



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 (≤ 34 , 35-39 and ≥ 40)
- **Information received, selection means, reimbursement in country of residence**

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

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

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	31.7	51.4	391	31.8
Germany		10.2	67.2	11.9	0.0	10.7	0.0	177	14.4
Netherlands		96.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	149	12.1
France		85.0	7.5	0.0	0.0	7.5	0.0	107	8.7
Norway		0.0	1.5	98.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	67	5.5
UK		7.6	52.8	11.3	0.0	28.3	0.0	53	4.3
Sweden		0.0	5.7	92.4	0.0	1.9	0.0	53	4.3
Total	n	365	252	154	65	193	201	1230	---
	%	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	
Belgium	359	66.6	28.1	5.3	20.5	6.8	0.3	
Czech Rep	251	98.4	1.6	0.0	9.5	52.9	11.9	
Denmark	154	43.5	53.2	3.3	40.9	1.3	0.6	
Slovenia	64	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Spain	190	94.2	1.6	4.2	4.1	62.2	4.7	
Switzerland	196	45.9	40.3	13.8	27.1	1.0	0.5	
Total	n 1214	886	269	59	225	281	42	
	%	---	73.0	22.2	4.9	18.3	22.8	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**

