



# **Cross border reproductive care: The facts from the ESHRE study**

Françoise Shenfield, RMU, UCLH, London, UK  
Strasbourg, Feb 2018



# Disclosures

I have no conflict of interest to declare



## Awareness of a growing phenomenon

- Cross-border medical care is a **growing phenomenon**. It indicates the **movements** by candidate health care recipients from **one country** or jurisdiction where treatment is unavailable for them **to another country** or jurisdiction where they can obtain the treatment they need
- **Avoid** the terms ‘reproductive’ or ‘procreative *tourism*’ because of their negative connotations and will use instead the **neutral term ‘cross-border reproductive care’**

• *Ethics and law TF 2008*

# Why CBRC: legal restrictions, availability

- **type** of treatment is forbidden by law (i.e. oocyte donation)
- **categories** of patients **not eligible** for ART (i.e. lesbian couples, single)
- **waiting lists** are too long in one's home country (i.e. oocyte donation)
- out-of-pocket **costs** for the patients are too high (i.e. No funding or insurance)
- technique **not available** because of **lack of expertise** or equipment (PGD), or not considered **safe** enough (ICSI/test sperm; egg freezing)
- personal wishes (i.e. **privacy** considerations)

# From awareness to gathering data

- **Cross border reproductive care in six European countries**, the ESHRE Taskforce on CBRC (Shenfield, de Mouzon, Pennings, Ferraretti, Nyboe Andersen, de Wert, and Goossens) ; **Human Reproduction**, Vol.25, No.6 pp. 1361–1368, **2010**
- Only 1 previous study with data: Pennings re French (single or same sex couples) women going to Belgium for DI

# 1230 foreign patients' data in 6 countries

*1 calendar month in clinics in Belgium, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Switzerland, Slovenia, and Spain*

- **Socio- demographic characteristics** (age, country of residence, marital status, sexual orientation, education)
- **Reasons for travelling:** **law** evasion (treatment illegal or restricted), **access** limitations at home, **quality** of care, **previous failure**, wish for **donation** (anonymous, direct,...), related to **country of origin** and women's **age** category ( $\leq 34$ , 35-39 and  $\geq 40$ )
- **Information received, selection means, reimbursement in country of residence**



## General reasons for travelling according to the CBRC patients' country of residence

Patients' residence	<b>Illegal</b>	Access difficulty	Better quality	Past failure	Anonymous Donation
Italy	<b>70.6</b>	2.6	<b>46.3</b>	26.1	14.1
Germany	<b>80.2</b>	6.8	63.8	43.5	25.4
Netherlands	32.2	7.4	<b>53.0</b>	25.5	10.7
France	<b>64.5</b>	12.2	20.6	18.7	42.1
Norway	<b>71.6</b>	0.0	22.4	16.4	16.4
UK	9.4	<b>34.0</b>	28.3	37.7	26.4
Sweden	<b>56.6</b>	13.2	24.5	5.7	18.9
Total	<b>674</b>	86	531	358	220
	<b>54.8</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>23.2</b>	<b>29.1</b>	<b>17.9</b>

# Summary of reasons for CBRC

- **Legal reasons** were predominant for Italian patients (70.6%), French (64.5%), German (80.2%), and Norwegian (71.6%)
- **Access** was more often noted in UK patients (34.0%) than in the other countries, and **quality** was an important factor for most patients

## Destination countries: vicinity

		Country of treatment							
Country of Residence		Be	CZ	DK	SLO	SPA	SWZ	TOTAL	
		%	%	%	%	%	%	N	%
Italy		13.0	2.6	0.3	1.0	<b>31.7</b>	<b>51.4</b>	391	31.8
Germany		10.2	<b>67.2</b>	11.9	0.0	10.7	0.0	177	14.4
Netherlands		<b>96.6</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	149	12.1
France		<b>85.0</b>	7.5	0.0	0.0	7.5	0.0	107	8.7
Norway		0.0	1.5	<b>98.5</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	67	5.5
UK		7.6	<b>52.8</b>	11.3	0.0	<b>28.3</b>	0.0	53	4.3
Sweden		0.0	5.7	<b>92.4</b>	0.0	1.9	0.0	53	4.3
Total	n	365	252	154	65	193	201	<b>1230</b>	---
	%	29.7	20.5	12.5	5.3	15.7	16.3	100.0	---

