



ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Obstetrics & Gynaecology

CAESAREAN SCAR ECTOPIC PREGNANCY: CASE SERIES, OUTCOMES ANALYSIS, AND ALGORITHMIC APPROACH AT A TERTIARY CARE CENTRE

KEY WORDS: Caesarean, Haemorrhage, Beta HCG, hysterectomy, hysterotomy.

Dr. Sangeeta Aggarwal

Professor, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Government Medical College and Rajindra Hospital, Patiala, Punjab, India

Dr. Navneet Kaur*

Associate Professor, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Government Medical College and Rajindra Hospital, Patiala, Punjab, India*Corresponding Author

Dr. Parneet Kaur

Professor and Head, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Government Medical College and Rajindra Hospital, Patiala, Punjab, India

ABSTRACT

Background: Caesarean scar pregnancy (CSP) is an uncommon and potentially dangerous complication following a caesarean section, with treatment methods continuously adapting as new evidence emerges. **Objective:** To assess CSP cases at a tertiary centre, document treatment results, and suggest a management algorithm that considers patient-specific factors and stability. **Methods:** This prospective observational study involved 13 cases from May 2024 to August 2025. Data were examined for demographics, presentation, imaging, beta-HCG levels, management strategies, and outcomes. **Results:** The average gestational age was 7.3 weeks (ranging from 5 to 13 weeks), with beta-HCG levels between 418 and 186,857 IU/mL. The most frequent treatments included suction/evacuation (30.8%) and hysterectomy (23.1%), with other options such as medical management. Conservative management was effective in early-stage cases, while advanced or ruptured CSP required surgical intervention. These findings are consistent with recent systematic reviews and institutional studies. **Conclusion:** Early and personalized management enhances outcomes. A step-by-step, algorithmic approach is advised.

INTRODUCTION

Caesarean scar is an abnormal implantation of the gestational sac in the area of the prior caesarean delivery (CD) scar ¹. Caesarean scar pregnancy (CSP) is a rare but increasingly identified subtype of ectopic pregnancy characterized by implantation of the gestational sac within the fibrous tissue of a previous caesarean section scar ². The increase in the rate of Caesarean Delivery (CD) in the last decades has caused an increment of both short- and long- term complications, such as uterine rupture, Placenta accreta Spectrum (PAS), hysterectomy, Caesarean Scar Pregnancy (CSP) and compromised fertility. The incidence of caesarean scar pregnancy (CSP) is increasing reflecting the global increase in caesarean section (CS) rate which has almost doubled since 2000 ³. The first case of CSP was reported in 1978 in a patient with a previous caesarean section (CS) who had heavy bleeding and abdominal pain after uterine curettage for a suspected miscarriage at 6 weeks. The CSD can be defined in terms of depth, residual myometrial thickness (RMT), and adjacent myometrial thickness (AMT). When the depth is more than 2 mm or RMT is <5 mm the defect is known as a niche. A large CSD is a defect with a 50%–80% reduction in wall thickness compared to the AMT or if the RMT is <2.2 mm by transvaginal ultrasound (TVUS) or <2.5 mm by hysterosalpingogram ⁴. This abnormal implantation carries significant clinical risks, including severe haemorrhage, uterine rupture, and potential loss of fertility, posing substantial diagnostic and therapeutic challenges. The ultrasound is the primary imaging modality for diagnosis. Approximately one third of the women with caesarean scar pregnancies are asymptomatic. The global rise in caesarean delivery rates, coupled with advances in imaging techniques such as transvaginal ultrasound and MRI, has contributed to the increased detection of CSP and rate has almost doubled since 2000 ⁵. Understanding the evolving risk factors—such as multiple caesarean sections, uterine surgery, and impaired scar healing—is critical for early diagnosis and appropriate management. The most frequent symptom is light, painless vaginal bleeding. Clinical examination is often unremarkable. Some patients have mild lower abdominal pain and tenderness.

