(\mathrm{BPD})+0.05(\mathrm{AC})-2.8(\mathrm{BPD})(\mathrm{AC})/1000+0.04(\mathrm{FL})-4.9(\mathrm{AC})(\mathrm{FL})/10000}$
Woo III (1985)[59]	$10^{1.13+0.18(\mathrm{BPD})+0.05(\mathrm{AC})-3.35(\mathrm{BPD})(\mathrm{AC})/1000}$
Woo IV (1985)[59]	$10^{1.63+0.16(\mathrm{BPD})+0.00111(\mathrm{AC})^2-0.0000859(\mathrm{BPD})(\mathrm{AC})^2}$
Woo V (1985)[59]	$10^{0.59+0.08(\mathrm{AC})+0.28(\mathrm{FL})-0.00716(\mathrm{AC})(\mathrm{FL})}$

Table 2: List of the formulas under investigation.

4 Discussion

4.1 Summary of results

In terms of a general overview of the results, approximately half of the formulas (45%) have at least one parameter with a first-order Sobol' index that is less than 0.3. This indicates that half of the formulas are not parsimonious, as they utilize more parameters than are necessary to make a prediction for the EFW.

Moreover, 66% of the formulas exhibit a crossing of indices at some point during pregnancy. This indicates that in most formulas, the parameters undergo a reversal in their significance level.

With regard to the monotonicity of the indices, it can be observed that, following the 20th week, the vast majority of the studied formulas exhibit strictly monotone indices. During weeks 10 to 20, approximately 41% of the formulas exhibit at least one index with a turning point. Schild (2004) displays the turning point a couple of weeks after week 20. Notably, all of these formulas contain FL as a parameter. Furthermore, only two of the sixteen formulas with FL as a parameter do not display a turning point (12.5%).

With respect to the importance of each parameter, the presence of HC is insignificant (having an index less than 0.3 throughout the whole gestation) in 20% of the formulas that it appears in, BPD in 33%, AC in 4%, and FL in 38%. On the contrary, only 2 of the formulas (7%) have a dominant index, with values greater than 0.7 throughout the gestation. Specifically, HC is dominant in Weiner II (1985) and AC is dominant in Merz (1988). AC is generally considered to be a crucial parameter in fetal weight estimation. After all, it is included in all the studied formulas. The results of the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

present study highlight the importance of AC, however, just like all the tested parameters, its contribution depends on both the choice of the formula and the gestation age.

Regarding the second-order Sobol' indices, they measure the degree of interaction between the associated parameters. The term "interaction" is used to describe a situation in which the effect of one variable on an outcome depends on the level of another variable. Consequently, if the second-order index between two parameters of a formula were to be identified as significant, it could, for instance, signify that one of the parameters must be above or below a specific threshold in order for the other to be taken into account. This scenario would be incongruent with the objective of fetal weight estimation, as the larger the value of a biometric parameter is, the larger the EFW should be, irrespective of the value of the remaining parameters. Hence, since none of the under investigation formulas admitted a significant second-order Sobol' index, they are all well-defined.

As far as the uncertainty of the estimates is concerned, the length of the 95% CI is generally narrow, indicating a precise estimate. However, some formulas have a more broad 95% CI during weeks 10 to 15, such as INTERGROWTH-21 (2017) and Shepard I (1982), as well as during weeks 41 and 42, such as INTERGROWTH-21 (2017) and Halaska (2006). One potential explanation for the broader estimates is the smaller number of data points available for analysis in those weeks. As can be seen in Table 1, most of the datasets utilized do not provide data for the aforementioned weeks. This results in the bootstrap estimate being less reliable, thereby increasing the uncertainty, due to the smaller sample size. Another potential reason for this could be the variability of the data in those weeks. During early gestation, particularly between weeks 10 and 15, the fetus is still small, which can make accurate measurements of the parameters difficult[44], thus, influencing the 10th and 90th percentile charts on which this study's approach relies on.

