#### Check for updates

#### **OPEN ACCESS**

EDITED BY Stefano Restaino, Ospedale Santa Maria della Misericordia di Udine, Italy

#### REVIEWED BY

Guglielmo Stabile, Institute for Maternal and Child Health Burlo Garofolo (IRCCS), Italy Emanuele Perrone,

Agostino Gemelli University Polyclinic (IRCCS), Italy

\*CORRESPONDENCE Li Haibo lihaibo7120@yeah.net

#### SPECIALTY SECTION

This article was submitted to Obstetrics and Gynecological Surgery, a section of the journal Frontiers in Surgery

RECEIVED 19 July 2022 ACCEPTED 13 September 2022 PUBLISHED 11 October 2022

#### CITATION

Wenjing L and Haibo L (2022) Therapeutic effect of laparoscopic salpingotomy vs. salpingectomy on patients with ectopic pregnancy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Front. Surg. 9:997490. doi: 10.3389/fsurg.2022.997490

#### COPYRIGHT

© 2022 Wenjing and Haibo. This is an openaccess article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

# Therapeutic effect of laparoscopic salpingotomy vs. salpingectomy on patients with ectopic pregnancy: A systematic review and meta-analysis

### Lin Wenjing and Li Haibo\*

Department of Obstetrics, Baoji Central Hospital, Baoji, China

**Background and aim:** Laparoscopic treatment of ectopic pregnancy mainly includes laparoscopic salpingotomy and salpingectomy. We aimed to assess the therapeutic effect of laparoscopic salpingotomy and salpingectomy on patients with tubal pregnancy.

**Methods:** From January 2000 through June 2022, the Cochrane Library, Medline, PubMed, Web of Science, EMBASE, and the Chinese Biomedicine Database were searched for studies that compared the therapeutic effect of laparoscopic salpingotomy vs. salpingectomy in the treatment of tubal pregnancy.

**Results:** Twenty-four randomized clinical trials (RCTs) studies were incorporated into this analysis. No statistical differences were found between the two groups in terms of operation duration and postoperative hospitalize length, but the volume of intraoperative blood loss in patients with laparoscopic salpingotomy was less than that in salpingectomy. Importantly, the natural intrauterine pregnancy rate after laparoscopic salpingotomy was significantly higher than those who underwent salpingectomy. In addition, laparoscopic salpingotomy can better protect the ovarian reserve function and endocrine function and provide favorable conditions for the second pregnancy.

**Conclusion**: Patients with ectopic tubal pregnancy should give priority to laparoscopic salpingotomy for embryo extraction.

#### KEYWORDS

tubal pregnancy, salpingotomy, salpingectomy, meta-analysis, RCT (randomised controlled trial)

# Introduction

Ectopic pregnancy refers to the implantation of fertilized eggs outside the normal site and is one of the common gynecological diseases (1). The fallopian tube is the most common site of ectopic pregnancy (about 95%) (2). If the patient does not receive treatment in time, once the fallopian tube ruptures due to embryonic development, it can lead to massive bleeding in the abdominal cavity of the patient and, in serious cases, can endanger the life of the patient. For patients with ectopic pregnancy, the

01

embryo must be removed from the fallopian tube to terminate the pregnancy. At present, surgery is the most effective way to treat ectopic pregnancy (3-5).

Laparoscopic fallopian tube surgery only has small trauma and rapid postoperative recovery; hence, it should be the first choice for the treatment of fallopian tube pregnancy (6-8). Laparoscopic treatment of ectopic pregnancy mainly includes laparoscopic salpingotomy and salpingectomy. Although both methods have good curative effects, the effects of different surgical methods on the postoperative reproductive function of patients have not yielded a consistent conclusion. Fernandez et al. (9) found that the two-year intrauterine pregnancy rate in the salpingotomy group was significantly higher than that in the salpingectomy group and believed that salpingotomy had a greater advantage in the postoperative intrauterine pregnancy rate. On the contrary, Mol et al. (10) conducted a multicenter, randomized controlled study and found no significant difference in the postoperative intrauterine pregnancy rate and the re-ectopic pregnancy rate between the two groups. Besides, there have been relatively few clinical studies on the effects of different laparoscopic methods for surgical treatment of tubal pregnancy on ovarian blood supply and ovarian reserve function, and the effects of the two surgical methods on patients' postoperative ovarian reserve function are still controversial.

With the emergence of new clinical research evidence in recent years, we conducted a meta-analysis to study the therapeutic effect of salpingotomy and salpingectomy on patients with tubal pregnancy. The perioperative safety, postoperative natural intrauterine pregnancy rate, ectopic pregnancy rate of the two surgical methods, and the effects of the two surgical methods on the ovarian reserve function of patients were compared.

# **Methods**

### Search strategies

From January 2000 through June 2022, the Cochrane Library, Medline, PubMed, Web of Science, EMBASE, and the Chinese Biomedicine Database were searched. Our subject-related searches comprised both free and MESH terms without language constraints. The following keywords were used in the search: ("tubal pregnancy" OR "ectopic pregnancy" OR "tubal ectopic pregnancy" OR "tubal gestation" OR "tubal ectopic pregnancy") AND ("conservative surgery" OR "conservative procedure" OR "salpingotomy") AND ("salpingectomy" OR "tubal excision" OR "tubectomy" OR "radical surgery" OR "radical procedure") NOT "animals." Two independent researchers used these keywords to search for titles, abstracts, and medical subject headings. The consensus was developed between the

two researchers to make a final determination on the eligibility of the article for inclusion. When no consensus could be established, a third researcher made the ultimate decision. The outcomes of the investigated search approach are displayed as a flow diagram (Figure 1). Since the analysis was based on studies that were previously published, neither ethical approval nor patient permission was necessary.

## Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The studies included in this analysis were chosen based on the following criteria: (1) Studies including comparisons of groups of patients who underwent salpingectomy against salpingostomy; (2) Pregnancies resulting from *in vitro* fertilization were likewise excluded from all included studies; (3) If the same data had been published many times, only the most recent report was considered; (4) Only studies with at least one significant study result were considered for inclusion; (5) Only studies for which full-text access was accessible were considered; (6) RCT studies.

The studies listed below were eliminated from consideration in this study. (1) Studies that did not mention in detail the type of surgery that was performed; (2) Studies that do not have data readily available for extraction; (3) Analyses of non-tubal ectopic pregnancies; (4) Not RCT studies. (5) Studies are categorized as abstracts, case reports, reviews, letters, comments, animal studies or investigations with insufficient data.

## Data extraction and definition

The following outcome indices were used: (1) the volume of bleeding during operation; (2) operation duration; (3) postoperative hospitalize length; (4) HCG level: Serum HCG level was detected 12 h after the operation. (5). About 93% of second pregnancies occurred about 18 months after the operation (11), and only the data of second pregnancies from included literature with more than 18 months were analyzed. Intrauterine pregnancy: spontaneous intrauterine pregnancy during postoperative follow-up, including full-term delivery and spontaneous intrauterine pregnancy abortion. Ectopic pregnancy: ectopic pregnancy in any part that occurs again during postoperative follow-up. (6) Serum ovarian hormone level: The level of FSH (follicle-stimulating hormone), LH (luteinizing hormone), E2 (estradiol), T (testosterone) and P (progesterone) were detected 6 months after operation; (7). Ultrasound examination: EDV (end-diastolic velocity), PSV (peak systolic velocity), RI (resistance index), numbers of follicles, and cross-sectional area of the affected ovary were examined by ultrasound 6 months after the operation.



# Assessing the quality and the bias risk of included RCTs

The methodological quality was assessed employing the modified Jadad scoring system. The risk of bias in the considered RCTs was assessed using the quality criteria recommended by the Cochrane Handbook (Figure 2).

# Statistical analysis

The Review Manager software was utilized to conduct metaanalyses. Both continuous and categorical variables were evaluated using weighted mean differences (WMDs) and odds ratios (ORs) with corresponding 95% CIs. Chi-squared, Mantel-Hansel, and  $I^2$  tests were employed to analyze to examine study heterogeneity. In instances where  $I^2$  was greater than or equal to 50%, a random-effects model was utilized, while if  $I^2$  less than 50%, a fixed-effects model was utilized. The funnel plot was applied to assess the publication bias. Differences with p < 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

# Results

# Quality and characteristics of the included RCT studies

This meta-analysis comprised a total of twenty-four RCTs. There were a total of 2,354 patients involved in the study,



FIGURE 2

Risk of bias: "+" and "?" indicated the low risk and unclear risk of bias, respectively.

with 1,171 patients assigned to the salpingotomy group and 1,183 patients assigned to the salpingectomy group. Table 1 summarizes the parameters of the investigations that were incorporated into the meta-analysis. We determined the scores for each of the examined studies. The scores ranged from 4 to 7, suggesting that the included RCT studies were of good quality (Table 2).

# Meta-analysis of perioperative safety

### **Operating duration**

Operation duration was reported by nine of the included studies. The results of the meta-analysis, which used a random model ( $I^2 = 98\%$ ), showed that there was no marked difference between two groups (WMD = -1.73; 95%CI, -6.10-2.65; p = 0.44) (Figure 3A).

#### Volume of bleeding during operation

Eleven included studies reported the volume of bleeding during operation. The results of the meta-analysis, which used a random model ( $I^2 = 99\%$ ), showed that the volume of bleeding was significantly less in salpingotomy group (WMD = -164.86; 95%CI, -195.3-134.34; p < 0.00001) (Figure 3B).

#### Postoperative hospitalize length

Postoperative hospitalize length was reported by eight of the included studies. The results of the meta-analysis, which used a random model ( $I^2 = 88\%$ ), showed that there was no distinct difference between two groups (WMD = -0.39; 95%CI, -1.00-0.23; p = 0.22) (Figure 3C).

## Postoperative hCG level

Postoperative hCG level was reported by seven of the included studies. The results of the meta-analysis, which used a random model ( $I^2 = 99\%$ ), showed that there was no distinct difference between two groups (WMD = -4.88; 95%CI, -14.43-4.68; p = 0.32) (Figure 3D).

# Meta-analysis of reproductive outcome after operation

#### Postoperative intrauterine pregnancy rate

Fifteen included studies reported the intrauterine pregnancy rate. The results of the meta-analysis, which used a random model ( $I^2 = 75\%$ ), showed that intrauterine pregnancy rate was significantly higher in salpingotomy group (OR = 2.49; 95%CI, 1.61–3.86; p < 0.0001) (Figure 4A).

#### Postoperative ectopic pregnancy rate

Fourteen included studies reported the ectopic pregnancy rate. The results of the meta-analysis, which used a random

Author	Year	Country	Group	Ν	Age, y	Outcome
Xie et al. (12)	2012	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	20 20	20–40 20–40	6,7
Fernandez et al. (9)	2013	Europe	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	101 98	29.28 (Mean) 31.25 (Mean)	5
Zhu et al. (13)	2013	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	20 20	25–35 25–35	6,7
Mol et al. (10)	2014	France	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	215 231	$30.9 \pm 5.5$ $30.9 \pm 5.5$	5
Yang et al. (14)	2015	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	34 34	21–37 21–37	6
Zhang et al. (15)	2015	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	30 30	$29.0 \pm 2.2$ $32.0 \pm 2.4$	1,2,3,5,7
Sun et al. (16)	2016	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	50 50	$26.21 \pm 3.26$ $27.05 \pm 3.12$	1,2,3,4,5
Huang et al. (17)	2016	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	35 35	$27.5 \pm 5.0$ $26.1 \pm 5.4$	1,2,3,4,5
Zhong et al. (18)	2017	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	42 42	$27.49 \pm 3.19$ $27.75 \pm 3.21$	1,2,3,4,5
Shan et al. (19)	2017	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	30 30	$27.6 \pm 6.3$ $26.7 \pm 6.9$	6,7
Gong et al. (20)	2017	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	36 36	$35.7 \pm 3.3$ $37.1 \pm 4.9$	1,2,3,4
Liao et al. (21)	2017	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	25 25	$28.0 \pm 5.0$ $29.5 \pm 5.5$	6,7
Liu et al. (22)	2017	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	50 50	$28.2 \pm 3.4$ $27.9 \pm 3.6$	1,2,3,4,5
Shi et al. (23)	2018	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	40 40	$28.7 \pm 3.4$ $28.3 \pm 3.6$	5,6,7
Wu et al. (24)	2018	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	30 30	20–40 20–40	6
Wang et al. (25)	2018	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	60 60	$29.87 \pm 4.56 \\28.47 \pm 4.38$	5
7an et al. (26)	2018	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	40 40	$29.54 \pm 3.74$ $29.57 \pm 3.80$	1,2,5
Zhang et al. (27)	2018	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	38 38	28.48 (Mean) 28.37 (Mean)	1,2,3,4,5
Zhou et al. (28)	2018	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	53 53	$27.83 \pm 1.16$ $27.83 \pm 1.16$	5
Yue et al. (29)	2019	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	40 39	$28.27 \pm 4.43$ $29.49 \pm 5.13$	5,6
Zhou et al. (30)	2019	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	30 30	$29.47 \pm 4.35 \\28.86 \pm 4.15$	5,6,7
Wei et al. (31)	2020	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	54 54	$29.54 \pm 2.36$ $28.43 \pm 3.21$	1,2,3,5
Wang et al. (32)	2020	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	40 40	$25.84 \pm 3.11$ $26.78 \pm 3.58$	2,4,5
Bian et al. (33)	2020	China	Salpingotomy Salpingectomy	58 58	$28.75 \pm 4.2$ $27.9 \pm 4.55$	2,5

#### TABLE 1 Main characteristics of all the included RCT studies.

Outcome: 1: Time of operation; 2: intraoperative blood loss; 3: postoperative hospital stay; 4: HCG level; 5: Intrauterine pregnancy and ectopic pregnancy; 6: Serum ovarian hormone level; 7: Ultrasound examination.

