

RESULTS

Table (1): Clinical characters of both groups

Parameter	Tactile n = (25)	Hysteroscopic n = (25)	t	p
Age (years)	25.13 (± 7.4)	25.41 (± 6.53)	0.14	>0.05
BMI (Kg/m ²)	22.1 (± 3.5)	21.9 (± 3.9)	0.19	>0.05
Period of infertility (years)	4.4 (± 1.5)	4.1 (± 1.2)	0.78	>0.05

Table (1) shows the clinical criteria of both group regarding age, body mass index (BMI) and period of infertility. There was a statistically non-significant ($p > 0.05$) difference between both groups.

Table (2): Incidence of type of infertility

Parameter	Tactile (n=25)	Hysteroscopic (n=25)	χ^2	p
1 ^{ry} infertility	10 (40%)	9 (36%)	0.03	>0.05
2 nd infertility	15 (60%)	16 (64%)		

Table (2) shows the incidence of primary or secondary infertility in both groups. There was a statistically non-significant ($p > 0.05$) difference between both groups.

Table (3): Method of contraception used

Parameter	Tactile (n=25)	Hysteroscopic (n=25)	χ^2	p
No	16 (64%)	17 (68%)	0.867	> 0.05
Pills	3 (12%)	2 (8%)		
IUCD	5 (20%)	6 (24%)		
Injectable	1 (4%)	0 (0.0)		

Table (3) shows the method of contraception used, 64% and 68% of tactile and hysteroscope group respectively used no methods of contraception, 36% and 32% of tactile and hysteroscopic group used contraception methods respectively. There was a statistically non-significant ($p>0.05$) difference between both groups.

Table (4): Incidence of blocked tubes as detected by HSG in studied patients

Parameter	Tactile (n=25)	Hysteroscopic (n=25)	χ^2	p
Unilateral	14 (56%)	12 (48%)	0.344	>0.05
Bilateral	11 (44%)	13 (52%)		

Table (4) shows the incidence of blocked tubes in unilateral and bilateral proximal tubal block in both groups.

Table (5): Technical success rate in hysteroscopic group

Parameter	Unilateral (n=12)	Bilateral (n=13)	χ^2	p
Successful	11 (91.7 %)	11 (84.6%)	0.05	>0.05
unsuccessful	1 (8.3%)	2 (15.4%)		

Table (6) shows that regarding the unilateral cases we failed to see the right tubal ostium in one case with a technical success rate of 91.7%. While in bilateral cases, tubal ostia could not be localized in one case and were localized but we failed to direct the catheter into the tubes in another case with a technical success rate of 84.6% and the total technical success rate was 88%. There was a non-significant ($p>0.05$) increase in the technical success rate reported in cases with unilateral versus those with bilateral tubal block

Table (6): Recanalization success rate in tactile group

Parameter	Unilateral (n=14)	Bilateral (n=11)	χ^2	p
Successful	13 (92.9 %)	3 (27.3%)	7.369	<0.001
unsuccessful	1 (7.1%)	8 (72.7%)		

Table (5) shows the recanalization success rate reported in tactile group; there was a significant ($p<0.001$) increase in the success rate reported in cases with unilateral versus those with bilateral tubal block

Table (7): Recanalization success rate in hysteroscopic group

Parameter	Unilateral (n=12)	Bilateral (n=13)	χ^2	p
Successful	11 (91.7 %)	7 (53.8%)	6.31	<0.001
unsuccessful	1 (8.3%)	6 (46.2%)		

Table (7) shows the recanalization success rate reported in hysteroscopic group; there was a significant ($p<0.001$) increase in the success rate reported in cases with unilateral versus those with bilateral tubal block

Table (8): Comparison between tactile and hysteroscopic recanalization success rate in patients with unilateral proximal tubal block

Parameter	Tactile (n=14)	Hysteroscopic (n=12)	χ^2	p
Successful	13 (92.9 %)	11 (91.7 %)	0.546	> 0.05
unsuccessful	1 (7.1%)	1 (8.3%)		

Table (8) shows the success rate in patients unilateral proximal tubal block; there was a non-significant difference ($p>0.05$) between both groups

Table (9): Comparison between tactile and hystroscopic recanalization success rate in patients with bilateral proximal tubal block

Parameter	Tactile (n=11)	Hysteroscopic (n=13)	χ^2	p
Successful	3 (27.3%)	7 (53.8%)	0.085	>0.05
unsuccessful	8 (72.7%)	6 (46.2%)		

Table (9) shows the success rate in patients with bilateral proximal tubal block; there was a non-significant difference ($p>0.05$) between both groups

Table (10): Comparison between tactile and hystroscopic recanalization rate in patients studied

Parameter	Tactile (n=25)	Hysteroscopic (n=25)	χ^2	p
Successful	16 (64%)	18 (72%)	0.373	>0.05
unsuccessful	9 (36%)	7 (28%)		

Table (10) shows the success rate in patients with proximal tubal block; there was a non-significant difference ($p>0.05$) between both groups