Keep it simple: Specific aspects of IUI in developing countries

Hassan N. Sallam, MD, FRCOG (England), PhD (London) Professor and Chair, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, The University of Alexandria, and Director of the Suzanne Mubarak Regional Center for Women's Health and Development

ESHRE Campus symposium "Artificial Insemination: an update", Genk, Belgium, 13-15 December 2009

The old Alexandria medical school







The lighthouse, the Library and the uterus after Soranus of Ephesus



Antony van Leeuwenhoek, (1632-1723), Dutch student of natural history and maker of microscopes, Delft









Regnier van De Graaf, born in Schoonhoven, Netherlands, 30 July 1641; died in Delft, Netherlands, 21 August 1673)

History of artificial insemination

Year	Event
14 th Century	A.I. of Arab brood mares
17 th Century	A.I. of fish by John Swammerdam (a Leyden physician) - unsuccessful
1742	A.I. of fish Ludwig Jacobi (successful)
1780	A.I. of dogs by Lazario Spallanzani of Modena (successful)
1790	AIH in humans by John Hunter of London (successful)
1838	AIH in humans by the French physician Girault (successful)

History of artificial insemination (cont...)

Year	Event
1866	James Marion Sims performed 55 AIH for 6 women (1 became pregnant) followed by a public outcry
1868	Girault publishes a series of 10 AIH (8 pregnancies including one pair of twins)
1884	First AID pregnancy in Philadelphia by Dr. William Pancoast. Case considered rape as patient was not informed
1941	Postal survey of 30.000 physicians reports 9489 cases of women achieving a least one pregnancy (5728 by AIH and 3510 by AID)
1949	Technique of sperm freezing developed
1953	First human baby from stored semen



Definition of developing countries

World Bank definition
 UNDP definition

World Bank ranking

• High income countries (GDP >3500 US\$ per capita) • High middle income countries (GDP 2500 - 3500 US\$ per capita) • Low middle income countries (GDP 1500 - 2500 US\$ per capita) • Low income countries (GDP <1500 US\$ per capita)

World Bank ranking

• High income countries (GDP >3500 US\$ per capita) High middle income countries (GDP 2500 - 3500 US\$ per capita) Low middle income countries (GDP 1500 - 2500 US\$ per capita) Low income countries (GDP <1500 US\$ per capita)

Table I. World Bank classification of countries by GNI per capita.

