Implications of chronic inflammation, endometrial dysfunction, and vascular remodeling in uterine niches (cesarean scar defects) associated with abnormal uterine bleeding and infertility — a systematic review

Gabriel M. Lino[1], Pauliana V. M. Galvão[2]*, Maria L. F. da Silva[1], Valda L. M. Luna[1], George A. M. Conrado[1]

[1]University of Pernambuco, Serra Talhada, Brazil

[2]Faculty of Medical Sciences, University of Pernambuco, Recife, Brazil

Correspondence related to the preprint: gabriel.lino@upe.br

ABSTRACT

Aim: To review the pathological findings of uterine niches in women presenting with infertility and abnormal uterine bleeding.

Methods: The Medline, Embase, and Cochrane Central databases were searched until 1 May 2025. We included cohorts, case-controls, and case series. The risk of bias was evaluated with ROBINS-I, and the certainty of evidence was presented according to GRADE.

Results: We included fourteen studies (637 women). Chronic inflammation was observed in 54% (95% CI 25 to 81%; 5 studies, 280 women; I^2 = 94.3%); fibrosis in 83% (95% CI 51 to 96%; 6 studies, 266 women; I^2 = 92.1%); endometrial defects in 90% (95% CI 75 to 96%; 4 studies, 177 women; I^2 = 64.6%); ectopic endometrium in 26% (95% CI 18 to 36%; 9 studies, 411 women; I^2 = 74.2%); and vascular remodeling in 81% (95% CI 75 to 86%; 6 studies, 205 women; I^2 = 0.0%). There was an increased risk of endometrial defects in women with niches compared to those with prior cesarean deliveries (RR 2.13, 95% CI 1.27 to 3.55; 2 studies, 124 women; I^2 = 0.0%), similarly for ectopic endometrium (RR 2.86, 95% CI 1.03 to 7.96; 2 studies, 97 women; I^2 = 0.0%). Additionally, niches exhibited a pro-inflammatory phenotype, characterized by elevated expression of CD138 and TNF-α.

Conclusions: The observed pathological features suggest an underlying process driven by the interplay of chronic inflammation, altered immune cell recruitment, hyperestrogenism, fibrosis, and vascular remodeling within the regenerating endometrium.

Registration number: CRD420251049667.

Keywords: Cesarean scar defect; Uterine niche; Isthmocele; Infertility; Abnormal uterine bleeding.

INTRODUCTION

Long-term morbidity following cesarean delivery has become a major concern in obstetrics [1]. Reduced fecundability, increased risks of placenta accreta, placenta previa, and abnormal uterine bleeding have all been associated with prior cesarean sections [1–3]. However, the mechanisms underlying these associations are extremely unclear. Over the past decade, growing attention has been directed toward small anatomic defects at the site of the uterine scar, commonly referred to as uterine niches or cesarean scar defects, as key contributors to these adverse outcomes.

Uterine niches are present in 50 to 60% of women who had a cesarean delivery [4]. Defined as defects of at least 2 mm of depth, niches classically present with abnormal uterine bleeding and infertility, although dysmenorrhea and dyspareunia are also often reported [5,6]. Crucially, symptoms can persist for years after the surgery.

In theory, damage to the endometrium and endometrial-myometrial interface is the initiator of this process [7]. Thereafter, local dysfunctional hormonal, metabolic, and inflammatory mechanisms lead to reproductive disorders [8].

Further, symptom onset has been linked to the presence of extensive fibrosis and ectopic endometrium. Deficiency of eutopic endometrium, leukocyte recruitment, and abnormal vascular dynamics are also implicated [9]. These same mechanisms could be involved in placenta accreta, indicating an increased risk in women diagnosed with niches [10]. Despite the clinical relevance of this condition, a systematic assessment of the pathological findings associated with uterine niches remains lacking. Such an understanding could provide valuable insights into the underlying mechanisms and inform both clinical management and future research directions aimed at reducing long-term morbidity following cesarean delivery. Therefore, we systematically reviewed pathological findings in uterine niches of symptomatic women.

METHODS

This systematic review was registered prospectively in the PROSPERO database (CRD420251049667). We followed the PRISMA 2020 guidelines for the reporting of systematic reviews and meta-analyses [11].

Criteria for considering studies for this review

We considered randomized controlled trials, cohorts, case controls, and case series reporting pathological findings of women diagnosed with uterine niches after cesarean delivery and presenting with abnormal uterine bleeding, infertility, or related disorders. The following outcomes were sought in these studies: inflammation (and inflammatory markers), fibrosis, endometrial defects overlying the scar, presence of ectopic foci of endometrial tissue or glands, asynchrony of the menstrual cycle in the scar compared to healthy areas of endometrium in the same patient, and angiogenesis or changes in the surrounding vasculatures (including dilated capillaries and thick-walled vessels).

Search methods for identification of studies

We searched the Medical Literature Analysis and Retrievel System Online (Medline), Embase, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (Central) databases until 1 May 2025. A combination of the following terms composed the search query: (Cesarean scar defect OR cesarean scar syndrome OR "cesarean scar" OR "uterine scar" OR "uterine defect" OR isthmocele OR uterine niche OR "cesarean scar diverticulum") AND ("histology" OR "histological" OR "histologic" OR "histopathological" OR "pathological" OR "Histopathology" OR specimen OR "biopsy" OR "autopsy" OR "biopsies" OR "tissue sample" OR "tissue samples"). These terms were adapted for each database search. There were no language or publication date restrictions to the search strategy.

Data collection and analysis

Two investigators were responsible for independently screening the title and abstract of the identified records. In this stage, if one of the authors considered the record eligible, both assessed the full text. Subsequently, they proceeded with the selection and extraction of key information from the included studies into a previously cross-validated file. Disagreements on which studies should be included in the review were resolved by discussing with a third investigator. Extracted information included authorship, conflict of interest, funding, country, setting, population, inclusion and exclusion criteria, information on baseline characteristics, adjustment methods for baseline imbalances, outcomes reported and how they were assessed, follow-up of participants, information on risk of bias, suture techniques in uterine closure, histological observations, and immunohistochemistry markers of inflammation, proliferation, and hormone expression (CD138, CD16, CD3, CD20, CD56, CD68, CD163, myeloperoxidase [MPO], tryptase, tumor necrosis factor-α [TNF-α], α-smooth muscle actin [α-SMA], Ki67, CD10, CD31, estrogen receptor [ER], and progesterone receptor [PR]).

Specific definitions for the outcomes were not required for inclusion in the review, as long as they were reported in the histological analyses. Uterine niches were considered appropriately defined when described as defects in the cesarean scar measuring more than 2 mm. When clear definitions for uterine niche diagnosis or outcome classification were lacking, the available information was recorded and used to inform the risk of bias assessment.

