

Patient-centered fertility care Special Interest Group Group Safety and Quality

& the Task Force Developing Countries and Infertility

27 June 2010 Rome, Italy

PRE-CONGRESS COURSE 10 – Table of contents

Patient-centered Fertility Care

Organised by the Special Interest Group Safety and Quality in ART and the Task Forces Mild Approaches in Assisted Reproduction and Developing Countries and Infertility

Introduction to ESHRE	Page 3
Course programme	Page 9
Speakers' contributions	
Why do couples drop out from infertility treatment? - Bart Fauser (The Netherlands)	Page 11
Mild stimulation protocols for IVF: an update - Geeta Nargund (United Kingdom)	Page 22
Coming soon to your clinic: patient-centered high-quality care - Jan Kremer (Th Netherlands)	e Page 38
Lifestyle factors and infertility - Nick Macklon (United Kingdom)	Page 49
Infertility-related stress in men and women - Jacky Boivin (United Kingdom)	Page 62
Patient-friendly ART: the patients view – Clare Lewis-Jones (United Kingdom)	Page 71
Accessible and affordable infertility services in developing countries - Willem Ombelet (Belgium)	Page 90
IVF in developing countries: Principles, procedures and protocols – Jonathan Va Blerkom (USA)	an Page 100
Upcoming ESHRE activities	Page 104
Notes	Page 106



ESHRE – European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology

What is ESHRE?

ESHRE was founded in 1985 and its Mission Statement is to:

- promote interest in, and understanding of, reproductive science and medicine.
- facilitate research and dissemination of research findings in human reproduction and embryology to the general public, scientists, clinicians and patient associations.
- inform politicians and policy makers in Europe.
- · promote improvements in clinical practice through educational activities
- · develop and maintain data registries
- · implement methods to improve safety and quality assurance



Chairman	 Luca Gianaroli 	Italy	
Chairman Elect	 Anna Veiga 	Spain	
Past Chairman	 Joep Geraedts 	Netherlands	
	 Jean François Guérin 	France	
	 Timur Gürgan 	Turkey	
	 Ursula Eichenlaub-Ritte 	r Germany	
	 Antonis Makrigiannakis 	Greece	
	 Miodrag Stojkovic 	Serbia	
	 Anne-Maria Suikkari 	Finland	
	 Carlos Plancha 	Portugal	
	 Françoise Shenfield 	United Kingdom	
	 Etienne Van den Abbee 	l Belgium	
	 Heidi Van Ranst 	Belgium	
	 Veljko Vlaisavljevic 	Slovenia	
	 Søren Ziebe 	Denmark	





ESHRE Activities – Annual Meeting

One of the most important events in reproductive science and medicine
 Steady increase in terms of attendance and of scientific recognition

Track record: ESHRE 2008 – Barcelona: 7559 participants ESHRE 2009 – Amsterdam: 8132 participants

Future meetings:

ESHRE 2010 – Rome, 27-30 June 2010 ESHRE 2011 – Stockholm, 3-6 July 2011





ESHRE Activities – Campus and Data Collection

- · Educational Activities / Workshops
- · Meetings on dedicated topics are organised across Europe
- Organised by the Special Interest Groups
- Visit: www.eshre.eu under CALENDAR
- Data collection and monitoring
 - EIM data collection
 - PGD data collection
 - Cross border reproductive care survey



ESHRE Activities - Other

- Embryology Certification
- · Guidelines & position papers
- · News magazine "Focus on Reproduction"
- Web services:
- RSS feeds for news in reproductive medicine / science

facebook

- Find a member
- ESHRE Community



shre

ESHRE Membership (1/3)

- ESHRE represents over 5,300 members (infertility specialists, embryologists, geneticists, stem cell scientists, developmental biologists, technicians and nurses)
- Overall, the membership is distributed over 114 different countries, with 50% of members from Europe (EU). 11% come from the US, India and Australia.



	1 yr	3 yrs
Ordinary Member	€60	€180
Paramedical Member*	€30	€90
Student Member**	€30	N.A.

*Paramedical membership applies to support personnel working in a routine environment such as nurses and lab technicians. **Student membership applies to undergraduate, graduate and medical students, residents and postdoctoral research trainees.



ESHRE Membership – Benefits (3/3)

1) Reduced registration fees for all ESHRE activities:			
Annual Meeting	Ordinary	€ 480	(€ 720)
	Students/Paramedicals	€240	(€ 360)
Workshops	All members	€150	(€ 200)

- Reduced <u>subscription fees</u> to all ESHRE journals e.g. for Human Reproduction €191 (€ 573!)
- 3) ESHRE monthly e-newsletter
- 4) News Magazine "Focus on Reproduction" (3 issues p. a.)
- 5) Active participation in the Society's policy-making



Special Interest Groups (SIGs)

The SIGs reflect the scientific interests of the Society's membership and bring together members of the Society in sub-fields of common interest

Embryology

Early Pregnancy

Psychology & Counselling

- Reproductive Genetics Reproductive Surgery
- Endometriosis / Endometrium S
- Ethics & Law
- Safety & Quality in ART
- Stem Cells
- Reproductive Endocrinology



Task Forces

- A task force is a unit established to work on a single defined task / activity
- · Fertility Preservation in Severe Diseases
- Developing Countries and Infertility
- Cross Border Reproductive Care
- · Reproduction and Society
- Basic Reproductive Science
- Fertility and Viral Diseases
- Management of Infertility Units
- PGS
- · EU Tissues and Cells Directive



Annual Meeting Rome, Italy 27 June to 30 June 2010 Pre-congress courses (27 June): • PCC 1: Cross-border reproductive care: information and reflection • PCC 2: From gametes to embryo: genetics and developmental biology • PCC 3: New developments in the diagnosis and management of early pregnancy complications • PCC 4: Basic course on environment and human male reproduction • PCC 5: The lost art of ovulation induction • PCC 6: Endometriosis: How new technologies may help • PCC 7: NOTES and single access surgery • PCC 8: Stem cells in reproductive medicine • PCC 9: Current developments and their impact on counselling • PCC 10: Patient-centred fertility care • PCC 11: Fertility preservation in cancer disease • PCC 12: ESHRE journals course for authors eshre

Annual Meeting – Scientific Programme (1/2) Rome, Italy 27 June to 30 June 2010 • Molecular timing in reproduction • Rise and decline of the male • Pluripotency • Preventing maternal death • Use and abuse of sperm in ART • Live surgery • Emerging technologies in the ART laboratory • Debate: Multiple natural cycle IVF versus single stimulated cycle and freezing

Annual Meeting – Scientific Programme (2/2)

- Fertility preservation
- Congenital malformations
- ESHRE guidelines
- Data from the PGD Consortium
- European IVF Monitoring 2007
- Debate: Selection of male/female gametes
- Third party reproduction in the United States
- Debate: Alternative Medicine, patients feeling in control?
- Historical lecture: "Catholicism and human reproduction"



Angesie.

Certificate of attendance

1/ Please fill out the evaluation form during the campus

- 2/ After the campus you can retrieve your certificate of attendance at www.eshre.eu
- 3/ You need to enter the results of the evaluation form online
- 4/ Once the results are entered, you can print the certificate of attendance from the ESHRE website
- 5/ After the campus you will receive an email from ESHRE with the instructions
- 6/ You will have TWO WEEKS to print your certificate of attendance





PRE-CONGRESS COURSE 10 - Programme

Patient-centered Fertility Care

Organised by the Special Interest Group Safety and Quality in ART and the Task Forces Mild Approaches in Assisted Reproduction and Developing Countries and Infertility

<u>Course coordinators</u>: Geeta Nargund (United Kingdom), Jan Kremer (The Netherlands) and Willem Ombelet (Belgium)

<u>Course description</u>: It is our aim to provide an overview of different methods and effective strategies to increase patient satisfaction with fertility care. Methods to improve our understanding of determinants of patient satisfaction will be highlighted as well as possible methods to achieve acceptable live birth rates while minimizing side effects. Strategies to increase accessibility to infertility services in developing countries will be described.

<u>Target audience</u>: Clinicians, psychologists, biologists, embryologists, counsellors, midwives, nurses and other paramedicals working in the field of reproductive medicine.

Scientific programme:

09:00 - 09:30	Why do couples drop out from infertility treatment? - Bart Fauser (The Netherlands)
09.30 - 09:45	Discussion
09.45 - 10:15	Mild stimulation protocols for IVF: an update - Geeta Nargund (United Kingdom)
10:15 – 10:30	Discussion
10:30 - 11:00	Coffee break
11:00 - 11:30	Coming soon to your clinic: patient-centered high-quality care - Jan Kremer (The Netherlands)
11:30 - 11:45	Discussion
11:45 – 12:15	Lifestyle factors and infertility - Nick Macklon (United Kingdom)
12:15 – 12:30	Discussion
12:30 - 13:30	Lunch
13:30 - 14:00	Infertility-related stress in men and women - Jacky Boivin (United Kingdom)
14:00 - 14:15	Discussion
14:15 – 14:45	Patient-friendly ART: the patients view – Clare Lewis-Jones (United Kingdom)
14:45 – 15:00	Discussion
15:00 - 15:30	Coffee break
15:30 - 16:00	Accessible and affordable infertility services in developing countries - Willem Ombelet (Belgium)
16:00 - 16:15	Discussion
16:15 – 16:45	IVF in developing countries: Principles, procedures and protocols – Jonathan Van
	Blerkom (USA)

16:45 – 17:00 Discussion 17:00 Conclusion

ovarian stimulation for IVF; - drop outs

Prof.Dr. Bart CJM Fauser University Medical Center, Utrecht, The Netherlands



















Why discontin (Olivius, F&S	
reasons	percentage

tele Medisch C

porcontago
26
25
19
6
2
7
estionnaire

Comments from 143 patients about care in IVF clinic			
Type of comment	Example	n (%)	
Emotional and stressful reaction due to infertility	Couldn't cope, need a psychologist	25 (17%)	
Organisational problems	Poor organisation, insufficient care, never same people	37 (26%)	
Poor ability to handle psychological distress	Doctors and nurses didn't listen, no empathy	43 (30%)	
Lack of autonomy during treatment	Assembly line, stressful, need more information	60 (42%)	
	Oliviu	us, FS 2004	



Other psychological reasons for IVF discontinuation

Reasons	Reference
Balancing treatment and work committment	Osamangaoglu'99
Distance from clinic	Malcolm'04
Undergone agreed number of cycles	De Vries'99

tair Medisch C

IVF dropouts?	le le	Medisch Centrum Joseph
Research question	Impact of loss to follow-up on cumulative pregnancy rates Pregnancy rate of drop outs between no vs same probability	
Study design	Retrospective, 588 couples starting IVF	i .
Results	Cycle based CPR (3 cycles) - 63-71% as treated - 65% completed Real time CPR (9 months) - 54-59% as treated - 55% completed	
Conclusions	Accurate estimate for PR in drop outs = 14%	