4.2 Interpretations of results

To facilitate the interpretation of the results, some examples are in order. The following examples use data from Papageorghiou et al.[38], and concern week 38, which is an important week to predict fetal weight.

Assuming a fetus with the median biometric parameters, Hadlock III (1985) predicts the EFW to be $2990.85\,\mathrm{g}$. When HC lies at the 90th percentile, with the remaining parameters lying at the median, then the EFW is $3102.99\,\mathrm{g}$ (3.7% increase). Doing the same for HC results in the EFW to be $3376.14\,\mathrm{g}$ (2.2% increase), whereas for AC the result is $3376.14\,\mathrm{g}$ (12.8% increase) and for FL is $3123.26\,\mathrm{g}$ (4.42% increase). The respective first-order Sobol' indices for HC, AC and FL are 0.075, 0.82 and 0.103. It is obvious that the most substantial change occurs when AC is altered, followed by FL, and then HC.

Assuming a fetus with the median biometric parameters, Hadlock IV (1985) predicts the EFW to be $3049.05\,\mathrm{g}$. When BPD lies at the 90th percentile, with the remaining parameters lying at the median, then the EFW is $3116.23\,\mathrm{g}$ (2.2% increase). Doing the same for HC results in the EFW to be $3116.92\,\mathrm{g}$ (2.2% increase), whereas for AC the result is $3444.67\,\mathrm{g}$ (12.97% increase) and for FL is $3173.29\,\mathrm{g}$ (4.07% increase). The respective first-order Sobol' indices for BPD, HC, AC and FL are 0.027, 0.027, 0.853 and 0.09. It is evident that the most significant change occurs when AC is altered, followed by FL, and then BPD and HC, which both affect EFW similarly.

The results of the above practical examples demonstrate complete alignment with the findings of the present study.

4.3 Implications

The findings of the present study have immediate and significant clinical implications. For example, it can become increasingly challenging to accurately measure the parameters of the fetus's head toward the later stages of pregnancy. Various factors, including the position of the fetus, the volume of amniotic fluid, and the presence of an anterior placenta, can influence the precision of these measurements. Furthermore, the fetal head may engage with the pelvis, potentially impeding the acquisition of clear ultrasound images[34;60;41]. Therefore, to minimize the error in predictions, it is recommended to use a formula with small first-order indices for HC and BPD.

4.4 Strengths and limitations

A notable strength of this study is its minimal reliance on a single, specific dataset of measurements, which could potentially be biased towards particular values. On the contrary, it relies solely on the estimates of the 10th and 90th percentile charts, allowing it to investigate the entire parameter space evenly, ensuring that the results are objective and impartial. Furthermore, the results are based on a bootstrap estimate of numerous datasets, with participants of various ethnicities, which provides additional assurance regarding the reliability of the findings.

A limitation of this study is the exclusion of outlier measurements from the explored parameter range. The omission of measurements scoring below the 10th and above the 90th percentile ensures the validity of the results for appropriate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Combs (1993).



Figure 4: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Ferrero (1994).

for gestational age fetuses. However, it should be noted that the respective indices for small and large for gestational age fetuses may vary from those presented in the current article. Hence, the dependence of fetal weight on individual biometric parameters for small and large for gestational age fetuses could be explored in a future study.

5 Conclusions

The above analysis leads to the following two conclusions:

1. The behavior of certain parameters of some formulas is subject to qualitative variation during pregnancy, as the values of the corresponding indices change dramatically. Therefore, each sonographer should take into account the gestational age in relation to the formula used for the fetal weight assessment.

2. Certain parameters of some formulas are insignificant throughout pregnancy, which has been confirmed in previous statistical studies[46], such as the HC of Hadlock III (1985). Since fewer parameters are generally preferred (especially in a crude estimation on an emergency basis), some commonly used formulas should be reassessed in this context.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 5: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Hadlock I (1985).