Low-income economies (53)		
Afghanistan	India	Rwanda
Bangladesh	Kenya	São Tomé and Principe
Benin	Korea, Dem Rep.	Senegal
Burkina Faso	Kyrgyz Republic	Sierra Leone
Burundi	Lao PDR	Solomon Islands
Cambodia	Liberia	Somalia
Central African Republic	Madagascar	Sudan
Chad	Malawi	Tajikistan
Comoros	Mali	Tanzania
Congo, Dem. Rep	Mauritania	Timor-Leste
Côte d'Ivoire	Mongolia	Togo
Eritrea	Mozambique	Uganda
Ethiopia	Myanmar	Uzbekistan
Gambia, The	Nepal	Vietnam
Ghana	Niger	Yemen, Rep.
Guinea	Nigeria	Zambia
Guinea-Bissau	Pakistan	Zimbabwe
Haiti	Papua New Guinea	
	x	
Lower-middle-income economies (55)		
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania	El Salvador	Namibia
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria	El Salvador Fiji	Namibia Nicaragua
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola	El Salvador Fiji Georgia	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola Armenia	El Salvador Fiji Georgia Guatemala	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay Peru
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola Armenia Azerbaijan	El Salvador Fiji Georgia Guatemala Guvana	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay Peru Philippines
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola Armenia Azerbaijan Belarus	El Salvador Fiji Georgia Guatemala Guyana Honduras	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay Peru Philippines Samoa
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola Armenia Azerbaijan Belarus Bhutan	El Salvador Fiji Georgia Guatemala Guyana Honduras Indonesia	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay Peru Philippines Samoa Sri Lanka
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola Armenia Azerbaijan Belarus Bhutan Bolivia	El Salvador Fiji Georgia Guatemala Guyana Honduras Indonesia Iran, Islamic Rep.	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay Peru Philippines Samoa Sri Lanka Suriname
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola Armenia Azerbaijan Belarus Bhutan Bolivia Bosnia and Herzegovina	El Salvador Fiji Georgia Guatemala Guyana Honduras Indonesia Iran, Islamic Rep. Iraq	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay Peru Philippines Samoa Sri Lanka Suriname Swaziland
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola Armenia Azerbaijan Belarus Bhutan Bolivia Bosnia and Herzegovina Cameroon	El Salvador Fiji Georgia Guatemala Guyana Honduras Indonesia Iran, Islamic Rep. Iraq Jamaica	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay Peru Philippines Samoa Sri Lanka Suriname Swaziland Syrian Arab Republic
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola Armenia Azerbaijan Belarus Bhutan Bolivia Bosnia and Herzegovina Cameroon Cape Verde	El Salvador Fiji Georgia Guatemala Guyana Honduras Indonesia Iran, Islamic Rep. Iraq Jamaica Jordan	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay Peru Philippines Samoa Sri Lanka Suriname Swaziland Syrian Arab Republic Thailand
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola Armenia Azerbaijan Belarus Bhutan Bolivia Bosnia and Herzegovina Cameroon Cape Verde China	El Salvador Fiji Georgia Guatemala Guyana Honduras Indonesia Iran, Islamic Rep. Iraq Jamaica Jordan Kiribati	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay Peru Philippines Samoa Sri Lanka Suriname Swaziland Syrian Arab Republic Thailand Tonga
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola Armenia Azerbaijan Belarus Bhutan Bolivia Bosnia and Herzegovina Cameroon Cape Verde China Colombia	El Salvador Fiji Georgia Guatemala Guyana Honduras Indonesia Iran, Islamic Rep. Iraq Jamaica Jordan Kiribati Lesotho	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay Peru Philippines Samoa Sri Lanka Suriname Swaziland Syrian Arab Republic Thailand Tonga Tunisia
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola Armenia Azerbaijan Belarus Bhutan Bolivia Bosnia and Herzegovina Cameroon Cape Verde China Colombia Congo, Rep.	El Salvador Fiji Georgia Guatemala Guyana Honduras Indonesia Iran, Islamic Rep. Iraq Jamaica Jordan Kiribati Lesotho Macedonia, FYR	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay Peru Philippines Samoa Sri Lanka Suriname Swaziland Syrian Arab Republic Thailand Tonga Tunisia Turkmenistan
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola Armenia Azerbaijan Belarus Bhutan Bolivia Bosnia and Herzegovina Cameroon Cape Verde China Colombia Congo, Rep. Cuba	El Salvador Fiji Georgia Guatemala Guyana Honduras Indonesia Iran, Islamic Rep. Iraq Jamaica Jordan Kiribati Lesotho Macedonia, FYR Maldives	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay Peru Philippines Samoa Sri Lanka Suriname Swaziland Syrian Arab Republic Thailand Tonga Tunisia Turkmenistan Ukraine
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola Armenia Azerbaijan Belarus Bhutan Bolivia Bosnia and Herzegovina Cameroon Cape Verde China Colombia Congo, Rep. Cuba Djibouti	El Salvador Fiji Georgia Guatemala Guyana Honduras Indonesia Iran, Islamic Rep. Iraq Jamaica Jordan Kiribati Lesotho Macedonia, FYR Maldives Marshall Islands	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay Peru Philippines Samoa Sri Lanka Suriname Swaziland Syrian Arab Republic Thailand Tonga Tunisia Turkmenistan Ukraine Vanuatu
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola Armenia Azerbaijan Belarus Bhutan Bolivia Bosnia and Herzegovina Cameroon Cape Verde China Colombia Congo, Rep. Cuba Djibouti Dominican Republic	El Salvador Fiji Georgia Guatemala Guyana Honduras Indonesia Iran, Islamic Rep. Iraq Jamaica Jordan Kiribati Lesotho Macedonia, FYR Maldives Marshall Islands Micronesia, Fed. Sts.	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay Peru Philippines Samoa Sri Lanka Suriname Swaziland Syrian Arab Republic Thailand Tonga Tunisia Turkmenistan Ukraine Vanuatu West Bank and Gaza
Lower-middle-income economies (55) Albania Algeria Angola Armenia Azerbaijan Belarus Bhutan Bolivia Bosnia and Herzegovina Cameroon Cape Verde China Colombia Congo, Rep. Cuba Djibouti Dominican Republic Ecuador	El Salvador Fiji Georgia Guatemala Guyana Honduras Indonesia Iran, Islamic Rep. Iraq Jamaica Jordan Kiribati Lesotho Macedonia, FYR Maldives Marshall Islands Micronesia, Fed. Sts. Moldova	Namibia Nicaragua Paraguay Peru Philippines Samoa Sri Lanka Suriname Swaziland Syrian Arab Republic Thailand Tonga Tunisia Turkmenistan Ukraine Vanuatu West Bank and Gaza

Upper-middle-income economies (41)		
American Samoa	Kazakhstan	Poland
Argentina	Latvia	Romania
Belize	Lebanon	Russian Federation
Botswana	Libya	Serbia
Brazil	Lithuania	Seychelles
Bulgaria	Malaysia	Slovak Republic
Chile	Mauritius	South Africa
Costa Rica	Mayotte	St. Kitts and Nevis
Croatia	Mexico	St. Lucia
Dominica	Montenegro	St. Vincent and the Grenadines
Equatorial Guinea	Northern Mariana Islands	Turkey
Gabon	Oman	Uruguay
Grenada	Palau	Venezuela, RB
Hungary	Panama	
High-income economies (60)		
Andorra	France	Netherlands
Antigua and Barbuda	French Polynesia	Netherlands Antilles
Aruba	Germany	New Caledonia
Australia	Greece	New Zealand
Austria	Greenland	Norway
Bahamas, The	Guam	Portugal
Bahrain	Hong Kong, China	Puerto Rico
Barbados	Iceland	Qatar
Belgium	Ireland	San Marino
Bermuda	Isle of Man	Saudi Arabia
Brunei Darussalam	Israel	Singapore
Canada	Italy	Slovenia
Cayman Islands	Japan	Spain
Channel Islands	Korea, Rep.	Sweden
Cyprus	Kuwait	Switzerland
Czech Republic	Liechtenstein	Trinidad and Tobago
Denmark	Luxembourg	United Arab Emirates
Estonia	Macao, China	United Kingdom
Faeroe Islands	Malta	United States
Finland	Monaco	Virgin Islands (U.S.)

UNDP classification

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) takes into consideration three criteria for the evaluation of countries' development:

Low-income criterion,
 Human resources weakness criterion
 Economic vulnerability criterion.