Risk of bias assessment in included studies

Two investigators independently used the Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for nonrandomized studies of intervention (ROBINS), version 2024, to assess the risk of bias/quality of the included

studies [12]. When different classifications were reached, the final risk assessment was reached by discussion.

Synthesis methods

We used an inverse-variance random effects model, reporting dichotomous data as Relative Risk (RR) with 95% Confidence intervals (CI) and continuous outcomes as mean differences (MD) and 95% CI. We also presented the baseline risk and risk difference (RD) for the critical outcomes [13]. Statistical heterogeneity was assessed by calculating tau, tau^2, and I^2. No specific threshold of I^2 was considered a significant indicator of heterogeneity; rather, a contextualized I^2 was considered based on visual inspection and acceptable between-study estimate variation [14]. We investigated publication bias with funnel plots.

The analyses were conducted in R, with the packages meta and metafor [15,16].

Certainty of the evidence assessment

The overall certainty of the evidence for each outcome was assessed by two investigators using the GRADE approach, formulating a summary of findings and certainty of evidence tables containing the critical outcomes investigated. There were no disagreements, this process was conducted by deliberation.

The Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) handbook was followed to determine the quality of the evidence of the analyses conducted [17]. For the evaluation of imprecision, the update provided in 2022 was followed [18]. Inconsistency was evaluated by investigating contextualized heterogeneity, based on whether reasonable explanations for study variations could be provided [14,19].

The tables were generated using the GRADEpro GDT software available online.

RESULTS

Results of the search

We identified 447 records in three databases, Medline, Embase, and Central (Figure 1). After excluding duplicates and records marked as ineligible (case reports and reviews), we assessed the title and abstract of 318 records. Subsequently, we excluded 292 records for being outside the review scope. One additional study was excluded because the digital record was not available. The full text was extracted from 25 records. Finally, we excluded eight studies that did not report any histological analysis and three that did not investigate uterine niches.

Included studies

Fourteen studies met the inclusion criteria for this review. Their main characteristics are summarized in Table 1, with additional details provided in Table S1. Additionally, the most common symptoms reported were abnormal uterine bleeding and infertility. However, in some cases, these symptoms could not be clearly attributed to the uterine niche due to coexisting comorbidities – an issue further addressed in the risk of bias assessment.

Histological samples were obtained either through hysteroscopic resection or hysterectomy, with varying time intervals between symptom onset and surgical management.

Commonly reported histological features included chronic inflammation, fibrosis, endometrial defects, ectopic endometrium, asynchronous menstrual cycle, vascular remodeling, and immunohistochemistry markers of inflammation and cell proliferation. A visual summary of these findings across studies is provided in Figure S1.

Most studies employed single-arm, retrospective, or prospective designs, typically involving nonconsecutive patient series.

Risk of bias

The overall risk of bias is presented in Table 1, while a more detailed description of each domain is provided in Table S2. In general, the quality of most studies was limited by selection bias and unclear reporting of pathological findings (reporting bias). Except for Wang 2025, Raimondo 2015, and Gubbini 2011, inadequate adjustment for baseline imbalances and nonconsecutive patient recruitment led to substantial residual confounding, resulting in at least a serious risk of bias for all other studies.

Analyses of histopathological observations

Chronic inflammation

Six studies investigated chronic inflammation, resulting in a pooled prevalence of 48% (95% CI 23 to 74%; 6 studies, 318 women; I^2 = 93.5%; very low-certainty evidence; Figure 2). In the analysis stratified by risk of bias, limited to studies at moderate and high risk, the prevalence is 4% (95% CI 25 to 81%; 5 studies, 280 women; I^2 = 94.3%; very low-certainty evidence; Figure S2). Raimondo 2015 had a conflicting estimate with the remaining studies, probably due to differences in patient factors or the stage of the inflammatory response, leading to extensive fibrosis that could have masked the presence of inflammation, which arguably would have been better elucidated with immunohistochemistry markers. Hence, the pooled prevalence further changes to 66% when Raimondo 2015 is excluded (95% CI 54 to 76%; 4 studies, 160 women; I^2 = 48.9%; very low-certainty evidence; Figure S3).

Fibrosis

Six studies investigated fibrosis, finding a pooled prevalence of 83% (95% CI 51 to 96%; 6 studies, 266 women; I^2 = 92.1%; very low-certainty evidence; Figures 3 and S4). As in the previous outcome, Gubbini 2011 and Raimondo 2015 had conflicting results, probably due

to the same factors mentioned above. Excluding Gubbini from the fibrosis analysis results in a prevalence of 88% (95% CI 81 to 93%; 5 studies, 225 women; I^2 = 24,3%; low-certainty evidence; Figure S5).

Endometrial defects

Four studies reported endometrial defects, resulting in a pooled prevalence of 90% (95% CI 75 to 96%; 4 studies, 177 women; I^2 = 64.6%; very low-certainty evidence; Figure 4). Additionally, Huang 2023 and Higuchi 2021 observed an increased risk of endometrial defects in women with niches compared to those with prior cesarean deliveries but without niches (RR 2.13, 95% CI 1.27 to 3.55; 2 studies, 124 women; I^2 = 0.0%; low-certainty evidence; Figure S6). Further, Wang 2025 also observed an increased risk of endometrial defects in women with symptomatic niches compared to asymptomatic niches (RR 2.71, 95% CI 2.00 to 3.67; 1 study, 155 women; low-certainty evidence).

Ectopic endometrium

Ten studies reported the presence of ectopic endometrium within the scar, with a pooled prevalence of 31% (95% CI 20 to 44%; 10 studies, 449 women; I^2 = 84.8%; very low-certainty evidence; Figure S7). Excluding studies at critical risk of bias resulted in a more conservative prevalence of 26% (95% CI 18 to 36%; 9 studies, 411 women; I^2 = 74.2%; very low-certainty evidence; Figure S8). Additionally, two studies compared women with uterine niches to those with prior cesarean deliveries but without niches. The presence of ectopic endometrium was associated with an increased risk of niche (RR 2.86, 95% CI 1.03 to 7.96; 2 studies, 97 women; I^2 = 0.0%; low-certainty evidence; Figure S9). Further, Wang 2025 compared the risk of symptoms in niches with and without ectopic endometrium, finding a large increase in risk (RR 7.48, 95% CI 3.06 to 18.25; 1 study, 155 women; low-certainty evidence).

Asynchronous menstrual cycle

Three studies investigated asynchrony of the menstrual cycle, comparing cells in the niche to specimens of the uterine cavity. The estimated pooled prevalence was 30% (95% CI 13 to 55%; 3 studies, 157 women; I^2 = 87.4%; very low-certainty evidence; Figure S10). Restricting the analysis to studies not at critical risk of bias yields a slightly higher estimate of 42% (95% CI 23 to 63%; 2 studies, 119 women; I^2 = 80.9%; very low-certainty evidence; Figure S11).