Figure 6: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Hadlock II (1985).



Figure 7: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Hadlock III (1985).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 8: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Hadlock IV (1985).



Figure 9: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Halaska (2006).



Figure 10: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Hsieh (1987).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 11: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of INTERGROWTH-21 (2017).



Figure 12: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Jordaan I (1983).



Figure 13: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Jordaan II (1983).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 14: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Merz (1988).



Figure 15: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Ott (1986).



Figure 16: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Roberts (1985).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 17: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Schild (2004).



Figure 18: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Shepard I (1982).



Figure 19: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Shepard II (1982).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 20: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Siemer (2007).



Figure 21: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Thurnau (1983).



Figure 22: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Vintzileos I (1987).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 23: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Warsof (1977).



Figure 24: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Weiner I (1985).



Figure 25: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Weiner II (1985).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 26: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Woo (1986).



Figure 27: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Woo I (1985).



Figure 28: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Woo II (1985).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 29: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Woo III (1985).



Figure 30: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Woo IV (1985).



Figure 31: Estimate of the mean of the first-order Sobol' indices of Woo V (1985).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Data Availability

The data and code that support the findings of this study are openly available on GitHub at `github.com/TsilidisV/DopEFW.jl`.

Author Contributions

All authors contributed equally to this work.

Conflicts of Interest

None declared.

Funding Information

This paper has been financed by the funding programme "MEDICUS", of the University of Patras.

References

[1] Araujo Júnior E, EF Martins Santana, WP Martins, JE Júnior, R Ruano, CR Pires, & SMZ Filho 2014 'Reference Charts of Fetal Biometric Parameters in 31,476 Brazilian Singleton Pregnancies' *Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine* 33(7):1185–1191 doi:10.7863/ultra.33.7.1185.

[2] Brons J, H Van Geijn, P Bezemer, J Nauta, & NFTh Arts 1990 'The fetal skeleton; ultrasonographic evaluation of the normal growth' *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology* 34(1-2):21–36 doi:10.1016/0028-2243(90)90004-K.

[3] Browne P, L Hamner, & W Clark 1992 'Sonographic Fetal Growth Curves from an Indigent Population in Atlanta, Georgia: I. Singleton Pregnancies' *American Journal of Perinatology* 9(05/06):467–476 doi:10.1055/s-2007-999291.

[4] Buck Louis GM, J Grewal, PS Albert, A Sciscione, DA Wing, WA Grobman, RB Newman, R Wapner, ME D'Alton, D Skupski, MP Nageotte, AC Ranzini, J Owen, EK Chien, S Craigo, ML Hediger, S Kim, C Zhang, & KL Grantz 2015 'Racial/ethnic standards for fetal growth: The NICHD Fetal Growth Studies' *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology* 213(4):449.e1–449.e41 doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2015.08.032.

[5] Burd I, S Srinivas, E Paré, V Dharan, & E Wang 2009 'Is sonographic assessment of fetal weight influenced by formula selection?' *Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine* 28(8):1019–1024 doi:10.7863/jum.2009.28.8.1019.

[6] Casella G & RW Berger 2024 *Statistical Inference* CRC Texts in Statistical Science Series Boca Raton: CRC Press.

[7] Chitty LS, DG Altman, A Henderson, & S Campbell 1994 'Charts of fetal size: 2. Head measurements*' *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology* 101(1):35–43 doi:10.1111/j.1471-0528.1994.tb13007.x.

[8] Chitty LS, DG Altman, A Henderson, & S Campbell 1994 'Charts of fetal size: 3. Abdominal measurements' *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology* 101(2):125–131 doi:10.1111/j.1471-0528.1994.tb13077.x.

[9] Chitty LS, DG Altman, A Henderson, & S Campbell 1994 'Charts of fetal size: 4. Femur length' *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology* 101(2):132–135 doi:10.1111/j.1471-0528.1994.tb13078.x.