The algorithm for the management of Caesarean Scar Pregnancy is:

1: Diagnosis of caesarean scar pregnancy was confirmed by transvaginal ultrasound ±MRI. The gestational age, viability (cardiac activity), -hCG level, scar thickness, hemodynamic stability, fertility desire was confirmed ³.

2: Assess Hemodynamic Status, if the patient was Unstable (shock, active bleeding), then Laparotomy ±Hysterectomy was done. If stable, then proceed to treatment selection.

3: After determining the gestational status:
 If 1. Early, Non-viable CSP (≤8 weeks, no cardiac activity, low -hCG, stable patient), then Systemic Methotrexate (MTX) (preferred) ± Uterine artery embolization (UAE) for bleeding control
 2. Viable CSP (Cardiac activity present, stable patient, fertility desired): Local injection (MTX / KCl) under USG or hysteroscopy guidance ±UAE or hysteroscopic resection
 3. Large Gestation / Failed Medical Management / Scar Defect Repair Needed, then laparoscopic resection & scar repair (preferred if expertise available) or laparotomy if laparoscopy not feasible
 4. If severe bleeding and no fertility desire or failed conservative management, then hysterectomy (definitive, life-saving). done is

The follow up of the patients is done by:
 Serial β-HCG monitoring until undetectable
 Ultrasound to confirm resolution
 Counselling is done and advised to delay the conception ≥1 year and discuss the recurrence risk also.

Diagnostic evaluation of CSP relies primarily on characteristic ultrasound findings, including an empty uterine cavity and cervical canal, a gestational sac embedded at the caesarean scar site, and reduced myometrial thickness between the bladder and sac with MRI serving as a complementary modality in complex cases ⁶. Treatment modalities vary widely, encompassing medical management with systemic or local methotrexate, expectant management, and surgical interventions such as hysteroscopic resection or laparoscopic excision ⁷. These approaches require careful individualization based on gestational age, hemodynamic stability, and reproductive goals to optimize maternal safety and preserve fertility. Once diagnosed, the recommendation is to offer early termination of pregnancy because of the potential risks of continuing the pregnancy. Currently, first

trimester termination is recommended to minimize complications. Multidisciplinary collaboration is essential to develop tailored treatment plans that balance these priorities effectively.

Aims and Objectives

To report a prospective case series of 13 Caesarean scar pregnancies with detailed outcomes.

To analyse efficacy and safety of various management strategies.

To formulate a practical, evidence-based management algorithm.

Materials and Methods

This prospective interventional study included a case series which comprised of 13 confirmed CSP cases managed between May 2024 and August 2025 at Govt. Medical College Patiala, a tertiary care centre. Transvaginal ultrasound is the first line modality for diagnosing CSP criteria's. Diagnosis followed Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine (SMFM) and ACOG criteria:

Empty uterine cavity Empty cervical canal Gestational sac located in the anterior lower uterine segment/ at the level of prior caesarean scar Thin or absent myometrium between the gestational sac and the bladder Increased peritrophoblastic / periplacental vascularity on doppler.

Data abstracted included: age, parity, number of LSCS, gestational age, beta-HCG, presenting signs/symptoms, imaging, management [medical, surgical], and follow-up. Descriptive statistics summarized distributions and frequencies. Institutional protocols prioritized conservative management in stable, early, non-viable CSP and surgery for late or emergent presentations—as described in current international reviews and single institution experiences .

Observations and Results

Thirteen patients presented with CSP during this time period. Their demographic profile, clinical presentation, imaging findings, period of gestation, treatment and outcomes were analysed.

Our study reflects:

- Average POG at diagnosis as 5 to 7 weeks (69.2%)
- All patients were symptomatic except one
- All with at least one prior LSCS, most has 2-3.
- Beta hcg levels: 418 to 186857 IU
- CSP confirmed in all conservative surgical management (suction and evacuation) being the most common (53.8%) followed by definitive surgery (hysterectomy) (23%) followed by medical management (0.8%).
- Symptoms: Vaginal bleeding and pain were most common. Several patients reported with recent medical abortion kit intakes.