TABLE 2 Modified Jadad scale system for r	randomized controlled trials.
---	-------------------------------

Refs	Α	В	С	D	E
Xie et al. (12)	2	1	1	0	4
Fernandez et al. (9)	2	2	2	1	7
Zhu et al. (13)	2	1	1	0	4
Mol et al. (10)	2	2	2	1	7
Yang et al. (14)	2	2	1	0	5
Zhang et al. (15)	2	1	1	0	4
Sun et al. (16)	2	1	1	0	4
Huang et al. (17)	2	2	1	0	5
Zhong et al. (18)	2	2	1	1	6
Shan et al. (19)	2	2	1	1	6
Gong et al. (20)	2	2	1	1	6
Liao et al. (21)	2	2	1	0	5
Liu et al. (22)	2	2	0	0	4
Shi et al. (23)	2	2	1	0	5
Wu et al. (24)	2	2	0	0	4
Wang et al. (25)	2	2	0	0	4
Yan et al. (26)	2	2	1	0	5
Zhang et al. (27)	2	2	1	1	6
Zhou et al. (28)	2	2	1	0	5
Yue et al. (29)	2	2	0	0	4
Zhou et al. (30)	2	2	1	0	5
Wei et al. (31)	2	2	1	1	6
Wang et al. (32)	2	2	0	0	4
Bian et al. (33)	2	2	1	1	6

1. Modified Jadad scale system: The system was used to assess randomization, concealment of allocation, blinding, and withdrawals in the study. Each item was given a score of 0–2 and 7 score in total. If the total score was  $\geq$ 4, the RCT was of high quality.

2. A: Randomization; B: Concealment of allocation; C: Double blinding; D: Withdrawals and drop out; E: Total Score.

model ( $I^2 = 63\%$ ), showed that there was no marked difference between two groups (OR = 1.15; 95%CI, 0.64–2.07; p = 0.64) (Figure 4B).

# Meta-analysis of ovarian function after the operation

#### Serum ovarian hormone level

The values of FSH (WMD = -2.22; 95%CI, -2.8-1.61; p < 0.00001) and LH (WMD = -0.97; 95%CI, -1.7-0.23; p = 0.01) was significantly higher in salpingectomy group. The values of E2 (WMD = 11.58; 95%CI, 2.96-20.20; p = 0.008), T (WMD = 0.14; 95%CI, 0.11-0.17; p < 0.00001) and P (WMD = 0.68; 95%CI, 0.59-0.77; p < 0.00001) was significantly higher in salpingotomy group (Figures 5A–E).

#### Ultrasound examination of the affected ovary

The numbers of follicles (WMD = 3.84; 95%CI, 3.49–4.20; p < 0.00001), cross-sectional area (WMD = 1.82; 95%CI, 1.43–2.22; p < 0.00001), PSV (WMD = 1.67; 95%CI, 1.46–1.89; p < 0.00001) and EDV (WMD = 1.59; 95%CI, 1.38–1.79; p < 0.00001) was significantly higher in salpingotomy group. The values of RI (WMD = -0.10; 95%CI, -0.1–0.05; p < 0.0001) was significantly higher in salpingectomy group (Figures 6A–E).

### Meta-analysis of subgroups

At present, whether to suture the tubal after salpingotomy is a controversial clinical issue. In order to clarify whether this factor will affect the results of this meta-analysis, we conducted a subgroup analysis according to with or without suturing. The analysis results were shown in Table 3. Consistently, the results of our subgroup analysis suggested that the postoperative intrauterine pregnancy rate of salpingotomy group is significantly higher than that of the salpingectomy group, regardless of whether with suturing (OR = 4.56, p < 0.00001) or not (OR = 1.42, p = 0.003). Interestingly, patients with salpingotomy combined with suture showed a significantly lower ectopic pregnancy rate than that of patients with salpingectomy (OR = 2.61, p = 0.007). however, salpingotomy without suture did not show this advantage (OR = 2.14, p = 0.17). Further analysis found that salpingotomy combined with suture had higher intrauterine pregnancy rate (64% vs. 49%) and lower extrauterine pregnancy rate (7% vs. 22%) than that of salpingotomy without suture (Figure 7).

# **Publication bias**

**Figure 8** demonstrates that the funnel plots have no discernible asymmetry, which indicating a low probability of publication bias.

## Discussion

With the development and improvement in laparoscopic technology, the advantages of laparoscopic surgery in the treatment of tubal pregnancy are being clinically recognized. The incidence of tubal pregnancy is gradually increasing, and the number of patients with reproductive requirements is also increasing. Therefore, protecting the reproductive function of patients after treatment has become a clinical hot spot. Laparoscopic salpingotomy and salpingectomy are common methods for the treatment of ectopic pregnancy. Nonetheless, perioperative safety, postoperative fertility, and the impact on ovarian reserve function of the two surgical methods are still controversial.