[10] Combs CA, RK Jaekle, B Rosenn, M Pope, M Miodovnik, & TA Siddiqi 1993 'Sonographic estimation of fetal weight based on a model of fetal volume' *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 82(3):365–370.

[11] de la Vega A, N Ruiz-Febo, & ZC Roberts 2008 'Fetal ultrasound biometry: Normative charts for a Puerto Rican population' *Puerto Rico Health Sciences Journal* 27(1):81–84.

[12] Dixit VK & C Rackauckas 2022 'Globalsensitivity. jl: Performant and parallel global sensitivity analysis with julia' *Journal of Open Source Software* 7(76):4561 doi:https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.04561.

[13] Dubiel M, M Krajewski, M Pietryga, A Tretyn, G Breborowicz, P Lindquist, & S Gudmundsson 2008 'Fetal biometry between 20-42 weeks of gestation for Polish population' *Ginekologia Polska* 79(11):746–753.

[14] Dulger O, F Taser, UO Osmanoglu, & AN Serin 2024 'Fetal biometric parameter reference charts of a Central Anatolian Turkish copulation' *Cureus* doi:10.7759/cureus.55252.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[15] Esinler D, O Bircan, S Esin, EG Sahin, O Kandemir, & S Yalvac 2015 'Finding the best formula to predict the fetal weight: comparison of 18 formulas' *Gynecologic and Obstetric Investigation* 80(2):78–84 doi:10.1159/000365814.

[16] Ferrero A, E Maggi, A Giancotti, F Torcia, & A Pachi 1994 'Regression formula for estimation of fetal weight with use of abdominal circumference and femur length: a prospective study.' *Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine* 13(11):823–833 doi:10.7863/jum.1994.13.11.823.

[17] Fouad M, S Elsirgany, MF Sharaf, RM Abdella, SM Sobh, D Samir, NS AbdelHakim, M ElHodiby, S Aboelsaoud, A Farina, PI Cavoretto, AND Gatta, A Seidenari, & MM AbulGhar 'Clinical Relevance of Using Local Fetal Biometry Charts as Compared to Intergrowth-21st Standard: A Cross-Sectional Study at Kasr El- Ainy Hospital, Cairo University, Egypt' doi:10.37515/gynaecology.8088.4301.

[18] Geerts L & T Widmer 2011 'Which is the most accurate formula to estimate fetal weight in women with severe preterm preeclampsia?' *The Journal of Maternal-Fetal & Neonatal Medicine* 24(2):271–279 doi:10.3109/14767058.2010.485232.

[19] Giorlandino M, F Padula, P Cignini, M Mastrandrea, R Vigna, G Buscicchio, & C Giorlandino 2009 'Reference interval for fetal biometry in Italian population' *Journal of Prenatal Medicine* 3(4):62–65.

[20] Hadlock FP, R Harrist, RS Sharman, RL Deter, & SK Park 1985 'Estimation of fetal weight with the use of head, body, and femur measurements—a prospective study' *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology* 151(3):333–337.

[21] Halaska MG, R Vlk, P Feldmar, M Hrehorcak, M Krcmar, H Mlcochova, I Mala, & L Rob 2006 'Predicting term birth weight using ultrasound and maternal characteristics' *European Journal of Obstetrics Gynecology and Reproductive Biology* 128(1):231–235 doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejogrb.2006.01.020.

[22] Hammami A, A Mazer Zumaeta, A Syngelaki, R Akolekar, & KH Nicolaides 2018 'Ultrasonographic estimation of fetal weight: development of new model and assessment of performance of previous models' *Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology* 52(1):35–43 doi:10.1002/uog.19066.

[23] Hoopmann M, H Abele, N Wagner, D Wallwiener, & KO Kagan 2010 'Performance of 36 different weight estimation formulae in fetuses with macrosomia' *Fetal Diagnosis and Therapy* 27(4):204–213 doi:10.1159/000299475.