Two conservatively managed patients recovered with regular menses. Advanced/ruptured caesarean scar pregnancies required hysterectomy or more complex surgery, these required transfusion and critical care. But the patients recovered and were discharged in satisfactory condition. The following table reflects the results of our study. 3 patients were lost to follow up.

DISCUSSION

Our study reflects spectrum of management options, from conservative to definitive surgery guided by clinical stability, imaging findings, and patients wish for fertility. Findings at RHP are consistent with literature, which emphasizes that no single modality is universally superior instead management must be individualised.

Our findings align with recent systematic reviews and multi centre reports describing the heterogeneity of CSP

presentation and the absence of a consensus management pathway² . In our cohort, conservative management using suction or methotrexate was successful for stable, early, or non-viable CSP, confirming results from Wang et al. and Karahasanoglu et al⁷.

The risk of catastrophic haemorrhage, placenta accreta, and uterine rupture— in both our series and published literature—requires that late presenters and unstable cases be triaged to prompt surgery (hysterectomy, hysterectomy) ⁹. Our management algorithm (see below) mirrors proposals from recent expert reviews, stratifying by stability, gestational age, and fertility wishes ⁷. The surgery was done in our study in cases of haemorrhage or failed conservative management which was similar to study done by Andrea Kaelin Agten et al ¹⁶

Success with suction/evacuation and methotrexate in our and comparable cohorts supports their use for early CSP with favourable anatomy. Failure or progression of conservative management—including rising beta-HCG or increased bleeding—should prompt escalation according to published guidelines ^{3, 2}.