		ingotom	-		gectom			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgrou			Total I				Neight	IV. Random, 95% CI Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Wei XT 2020	41.89	5.75			6.11	54		-21.32 [-23.56, -19.08] 2020 ٩	
Yan XL 2018	63.74	9.58	40	65.14	10.26	40	10.4%	-1.40 [-5.75, 2.95] 2018	
Zhang YL 2018	50.07	4.8	38 4	49.42	4.43	38	11.3%	0.65 [-1.43, 2.73] 2018	
Gong CJ 2017	48.75	3.68	36	49.04	3.52	36	11.4%	-0.29 [-1.95, 1.37] 2017	
Liu XM 2017	47.6	3.2	50	48.1	3.4	50	11.5%	-0.50 [-1.79, 0.79] 2017	
Zhong YP 2017	49.53	4.47			4.78		11.3%	-0.89 [-2.87, 1.09] 2017	
Huang YQ 2016	49.5	4.4	35	50.4	4.8		11.3%	-0.90 [-3.06, 1.26] 2016	
Sun M 2016	49.5	4.2	50	49.6	4.1		11.4%	-0.10 [-1.73, 1.53] 2016	
Zhang Y 2015	49.1	9.3	30	38.7	10.4	30	10.1%	10.40 [5.41, 15.39] 2015	
Total (95% CI)			375				100.0%	-1.73 [-6.10, 2.65]	
Heterogeneity: Tau				f = 8 (P	< 0.0000	01); l² =	= 98%	_	-10 -5 0 5 10
Test for overall effe	ect: Z = 0.77	(P = 0.4	14)						Favours [Salpingotomy] Favours [Salpingectomy]
Chudu ar Cubaraus		ngotomy			ngectom		Weight	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup		SD 1		Mean			Weight	IV. Random, 95% CI Year	IV. Random, 95% Cl
Wang MX 2020	960.33				470.32				· · ·
Bian XY 2020	823.64	42.9	58	980.11	51.67	58		-156.47 [-173.75, -139.19] 2020	•
Wei XT 2020	41.15	8.73	54	66.49	10.05			-25.34 [-28.89, -21.79] 2020	•
Zhang YL 2018	97.74		38	125.72				-27.98 [-92.13, 36.17] 2018	-
Yan XL 2018	874.65	95.47	40	985.64	100.25	40	12.2%	-110.99 [-153.89, -68.09] 2018	-
Zhong YP 2017	982.47	112.57	42 1	1,551.34	480.31	42	3.3%	-568.87 [-718.07, -419.67] 2017	
Gong CJ 2017	977.33	111.44	36 1	1,322.88	311.01	36	5.3%	-345.55 [-453.47, -237.63] 2017	
Liu XM 2017	977.7	57.6	50	1,321.4	124	50	12.8%	-343.70 [-381.60, -305.80] 2017	<b>T</b>
Sun M 2016	980.2	112.2	50	1,289.2	489.8	50	3.7%	-309.00 [-448.28, -169.72] 2016	
Huang YQ 2016	981.8	112.6	35	1,250.6	481.3	35	2.9%	-268.80 [-432.56, -105.04] 2016	
Zhang Y 2015	51.1	2.1	30	55.3	1.6	30	16.0%	-4.20 [-5.14, -3.26] 2015	
								Andrew Contraction and Contraction	
Total (95% CI)			473			473	100.0%	-164.86 [-195.37, -134.34]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup>	= 1515.77; 0	chi <sup>2</sup> = 928	3.17, df	= 10 (P	< 0.0000	1);   <sup>2</sup> =	99%		
Test for overall effect									-1000 -500 0 500 100
	a. 2 – 10.39 (	P < 0.00	001)						Favours [Salpingotomy] Favours [Salpingectomy]
	Salp	oingotor	ny		ngecton		Weight	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgrou	Salp up Mean	oingotor SD	ny Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI Year	
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020	Salp up Mean 5.27	oingotor SD 0.92	ny <u>Total</u> 54	Mean 7.13	<b>SD</b> 1.03	Total 54	14.0%	IV. Random. 95% CI Year -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49] 2020	Mean Difference
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018	Salp <u>Ip Mean</u> 5.27 5.32	0ingotor SD 0.92 2.01	ny <u>Total</u> 54 38	Mean 7.13 5.24	SD 1.03 1.88	<u>Total</u> 54 38	14.0% 11.4%	IV. Random. 95% CI Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018	Mean Difference
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020	Salp up Mean 5.27	oingotor SD 0.92	ny <u>Total</u> 54	Mean 7.13	<b>SD</b> 1.03	Total 54	14.0%	IV. Random. 95% CI Year -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49] 2020	Mean Difference
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018	Salp <u>Ip Mean</u> 5.27 5.32	<b>bingotor</b> <b>SD</b> 0.92 2.01 1.4	ny <u>Total</u> 54 38	Mean 7.13 5.24	SD 1.03 1.88	<u>Total</u> 54 38	14.0% 11.4%	IV. Random. 95% CI Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018	Mean Difference
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017	Salp up Mean 5.27 5.32 5.1 5.1	<b>singoton</b> <b>SD</b> 0.92 2.01 1.4 2.14	my Total 54 38 50 42	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.2 5.29	<b>SD</b> 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11	Total 54 38 50 42	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2%	IV. Random, 95% CI Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017	Mean Difference
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017	Salp up Mean 5.27 5.32 5.1 5.16 5.12	<b>singotor</b> <b>SD</b> 0.92 2.01 1.4 2.14 1.83	ny Total 54 38 50 42 36	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.2 5.29 5.29 5.2	<b>SD</b> 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11 1.6	Total 54 38 50 42 36	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 11.9%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017	Mean Difference
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016	Salp up Mean 5.27 5.32 5.16 5.16 5.12 5	bingoton SD 0.92 2.01 1.4 2.14 1.83 1.2	ny Total 54 38 50 42 36 50	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.2 5.29 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.2	SD 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11 1.6 1.1	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 11.9% 13.7%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           0.00 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016	Mean Difference
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016	Salp <u>up Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.11 5.16 5.12 5 5.1	0.92 2.01 1.4 2.14 1.83 1.2 1.9	ny <u>Total</u> 54 38 50 42 36 50 35	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.2 5.29 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.3	<b>SD</b> 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11 1.6 1.1 2	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 11.9% 13.7% 11.1%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.00 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2016	Mean Difference
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016	Salp up Mean 5.27 5.32 5.16 5.16 5.12 5	0.92 2.01 1.4 2.14 1.83 1.2 1.9	ny Total 54 38 50 42 36 50	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.2 5.29 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.2	SD 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11 1.6 1.1	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 11.9% 13.7%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           0.00 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016	Mean Difference
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015	Salp <u>up Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.11 5.16 5.12 5 5.1	0.92 2.01 1.4 2.14 1.83 1.2 1.9	ny <u>Total</u> 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.2 5.29 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.3	<b>SD</b> 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11 1.6 1.1 2	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 11.9% 13.7% 11.1% 13.7%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.00 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2016           -0.56 [-1.01, -0.11]         2015	Mean Difference
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% CI)	Salışı <u>up Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.1 5.16 5.12 5 5.1 3.29	0.92 2.01 1.4 2.14 1.83 1.2 0.92	ny Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 335	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.29 5.2 5.2 5.3 3.85	<b>SD</b> 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11 1.6 1.1 2 0.87	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 <b>335</b>	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 11.9% 13.7% 11.1% 13.7% <b>100.0%</b>	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.00 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2016	Mean Difference
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tai	Salşı <u>up Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.16 5.12 5.12 5.1 3.29 µ <sup>2</sup> = 0.66; C	0.92 2.01 1.4 2.14 1.83 1.2 1.9 0.92 hi <sup>2</sup> = 59.	my <u>Total</u> 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 <b>335</b> 69, df =	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.29 5.2 5.2 5.3 3.85	<b>SD</b> 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11 1.6 1.1 2 0.87	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 <b>335</b>	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 11.9% 13.7% 11.1% 13.7% <b>100.0%</b>	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.00 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2016           -0.56 [-1.01, -0.11]         2015	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% CI)	Salşı <u>up Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.16 5.12 5.12 5.1 3.29 µ <sup>2</sup> = 0.66; C	0.92 2.01 1.4 2.14 1.83 1.2 1.9 0.92 hi <sup>2</sup> = 59.	my <u>Total</u> 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 <b>335</b> 69, df =	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.29 5.2 5.2 5.3 3.85	<b>SD</b> 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11 1.6 1.1 2 0.87	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 <b>335</b>	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 11.9% 13.7% 11.1% 13.7% <b>100.0%</b>	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.00 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2016           -0.56 [-1.01, -0.11]         2015	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tai	Salşı <u>up Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.16 5.12 5.12 5.1 3.29 µ <sup>2</sup> = 0.66; C	0.92 2.01 1.4 2.14 1.83 1.2 1.9 0.92 hi <sup>2</sup> = 59.	my <u>Total</u> 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 <b>335</b> 69, df =	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.29 5.2 5.2 5.3 3.85	<b>SD</b> 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11 1.6 1.1 2 0.87	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 <b>335</b>	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 11.9% 13.7% 11.1% 13.7% <b>100.0%</b>	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.00 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2016           -0.56 [-1.01, -0.11]         2015	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tai	Salşı <u>up Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.16 5.12 5.12 5.1 3.29 µ <sup>2</sup> = 0.66; C	0.92 2.01 1.4 2.14 1.83 1.2 1.9 0.92 hi <sup>2</sup> = 59.	my <u>Total</u> 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 <b>335</b> 69, df =	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.29 5.2 5.2 5.3 3.85	<b>SD</b> 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11 1.6 1.1 2 0.87	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 <b>335</b>	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 11.9% 13.7% 11.1% 13.7% <b>100.0%</b>	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.00 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2016           -0.56 [-1.01, -0.11]         2015	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tar Test for overall effe	Salp <u>p Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.11 5.16 5.12 5 5.1 3.29 µ <sup>2</sup> = 0.66; C ect: Z = 1.2 <sup>4</sup> Sal	bingoton <u>SD</u> 0.92 2.01 1.4 2.14 1.83 1.2 1.9 0.92 hi² = 59.4 ↓ (P = 0.4) pingotol	ny <u>Total</u> 54 36 50 42 36 50 30 335 69, df 222) my	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.29 5.2 5.3 3.85 = 7 (P <	SD	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 <b>335</b> 1);   <sup>2</sup> =	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 13.7% 13.7% 100.0% 88%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2015           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau Test for overall effor	Salp <u>p Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.1 5.16 5.12 5. 5.1 3.29 y <sup>2</sup> = 0.66; C ect: Z = 1.24 Sal	sp           0.92           2.01           1.4           1.83           1.2           1.9           0.92           init (P = 0.)           hi <sup>2</sup> = 59.0           hi <sup>2</sup> = 59.0           hi <sup>2</sup> = 59.0           hi <sup>2</sup> = 59.0	my <u>Total</u> 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 335 69, df = 22) my <u>Total</u>	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.29 5.2 5 5.3 3.85 = 7 (P < Salp Mean	<u>SD</u> 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11 1.6 1.1 2 0.87 0.0000 <sup>-</sup>	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 335 1);   <sup>2</sup> =	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 11.2% 13.7% 13.7% 100.0% 88%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.00 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2015           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tar Test for overall effe	Salp <u>p Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.1 5.16 5.12 5. 5.1 3.29 y <sup>2</sup> = 0.66; C ect: Z = 1.24 Sal	bingoton <u>SD</u> 0.92 2.01 1.4 2.14 1.83 1.2 1.9 0.92 hi² = 59.4 ↓ (P = 0.4) pingotol	my <u>Total</u> 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 335 69, df = 22) my <u>Total</u>	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.29 5.2 5.3 3.85 = 7 (P <	<u>SD</u> 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11 1.6 1.1 2 0.87 0.0000 <sup>-</sup>	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 <b>335</b> 1);   <sup>2</sup> =	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 11.2% 13.7% 13.7% 100.0% 88%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2015           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tai Test for overall effe	Salp <u>p Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.1 5.16 5.12 5. 5.1 3.29 y <sup>2</sup> = 0.66; C ect: Z = 1.24 Sal	$\begin{array}{c} \text{spingotor} \\ \text{SD} \\ 0.92 \\ 2.01 \\ 1.4 \\ 2.14 \\ 1.83 \\ 1.2 \\ 1.9 \\ 0.92 \\ \text{hi}^2 = 59. \\ \text{hi}^2 = 5$	ny <u>Total</u> 54 38 50 42 366 50 35 30 335 69, df = 22) my <u>Total</u> 40	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.29 5.2 5 5.3 3.85 = 7 (P < Salp Mean	<u>SD</u> 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11 1.6 1.1 2 0.87 0.0000 <sup>-</sup> ingecto <u>SD</u> 4.98	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 335 1);   <sup>2</sup> =	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 13.7% 13.7% 13.7% 100.0% 88%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.08 [-0.70, 70.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.77, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2015           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tan Test for overall effe	Salp <u>p Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.11 5.16 5.12 5.1 3.29 J <sup>2</sup> = 0.66; C ect: Z = 1.24 <u>up Mean</u> <u>99.66</u> 126.8	bingotor <u>SD</u> 0.92 2.01 1.4 2.14 1.83 1.2 1.9 0.92 bi <sup>2</sup> = 59.1 k (P = 0.) bi <sup>2</sup> = 59.1 k (P = 0.) bi <sup>2</sup> = 59.1 bi <sup>3</sup> = 59.1 bi <sup>3</sup> = 50.1 bi <sup>3</sup> = 50.1	ny <u>Total</u> 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 335 69, df = 22) my <u>Total</u> 40 38	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.29 5.2 5.3 3.85 = 7 (P < Salp Mean 129.55	SD 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11 1.6 1.1 2 0.87 0.0000 <sup>-1</sup> ingecto 5 4.98 6.13	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 335 1); I <sup>2</sup> =	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.9% 13.7% 13.7% 100.0% 88% Weight 14.4%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2016           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tar Test for overall effor Study or Subgro Wang MX 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017	Salp <u>p Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.1 5.12 5.1 3.29 µ <sup>2</sup> = 0.66; C ect: Z = 1.24 <u>Sal</u> <u>up Mean</u> 99.6 126.8 128.7	bingotor <u>SD</u> 0.92 2.01 1.4 2.14 1.83 1.2 1.9 0.92 1.9 0.92 ↓(P = 0.) biP = 59.9 biP =	my <u>Total</u> 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 335 69, df = 22) <u>Total</u> 40 38 42 23 40 335 42 40 335 42 42 42 42 43 42 43 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.29 5.2 5.3 3.85 = 7 (P < Salp Mean 129.52 127.74 129.32	SD 7 1.03 1.88 1.6 2.11 1.6 1.1 2 0.87 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.000000 0.00000 0.00000000	Total           54           38           50           42           36           50           35           35           30           335           1); $ ^2 =$ my           Total           40           38           42           38           42           30	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 11.2% 13.7% 13.7% 100.0% 88% Weight 14.4% 14.4% 14.4%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2015           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -20.86 [-32.04, -27.68]         2020           -0.93 [-3.52, 1.66]         2018           -0.57 [-2.94, 1.80]         2017	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang YQ 2016 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tai Test for overall effo Study or Subgro Wang MX 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017	Salp <u>p Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.1 5.16 5.12 5 5.1 3.29 $\mu^2 = 0.66; C$ ect: $Z = 1.24$ Sal <u>up Mean</u> 99.6 128.7 128.	