Results

Table 1→ Sociodemographic characteristics of the studied groups .

Variable	**2ry tubal infertility**	**2ry nontubal infertility**	**T**	**P** value	**fertile group**	**T**	**P** value
Age (yrs) (mean ±D)	32,4 ± (5.1)	32,2 ± (5.2)	,28	> 0.05 **N S**	31,6 ±(5,3)	,34	> 0.05 **N S**
Range	24 - 40	25 - 40			22 - 40		
Duration of marriage(yrs) (Mean ± D)	9 ± 4	10 ± 4.6	,62	> 0.05 **N S**	9.4 ± 4.9	,21	> 0.05 **N S**
Range	(4 - 23)	(3 - 20)			(4 - 21)		
Parity (Mean ± D)	1,6	1,4	,34	> 0.05 **N S**	2,7	,68	> 0.05 **N S**
Range	1- 3	1- 2			1- 4		

Table 1 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between cases and both control groups as regarding age , duration of marriage and parity by using un-paired t-test.

Table 2 → History of PID among 2ry tubal infertility group compared to history of PID among 2ry non-tubal infertility and fertile women groups .

Variable	**2ry tubal infertility** **N=50** **100%**	**2ry non tubal infertility** **N =50** **100%**	**P** value	**fertile group** **N=50** **100%**	**P** value
PID history	7 14%	2 4%	< 0.01 **HS**	1 2%	< 0.01 **HS**
No PID history	43 86%	48 96%		49 98%	

Tables 2 shows that history of PID is highly significant among women with 2ry tubal infertility compared to history of PID among women with 2ry non-tubal infertility and fertile women groups using chi-square test.

Table 3→ History of ectopic pregnancy among 2ry tubal infertility group compared to history of ectopic pregnancy among 2ry non-tubal infertility and fertile women groups.

Variable	**2ry tubal infertility** **N=50 100%**	**2ry nontubal infertility** **N =50 100%**	**P** value	**fertile group** **N = 50 100%**	**P** value
History of ectopic pregnancy	6 12%	2 4%	< 0.05 **S**	1 2%	< 0.01 **HS**
No history of ectopic pregnancy	44 88%	48 96%		49 98%	

Table 3 Shows that history of ectopic pregnancy is significant among women with 2ry tubal infertility group compared to history of ectopic pregnancy among women with 2ry non-tubal infertility group but it is highly significant when compared to fertile women group using chi-square test.

Table 4→ History of IUCD use among 2ry tubal infertility group compared to history of IUCD use among 2ry non-tubal infertility and fertile women groups.

Variable	**2ry tubal infertility**		**2ry nontubal infertility**		**P** value	**fertile group**		**P** value
	N=50	**100%**	**N =50**	**100%**		**N=50**	**100%**	
History of IUCD use	8	16%	4	8%	< 0.05 **S**	0	0%	< 0.01 **HS**
No history of IUCD use	42	84%	46	92%		50	100%	

Tables 4 Shows that history of IUCD use is significant among women with 2ry tubal infertility group compared to history of IUCD use among women with 2ry non-tubal infertility group but is highly significant when compared to fertile women group using chi-square test.

Table 5→ History of pelvic surgery among 2ry tubal infertility group compared to history of pelvic surgery among 2ry non-tubal infertility and fertile women groups.

Variable	**2ry tubal infertility** **N=50 100%**	**2ry non tubal infertility** **N = 50 100%**	**P** value	**fertile group** **N=50 100%**	**P** value
History of pelvic surgery	7 14%	2 4%	< 0.01 **HS**	0 0%	< 0.01 **HS**
No history of pelvic surgery	43 86 %	48 96%		50 100%	

Table 5 Shows that history of pelvic surgery *(dilatation and curettage (D&C) , ovarian cystectomy , myomectomy and pelvic abscess)* is highly significant among women with 2ry tubal infertility compared to history of pelvic surgery among women with 2ry non-tubal infertility and fertile women groups using chi-square test.

Table 6 → History of appendectomy among 2ry tubal infertility group compared to history of appendectomy among 2ry non-tubal infertility and fertile women groups .

Variable	**2ry tubal infertility** **N=50 100%**	**2ry non tubal Infertility** **N=50 100%**	**P** value	**fertile group** **N=50 100%**	**P** value
History of appendectomy	5 10%	4 8%	> 0.05 **N S**	2 4%	< 0.05 **S**
No history of appendectomy	45 90%	46 92%		48 96%	

Table 6 Shows that history of appendectomy is not significant among women with 2ry tubal infertility compared to history of appendectomy among women with 2ry non tubal infertility group but it is significant when compared to fertile women group using chi-square test.

Table 7→ History of miscarriage among 2ry tubal infertility group compared to history of miscarriage among 2ry non-tubal infertility and fertile women groups .

Variable	**2ry tubal infertility**		**2ry nontubal infertility**		**P** value	**fertile group**		**P** value
	N=50	**100%**	**N=50**	**100%**		**N=50**	**100%**	
History of miscarriage	10	20%	14	28%	< 0.05 **S**	7	14%	< 0.05 **S**
No history of miscarriage	40	80%	36	72%		43	86%	

Table 7 Shows that history of miscarriage is significantly lower among women with 2ry tubal infertility group when compared to history of miscarriage among women with 2ry non tubal infertility group but it is significantly higher when compared to fertile women group using chi-square test

Table 8 → History of termination of pregnancy among 2ry tubal infertility group compared to history of termination of pregnancy among 2ry non-tubal infertility and fertile women groups .

Variable	**2ry tubal infertility**		**2ry non tubal infertility**		**P** value	**fertile group**		**P** value
	N=50	**100%**	**N=50**	**100%**		**N=50**	**100%**	
History of termination of pregnancy	9	18%	8	16%	> 0.05 **NS**	8	16%	> 0.05 **NS**
NO history of termination of pregnancy	41	82%	42	84%		42	84%	

Table 8 Shows that no statistically significant difference between 2ry tubal infertility group and both control groups as regarding history of termination of pregnancy using chi-square test.

Table 9→ Mode of delivery among 2ry tubal infertility group compared to mode of delivery among 2ry non-tubal infertility and fertile women groups .

Variable	**2ry tubal infertility**		**2ry non tubal infertility**		**P** value	**fertile group**		**P** value
	N=50	**100%**	**N=50**	**100%**		**N=50**	**100%**	
Previous CS	9	18%	11	22%	> 0.05 **N S**	10	20%	> 0.05 **N S**
Normal labour	41	82%	39	78%		40	80%	

Table 9 Shows that no statistically significant difference in the mode of delivery among 2ry tubal infertility group compared to the mode of delivery among 2ry non-tubal infertility and fertile women groups using chi-square test.