AGE OBSTETRICAL FORMULA PREV LSCS	GESTATIONAL AGE AT DIAGNOSIS	BETA HCG AT DIAGNOSIS(IU/ML)	TVUS/MRI FINDINGS	TREATMENT MODALITY
27 yrs old GSP2L2A2 WITH PREV 2 LSCS	6 weeks POG	2558 Repeat levels: 27,102	GS SAC WITH YOLK SAC AND FETAL POLE WITHOUT CARDIAC ACTIVITY AT PRIOR SCAR SITE, MYOMETRIUM 1.5mm	Injection methotrexate + Ietrozole f/b suction and evacuation
31 yrs old GSP2L2 PREV 2 LSCS	7 weeks POG	186857	SCAR SITE ECTOPIC PREGNANCY AND MYOMETRIAL THINNING ON TVUS	Suction and evacuation
32 yrs old GSP2L2 PREV 2 LSCS	10 weeks POG	1249 REPEAT: 535	10 mm Gsac at prior scar site on MRI	suction and evacuation
AGE OBSTETRICAL FORMULA PREV LSCS	GESTATIONAL AGE AT DIAGNOSIS	BETA HCG LEVELS AT DIAGNOSIS	TVUS/MRI FINDINGS	TREATMENT MODALITY
29 yrs old GSP2L2 PREV 2 LSCS	6 weeks 3 days POG	2229 REPEAT:625.5	RPOCS SEEN AT SCAR SITE ON MRI	SUCTION AND EVACUATION
35 yrs old GSP2L2 PREV 2 LSCS	7 weeks POG	2533 REPEAT:167	GSAC SEEN AT LUS WITHOUT CARDIAC ACTIVITY	SUCTION AND EVACUATION
32 YRS OLD GSP2L2 PREV 2 LSCS	13 weeks POG	449 REPEAT:251	14 MM RPOCS AT SCAR SITE	LAPROSCOPIC GUIDED SUCTION AND EVACUATION
28 yrs old GSP1L1 PREV1LSCS	5 weeks POG	2245	Gsac ADJACENT TO SCAR SITE ON TVUS	SUCTION AND EVACUATION
AGE OBSTETRICAL FORMULA PREV LSCS	GESTATIONAL AGE AT DIAGNOSIS	BETA HCG LEVELS AT DIAGNOSIS (IU/ML)	TVUS/MRI FINDINGS	TREATMENT MODALITY
34 yrs old GSP3L3A2 PREV 3 LSCS	5 weeks POG	46,054	SCAR SITE PREGNANCY AND MYOMETRIAL THINNING	HYSTEROTOMY FOLLOWED BY BLADDER REPAIR
35 yrs OLD GSP3L3A1 PREV 2 LSCS	6 WEEKS POG	418	1.3-1.6cm STRUCTURE AT LUS WITH MYOMETRIAL THINNING(less than 2 mm)	HYSTEROTOMY WITH BILATERAL TUBECTOMY
AGE OBSTETRICAL FORMULA PREV LSCS	GESTATIONAL AGE AT DIAGNOSIS	BETA HCG LEVELS AT DIAGNOSIS (IU/ML)	TVUS/MRI FINDINGS	TREATMENT MODALITY
31 YRS OLD P3L3A1 PREV 1LSCS	HISTORY OF MULTIPLE MTP KIT INTAKE AND PRIOR D AND C	51,860	ENDOMETRIAL THINNING 40-41 mm HYPERVASCULAR ADHERENT RPOCS AT SCAR SITE	SUCTION AND EVACUATION WHICH LEAD TO PRUFUSE BLEEDING HENCE LAPROTOMY WAS DONE LEADING TO HYSTERECTOMY
32 yrs old GSP2L2 PREV 2 LSCS	PRESENTED WITH RUPTURED SCAR SITE ECTOPIC PREGNANCY			EMERGENCY LAPROTOMY FOLLOWED BY HYSTERECTOMY AND BLADDER REPAIR 4 PRBCs,4FFP AND 2PCs were TRANSFUSED LAPROTOMY FOLLOWED BY SUBTOTAL HYSTERECTOMY 3 PRBCs WERE TRANSFUSED INTRAOP
31 yrs old P3L3A1 PREV 3 LSCS	20 weeks POG HISTORY OF D AND C 15 days back		ADHERENT PLACENTA WAS SEEN ON MRI	FOLLOWED BY SUBTOTAL HYSTERECTOMY

CONCLUSION

The management of caesarean scar pregnancy (CSP) requires a nuanced, patient-centred approach that integrates clinical stability, gestational age, and reproductive intentions. The increasing rates of the caesarean sections in the recent years have increased the incidence of caesarean scar pregnancies with time ⁸. Our proposed algorithm, aligned with recent expert recommendations, emphasizes early detection through routine ultrasound screening and prioritizes conservative interventions such as suction/evacuation combined with methotrexate for early-stage CSP with favourable anatomical features ⁷. Close monitoring is essential, with prompt escalation to more invasive procedures in cases of treatment failure, rising beta-HCG levels, or increased haemorrhage, consistent with established guidelines ¹⁰.

Counselling plays a very important role and the patient should be explained about more chances of the caesarean scar pregnancy in patients with history of previous caesarean scar pregnancy managed conservatively. Implementing a stratified, algorithmic management plan can significantly reduce morbidity associated with CSP while optimizing fertility preservation. The evidence from our cohort and international literature supports this tailored strategy as effective and safe. Ultimately, multidisciplinary collaboration and individualized care plans remain critical to balancing maternal safety with reproductive outcomes in this complex clinical condition.