Table II. List of the LDCs according to the UNDP.			
1	Afghanistan [#]	26	Madagascar
2	Angola	27	Malawi [#]
3	Bangladesh	28	Maldives*
4	Benin	29	Mali [#]
5	Bhutan [#]	30	Mauritania
6	Burkina Faso [#]	31	Mozambique
7	Burundi [#]	32	Myanmar
8	Cambodia	33	Nepal [#]
9	Cape Verde*	34	Niger [#]
10	Central African Republic [#]	35	Rwanda [#]
11	Chad [#]	36	Samoa*
12	Comoros*	37	São Tomé and Principe*
13	Democratic Republic	38	Senegal
	of the Congo		
14	Djibouti	39	Sierra Leone
15	Equatorial Guinea	40	Solomon Islands*
16	Eritrea	41	Somalia
17	Ethiopia [#]	42	Sudan
18	Gambia	43	Timor-Lesté*
19	Guinea	44	Togo
20	Guinea-Bissau*	45	Tuvalu*
21	Haiti*	46	Uganda [#]
22	Kiribati*	47	United Republic of Tanzania
23	Lao People's	48	Vanuatu*
	Democratic Republic [#]		
24	Lesotho [#]	49	Yemen
25	Liberia	50	Zambia [#]

See Appendix for criteria of inclusion.

33 in Africa

*Also SIDs (Small island developing countries). *Also LLDCs (Land locked developing countries). Reference: http://www.un.org/special-rep/ohrlls/ldc/list.htm

Situation analysis

Level 1 – Basic infertility clinic: Investigating infertility, semen analysis, hormonal assays, follicular scanning, PCT, ovulation induction, IUI

> Level 2 – Advanced infertility clinic: IVF, diagnostic endoscopy

Level 3 – Tertiary level infertility clinic: ICSI, cryopreservation, operative endoscopy Specific aspects of infertility in developing countries (DCs)

Prevalence of infertility in DCs
 Causes of infertility in DCs
 Infections: HIV, HCV
 Consequences of infertility in DCs
 Obstacles to treatment
 Financial aspects
 Cultural aspects

Specific aspects of infertility in developing countries (DCs) 1. Prevalence of infertility in DCs 2. Causes of infertility in DCs **3.** Infections: HIV, HCV 4. Consequences of infertility in DCs 5. Obstacles to treatment 6. Financial aspects 7. Cultural aspects

Prevalence of infertility in DCs

Study	Country	Infertility (%)
Che and Cleland (2002)	China	9.3
Larsen (2005)	Tanzania	6.9
Sundby et al (1998)	Gambia	9.2
Barden-O'Fallon (2005)	Malawi	19.6
Fuentes and Devoto (1994)	Chile	25.7
Geelhoed et al. (2002)	Ghana	11.8
Unisa (1999)	India (Pradesh)	5
Zarger et al (1997)	India (Kashmir)	15.1
Che and Cleland (2002)	China (Shanghai)	3
Ericksen and Brunette (1996)	Sub-Saharan Africa	14.5
Larsen (2000)	Sub-Saharan Africa	16.4
Liu et al (2005)	China (National)	1.3

Boivin et al, Hum Reprod 22:1506–1512, 2007

Prevalence of infertility in Africa

Average Southern Africa Eastern Africa Namibia 14.9% 16.7 % - 21.4 % 9.8 % - 12.2 % 14 - 32 %

Ericksen, K. and Brunette, T. Patterns and predictors of infertility among African women: A cross-national survey of twenty-seven nations. Social Science and Medicine 42(2):209-220, 1996

Secondary infertility

Asia23 %North Africa16 %Sub-Saharan Africa52 %Latin America40 %

Cates, W. et al. Worldwide patterns of infertility: Is Africa Different? Lancet 2 (8455): 596-598, 1985

Specific aspects of infertility in developing countries (DCs) 1. Prevalence of infertility in DCs 2. Causes of infertility in DCs **3.** Infections: HIV, HCV 4. Consequences of infertility in DCs 5. Obstacles to treatment 6. Financial aspects 7. Cultural aspects

Causes of infertility worldwide

WHO study of 5,800 infertile couples from 33 medical centers in 22 developed and developing countries

Female causes25 to 37 %Male causes8 to 22 %Both male and female21 to 38 %

Cates, W. et al. Worldwide patterns of infertility: Is Africa Different? Lancet 2 (8455): 596-598, 1985

Causes of Couple Infertility, by Region



Cates, W. et al. Worldwide patterns of infertility: Is Africa Different? Lancet 2 (8455): 596-598, 1985

Possible causes of variability in the prevalence of infertility in DCs

- Sexually transmitted, infectious, and parasitic diseases
 - Health care practices and policies

• Exposure to potentially toxic substances in the diet or the environment

World Health Organization. Infertility: A Tabulation of Available Data on Prevalence of Primary and Secondary Infertility. Geneva, 1991 Specific aspects of infertility in developing countries (DCs) 1. Prevalence of infertility in DCs 2. Causes of infertility in DCs 3. Infections: HIV, HCV 4. Consequences of infertility in DCs 5. Obstacles to treatment 6. Financial aspects 7. Cultural aspects

Percent of Infertile Women with Infectionrelated Diagnoses, by Region



World Health Organization. Infertility: A Tabulation of Available Data on Prevalence of Primary and Secondary Infertility. Geneva, 1991



Specific aspects of infertility in developing countries (DCs)