Gynceologie and Obstetrie Investigation	Gynecol Obstet Invest 2009/66/56-64 Restand Accessed Publiced 11439 University University University
Reasons for Drop Treatment	
U. Van den Broeck ^a L. Holvoet ^a T. D'Hooghe ^a	P. Enzlin ^b E. Bakelants ^a K. Demyttenaere ^e
Drop-out reasons accord	ling to degree of impact (n=142)
Psychological burden	6.0
Physical burden	4.5
Women's age	3.6
Relationship burden	3.4
Perceived lack of staff e	mpathy 3.5
Alternatives for child wis	h 2.4
Financial burden	2.2
Negative impact on soci	al contacts 2.1







Incidence o	f drop-out
Incidence	reference
25 %	Osmanagaoglu, 1999
25 %	Olivius, 2004
17 %	Verberg, 2008
18 %	Brandes, 2009







Human Reproduction Vol.20, No.7 pp. 1944–1951, 2005 Advance Access publication March 31, 2005	doi:10.1095/hurreepideh8
A qualitative study of women's decision-making of IVF treatment	at the end

V.L.Peddie^{1,3}, E.van Teijlingen² and S.Bhattacharya¹

Objective	Examine patients perspective of decision making
Methods	Semi-structured interviews in 25 women who decided to end treatment
Results	 Women experience difficulty in accepting infertility remains unresolved Felt that they started with unrealistic expectations Felt vulnerable by pressure of media and society Decision to stop offered way out of emotional distress Had to address issues they previously avoided
Conclusion	Psychological preparation of couples who decide to end IVF should improve

_

_



Miles See	GINAL ARTICLE Populangy and en 'heen and why do sub- scontinue their fertil- longitudinal cohort condary care subfer- brudes', John yan der Stean', S Ch, Hamiten', Je, der Stean', S LAth, Resmer ²	ofertile couples lity care? study in a tility population .B. Bokdam ² ,	vitais Medich Centre Chrocht
Reasons IVF di	scontinuation (n=319)	%	
Emotional dist	ress	49	
Poor prognosi	s (doctor's refusal)	33	
Relationship p	roblems	8.8	
No faith in trea	Itment	7.0	
	ns	1.8	

insured United fertilization trea	vestigation into the reasons why States patients drop out of in vitro tment F&S 2010
Objective	Why insured patients drop out of IVF in the USA ?
Design	Women < 40 yrs, private clinic, insured, not pregnant, who did not return
Results	39% of termination due to stress - toll on couples relationship - too anxious or depressed Suggestion for patient support - written information on how to deal with psychological stress - easy access to psychologist or social worker
Conclusions	US patients similar reasons for terminating IVF compared to Europe and Australia

Questions concerning drop outs

- Frequency of discontinuation of treatment in other areas in medicine?
- Balance IVF outcomes per cycle versus per treatment strategy paradigm
- Balance burden of treatment versus efficacy
- Introduce support by social worker / psychologist
- Implement concept of hostmanship in team

IVF study design issues

How to define success	Conventional context	Current context
Measure of success	Pregnancy rate	Healthy babies
Relevant denominator	Per cycle	Per started treatment (given period of time)
Success context	Isolated focus on success	Holistic approach involving success in relation to discomfort, stress, complications and cost







Cycle specific characteristics

	Mild treatment (n=444)	Standard treatment (n=325)	р
Duration of ovarian stimulation (days)	8-3 (2-2)	11-5 (3)	<0.0001*
Duration of injections (days)	8-5 (2-7)	25-3 (6-8)	<0.0001*
fotal dose of follicle stimulating hormone (IU)	1307 (529)	1832 (758)	<0.0001*
ancellation of started cycle	80 (18-0%)	27 (8-3%)	<0.0001
Rumber of oocytes per retrieval	6-9 (4-8)	85(43)	<0.0001*
Number of embryos per retrieval	2-8 (2-7)	3-8 (2-9)	0-0002*
iumber of cryopreserved embryos per fresh embry transfer cycle	0.9(1.8)	0-6 (2-4)	0.04*
Continuing pregnancy per started cycle (fresh embryos)	78 (17-6%)	93 (28-6%)	<0.0001
Continuing pregnancy per started cycle (oryopreserved embryos)	6 (1.4%)	4 (1-2%)	0-8†
ferm livebirth per started cycle (fresh embryos)	70 (15-8%)	78 (24-0%)	0-0031
ferm livebirth per started cycle (cryopreserved embryos)	49 (1.1%)	3 (0.9%)	0-8†
Ovarian hyperstimulation syndrome	6 (1-4%)	12 (3-7%)	0-041
alues are mean (SD) or number (%) of cycles. *t test for difference or 1 Pearson χ^2 t varian hyperstimulation syndrome.	test for difference. #Embryos su	itable for embryo transfer. SMi	id, moderate, and severe

0



Patient distre	Universitäle Medisch Centrum
Effectiveness of a psychosocial counselling intervention for first-time IVF couples: a randomized controlled trial HR 2005- Cab they'', JALMAR (J.L.M. Bunner, J.M. and Oner, M. J.M. Bunner, Provinty, and N.N. Sakahari, J.	Conclusions: Little perceived need for counselling No difference 3 counselling sessions
The psychological impact of mild ovarian stimulation combined with single embryo transfer compared with conventional IVE <i>HR 2006</i> .	More physical and depressive symptoms during down regulation in conventional IVF
The psychological impact of IVF failure after two or more cycles of IVF with a mild versus standard treatment strategy HR 2007 C dr Kink ¹ / N.S. Methods ¹ , EALEN, Brigne ¹⁰ , M.J.C. Eijkenser ¹ , R.C.M. Faner ¹⁰	Failed IVF results in less depressive symptoms after mild IVF

Low negative affect prior to treatment is associated with a decreased chance of live brint from a first IVF cycle HR 2006 C & Kell^V-1.AM. Mudde¹, MLNN. Bigen², MLC Tightmen, RCJAM. Family² Product and States of the states of the

























Drop outs in IVF	
Definition	Event of interest cannot be observed
Frequency	Up to 30%
Statistical handling	Assume no, normal, or intermediate chance of pregnancy
Causes	 Stress, marital difficulty, family, work Discomfort, side effects, complications Poor prognosis, counselling by doctor Money

Mild stimulation protocols for IVF: An update

Geeta Nargund FRCOG

Lead Consultant, Department of Reproductive Medicine St George's Hospital, London

President

International Society for Mild Approaches in Assisted Reproduction (ISMAAR) –Registered Charity 1123677 www.ismaar.org

Learning Objectives

- To outline the terminology for mild stimulation protocols for IVF
- To discuss different protocols for mild stimulation
- To discuss basic physiology of follicular maturation
- To present scientific evidence for Natural & Mild IVF
- To outline the problems with conventional IVF
- To discuss the benefits of Mild/Natural IVF
- To evaluate monitoring methods for Mild/Natural IVF
- To highlight safety & cost-effectiveness of mild approaches in ART

Mild stimulation strategies for IVF

- Natural cycle
- Modified natural cycle
- Mild
- -Clomid + hCG
- -Clomid +FSH/HMG ± antagonist +hCG
- -Day 5 start FSH+antagonist+hCG
- -FSH + 200iu hCG +antagonist +hCG
- Low dose hCG/agonist for trigger ($\downarrow OHSS$)
- Natural cycle with IVM



Increase simplicity, affordability, Safety, Comfort and Success

Conventional stimulation (downregulation & *high stimulation) approaches:*

- Complex /unphysiological/unnecessary/unpleasant
- Time consuming (up to 4-5 weeks)
- High costs (direct and indirect)
- · Patient discomfort (prolonged injections)
- Menopausal symptoms, Headaches •
- Supra-physiological steroid levels
- OHSS
- · Thrombo-embolism
- Concrn about increase in chromosome abnormalities in oocytes & embryos
- Adverse endometrial conditions ٠
- ٠ Long-term health consequences
- High drop-out rates (psychological burden)

Mild IVF : Why Now?

- · Clinical availability of antagonists
- Advances in Endocrinology
- Latest Ultrasound Technology
- •
- Improved Embryology Elective Single Embryo Transfer ٠
- Fertile women having stimulation for ICSI (male factor only) •
- ٠ Safety & comfort of oocyte donors
- Concerns about embryo & endometrial quality "Cost" of conventional IVF .
- •
- **Cancer survivors requiring ART**
- Increased demand in public health service





<u>The ISMAAR proposal on Terminology for</u> <u>Ovarian Stimulation for IVF</u>

Rotterdam consensus group on Terminology for ovarian stimulation for IVF

Nargund G , Fauser BCJM , Macklon NS , Ombelet W , Nygren K and Frydman R Human Reprod: 1-4,September 2007

For the ISMAAR Consensus Group on Terminology for Ovarian Stimulation for IVF

ISMAAR Definitions				
Terminology	Aim	Methodology		
Natural cycle IVF	Single oocyte	No medication		
Modified Natural cycle IVF	Single oocyte	hCG only Antagonist & FSH/HMG add- back		
Mild IVF	2-7 oocytes	Low dose FSH/HMG, oral compounds & antagonist		
Conventional IVF	≥8 oocytes	Agonist or antagonist conventional FSH/HMG dose		



Modified Natural cycle & Mild IVF -Protocols

Modified natural cycle IVF

Indomethacin 50mg tds

- . Antagonist ± HMG/FSH
- •
- .
- hCG 5k or 10k Flushing or no flushing Luteal support –hCG or progesterone
- Mild IVF
- Clomiphene alone +hCG
- Curomponene atong +hCG
 Day 2 Clomiphene +HMG or rFSH+hCG or Gn RH agonist
 Day 5 FSH + antagonist
 FSH +Low dose hCG+antagonist
 Luteal support hCG or Progesterone

Ultrasound alone is effective for monitoring :Cochrane review 2008

Pre-IVF assessment

- Ovarian reserve assessment (AFC)
- Identifying risks for over-response (PCO, $\downarrow \mathsf{BMI})$
- Monitoring a spontaneous cycle & its length (for natural cycle IVF)
- Planning mild IVF
- · Optimisation of hCG dose
- Availability of facility and expertise













AMH & inhibin B in relation to follicle diameter in small antral follicles

- AMH & inhibin B in follicles 3-12mm
- AMH 1124±158ng/ml in 3mm follicles
- AMH 392±98ng/ml in 12mm follicles (P<0.0005)
- inhibin B 57±10ng/ml in 3mm follicles
- . Inhibin B 142±10ng/ml in 12 mm follicles
- Intrafollicular AMH progressively \downarrow with \uparrow follicle diameter •
- Intrafollicular inhibin B \uparrow with \uparrow follicle diameter
- · AMH, inhibin B are important for follicle selection

Andersen A, Schmidt KT, Kristensen SG et al: Hum Reprod March 2010

Prediction of high ovarian response: AMH vs small AFC (2-6 mm)

