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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 09:00-09:05| **Welcome**  
*Chaired by Boris Tutschek and Christoph Lees* | **Open Discussion**  
*Chaired by Patrick Rozenberg, MD and Torbjørn Eggebo, MD* |
| 09:05-09:10| 1 Uptake of optional intrapartum ultrasound before instrumental delivery - a single centre experience | 11 Fetal head movement during contractions |
| 09:09-09:15| 2 Sonographic prediction of outcome of instrumental vaginal delivery using dynamic 2D transperineal ultrasound: a prospective cohort study | 12 Can ultrasound analysis of the pressure forces generated by maternal musculoskeletal elements predict 2nd stage outcomes? |
| 09:15-09:20| 3 Ultrasonographic prediction of vacuum failure | 13 Levator ani contraction during valsalva maneuver (co-activation) at term and labor outcome in nulliparous women |
| 09:20-09:30| **Open Discussion** | **Open Discussion**  
*Coffee Break* |
| 09:30-09:35| 4 Quality control and teaching of rotational forceps delivery: a novel use of intrapartum ultrasound | 11 Fetal head movement during contractions |
| 09:35-09:45| 5 Predictive value of angle of progression measurement for a successful vaginal delivery during a prolonged second stage of labor | 12 Can ultrasound analysis of the pressure forces generated by maternal musculoskeletal elements predict 2nd stage outcomes? |
| 09:40-09:45| 6 Is angle of progression useful to predict intraoperative surgical complications in second-stage cesarean delivery? | 13 Levator ani contraction during valsalva maneuver (co-activation) at term and labor outcome in nulliparous women |
| 09:45-9:50 | 7 A Case of preterm birth using transperineal ultrasonography in deciding method of delivery | 14 To push or not to push - can ultrasound better |
| 10:05-10:05| **Open Discussion** | **Open Discussion**  
*Coffee Break* |
| 10:05-10:10| 8 Management of fetal malpositions in the 1st stage of labour with ultrasound guided change of maternal position | 11 Fetal head movement during contractions |
| 10:10-10:15| 9 Molding in OA and OP positions | 12 Can ultrasound analysis of the pressure forces generated by maternal musculoskeletal elements predict 2nd stage outcomes? |
| 10:15-10:20| 10 The Chin-Chest distance: a new objective method to assess the degree of fetal head deflexion in OP fetuses | 13 Levator ani contraction during valsalva maneuver (co-activation) at term and labor outcome in nulliparous women |
| 10:35-11:00| **Coffee Break** | **Open discussion**  
*Chaired by Patrick Rozenberg, MD and Torbjørn Eggebo, MD* |
| 11:00-11:05| 11 Fetal head movement during contractions | 14 To push or not to push - can ultrasound better |
| 11:05-11:10| 12 Can ultrasound analysis of the pressure forces generated by maternal musculoskeletal elements predict 2nd stage outcomes? | 14 To push or not to push - can ultrasound better |
| 11:10-11:15| 13 Levator ani contraction during valsalva maneuver (co-activation) at term and labor outcome in nulliparous women | 14 To push or not to push - can ultrasound better |
| 11:15-11:30| **Open discussion** | **Open discussion**  
*Chaired by Patrick Rozenberg, MD and Torbjørn Eggebo, MD* |
<p>| 11:30-11:35| 14 To push or not to push - can ultrasound better | 14 To push or not to push - can ultrasound better |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Speaker/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:35-11:40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Intrapartum ultrasound for the non-invasive assessment of labor progression parameters during contractions: rationale and preliminary clinical results.</td>
<td>F. Conversano (Lecce, Italy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40-11:45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ultrasound guidance of the 2nd stage of labour: both for passive 2nd stage and active pushing - ultrasound guided pushing</td>
<td>P. Antsaklis (Athens, Greece)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45-11:50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Visual biofeedback intervention during the second stage of labor to prevent post-traumatic stress following childbirth</td>
<td>Y. Gilboa (Tel Aviv, Israel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:50-12:05</td>
<td>Open discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:05-12:10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Differences in progression of labor among women undergoing TOLAC; a sonographic study</td>
<td>G. Rizzo (Rome, Italy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10-12:15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>A non-invasive and automatic ultrasound technique for head-perineum distance measurements during childbirth labor</td>
<td>A. Dall’Asta / F. Conversano (Lecce, Italy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-12:25</td>
<td>Open discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:25-12:30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fetal station assessed with transabdominal ultrasound</td>
<td>J. K. Iversen (Oslo, Norway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-12:35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Transperineal ultrasound characterization of station 0</td>
<td>D. Iliescu (Craiova, Romania)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:35-12:40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Relationship between fetal head and maternal ischial spines: what happens in the plane of the pelvic brim?</td>
<td>E. Simon and C. Arthuis (France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:40-12:45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Evaluation of head progression through intrapartum transperineal ultrasound (angle of progression and head perineum distance): two methods compared</td>
<td>I Giardina (Perugia, Italy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:40-12:45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Anatomical evaluation of the symphysis pubis: its possible role in the determination of the occiput position in the birth canal</td>
<td>A. Barbera (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45-13:00</td>
<td>Open discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-14:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-14:00</td>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>Chaired by Wailam Lau, MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-14:05</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cervical dilatation by ultrasound</td>