Prevalence of infertility in DCs
 Causes of infertility in DCs
 Infections: HIV, HCV
 Consequences of infertility in DCs
 Obstacles to treatment
 Financial aspects
 Cultural aspects

Consequences of infertility in DCs

1. Loss of social status 2. Social isolation 3. Marital instability 4. Loss of social security 5. Gender identity 6. Psychological consequences (guilt, depression, shame, grief, sense of worthlessness) 7. Continuity: funeral tradition



Ombelet et al, HRU 14 (6): 605–621, 2008

Specific aspects of infertility in developing countries (DCs)

Prevalence of infertility in DCs
 Causes of infertility in DCs
 Infections: HIV, HCV
 Consequences of infertility in DCs
 Obstacles to treatment
 Financial aspects
 Cultural aspects

Obstacles to treating infertility in developing countries

Lack of services
Lack of know how
Lack of finance
Lack of access to services
Acceptance of fate (curse from God)
Bad experience of neighbors
Traditional healers

Nygren and Zegers-Hochschild, Hum Repropd Suppl 1: 5, 2008

Specific aspects of infertility in developing countries

1. Prevalence of infertility in DCs 2. Causes of infertility in DCs **3.** Infections: HIV, HCV 4. Consequences of infertility in DCs 5. Obstacles to treatment 6. Financial aspects 7. Cultural aspects

Global health spending

	Developing countries	Developed countries
Global population	84%	16%
Global disease burden	90%	10%
Global health spending	12%	88%

Schieber G. Health financing in developing countries. Economic viewpoint June 2006

Public share of total health spending

Country	Percentage of spending share
Low-income countries	<u>29%</u>
Lower-middle income countries	42%
Upper-middle income countries	56%
High income countries	65%

Schieber G. Health financing in developing countries. Economic viewpoint June 2006

Obstacles to funding infertility projects

Infertility is not a disease
Infertility is not a serious disease
Infertility treatment is not effective
Infertility treatment is expensive
Treating infertility in an overpopulated country

Specific aspects of infertility in developing countries (DCs)

Prevalence of infertility in DCs
 Causes of infertility in DCs
 Infections: HIV, HCV
 Consequences of infertility in DCs
 Obstacles to treatment
 Financial aspects
 Cultural aspects
Cultural aspects of infertility in developing countries

Stigmatization of infertile women/VAW
The culture of son-preference

Donor insemination
Lesbian couples and nontraditional families







Infertility as a form of VAW

Number of infertile women	233
Experienced domestic violence	97 (41.6%)
Psychological torture	50 (51.5%)
Verbal abuse	38 (39.2%)
Ridicule	27 (27.8%)
Physical abuse	17 (17.5%)
Deprivation	6 (6.2%)
By the husband	47 (48.5%)
By female in-laws	31 (32%).

Ameh et al. Niger Med J 16(4):375, 2007

Discrimination against the female child



In treatmentIn educationIn feeding

This Pakistani mother gave birth to twins. She breast-fed the boy and bottlefed the girl. The girl died the following day this picture was taken.

The missing females



About 100 million women are missing (44m in China, 37m in India) due to:

- Prenatal sex selection/abortion
 - Discrimination against the female child
 - Postpartum hemorrhage

Sen AK. Missing women, BMJ 304: 586-7, 1992 Sen A. Missing women – revisited, BMJ 367: 185-6, 2003

The missing females World population by sex in 2008

Population in thousands	Males	Females
World	3 442 851	3 386 510
High income	451 069	464 797
Low and Middle income	2 594 306	2 535 000

United Nations Report: Population prospects: the 2008 revision, 2009





Sunni Islam has no supreme juridicalreligious authority or teaching For Shi'a Moslems, the Grand Ayatollah represents God's authority

Gamete donation

• <u>Gamete donation is prohibited by Sunni</u> <u>Muslims but allowed by Shi'ite Muslims</u>

• The Sunni Muslims opinion is based on the sanctity of the male inheritance line

• The Shi'ite Muslim decision is based on the fact that it does not involve sexual intercourse (Fatwa by Ayatollah Ali Hussein Khamenei in 1999)

Serour G. Infertility and Assisted Reproduction. Eds: Rizk et al, 737, 2008







- Wombs for Rent: Commercial Surrogacy Growing in India, 30 December 2007
 - Japanese Woman, 61, Gives Birth to Grandchild, 21 August 2008



Israeli gay couple in India has baby through IVF

Mumbai: A three-kilo-baby is literally a bundle of joy for Israeli gay couple Omer and Yonatan Gher. The couple had a baby through invitro fertilisation in a Mumbaibased clinic. [Prachi Jatania, CNN-IBN] Wed, Nov 19, 2008 at 00:25

Advantages of IUI over IVF in DCs

Less equipment necessary
Easy technique to learn

Less invasive
Less expensive

Reduced psychological burden
Good couple compliancy (low dropout rate)

Low risk for OHSS

Low multiple pregnancy rate with natural cycles, clomiphene or low-dose HMG protocols

Ombelet, Hum Reprod 64S, 2008

IUI in developing countries

1. Simple stimulation protocols 2. Simple monitoring techniques **3**. Evaluation of the semen sample 4. Simple sperm preparation techniques **5**. Simple insemination devices 6. Timing of IUI 7. Single versus double insemination 8. AID, HIV and sex pre-selection

