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MATERIALS AND METHODS: This is a retrospective cohort study, in a university-based fertility clinic. All new patients seen via telemedicine between March 11, 2020, and March 10, 2021, were compared with all new patients seen between March 11, 2019, and March 10, 2020. Statistics analysis included the pandemic exact test and Pearson chi square. The primary outcome was clinical pregnancy rate. Secondary outcomes included protocol type, dosage of Gonadotropins, duration of stimulation, type of trigger medication (HCG vs. GnRH agonist), number of oocytes retrieved, fresh embryo transfer rate, “freeze all” rate due to OHSS reduction and implantation rate.

RESULTS: The study included 715 new patient in the fertility clinic; 365 patients seen in person (March 11, 2019 - March 10, 2020), and 350 patients seen via telemedicine (March 11, 2020 - March 10, 2021). The following were similar between the Covid year and the previous year: Female age (35.9 ± 5.06 vs. 36.4 ± 4.9, P = 0.21), number of oocytes retrieved at the first IVF cycle (12.8 ± 9.0 vs. 12.7 ± 8.5, P = 0.92), and stage of embryo transfer (cleavage stage 66 (41.3%) Vs. 86 (47.3%) and Blastocysts 94 (58.7%) vs. 96 (52.7%) P = 0.27). There were more cases of male factor infertility and less cases of unexplained infertility in Covid year compared to the previous year (29% vs. 19%, P = 0.001 and 9% vs. 16%, P = 0.003 respectively), however, there was no difference in other diagnoses made at new-patient visit. There were no differences between the groups in the following outcomes: type of protocol (P = 0.41), FSH dosage (P = 0.25), number of days of stimulation (P = 0.10), maximal estradiol value (P = 0.97) type of trigger medication (HCG 227 (72.8%) vs. 266 (74.9%), P = 0.38, Agonist 86 (27.2%) vs. 89 (25.1%), P = 0.34, and fresh embryo transfer rate (47.7% vs. 51.2%, P = 0.36). There were less cases of “freeze all” to reduce OHSS risk in the Covid year (3.1% vs. 13.4%, P < 0.0001).

There was no difference between the groups in the clinical pregnancy rates (35.3% vs. 36.3%, P = 0.91) and implantation rates (29.2% vs. 32.7%, P = 0.42).

CONCLUSIONS: New patients seen in person and those evaluated via telemedicine are likely to receive similar treatment protocols, medication doses and are likely to have similar duration of stimulation. IVF outcomes are not affected by telemedicine consultation, either.

IMPACT STATEMENT: Telemedicine consultation for new-patient visits is feasible in an academic fertility practice for IVF treatment and may be particularly useful during the pandemic.
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OVERALL POSITIVE POSTS AFTER INTRODUCTION OF COVID-19 VACCINE ON FERTILITY-RELATED SOCIAL MEDIA.
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OBJECTIVE: Social media is a popular way to disseminate new information and opinions, perhaps furthered by the COVID-19 pandemic and quarantine. Our objective was to analyze information and sentiments posted regarding the COVID-19 vaccine (VAX) on fertility-related social media.

MATERIALS AND METHODS: The search function of Instagram (IG) and Twitter (TW) was used to identify the first fifty accounts with the following terms: fertility doctor, fertility, OBGYN, infertility, TTC, and IVF. Accounts not in English, private, no posts in >1 year, or content unrelated to search terms were excluded. Accounts were evaluated for author type and categorized as physician (PH), individual (ID), or fertility center/fertility-related organization (FCO). Account demographics including number of followers and prior baseline post activity (number of likes/number of followers) were recorded. The VAX was approved on 12/1/2020 and posts dated 12/1/2020 - 2/28/2021 were reviewed. Posts mentioning the VAX were analyzed for content: sentiment (positive, negative, or neutral), mention of research studies (RS), national guidelines (NG), personal experience (PE), side effects (SE), reproductive related (RR) content and post activity. Statistical analysis included Chi-Squared and Fisher’s exact tests, with significance set to < 0.05 (*). IG and TW accounts: 536 accounts identified and included (133 IG and 143 TW). There were 104 PH accounts (45 IG, 59 TW), 91 ID accounts (62 IG, 29 TW), and 81 FCO accounts (26 IG, 55 TW). PH accounts were most associated with mention of COVID (83.7%*) and VAX (68.5%*), followed by FCO (37% COVID*, 30.9% VAX*), and ID (8.8% COVID*, 6.6% VAX*). PH was most associated with >1 VAX posts compared to FCO or ID (51.0% v 11.1% v 1.0%*). Sentiments toward the VAX were largely positive for all groups (PH 90.3%, ID 71.4%, FCO 70%), or neutral (PH 9.7%, ID 28.6%, FCO 30%), with no negative posts identified. Trends in mentions and sentiments were similar on both IG and TW platforms. PH cited NG (24.6%*) and RS (17.5%) more than ID and FCO, with most cited guidelines from ACOG, ASRM, and SMFM. ID posts were mostly PE (87.5%*) and SE (57.1%). RR posts were most associated with FCO accounts (89%) while PH showed pregnancy, infertility, and breastfeeding. Sub-group analysis of IG accounts showed an increase in activity on VAX posts compared to baseline by likes (PH 4.86% v 3.76%, ID 7.5% v 6.37%, FCO 2.4% v 0.52%) as well as comments (PH 0.35% v 0.28%, ID 0.90% v 0.69%, FCO 0.10% v 0.02%).

CONCLUSIONS: Overall, the majority of posts expressed positive sentiments toward the VAX with no negative posts identified. PH were most likely to post about COVID-19, the VAX and guidelines. Few ID accounts posted but when present were about personal experiences or side effects and remained positive.

IMPACT STATEMENT: There is an active conversation regarding COVID-19 and VAX information on social media, with the majority of posts expressing positive sentiment. Physicians play a large role in circulating information regarding the VAX on social media platforms, and can be influential in discussions of VAX guidelines and dispelling fertility myths.

SUPPORT: None.