Vascular remodeling

Vessels with prominent wall proliferation, referred to as thick-walled vessels, were investigated by six studies, observing a pooled prevalence of 81% (95% CI 75 to 86%; 6 studies, 205 women; I^2 = 0.0%; low-certainty evidence; Figure S12).

Immunohistochemistry markers (inflammation and cell proliferation)

Four studies conducted immunohistochemistry analyses on markers of inflammation, inflammatory cells, cell proliferation, or hormonal expression (Tables S3 and S4). All studies, except for Wang 2025, compared these markers in women with niches with those without niches but with prior cesareans. Three studies assessed inflammatory markers in niche specimens, including CD138, CD16, CD3, CD20, CD56, CD68, CD163, myeloperoxidase (MPO), tryptase, and tumor necrosis factor-α (TNF-α). They reported increased expression of CD138, CD16, and TNF-α; decreased expression of CD3, CD20, CD68, CD163, and tryptase; and no significant change in CD56 and MPO (Table S3).

Regarding cell proliferation and hormonal receptors, three studies assessed markers such as α-smooth muscle actin (α-SMA), Ki67, CD10, CD31, estrogen receptor (ER), and

progesterone receptor (PR). They reported significantly increased expression of CD31; α-SMA was either similar or increased; and Ki67, CD10, ER, and PR showed no significant change (Table S4).

Certainty of evidence

As most of the publications consisted of retrospective observational studies, the certainty of our observations was low to very low. The domains in which we downgraded the quality of evidence were inconsistency (one level), as studies were inclined to report non-standardized findings, and risk of bias extracted from ROBINS-I (two levels). Therefore, the certainty started at high and was downgraded by three levels (very low-certainty) in some cases and by two levels when inconsistency was not substantial (low-certainty).

DISCUSSION

Summary of findings

In this systematic review of women diagnosed with uterine niches in the cesarean scar and presenting chiefly with infertility and abnormal uterine bleeding, the most prevalent histological findings were fibrosis in 83% (51% to 96%), endometrial defects in 88% (81% to 93%), thick-walled vessels in 81% (75% to 86%), and chronic inflammation in 54% (25% to 81%). Furthermore, compared to women with prior cesarean deliveries but without niches, CD138, CD16, and TNF-α expression is increased, especially around thick-walled vessels, while CD3, CD20, CD68, CD163, and tryptase are comparatively reduced.

Although ectopic endometrium was not highly prevalent (18% to 36%), women with uterine niches had nearly a threefold higher risk of ectopic endometrium compared to those with prior cesarean deliveries. A similar increase in risk was observed for endometrial defects.

A less frequent but notable observation was endometrial asynchrony between the niche and the surrounding uterine cavity.

Limitations of the findings

A key limitation was the unclear reporting of pathological findings. Certain histological features were described in some studies but not in others, raising uncertainty about whether these abnormalities were truly absent or simply not assessed. This ambiguity also raises concerns about the consistency of specimen evaluation, specifically, whether all samples were analyzed using the same criteria and by the same group of pathologists.

In addition, the high heterogeneity observed in our analyses represents an important limitation. While some variability was anticipated—given the unstandardized patient selection and inherent design limitations of the included studies (mainly case series and small retrospective cohorts)—the extent of heterogeneity may also reflect true differences in patient factors (age, smoking, body mass index), the inflammatory stage, and the degree of tissue remodeling. However, it remains unclear whether these variations stem from between-study bias or genuine biological differences in the inflammatory response across study populations.

One observation that supports the latter hypothesis is the apparent association between the prevalence of chronic inflammation and extensive fibrosis across studies. In some cases, fibrosis was highly prevalent while chronic inflammation was not reported, whereas in others, chronic inflammation was common and extensive fibrosis was less frequently observed.

Uterine niches and immune-mediated inflammation

The extent of damage to the uterine wall, particularly the endometrium, may influence both the magnitude of the inflammatory response and the likelihood of its chronic persistence

[34,35]. Other factors, such as genetic predisposition, are also likely to play a role, although these remain poorly understood in uterine physiology.

Altogether, there is a plausible indication that immune-mediated inflammation is central to the pathogenesis of niches. Higuchi 2021 [26] observed a distinct phenotype of immune cell recruitment in patients with niches compared to those with previous cesarean deliveries. In the immunohistochemistry assessment, they observed decreased T lymphocytes (assessed by CD3), B lymphocytes (assessed by CD20), macrophages (assessed by CD68), and tryptase-positive cells expression, and increased CD138 expression (plasmocytic proliferation), which is more associated with chronic responses.

In comparison, a similar immune-mediated response is observed in eutopic endometrial cells of women with adenomyosis. Overall, there is increased lymphocyte and macrophage cell recruitment and upregulation of pro-inflammatory markers[36]. Persistence of the inflammatory milieu is attributed to both altered hormonal expression and signaling from ectopic cells. The initial disturbance leading to an altered immune microenvironment in uterine niches could be hypoxia caused by surgical injury or suture techniques. Increased expression of hypoxia-inducible factor 1α and consequential classic epithelial-mesenchymal changes has been reported in patients with endometriosis [37]. Although reversal of hypoxic conditions can ultimately lead to the resolution of abnormal signaling, there could be chronic expression of transforming growth factor (TGF)-β1, long-term effects on tissue architecture [38] and altered cell phenotypes [37].

Resistance to cell death, even in a dysfunctional state, appears to be a feature of uterine niches, as evidenced by increased expression of TNF-α. This upregulation of pro-inflammatory markers plays a key role in promoting the consolidation of mesenchymal phenotypes, along with increased cellular invasiveness, hyperestrogenism, and vascular remodeling, as discussed in further detail below. Ultimately, chronic inflammation appears to be deeply interwoven with

the pathogenesis of niches. Symptomatic women have higher expression of CD138 than asymptomatic counterparts, which further exemplifies the implication of inflammation in these defects [20].

Uterine niches and increased endometrial invasiveness

Structural defects in the eutopic endometrium were present in nearly all women, which are crucial for endometrial migration in multiple diseases. In adenomyosis, downregulation of E-cadherin and upregulation of vimentin are associated with increased cellular invasiveness and a mesenchymal-like phenotype [39]. In parallel, epithelial deficiency, exposed blood vessels and hyperplastic vessels in areas of endometrial defects were associated with the development of niches, whereas underlying myometrial defects were not reliable predictors of this pathology [20]. The study of the influence of surgical trauma on the eutopic endometrium validates these notions, where attempted preservation of endometrium is associated with a lower prevalence of uterine niches [40,41].