IUI in developing countries

1. Simple stimulation protocols 2. Simple monitoring techniques **3**. Evaluation of the semen sample 4. Simple sperm preparation techniques **5**. Simple insemination devices 6. Timing of IUI 7. Single versus double insemination 8. AID, HIV and sex pre-selection

Factors affecting the success of IUI

Table IV. Logistic regression model for predicting the success of intrauterine insemination

Variable	OR ^a	CIp	Р
Age ^c			0.028
<40 (years)	3.24	(1.14, 9.23)	
Infertility duration ^c			0.017
≤6 (years)	2.33	(1.16, 4.66)	
Infertility actiology ^c			0.045
unexplained	2.79	(1.33, 5.87)	
Number of follicles (>16 mm) ^c			0.031
2	2.45	(1.16, 5.18)	
3	3.18	(1.48, 6.81)	
≥4	2.51	(1.13, 5.55)	
Number of treatment cycle ^d			0.009
2	0.57	(0.34, 0.96)	
3	0.44	(0.24, 0.83)	
4	0.43	(0.19, 1.03)	
≥5	0.22	(0.07, 0.75)	
^a Odds ratio.			
^b 95% confidence interval.		n = 811 c	cycles

Odds ratio in contrast to the poorest category.

^dOdds ratio in contrast to the best category.

Nuojua-Huttunen et al. Hum Reprod 14: 698, 1999

IUI with COH versus timed intercourse



Hughes, Human Reprod 12: 1865, 1997

IUI with HMG

Pregnancy outcome	No. of patients	
Pregnancies/cycle (%)	102/811 (12.6)	
Live births	72 (70.6)	
Miscarriages	24 (23.5)	
Ectopic pregnancies	6 (5.9)	
Multiple pregnancies	14 (13.7)	
Multiple births/live births	12/72 (16.7)	

Values in parentheses are percentages

Nuojua-Huttunen et al. Hum Reprod 14: 698, 1999

IUI with clomiphene citrate + HCG



Ombelet et al, Hum Reprod 12: 1458-63, 1997

CPR in IUI with CC v/s HMG (RCT)

Cycle rank	IUI with CC then HMG	IUI with HMG then CC	P value
1	7.4 %	6.9 %	NS
2	22.2 %	10.5 %	NS
3	35.2 %	18.6 %	NS
4	35.2 %	44.0 %	NS
Total	35.2 %	44.0 %	NS

Ecochard et al, Fertil Steril 73: 90, 2000

Minimal stimulation for IUI

Conventional stimulation

CC from days 3 to 7
HMG 150 IU/day from day 8
HCG when follicle >17 mm and E2> 1500 pmol/L

Minimal stimulation

CC from days 3 to 7
HMG 150 IU once on day 9
HCG when follicle >17 mm

Dhaliwal et al. J Obstet Gynaecol Res 28: 295–299, 2002

Minimal stimulation for IUI

Table 3 Outcome of treatment with both protocols					
	Minimal stimulation	Full stimulation			
No. of cases	100	100			
No. of treatment cycles	216	204			
No. of dominant follicles [†]	1.83 ± 0.71	3.16 ± 1.50			
No. of visits for monitoring ⁺	1	3.15 ± 1.21			
No. of ampoules of hMG ⁺ (75 IU)	2**	12±5.4			
Pregnancy rate per couple	35%	39%			
Pregnancy rate per cycle	16.20%	19.12%			
Abortion	2 (5.7%)*	9 (23%)			
Multiple gestation	-	2 (5.13%)			
Hyperstimulation	-	6 (3%)			

*P<0.05; **P<0.01.

hMG, human menopausal gonadotrophin. [†](mean ± SD)

Dhaliwal et al. J Obstet Gynaecol Res 28: 295–299, 2002

Minimal stimulation for IUI

Table 4 Medication and monitoring expenses per cycle (in US\$)

	Minimal stimulation	Full stimulation
Clomiphene citrate (100 mg×5 days)	\$2.00	\$2.00
hMG	\$27.00	\$162.00
hCG (5000 IU)	\$8.00	\$8.00
Luteal phase 2000 IU×3	\$17.00	\$17.00
Ultrasound	\$3.50	\$10.50
Serum estradiol	\$6.00	\$17.00
Total	(\$63.50)	(\$216.50)
		-

hMG, human menopausal gonadotrophin; hCG, human chorionic gonadotrophin.

Dhaliwal et al. J Obstet Gynaecol Res 28: 295–299, 2002

IUI in developing countries

1. Simple stimulation protocols 2. Simple monitoring techniques **3**. Evaluation of the semen sample 4. Simple sperm preparation techniques **5**. Simple insemination devices 6. Timing of IUI 7. Single versus double insemination 8. AID, HIV and sex pre-selection

U/S versus U/S + E2 monitoring (Cochrane review)

Clinical pregnancy rate per woman RR = 1.07 (95% CI = 0.77 to 1.49)

Mean number of oocytes retrieved OR = -0.55 (95% CI = -1.79 to 0.69)

Incidence of ovarian hyperstimulation RR = 0.73 (95% CI = 0.30 to 1.78)

Kwan et al, Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2008 Apr 16;(2):CD005289

LH rise during ovulation induction

49% of spontaneous cycles (Cunha-Filho et al, 2003)
24% of spontaneous cycles (Cohlen et al, 1998)
36% of spontaneous cycles (Cantineau et al, 2007)

Cunha-Filho Reprod Biomed Online 7:194, 2003; Cohlen et al, Hum Reprod 13:1553, 1998 ; Cantineau et al, Fertil Steril 88: 107, 2007

