

Supplementary Table 5. Subgroup analyses for comparing postoperative sexual functions between conventional and nerve sparing radical surgery for cervical cancer

Category	No. of studies	OR	95% CI	Heterogeneity		Model used
				p-value	I ²	
Decrease of sexual interest						
Study design						
Prospective	2	0.305	0.043–2.170	0.055	72.839	Random effects
Retrospective	3	0.774	0.467–1.281	0.461	<0.001	Fixed effect
Quality of study (NOS)						
≥8	4	0.480	0.194–1.185	0.011	73.057	Random effects
Surgical approach						
Laparotomy	3	0.911	0.532–1.560	0.967	<0.001	Fixed effect
Radicality						
Type III or C	4	0.786	0.484–1.277	0.659	<0.001	Fixed effect
Follow-up for evaluating dysfunctions (mo)						
12	4	0.440	0.166–1.166	0.020	69.574	Random effects
Adjustment for potential confounding factors						
Age, adjuvant treatment, FIGO stage	4	0.480	0.194–1.185	0.011	73.057	Random effects
Age, adjuvant treatment, extent of lymphadenectomy, FIGO stage	3	0.378	0.112–1.269	0.017	75.327	Random effects
Dyspareunia						
Surgical approach						
Laparotomy	2	0.763	0.408–1.426	0.449	<0.001	Fixed effect
Radicality						
Type III or C	2	0.711	0.389–1.298	0.530	<0.001	Fixed effect
Follow-up for evaluating dysfunctions (mo)						
12	2	0.504	0.223–1.138	0.754	<0.001	Fixed effect
Adjustment for potential confounding factors						
Age, adjuvant treatment, extent of lymphadenectomy, FIGO stage	3	0.759	0.350–1.648	0.467	75.327	Fixed effect

CI, confidence interval; FIGO, International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics; NOS, the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale; OR, odds ratio.