After impaired cell-cell communication in the eutopic endometrium, there is an increased probability of invasion into the myometrium. Further, it has been proposed that the presence of ectopic endometrium and activation of TGF-β signaling—driven by a transition to a mesenchymal phenotype—increase local metabolic demand and trigger hypoxia signaling [42]. Due to heightened oxygen consumption and insufficient vascular supply to the ectopic tissue, there is upregulation of pro-angiogenic factors associated with inflammation [43]. This likely contributes to the development of remodeled vessels and increased α-SMA deposition observed in uterine niches, linking these changes in vascular dynamics to the persistence of pro-angiogenic and consequently pro-inflammatory signaling in affected patients. Perivascular fibroblasts, activated by endothelial-derived signals, are prone to adopt a pro-inflammatory phenotype, potentially contributing to prolonged and unresolved inflammation [44].

Analysis of α-SMA in hysteroscopic resected niches showed strong expression when compared to other areas of the cesarean scar, particularly when analyzing ectopic glands, areas of intense fibrosis, and remodeled vessels.

Uterine niches and hyperestrogenism

In principle, endometrial invasion could explain the continued inflammation; however, another mechanism of probable involvement is increased peripheral androgen conversion in uterine niches. In healthy women, endometrial stromal cells' responsiveness to estrogen promotes angiogenesis and increased capillary diameter and growth from the basalis layer. The involution of a highly vascularized endometrium can be orchestrated to result in no scarring and the preservation of the original architecture in the menstrual cycle.

Injury to the endometrium causes an intracellular increase in COX-2 activity, and consequently of prostaglandins, of note, prostaglandin E2 (PGE2) [45]. Thereafter, PGE2 increases cAMP activity, which mediates aromatase conversion of androgens. This leads to a hyperestrogenic milieu that, in itself, does not produce any adverse effects on tissue regeneration. However, in persistent inflammation, estrogen interacts with estrogen alpha receptors on the adjacent myometrium, promoting muscle contraction. Consequently, this promotes tissue auto-traumatization and subverts conventional regenerative pathways [46].

Inflammatory spillover from the endometrium may activate excessive fibrous extracellular matrix deposition in the myometrium, potentially impairing scar healing [47]. Conversely, aberrant myometrial remodeling with extensive fibrosis can disrupt normal endometrial regeneration, perpetuating a cycle of chronic inflammation and defective tissue repair. Progressive loss of epithelial endometrium and apposition of fibrosis might contribute to the chronicity of this process.

Supporting hyperestrogenism as the key mediator of this pathology, direct observation of ectopic endometrium was identified in a smaller proportion of women, around 30%. Nevertheless, its presence was associated with both the development of uterine niches and the occurrence of clinical symptoms, and should be seen as a contributor to symptomatology.

Implications for clinical symptoms and surgical management

Abnormal uterine bleeding is the main complaint of women with niches, and whether bleeding arises from blood stasis in these areas or from spontaneous vascular leakage is debatable [4]. Tanimura 2015 reported persistent bleeding from scarred areas containing ectopic endometrium, suggesting that increased local bleeding is likely an underlying mechanism. Based on the observations from the sections above, altered vascular dynamics and angiogenesis likely increase the propensity for bleeding within uterine niches, along with asynchrony compared to the uterine cavity. Similar vascular alterations are also thought to contribute to the pathogenesis of placenta accreta [9]. Additional contributing factors may include abnormal trophoblast migration, impaired spiral artery remodeling, and an altered endometrial phenotype, all of which could facilitate abnormal placentation [48].

Secondary infertility is also frequently reported. A recent systematic review by Vitagliano and collaborators [5] demonstrated that infertility is more closely associated with the presence of uterine niches than with cesarean delivery itself. Such observation reinforces the view that adequately healed cesarean scars are generally not problematic and may only confer a very modest increase in risk. In contrast, poor scar healing, typically characterized by the formation of uterine niches, creates the necessary conditions for adverse reproductive outcomes in women with prior cesarean sections. Plausible mechanisms for niche-associated infertility include reduced endometrial receptivity during implantation due to dysfunctional signaling and embryotoxic effects of chronic inflammation [8]. In particular, fibrosis — a prevalent finding in

uterine niches — may be associated with a defective or poorly responsive endometrium. This mirrors observations in other gynecological conditions, such as endometriosis, where extensive fibrosis is linked to impaired endometrial function and reduced implantation potential [49].

For both infertility and abnormal uterine bleeding, hysteroscopic resection results in restoration of normal functional endometrium and resolution or improvement of symptoms in approximately 70% of women [31,32,50]. The underlying mechanism may involve re-epithelialization driven by healthy progenitor cells [35], suggesting that the formation of uterine niches and associated fibrosis results from a delicate imbalance in regenerative pathways. Overall, this imbalance is probably linked to dysregulated epithelial-mesenchymal and mesenchymal-epithelial transitions [51]. Further remains to be elucidated, principally the molecular expression of pro-inflammatory phenotypes, angiogenesis, and defective eutopic endometrium.

Considering the findings of this review and the discussed literature, hormonal treatments may offer comparable efficacy in managing symptoms associated with this condition. To this day, only one randomized controlled trial has evaluated the use of levonorgestrel-releasing intrauterine devices, demonstrating superior long-term control of abnormal uterine bleeding compared to hysteroscopic resection [52].

Whether distinct histopathological features influence treatment efficacy remains an open question. In theory, pronounced fibrosis results in decreased PGE_2 activity, whereas substantial vascular remodeling could indicate higher underlying inflammation and hyperestrogenism. One study reported better bleeding control with levonorgestrel-releasing intrauterine devices in patients showing more clinical signs of vascular proliferation, suggesting that certain histological patterns might influence treatment efficacy [53].

Lastly, the proposed association between hypoxia and surgical trauma in the pathogenesis of uterine niches may have direct implications for uterine closure techniques.

Hypoxia has been extensively implicated in the regulation of angiogenesis, epithelial-mesenchymal transition, and the downregulation of cell adhesion molecules such as E-cadherin, all of which may hinder proper tissue regeneration, as previously discussed. In a recent study, reduced niche prevalence was observed by not including the endometrium in uterine closure [54]. This technique involves maintaining a 4 to 5 mm margin from the endometrial cavity during suture placement, thereby minimizing hypoxic insult and preventing a favorable environment for phenotypical changes of endometrial cells. Given that uterine niche formation appears to be primarily a localized phenomenon, preserving a thin margin of tissue adjacent to the cavity may facilitate re-epithelialization and reduce the risk of defective scar healing.

Overall, the pathogenesis of uterine niches appears to result from the interplay of chronic inflammation, dysregulated immune cell recruitment, hyperestrogenism, fibrosis, and vascular remodeling within the regenerating endometrium following surgical injury. A more comprehensive understanding of these mechanisms will require well-designed studies directly comparing scar characteristics in patients who undergo endometrial closure versus those with endometrial exclusion during cesarean repair.

DISCLOSURE

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no competing interests, nor was funding received for this project.

CRediT Authorship Contribution Statement:

GL: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Software, Visualization, Writing – original draft.