CC + HCG versus LH monitoring (CPR)

Review: Comparison: Outcome: Clomiphene plus hCG versus Clomiphene plus LH 01 domiphene + hcg vs clomiphene + Lh overall 01 domiphene + hCG VS domiphene + LH

Study or sub-category	Treatment n/N	Control n/N	OR (fixed) 95% CI	Weight %	OR (fixed) 95% CI	Year
Martinez	4/43	9/44		6.07	0.40 [0.11, 1.41]	1991
Agarwal	17/247	29/261	_	19.74	0.59 [0.32, 1.11]	1995
Deaton	10/182	17/250		10.18	0.80 [0.36, 1.78]	1997
Ling	25/420	28/291	_ _	23.39	0.59 [0.34, 1.04]	1997
Zreik	2/27	4/25	← - - -	2.89	0.42 [0.07, 2.53]	1999
Vlahos	58/468	32/223		28.55	0.84 [0.53, 1.34]	2005
Lewis	23/74	17/68	+	9.18	1.35 [0.65, 2.83]	2006
Total (95% CI)	1461	1162	•	100.00	0.74 [0.57, 0.96]	
Total events: 139 (Treatmen	t), 136 (Control)		-			
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ²	= 5.30, df = 6 (P = 0.51), P = 0	%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.	30 (P = 0.02)					
			0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5	5 10		
			Eavors control Eavors treatr	nent		

Kosmas et al, Fertil Steril 87: 607, 2007

IUI in developing countries

1. Simple stimulation protocols 2. Simple monitoring techniques 3. Evaluation of the semen sample 4. Simple sperm preparation techniques **5**. Simple insemination devices 6. Timing of IUI 7. Single versus double insemination 8. AID, HIV and sex pre-selection

Sperm count





The number of spermatozoa counted in any strip of 10 squares indicates their concentration as millions per ML.



Sperm evaluation by pattern recognition



Curtsey of Professor Jonathan van Blerkom, Boulder, Colorado

Predictors of sperm fertilizing capacity

TABLE IIIMultiple regression analysis taking the
fertilization rate as the dependent factor.

Parameter	R ²	t	% Contribution
Age	0.041	-1.502	2.1
Sperm count	0.042	1.522	3.6
Grade A motility	0.033	1.353	15.6
Grade B motility	0.024	1.131	12.3
Grade C motility	0.003	-0.374	0.4
Grade A+B motility	0.037	1.421	31.9
Sperm velocity (µm/s)	0.076*	2.083	19.2
Linear velocity (µm/s)	0.029	1.258	10.4
Linearity index	0.008	-0.671	0.8
Strict morphology (%)	0.075*	2.070	3.3
HOS test (%)	0.017	0.946	0.3

*Statistically significant (P < .05)

Sallam et al. Int J Fertil 48: 88, 2003

Predictive value of the morphology score

Table III. Comparison of the morphology score (mean value \pm SD) in the different subgroups (1, 2, 3, 4)^a for pregnant and non-pregnant couples

	Morphology	Significance						
	Pregnant (n	n = 116) Not pregnant			Pregnant $(n = 116)$ Not pregnant		t	(unpared 1-lest)
	Range	Mean (\pm SD)	Range	Mean(± SD)				
Subgroup 1 $(n = 56)$ Subgroup 2 $(n = 37)$ Subgroup 3 $(n = 156)$ Subgroup 4 $(n = 124)$	3.5–17 1–11 0–18 2–18	8.3 ± 4.0 5.8 ± 2.6 7.3 ± 4.0 8.8 ± 3.7	0–16 1–16 0–15 2 – 22	5.0 ± 3.8 6.9 ± 3.8 6.6 ± 3.5 9.2 ± 4.2	P < 0.05 NS NS NS			

NS = not significant.

^aSubgroups defined by number of motile spermatozoa recovered after washing. Subgroup 1: $<1\times10^6$; subgroup 2: $\geq 1-<2\times10^6$; subgroup 3: $\geq 2-<10\times10^6$; subgroup 4: $\geq 10\times10^6$.

Ombelet et al, Hum Reprod 12: 1458-63, 1997

Sperm morphology evaluation



COMPLETELY NORMAL	%		:	
HEAD	Γ	Regular	%	Irregular
Oval	T	0	Γ	000
Tapering - pear shaped		0000		0000
Round	Ι	0		0
Duplicate		Q		n de la construction de la construcción de Re
Amorphous				
Pinhead				• •
MID PIECE		Normal -O-	•	-
Cytoplasmic remnant	Ī	- C+	61110101 61	
Abnormal implantation / broken		a d	***********	00
Too broad				2 2
FLAGELLUM	Τ	Normal O-		
Coiled	Γ	0-0	5	Ø
Duplicate		0	-	unersta filmen unersta filme enter gener i Malander
Irregular - frayed		0		
Too short	T	0	_	
REMARKS		to 22		electronic de la composición de la comp Po

IUI in developing countries

1. Simple stimulation protocols 2. Simple monitoring techniques **3**. Evaluation of the semen sample 4. Simple sperm preparation techniques **5**. Simple insemination devices 6. Timing of IUI 7. Single versus double insemination 8. AID, HIV and sex pre-selection

Sperm preparation techniques

Sperm washing
 Swim up technique
 Glass wool filtration
 Gradient centrifugation
 Electrophoretic sperm selection
 Magnetic-activated cell sorting

Sperm preparation techniques (RCT)

Clinical correlates of the methods of sperm preparation for IUI.