bingotor           SD           0.92           2.01           1.4           1.83           1.2           1.9           0.92           bir           i           9           9           9           1           5           5           8           17	ny <u>Total</u> 54 38 50 36 50 35 335 69, df = 22) my <u>Total</u> 40 38 42 50 30 50 50 30 50 30 50 50 30 50 30 50 30 50 30 50 50 30 50 30 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 5	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.2 5.2 5.3 3.85 = 7 (P < Salp Mean 129.55 127.74 129.32 122 3.25 125 125 125 125 125 125 125 1	SD         I.03           1.03         1.88           1.6         2.11           1.6         2.11           0.00000         0.00000           0.00000         0.00000           ingecto         SD           i         4.98           6.13         5.49           5.49         5.42	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 335 30 335 1); I <sup>2</sup> = my Total 40 38 42 50 35 30 35 50 35 50 30 35 50 35 30 35 50 35 50 35 50 30 35 50 35 50 30 50 50 35 50 30 50 50 30 50 50 30 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 5	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.2% 13.7% 13.7% 13.7% 100.0% 88% Weight 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 13.6%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2016           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -29.86 [-32.04, -27.68]         2020           -0.93 [-3.52, 1.66]         2018           -0.51 [-2.94, 1.80]         2017	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tai Test for overall effer Study or Subgrou Wang MX 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017	Salıçı <u>p Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.1 5.16 5.12 5 5.1 3.29 y <sup>2</sup> = 0.66; C ect: Z = 1.24 Sal <u>up Mean</u> 99.6 126.8 128.7 122.4	$\begin{array}{c} \text{spingotor} \\ \text{SD} \\ 0.92 \\ 2.01 \\ 1.4 \\ 2.14 \\ 1.83 \\ 1.2 \\ 1.9 \\ 0.92 \\ \text{hi}^2 = 59.4 \\ \text{hi}^2 = 59.4 \\ \text{hi}^2 = 59.1 \\ \text{hi}^2 = 59.1 \\ \text{hi}^2 = 59.1 \\ 1.5 \\ $	my <u>Total</u> 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 335 69, df 222) my <u>Total</u> 40 38 42 30 335 69, df 42 222)	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.29 5.2 5.3 3.85 = 7 (P < Salp Mean 129.55 127.74 129.32 122.55 127.74 129.32 122.55 127.74 129.55	SD         1.03           1.88         1.6           2.11         1.6           1.6         1.1           2         2.11           0.87         0.0000*           impecto         SD           i         4.98           6.13         5.12           3         6.19	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 <b>335</b> 1);   <sup>2</sup> = <b>Total</b> 40 38 40 38 40 30 30 50 50 30 50 30 50 50 30 50 50 30 50 50 50 50 30 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 5	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.9% 13.7% 13.7% 100.0% 88% Weight 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.3%	IV. Random. 95% CI Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.08 [-0.70, 70.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.77, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.77, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.77, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.70, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2016           -0.56 [-1.01, -0.11]         2015           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -29.86 [-32.04, -27.68]         2020           -0.93 [-3.52, 1.66]         2018           -0.57 [-2.94, 1.80]         2017           -1.00 [-7.47, 5.47]         2017           -1.61 [-4.56, 1.34]         2017	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tar Test for overall effer Wang MX 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Huang YQ 2016	Salp <u>p Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.11 5.16 5.12 5.1 3.29 y <sup>2</sup> = 0.66; C act: Z = 1.24 Sal <u>up Mean</u> 99.6 126.8 128.7 12. 122.4 129.4	$\begin{array}{c} \text{sngotor} \\ & \text{SD} \\ 0.92 \\ 2.01 \\ 1.4 \\ 2.14 \\ 1.83 \\ 1.2 \\ 1.9 \\ 0.92 \\ 4 (P = 0.) \\ 9 \\ 4 (P = 0.) \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 1 \\ 5 \\ 9 \\ 1 \\ 5 \\ 1 \\ 5 \\ 1 \\ 5 \\ 1 \\ 5 \\ 1 \\ 1$	my <u>Total</u> 54 38 50 42 36 50 42 36 335 69, df = 22) <u>Total</u> 40 38 42 50 0 335 69, df = 22)	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.2 5.2 5.3 3.85 = 7 (P < Salp Mean 129.5¢ 127.74 129.32 122 224.0¢ 128 124.0¢	SD         I.03           1.03         1.88           1.6         2.11           1.6         2.11           1.6         2.11           0.00000         0.00000           0.00000         0.00000           0.00000         0.00000           0.00000         0.00000           0.00000         0.00000           0.00000         0.00000	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 335 1); I <sup>2</sup> = my Total 40 38 42 50 30 35 30 38 38 30 38 50 38 30 38 50 38 30 38 38 30 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.9% 13.7% 13.7% 100.0% 88% Weight 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.4%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2015           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -29.86 [-32.04, -27.68]         2020           -0.93 [-3.52, 1.66]         2018           -0.57 [-2.94, 1.80]         2017           -1.01 [-4.45, 1.34]         2017           -1.01 [-4.45, 5.375]         2016	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tar Test for overall effer Study or Subgrou Wang MX 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017	Salıçı <u>p Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.1 5.16 5.12 5 5.1 3.29 y <sup>2</sup> = 0.66; C ect: Z = 1.24 Sal <u>up Mean</u> 99.6 126.8 128.7 122.4	$\begin{array}{c} \text{sngotor} \\ & \text{SD} \\ 0.92 \\ 2.01 \\ 1.4 \\ 2.14 \\ 1.83 \\ 1.2 \\ 1.9 \\ 0.92 \\ 4 (P = 0.) \\ 9 \\ 4 (P = 0.) \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 1 \\ 5 \\ 9 \\ 1 \\ 5 \\ 1 \\ 5 \\ 1 \\ 5 \\ 1 \\ 5 \\ 1 \\ 1$	my <u>Total</u> 54 38 50 42 36 50 42 36 335 69, df = 22) <u>Total</u> 40 38 42 50 0 335 69, df = 22)	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.2 5.2 5.3 3.85 = 7 (P < Salp Mean 129.5¢ 127.74 129.32 122 224.0¢ 128 124.0¢	SD         I.03           1.03         1.88           1.6         2.11           1.6         2.11           1.6         2.11           0.00000         0.00000           0.00000         0.00000           0.00000         0.00000           0.00000         0.00000           0.00000         0.00000           0.00000         0.00000	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 35 30 <b>335</b> 1);   <sup>2</sup> = <b>Total</b> 40 38 40 38 40 30 30 50 50 30 50 30 50 50 30 50 50 30 50 50 50 50 30 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 5	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.9% 13.7% 13.7% 100.0% 88% Weight 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.4%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.13 [-1.04, 0.78]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2015           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -29.86 [-32.04, -27.68]         2020           -0.93 [-3.52, 1.66]         2018           -0.57 [-2.94, 1.80]         2017           -1.01 [-4.45, 1.34]         2017           -1.01 [-4.45, 5.375]         2016	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tar Test for overall effer Wang MX 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016	Salp <u>p Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.11 5.16 5.12 5 5.1 3.29 J <sup>2</sup> = 0.66; C ect: Z = 1.24 <u>yp Mean</u> 99.6 126.8 128.7 122.4 129.	$\begin{array}{c} \text{spingotor} \\ & \text{SD} \\ 0.92 \\ 2.01 \\ 1.4 \\ 2.14 \\ 1.83 \\ 1.2 \\ 0.92 \\ 0.92 \\ 1.537 \\ 5.64 \\ 8.17 \\ 7.658 \\ 1.5.9 \\ 2.5.5 \end{array}$	my <u>Total</u> 54 38 50 42 36 50 335 69, df = 22) my <u>Total</u> 40 38 42 50 335 50 221 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.2 5.3 3.85 = 7 (P < Salp Mean 129.55 122.74 129.32 124.05 128.42 129.25 124.05 128.42 129.25	SD         .           1.03         1.03           1.88         1.6           2.11         1.6           2.11         2           1.6         0.0000*	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 30 335 30 335 30 315 1); 1 <sup>2</sup> = 40 38 40 38 42 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.9% 13.7% 13.7% 100.0% 88% Weight 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.3% 14.3% 14.4%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.08 [-0.70, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.70, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.70, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.70, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2016           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-3.52, 1.66]         2017           -1.61 [-4.56, 1.34]         2017           -1.61 [-4.56, 1.34]         2017           -1.61 [-4.56, 1.34]         2017 <td>Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I</td>	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tar Test for overall effor Wang MX 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Ta	Salp <u>p Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.1 5.12 5.1 3.29 $\mu^2 = 0.66; C ect: Z = 1.24 Sal up Mean 99.6 126.8 128.7 12: 122.4 128.7 12: 128.7$	$\begin{array}{c} \text{bingotor} \\ & \text{SD} \\ 0.92 \\ 2.01 \\ 1.4 \\ 2.14 \\ 1.83 \\ 1.2 \\ 0.92 \\ 0.92 \\ 4 (P = 0. \\ 0.92 \\ 0.92 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 6.44 \\ 8 \\ 1 \\ 7 \\ 6 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 6.44 \\ 8 \\ 1 \\ 7 \\ 6 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 5 \\ 7 \\ 6 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5$	my Total 54 38 50 36 50 335 69, df 22) Total 40 38 42 50 38 42 50 335 50 22) Total 40 35 50 22) 22 50 22 50 22 50 22 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.2 5.3 3.85 = 7 (P < Salp Mean 129.55 122.74 129.32 122.420 128.42 129.24	SD	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 30 335 30 335 30 315 1); 1 <sup>2</sup> = 40 38 40 38 42 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.9% 13.7% 13.7% 100.0% 88% Weight 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.3% 14.3% 14.4%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2016           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tar Test for overall effe Wang MX 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016	Salp <u>p Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.1 5.12 5.1 3.29 $\mu^2 = 0.66; C ect: Z = 1.24 Sal up Mean 99.6 126.8 128.7 12: 122.4 128.7 12: 128.7$	$\begin{array}{c} \text{bingotor} \\ & \text{SD} \\ 0.92 \\ 2.01 \\ 1.4 \\ 2.14 \\ 1.83 \\ 1.2 \\ 0.92 \\ 0.92 \\ 4 (P = 0. \\ 0.92 \\ 0.92 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 6.44 \\ 8 \\ 1 \\ 7 \\ 6 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 6.44 \\ 8 \\ 1 \\ 7 \\ 6 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 5 \\ 7 \\ 6 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5$	my Total 54 38 50 36 50 335 69, df 22) Total 40 38 42 50 38 42 50 335 50 22) Total 40 35 50 22) 22 50 22 50 22 50 22 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.2 5.3 3.85 = 7 (P < Salp Mean 129.55 122.74 129.32 122.420 128.42 129.24	SD	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 30 335 30 335 30 315 1); 1 <sup>2</sup> = 40 38 40 38 42 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.9% 13.7% 13.7% 100.0% 88% Weight 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.3% 14.3% 14.4%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2016           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -2 -1 0 1 2 Favours [Salpingotomy] Favours [Salpingectomy] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -2 -10 0 10 20
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tar Test for overall effor Wang MX 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Ta	Salp <u>p Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.1 5.12 5.1 3.29 $\mu^2 = 0.66; C ect: Z = 1.24 Sal up Mean 99.6 126.8 128.7 12: 122.4 128.7 12: 128.7$	$\begin{array}{c} \text{bingotor} \\ & \text{SD} \\ 0.92 \\ 2.01 \\ 1.4 \\ 2.14 \\ 1.83 \\ 1.2 \\ 0.92 \\ 0.92 \\ 4 (P = 0. \\ 0.92 \\ 0.92 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 6.44 \\ 8 \\ 1 \\ 7 \\ 6 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 6.44 \\ 8 \\ 1 \\ 7 \\ 6 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 5 \\ 7 \\ 6 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5$	my Total 54 38 50 36 50 335 69, df 22) Total 40 38 42 50 38 42 50 335 50 22) Total 40 35 50 22) 22 50 22 50 22 50 22 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.2 5.3 3.85 = 7 (P < Salp Mean 129.55 122.74 129.32 122.420 128.42 129.24	SD	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 30 335 30 335 30 315 1); 1 <sup>2</sup> = 40 38 40 38 42 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.9% 13.7% 13.7% 100.0% 88% Weight 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.3% 14.3% 14.4%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2016           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 
Study or Subgrou Wei XT 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Sun M 2016 Huang YQ 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tai Test for overall effor Study or Subgrou Wang MX 2020 Zhang YL 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Gong CJ 2017 Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Ta	Salp <u>p Mean</u> 5.27 5.32 5.1 5.12 5.1 3.29 $\mu^2 = 0.66; C ect: Z = 1.24 Sal up Mean 99.6 126.8 128.7 12: 122.4 128.7 12: 128.7$	$\begin{array}{c} \text{bingotor} \\ & \text{SD} \\ 0.92 \\ 2.01 \\ 1.4 \\ 2.14 \\ 1.83 \\ 1.2 \\ 0.92 \\ 0.92 \\ 4 (P = 0. \\ 0.92 \\ 0.92 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 6.44 \\ 8 \\ 1 \\ 7 \\ 6 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 6.44 \\ 8 \\ 1 \\ 7 \\ 6 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 5 \\ 7 \\ 6 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1$	my Total 54 38 50 36 50 335 69, df 22) Total 40 38 42 50 38 42 50 335 50 22) Total 40 35 50 22) 22 50 22 50 22 50 22 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	Mean 7.13 5.24 5.2 5.3 3.85 = 7 (P < Salp Mean 129.55 122.74 129.32 122.420 128.42 129.24	SD	Total 54 38 50 42 36 50 30 335 30 335 30 315 1); 1 <sup>2</sup> = 40 38 40 38 42 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	14.0% 11.4% 13.0% 11.9% 13.7% 13.7% 100.0% 88% Weight 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.4% 14.3% 14.3% 14.4%	IV. Random. 95% Cl Year           -1.86 [-2.23, -1.49]         2020           0.08 [-0.80, 0.96]         2018           -0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.87, 0.71]         2017           -0.08 [-0.45, 0.45]         2016           -0.20 [-1.11, 0.71]         2016           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -           -0.39 [-1.00, 0.23]         -	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -2 -1 0 1 2 Favours [Salpingotomy] Favours [Salpingectomy] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -2 -10 0 10 20