[24] Hsieh F, F Chang, H Huang, C Lu, T Ko, & H Chen 1987 'Computer-assisted analysis for prediction of fetal weight by ultrasound-comparison of biparietal diameter (BPD), abdominal circumference (AC) and femur length (FL)' *Taiwan yi xue hui za zhi Journal of the Formosan Medical Association* 86(9):957–964.

[25] Johnsen SL, T Wilsgaard, S Rasmussen, R Sollien, & T Kiserud 2006 'Longitudinal reference charts for growth of the fetal head, abdomen and femur' *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology* 127(2):172–185 doi:10.1016/j.ejogrb.2005.10.004.

[26] Jordaan HV 1983 'Estimation of fetal weight by ultrasound' *Journal of Clinical Ultrasound* 11(2):59–66 doi:10.1002/jcu.1870110202.

[27] Jung SI, YH Lee, MH Moon, MJ Song, JY Min, JA Kim, JH Park, JH Yang, MY Kim, JH Chung, JY Cho, & KG Kim 2007 'Reference charts and equations of Korean fetal biometry' *Prenatal Diagnosis* 27(6):545–551 doi:10.1002/pd.1729.

[28] Kiserud T, G Piaggio, G Carroli, M Widmer, J Carvalho, L Neerup Jensen, D Giordano, JG Cecatti, H Abdel Aleem, SA Talegawkar, A Benachi, A Diemert, A Tshefu Kitoto, J Thinkhamrop, P Lumbiganon, A Tabor, A Kriplani, R Gonzalez Perez, K Hecher, MA Hanson, AM Gülmezoglu, & LD Platt 2017 'The World Health Organization Fetal Growth Charts: A Multinational Longitudinal Study of Ultrasound Biometric Measurements and Estimated Fetal Weight' *PLOS Medicine* 14(1):e1002220 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002220.

[29] Kwon JY, IY Park, JH Wie, S Choe, CJ Kim, & JC Shin 2014 'Fetal biometry in the Korean population: Reference charts and comparison with charts from other populations' *Prenatal Diagnosis* 34(10):927–934 doi:10.1002/pd.4394.

[30] Lai FM & GS Yeo 1995 'Reference charts of foetal biometry in Asians' *Singapore Medical Journal* 36(6):628–636.

[31] Lessoway VA, M Schulzer, BK Wittmann, FA Gagnon, & RD Wilson 1998 'Ultrasound fetal biometry charts for a North American caucasian population' *Journal of Clinical Ultrasound* 26(9):433–453 doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-0096(199811/12)26:9<433::AID-JCU3>3.0.CO;2-O.

[32] Lindström L, M Ageheim, O Axelsson, L Hussain-Alkhateeb, A Skalkidou, & E Bergman 2020 'Swedish intrauterine growth reference ranges of biometric measurements of fetal head, abdomen and femur' *Scientific Reports* 10(1):22441 doi:10.1038/s41598-020-79797-8.

[33] Merz E, H Lieser, K Schicketanz, & J Härle 1988 'Intrauterine fetal weight assessment using ultrasound. a comparison of several weight assessment methods and development of a new formula for the determination of fetal weight' *Ultraschall in der Medizin (Stuttgart, Germany: 1980)* 9(1):15–24.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[34] Molina FS, R Terra, MP Carrillo, A Puertas, & KH Nicolaides 2010 'What is the most reliable ultrasound parameter for assessment of fetal head descent?' *Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology* 36(4):493–499 doi:10.1002/uog.7709.

[35] Munim S, T Morris, N Baber, Y Ansari, & S Iqbal Azam 2012 'Growth charts of fetal biometry: A longitudinal study' *The Journal of Maternal-Fetal & Neonatal Medicine* 25(6):692–698 doi:10.3109/14767058.2011.592878.