- · Prospective study
- 159 patients
- · Basal AMH & small AFC measured
- · AMH & small AFC have same predictive value for high response
- Sensitivity & specificity -89% & 92% (small AFC)
- Sensitivity & specificity 93% & 78% (AMH)

Aflatoonian A, Oskouian H, Ahmadi S and Oskouian L: J Assist Reprod Genet 2009 26 (6); 319-25

Revival of Natural cycle IVF

- 44 cycles
- 33 women (26-36 years)
- . Single dose Cetrorelix & HMG (4.7±1.4 amps)
- 4 cycles cancelled
- 40 oocyte collections ٠
- · 10 cycles with no oocytes 22 embryo transfers ٠
- 7 clinical pregnancies
- 32% clinical pregnancy per ET
 17.5% clinical pregnancy per oocyte collection
- Rongieres-Bertrand C et al Human Repro 1999:14 (3): 683-8

Natural/Modified natural cycle IVF:

Patient selection - Current practice

- Young women with blocked tubes
- In cancer patients & those with family H/O cancer
- Poor responders
- Older women
- Failed implantation
- For those who want to avoid drugs
- Monitoring & Optimisation of cycles
- Normal cycle length
- Follicular-Endometrial synchronisation
- Timing egg collection
- Luteal support

Medication used to prevent LH surge/ ovulation in modified natural cycles

- Indomethacin (50mg TDS)
- Antagonist (2-3 days)
- Indomethacin + Antagonist

Natural Cycle IVF

Cumulative Conception & Live birth Rates: Nargund et al Human Reprod 2001 -181 cycles 82% had eggs collected with 70% fertilisation rate 24%/ET pregnancies : 16.7%/ET LBR -Life table analysis After 4 successive cycles of treatment Cumulative probability of pregnancy -46% Cumulative probability of Live birth -32%

Natural Cycle IVF

Nargund et al: Human Reprod 2001

Conclusions:

- 1.For maximum effectiveness, must be offered as a series of treatment cycles
- 2.Safer, less stressful and can be offered over consecutive cycles
- 3.Can be offered at ~23% of the cost of stimulated cycle

Modified Natural Cycle IVF

- Feldman B et al: Gynae Endo 2001
- Nargund et al: Human Reprod 2001
- Ubaldi FM : RBM online 2005
- -Favourable in poor responders & failed implantation
- -The use of antagonists did not change intrafollicular VEGF/Inhibin A levels

Semi-Natural Cycle IVF

For Poor responders/Low ovarian reserve/Failed implantation

1. Castlo-Branco, Frydman (France) 2004

133 cycles/16.6% pregnancy/oocyte collection 2. Elizur S 2005 -540 cycles-Agonist/Antagonist/Natural IVF 10.6%/6.75%/10.2% pregnancy/cycle

Semi-Natural Cycle is a feasible alternative

Semi-Natural Cycle IVF

Pelinck MJ (Netherlands): Human Reprod 2005

-Late follicular start FSH/Antagonist -50 patients/119 cycles (2.4 cycles/pt) -52 Embryo Transfers -17 ongoing pregnancies -PR = 32.7%/ET Cumulative ongoing pregnancy rate -After 3 cycles: 34% -Live Birth Rate per patient: 32%

Semi-Natural IVF:

In Poor prognosis patients

- Prospective study -133 cycles
- Altered ovarian status & Implantation failure
- 66 patients (AOS -47; IF-19)
- OPU rate (81.2%;61.1%)
- Clinical pregnancy rate/OPU (15.4%;16.6%)

Castelo-Branco A et al:Gynae Obstet Biol Reprod: 2004

Modified Natural cycle IVF: In Poor Responders

- 540 cycles
- Retrospective evaluation
- MNIVF vs Antagonist SIVF vs LongSIVF
- 52 vs 200 vs 288 cycles
- 1.4 vs 2.3 vs 2.5 oocytes
- 10% vs 14.3% vs 6.75% implantation
- 10.2% vs 7.4% vs 10.6% pregnancies Elizur et al: Assist Reprod Genetics 2005

Natural cycle IVF: In Poor Responders

- 294 patients & 500 consecutive cycles
- ≤ 35 : 36-39 : ≥40 years old
- 18.1% : 11.7% : 5.8% pregnancy/cycle
- 29.2% : 20.6% : 10.5% pregnancy/ET
- 31.7% : 20.3% : 10.5% pregnancy/pt NCIVF is an effective treatment. *Schimberni et al: Fertil Steril 2008*

Natural /Modified Natural cycle IVF/ICSI: In cancer risk women

- In BRCA1 & BRCA2 carriers
- H/O breast tumours
- Other oestrogen dependent tumours
- Prior to chemotherapy in other cancers
- Severe endometriosis

An effective & safe option Hirt et al: Fertil steril 2008 Dor J: NCIVF abstracts :2006

Natural cycle IVF with IVM: A New approach?

- In ovulatory Normal & PCO women
- hCG 10,000 IU
- 3 women
- 3 pregnancies
- 2 live births
- Chain RC et al : Fertil Steril 2004
- 350 cycles
- 262 women
- 15.2% ongoing pregnancy rate

Benkhalifa M et al:RBM Online 2009







	Terar	noto	& Kat	to: RB	M Or	nline 2	2007	
Age	27-29	30-32	33-35	36-38	39-41	42-44	45-47	Tota
cycles	107	3335	6286	8465	10688	9732	4767	4434
ETs	499	1460	2671	3279	3447	2522	1011	1488
LBR/ Cycle (%)	14.6	13.5	10.5	7.4	3.1	1.0	0.1	5.2



Study		Study protocol	Control stimulation protocol	Main outcome
MacDougall et al. (1994)	Patients 38 years with .1 year of infertility, spontaneous ovulatory regular cycles and normal semen analysis	CC 100 mg, from Days 2–6, hCG when the leading follicle was 17 mm (n ½ 16)	Natural cycle IVF with hCG when the leading follicle was 17 mm (n ½ 14)	Cancellation rate 0 versus 71% Ongoing pregnancy rate 13 versus 0% (NS)
Dhont et al. (1995)	Patients with no previous IVF attempts. Treatment included IVF-ET, ZIFT and GIFT	OAC pretreatment, CC 100 mg for 5 Days and (150) subsequent HMG (n % 151)	OAC pretreatment, long acting GnRH agonist and (300 IU) HMG (n ½ 152)	Cancellation rate 20.5 versus 2.6%. Ongoing pregnancy rate 24.5 versus 36.8% (P % 0.02)
Ingerslev et al. (2001)	Couples with no previous IVF attempts under 35 years with ICSI indication, tubal factor or idiopathic infertility	CC 100 mg, from Days 3-7 and hCG when the leading follicle was 20 mm (68 patients, 111 cycles)	Natural cycle IVF with hCG when the leading follicle was 17 mm (64 patients, 114 cycles)	Cycles resulting in embryo transfer 53.2 versus 25.4%. Ongoing pregnancy rate (per cycle) 18.0versus 3.5% (P, 0.001)
Fiedler et al. (2001) (abstract)	Random selected normal cycling women	100 mg CC CD 5+9, from Day 9 additional 150 IU HMG or FSH. GnRH antagonist from Day 10 (n % 295)	100 mg CC CD 5–9, from Day 9 additional 150 IU HMG or FSH (n % 291)	Ongoing pregnancy rate 23 versus 21% (NS)
Weigert et al. (2002)	Women with no previous IVF cycles, between 20 and 39 years, with normal ovulatory cycles with tubal, male factor or unexplained infertility	OAC pretreatment. CC 100 mg for 5 days in combination with 225 IU of rFSH and 75 IU of rLH on alternate days (n % 154)	Long GnRH suppression and 150 IU rFSH (n ½ 140)	Ongoing pregnancy rate 35 versus 29% (NS)
Engel et al. (2003)	Healthy female partners of infertile couples, between 18 and 39 years, with regular cycle length. No more than three previous IVF cycles or basal FSH .10 IU/I	Single dose GinRH antagonist protocol. CC 100 mg CD 2–6 of 3–7, CD 6 start 150 IU rFSH (n ½ 5)	Single dose GnRH antagonist protocol. CC 100 mg CD 2– 6 of 3–7, CD 6 start 150 IU HMG (n % 5)	Live birth rate 40 versus 20% (NS)
Lin et al. (2006)	Couples with male-factor infertility who were about to undergo their first ICSI cycle	CC/HMG. Cetrorelix protocol (n % 60)	buserelin long protocol (n % 60)	Pregnancy rate 41.7 versus 40% (NS)

	_
	_
	_

A Simplified COS protocol for IVF in low resource setting

- Clomiphene 100mg/day day 3-7
- The first ovarian sonography at cycle day 10-12 depending on cycle length
- No antagonists are used
- A single urinary LH at the time when the patient is going to trigger ovulation, that is when the leading follicle is ≥17 mm.
- If urinary LH is positive the retrieval is advanced one day.
- A single dose of hCG 5000 iu is used to trigger ovulation.
- Oocyte retrieval is done irrespective of follicle number.
- No luteal support is given

Andersen et al -Manuscript in preparation

	Inclusion criteria	Study protocol	Control stimulation protocol	Main outcome
De Jong et al. (2000)	Normo-ovulatory patients with a regular indication for IVF	From CD 5 ovarian stimulation with 100 IU/day FSH. GnRH antagonist from CD 8 or from leading foll 13 mm. No luteal support was provided (n % 8)	From CD 5 ovarian stimulation with 150 IU/day FSH. GnRH antagonist from CD 8 or from leading foll 13 mm. No luteal support was provided (n ½ 7)	Multiple follicle development 63 versus 100%. Orgoing pregnancy rate 25 versus 14% (NS)
Hohmann et al. (2003)	Normo-ovulatory patients with a regular indication for IVF (or IVF/ICSI)	Fixed FSH doses 150 IU/day from CD 5, GnRH antagonist from leading foll 14 mm (n % 45)	 Fixed FSH doses 150 IU/day from CD 2, GnRH antagonist from leading foll 14 mm (n % 48). 2. Long GnRH agonist protocol, fixed FSH doses after 2 weeks 150 IU/day (n % 49) 	Ongoing pregnancy rate 16 versus 17% (1.) versus 18% (2.) (NS)
Heijnen et al. (2007)	Regular cycling patients, below 38 years, BMI 19–29	Fixed FSH doses 150 IU/day from CD 5, GnRH antagonist from leading foil 14 mm. Combined with single embryo transfer (205 patients, 444 cycles)	Long GnRH agonist protocol, fixed FSH doses after 2 weeks 150 IU/day (199 patients, 325 cycles)	Ongoing pregnancy rate pe year of treatment 47 versus 51% (NS)
Baart et al. (2007)	Regular cycling patients, below 38 years, BMI 19–29. Sperm count .5 million/ml. First cycles	Fixed FSH doses 150 IU/day from CD 5, GnRH antagonist from leading foll 14 mm (n 14 55)	Long GnRH agonist protocol, fixed FSH doses after 2 weeks 225 IU/day (n ½ 40)	Proportionally less chromosomal abnormal embryos were obtained after mild ovarian stimulation



Mild Vs Standard Strategy Heijnen et al: Lancet 2007 Mild Strategy Standard Strategy

- 444 cycles
- SET
- Term live birth rate
- 43.4% OHSS -1.4%
- Mean cycle -2.3
- 325 cycles • DET • Term live birth rate 44.7%

- OHSS 3.7% • Mean cycle – 1.7

D5 150iu FSH +antagonist

Long protocol+225FSH

What could it mean to the embryologist? Conventional ovarian stimulation: Mild ovarian stimulation: St


Mild+ SET Vs Std +DET (205 cycles Vs 199 cycles)

- Over 1 year (4 Mild vs 3 Std cycles)
- Cost of IVF €8337 Vs 10,745
- 6 vs 16 preterm livebirths (<37weeks)
- Obs/postnatal cost/preg -€1947 vs 4136
- Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio/extra pregnancy-Term livebirth €185k

Polinder et al: Human Reprod 2007

Can 200IU hCG replace FSH in IVF cycles?