	Method of sperm preparation				
Variable	Double centrifugation	Multiple-tube swim-up	Percoll density gradient separation		
No. of treatment cycles	53	49	51		
Estradiol level (pg/mL)	962 ± 430	882 ± 457	879 ± 469		
No. of follicles	4.4 ± 2.2	4.1 ± 2.5	4.1 ± 2.2		
Initial total motile sperm					
(×10 ⁶)	60 ± 47	92 ± 68	92 ± 109		
Final total motile sperm					
(×10 ⁶)	$29 \pm 25^*$	6 ± 6*	$27 \pm 24^*$		
Percentage recovery	$52 \pm 32^*$	$7 \pm 6^{*}$	38 ± 29*		
Final normal					
morphology (%)	$14 \pm 8^{*}$	$20 \pm 12^{*}$	$27 \pm 11^*$		
No. of pregnancies	8	7	10		
Cycle fecundity	0.15	0.14	0.20		
<i>Note:</i> Values are means \pm SD unless otherwise indicated.					

*P<0.05.

Dodson et al, Fertil Steril 70: 574, 1998

IUI in developing countries

1. Simple stimulation protocols 2. Simple monitoring techniques **3**. Evaluation of the semen sample 4. Simple sperm preparation techniques 5. Simple insemination devices 6. Timing of IUI 7. Single versus double insemination 8. AID, HIV and sex pre-selection
Tomcat IUI catheter



Miller et al, Fertil Steril 83: 1544, 2005

Rigid vs flexible catheters for IUI (RCT)

TABLE 1

Demographic and outcome data for Tomcat and Cook catheter groups.

	Tomcat	Cook	
	(n = 51)	(n = 49)	Р
Age ^a	31.4 ± 3.2	30.9 ± 3.7	.46
Number of prior IUI ^a	2.1 ± 0.9	2.4 ± 0.8	.20
Days of abstinence ^a	3.78 ± 2.0	4.25 ± 2.9	.38
Total motile sperm (× millions) ^a	113 ± 90	114 ± 104	.99
Difficulty rating ^a	1.3 ± 0.7	1.2 ± 0.4	.32
Cycle type ^b			.36
Natural	4	1	
Clomiphene citrate	23	26	
Minimal stimulation	24	22	
Diagnoses ^b			.90
Ovulatory dysfunction	40	41	
Endometriosis	9	6	
Male factor	1	1	
Uterine/tubal factor	1	1	
Pregnancy rate ^b	16%	22%	.45
^a Values are means ± SD; Student's <i>t</i> -test.			
$^{\rm b}\chi^2$ analysis.			

Miller. Flexible vs. rigid insemination catheters. Fertil Steril 2005.

Miller et al, Fertil Steril 83: 1544, 2005

Firm versus soft catheters for IUI

(A)

Study	Firm IUI Catheter	Soft IUICatheter	Peto OR	Weight	Peto OR
or sub-category	n/N	n/N	95% Cl	%	95% CI
Segal 1998	0/17	5/34		2.68	0.20 [0.03, 1.36]
Smith 2002	68/184	61/180		54.78	1.14 [0.74, 1.76]
Fancsovits 2005	33/127	34/124		32.34	0.93 [0.53, 1.62]
Total (95% CI) Total events: 109 (Firm IUI Test for heterogeneity: Chi ²	379 Catheter), 111 (Soft IUICathete = 3.84, df = 3 (P = 0.28), I ² = 2	387 387 1.8%	•	100.00	0.96 [0.70, 1.32]
$\frac{1}{2} = 0$	0.24 (P = 0.81)		0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2	5 10	

Favours Soft Favours Firm

(B)

Study or sub-category	Firm IUI Catheter n/N	Soft IUICatheter n/N	Peto OR 95% CI	Weight %	Peto OR 95% CI
Fancsovits 2005	20/127	23/124		100.00	0.82 [0.43, 1.58]
Total (95% CI) Total events: 20 (Firm IUI Ca Test for heterogeneity: not a Test for overall effect: Z = 0.4	127 atheter), 23 (Soft IUICatheter) pplicable 59 (P = 0.56)	124		100.00	0.82 [0.43, 1.58]
		0.	1 0.2 0.5 1 2 Favours Soft Favours Firr	n 1 10	

Abou-Setta et al, Hum Reprod 21: 1961, 2006

IUI in developing countries

1. Simple stimulation protocols 2. Simple monitoring techniques **3**. Evaluation of the semen sample 4. Simple sperm preparation techniques 5. Simple insemination devices 6. Timing of IUI 7. Single versus double insemination 8. AID, HIV and sex pre-selection

Timing IUI (CCT)

	Single 24 hours	Double 24 + 36 hours	Single 36 hours
Ν	150	150	150
Pregnancies	17	21	26
Pregnancy rate	11.3%	14.0%	17.2%

Tonguc et al, Fertil Steril. 2009 Sep 25. [Epub ahead of print

Probability of conception relative to BBT

	Day						
	- 6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0
Barrett et al, 1969		0.13	0.20	0.17	0.30	0.14	0.07
Schwartz et al, 1980	0.04	0.14	1.20	0.20	0.34	0.14	0.07
Royston, 1982	0.01	0.12	0.22	0.23	0.35	0.17	0.07

Schwartz D, J Gynecol Obstet Biol Reprod 9(6): 607, 1980; Royston JP, Biometrics 38(2):397, 1982