MS and VL: Conceptualization, Data curation, Writing – review & editing.

PG: Project administration, Supervision, Validation, Formal analysis, Software, Writing – review & editing.

GC: Conceptualization, Project administration, Supervision, Validation, Writing – review & editing.

REFERENCES

1. Sandall J, Tribe RM, Avery L, et al. Short-term and long-term effects of caesarean section on the health of women and children. *Lancet*. 2018;392(10155):1349-1357. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31930-5

2. Murji A, Sanders AP, Monteiro I, et al. Cesarean scar defects and abnormal uterine bleeding: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Fertil Steril*. 2022;118(4):758-766. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2022.06.031

3. Sima YT, Magnus MC, Kvalvik LG, et al. The relationship between cesarean delivery and fecundability: a population-based cohort study. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2024;230(6):667.e1-667.e21. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2023.10.029

4. Vissers J, Hehenkamp W, Lambalk CB, Huirne JA. Post-Caesarean section niche-related impaired fertility: hypothetical mechanisms. *Hum Reprod*. 2020;35(7):1484-1494. doi:10.1093/humrep/deaa094

5. Vitagliano A, Cicinelli E, Viganò P, et al. Isthmocele, not cesarean section per se, reduces in vitro fertilization success: a systematic review and meta-analysis of over 10,000 embryo transfer cycles. *Fertility and Sterility*. 2024;121(2):299-313. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2023.11.007

6. Donnez O. Cesarean scar defects: management of an iatrogenic pathology whose prevalence has dramatically increased. *Fertil Steril*. 2020;113(4):704-716. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2020.01.037

7. Leyendecker G, Wildt L, Mall G. The pathophysiology of endometriosis and adenomyosis: tissue injury and repair. *Arch Gynecol Obstet*. 2009;280(4):529-538. doi:10.1007/s00404-009-1191-0

8. Vannuccini S, Clifton VL, Fraser IS, et al. Infertility and reproductive disorders: impact of hormonal and inflammatory mechanisms on pregnancy outcome. *Human Reproduction Update*. 2016;22(1):104-115. doi:10.1093/humupd/dmv044

9. Jauniaux E, Collins S, Burton GJ. Placenta accreta spectrum: pathophysiology and evidence-based anatomy for prenatal ultrasound imaging. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2018;218(1):75-87. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2017.05.067

10. Afshar Y, Kashani Ligumsky L, Bartels HC, Krakow D. Biology and Pathophysiology of Placenta Accreta Spectrum Disorder. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*. 2025;145(6):611. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000005903

11. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *PLOS Medicine*. 2021;18(3):e1003583. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003583

12. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, et al. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ*. 2016;355:i4919. doi:10.1136/bmj.i4919

13. Deeks JJ, Higgins JP, Altman DG, McKenzie J, Veroniki A. Chapter 10: Analysing data and undertaking meta-analyses [last updated November 2024]. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). Published online 2024. Accessed April 5, 2025. https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-10

14. Guyatt G, Zhao Y, Mayer M, et al. GRADE guidance 36: updates to GRADE's approach to

addressing inconsistency. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2023;158:70-83. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2023.03.003

15. Viechtbauer W. Conducting meta-analyses in {R} with the {metafor} package. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2010;36(3).

16. Balduzzi S, Rücker G, Schwarzer G. How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a practical tutorial. *Evid Based Ment Health*. 2019;22(4):153-160. doi:10.1136/ebmental-2019-300117

17. Schünemann H, Brożek J, Guyatt G, Oxman A, editor(s). Handbook for grading the quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations using the GRADE approach (updated October 2013). Published online 2013. https://gdt.gradepro.org/app/handbook/handbook.html

18. Zeng L, Brignardello-Petersen R, Hultcrantz M, et al. GRADE Guidance 34: update on rating imprecision using a minimally contextualized approach. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2022;150:216-224. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2022.07.014

19. Schandelmaier S, Briel M, Varadhan R, et al. Development of the Instrument to assess the Credibility of Effect Modification Analyses (ICEMAN) in randomized controlled trials and meta-analyses. *CMAJ*. 2020;192(32):E901-E906. doi:10.1503/cmaj.200077

20. Wang Y, Han Y, Guo X, et al. Caesarean Scar Endometrial Defects Contribute to Post-Caesarean Abnormal Uterine Bleeding and Chronic Endometritis: A Retrospective Case-Control Study. *BJOG*. 2025;132 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):132-139. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.18089

21. Maudot C, Debras E, Laurent-Bellue A, et al. Caesarean section scar: Histological analysis on hysterectomy specimen. A pilot study. *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*. 2024;303:236-243. doi:10.1016/j.ejogrb.2024.10.048

22. Amro B, Ramirez M, Farhan R, et al. Isthmoceles - Accuracy of imaging diagnosis and clinical correlation with histology: A prospective cohort study. *Facts Views Vis Obgyn*. 2024;16(2):173-183. doi:10.52054/FVVO.16.2.021

23. Hladchuk ZI, Rozhkovska NM, Sytnikova VO, Syvyi SM. Morphofunctional features of isthmocele complicated by abnormal uterine bleeding. *REPRODUCTIVE ENDOCRINOLOGY*. 2024;(73):30-34. doi:10.18370/2309-4117.2024.73.30-34

24. Huang J, Liu X, Hou Y, et al. Macrophage polarisation in caesarean scar diverticulum. *J Clin Pathol*. 2023;76(6):379-383. doi:10.1136/jclinpath-2021-207926

25. AbdullGaffar B, Almulla A. A Histopathologic Approach to Uterine Niche: What to Expect and to Report in Hysteroscopy-Resected Isthmocele Specimens. *Int J Surg Pathol*. 2022;30(3):240-250. doi:10.1177/10668969211039415

26. Higuchi A, Tsuji S, Nobuta Y, et al. Histopathological evaluation of cesarean scar defect in women with cesarean scar syndrome. *Reprod Med Biol*. 2021;21(1):e12431. doi:10.1002/rmb2.12431

27. Karpathiou G, Chauleur C, Dridi M, et al. Histologic Findings of Uterine Niches. *Am J Clin Pathol*. 2020;154(5):645-655. doi:10.1093/ajcp/aqaa080

28. Shapira M, Mashiach R, Meller N, et al. Clinical Success Rate of Extensive Hysteroscopic Cesarean Scar Defect Excision and Correlation to Histologic Findings. *J Minim Invasive Gynecol*. 2020;27(1):129-134. doi:10.1016/j.jmig.2019.03.001

29. Donnez O, Donnez J, Orellana R, Dolmans MM. Gynecological and obstetrical outcomes after laparoscopic repair of a cesarean scar defect in a series of 38 women. *Fertil Steril*.