Can 200 IU hCG replace FSH in IVF Cycles? Blockeel, De Vos, Verpoest et al HR 2009

rFSH Group (35)

- No with +ve hCG -19
- Positive hCG /cycle- 55%
- Positive hCG/ET-66%
- Live birth/cycle-29%
- Live birth/retrieval-31%
- Live birth/ET -35%
- Low-dose hCG (35)
- No with +ve hCG -17
- Positive hCG/cycle-49%
- Positive hCG/ET-63%
- Live birth/cycle-37%
- Live birth/Retrieval-45%
- Live birth/ET-48%

Low-dose hCG is useful in the prevention of OHSS

Nargund G et al RBM Online 2007

- Women at risk of severe OHSS (PCO/PCOS)
- High ovarian volume & more than 40 follicles
- High vascularity & serum E2 levels
- Low-dose hCG at 2500 iu may be useful in preventing OHSS
- Low-dose hCG does not seem to adversely affect the pregnancy rate of IVF cycles
- The current minimum dose of hCG could be reduced from 5000 iu to 2500 iu
- Further large randomised studies are required

Conclusions

- Minimal effective dose of stimulation based on BMI, age & ovarian reserve to be used in the first cycle
- · Options regarding no/mild stimulation to be offered as appropriate
- Counselling regarding safety ,comfort & success rates & closure essential
- Mild stimulation combined with eSET can help to reduce risks, cost and to increase safety and accessibility of ART
- Natural/Modified Natural cycle are useful in women with H/O poor ovarian response, failed implantation & those at cancer risk
- Mild IVF with oral compounds ± minimal amounts of gonadotrophins is useful in low resource settings
- Further prospective randomised studies are needed

References

- Nargund G, Waterstone J, Bland J, Philips Z, Parsons J, Campbell S, Cumulative conception and live birth rates in natural (unstimulated) IVF cycles. Hum Reprod. 2001 Feb;16(2):259-62.
- Nargund G, Fauser BC, Macklon NS, Ombelet W, Nyeren K, Frydman R; Rotterdam ISMAAR Consensus Group on Terminology for Ovarian Stimulation for IVF. The ISMAAR proposal on terminology for ovarian stimulation for IVF. Hum Reprod. 2007 Nov;22(11):201-4.
- Feldman B, Seidman DS, Levron J, Bider D, Shulman A, Shine S, Dor J. In vitro fertilization following natural cycles in poor responders. Gynecol Endocrinol. 2001 Oct;15(5):328-34.
- <u>Andersen A, Schmidt KT,Kristensen SG et al</u>
 AMH and inhibin B in relation to follicle diameter in small antral follicles in humans,
 Hum Reprod March 2010

References

- Nargund G, Frydman R. Towards a more physiological approach to IVF.
- Reprod Biomed Online. 2007 May;14(5):550-2. Elizur SE, Aslan D, Shulman A, Weisz B, Bider D, Dor J.
- Modified natural cycle using GnRH antagonist can be an optional treatment in poor responders undergoing IVF. J Assist Reprod Genet. 2005 Feb;22(2):75-9.
- Seifer DB, Frazier LM, Grainger DA Disparity in assisted reproductive technologies outcomes in black women compared with white women.
- Fertil Steril. 2007 Nov Pelinck MJ, Vogel NE, Hoek A, Arts EG, Simons AH, Heineman MJ.
- Minimal stimulation IVF with late follicular phase administration of the GnRH antagonist cetrorelix and concomitant substitution with recombinant FSH: a pilot study. Hum Reprod. 2005 Mar;20(3):642-8.
- Ubaldi FM, Rienzi L, Ferrero S, Baroni E, Sapienza F, Cobellis L, Greco E, Management of poor responders in IVF. Reprod Biomed Online. 2005 Feb;10(2):235-46. Review.

References

- Heijnen EM, Eijkemans MJ, De Klerk C, Polinder S, Beckers NG, Klinkert ER, Broekma Velde ER, Macklon NS, Fauser BC. A mild treatment strategy for in-vitro fertilisation: a randomised non-inferiority trial.
- Lancet. 2007 Mar 3;369(9563):743-9.
- Roest J, Verhoeff A, van Heusden AM, Zeilmaker GH. Index of Vention A, van Inducen Ann, centrater on A Minimal monitoring of ovarian hyperstimulation: a useful simplification of the clinical phase of in vitro fertilization treatment. Fertil Steril. 1995 Sep;64(3):552-6.
- Hurst BS, Tucker KE, Schlaff WD. A minimally monitored assisted reproduction stimulation protocol reduces cost without compromising
- success.
- Fertil Steril. 2002 Jan:77(1):98-100.
- Lass A; UK Timing of hCG Group.
- Monitoring of in vitro fertilization-embryo transfer cycles by ultrasound versus by ultrasound and hormonal levels: a prospective, multicenter, randomized study. Fertil Steril 2020 Jul@0(1):80-5.

References

- Castelo-Branco A, Frydman N, Kadoch J, Le Du A, Fernandez H, Fanchin R, Frydman R, [The role of the semi natural cycle as option of treatment of patients with a poor prognosis for successful in vitro ferilization] J Gynecol Obstet Biol Reprod (Paris). 2004 Oct;33(6 Pt 1):518-24. French.
- Sopretor Josset und reprove years; 2000 CCC, 2007 1; 2122-221, Testori, Bonglieres-Bernald, C. Dolvmen, E. Righlin, C. Fandhun, B. Talebi, J. Hannanh, S. Bouchard, P. Endman, R. Revival of the natural cycles in in-vitro fertilization with the use of a new gonadotrophin-releasing hormone antagonis (ICCronolis); a pilot study with minimal stimulation. Hum Reprod. 1999 Mar;14(3):683-8. Teramotol S: Xiao O,
- Jaramino S. Auto U. Minimal ovarian stimulation with clomiphene citrate: a large-scale retrospective study. Reprod Biomed Online. 2007 Aug;15(2):134-48. Alfatonian A. Okavain H. Ahmadi San d Osbouin L: Prediction of high ovarian response:AMH versus small antral folicles (2-6 mm) Jassis Reprod Genet 2009 26 (6): 319-25
- J Assist Neproto Gener 2009 20 (s): 519-25 Verberg MFG,Macklon NS,Nargund G,Frydman R,Devroey P, Broekmans FJ and Fauser BCJM: Mild ovarian stimulation for IVF Human Reproduction Update:2009, 15 (1) 13-29

Coming soon to your clinic: Patient Centered ART



Prof. dr. Jan A.M. Kremer, gynaecologist Head of the IVF centre Nijmegen

UMC 🛞 St Radboud

Radboud University Medical Centre Nijmegen

UMC 🛞 St Radboud

Rome, June 27th, 2010

Learning objectives

- · Know the definition of patient centeredness
- Know the different dimensions of patient centeredness
- · Learn more about the relationship between EBM and PCM
- · Learn how to measure patient centeredness
- Know the possibilities of web 2.0 tools to facilitate patient centeredness













UMC 🛞 St Radboud

Is patient centered ART the same as patient friendly ART?

- Patient-friendly ART is a wrong term; do not use it
 - False attractiveness: too positive, ART and infertility is not friendly
 - No clear definition: could be used for any less invasive form of ART
 Commercial incentives: can be used to prevent drop-outs and to increase the turnover of cycles and medication
- "Patient-centered ART" is much better!







Access to care Respect for patient's values, preferences, needs Coordination and integration of care Information, communication and education Physical comfort Emotional support and alleviation of fear and anxiety Involvement of partner, family and friends Transition and continuity





Page 41 of 113





















UMC 🛞 St Radboud

- State and Trait Anxiety Inventory' (STAI), Spielberger 1983
- Beck Depression Index (BDI)
 Beck 1997



















UMC 🛞 St Radboud

Examples of patient centered PhD projects in Nijmegen

- Shared decision making in SET or DET (A. v. Peperstraten)
- Implementation of clinical guidelines via patients (S.Mourad)
- Stress reduction by online cognitive therapy (J. Dapperen)
- Patient participation in guidelines by wiki's (E. den Breejen)
- Patient participation in leaflets by wiki's (T. van de Belt)
- Evaluation of patient centered Fertility community (A. Aarts)
- Measuring patient centeredness, CQ NL (I. van Empel)
- Measuring patient centeredness, PC Europe (E. Dancet)
- Interactive Personal Health Record (W. Tuil)

















Southampton School of Medicine

Lifestyle factors and infertility

Nick Macklon MD, PhD, FRCOG Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University of Southampton,UK Director, Complete Fertility Centre, Southampton

Disclosures

Southampton School of Medicine

- · I have received research funding and speaker and consultancy fees from:
- Schering Plough, MSD, Merck Serono, Ferring, Anecova

Southampton

Learning Objectives

To understand:

- · How does lifestyle impact on fertility?
- · How does lifestyle impact the embryo?
- · What can we do about it?