Our results indicated that no difference in the operation time and postoperative hospitalization time between the two surgical methods, but the volume of bleeding in patients with laparoscopic salpingotomy and the damage to patients is less than that in salpingectomy. Salpingectomy can completely remove the affected side of the fallopian tube and completely

Study or Subaroup	Salpingot Events		Salpingec Events		Woight	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI Ye	or	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Wang MX 2020	20	40	4	40	5.5%	9.00 [2.70, 30.02] 20		M-H, Kandolli, 95% Cl	
Wei XT 2020	34	40 54	17	40 54	5.5% 7.1%	3.70 [1.67, 8.21] 20			
Zhou CY 2019	25	30	13	30	5.5%	6.54 [1.97, 21.74] 20			
Yue YH 2019	33	40	24	39	5.5% 6.1%	2.95 [1.04, 8.34] 20			
Wang ZX 2018	26	60	17	60	7.3%	1.93 [0.91, 4.13] 20			
Shi SX 2018	20	40	35	40	5.7%	0.30 [0.09, 0.93] 20			
Zhou Y 2018	19	53	18	53	7.1%	1.09 [0.49, 2.42] 20			
Yan XL 2018	21	40	12	40	6.6%	2.58 [1.03, 6.46] 20			
Zhang YL 2018	19	38	12	38	6.4%	2.80 [1.07, 7.33] 20			
Zhong YP 2017	21	42	10	42	6.7%	2.50 [1.01, 6.16] 20			
Liu XM 2017	32	42 50	9	42 50	6.6%	8.10 [3.21, 20.41] 20			
Sun M 2016	32	50	10	50	6.7%	7.11 [2.89, 17.53] 20			
Huang YQ 2016	18	35	10	35	6.3%	2.65 [0.99, 7.11] 20			
Moif 2014	108	215	10	231	6.3% 8.8%	1.04 [0.71, 1.50] 20			
Fernandez H 2013	44	63	42	66	0.0% 7.4%				
Femandez FI 2013	44	03	42	00	7.4%	1.32 [0.63, 2.76] 20	13		
Total (95% CI)		850		868	100.0%	2.49 [1.61, 3.86]		•	
Total events	479		347						
	Salpinge	otomy	Salpinge	ctomy		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Salpinge Events	otomy Tota			l Weight		ear	Odds Ratio M-H. Random. 95% Cl	
Study or Subgroup Wang MX 2020			Events						
	Events	Tota	Events 6	Tota	4.6%	M-H, Random, 95% CI	020 —		
Wang MX 2020	Events 1	Tota 40	Events 6 5 9	Tota 40	4.6% 7.3%	M-H, Random, 95% CI ) 0.15 [0.02, 1.27] 2	020 — 020		
Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020	Events 1 4	<u>Tota</u> 40 58	Events 6 5 9	<u>Tota</u> 40 58	4.6% 7.3% 6.3%	M-H. Random. 95% CI ) 0.15 [0.02, 1.27] 2 0.79 [0.20, 3.08] 2	020 — 020 019		
Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Zhou CY 2019	Events 1 4 2 13 3	Tota 40 58 30	Events 6 5 9 8 5	Tota 40 58 30	4.6%         7.3%         6.3%         9.1%	M-H. Random, 95% CI ) 0.15 [0.02, 1.27] 2 0.79 [0.20, 3.08] 2 0.17 [0.03, 0.85] 2	020 — 020 019 018		
Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Zhou CY 2019 Zhou Y 2018	Events 1 4 2 13 3 5	Total 40 58 30 53	Events 6 5 9 8 5 3	Tota 40 58 30 53 38 40	4.6%         3       7.3%         0       6.3%         3       9.1%         3       6.7%         0       6.8%	M-H. Random. 95% CI           0.15 [0.02, 1.27]         2           0.79 [0.20, 3.08]         2           0.17 [0.03, 0.85]         2           1.83 [0.69, 4.86]         2	020 — 020 019 018 018		
Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Zhou CY 2019 Zhou CY 2018 Zhang YL 2018 Yan XL 2018 Wang ZX 2018	Events 1 4 2 13 3 5 26	Total 40 58 30 53 38 40 60	Events 6 5 9 8 5 3 5 5	Tota 40 58 30 53 38 40 60	4.6%         3       7.3%         0       6.3%         3       9.1%         3       6.7%         0       6.8%         0       8.8%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% Cl \</u> 0.15 [0.02, 1.27] 2 0.79 [0.20, 3.08] 2 0.17 [0.03, 0.85] 2 1.83 [0.69, 4.86] 2 0.57 [0.13, 2.56] 2 1.76 [0.39, 7.33] 2 8.41 [2.95, 24.00] 2	020 — 020 019 018 018 018 018 018		
Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Zhou CY 2019 Zhou Y 2018 Zhang YL 2018 Yan XL 2018 Wang ZX 2018 Zhong YP 2017	Events 1 4 2 13 3 5 26 4	Tota 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42	Events 6 5 9 8 5 3 5 5 6	Tota 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42	4.6%         3       7.3%         0       6.3%         3       9.1%         3       6.7%         0       6.8%         0       8.8%         2       7.4%	<u>M-H. Random. 95% Cl )</u> 0.15 [0.02, 1.27] 2 0.79 [0.20, 3.08] 2 0.17 [0.03, 0.85] 2 1.83 [0.69, 4.86] 2 0.57 [0.13, 2.56] 2 1.76 [0.39, 7.93] 2 8.41 [2.95, 24.00] 2 0.63 [0.16, 2.42] 2	020 — 020 019 018 018 018 018 018 018 017		
Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Zhou CY 2019 Zhou Y 2018 Zhang YL 2018 Yan XL 2018 Wang ZX 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017	Events 1 4 2 13 3 5 26 4 5	Tota 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42 50	Events 6 9 8 5 3 5 5 6 6 6	Tota 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42 50	4.6%           7.3%           6.3%           9.1%           8.6.7%           0.6.8%           0.8.8%           2.7.4%           0.7.8%	<u>M-H. Random. 95% Cl</u> 0.15 [0.02, 1.27] 2 0.79 [0.20, 3.08] 2 0.17 [0.03, 0.85] 2 1.83 [0.69, 4.86] 2 0.57 [0.13, 2.56] 2 1.76 [0.39, 7.93] 2 8.41 [2.95, 24.00] 2 0.63 [0.16, 2.42] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2	020 — 020 019 018 018 018 018 018 017 017		
Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Zhou CY 2019 Zhou Y 2018 Zhang YL 2018 Yan XL 2018 Wang ZX 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Huang YQ 2016	Events 1 4 2 13 3 5 26 4 5 5 5	Tota 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42 50 35	Events 6 5 9 8 5 3 5 5 6 6 6 6 3	Tota 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 60 42 50 35	4.6%           7.3%           6.3%           9.1%           8.6.7%           0.6.8%           0.8.8%           2.7.4%           0.7.8%           5.6.7%	<u>M-H. Random. 95% Cl</u> 0.15 [0.02, 1.27] 2 0.79 [0.20, 3.08] 2 0.17 [0.03, 0.85] 2 1.83 [0.69, 4.86] 2 0.57 [0.13, 2.56] 2 1.76 [0.39, 7.93] 2 8.41 [2.95, 24.00] 2 0.63 [0.16, 2.42] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2 1.78 [0.39, 8.09] 2	020		
Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Zhou CY 2019 Zhou Y 2018 Zhang YL 2018 Yan XL 2018 Wang ZX 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016	Events 1 4 2 13 3 5 26 4 5 5 5 5	Tota 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42 50 35 50	Events 6 5 9 8 5 3 5 6 6 6 3 3 6	Tota 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42 50 35 50	4.6%         7.3%         6.3%         9.1%         8.6.7%         9.6.8%         9.7.4%         9.7.8%         6.7%         9.7.8%         9.7.8%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% Cl</u> 1 0.15 [0.02, 1.27] 2 0.79 [0.20, 3.08] 2 1.83 [0.69, 4.86] 2 0.57 [0.13, 2.56] 2 1.76 [0.39, 7.93] 2 8.41 [2.95, 24.00] 2 0.63 [0.16, 2.42] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2	020		
Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Zhou CY 2019 Zhou CY 2018 Zhang YL 2018 Yan XL 2018 Wang ZX 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Zhang Y 2015	Events 1 4 2 13 3 5 26 4 5 5 5 5 14	Total 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42 50 35 50 35 30	Events 6 5 9 8 5 3 5 6 6 6 3 6 6 0	Tota 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42 50 38 50 30 30	4.6%         7.3%         6.3%         9.1%         8.6.7%         9.6.8%         9.7.4%         9.7.4%         9.7.8%         9.7.8%         9.7.8%         9.7.8%         9.3.1%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% CI</u> 0.15 [0.02, 1.27] 2 0.79 [0.20, 3.08] 2 0.17 [0.03, 0.85] 2 1.83 [0.69, 4.86] 2 0.57 [0.13, 2.56] 2 1.76 [0.39, 7.93] 2 8.41 [2.95, 24.00] 2 0.63 [0.16, 2.42] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2 53.61 [3.00, 956.98] 2	020		
Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Zhou CY 2019 Zhou Y 2018 Zhang YL 2018 Yan XL 2018 Wang ZX 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016	Events 1 4 2 13 3 5 26 4 5 5 5 5 5 14 18	Total 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42 50 35 50 35 50 30 215	Events 6 5 9 8 5 3 5 6 6 6 6 3 6 0 0 12	Tota 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42 50 35 50 30 231	4.6%         7.3%         6.3%         9.1%         8.9.1%         8.6.7%         9.8.8%         9.7.4%         9.7.8%         9.7.8%         9.3.1%         10.1%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% Cl</u> 1 0.15 [0.02, 1.27] 2 0.79 [0.20, 3.08] 2 1.83 [0.69, 4.86] 2 0.57 [0.13, 2.56] 2 1.76 [0.39, 7.93] 2 8.41 [2.95, 24.00] 2 0.63 [0.16, 2.42] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2	020		,
Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Zhou CY 2019 Zhou CY 2018 Zhang YL 2018 Yan XL 2018 Wang ZX 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Zhang Y 2015	Events 1 4 2 13 3 5 26 4 5 5 5 5 14	Total 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42 50 35 50 35 30	Events 6 5 9 8 5 3 5 6 6 6 6 3 6 0 0 12	Tota 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42 50 38 50 30 30	4.6%         7.3%         6.3%         9.1%         8.9.1%         8.6.7%         9.8.8%         9.7.4%         9.7.8%         9.7.8%         9.3.1%         10.1%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% CI</u> 0.15 [0.02, 1.27] 2 0.79 [0.20, 3.08] 2 0.17 [0.03, 0.85] 2 1.83 [0.69, 4.86] 2 0.57 [0.13, 2.56] 2 1.76 [0.39, 7.93] 2 8.41 [2.95, 24.00] 2 0.63 [0.16, 2.42] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2 53.61 [3.00, 956.98] 2	020		
Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Zhou CY 2019 Zhou Y 2018 Zhang YL 2018 Yan XL 2018 Wang ZX 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Moif 2014	Events 1 4 2 13 3 5 26 4 5 5 5 5 5 14 18	Total 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42 50 35 50 35 50 30 215	Events 6 5 9 8 5 3 3 5 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 0 0 12 6	Tota 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42 50 35 50 30 30 30 30 30 66	4.6%         7.3%         6.3%         9.1%         8.9.1%         8.6.7%         9.8.8%         9.7.4%         9.7.8%         9.7.8%         9.3.1%         10.1%	<u>M-H. Random. 95% Cl</u> 0.15 [0.02, 1.27] 2 0.79 [0.20, 3.08] 2 0.17 [0.03, 0.85] 2 1.83 [0.69, 4.86] 2 0.57 [0.13, 2.56] 2 1.76 [0.39, 7.93] 2 8.41 [2.95, 24.00] 2 0.63 [0.16, 2.42] 2 0.63 [0.16, 2.42] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2 1.78 [0.39, 8.09] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2 53.61 [3.00, 956.98] 2 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 2	020		,
Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Zhou CY 2019 Zhou Y 2018 Zhang YL 2018 Yan XL 2018 Wang ZX 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Moif 2014 Fernandez H 2013 <b>Total (95% CI)</b> Total events	Events 1 1 4 2 1 3 3 5 26 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 14 4 18 4 109	Total 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 42 50 35 50 30 215 63 804	Events 6 9 9 8 5 5 5 6 6 6 6 1 6 1 2 6 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	Tota 40 56 30 53 38 40 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60	4.6%           7.3%           6.3%           9.1%           6.7%           7.4%           7.4%           7.4%           7.4%           7.4%           7.4%           7.5%           10.1%           7.5%	M-H. Random. 95% Cl 1 0.15 [0.02, 1.27] 2 0.79 [0.20, 3.08] 2 0.17 [0.03, 0.85] 2 1.38 [0.69, 4.86] 2 0.57 [0.13, 2.56] 2 1.76 [0.39, 7.93] 2 8.41 [2.95, 24.00] 2 0.63 [0.16, 2.42] 2 0.63 [0.16, 2.42] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2 1.78 [0.39, 8.09] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2 53.61 [3.00, 956.98] 2 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 2 0.68 [0.18, 2.53] 2 1.15 [0.64, 2.07]	020		
Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Zhou CY 2019 Zhou CY 2018 Zhang YL 2018 Yan XL 2018 Wang ZX 2018 Zhong YP 2017 Liu XM 2017 Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Zhang Y 2015 Moif 2014 Fernandez H 2013 Total (95% CI)	Events 1 4 2 1 3 3 5 26 4 5 5 5 5 5 14 4 18 4 9 109 = 0.73; Chi <sup>2</sup>	Total 40 58 30 53 38 40 60 60 42 50 35 50 30 215 63 804 = 34.93	L Events 6 5 9 8 5 5 6 6 6 12 6 0 0 12 6 80 , df = 13 (P	Tota 40 56 30 53 38 40 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60	4.6%           7.3%           6.3%           9.1%           6.7%           7.4%           7.4%           7.4%           7.4%           7.4%           7.4%           7.5%           10.1%           7.5%	M-H. Random. 95% Cl 1 0.15 [0.02, 1.27] 2 0.79 [0.20, 3.08] 2 0.17 [0.03, 0.85] 2 1.38 [0.69, 4.86] 2 0.57 [0.13, 2.56] 2 1.76 [0.39, 7.93] 2 8.41 [2.95, 24.00] 2 0.63 [0.16, 2.42] 2 0.63 [0.16, 2.42] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2 1.78 [0.39, 8.09] 2 0.81 [0.23, 2.87] 2 53.61 [3.00, 956.98] 2 1.67 [0.78, 3.55] 2 0.68 [0.18, 2.53] 2 1.15 [0.64, 2.07]	020	M-H. Random. 95% Cl	+ + 10 5ingectomy]

remove the focus. Because salpingotomy retains the diseased fallopian tube, it may increase the risk of embryonic tissue residue. A comparison of the postoperative hCG levels of patients reveals no significant difference in hCG levels between the two surgical methods, suggesting that salpingotomy can also effectively remove the embryonic tissue in the fallopian tube.

Many studies have reported the intrauterine pregnancy rate after ectopic pregnancy surgery, but so far, there is no consensus on the impact of salpingotomy and salpingectomy on fertility in patients with ectopic pregnancy. Although salpingectomy retains the contralateral fallopian tube, it will still affect the postoperative fertility rate of patients. Studies (9, 34–36) have found that if the contralateral fallopian tube is healthy, there is no difference in fertility between salpingotomy and salpingectomy. However, for patients with infertility history, fallopian tube disease, or age more than 35 years old, the intrauterine pregnancy rate after salpingotomy is significantly higher than that of patients with salpingectomy (37-38). Our meta-analysis results also suggest that without considering these confounding factors, the intrauterine pregnancy rate of patients after salpingotomy is significantly higher than that after salpingectomy, and there is no difference in the incidence of ectopic pregnancy. Therefore, the reproductive function of patients is better protected by laparoscopic salpingotomy. Interestingly, subgroup analysis results showed patients with salpingotomy combined with suture exhibited a significantly lower ectopic pregnancy rate than that of patients with salpingectomy. Besides, salpingotomy combined with suture had higher intrauterine pregnancy rate and lower extrauterine pregnancy rate than that of salpingotomy without suture. Therefore, salpingotomy combined with suture should be recommend, according to the results of this meta-analysis. At present, whether to suture the tubal after salpingotomy is a