[36] Ott WJ, S Doyle, & S Flamm 1986 'Accurate ultrasonic estimation of fetal weight' *American Journal of Perinatology* 3(03):193–197 doi:10.1055/s-2007-999866.

[37] Paladini D, M Rustico, E Viora, U Giani, D Bruzzese, M Campogrande, & P Martinelli 2005 'Fetal size charts for the Italian population. Normative curves of head, abdomen and long bones' *Prenatal Diagnosis* 25(6):456–464 doi:10.1002/pd.1158.

[38] Papageorghiou AT, EO Ohuma, DG Altman, T Todros, LC Ismail, A Lambert, YA Jaffer, E Bertino, MG Gravett, M Purwar, JA Noble, R Pang, CG Victora, FC Barros, M Carvalho, LJ Salomon, ZA Bhutta, SH Kennedy, & J Villar 2014 'International standards for fetal growth based on serial ultrasound measurements: The Fetal Growth Longitudinal Study of the INTERGROWTH-21st Project' *The Lancet* 384(9946):869–879 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61490-2.

[39] Pinette MG, Y Pan, SG Pinette, J Blackstone, J Garrett, & A Cartin 1999 'Estimation of fetal weight: mean value from multiple formulas.' *Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine* 18(12):813–817 doi:10.7863/jum.1999.18.12.813.

[40] Plonka M, M Bociaga, M Radon-Pokracka, M Nowak, & H Huras 2020 'Comparison of eleven commonly used formulae for sonographic estimation of fetal weight in prediction of actual birth weight' *Ginekologia Polska* 91(1):17–23 doi:10.5603/GP.2020.0005.

[41] Poojari VG, A Jose, & MV Pai 2022 'Sonographic Estimation of the Fetal Head Circumference: Accuracy and Factors Affecting the Error' *The Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology of India* 72(S1):134–138 doi:10.1007/s13224-021-01574-y.

[42] Roberts A, A Lee, & A James 1985 'Ultrasonic estimation of fetal weight: A new predictive model incorporating femur length for the low-birth-weight fetus' *Journal of Clinical Ultrasound* 13(8):555–559

[43] Saksiriwuttho P, T Ratanasiri, & R Komwilaisak 2007 'Fetal biometry charts for normal pregnant women in northeastern Thailand' *Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand = Chotmaihet Thangphaet* 90(10):1963–1969.

[44] Salomon L, Z Alfirevic, F Da Silva Costa, R Deter, F Figueras, T Ghi, P Glanc, A Khalil, W Lee, R Napolitano, A Papageorghiou, A Sotiriadis, J Stirnemann, A Toi, & G Yeo 2019 'ISUOG Practice Guidelines: Ultrasound assessment of fetal biometry and growth' *Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology* 53(6):715–723 doi:10.1002/uog.20272.

[45] Schild RL, K Fell, R Fimmers, U Gembruch, & M Hansmann 2004 'A new formula for calculating weight in the fetus of 1600 g' *Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology* 24(7):775–780 doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/uog.1741.

[46] Shaheen JD, R Hershkovitz, SA Mastrolia, R Charach, R Eshel, D Tirosh, N Shaheen, & J Baron 2019 'Estimation of fetal weight using hadlock's formulas: Is head circumference an essential parameter?' *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology* 243:87–92.

[47] Shepard MJ, VA Richards, RL Berkowitz, SL Warsof, & JC Hobbins 1982 'An evaluation of two equations for predicting fetal weight by ultrasound' *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology* 142(1):47–54 doi:10.1016/S0002-9378(16)32283-9.

[48] Siemer J, N Egger, N Hart, B Meurer, A Müller, O Dathe, T Goecke, & R Schild 2008 'Fetal weight estimation by ultrasound: comparison of 11 different formulae and examiners with differing skill levels' *Ultraschall in der Medizin-European Journal of Ultrasound* 29(02):159–164 doi:10.1055/s-2007-963165.