## Treatment sought according to the recipient country

		Infertility treatment (total=100%)			Donation			
Country	Files (n)	ART only	IUI only	ART/IUI	Semen	Oocyte	Embryo	
<b>Belgium</b>	359	66.6	28.1	5.3	<b>20.5</b>	6.8	0.3	
<b>Czech Rep</b>	251	98.4	1.6	0.0	9.5	<b>52.9</b>	11.9	
Denmark	154	43.5	53.2	3.3	<b>40.9</b>	1.3	0.6	
Slovenia	64	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
<b>Spain</b>	190	94.2	1.6	4.2	4.1	<b>62.2</b>	4.7	
Switzerland	196	45.9	<b>40.3</b>	13.8	<b>27.1</b>	1.0	0.5	
<b>Total</b>	n	<b>1214</b>	886	269	59	225	281	42
	%	---	<b>73.0</b>	<b>22.2</b>	4.9	<b>18.3</b>	<b>22.8</b>	3.4

# Age, civil status

- Mean age= **37.3 years** (21– 51 years)older than home national data(EIM data)
- Women 40 or + = **34.9%**, **51.1%** for German and **63.5%** UK women (32.2% It, 30.2% Fr)
- **Civil status:** 69.9% married, 24.0% cohabiting and 6.1% single. Most Italian women were married (82.0%), **43% Swedish were single**
- Many same sex couples from France, Sweden and Norway

# Treatment distribution

- **Treatments:** 22.2% of patients were seeking IUI only, 73.0% sought ART only, and 4.9% both. Majority of IUI/D for French (53.3%) and Swedish (62.3%) patients, and a majority of ART for most other countries
- **Gametes and embryo donation:** 18.3% of patients were looking for **semen** donation, **22.8% for egg donation** and 3.4% for embryo donation. Often > 1 possibility

# Change from **2008 to now** (and later)?

- In **Sweden**: only **couples** have ART access, which explains the **high proportion of single Swedish** women (43.4%) seeking treatment abroad
- donor insemination was unavailable to lesbian couples in **Norway** (Norwegian Law, 1987); changed (thanks to legislation on non-discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation) in early 2009: 20% of Norwegian participants were lesbian couples  
***Now different?***
- In France, assisted conception for single or same sex couples is illegal (**change @ revision 2018?**)

## Germany recent case (October 2017)

---



# Selection of centres and destinations

- **2 main sources of information: internet** (41.1%) and **patients' doctors** (41.1%); friends and relatives consulted (24.2%); patients' **organizations** rarely (5.0%)
- **Internet** was a frequent source in Sweden (73.6%), Germany (65.0%) and the UK (58.5%); **patients' doctors** more often for Italian women (55.2%), less for French (27%) or Germans (35%)

# How common is CBRC?

- The full extent of CBRC in Europe *is not precisely known* because many national treatment registries do not record the patient's country of origin; Estimated: **around 5%**
- **1230 questionnaires in 1 month** represent around 12 000–15 000 cycles, X two as minimum 24 000–30 000 cycles (75% ART, 25% IUI) with 2 ART cycles and 3 IUI
- 11 000–14 000 patients per year .

# CBRC = freedom of patient movement

- EU principle(2008 Directive of the European Commission)
- ...But we should balance **Freedom v Burden: Patients'** (women's ) interests: more **choice (autonomy) v burden away from psycho-social support; legal conflicts** (donor anonymity, surrogacy ...) for now and the future
- Safe and effective standards: the « Good Parctice Guide »

# The ESHRE CBRC Good Practice Guide

1. **Enhance Clinical standards** (“good practice”) and **Lab safety** (comparatively easy, in Europe at least with EUTD)
  2. **Reduce** multiple pregnancy
  3. **Protect** vulnerable collaborators
  4. **Disseminate information** re standards via patients’ organisation, etc...
- ***Principles:*** equity, safety, efficiency, effectiveness (including evidence based care), timeliness and patient centeredness

Shenfield F, Pennings G, De Mouzon J, et al. ESHRE’s good practice guide for cross-border reproductive care for centers and practitioners. Hum Reprod. 2011; 26:



# Some GPG recommendations

- Patients: provision of accurate success rates, evidence based treatment or « experimental protocol »
- Donors: establish national registers of donors, application EUTD for std screening
- Surrogacy: single ET
- Children: diminish X, single ET with OD ,(max 2)
- Professional: good communication

# Conclusions

- The **main reasons** for travelling were **legal restrictions** based on prohibition of the technique *per se*, or because of **inaccessibility** due to the characteristics of the patients (like age, sexual orientation or civil status)
- **Consequences:** patients cross borders in order to avoid ‘unfriendly’ legislation
- *Possible legal changes: some work in progress (Italy **now allows** gametes donation, difficult to build up recruitment)*
- **Continue data collection**