	Study or Subgroup	Salpi Mean	ngotor SD	my Total	Salpin Mean				Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI Year	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl
	Zhou CY 2019		1.42	30		1.74	30	11.5%	-0.88 [-1.68, -0.08] 2019	
	Yue YH 2019		2.54	40		2.43	39	9.8%	-2.12 [-3.22, -1.02] 2019	
	Shi SX 2018	5.4	1.5	40	6.3	1.9	40	11.8%	-0.90 [-1.65, -0.15] 2018	_
	Wu XM 2018		1.41	30		1.44	30	11.9%	-3.53 [-4.25, -2.81] 2018	
	Liao C 2017		1.59	50		1.95	50	12.1%	-2.41 [-3.11, -1.71] 2017	
	Shan DY 2017		1.23	30		1.86	30	11.5%	-2.53 [-3.33, -1.73] 2017	
	Yang L 2015		1.34	30		1.87	30	11.4%	-2.57 [-3.39, -1.75] 2015	
	Zhu L 2013	5.17	1.45	20	7.72	1.91	20	10.1%	-2.55 [-3.60, -1.50] 2013	
	Xie QX 2012	5.16	1.48	20	7.73	1.92	20	10.0%	-2.57 [-3.63, -1.51] 2012	
	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.68; Chi	i² = 37.	290 .64. df =	= 8 (P < (	0.00001		100.0% 79%	-2.22 [-2.83, -1.61]	
	Test for overall effect:	Z = 7.14	(P < 0.	00001)	ĺ					-4 -2 0 2 4 Favours [Salpingotomy] Favours [Salpingectomy]
		Salp	oingoto	omy	Salpi	ngecto	my		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
e.	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
	Zhou CY 2019	6.95	1.85	30	7.19	2.35	30	10.6%	-0.24 [-1.31, 0.83] 2019	
	Yue YH 2019	6.84	1.81	40	5.33	1.94	39	11.6%	1.51 [0.68, 2.34] 2019	
	Wu XM 2018	6.55				1.61	30	11.6%	-1.43 [-2.26, -0.60] 2018	
	Shi SX 2018	6.2				4.2	40	8.8%	-2.20 [-3.70, -0.70] 2018	
	Shan DY 2017	6.22				1.61	30	11.7%	-1.70 [-2.50, -0.90] 2017	
	Liao C 2017	6.49				1.76	50	12.2%	-1.75 [-2.43, -1.07] 2017	
	Yang L 2015	6.89				1.6	34	11.7%	-1.02 [-1.84, -0.20] 2015	
	Zhu L 2013	6.88				1.62	20	10.9%	-1.06 [-2.08, -0.04] 2013	
	Xie QX 2012	6.89		20		1.62	20	10.9%		
	AIC QA ZUIZ	0.09	1.07	20	1.95	1.05	20	10.0%	-1.06 [-2.08, -0.04] 2012	
	Total (95% CI)			294			202	100.0%	-0.97 [-1.72, -0.23]	
	Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	- 1 00. 0	hi2 - 44		- 0 /D	0.0000			-0.07 [-1.72, -0.23]	
	Test for overall effect:				- 0 (F <	0.0000	· ı), ı- =	- 03%		-4 -2 0 2 4 Favours [Salpingotomyl] Favours [Salpingectomy]
		Salp	pingoto	omy	Salp	ingect	omy		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
	Study or Subgroup	Mean	S	D Tota	I Mean	S	) Tota	al Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI Year	IV. Random, 95% CI
	Zhou CY 2019	142.97	20.83	3 30	131.62	19.35	5 3	0 12.5%	11.35 [1.18, 21.52] 2019	
	Yue YH 2019	72.55	2.71	1 40	60.18	3.23	3 3	9 15.1%	12.37 [11.05, 13.69] 2019	
	Shi SX 2018	38.5	6.1	1 40	44.3	8.5	5 4	0 14.8%	-5.80 [-9.04, -2.56] 2018	+
	Shan DY 2017	142.7	24.2	2 30	132.7	20.7	7 3	0 12.0%	10.00 [-1.40, 21.40] 2017	
	Liao C 2017	165.46	23.2	1 50	0 133.72	23.04	4 5	0 12.9%		
	Yang L 2015	148.23				21.32		4 12.0%	12.03 [0.67, 23.39] 2015	
	Zhu L 2013	146.78								
	Xie QX 2012	147.26							construction and the comments and the second s	
	Total (95% CI)			264	ł		26	3 100.0%	11.58 [2.96, 20.20]	•
	Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:				df = 7 (F	< 0.00	001); l <sup>a</sup>	² = 94%		-100 -50 0 50 10
		2 2.00	(							Favours [Salpingectomy] Favours [Salpingotomy]
			ingoto			ngecto			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
-	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI Year	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
-	<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Shan DY 2017	<u>Mean</u> 0.37	<b>SD</b> 0.12	Total 30	<u>Mean</u> 0.24	<b>SD</b> 0.04	Total 30	Weight 42.9%	IV. Fixed. 95% CI Year 0.13 [0.08, 0.18] 2017	
	<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015	Mean 0.37 0.39	<b>SD</b> 0.12 0.17	<u>Total</u> 30 34	Mean 0.24 0.24	SD 0.04 0.07	Total 30 34	Weight 42.9% 23.0%	IV. Fixed, 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015	
	<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013	Mean 0.37 0.39 0.38	<b>SD</b> 0.12 0.17 0.15	Total 30 34 20	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05	Total 30 34 20	Weight 42.9% 23.0% 18.3%	IV. Fixed, 95% CI Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013	
	<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015	Mean 0.37 0.39 0.38	<b>SD</b> 0.12 0.17	Total 30 34 20	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24	SD 0.04 0.07	Total 30 34	Weight 42.9% 23.0% 18.3%	IV. Fixed, 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015	
	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012	Mean 0.37 0.39 0.38	<b>SD</b> 0.12 0.17 0.15	Total 30 34 20 20	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05	Total 30 34 20 20	Weight 42.9% 23.0% 18.3% 15.7%	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012	
	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% CI)	Mean 0.37 0.39 0.38 0.39	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16	Total 30 34 20 20 104	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24	<b>SD</b> 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06	Total 30 34 20 20	Weight 42.9% 23.0% 18.3%	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012	
	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	Mean 0.37 0.39 0.38 0.39 0.39	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 = 3 (P	Total 30 34 20 20 <b>104</b> = 0.95)	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24	<b>SD</b> 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06	Total 30 34 20 20	Weight 42.9% 23.0% 18.3% 15.7%	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012	IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% CI)	Mean 0.37 0.39 0.38 0.39 0.39	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 = 3 (P	Total 30 34 20 20 <b>104</b> = 0.95)	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24	<b>SD</b> 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06	Total 30 34 20 20	Weight 42.9% 23.0% 18.3% 15.7%	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012	
	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	<u>Mean</u> 0.37 0.39 0.38 0.39 0.36, df Z = 9.22	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 = 3 (P 2 (P < 0	Total 30 34 20 20 104 = 0.95)	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 1)	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06	Total 30 34 20 20 104	Weight           42.9%           23.0%           18.3%           15.7%           100.0%	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012           0.14 [0.11, 0.17]	-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [Salpingectomy] Favours [Salpingotomy]
-	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	<u>Mean</u> 0.37 0.39 0.38 0.39 0.36, df Z = 9.22 Salp	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 = 3 (P 2 (P < 0	Total 30 34 20 20 104 = 0.95) 0.00001	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06	Total 30 34 20 20 104	Weight 42.9% 23.0% 18.3% 15.7% 100.0%	IV. Fixed. 95% CI Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012           0.14 [0.11, 0.17]         -	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl -0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [Salpingectomy] Favours [Salpingotomy] Mean Difference
_	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup	<u>Mean</u> 0.37 0.39 0.38 0.39 0.36, df Z = 9.22 Salp <u>Mean</u>	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 = 3 (P 2 (P < 0 SD	Total 30 34 20 20 104 = 0.95) 0.00001 pmy Total	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06	Total 30 34 20 20 104 104	Weight 42.9% 23.0% 18.3% 15.7% 100.0% Weight	IV. Fixed, 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012           0.14 [0.11, 0.17]	-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [Salpingectomy] Favours [Salpingotomy]
_	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Liao C 2017	<u>Mean</u> 0.37 0.39 0.38 0.39 0.36, df : Z = 9.22 Salp <u>Mean</u> 2.13	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 = 3 (P = 2 (P < 0 sb 0.37	Total 30 34 20 20 104 = 0.95) 0.00001 pmy Total 50	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06	Total 30 34 20 20 104 704	Weight 42.9% 23.0% 18.3% 15.7% 100.0% Weight 49.0%	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012           0.14 [0.11, 0.17]	IV. Fixed, 95% Cl .0.2 .0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [Salpingectomy] Favours [Salpingotomy] Mean Difference
_	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Liao C 2017 Shan DY 2017	Mean 0.37 0.39 0.38 0.39 Z = 9.22 Salp Mean 2.13 2.21	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 = 3 (P = 0 2 (P < 0 SD 0.37 0.42	Total 30 34 20 20 104 = 0.95) 0.00001 0.0000000000	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06 0.06 SD 0.26 0.37	Total 30 34 20 20 104 104	Weight           42.9%           23.0%           18.3%           15.7%           100.0%           Weight           49.0%           19.2%	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012           0.14 [0.11, 0.17]	IV. Fixed, 95% Cl .0.2 .0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [Salpingectomy] Favours [Salpingotomy] Mean Difference
_	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Liao C 2017 Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015	Mean 0.37 0.39 0.38 0.39 0.36, df Z = 9.22 Salp Mean 2.13 2.21 2.19	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 = 3 (P = 0 2 (P < 0 5D 0.37 0.42 0.56	Total 30 34 20 20 104 = 0.95) 0.00001 50 30 34	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06 0.06 SD 0.26 0.37 0.32	Total 30 34 20 20 104 104 50 30 34	Weight           42.9%           23.0%           18.3%           15.7%           100.0%           Weight           49.0%           19.2%           16.4%	IV. Fixed. 95% CI Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012           0.14 [0.11, 0.17]	IV. Fixed, 95% Cl .0.2 .0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [Salpingectomy] Favours [Salpingotomy] Mean Difference
	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Liao C 2017 Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013	Mean 0.37 0.39 0.38 0.39 0.36, df Z = 9.22 Salp Mean 2.13 2.21 2.19 2.11	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 = 3 (P = 0 2 (P < 0 0 sD 0.37 0.42 0.56 0.54	Total 30 34 20 20 104 = 0.95) 0.00001 50 30 34 20	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06 0.06 0.26 0.37 0.32 0.44	Total 30 34 20 20 104 104 50 30 34 20	Weight           42.9%           23.0%           18.3%           15.7%           100.0%           Weight           49.0%           19.2%           16.4%           8.3%	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012           0.14 [0.11, 0.17]	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl -0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [Salpingectomy] Favours [Salpingotomy] Mean Difference
_	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Liao C 2017 Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015	Mean 0.37 0.39 0.38 0.39 0.36, df Z = 9.22 Salp Mean 2.13 2.21 2.19 2.11	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 = 3 (P = 0 2 (P < 0 5D 0.37 0.42 0.56	Total 30 34 20 20 104 = 0.95) 0.00001 50 30 34	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06 0.06 SD 0.26 0.37 0.32	Total 30 34 20 20 104 104 50 30 34	Weight           42.9%           23.0%           18.3%           15.7%           100.0%           Weight           49.0%           19.2%           16.4%           8.3%	IV. Fixed. 95% CI Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012           0.14 [0.11, 0.17]	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl -0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [Salpingectomy] Favours [Salpingotomy] Mean Difference
_	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Liao C 2017 Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012	Mean 0.37 0.39 0.38 0.39 0.36, df Z = 9.22 Salp Mean 2.13 2.21 2.19 2.11	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 = 3 (P = 0 2 (P < 0 0 sD 0.37 0.42 0.56 0.54	Total 30 34 20 104 = 0.95) 0.00001 50 30 34 20 20	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06 0.06 0.26 0.37 0.32 0.44	Total 30 34 20 20 104 104 50 30 30 34 20 20	Weight           42.9%           23.0%           18.3%           15.7%           100.0%           Weight           49.0%           19.2%           16.4%           8.3%           7.1%	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012           0.14 [0.11, 0.17]	IV. Fixed, 95% Cl .0.2 .0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [Salpingectomy] Favours [Salpingotomy] Mean Difference
_	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Liao C 2017 Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013	Mean 0.37 0.39 0.38 0.39 0.36, df Z = 9.22 Salp Mean 2.13 2.21 2.19 2.11	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 = 3 (P = 0 2 (P < 0 0 sD 0.37 0.42 0.56 0.54	Total 30 34 20 20 104 = 0.95) 0.00001 50 30 34 20	Mean 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06 0.06 0.26 0.37 0.32 0.44	Total 30 34 20 20 104 104 50 30 30 34 20 20	Weight           42.9%           23.0%           18.3%           15.7%           100.0%           Weight           49.0%           19.2%           16.4%           8.3%	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012           0.14 [0.11, 0.17]	IV. Fixed, 95% Cl .0.2 .0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [Salpingectomy] Favours [Salpingotomy] Mean Difference
-	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Liao C 2017 Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012	Mean           0.37           0.39           0.36, df =           Z = 9.22           Salp           Mean           2.11           2.18	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 ≥ (P < 0 0.37 0.42 0.56 0.54 0.58	<u>Total</u> 30 34 20 20 104 = 0.95) 0.00001 50 30 30 34 20 20 154	Mean           0.24           0.25           0.26	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06 SD 0.26 0.37 0.32 0.44 0.48	Total 30 34 20 20 104 104 50 30 30 34 20 20	Weight           42.9%           23.0%           18.3%           15.7%           100.0%           Weight           49.0%           19.2%           16.4%           8.3%           7.1%	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012           0.14 [0.11, 0.17]	IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
_	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Liao C 2017 Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	Mean           0.37           0.39           0.38, df 0           Z = 9.22           Salp           Mean           2.13           2.13           2.11           2.18           0.664, df 1	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 ≥ (P < 0 0.37 0.42 0.56 0.54 0.58 = 4 (P = 100000000000000000000000000000000000	<u>Total</u> 30 34 20 20 <b>104</b> = 0.95) 0.00001 <b>50</b> 30 34 20 20 454 = 0.96)	Mean           0.24           1.42           1.54           1.51           y; l <sup>2</sup> = 0%	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06 SD 0.26 0.37 0.32 0.44 0.48	Total 30 34 20 20 104 104 50 30 30 34 20 20	Weight           42.9%           23.0%           18.3%           15.7%           100.0%           Weight           49.0%           19.2%           16.4%           8.3%           7.1%	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012           0.14 [0.11, 0.17]	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl           -0.2         -0.1         0         0.1         0.2           Favours [Salpingectomy]         Favours [Salpingotomy]
_	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Liao C 2017 Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% Cl)	Mean           0.37           0.39           0.38, df 0           Z = 9.22           Salp           Mean           2.13           2.13           2.11           2.18           0.664, df 1	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 ≥ (P < 0 0.37 0.42 0.56 0.54 0.58 = 4 (P = 100000000000000000000000000000000000	<u>Total</u> 30 34 20 20 <b>104</b> = 0.95) 0.00001 <b>50</b> 30 34 20 20 454 = 0.96)	Mean           0.24           1.42           1.54           1.51           y; l <sup>2</sup> = 0%	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06 SD 0.26 0.37 0.32 0.44 0.48	Total 30 34 20 20 104 104 50 30 30 34 20 20	Weight           42.9%           23.0%           18.3%           15.7%           100.0%           Weight           49.0%           19.2%           16.4%           8.3%           7.1%	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012           0.14 [0.11, 0.17]	IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
_	Study or Subgroup Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Liao C 2017 Shan DY 2017 Yang L 2015 Zhu L 2013 Xie QX 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	Mean           0.37           0.39           0.38, df 0           Z = 9.22           Salp           Mean           2.13           2.13           2.11           2.18           0.664, df 1	SD 0.12 0.17 0.15 0.16 ≥ (P < 0 0.37 0.42 0.56 0.54 0.58 = 4 (P = 100000000000000000000000000000000000	<u>Total</u> 30 34 20 20 <b>104</b> = 0.95) 0.00001 <b>50</b> 30 34 20 20 454 = 0.96)	Mean           0.24           1.42           1.54           1.51           y; l <sup>2</sup> = 0%	SD 0.04 0.07 0.05 0.06 SD 0.26 0.37 0.32 0.44 0.48	Total 30 34 20 20 104 104 50 30 30 34 20 20	Weight           42.9%           23.0%           18.3%           15.7%           100.0%           Weight           49.0%           19.2%           16.4%           8.3%           7.1%	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl Year           0.13 [0.08, 0.18]         2017           0.15 [0.09, 0.21]         2015           0.14 [0.07, 0.21]         2013           0.15 [0.08, 0.22]         2012           0.14 [0.11, 0.17]	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl           -0.2         -0.1         0         0.1         0.2           Favours [Salpingectomy]         Favours [Salpingotomy]

09



controversial clinical issue, we expect multi-center, large sample randomized controlled studies to further illustrate this problem.