Endocrine Impact of Obesity Southampton school of Medicine

•Obesity associated with increased insulin resistance

High serum insulin may drive increased androgen production
Insulin resistance associated with suppression of SHBG

Women with PCOS and obesity have higher T4 than PCOS alone Peripubertal obesity associated with 2 fold increase in T4 levels *Hoeger K, Clin Obstet Gynecol*, 2007

Obesity and reproduction – bad synergies

Prior to pregnancy

Increases length of time to pregnancy, menstrual disorders, more drugs needed

Early pregnancy

Miscarriage, fetal anomalies

During pregnancy

Increased gestational diabetes, high blood pressure, PET, DVT, instrumental and operative delivery



Haemorrhage, infection, DVT

After pregnancy

Increases diabetes mellitus, high blood pressure, endometrial cancer, cardiovascular disease, musculoskeletal problems

Remediated International Control (International International Internatio	Southampton School of Medicine		
C.M.Boomsma ^{1,2} , M.J.C.Eijkemans ² , E.G.Hughes ³ , G.H.A.Visser ⁴ , B.C.J and N.S.Macklon ⁶	M.Fauser ^s		
Meta-analysis: 720 women with P	COS vs 4	505 controls	
	OR	95% CI	
Gestational Diabetes:	2.94	1.70-5.08	
Pregnancy induced hypertension	: 3.67	1.98-6.81	
pre-eclampsia	3.47	1.95-6.17	
Pre-term birth	1.75	1.16-2.62	
Peri-natal mortality	3.07	1.03-9.21	















Smoking and infertility

Smoking and infertility

The Practice Committee of the American Society for Reproductive Medicine American Society for Reproductive Medicine, Birmingham, Alabama

Approximately 30% of reproductive age women and 35% of reproductive age men in the United States smoke cigarettes. Substatial harmful effects of cigarette smoke on focundity and reproduction have become apparent but are not generally appreciated. (Fertil Steril[®] 2006;86(Suppl 4):5172-7. ©2006 by American Society for Reproductive Medicine.)

'13% of infertility is due to smoking'

Smoking and Infertility

Human Reproduction Vol.20, No.7 pp. 1867–1875, 2005 Advance Access publication April 7, 2005

Effects of subfertility cause, smoking and body weight on the success rate of IVF

A.M.E.Lintsen^{1,7}, P.C.M.Pasker-de Jong², E.J.de Boer³, C.W.Burger⁴, C.A.M.Jansen⁵, D.D.M.Braat¹ and F.E.van Leeuwen⁶ on behalf of the OMEGA project group

- 8000 women
- Effect of smoking on IVF outcomes:

Smoking makes your ovaries 10 years older

, and I	vr succ	.035		School of Medicine
Smokers nN	Non-smokers nN	OR (random) 95%C1	Weight %	OR (random) 95%Cl
1/20	4/21		1.20	0.22 [0.02, 2.20]
2/40	26/90		2.51	0.13 [0.03, 0.58]
4/17	9/43	-	2.98	1.16 [0.30, 4.44]
3/38	12/76		3.01	0.46 [0.12, 1.73]
4/38	20/62		3.67	0.25 [0.08, 0.79]
5/38	17/38		3.80	0.19 [0.06, 0.58]
5/50	18/50		4.04	0.20 [0.07, 0.59]
8/29	21/73		4.78	0.94 [0.36, 2.46]
8/37	141/351		5.84	0.41 [0.18, 0.92]
11/65	23/108		5.97	0.75 [0.34, 1.67]
8/108	119/542		6.37	0.28 [0.13, 0.60]
23/103	15/68	+	6.47	1.02 [0.49, 2.12]
13/155	25/182		6.74	0.57 [0.28, 1.17]
18/36	132/306		6.89	1.32 [0.66, 2.63]
15/44	351/680		7.38	0.48 [0.26, 0.92]
19/124	50/236		8.02	0.67 [0.38, 1.20]
40/142	126/399	+	9.82	0.85 [0.56, 1.30]
49/200	194/634	•	10.50	0.74 (0.61, 1.06)
1284	3959	•	100.00	0.56 [0.43, 0.73]
	0.01	0.1 1 10	100	
	Envire nor	smolers Eavo	irs smokers	
	Simokers nN 2/40 2/40 4/10 5/78 5/78 8/79 8/79 8/79 8/79 8/79 8/79 8/79 8	Immit N Normality 1/0 4/11 1/1 4/11 1/1 1/14 1/2 1/14 1/2 1/14 1/1 1/14 1/1 1/14 1/1 1/14 1/1 1/14 1/1 1/14 1/1 1/14 1/14	mi mi mi ghtch 1220 4/21 56/90	Inner nl Nonmiers Of (mode) 996.00 Weget 996.00 1200 4211 1 120 1200 4211 1 120 1210 4213 1 120 1210 1276 1 120 1211 12176 1 100 1219 12776 1 100 1219 12776 1 100 1219 12776 1 100 1219 12776 1 100 12171 14718 1 100 12171 121718 1 100 121718 121718 1 100 121718 121718 1 100 121718 121718 100 100 121718 121718 100 100 121718 121718 100 100 121718 121718 100 100 121718 121718 100 100 <tr< td=""></tr<>











































Hoeger K, Clin Obstet Gynecol, 2007



0615 Print	Which diet? To based of Classic Educations of Control and Control	ton
M	ietary Composition in Restoring Reproductive and letabolic Physiology in Overweight Women with olycystic Ovary Syndrome	ine
Rep (L.	J. MORAN, M. NOAKES, P. M. CLIPTON, L. TOMLINSON, sate R. J. NORMAN modurities Medicine Usin, Department of Obstatries and Grosselage, University of Addatide, Quane Elizabeth Hospital (M., L. F. 18, J.N., Marchille, Sund Antoniae 301), Asstructing and CSIRO Health Sciences and Natrition (L.J.M., M.N., I.C., Addatade, South Australia 5000, Australia	
	nergy restriction diet sed to high or low protein diet	
RESULTS		
	th interventions improved cyclicity, lipid profile	
	ean weightloss 7.5% diet : HDLs decreased 10%	
-LP	: FAI increased 44%	
CONCLUS	SIONS:	
	Both diets work!	
	High protein diet may have slight advantages	



Effect of a very-low-calorie diet on in vitro fertilization outcomes

A low-calorie diet in a group of overweight or obese patients for a short period before and during IVF results in variable tolerance to the dictary regime and an unsutifactory IVF outcome. (Fertil Sterille 2006;86:227-9. 02006 by American Society for Reproductive Medicine.)

10 women, 18-40 years, BMI >28, indication for IVF

Diet from day14 or day 21 of previous cycle to day of OPU

4 patients withdrew Mean duration of diet: 27-41 days Weight loss: 5.3-8.2 kg (mean 6.3% of body weight) 3 patients : total fertilization failure

Tsegareli et al 2006 Fertil Steril

Southampton

Diet and Fertility: where are we now?

 $\bullet Calories \ more \ important \ than \ dietary \ composition$

•Short term restriction may be all that is needed

•But beware of ketotic diets for fertility

•No real evidence of benefit of Glycaemic Index diets





Diet and I	VF outcome?	Southampton school of Medicine
	ARTICLE IN PRESS	S
coupl intrac	reconception Mediterranean o es undergoing in vitro fertiliz ytoplasmic sperm injection tr hance of pregnancy	ation/
Marijana V Peter J. va	iujkovic, B.Sc., ^a Jeanne H. de Vries, Ph.D., ^g Jan Lindemans, I 1 der Spek, Ph.D., ^c Eric A. P. Steegers, Ph.D., ^a and Régine P.	Ph.D., ^b Nick S. Macklon, Ph.D., ^{s,b,i} M. Swegers-Theunissen, Ph.D. ^{s,d,e,f}
	indergoing IVF/ICSI etary questionnaire	Fertil Steril 2010
DII	ET: 'Health conscious'	'Mediterranean'
Blood Folate		+
Blood Vit B6		+
Follicle Vit B6		+







CONCLUSIONS

Southampton

- 1. Larger RCTS needed to assess impact of interventions.
- 2. MORE EMPHASIS ON PREVENTION: Focus on lifestyle and diet in adolescent girls
- 3. Build lifestyle interventions into reproductive treatment pathway
- 4. Invest effort and money into lifestyle programs



Southampton

Further reading

- Hassan and Killick(2004) Fertil Steril 81,384
- Boomsma et al, (2006) Hum Rep Update 12, 673
- Boxmeer et al (2008) Hum Rep 23, 2570
- + Watkins et al (2008) Semin Reprod Med 26, 175
- Homan et al (2007) Hum Rep Update 13, 209
- Macklon et al (eds) (2009) Textbook of Periconceptional Medicine



Conflict of interest

- Research funding from Merck-Serono S.A. in collaboration with the Economic and Social Research Council on the international survey of contemporary reproductive decision-making in 18 countries www.startingfamilies.com
- Consultancy work with Schering-Plough on reducing the burden of treatment



Learning objectives

- Learn proportion of psychosocial research on stress
- Describe domains of investigation in psychosocial stress research
- Identify factors that contribute to stress during treatment
- Describe the quality of research on anxiety and depression related to outcome of ART
- Understand the impact of stress [anxiety] on ART single cycle of ART









Page 63 of 113

Comprehensive review & meta-analysis of stress research

□ Is pre-treatment emotional distress associated with outcome after a cycle of ART?

With Emily Griffiths & Christos Venetis

Search strategy

- An exhaustive search of bibliographic databases and manual search of reference lists on seven databases
 - PubMed, PsycINFO/PsychNET, ISI Web of Knowledge and Web of Science
 - **1985** to April 2009 [update April 2010]
 - contact 28 authors to obtain unpublished work (including unpublished dissertations), additional data or clarification
 - No limit on language



Inclusion criteria

- □ Women*
- □ ART cycle (IVF, ICSI GIFT)
- Prospective study with psychological assessment prior to Day 5 of stimulation
- Stress' measured as anxiety/depression
- Measure of treatment outcomePreclinical, clinical or live birth
- *Male data used only for topics report due to insufficient data on ART outcome

Exclusion criteria

- □ ART with donated gametes
- □ RCTs evaluating psychological interventions
- □ Multiple cycles of ART
- □ Multiple publication
 - included team study with greatest sample size and relevant data

Data extraction

- □ Extracted by EG & JB
- All studies evaluated with Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Scales

Analysis

- Standardised mean difference (Hedges g, adjusted for small sample) [primary outcome]
 - Pregnant and non-pregnant groups compared on the pretreatment anxiety/depressions scores
 - One effect size per study, priority on anxiety
- Fixed effects model (random with heterogeneity)
- $\hfill\square\hfill Q$ and I^2 reported
- Sub-group & sensitivity analysis
- Small study bias evaluated
 - Funnel plot
 - Egger's test
- Review Manager & Stata













Popular topics (> 10%)

- □ Follow-up of children with ART (16.2%, n=187))
- Reactions during ART (10.1%, n=116)
- □ Effect of ART outcome (6.8%, n=78)
- Treatment burden (5.4%, n=62)

Irrelevant studies (10.9%)







Characteristics of included studies (n=16)

- □ age range 29.7 to 36.8 years
- □ duration of infertility range 3.2 to 7.8 years
- 14/16 studies sampled women with previous experience of using ART
- Day 5 to 2.8 months pre-IVF
- $\hfill\square$ 25% assessed outcome 14+ days after ET
- 43.8% non-pregnant group included cancelled cycles