<td>W. Hassan (Colchester, UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:05-14:10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>The relationship between sonographic and MRI angle-of-progression and bisischiatic-to-head station assessment: a case of perceptive blindness</td>
<td>E Ferrazzi (Milan, Italy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:10-14:15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Caput succedaneum by ultrasound</td>
<td>W. Hassan (Colchester, UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:15-14:30</td>
<td>Open Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-14:35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Correlation between clinical examinations and ultrasound when performed by experts</td>
<td>J. K. Iversen (Trondheim, Norway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:35-14:40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>US vs clinical training in detecting fetal head position in labor: proposal for a RCT</td>
<td>E. Di Pasquio (Parma, Italy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:40-14:45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>A new Artificial Intelligence US system for the</td>
<td>F. Conversano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Speaker/Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45-15.00</td>
<td>Open Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-15.05</td>
<td>From the first image of translabial ultrasound to the current use at the Charité</td>
<td>W. Henrich (Berlin, Germany)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:05-15.10</td>
<td>Cardinal Movements of Labor: let's check them out by ultrasound!</td>
<td>V. Berghella (Philadelphia, USA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:10-15.15</td>
<td>Physiology of normal delivery as seen on transperineal ultrasound</td>
<td>B. Tutschek (Zurich, Switzerland)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15-15.20</td>
<td>Intrapartum Ultrasound, from admission to delivery</td>
<td>MJ Cuerva (Madrid, Spain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:20-15.30</td>
<td>Open Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-15.35</td>
<td>Intrapartum prediction for mode of delivery: comparison of models</td>
<td>S. Usman (London, UK)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:35-15.40</td>
<td>Redesigning the partogram for nulliparous women based on repeat ultrasound measurements</td>
<td>S. Usman (London, UK)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:40-15.45</td>
<td>Future as an objective past. Correlations of the sonopartogram with classic clinical partogram</td>
<td>D. Iliescu (Craiova, Romania)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:45-16.00</td>
<td>Open Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16.30</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-16.35</td>
<td>New ultrasound data for induction of labour - could we modify the Bishop score with ultrasound parameters</td>
<td>P. Antsaklis (Athens, Greece)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:35-16.40</td>
<td>The value of two new transperineal ultrasound indices in the prediction of the outcome of induction of labor</td>
<td>R. Kamel (Cairo, Egypt)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:40-16.45</td>
<td>Ultrasonographic changes of the uterine cervix after cervical ripening balloon insertion</td>
<td>G. Rizzo (Rome, Italy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45-17.00</td>
<td>Open discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00-17.05</td>
<td>Personalised Obstetrics: Maternal-pelvic-fetal sonographic model for the prediction of an uneventful vaginal birth</td>
<td>R. Achiron (Tel Aviv, Israel)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:05-17.10</td>
<td>WITHDRAWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:10-17.15</td>
<td>Prediction of the mode of delivery before labor onset in women at term without prior vaginal deliveries</td>
<td>E. Vaisbuch (Rehovot, Israel)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15-17.30</td>
<td>Open discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-17.35</td>
<td>The predictive value of fetal head position determined by transabdominal ultrasound, cervical length measured by transvaginal ultrasound, and angle of progression (AoP) measured by transperineal ultrasound for the risk of CD</td>
<td>T. Quibel (Paris, France)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:35-17.40</td>
<td>The occiput spine angle to predict the mode of delivery in nulliparous with prolonged first stage of labor: preliminary data and proposal for a prospective multicentric study</td>
<td>A. Dall’Asta (Parma, Italy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:40-17.45</td>
<td><strong>WITHDRAWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **B** - BJO 2010, extd. pres., sample PPTX
- **WITHDRAWN** - Session withdrawn.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17:40-17:45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td><strong>WITHDRAWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:45-18:00</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Open discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00-18:05</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Sonographic assessment of shoulder engagement and early recognition of shoulder dystocia</td>
<td>W. Lau (Hong Kong, China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:05-18:10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Intrapartum ultrasound of fetal shoulder after head delivery in women at risk of shoulder dystocia: proposal for a prospective multicentric study</td>
<td>N. Volpe (Parma, Italy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:10-18:15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>The use of a “hybrid” mannequin in the hi-fi simulation of clinical and ultrasound assessment in labor: practical demonstration and potential applications</td>
<td>T. Ghi (Parma, Italy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:15-18:30</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Open discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.30</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Adjourn and summary of future collaborative studies</strong></td>
<td>Tullio Ghi, MD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>