RESULTS

RESULTS

Table 1: Shows that the incidence of positive tissue culture for GHV was 18.8%.

Table 2: Shows that there was no significant difference between the mean age in positive and negative GHV groups.

Table 3: Shows that there were no significant difference between the mean gravidity and the mean parity in positive and negative GHV groups.

Table 4: Shows that the incidence of history of abortion was significantly higher in the positive GHV group **(P<0.05)**.

Table (1): Result of tissue culture for GHV.

Group	No	%
Total cases	96	
Positive GHV	18	18.8
Negative GHV	78	81.2

Elisa should be stated here comparison with Tissue culture

Table (2): Comparison of the mean age in positive and negative GHV.

(ranges)?

Group	No	Mean age	±S.D.
		40 - 31	
Positive GHV	18	28.6	4.40
Negative GHV	78	25.6	5.28

t = 1.67

P N.S.

Conclusion Tissue culture is more sensitive → so rest of results with Tissue culture

Table (3): Comparison of the mean gravidity and the mean parity in positive and negative GHV.

Specify which method is used

Group	No	Mean gravidity ± S.D.	Mean parity ± S.D.
Positive GHV	18	3.7±1.72	1.3±0.88
Negative GHV	78	3.0±1.40	1.7±0.82
t		0.84	1.8
p		N.S.	N.S.

Table (4): Comparison of the incidence of history of abortion in positive and negative GHV.

Group	No. of pregnancies	No. of abortion	%
Positive GHV	61	20	32.7
Negative GHV	236	20	8.5

Z = 2.27

P <0.05

Table 5: Shows that there was no significant difference between the incidence of history of premature labour in positive and negative GHV groups.

Table 6: Shows that there was no significant difference between the incidence of history of neonatal deathes in positive and negative GHV groups.

Table 7: Shows that there was no significant difference between the incidence of history of oral herpes in positive and negative GHV groups.

Table 8: Shows that the incidence of cases complaining of discharge $\pm$ pruritis was significantly higher in the positive than in the negative GHV group **($P<0.01$)**.

Table (5): Comparison of the incidence of history of premature labour in positive and negative GHV.

Group	No. of labour	No. of premature labour	%
Positive GHV	24	7	29.2
Negative GHV	132	12	9.1

Z = 1.7

P N.S.

Table (6): Comparison of the incidence of history of neonatal deathes in positive and negative GHV.

Group	No. of newborn	No. of neonatal deathes	%
Positive GHV	24	3	12.5
Negative GHV	132	7	5.3

Z = 0.4

P N.S.

Table (7): Comparison of the incidence of history of oral herpes in positive and negative GHV.

Group	No. of cases	No. of cases with history of oral herpes	%
Positive GHV	18	10	55.6
Negative GHV	78	30	38.5

Z = 0.95

P N.S.

Table (8): Comparison of the incidence of cases complaining of discharge ± pruritis vulva in positive and negative GHV.

Group	No. of cases	No. of cases with discharge ± pruritis	%
Positive GHV	18	17	44.4
Negative GHV	78	32	41.0

Z = 3.56

P <0.01

Table 9: Shows that the incidence of cases complaining of lower urinary tract symptoms was significantly higher in the positive GHV group **(P<0.01).**

Table 10: Shows that the incidence of cases complaining of neuretic pain was significantly higher in the positive GHV group **(P<0.01).**

Table 11: Shows that the incidence of monilial infection in the positive group was 72.2% and in the negative group was 23.1% **(P<0.01),** while the incidence of trichomonas infection in the positive group was 6.7 and in the negative group was 9% **(N.S.).**

Table 12: Shows that there was a positive correlation between GHV infection and monilial infection **(P<0.01).**

Table (9): Comparison of the incidence of cases complaining of lower urinary tract symptoms in positive and negative GHV.

Group	No. of cases	No. of cases with urinary tract symptoms	%
Positive GHV	18	16	88.9
Negative GHV	78	30	38.5

Z = 3.27

P <0.01

Table (10): Comparison of the incidence of cases complaining of neuritic pain in positive and negative GHV.

Group	No. of cases	No. of cases with neuretic pain	%
Positive GHV	18	17	44.4
Negative GHV	78	10	12.8

Z = 4.56

P <0.01

Table (11): Comparison of the incidence of Monilial, Trichomonas and nonspecific vagnitis in positive and negative GHV groups.

Infection (No.)	+ve GHV n = 18		-ve GHV n = 78		Z	P
	No	%	No	%		
Monilial (31)	13	72.2	18	23.1	2.90	<0.01
Trichmonas (10)	3	6.7	7	9.0	0.37	N.S.
Non specific (2)	0	0	2	2.6		

Table (12): Correlation between GHV and Monilial infection.

GHV	Monilial		Total
	positive	negative	
Positive	13	5	18
Negative	18	60	78
Total	31	65	96

$X^2 = 16.2$

P <0.01

Table 13: Shows that there was no correlation between GHV infection and trichomonas infection.

Table 14: Shows that the result of positive GHV by Elisa test was 20.8%.

Table 15: Shows that there was a positive correlation between the results of tissue culture and Elisa test in the diagnosis of GHV infection **(P<0.01).**

Table 16: Shows the diagnostic value of the Elisa test in relation to tissue culture in the diagnosis of GHV infection. The sensitivity of the Elisa test was 44.4%, the specificity was 84.6%, while the predictive value of the Elisa test in the diagnosis of positive cases was 40.0% and of negative cases was 86.8%.

Table (13): Correlation between GHV and trichomonas infection.

GHV	Trichomonas		Total
	positive	negative	
Positive	3	15	18
Negative	7	71	78
Total	10	86	96

$X^2 = 0.85$

P N.S.

Table (14): Results of Elisa test for GHV.

Group	No.	%
Total cases	96	
Positive GHV (Elisa)	20	20.8
Negative GHV (Elisa)	76	79.2

Table (15): Correlation between cell culture and Elisa test in GHV diagnosis.

Cell culture	Elisa		Total
	positive	negative	
Positive	8	10	18
Negative	12	66	78
Total	20	76	96

$X^2 = 7.5$

P <0.01

Table (16): Diagnostic value of the Elisa test compared to tissue culture.

Sensitivity	44.4%
Specificity	84.6%
Predictive value	
positive	40.0%
negative	86.8%