The ovary is an important reproductive and endocrine organ of women, which has the functions of oviposition, ovulation, and endocrine. The blood supply to the fallopian tube and ovary comes from the fallopian tube branches and ovarian branches from the uterine artery and ovarian artery. These branches coincide with each other in the mesosalpinx to form a rich vascular network. The anastomotic arch of the intra mesosalpinx artery is vulnerable to damage during fallopian tube surgery, affecting the blood supply of the ipsilateral ovary (39). Mekin et al. (40) found that after salpingectomy, the average pulsatile index, RI and systolic/ diastolic ratio of patients' ovaries were significantly lower than

	Subgroup	Salpingotomy ( <i>n</i> =)	Salpingectomy ( <i>n</i> =)	Effects model	OR/WMD (95% CI)	<i>p</i> -value	Favours
Operating duration	Tubal suturing	231	231	Random	-4.72 (-11.56-2.13)	0.18	
	No-tubal suturing	114	114	Fixed	-0.04 (-1.29-1.20)	0.95	-
Hemorrhage	Tubal suturing	329	329	Random	307.46 (197.21 -417.72)	< 0.00001	Salpingotomy
	No-tubal suturing	114	114	Random	152.96 (17.67– 288.24)	< 0.00001	Salpingotomy
Hospitalize length	Tubal suturing	231	231	Random	-0.48 (-1.42-0.45)	0.31	_
	No-tubal suturing	74	74	Fixed	-0.01 (-0.60-0.58)	0.98	-
β-hCG level	Tubal suturing	217	217	Random	-6.31 (-19.55-6.92)	0.35	-
	No-tubal suturing	74	74	Fixed	-1.23 (-3.17-0.72)	0.22	-
Intrauterine	Tubal suturing	341	340	Fixed	4.56 (3.25-6.38)	< 0.00001	Salpingotomy
pregnancy	No-tubal suturing	231	231	Random	1.42 (0.71–2.83)	0.003	Salpingotomy
Ectopic pregnancy	Tubal suturing	305	305	Fixed	2.61 (1.50-4.55)	0.007	Salpingotomy
	No-tubal suturing	191	191	Fixed	2.14 (0.72-6.40)	0.17	-
FSH level	Tubal suturing	120	119	Random	2.00 (1.14-2.87)	< 0.00001	Salpingotomy
	No-tubal suturing	170	170	Random	2.39 (1.50-3.27)	< 0.0001	Salpingotomy
LH level	Tubal suturing	84	84	Fixed	0.83 (0.28-1.38)	0.003	Salpingotomy
	No-tubal suturing	210	209	Random	1.08 (0.03-2.18)	0.03	Salpingotomy
E2 level	Tubal suturing	124	124	Fixed	12.34 (11.05-13.63)	< 0.00001	Salpingotomy
	No-tubal suturing	140	140	Random	11.82 (-8.1-31.75)	0.02	Salpingotomy
T level	Tubal suturing	54	54	Fixed	0.15 (0.10-0.19)	< 0.00001	Salpingotomy
	No-tubal suturing	50	50	Fixed	0.14 (0.10-0.17)	<0.00001	Salpingotomy
P level	Tubal suturing	54	54	Fixed	0.62 (0.45-0.80)	< 0.00001	Salpingotomy
	No-tubal suturing	100	100	Fixed	0.70 (0.59–0.80)	<0.00001	Salpingotomy
Cross-sectional area	Tubal suturing	50	50	Fixed	1.39 (0.88-1.90)	< 0.00001	Salpingotomy
	No-tubal suturing	140	140	Random	2.01 (1.58–2.45)	< 0.00001	Salpingotomy
PSV	Tubal suturing	54	54	Random	1.72 (1.63-1.80)	< 0.00001	Salpingotomy
	No-tubal suturing	100	100	Random	1.64 (1.35–1.92)	<0.00001	Salpingotomy
EDV	Tubal suturing	54	54	Random	1.67 (1.64-1.70)	< 0.00001	Salpingotomy
	No-tubal suturing	100	100	Random	1.52 (1.19–1.85)	<0.00001	Salpingotomy
RI	Tubal suturing	54	54	Random	0.11 (0.08-0.14)	< 0.00001	Salpingotomy
	No-tubal suturing	50	50	Random	0.08 (0.00-0.17)	< 0.00001	Salpingotomy

TABLE 3 Meat-analysis of subgroups according to with or without suturing.

the normal level. Therefore, salpingectomy can easily destroy the blood supply of the ipsilateral ovary. However, the incision of salpingotomy is located on the opposite side of the mesosalpinx, which can preserve the normal function and structure of the fallopian tube, reduce the injury of the mesosalpinx vessels, and preserve the normal blood supply of the ovary. This meta-analysis reveals that the PSV and EDV of the internal stromal artery of the affected side of the ovary in patients with laparoscopic salpingotomy 6 months after operation were significantly higher than those of salpingectomy, suggesting the blood supply of the affected side of the ovary can be better preserved by laparoscopic salpingotomy.

Chan et al. (41) found that laparoscopic salpingectomy on the affected side can block a part of the blood supply to the fallopian tube and ovary, resulting in a decrease in the

Study		%
ID	ES (95% CI)	Weight
Tubal suturing subgroup		
	0.51 (0.35, 0.68)	7.09
Sun M 2016	0.64 (0.51, 0.77)	7.89
Liu XM 2017		7.89
Zhong YP 2017		7.44
Yue YH 2019		8.25
Zhou CY 2019	0.83 (0.70, 0.97)	7.88
Wang MX 2020	0.50 (0.35, 0.65)	7.35
Wei XT 2020	0.63 (0.50, 0.76)	7.99
Subtotal (I-squared = 72.8%, p = 0.001)	0.64 (0.55, 0.74)	61.76
No tubal suturing subgroup		
Shi SX 2018	0.68 (0.53, 0.82)	7.59
Wang ZX 2018	0.43 (0.31, 0.56)	8.07
Yan XL 2018	0.52 (0.37, 0.68)	7.35
Zhang YL 2018	0.50 (0.34, 0.66)	7.25
Zhou Y 2018	0.36 (0.23, 0.49)	7.98
Subtotal (I-squared = 64.3%, p = 0.024)	0.49 (0.39, 0.60)	38.24
Overall (I-squared = 78.0%, p = 0.000)	0.58 (0.50, 0.67)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		
967 0	.967	
	ES (95% CI)	% Weight
Tubal suturing subgroup	0.14 (0.03, 0.26)	7 86
Tubal suturing subgroup Huang YQ 2016	0.14 (0.03, 0.26)	7.86
Tubal suturing subgroup Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016	0.10 (0.02, 0.18)	9.51
Tubal suturing subgroup       Huang YQ 2016       Sun M 2016       Liu XM 2017	0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.02, 0.18)	9.51 9.51
Tubal suturing subgroupHuang YQ 2016Sun M 2016Liu XM 2017Zhong YP 2017	0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.01, 0.18)	9.51 9.51 9.22
Tubal suturing subgroup         Huang YQ 2016         Sun M 2016         Liu XM 2017         Zhong YP 2017         Zhou CY 2019	0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.01, 0.18) 0.07 (-0.02, 0.16)	9.51 9.51 9.22 9.20
Tubal suturing subgroup         Huang YQ 2016         Sun M 2016         Liu XM 2017         Zhong YP 2017         Zhou CY 2019         Wang MX 2020	0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.01, 0.18) 0.07 (-0.02, 0.16) 0.03 (-0.02, 0.07)	9.51 9.51 9.22 9.20 11.15
Tubal suturing subgroup         Huang YQ 2016         Sun M 2016         Liu XM 2017         Zhong YP 2017         Zhou CY 2019	0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.01, 0.18) 0.07 (-0.02, 0.16)	9.51 9.51 9.22 9.20
Tubal suturing subgroup Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Liu XM 2017 Zhong YP 2017 Zhou CY 2019 Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Subtotal (I-squared = 2.2%, p = 0.408)	0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.01, 0.18) 0.07 (-0.02, 0.16) 0.03 (-0.02, 0.07) 0.07 (0.00, 0.13)	9.51 9.51 9.22 9.20 11.15 10.40
Tubal suturing subgroup Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Liu XM 2017 Zhong YP 2017 Zhou CY 2019 Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Subtotal (I-squared = 2.2%, p = 0.408) No tubal suturing subgroup	0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.01, 0.18) 0.07 (-0.02, 0.16) 0.03 (-0.02, 0.07) 0.07 (0.00, 0.13) 0.07 (0.04, 0.10)	9.51 9.51 9.22 9.20 11.15 10.40 66.83
Tubal suturing subgroup Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Liu XM 2017 Zhong YP 2017 Zhou CY 2019 Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Subtotal (I-squared = 2.2%, p = 0.408) No tubal suturing subgroup Wang ZX 2018	0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.01, 0.18) 0.07 (-0.02, 0.16) 0.03 (-0.02, 0.07) 0.07 (0.00, 0.13) 0.07 (0.04, 0.10) 0.43 (0.31, 0.56)	9.51 9.51 9.22 9.20 11.15 10.40 66.83
Tubal suturing subgroup Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Liu XM 2017 Zhong YP 2017 Zhou CY 2019 Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Subtotal (I-squared = $2.2\%$ , p = $0.408$ ) No tubal suturing subgroup Wang ZX 2018 Yan XL 2018	0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.01, 0.18) 0.07 (-0.02, 0.16) 0.03 (-0.02, 0.07) 0.07 (0.00, 0.13) 0.07 (0.04, 0.10) 0.43 (0.31, 0.56) 0.13 (0.02, 0.23)	9.51 9.51 9.22 9.20 11.15 10.40 66.83 7.41 8.52
Tubal suturing subgroup Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Liu XM 2017 Zhong YP 2017 Zhou CY 2019 Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Subtotal (I-squared = 2.2%, p = 0.408) No tubal suturing subgroup Wang ZX 2018 Yan XL 2018 Zhang YL 2018	0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.01, 0.18) 0.07 (-0.02, 0.16) 0.03 (-0.02, 0.07) 0.07 (0.00, 0.13) 0.07 (0.04, 0.10) 0.43 (0.31, 0.56) 0.13 (0.02, 0.23) 0.08 (-0.01, 0.16)	9.51 9.51 9.22 9.20 11.15 10.40 66.83 7.41 8.52 9.38
Tubal suturing subgroup Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Liu XM 2017 Zhong YP 2017 Zhou CY 2019 Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Subtotal (I-squared = $2.2\%$ , p = $0.408$ ) No tubal suturing subgroup Wang ZX 2018 Yan XL 2018	0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.01, 0.18) 0.07 (-0.02, 0.16) 0.03 (-0.02, 0.07) 0.07 (0.00, 0.13) 0.07 (0.04, 0.10) 0.43 (0.31, 0.56) 0.13 (0.02, 0.23)	9.51 9.51 9.22 9.20 11.15 10.40 66.83 7.41 8.52
Tubal suturing subgroupHuang YQ 2016Sun M 2016Liu XM 2017Zhong YP 2017Zhou CY 2019Wang MX 2020Bian XY 2020Subtotal (I-squared = $2.2\%$ , p = $0.408$ ).No tubal suturing subgroupWang ZX 2018Yan XL 2018Zhou Y 2018	0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.01, 0.18) 0.07 (-0.02, 0.16) 0.03 (-0.02, 0.07) 0.07 (0.00, 0.13) 0.07 (0.04, 0.10) 0.43 (0.31, 0.56) 0.13 (0.02, 0.23) 0.08 (-0.01, 0.16) 0.25 (0.13, 0.36)	9.51 9.51 9.22 9.20 11.15 10.40 66.83 7.41 8.52 9.38 7.86
Tubal suturing subgroup Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Liu XM 2017 Zhong YP 2017 Zhou CY 2019 Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Subtotal (I-squared = $2.2\%$ , p = 0.408) No tubal suturing subgroup Wang ZX 2018 Yan XL 2018 Zhang YL 2018 Zhou Y 2018 Subtotal (I-squared = $87.1\%$ , p = 0.000)	0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.01, 0.18) 0.07 (-0.02, 0.16) 0.03 (-0.02, 0.07) 0.07 (0.00, 0.13) 0.07 (0.04, 0.10) 0.43 (0.31, 0.56) 0.13 (0.02, 0.23) 0.08 (-0.01, 0.16) 0.25 (0.13, 0.36) 0.22 (0.07, 0.36)	9.51 9.51 9.22 9.20 11.15 10.40 66.83 7.41 8.52 9.38 7.86 33.17
Tubal suturing subgroup Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Liu XM 2017 Zhong YP 2017 Zhou CY 2019 Wang MX 2020 Bian XY 2020 Subtotal (I-squared = 2.2%, p = 0.408) No tubal suturing subgroup Wang ZX 2018 Yan XL 2018 Zhang YL 2018 Zhou Y 2018 Subtotal (I-squared = 87.1%, p = 0.000) Overall (I-squared = 77.6%, p = 0.000)	0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.02, 0.18) 0.10 (0.01, 0.18) 0.07 (-0.02, 0.16) 0.03 (-0.02, 0.07) 0.07 (0.00, 0.13) 0.07 (0.04, 0.10) 0.43 (0.31, 0.56) 0.13 (0.02, 0.23) 0.08 (-0.01, 0.16) 0.25 (0.13, 0.36) 0.22 (0.07, 0.36)	9.51 9.51 9.22 9.20 11.15 10.40 66.83 7.41 8.52 9.38 7.86 33.17
	ID Tubal suturing subgroup Huang YQ 2016 Sun M 2016 Liu XM 2017 Zhong YP 2017 Yue YH 2019 Zhou CY 2019 Wang MX 2020 Wei XT 2020 Subtotal (I-squared = 72.8%, p = 0.001) No tubal suturing subgroup Shi SX 2018 Wang ZX 2018 Yan XL 2018 Zhang YL 2018 Zhou Y 2018 Subtotal (I-squared = 64.3%, p = 0.024) Overall (I-squared = 78.0%, p = 0.000)	ID       ES (95% Cl)         Tubal suturing subgroup       0.51 (0.35, 0.68)         Huang YQ 2016       0.64 (0.51, 0.77)         Sun M 2017       0.64 (0.51, 0.77)         Liu XM 2017       0.64 (0.51, 0.77)         Zhong YP 2017       0.50 (0.35, 0.65)         Yue YH 2019       0.82 (0.71, 0.94)         Zhou CY 2019       0.83 (0.70, 0.97)         Wang MX 2020       0.63 (0.50, 0.76)         Subtotal (I-squared = 72.8%, p = 0.001)       0.64 (0.55, 0.74)         .       0.68 (0.53, 0.82)         Wang ZX 2018       0.43 (0.31, 0.56)         Yan XL 2018       0.43 (0.31, 0.56)         Zhong YL 2018       0.50 (0.34, 0.66)         Justotal (I-squared = 64.3%, p = 0.024)       0.49 (0.39, 0.60)         .        0.58 (0.50, 0.67)         NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis         967       0



number of ovarian follicles on the affected side, consequently, a decrease in ovarian reserve function on the affected side. Ovarian volume and the number of sinus follicles can reflect the reserve function of the ovary. The number of sinus follicles is a stage in the growth and development of follicles, which is the precursor of mature follicles. When ovarian function decreases, the number of sinus follicles also shows a parallel downward trend. Similarly, the number of sinus follicles is closely related to ovarian volume. When ovarian reserve function decreases, ovarian volume decreases. Metaanalysis showed a significantly higher number of follicles in the affected sinus and the cross-sectional area of ovaries in patients who underwent salpingotomy than those who underwent salpingectomy, indicating that salpingectomy reduced the reserve function of the affected ovary. In addition, Serum ovarian hormone level, such as FSH, LH, E2,