REFERENCES

1. Timor-Tritsch IE, Palacios-Jaraquemada JM, Arslan AA, et al. Caesarean scar pregnancy and early placenta accreta share common histology. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol.* 2014;43(4):383-95.
2. Timor-Tritsch IE, Monteagudo A, Bennett TA, et al. A new minimally invasive treatment for caesarean scar pregnancy and cervical pregnancy. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2016;215(3):351.e1-351.e8.
3. Birch Petersen K, Hoffmann E, Rifbjerg Larsen C, Nielsen HS. Caesarean scar pregnancy: a systematic review of treatment studies. *Fertil Steril.* 2016; 105(4):958-67.
4. Hegde CV. Caesarean Scar Pregnancy: Some Management Options. *J Obstet Gynecol India.* 2017;67(3):153-56.
5. Giampaolino P, De Rosa N, Morra I, et al. Management of Caesarean Scar Pregnancy: A Single-Institution Retrospective Review. *Biomed Res Int.* 2018; 2018:6486407.
6. Karahasanoglu A, Ozdemir M, Deregözü A, Uzun I. Successful Treatment of Caesarean Scar Pregnancy with Suction Curettage: Our Experiences in Early Pregnancy. *Ochsner J.* 2018; 18(3):222-25.
7. Wang S, Beejadhursing R, Ma X, Li Y. Management of Caesarean scar pregnancy with or without methotrexate before curettage: human chorionic gonadotropin trends and patient outcomes. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2018; 18(1):317.
8. T, P Mirable C. Expectant Management of Caesarean Scar Ectopic Pregnancy: A Case Report. *Gynecol Obstet Case Rep.* 2020; 6(1):84.
9. Fowler ML, Little S, Muto M, Mahalingaiah S. Mid-trimester caesarean scar pregnancy: a case report. *Fertil Res Pract.* 2021; 7(1):10.
10. Mohamed Siraj Shahul Hameed , Ann Wright , Bernard Su Min Chern. Caesarean Scar Pregnancy: Current Understanding and Treatment Including Role of Minimally Invasive Surgical Techniques *Gynecol Minim Invasive Therapy.* 2023 Apr 19; 12(2):64-71.
11. Raja Rajeswari K. S., Anushri Manimaran, Priya Shaunthani, Caesarean scar pregnancy: diagnostic dilemma. Rajeswari KSR et al. *Int J Reprod Contracept Obstet Gynecol.* 2023 Dec; 12(12):3692-94.
12. Roberta Granese, Ferdinando Antonio Gulino, Giosuè Giordano Incognito, Canio Martinelli, Stefano Cianci and Alfredo Ercoli. Scar Pregnancy: A Rare, but Challenging, Obstetric Condition. *J. Clin. Med.* 2023, 12, 3975.
13. Pradeep M Jayaram Gbemisola O Okunoye Justin Konje. Caesarean scar ectopic pregnancy: diagnostic challenges and management options. *TOG The Obstetrician and Gynaecologist.* 2017 Jan; 19(1):13-20.
14. Beatriz Silva, Pedro Viana Pinto, Maria Antonia Costa. Caesarean Scar Pregnancy: A systematic review on expectant management. *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology and Reproductive Biology* 288 (2023) 36-43.
15. Russell Miller, and Cynthia Gyamfi-Bannerman. Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine Consult Series #63: Cesarean scar ectopic pregnancy September 2022: B9-20.
16. Andrea Kaelin Agten et al. First-trimester cesarean scar pregnancy: a comparative analysis of treatment options from the international registry. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology* Volume 230, Issue 6, June 2024, Pages 669.e1-669.e19.
17. Suzuki N, Kyozuka H, Fukuda T, Murata T, Kanno A, Yasuda S, et al. Late-diagnosed cesarean scar pregnancy resulting in unexpected placenta accreta spectrum necessitating hysterectomy. *Fukushima J Med Sci* 2020; 66(3):156-9.
18. Orhan A, Kasapoğlu I, Çetinkaya Demir B, Ozerkan K, Duzok N, Uncu G. Different treatment modalities and outcomes in cesarean scar pregnancy: a retrospective analysis of 31 cases in a university hospital. *Ginekol Pol* 2019; 90(6):291-307.