2017;107(1):289-296.e2. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2016.09.033

30. Tanimura S, Funamoto H, Hosono T, et al. New diagnostic criteria and operative strategy for cesarean scar syndrome: Endoscopic repair for secondary infertility caused by cesarean scar defect. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res*. 2015;41(9):1363-1369. doi:10.1111/jog.12738

31. Raimondo G, Grifone G, Raimondo D, Seracchioli R, Scambia G, Masciullo V. Hysteroscopic treatment of symptomatic cesarean-induced isthmocele: a prospective study. *J Minim Invasive Gynecol*. 2015;22(2):297-301. doi:10.1016/j.jmig.2014.09.011

32. Gubbini G, Centini G, Nascetti D, et al. Surgical hysteroscopic treatment of cesarean-induced isthmocele in restoring fertility: prospective study. *J Minim Invasive Gynecol*. 2011;18(2):234-237. doi:10.1016/j.jmig.2010.10.011

33. Morris H. Surgical pathology of the lower uterine segment caesarean section scar: is the scar a source of clinical symptoms? *Int J Gynecol Pathol*. 1995;14(1):16-20. doi:10.1097/00004347-199501000-00004

34. Ben-Nagi J, Walker A, Jurkovic D, Yazbek J, Aplin JD. Effect of cesarean delivery on the endometrium. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet*. 2009;106(1):30-34. doi:10.1016/j.ijgo.2009.02.019

35. Ang CJ, Skokan TD, McKinley KL. Mechanisms of Regeneration and Fibrosis in the Endometrium. *Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol*. 2023;39:197-221. doi:10.1146/annurev-cellbio-011723-021442

36. Bourdon M, Santulli P, Jeljeli M, et al. Immunological changes associated with adenomyosis: a systematic review. *Hum Reprod Update*. 2021;27(1):108-129. doi:10.1093/humupd/dmaa038

37. Xiong Y, Liu Y, Xiong W, et al. Hypoxia-inducible factor 1α-induced epithelial-mesenchymal transition of endometrial epithelial cells may contribute to the development of endometriosis. *Hum Reprod*. 2016;31(6):1327-1338. doi:10.1093/humrep/dew081

38. Lin X, Dai Y, Xu W, et al. Hypoxia Promotes Ectopic Adhesion Ability of Endometrial Stromal Cells via TGF-β1/Smad Signaling in Endometriosis. *Endocrinology*. 2018;159(4):1630-1641. doi:10.1210/en.2017-03227

39. Zhou S, Yi T, Liu R, et al. Proteomics identification of annexin A2 as a key mediator in the metastasis and proangiogenesis of endometrial cells in human adenomyosis. *Mol Cell Proteomics*. 2012;11(7):M112.017988. doi:10.1074/mcp.M112.017988

40. Stegwee SI, van der Voet LF, Ben AJ, et al. Effect of single- versus double-layer uterine closure during caesarean section on postmenstrual spotting (2Close): multicentre, double-blind, randomised controlled superiority trial. *BJOG*. 2021;128(5):866-878. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.16472

41. Antoine C, Meyer JA, Silverstein J, Buldo-Licciardi J, Lyu C, Timor-Tritsch IE. Endometrium-Free Closure Technique During Cesarean Delivery for Reducing the Risk of Niche Formation and Placenta Accreta Spectrum Disorders. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2025;145(6):674-682. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000005813

42. Wu MH, Chen KF, Lin SC, Lgu CW, Tsai SJ. Aberrant expression of leptin in human endometriotic stromal cells is induced by elevated levels of hypoxia inducible factor-1alpha. *Am J Pathol*. 2007;170(2):590-598. doi:10.2353/ajpath.2007.060477

43. Laschke MW, Menger MD. In vitro and in vivo approaches to study angiogenesis in the pathophysiology and therapy of endometriosis. *Hum Reprod Update*. 2007;13(4):331-342.

doi:10.1093/humupd/dmm006

44. Di Carlo SE, Peduto L. The perivascular origin of pathological fibroblasts. *J Clin Invest*. 2018;128(1):54-63. doi:10.1172/JCI93558

45. Banu SK, Lee J, Speights VO, Starzinski-Powitz A, Arosh JA. Cyclooxygenase-2 regulates survival, migration, and invasion of human endometriotic cells through multiple mechanisms. *Endocrinology*. 2008;149(3):1180-1189. doi:10.1210/en.2007-1168

46. García-Solares J, Donnez J, Donnez O, Dolmans MM. Pathogenesis of uterine adenomyosis: invagination or metaplasia? *Fertil Steril*. 2018;109(3):371-379. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2017.12.030

47. Jabbour HN, Sales KJ. Prostaglandin receptor signalling and function in human endometrial pathology. *Trends Endocrinol Metab*. 2004;15(8):398-404. doi:10.1016/j.tem.2004.08.006

48. Jauniaux E, Aplin JD, Fox KA, et al. Placenta accreta spectrum. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. 2025;11(1):40. doi:10.1038/s41572-025-00624-3

49. Vissers G, Giacomozzi M, Verdurmen W, Peek R, Nap A. The role of fibrosis in endometriosis: a systematic review. *Hum Reprod Update*. 2024;30(6):706-750. doi:10.1093/humupd/dmae023

50. Zhang J, Zhu C, Yan L, et al. Comparing levonorgestrel intrauterine system with hysteroscopic niche resection in women with postmenstrual spotting related to a niche in the uterine cesarean scar: a randomized, open-label, controlled trial. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2023;228(6):712.e1-712.e16. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2023.03.020

51. Owusu-Akyaw A, Krishnamoorthy K, Goldsmith LT, Morelli SS. The role of mesenchymal-epithelial transition in endometrial function. *Hum Reprod Update*. 2019;25(1):114-133. doi:10.1093/humupd/dmy035

52. Zhang J, Zhu C, Yan L, et al. Comparing levonorgestrel intrauterine system with hysteroscopic niche resection in women with postmenstrual spotting related to a niche in the uterine cesarean scar: a randomized, open-label, controlled trial. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2023;228(6):712.e1-712.e16. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2023.03.020

53. Huang SY, Chen YY, Tsai CC, Lin H, Ou YC. Evaluating resectoscopy and the levonorgestrel intrauterine system for intermenstrual bleeding associated with cesarean scar defects: A retrospective study of treatment outcomes. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res*. 2024;50(2):253-261. doi:10.1111/jog.15840

54. Lino GM, Galvão PVM, da Silva MLF, Conrado GAM. Not Closing Compared With Closing the Endometrial Layer During Cesarean Delivery: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Obstet Gynecol*. Published online June 12, 2025. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000005974

Figure 1 PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) 2020 flow diagram of study selection.

Figure 2 Proportion of chronic inflammation in histopathological observations in women with symptomatic uterine niches. IV, inverse variance.

Figure 3 Proportion of fibrosis in histopathological observations in women with symptomatic uterine niches. IV, inverse variance.