Table 1 Selected qualit	ty assessment criteria f	rom Newcastle-Ott	awa Quality Assess	ment Scale (Col	hort studie	s)	
	Representativeness	Ascertainment	Comparability	Outcome &	Other	Quality	
	of sample	of distress	on confounders	follow-up	bias	rating	
Akyuz 2006,		*		*		2	
[abstract]							
Anderneim 2003	*			*	8	3	
Boivin 1995		*	**	*		4	
Demyttenaere 1992		*	No report	*	*	3	
Demyttenaere 1998		*	**	*	*	5	
Ebbesen 2009	*	*	*	٠	*	5	
de Klerk 2008		*	*			2	
Klonoff-Cohen 2001		*	٠	٠	*	4	
Lancastle 2005	*	*	*		*	4	
Lee 2006 [abstract]	*	*		Not reported	8	3	
Lintsen 2009	*	*	*	٠	8	5	
Merari 2002		*	**	٠	8	5	
Sanders 1999		*	No evidence	*	8	3	
Sohrabyand 2009			**	٠		3	
Verhaak 2001	*	*	*	4	8	5	
			**	4		3	



State μ <				Pregnant Nonpr			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Angez et al. 10206 - 0-4 0.23 99 41 1.0%0.4 0-2.6.5, 0.051 Demptessare et al. 1032 - 0-36 0.21 77 21 1.660.61 0-2.6.5, 0.631 Demptessare et al. 1032 - 0-36 0.21 - 12 9 - 0.377, 12 Determined Sixth (Study or Subgroup	Std. Mean Difference	SE	Total	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
balon & Taximin, 19950.3 (i) 0.22 (i) 7 2 2 i 1.0 -0.3 (i) 0.3 (i) 0.22 (i) 0.23 (i) 0.2								
Dempinser et al. 1992 - 0.54 0.17 10 00 1.25 -0.58 (-1.31, 0.5) Metargonalistic # Biology (-1.24) - 0.27, f ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.24, d - 10 = 0.57, f ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.24, d - 10 = 0.57, f ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.24, d - 10 = 0.57, f ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.24, d - 10 = 0.57, f ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.24, d - 10 = 0.57, f ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.24, d - 10 = 0.57, f ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.20, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.21, 0 ² - 0.4 Heterogenetic (-1.24) - 0.21, 0 ²								•
$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{lines} 4 \mbox{lines} 0 li$								
Samual 95(10) 79 160 - 6.24, 4f = 1.9 = 6.27, f = 0 137 7.46 - 6.42 (-57, -6.14) 132 Property 7 14 - 6.00 (-7 - 6.24, 4f = 1.9 = 6.27, f = 0 132 Property 0 - 1140 - 6.20 (-7 - 7.1 - 6.17, -6.17, -6.17, -6.16, -6.14) 132 Property 0 - 1140 - 6.20 (-7 - 7.1								
Tatiff series affects 2 - 2.89 9 = 0.001 1.25 Propando 2 - 1.21 9 = 0.001 Madrithem rel 1.2005 Series affects 2 - 0.27 0 - 0.7 0 - 1.7 58 Series 4 - 0.05 0 - 0.2	Subtotal (95% CI)			79				•
3.12 Programmer 0-11 staps -0.17 0.17 0.18 81 5.18 -0.17 0.15,0,0.16 96 Birth et al. 2006 0.06 7.3 216 5.56 0.03 0.2,0,5,0.516 96 Birth et al. 2008 0.06 0.26 7.3 7.16 0.03 0.2,0,5,0.516 Momentsware et al. 1096 0.06 0.26 7.3 7.17 0.06 0.4,0,0.511 Moment-Subre et al. 2001 -0.22 0.18 6.49 0.11 0.14 0.511 Moment-Subre et al. 2001 -0.22 0.31 0.22 0.35 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31 0.21 0.31	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00	Chi ² = 0.24, df = 3 (P	- 0.93); l ² = 0%				
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Test for overall effect: Z = 2	.89 (P = 0.004)						
es fankrei al 2006 6.00 0.16 77 72 12 16 5.06 0.03 1-23 6.34 mempersamer at 61 2001 - 0.22 0.18 46 99 4.7% - 0.22 1-55 7.01 - 0.05 1-23 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05	1.3.2 Pregnancy (> 21 day	s)						
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					81		-0.17 [-0.50, 0.16]	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$								
Bioseff-Concer et al. 2001 -0.22 0.18 -66 90 -7% -0.22 -6.57 0.11 March et al. 1000 0.00 1.66 40 2.1% -0.02 0.45 0.11 March et al. 1000 0.00 1.66 40 2.1% 0.01 6.4 2.1% 0.01 6.4 2.1% 0.01 6.4 2.1% 0.01 6.4 2.1% 0.01 6.4 2.1% 0.01 6.4 2.1% 0.01 6.4 2.1% 0.01 6.4 2.1% 0.01 6.4 2.1% 0.03 6.2 2.1% 0.01 6.4 2.1% 0.03 6.2 2.1% 0.03 6.2 2.1% 0.03 6.4 6.01 6.2 6.01 <t< td=""><td>Demyttenaere et al. 1998</td><td>0.04</td><td>0.24</td><td>23</td><td>75</td><td>2.7%</td><td>0.04 [-0.43, 0.51]</td><td></td></t<>	Demyttenaere et al. 1998	0.04	0.24	23	75	2.7%	0.04 [-0.43, 0.51]	
$\label{eq:constraint} \begin{array}{c} \text{def} extra (206) \\ \text{def} (206) \\ \text$	Ebbesen et al. 2009	0	0.08	215	566	19.0%	0.00 [-0.16, 0.16]	+
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Kionoff-Cohen et al. 2001	-0.22	0.18	46	90	4.7%	-0.22 [-0.57, 0.13]	
Marcine List 2002 0.33 0.22 23 09 1.00 0.33 0.22 021 031 042 031 042 031 042 031 042 031 041	Lee et al. 2006	0.05	0.07	364	440	23.1%	0.05 [-0.09, 0.19]	+
Surders & Josephane 1 al 20 al 21 al 22 a	Lintsen et al. 2009	-0.02	0.08	196	494	19.0%	-0.02 [-0.18, 0.14]	+
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Merari et al. 2002	0.33	0.23	23	90	3.0%	0.33 [-0.12, 0.78]	
bindback et al. 2008 -1.11 0.27 25 81 0.09 -1.11 2.64 -1.54 remark et al. 2001 -0.21 0.15 91 44 6.84 -0.21 0.53 1.94 6.84 -0.21 6.93 -0.94	Sanders & Bruce, 1999	-0.18	0.28		75	2.0%		
Wrmak rel 2001 -0.21 0.15 59 144 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.43 6.68 -0.21 6.63 6.61 6.60 6.61 6.60 6.61 6.60 6.61 6.60 6.61 6.60 7.62 6.61 6.68 6.61 6.63 6.61 6.60 7.62 6.61 6.60 7.62 6.61 6.60 7.62 6.61 6.60 7.62 6.61 6.60	Sobrabyand et al. 2008	-2.11	0.27	25	81	0.0%		
Torge ret. J. 2000 0 0.35 12 21 J.N. 0.00 (-6.45, 6.64) Montel u95X (-7, 40, -04) -0.41, (-41.04) -0.41, (-40.04) -0.41, (-40.04) -0.41, (-40.04) Test for wall effect 2 - 0.37 (P - 6.71) -0.41, (-40.04) -0.44 -0.41, (-40.04) Monte (J95X (-7, 10.04), Ta ² - 0.00, (-0 ² + 1.41, 4f = 1.44) -1.44 -2.457, 100.058 -0.051, (-6.13, 0.00) Test for wall effect 2 - 1.27 (-9.02) -1.42 -0.312, (-5.94) -0.44 -0.44	Verbaak et al. 2001			59	148			
Text for overall effect 2 - 0.37 (P = 0.71) Text for overall effect 2 - 0.37 (P = 0.71) Text for overall effect 2 - 0.37 (P = 0.71) Hearogrammer Text - 0.001 (P = 1.5.4.1, df = 1.4.19 = 0.35); f = 98 Text for overall effect 2 - 1.2.2 (P = 0.21) Text for overall effect 2 - 1.2.2 (P = 0.21) Text for overall effect 2 - 1.2.2 (P = 0.21); f = 98 Text for 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2 (P = 0.21); f = 98 Text for 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2); f = 98 Text for 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2); f = 98 Text for 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2); f = 98 Text for 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2); f = 98 Text for 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2); f = 98 Text for 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2); f = 98 Text for 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2); f = 98 Text for 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2 (P = 0.2.2); f = 98	Yong et al. 2000 Subtotal (95% CI)				25	1.3%	0.00 [-0.69, 0.69]	
Total (95% CD) 1163 2457 100.0% -0.05 [-0.13, 0.03]	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00	Chi ² = 7.81, df = 10 (F	- 0.6	$(5); 1^2 = 0.06$				1
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 15.41, df = 14 (P = 0.35); P = 9%	Test for overall effect: Z = 0	.37 (P = 0.71)						
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.22 (P = 0.22)	Total (95% CI)			1163	2457	100.0%	-0.05 [-0.13, 0.03]	•
			(P = 0	.35); I ² = 9%				
Test for subgroup differences: Or = 7.35, df = 1 P = 0.0071, if = 86.4%								
	Test for subgroup difference	es: Chi ² = 7.35, df = 1.0	P = 0.	$(007), l^2 = 86.4\%$				becreases pregnancy increases pregnan
did								996







Conclusion

- Presence of emotional strain in ART well-established
 Explanatory research now needed on sources of burden
 - Moderator analyses
- Stress effects unlikely to affect ART outcome on single cycle
 Definitive good quality study on early and late pregnancy effects not yet done
 - Effect in high-risk group needs to be explored
- Less descriptive and more explanatory research required
- Coping interventions nevertheless required for effects on other end-points - quality of life and treatment burden




Commercial Relationships / Potential Conflict of Interest

- Infertility Network UK operate a corporate partnership scheme which offers different levels of partnership and allows companies to sponsor the charity's activities enabling the charity and corporate organisations to make an active and visible commitment to the development of high quality patient support and care. In the UK the Assn. of British Pharmaceutical Industries do not permit such companies to advertise their products to patients directly nor would I N UK agree to as we must remain independent.
- Accordingly both I N UK and our current corporate partners, Ferring Pharmaceuticals, Merck Serono, Merck Sharp Dohme, and Casmed do not publicise their product to our members/beneficiaries

Patient-friendly ART: the patients view

Clare Lewis-Jones MBE Chair – Fertility Europe And Chief Executive Infertility Network UK

Learning Objectives

- An understanding of the need for information, support, empathy, and honesty from clinics
- What clinics can do to help patients and provide patient-centered care
- The role and importance of patient organizations' as a partner with clinics in improving the patient journey and experience
- The importance of emotional support and counselling for couples going through fertility treatment

Topics to be covered

- What do we mean by "patient centered" or "patient friendly"?
- Do different patients interpret "patient-friendly" in different ways?
- The safety and efficacy of treatment in relation to patients autonomy.
- Some examples of this.
- Just what is the "bottom line" for patients in relation to patient-friendly care?
- · How ART clinics might address patients concerns.
- How patient organisations can help

Definition of "Patient Centered Care" The Institute of Medicine

"Care that is respectful of and responsive to individual patient preferences and needs and that is guided by patient values"

The King's Fund

"Patient centered care is multi-dimensional; it encompasses all aspects of how services are delivered to patients"

• Institute of Medicine offers

this list:

- Compassion, empathy and responsiveness to needs, values and expressed preferences
- Co-ordination and integration
- Information, communication and education
- Physical comfort
- Emotional support, relieving fear and anxiety
- Involvement of family and friends

Results of a survey performed by the National infertility
Awareness Campaign in 1997 on the emotional and financial
impact of infertility

•	Tearfulness	97%
•	Depression	94%
•	Anger	84%
•	Loss of sex drive	80%
•	Inadequacy	72%
•	Guilt / Shame	62%
•	Envy/jealousy of pregnant women	2%
•	Sadness	2%
•	Helplessness	1%
•	Despair	1%

Suggestions as to why patients feel these emotions

ANGER -

With themselves. With Society. With the NHS. With the clinic SHAME -Why me ? Why us? I'm letting my partner down. I'm letting my doctors down.