T and P are all sensitive indicators to evaluate ovarian endocrine function. With the decline in ovarian function, FSH and LH levels increase, while E2, T and P levels decrease. This meta-analysis showed that the serum FSH and LH levels of patients with salpingotomy were significantly lower than those in the salpingectomy group 6 months after the operation, and the levels of E2, T and P were significantly higher than that in the salpingectomy group, suggesting better preservation of the ovarian endocrine and reproductive function of patients after that laparoscopic salpingotomy can, which then improves the probability of postoperative second pregnancy.

Pretreatment with methotrexate or mifepristone can effectively inhibit the proliferation of trophoblasts and induce embryonic death, which could reduce the HCG level and intraoperative bleeding (42, 43). However, these ectopic

pregnancy patients included in this study were not pretreated with methotrexate or mifepristone before laparoscopic surgery, which exactly will increase the bias of the results, especially for salpingotomy. Besides, a potential limitation of our metaanalysis is that most of the included studies were from China. In fact, we have included two literatures from different countries include 645 patients, mainly from the United Kingdom, Netherlands, United Kingdom, France and United States, accounting for 27.4% (645/2,354) of the total number of patients included in this meta-analysis. However, a potential limitation of this meta-analysis that 72.7% of the included patients were from China, which may affect the representativeness of the conclusion. Another potential limitation is that the surgical experience used by different hospitals, perioperative management methods, and the urgency of patients for fertility may produce different results and increase the heterogeneity of included studies. Therefore, it is necessary to further conduct a well-designed large-scale multicenter randomized controlled trial to study the equivalence or non-inferiority of laparoscopic salpingectomy and salpingotomy in the treatment of tubal pregnancy.

## Conclusion

For patients with tubal pregnancy, the natural intrauterine pregnancy rate after laparoscopic salpingotomy was significantly higher than those who underwent salpingectomy. In addition, laparoscopic salpingotomy can better protect the ovarian reserve function and endocrine function and provide favorable conditions for the second pregnancy. Therefore, patients with ectopic tubal pregnancy should give priority to laparoscopic salpingotomy for embryo extraction, but we still look forward to a multi-center, large sample, long-term

# References

1. Barnhart KT. Clinical practice. Ectopic pregnancy. N Engl J Med. (2009) 36:379–87. doi: 10.1056/NEJMcp0810384

2. Cecchino GN, Araujo Júnior E, Elito Júnior J. Methotrexate for ectopic pregnancy: when and how. *Arch Gynecol Obstet.* (2014) 290(3):417-23. doi: 10. 1007/s00404-014-3266-9

3. Orazulike NC, Konje JC. Diagnosis and management of ectopic pregnancy. Women's Health. (2013) 9(4):373-85. doi: 10.2217/WHE.13.35

4. Alkatout I, Honemeyer U, Strauss A, Tinelli A, Malvasi A, Jonat W, et al. Clinical diagnosis and treatment of ectopic pregnancy. *Obstet Gynecol Surv.* (2013) 68(8):571–81. doi: 10.1097/OGX.0b013e31829cdbeb

5. Newbatt E, Beckles Z, Ullman R, Lumsden MA, Guideline Development Group. Ectopic pregnancy and miscarriage: summary of NICE guidance. Br Med J. (2012) 345:e8136. doi: 10.1136/bmj.e8136

6. Hajenius PJ, Mol F, Mol BW, Bossuyt PM, Ankum WM, van der Veen F. Interventions for tubal ectopic pregnancy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* (2007) 2007(1):CD000324. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD000324.pub2

follow-up randomized controlled study to provide more reliable clinical evidence.

# Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary Material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author/s.

# Author contributions

LW and LH were responsible for the analysis, interpretation of data and graphing. LW wrote the manuscript. LH supervised the whole analysis and contributed to data analysis and editing of the manuscript. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

## Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

# Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

7. Chatwani A, Yazigi R, Amin-Hanjani S. Operative laparoscopy in the management of tubal ectopic pregnancy. *J Laparoendosc Surg.* (1992) 2 (6):319–24. doi: 10.1089/lps.1992.2.319

8. Bangsgaard N, Lund CO, Ottesen B, Nilas L. Improved fertility following conservative surgical treatment of ectopic pregnancy. *BJOG.* (2003) 110 (8):765–70. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0528.2003.02253.x

9. Fernandez H, Capmas P, Lucot JP, Resch B, Panel P, Bouyer J, et al. Fertility after ectopic pregnancy: the DEMETER randomized trial. *Hum Reprod.* (2013) 28 (5):1247–53. doi: 10.1093/humrep/det037

10. Mol F, Van Mello NM, Strandell A, Strandell K, Jurkovic D, Ross J, et al. Salpingotomy versus salpingectomy in women with tubal pregnancy (ESEP study): an open-label, multicenter, randomized controlled trial. *Lancet.* (2014) 383(9927):1483–9. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)60123-9

11. Dubuisson JB, Aubriot FX, Foulot H, Bruel D, Bouquet de Jolinière J, Mandelbrot L. Reproductive outcome after laparoscopic salpingectomy for tubal pregnancy. *Fertil Steril.* (1990) 53(6):1004–7. doi: 10.1016/S0015-0282(16)53575-4 12. Xie QX, Yang C, Zheng MJ. The influence on the ovarian reserve function after different laparoscopic operation of tubal pregnancy. *Clin Med Eng.* (2012) 19 (3):356–8.

13. Zhu L. Effect of different laparoscopic surgery methods on ovarian reserve function of patients with tubal pregnancy. *China Foreign Med Treat.* (2013) 14:97–8.

14. Yang L. Effect of different laparoscopic surgery methods on ovarian reserve function in patients with tubal pregnancy. *Chin Matern Child Health Care.* (2015) 30(17):2841–3.

15. Zhang Y. Effect of different laparoscopic procedures on postoperative second pregnancy in patients with tubal pregnancy. *Heilongjiang Med J.* (2015) 28 (4):967–8.

16. Sun M, Yang D. Clinical application of laparoscopic salpingostomy and salpingectomy in the treatment of ectopic pregnancy. *J Clin Med.* (2016) 3 (56):11081-4.

17. Huang YQ, Huang RQ. Clinical effect of laparoscopic salpingotomy in treatment of ectopic pregnancy. *Guizhou Med J.* (2016) 40(8):867–9.

18. Zhong YP. Effect of laparoscopic salpingostomy and salpingectomy on pregnancy and recurrence of ectopic pregnancy after operation. *Mod Digan Treat.* (2017) 28(21):3933–5.

19. Shan DY. Effect of tubal pregnancy laparoscopic different operation methods on the ovarian reserve function. *Syst Med.* (2017) 3(2):111–4.

20. Gong CJ. Comparison of the effect between laparoscopic salpingostomy and salpingectomy in the treatment of ectopic pregnancy. *Pract Clin J Integr Tradit Chin Western Med.* (2017) 17(6):26–7.

21. Liao C, Wu SR. Effect of different surgical methods of laparoscopic tubal pregnancy on ovarian function. *China Med Device Inf.* (2017) 23(23):72–3.

22. Liu XM. Clinical effect of laparoscopic salpingostomy and salpingectomy in the treatment of ectopic pregnancy. *World Latest Med Inf.* (2017) 17(104):61–2.

23. Shi SX. Effect of laparoscopic salpingostomy on ovarian function and intrauterine pregnancy rate in ectopic pregnancy patients. *Cap Med.* (2018) 25(19):32.

24. Wu XM. Effects of different laparoscopic surgery methods on ovarian reserve function. *China Prac Med.* (2018) 13(20):76–7.

25. Wang ZX. Effect of different laparoscopic surgery methods on postoperative second pregnancy in patients with tubal pregnancy. *Chin Foreign Med Res.* (2018) 16(2):166–7.

26. Yan XL. Analysis of the effect of laparoscopic salpingotomy in the treatment of ectopic pregnancy. *Henan Med Res.* (2018) 27(4):677-8.

27. Zhang YL. Analysis of the clinical effect of different laparoscopic surgery methods on tubal pregnancy. *Henan J Surg.* (2018) 24(2):149–50.

28. Zhou Y, Bu LY. Comparison of clinical effects of different laparoscopic procedures in the treatment of ectopic pregnancy. *Mod Med Health Res.* (2018) 2(19):67–8.

29. Yue YH. Comparison of clinical effect between laparoscopic salpingotomy and salpingectomy on ectopic pregnancy. *Henan Med Res.* (2019) 28(3):468–9.

30. Zhou CY. Effect of laparoscopic salpingostomy on ovarian function and pregnancy rate in patients with ectopic pregnancy. *Health Must-Read Mag.* (2019) 3:213.

31. Wei XT. Evaluation of the curative effect of 54 patients with ectopic pregnancy treated by laparoscopic salpingotomy. *Med Diet Health.* (2020) 18 (18):86-8.

32. Wang MX. Clinical application of laparoscopic salpingostomy for ectopic pregnancy. *Spec Health.* (2020) 2(14):134.

33. Bian XY, Liu Y, Wang LL, An H. Effect of laparoscopic salpingotomy in the treatment of ectopic pregnancy. *Chin Baby*. (2020) 27(9):28.

34. Kuroda K, Takeuchi H, Kitade M, Kikuchi I, Shimanuki H, Kumakiri J, et al. Assessment of tubal disorder as a risk factor for repeat ectopic pregnancy after laparoscopic surgery for tubal pregnancy. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res.* (2010) 35 (3):520–4. doi: 10.1111/j.1447-0756.2008.00969.x

35. Varma R, Vindla S, Mascarenhas L. Fertility following radical, conservative-surgical or medical treatment for tubal pregnancy: a population-based study. *BJOG.* (2001) 108(1):714–21. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0528.2001.00052.x

36. Rashid M, Osman SH, Khashoggi TY, Kamal FA. Factors affecting fertility following radical versus conservative surgical treatment for tubal pregnancy. *Saudi Med J.* (2001) 22(4):337–41. PMID: 11331492

37. Calcagno A, Londero AP, Haag T, Driul L, Bertozzi S, Grassi T, et al. Surgical treatment of ectopic pregnancy associated with predisposing factors of tuboperitoneal infertility. *Minim Invasive Ther.* (2013) 22(2):97–103. doi: 10. 3109/13645706.2012.708346

38. de Bennetot M, Rabischong B, Aublet-Cuvelier B, Belard F, Fernandez H, Bouyer J, et al. Fertility after tubal ectopic pregnancy: results of a populationbased study. *Fertil Steril.* (2012) 98(5):1271–1276.e3. doi: 10.1016/j.fertnstert. 2012.06.041

39. Caric A, Poljicanin A, Tomic S, Vilovic K, Saraga-Babic M, Vukojevic K. Apoptotic pathways in ovarian surface epithelium of human embryos during embryogenesis and carcinogenesis: close relationship of developmental plasticity and neoplasm. *Acta Histochem.* (2014) 116(2):304–11. doi: 10.1016/j.acthis.2013. 08.005

40. Merritt MA, Riboli E. Weiderpass E, et al. Dietary fat intake and risk of epithelial ovarian cancer in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition. *Cancer Epidemiol.* (2014) 38(5):528–37. doi: 10.1016/j.canep. 2014.07.011

41. Chan CCW, Ng EHY, Li CF, Ho PC. Impaired ovarian blood flow and reduced antral follicle count following laparoscopic salpingectomy for ectopic pregnancy. *Hum Reprod.* (2003) 18(10):2175-80. doi: 10.1093/humrep/deg411

42. Stabile G, Romano F, Buonomo F, Zinicola G, Ricci G. Conservative treatment of interstitial ectopic pregnancy with the combination of mifepristone and methotrexate: our experience and review of the literature. *BioMed Res Int.* (2020) 2020(6):1–7. doi: 10.1155/2020/8703496

43. Ueda M, Ota K, Takahashi T, Suzuki S, Suzuki D, Kyozuka H, et al. Successful pregnancy and term delivery after treatment of unicornuate uterus with non-communicating rudimentary horn pregnancy with local methotrexate injection followed by laparoscopic resection: a case report and literature review. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* (2021) 21(1):1–8. doi: 10.1186/ s12884-021-04195-5