Figure 4 Proportion of endometrial defects in histopathological observations in women with symptomatic uterine niches. IV, inverse variance.

Figure S1 Prevalence of histological findings per study.

Figure S2 Subgroup analysis based on the risk of bias of the proportion of chronic inflammation in histopathological observations in women with symptomatic uterine niches. IV, inverse variance.

Figure S3 Subgroup analysis excluding Raimondo 2015 of the proportion of chronic inflammation in histopathological observations in women with symptomatic uterine niches. IV, inverse variance.

Figure S4 Subgroup analysis based on the risk of bias of the proportion of fibrosis in histopathological observations in women with symptomatic uterine niches. IV, inverse variance.

Figure S5 Subgroup analysis excluding Gubbini 2011 of the proportion of fibrosis in histopathological observations in women with symptomatic uterine niches. IV, inverse variance.

Figure S6 Relative risk of endometrial defects in histopathological observations in women with symptomatic uterine niches compared to women with previous cesarean deliveries without uterine niches. IV, inverse variance.

Figure S7 Proportion of ectopic endometrium in histopathological observations in women with symptomatic uterine niches. IV, inverse variance.

Figure S8 Subgroup analysis based on the risk of bias of the proportion of ectopic endometrium in histopathological observations in women with symptomatic uterine niches. IV, inverse variance.

Figure S9 Relative risk of ectopic endometrium in histopathological observations in women with symptomatic uterine niches compared to women with previous cesarean deliveries without uterine niches. IV, inverse variance.

Figure S10 Proportion of asynchronous menstrual cycle in histopathological observations in women with symptomatic uterine niches. IV, inverse variance.

Figure S11 Subgroup analysis based on the risk of bias of the proportion of asynchronous menstrual cycle in histopathological observations in women with symptomatic uterine niches. IV, inverse variance.

Figure S12 Proportion of thick-walled vessels in histopathological observations in women with symptomatic uterine niches. IV, inverse variance.

Study	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI
Amro 2024	33	60	17.7%	0.55 [0.42, 0.68]
Karpathiou 2020	6	8	13.3%	0.75 [0.35, 0.97]
Morris 1995	33	51	17.5%	0.65 [0.50, 0.78]
Hladchuk 2024	9	38	17.0%	0.24 [0.11, 0.40]
Raimondo 2015	12	120	17.5%	0.10 [0.05, 0.17]
Gubbini 2011	32	41	17.0%	0.78 [0.62, 0.89]
Total (95% CI)		**318**	**100.0%**	**0.48 [0.23, 0.74]**

Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 1.72$; $Chi^2 = 77.17$, df = 5 ($P < 0.01$); $I^2 = 93.5\%$



Study	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI
Donnez 2017	30	38	19.2%	0.79 [0.63, 0.90]
AbdullGaffar 2022	22	22	11.9%	1.00 [0.85, 1.00]
Huang 2023	33	37	18.5%	0.89 [0.75, 0.97]
Karpathiou 2020	8	8	11.7%	1.00 [0.63, 1.00]
Raimondo 2015	108	120	19.6%	0.90 [0.83, 0.95]
Gubbini 2011	7	41	19.1%	0.17 [0.07, 0.32]
Total (95% CI)		**266**	**100.0%**	**0.83 [0.51, 0.96]**

Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 2.91$; $Chi^2 = 63.23$, df = 5 ($P < 0.01$); $I^2 = 92.1\%$



Study	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI
Higuchi 2021	49	63	41.3%	0.78 [0.66, 0.87]
Wang 2025	63	69	36.7%	0.91 [0.82, 0.97]
Huang 2023	37	37	11.2%	1.00 [0.91, 1.00]
Karpathiou 2020	8	8	10.8%	1.00 [0.63, 1.00]
Total (95% CI)		**177**	**100.0%**	**0.90 [0.75, 0.96]**

Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.63$; $Chi^2 = 8.47$, df = 3 (P = 0.04); $I^2 = 64.6\%$




thickvessel
inflammation
fibrosis
endodef
ectopic
async
Finding
AbdulGaffar 2022
Amro 2024
Domnez 2017
Gubbini 2011
Higuchi 2022
Hladchuk 2024
Huang 2022
Karpathiou 2020
Maudot 2024
Morris 1996
Raimondo 2015
Shapira 2019
Tanimura 2015
Wang 2025
Study
Percentage
100
75
50
25
0

Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI
High				
Amro 2024	33	60	17.7%	0.55 [0.42, 0.68]
Karpathiou 2020	6	8	13.3%	0.75 [0.35, 0.97]
Morris 1995	33	51	17.5%	0.65 [0.50, 0.78]
Total (95% CI)		**369**	**48.5%**	**0.60 [0.51, 0.69]**
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$; $Chi^2 = 1.81$, df = 2 (P = 0.40); $I^2 = 0\%$				
Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA)				
Some concerns				
Raimondo 2015	12	120	17.5%	0.10 [0.05, 0.17]
Gubbini 2011	32	41	17.0%	0.78 [0.62, 0.89]
Total (95% CI)		**230**	**34.5%**	**0.38 [0.02, 0.95]**
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 5.89$; $Chi^2 = 51.12$, df = 1 (P < 0.01); $I^2 = 98\%$				
Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA)				
Critical				
Hladchuk 2024	9	38	17.0%	0.24 [0.11, 0.40]
Total (95% CI)		**318**	**100.0%**	**0.48 [0.23, 0.74]**
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 1.72$; $Chi^2 = 77.17$, df = 5 (P < 0.01); $I^2 = 93.5\%$				
Test for subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 14.01$, df = 2 (P < 0.01)				



Study	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI
Amro 2024	33	60	34.8%	0.55 [0.42, 0.68]
Karpathiou 2020	6	8	8.4%	0.75 [0.35, 0.97]
Morris 1995	33	51	31.8%	0.65 [0.50, 0.78]
Gubbini 2011	32	41	25.0%	0.78 [0.62, 0.89]
Total (95% CI)	**160**		**100.0%**	**0.66 [0.54, 0.76]**

Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.12$; $Chi^2 = 5.88$, df = 3 (P = 0.12); $I^2 = 48.9\%$



Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI
High				
Donnez 2017	30	38	19.2%	0.79 [0.63, 0.90]
AbdullGaffar 2022	22	22	11.9%	1.00 [0.85, 1.00]
Huang 2023	33	37	18.5%	0.89 [0.75, 0.97]
Karpathiou 2020	8	8	11.7%	1.00 [0.63, 1.00]
Total (95% CI)		**369**	**61.3%**	**0.87 [0.75, 0.94]**
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.21$; $Chi^2 = 4.24$, df = 3 (P = 0.24); $I^2 = 29.3\%$				
Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA)				
Some concerns				
Raimondo 2015	108	120	19.6%	0.90 [0.83, 0.95]
Gubbini 2011	7	41	19.1%	0.17 [0.07, 0.32]
Total (95% CI)		**230**	**38.7%**	**0.58 [0.03, 0.98]**
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 7.00$; $Chi^2 = 53.88$, df = 1 (P < 0.01); $I^2 = 98.1\%$				
Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA)				
Total (95% CI)		**266**	**100.0%**	**0.83 [0.51, 0.96]**
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 2.91$; $Chi^2 = 63.23$, df = 5 (P < 0.01); $I^2 = 92.1\%$				
Test for subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 0.68$, df = 1 (P = 0.41)				