FRUSTRATION

Everything seems to take so long Why aren't I pregnant yet? Why did the treatment fail again?

DENIAL

But there has never been a history of this in my family What the hell am I/are we doing here?

ISOLATION

Nobody understands My brothers/sisters/friends all have children Too private/personal to talk to people about

FEAR

What will happen? Who will I see and why? What questions will we be asked? Will we know the answers?

DEPRESSION

Especially as the months & years go by

And at the end of all that???

TIRED!

Loss of confidence

Lack of self-esteem

All of the emotions discussed are exhausting

The effects of sub-fertility on relationships

And what about the impact of infertility on relationships?

- Relationship unchanged 35%
- Relationship improved 28%
- Relationship worsened/strained 31%
- Strained initially, now improved 2%

The emotional impact cannot be under-estimated

One in five respondents to the NIAC survey indicated they had experienced suicidal thoughts whilst going through infertility

The wife who could not face life without children

The patients' perspective on fertility care: a systematic review E.A.F. Dancet et al 2010

• Results:

 "Overall, fertility patients want to be treated like human beings with a need for: medical skills, respect, coordination, accessibility, information, comfort, support, partner involvement and a good attitude of and relationship with fertility clinic staff"

"Patient-friendly" procedures

• What does "patient-friendly" mean to patients?

– Less drugs?

- Natural or Mild IVF
- Less painful procedures?

Injections

- Fewer visits to the clinic?

• "IVF in 2 weeks"

And/or?

- Clinic friendliness/understanding/time
- Safety versus success?
 eSET
- Honest appraisal of a couples chance of success?
 - Based on evidence available from scientific studies
- Cost of treatment?
 - Equity of access

Do different patients interpret "patientfriendly" in different ways?

- Given the various hurdles patients encounter during a treatment cycle – some of which are more patient-centered than others.
 - Some couples want to produce as many eggs as possible as they feel this gives them a better chance of success
 - Some women will perhaps feel that the egg collection was painful some won't
 - I would imagine most men would say surgical sperm retrieval as painful and not patient friendly! Whilst others would see it as just something they just have to get through.

Are patients really concerned about whether the treatment is "patient-friendly"?

- Or are they simply thankful that at least someone is willing to help them have a baby – no matter what that treatment entails in terms of safety/pain.
- Of course, this doesn't mean to say that those providing the treatment – and patient organisations such as members of Fertility Europe - shouldn't consider this aspect of fertility treatment

Or is it another aspect of care?

- Information both medical and psychosocial
- Supportive attitude from the clinic/medical staff

"Patients' attitudes to medical and psychosocial aspects of care in fertility clinics: findings from the Copenhagen Multi-centre Psychosocial Infertility (COMPI) Research Programme" L. Schmidt et al 2003

- 2250 patients responded 80% response rate
 Vast majority considered a high level of medical information and patient-centered care as important
 - Fewer felt that professional psychosocial services were important and/or had the intention to use these services
 - Main predictor of perceived importance in patientcentered care and professional psychosocial services was high infertility related stress in the marital, personal and social domain

Conclusions

- A supportive attitude from medical staff and the provision of both medical and psychosocial information and support should be integral aspects of medical care in fertility clinics.
- Although only a minority of the participants perceived professional psychosocial services as important, they should be available for patients whose infertility causes them much strain, especially for patients whose marital relationship suffered much because of infertility

L. Schmidt et al 2003

With apologies to UK clinics...

• Results of complaints received by the Human Fertilisation & Embryology Authority 2007/08

1

1

2

3

7

8

8

- AttitudeResponse
- Incident
- Consent
- Finance & Administration
- Information
- Other
- Consultation inc. clinical treatment 30

Information

- Conflicting information regarding sperm donation
- Overwhelming quantity of information
- Insufficient information regarding failed/abandoned cycles
- Lack of information and lack of staff concern
- Incorrect and lack of information

Consultation and Clinical treatment

- Concern about type of treatment offered
- Insufficient information regarding donor anonymity
- Donor details requested 5 months late
- Poor treatment
- · Centre did not act in best interests of patients
- After care following treatment
- Doctor didn't know patient and provided incorrect information

Recurrent theme

- Matches closely the issues raised by patients in general feedback to the HFEA
- In particular the quality and timeliness of information and emotional support received

Discussion

- Complaints remain low in relation to number of treatments per year – are patients nervous of complaining?
- Rushed consultation and a lack of understanding or empathy and failing to listen to patients is a common complaint about consultation with clinicians
- Complaints also arise because of differences in diagnosis when patients change to another clinic
- Lack of clarity and information for patients about costs hidden extras e.g. scans/blood tests

Safety and efficacy of treatment in relation to patient autonomy

- · Health risks to patient and to potential child
- Willingness to take that risk if it has the remotest possibility of achieving their deep-rooted desire to have a child?
- Willingness to take further risks after failed treatment?

There are many potential risks for patients and potential child from fertility treatment

- OHSS
- Ovarian cancer
- Surgical risks
- Risks of multiple pregnancies
- Ectopic pregnancy
- Heterotopic pregnancy
- Risk of miscarriage
- Psychological and emotional risks
 - Depression
 - Hormonal changes during a cycle of treatment
 - Strain on relationship

Why aren't patients more worried?

- Perhaps the right question we should ask is:
- Why are patients seemingly so willing to take risks, accept patientunfriendly treatment, forego patient autonomy?

Because they desperately want to have a baby!

They want to achieve something that seems to come so easily to the vast majority

The thought of facing a life without children – of "involuntary childlessness – is unbearable

Fears of remaining childless

- The following were fears described by a member of More to Life on one of our forums:
 - Getting old and having no one.
 - Getting ill and having no one to care.
 - Never moving on from this and living life to the full!
 - Having lots of regrets for not trying harder to have a child one way or another.
 - Having no one phone me i.e. a daughter or a son - to say "hi mum".

Patient-friendly procedures v. Success rates

- eSET
 - Reducing risk of conceiving a multiple pregnancy thus more "patient-friendly" in terms of safety
 - Reducing chances of conceiving even slightly is not considered "patient-friendly" by many patients – certainly currently in the UK.
 - Currently causing enormous anger amongst many patients in the UK

The funding of fertility treatment affects patients views in relation to patient autonomy and patient friendly treatment

- In the UK it is estimated that approx 70-80% of IVF takes place in the private sector
- Poor NHS funding leading to "Treatment by Postcode" or "Treatment by bank balance"
- Feel they need to take these risks particularly if they can only afford to pay for one cycle of treatment
- If a patient is paying for their treatment should they have more say in that treatment?



Ovarian stimulation v. risk of OHSS

- Rarely OHSS can be life threatening and fatalities have been reported
- Yet.....

A patient's response for feedback

"For me I never felt (not sure if I was a bit naïve) there were many risks to it, apart from the obvious one of how would we personally deal with the potential failure of a cycle, which was a huge one. I never felt at risk with the procedures or drugs as such. Although on my last go (3rd attempt) I was flagged up as at risk of OHSS which was worrying. I also had a couple of passing out episodes on this cycle at egg collection which was quite daunting. I never really thought too much about the risks of multiple births either. To be honest I think the subject was skimmed upon at the clinic, but to be fair I could have asked for more info too!"

When surveyed in 2006, what services & information did I N UK members want?

- More on complementary therapies
- Food & Nutrition Advice
- NHS Funding issues
- More liaison with clinics
- An A-Z in layman's terms
- More on male infertility
- More on volunteering
- More organised chats
- Local units and events regionallyInformation on causes
- Suggestions for coping with treatments
- Support during pregnancy
- NOTHING ABOUT INFORMATION ON PATIENT-FRIENDLY/CENTERED TREATMENTS OR RISKS



How Can Clinics Help "Get It Right" for the Patients?

Information

•Give patients written information on all aspects of their investigations/treatment right the way through their time at the clinic in a range of languages/formats

- Costed treatment plans
- Information evenings

How Can Clinics Help "Get It Right" for the Patients?

- Communication
 - Ensure patients know who to contact if they have questions/concerns
 - Access to a counsellor within the clinic and externally

How Can Clinics Help "Get It Right" for the Patients?

- Awareness
 - Think about how you give the patients their results –
 especially if negative obviously
 - Does the patient appear to be being impatient? Be aware that this might be the one and only IVF attempt they could afford
 - Remember patients are trying to achieve possibly the most important thing in a couples lives

Environment

- Allocate area / space where patients can go for privacy
- Avoid using same waiting room as ante-natal clinic
- If not possible, then remove posters / literature which may upset or offend

Counselling

- Should be available at ALL clinics
- Should be available at all stages of treatment i.E. Before, during and after
- Basic training in counselling for ALL clinic staff
- Leaflet explaining benefits of counselling and how to access it given to all patients

Time

• The most expensive thing of all, but almost the most important

How Can Patient Organisations Help?

Access to personal experiences

- Access to good information
- Self-help
- 🖀 Mutual help
- Removes the feelings of isolation

Does Belonging to I N UK Help With the Management of Your Treatment? – Yes 126 – No/not sure/sometimes 12

And in relation to SET?

 Some of the patients' views reviewed by the Expert Group on Multiple Births after IVF made it clear that "maintaining pregnancy rates" may be viewed differently by patients and clinicians

> "We will need additional thawed embryo transfers costing more money; more time off work; more trips to the hospital; more invasive treatment/consultations; more upset"

Patient's opinions on what clinics should/could do or improve on to help patients

- The risks of multiples should definitely be explained better
- Advice from the clinic needs to be clear and not force the decision on the patient blaming everyone else!
 i.e. it is being forced on me
- Clinicians need to believe in this policy in a very real way – i.e. follow it through – not blame others but be fully behind SET

Information which needs to get out there to patients.

- What is the problem with having twins or more?
- Will single embryo transfer halve my chances of becoming pregnant?
- At what point in their treatment / assessment would they be informed of a SET or DET?