IUI in developing countries

1. Simple stimulation protocols 2. Simple monitoring techniques **3**. Evaluation of the semen sample 4. Simple sperm preparation techniques **5**. Simple insemination devices 6. Timing of IUI 7. Single versus double insemination 8. AID, HIV and sex pre-selection

Single versus double insemination (Cochrane review)

OR = 1.45; 95% CI = 0.78-2.70 P=0.715

Cantineau et al, Human Reprod 18: 541, 2003

Single versus double insemination



Polyzos et al, Fertil Steril. 2009 Aug 7. [Epub ahead of print]

IUI in developing countries

1. Simple stimulation protocols 2. Simple monitoring techniques **3**. Evaluation of the semen sample 4. Simple sperm preparation techniques **5**. Simple insemination devices 6. Timing of IUI 7. Single versus double insemination 8. AID, HIV and sex pre-selection

HIV PCR detection (RNA and DNA) before, during and after sperm preparation



Englert et al, HRU 10: 149, 2004

Sperm preparation for HIV +ve samples

Blood viral load	Primary testing	%	Final testing
<i>x</i> < 50	7/41	17	0/41
50 < x < 1000	7/20	35	0/20
$1000 < x < 10\ 000$	4/8	50	0/8
$x > 10\ 000$	15/16	94	6/16 (37)
Total	33/85	39	6/85 (7)

Englert et al, HRU 10: 149, 2004

IUI for HIV or HCV patients

Systematic screening before IUI
Treating chronically infected patients
Separate "infected laboratory"

Adapted procedures
systematic use of ICSI
HIV testing post preparation

Englert et al, HRU 10: 149, 2004

Conclusions

• IUI is an ideal first choice ART treatment in infertile women from developing countries who have at least one patent tube

• The technique is easy to learn, inexpensive and is associated with good couple compliance

It requires mild ovarian stimulation, simple monitoring techniques and is associated with low risks of multiple pregnancies and OHSS
It should reduce psychological burden on the

infertile couple, a particularly important factor in developing countries

Keep it simple: Specific aspects of IUI in developing countries

Hassan N. Sallam, MD, FRCOG (England), PhD (London) Professor and Chair, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, The University of Alexandria, and Director of the Suzanne Mubarak Regional Center for Women's Health and Development

ESHRE Campus symposium "Artificial Insemination: an update", Genk, Belgium, 13-15 December 2009

Percoll gradient



Prevalence of infertility in Africa

Average Range Southern Africa Eastern Africa Namibia 14.9% 12.7 % - 16.9 % 16.7 % - 21.4 % 9.8 % - 12.2 % 14 - 32 %

Ericksen, K. and Brunette, T. Patterns and predictors of infertility among African women: A cross-national survey of twenty-seven nations. Social Science and Medicine 42(2):209-220, 1996



Study or sub-category	cc+hCG n/N	cc+LH	OR (fixed) 95% CI	Weight %	OR (fixed) 95% CI	Year
Deaton	0/65	1/47	• •	7.16	0.24 [0.01, 5.94]	1997
Zreik	1/9	0/9		1.76	3.35 [0.12, 93.83]	1999
Vlahos	28/226	18/99		91.08	0.64 [0.33, 1.21]	2005
Total (95% CI)	300	155	-	100.00	0.66 [0.35, 1.21]	
Total events: 29 (cc + hCG) Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² Test for overall effect: Z = 1.	, 19 (cc+ LH) = 1.31, df = 2 (P = 0.52), P = 0 .35 (P = 0.18)	%				
		0.	1 0.2 0.5 1 2	5 10		
		Fa	vors control Favors trea	atment		
Review: Clomiphe Comparison: Discrib Outcome: covulator	ne plus hCG versus Clomipher G VS cc+Lhovulatory dysfunct y dysfunction	ie plus LH ion				
Study or sub-category	cc+ hCG n/N	n/N	OR (fixed) 95% CI	Weight %	OR (fixed) 95% CI	Year
Deaton	4/36	6/69		49.98	1.31 [0.35, 4.99]	1997
Zreik	0/19	0/18			Not estimable	1999
Vianos	14/57	4/37		50.02	2.69 [0.81, 8.92]	2005
Total (95% CI) Total events: 18 (cc+ hCG), Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² Test for overall effect: Z = 1.	112 10 (cc+LH) = 0.61, df = 1 (P = 0.43), P = 0 .56 (P = 0.12)	124	-	100.00	2.00 [0.84, 4.77]	
		0.	1 0.2 0.5 1 2	5 10		
		Fa	vors control Favors trea	atment		
Review: Clomiphe Comparison: 04 cc+ hC Outcome: 01 unexpl	ne plus hCG versus Clomipher G VS CC+LH unexplained infe ained infertiilty	e plus LH ertility	OR (fixed)	Weight	OR (fixed)	
or sub-category	n/N	n/N	95% CI	%	95% CI	Year
Deaton	6/81	10/134		42.48	0.99 [0.35, 2.84]	1997
Zreik	2/42	3/44		- 16.99	0.68 [0.11, 4.31]	1999
VIANOS	6/ 12	0/4/		40.53	0.02 [0.19, 2.00]	2005
Total (95% CI)	195	225	-	100.00	0.79 [0.38, 1.64]	

Timing IUI

32-34 hours versus 38-40 hours after HCG OR = 1.28 (95% CI = 0.70-3.15)

Cantineau et al, Cochrane database, submitted



Aristotle the first teacher



Alexander the Great





Archibald Cochrane

Logic = common sense = evidence-based science