Study	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI
Donnez 2017	30	38	30.7%	0.79 [0.63, 0.90]
AbdullGaffar 2022	22	22	3.6%	1.00 [0.85, 1.00]
Huang 2023	33	37	20.7%	0.89 [0.75, 0.97]
Karpathiou 2020	8	8	3.5%	1.00 [0.63, 1.00]
Raimondo 2015	108	120	41.6%	0.90 [0.83, 0.95]
Total (95% CI)	**225**		**100.0%**	**0.88 [0.81, 0.93]**

Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.09$; $Chi^2 = 5.28$, df = 4 (P = 0.26); $I^2 = 24.3\%$



Study	Experimental Events	Experimental Total	Control Events	Control Total	Weight	Risk Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI
Higuchi 2021	49	63	8	21	83.6%	2.04 [1.17, 3.58]
Huang 2023	37	37	1	3	16.4%	2.63 [0.74, 9.33]
Total (95% CI)		**100**		**24**	**100.0%**	**2.13 [1.27, 3.55]**

Heterogeneity: Tau^2 = 0; Chi^2 = 0.13, df = 1 (P = 0.72); I^2 = 0%

Test for overall effect: Z = 2.89 (P < 0.01)



Study	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI
Shapira 2019	7	59	10.4%	0.12 [0.05, 0.23]
Donnez 2017	8	38	10.4%	0.21 [0.10, 0.37]
Higuchi 2021	27	63	11.7%	0.43 [0.30, 0.56]
Tanimura 2015	6	22	9.6%	0.27 [0.11, 0.50]
Wang 2025	30	69	11.8%	0.43 [0.32, 0.56]
Amro 2024	23	60	11.6%	0.38 [0.26, 0.52]
Karpathiou 2020	1	8	4.9%	0.12 [0.00, 0.53]
Morris 1995	14	51	11.2%	0.27 [0.16, 0.42]
Hladchuk 2024	32	38	10.0%	0.84 [0.69, 0.94]
Gubbini 2011	3	41	8.5%	0.07 [0.02, 0.20]
Total (95% CI)		**449**	**100.0%**	**0.31 [0.20, 0.44]**

Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.71$; $Chi^2 = 59.31$, df = 9 ($P < 0.01$); $I^2 = 84.8\%$



Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI
High				
Shapira 2019	7	59	10.4%	0.12 [0.05, 0.23]
Donnez 2017	8	38	10.4%	0.21 [0.10, 0.37]
Higuchi 2021	27	63	11.7%	0.43 [0.30, 0.56]
Tanimura 2015	6	22	9.6%	0.27 [0.11, 0.50]
Amro 2024	23	60	11.6%	0.38 [0.26, 0.52]
Karpathiou 2020	1	8	4.9%	0.12 [0.00, 0.53]
Morris 1995	14	51	11.2%	0.27 [0.16, 0.42]
Total (95% CI)		**369**	**69.8%**	**0.27 [0.19, 0.37]**
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.25$; $Chi^2 = 17.76$, df = 6 (P < 0.01); $I^2 = 66.2\%$				
Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA)				
Some concerns				
Wang 2025	30	69	11.8%	0.43 [0.32, 0.56]
Gubbini 2011	3	41	8.5%	0.07 [0.02, 0.20]
Total (95% CI)		**230**	**20.2%**	**0.21 [0.03, 0.71]**
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 2.38$; $Chi^2 = 12.38$, df = 1 (P < 0.01); $I^2 = 91.9\%$				
Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA)				
Critical				
Hladchuk 2024	32	38	10.0%	0.84 [0.69, 0.94]
Total (95% CI)		**449**	**100.0%**	**0.31 [0.20, 0.44]**
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.71$; $Chi^2 = 59.31$, df = 9 (P < 0.01); $I^2 = 84.8\%$				
Test for subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 28.30$, df = 2 (P < 0.01)				



Study	Experimental Events	Experimental Total	Control Events	Control Total	Weight	Risk Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI
Higuchi 2021	27	63	3	21	88.6%	3.00 [1.01, 8.89]
Karpathiou 2020	1	8	0	5	11.4%	2.00 [0.10, 41.37]
Total (95% CI)		**71**		**26**	**100.0%**	**2.86 [1.03, 7.96]**

Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$; $Chi^2 = 0.06$, df = 1 (P = 0.80); $I^2 = 0\%$
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.02 (P = 0.04)



Study	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI
Shapira 2019	31	59	35.9%	0.53 [0.39, 0.66]
Amro 2024	19	60	35.5%	0.32 [0.20, 0.45]
Hladchuk 2024	4	38	28.5%	0.11 [0.03, 0.25]
Total (95% CI)		**157**	**100.0%**	**0.30 [0.13, 0.55]**

Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.75$; $Chi^2 = 15.89$, df = 2 ($P < 0.01$); $I^2 = 87.4\%$



Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI
High				
Shapira 2019	31	59	35.9%	0.53 [0.39, 0.66]
Amro 2024	19	60	35.5%	0.32 [0.20, 0.45]
Total (95% CI)		**369**	**71.5%**	**0.42 [0.23, 0.63]**
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.31$; $Chi^2 = 5.23$, df = 1 (P = 0.02); $I^2 = 80.9\%$				
Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA)				
Critical				
Hladchuk 2024	4	38	28.5%	0.11 [0.03, 0.25]
Total (95% CI)		**157**	**100.0%**	**0.30 [0.13, 0.55]**
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.75$; $Chi^2 = 15.89$, df = 2 (P < 0.01); $I^2 = 87.4\%$				
Test for subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 7.00$, df = 1 (P < 0.01)				



Study	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI
Wang 2025	60	69	25.6%	0.87 [0.77, 0.94]
Maudot 2024	8	9	2.9%	0.89 [0.52, 1.00]
Amro 2024	47	60	33.4%	0.78 [0.66, 0.88]
AbdullGaffar 2022	17	22	12.7%	0.77 [0.55, 0.92]
Huang 2023	29	37	20.5%	0.78 [0.62, 0.90]
Karpathiou 2020	6	8	4.9%	0.75 [0.35, 0.97]
Total (95% CI)	**205**	**100.0%**	**0.81 [0.75, 0.86]**	

Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$; $Chi^2 = 2.74$, df = 5 (P = 0.74); $I^2 = 0.0\%$