Information which needs to get out there to patients.

- Will clinics differ in their risk assessment and hence decision-making?
- Isn't SET all about the Government trying to save money?
- How the embryologist knows which is the best embryo to choose? (standard standards!)

Questions health professionals may have to ask themselves or may get asked by patients and – most importantly – ALL, have the same answers to...

- In other words consistency
- Why should I recommend single embryo transfer?
- Won't SET mean that NHS patients are disadvantaged and private patients will incur increased costs
- What criteria do you use to select patients to be offered SET?

What information do patients need?

- Clinics to be consistent
- Clinics to have standardised information
- Clinics to be honest
- Clinics to be strong
- Clinics to be supportive
- Clinics not be to divisive or blaming others

An idea "borrowed" from the American Fertility Association

Infertility Risk Assessment

Women: Know Your Fertility Risks

Learn about some risks for infertility and what you might do to preserve your own ability to conceive a child.

Infertility is a disease that affects about 6 million American couples, roughly 10 percent of the reproductive age population. It's not just a female problem - men and women contribute about equally to the cause. Being aware of some risks for infertility may help you avoid a struggle when it comes time to try to get pregnant.

If you have any risk factors for infertility or have tried to conceive for one year without success, talk to your doctor.



"Creating a Family"



Creating a Family Is Central to the Life Plans of Most People. The Desire to Have Children Comes From Within the Individual. It Is a Conscious and Unconscious Complex Phenomena. Not Everyone Desires a Child With the Same Intensity and Not Everyone Will Actualise It. Nonetheless, It Is First and Foremost an Individual Issue.

References

- "Patients' attitudes to medical and psychosocial aspects of care in fertility clinics: findings from the Copenhagen Multi-centre Psychosocial Infertility (COMPI) Research Programme. Hum. Reprod. 2003 Mar; 18(3): 628-37.
- 2. "The patients' perspective on fertility care: a systematic review" Human Reproduction Update, Vol.00, No.0 pp 1-21, 2010



Accessible and affordable infertility services in developing countries

Willem Ombelet Coordinator ESHRE Special Task Force on "Developing countries and infertility"

> ESHRE - PCC 10 Rome, 27-06-10

Conflict of Interest

There are no commercial relationships or other activities that might be perceived as a potential conflict of interest





















Strategies to simplify ART

One-day diagnostic phase

Natural cycle / Clomiphene citrate / Low dose hMG or rec FSH

Monitoring : (only) ultrasound

Clinical part: material

Single (Double) Embryo Transfer / Day I transfer

Laboratory – technics

Laboratory - material













<u>4 Working Groups (WG)</u>	
The one-day diagnostic phase	R Campo
Ovarian stimulation for IUI & IVF/ICSI	AN Andersen
Laboratory phase for IUI & IVF/ICSI	JVan Blerkom
Fundraising <u>5 Study Groups (SG)</u>	H Sallam
Reproductive health education, prevention & awareness	G Serour
Burden of disease & cost-effectiveness	D Habberna
Training courses	I Cooke
Intravaginal // intrauterine culturing	R Frydman
Differences in ethics / law / religion / level of care	F van Balen







Accessible ART services

Diagnostic phase

Ovarian stimulation

Lab phase



Natural cycle IVF systematic review – 1800 cycles

- Complication rate (MPR & OHSS) : almost zero
- Much cheaper
- ET per cycle: 45.5 %
- + Ongoing pregnancy rate per cycle: 7.2 %
- Ongoing pregnancy rate per transfer: 15.8 %

Reason: premature LH rise / ovulation

 \rightarrow need for randomized controlled trials

Pelinck et al., HR Update, 8, 129, 2002





Mo	onitoring ART treatment
IUI	max 2 US no biochemical testing
IVF	max 2 or 3 US no biochemical testing I x urinary LH



Action Plan – Objective & background (J Van Blerkom)

- Minimalist approach back to basics
- \cdot Avoid needless complex instrumentation / reagents ..
- Simple incubation system single temperature (37°)
 Battery
 - Warm water baths
- Non-CO2 based culture conditions
 - Less oocytes / embryos
 - 24 36 culturing
- Culture medium: simple // for I 2 days
- Looking for pronuclear characteristics / mononucleation / blastomere symmetry

Pilot-projects for LC-IVF

Suggested countries / centres

Egypt SS-Africa South Africa Indonesia Paraguay ... Alexandria, Cairo Nairobi, Kampala Pretoria

Ascuncion

Selection of patients / methods

Only childless women

• Age limits: Women: > 18 & < 35 yrs Male: < 55 yrs

• only IVF (no ICSI)

• SET or DET





Training courses (ESHRE, IFFS)

- different packages (level 1 3)
- Manual & protocols for each level
- train the trainees
 Diagnostic phase (ISMAAR, EAGE ...)
 Clinical aspects IUI & IVF cycles
 Laboratory phase IUI & IVF/ICSI

Funding the project

<u>ESHRE</u>

training courses / website / secretarial support

The Walking Egg Project npo

secretarial support - project manager funding – campaigns (affordable art)

WHO Leaflets Implementing infertility services

Other foundations // NGOs Governments EC - United Nations African World Bank ...

World Community Statements

- "Men and woman of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to raise a family". This statement was adopted 60 years ago at the 1948 UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and can't be misunderstood: it implies the right to access to fertility treatments when couples are unable to have children.
- At the United Nations International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo in 1994 the following statement was made "Reproductive health therefore implies that people have the capability to reproduce and the freedom to decide if, when and how often to do so ... and to have the information and the means to do so ... "
- 3. <u>United Nations Millennium Declaration</u>, signed in September 2000 : "Achieve, by 2015, universal access to <u>reproductive health</u>".
- 4. In 2001, on the occasion of a WHO meeting on "Medical, Ethical and Social Aspects of Assisted Reproduction" in Geneva, a call for the integration of infertility into existing sexual and reproductive health care programmes in developing countries was made.
- In 2004 the World Health Assembly proposed five core statements, including "the provision of high-quality services for family-planning, including infertility services".
- At the World Summit in 2005, the largest-ever gathering of world leaders called for achieving these goals by the year 2015.
- 7. At the Oslo Ministerial Declaration in 2007 health was recognised as one of the most important long-term foreign policy issues by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Brazil, France, Indonesia, Norway, Senegal, South Africa, and Thailand. "The well functioning health systems that are needed to reduce maternal newborn and child mortality and to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria will also help countries to cope with other major health concerns such as sexual and reproductive health...





Developing Platforms for Providing Low Cost IVF In Developing Countries: Challenges, Platforms, Prospects

Jonathan Van Blerkom Department of Molecular Cellular and Developmental Biology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado

Colorado Reproductive Endocrinology Rose Medical Center, Denver, Colorado

ESHRE 2010

Challenges:

Each location presents unique problems: logistics--CO2, N2, availability of products, equipment maintenance and repair, technologists, patient compliance and acceptability of certain protocols, such as intravaginal culture.

The STF program is designed to be adaptable and adapted to each location, and to minimize manipulations, yet provide the ability to assess oocyte and embryo characteristics up to the 4cell stage in accordance with the recent ALPHA/ESHRE guidelines on assessment.

Platforms:

C02-based incubation: where CO2 is available, conventional IVF in tubes with incubation in portable units with long term battery backup built in.

One-Step Method: IVF performed in the transfer catheter, which will virtually eliminate the need for manipulation. Low sperm numbers (about 200), in low Volume (30ul) with separate 5 ul column of hyaluronidase to enzymatically assist cumulus and coronal cell removal.

Intravaginal (INVOcell): may be used in certain locations

Protocols:

Simplified medium to support fertilization and development to 2-to4-cell stage, with maternal serum supplementation (25%) supplying protein, amino acids, and labile ingredients, etc.

Standard plasma protein availability, when necessary.

Medium is designed to have a long shelf life and to be reconstituted on site, as needed.

IVF in one-step catheter format or in tubes.

Training:

Task-oriented, image-recognition for sperm Numbers.

Each unit has set of fixed oocytes and early embryos

Permanent in-house reference of normal and abnormal specimens, which can be used for training and acquisition of manipulation skills for denudation, handling and transfer, where appropriate.















Prospects and Achievable Goals :

adaptability is essential minimization of invasive steps rapid acquisition of essential and specific skills followed by ongoing education in embryology

evolution of protocols from experience leading to continual simplification without impairing outcome

commercial partners

training centers with unified and progressive curriculum (Alexandria)

Mark your calendar for the upcoming ESHRE campus workshops!

- Basic Genetics for ART Practitioners organised by the SIG Reproductive Genetics 16 April 2010 - Porto, Portugal
- Array technologies to apprehend developmental competence and endometrial receptivity: limits and possibilities organised by the Task Force Basic Science in Reproduction 22 April 2010 - Brussels, Belgium
- The management of infertility training workshop for junior doctors, paramedicals and embryologists organised by the SIG Reproductive Endocrinology, SIG Embryology and the Paramedical Group 26-27 May 2010 - Kiev, Ukraine
- Preimplantation genetic diagnosis: a celebration of 20 years organised by the SIG Reproductive Genetics 1 July 2010 - Rome, Italy
- EIM 10 years' celebration meeting organised by the European IVF Monitoring Consortium 11 September 2010 - Munich, Germany
- The determinants of a successful pregnancy organised by the SIGS Reproductive Surgery, Early Pregnancy and Reproductive Endocrinology 24-25 September 2010 - Dubrovnik, Croatia
- Basic training workshop for paramedics working in reproductive health organised by the Paramedical Group 6-8 October 2010 - Valencia, Spain
- Forgotten knowledge about gamete physiology and its impact on embryo quality organised by the SIG Embryology 9-10 October 2010 - Lisbon, Portugal

www.eshre.eu (see "Calendar")



Contact us at info@eshre.eu

Page 104 of 113

Keep an eye on our calendar section for more information on

Upcoming events

- Female and male surgery in human reproductive medicine 8-9 October 2010 Treviso, Italy
- **Promoting excellence in clinical research: from idea to publication** 5-6 November 2010 Thessaloniki, Greece
- "Update on pluripotent stem cells (hESC and iPS)" and hands on course on "Derivation and culture of pluripotent stem cells" 8-12 November 2010 - Valencia, Spain
- Women's health aspects of PCOS (excluding infertility) 18 November 2010 - Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- Endoscopy in reproductive medicine 24-26 November 2010 - Leuven, Belgium
- Fertility and Cancer 25-26 November 2010 - Bologna, Italy
- The maternal-embryonic interface 2-3 December 2010 - Valencia, Spain
- GnHR agonist for triggering of final oocyte maturation time for a paradigm shift
 3 December 2010 Madrid, Spain
- Raising competence in psychosocial care
 3-4 December 2010 Amsterdam, The Netherlands

www.eshre.eu (see "Calendar")



Contact us at info@eshre.eu

Page 105 of 113