[49] Sobol I 2001 'Global sensitivity indices for nonlinear mathematical models and their monte carlo estimates' *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation* 55(1):271–280 doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4754(00)00270-6 the Second IMACS Seminar on Monte Carlo Methods.

[50] Stampalija T, T Ghi, V Rosolen, G Rizzo, EM Ferrazzi, F Prefumo, A Dall'Asta, M Quadrifoglio, T Todros, & T Frusca 2020 'Current use and performance of the different fetal growth charts in the Italian population' *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology* 252:323–329 doi:10.1016/j.ejogrb.2020.06.059.

[51] Stirnemann J, J Villar, LJ Salomon, E Ohuma, P Ruyan, DG Altman, F Nosten, R Craik, S Munim, L Cheikh Ismail, FC Barros, A Lambert, S Norris, M Carvalho, YA Jaffer, JA Noble, E Bertino, MG Gravett, M Purwar, CG Victora, R Uauy, Z Bhutta, S Kennedy, AT Papageorghiou, & for the International Fetal and Newborn Growth Consortium for the 21st Century (INTERGROWTH-21st) 2017 'International estimated

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.17.24313697; this version posted January 23, 2025. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

fetal weight standards of the intergrowth-21st project' *Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology* 49(4):478–486 doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/uog.17347.

[52] Thurnau GR, RK Tamura, R Sabbagha, OR Depp III, A Dyer, R Larkin, T Lee, & C Laughlin 1983 'A simple estimated fetal weight equation based on real-time ultrasound measurements of fetuses less than thirty-four weeks' gestation' *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology* 145(5):557–561 doi:10.1016/0002-9378(83)91195-X.

[53] Tonismae T, J Voirol, F Schubert, & A Shanks 2018 'Comparison of formulas for estimation of fetal weight in pregnancies complicated by gastroschisis [34p]' *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 131:182S doi:10.1097/01.AOG.0000533208.66616.88.

[54] Verburg BO, EAP Steegers, M De Ridder, RJM Snijders, E Smith, A Hofman, HA Moll, VWV Jaddoe, & JCM Witteman 2008 'New charts for ultrasound dating of pregnancy and assessment of fetal growth: Longitudinal data from a population-based cohort study' *Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology* 31(4):388–396 doi:10.1002/uog.5225.

[55] Vintzileos AM, WA Campbell, JF Rodis, R Bors-Koefoed, & DJ Nochimson 1987 'Fetal weight estimation formulas with head, abdominal, femur, and thigh circumference measurements' *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology* 157(2):410–414 doi:10.1016/S0002-9378(87)80182-5.

[56] Warsof SL, P Gohari, RL Berkowitz, & JC Hobbins 1977 'The estimation of fetal weight by computer-assisted analysis' *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology* 128(8):881–892 doi:10.1016/0002-9378(77)90058-8.

[57] Weiner C, R Sabbagha, N Vaisrub, & M Socol 1985 'Ultrasonic fetal weight prediction: role of head circumference and femur length.' *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 65(6):812–817.

[58] Woo J & M Wan 1986 'An evaluation of fetal weight prediction using a simple equation containing the fetal femur length.' *Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine* 5(8):453–457 doi:10.7863/jum.1986.5.8.453.

[59] Woo J, C Wan, & K Cho 1985 'Computer-assisted evaluation of ultrasonic fetal weight prediction using multiple regression equations with and without the fetal femur length.' *Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine* 4(2):65–67 doi:10.7863/jum.1985.4.2.65.

[60] Zeng Y, PH Tsui, W Wu, Z Zhou, & S Wu 2021 'Fetal Ultrasound Image Segmentation for Automatic Head Circumference Biometry Using Deeply Supervised Attention-Gated V-Net' *Journal of Digital Imaging* 34(1):134–148 doi:10.1007/s10278-020-00410-5.