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Abstract

**Purpose:** To evaluate whether or not maternal body mass index (BMI) has an effect on pregnancy rates following in vitro fertilization-intracytoplasmic sperm injection (IVF-ICSI) treatment.

**Methods:** A total of 869 patients who had undergone IVF-ICSI treatment between 2012 and 2017 were included in this study. The participants were stratified according to maternal BMI as Group 1 (BMI < 25 kg/m²; n=394), Group 2 (25 kg/m² ≤ BMI < 30 kg/m²; n=303), and Group 3 (BMI ≥ 25 kg/m²; n=172). Basal parameters and IVF-ICSI outcomes were compared between the groups.

**Results:** While there were no differences between the groups in terms of age, smoking status, etiology of infertility, thyroid-stimulating hormone, prolactin levels, antral follicle count, and stimulation protocol (p>0.05), there was significant statistical difference (p<0.05) in terms of BMI, duration of infertility, baseline follicle-stimulating hormone, luteinizing hormone, estradiol (E₂), duration of stimulation, total gonadotropin dose required, peak E₂ levels, progesterone levels, endometrial thickness on hCG administration, and cycle cancellation rate. In addition, the numbers of MII and 2PN oocytes retrieved and the rates of clinical pregnancy, live births, and miscarriages were also different between the groups (p<0.05).

**Conclusion:** Our data suggest that there is an inverse impact of increased BMI on laboratory and reproductive outcome parameters of IVF-ICSI treatment. Taking cost-effectiveness into consideration, weight loss should be suggested before ovulation is induced.

Introduction

Obesity is a serious public health problem in developed and developing countries. Historically more prevalent in more advanced age groups, it is now seen with increasing frequency in reproductive ages where endocrinological effects such as hypothalamic-pituitary ovarian axis disorder can cause changes in the secretion of pulsatile gonadotropin, sex hormone-binding globulin, and ovarian androgen. This can prompt menstrual irregularity, anovulation, insulin resistance, have negative psychological and social effects, and can increase the risk of infertility by three times (1-3). It has also been demonstrated that weight loss can return women to spontaneous ovulation and pregnancy without any additional treatment (4-6).

Elsewhere, it has been reported that obesity reduces fecundity and increases the rate of miscarriage through a negative effect on endometrial receptivity (7). The adverse effects of pre-pregnancy obesity on perinatal (e.g., preeclampsia, gestational diabetes mellitus, preterm labor, and surgical delivery) and neonatal (e.g., macrosomic fetus) outcomes have also been reported (2). Additionally, obesity has been found to have a negative effect on serum testosterone and estrogen in men and to decrease sperm motility and quality (4,5).

There are conflicting results in the literature regarding the effects of maternal obesity on the success of assisted reproductive techniques (ART). Although some studies have found that maternal body mass index (BMI) has no negative effect on ART outcomes (8-11), others show that a higher BMI increases the amount of gonadotropin required, produces fewer oocytes, increases IVF-ICSI cancellation rate, decreases clinical pregnancy and live birth rates, and increases miscarriage rate (12-14). Since the effects of obesity on ART outcomes have not been fully elucidated, the current study sought to evaluate whether or not maternal BMI has an effect on pregnancy rates following in vitro fertilization-intracytoplasmic sperm injection (IVF-ICSI) treatment.

Materials And Method

**Study participants and data collection**

This prospective study was carried out at Ali Kemal Belviranli Women's Health and Children's Hospital, IVF Unit. Outcomes of 757 fresh ICSI cycles were reviewed between January 2012 and December 2017. Inclusion criteria were participants aged 20–44 years, body mass index (BMI) between 18 and 35 kg/m², regular menstrual cycles, no uterine abnormalities in the
ultrasound, and normal baseline hormonal levels. Participants were excluded from the study if they were ≥45 years, any
diseases that affect the outcome of IVF/ICSI, such as hydrosalpinx and endometriosis. The ethical board approval was given
from the institutional review board (2012/57). Written and oral informed agreement was given from the participants.

Data were obtained for age, BMI (kg/m²), smoking status, infertility period, cause of infertility, the baseline at day 3 for
follicle-stimulating hormone (FSH), luteinizing hormone (LH), and estradiol (E₂) levels, thyroid-stimulating hormone (TSH),
prolactin, antral follicle count, stimulation parameters, cycle cancellation rate, IVF-ICSI outcomes, CPR, live birth, and
miscarriage rates.

**Ovarian stimulation and oocyte retrieval**

Controlled ovulation stimulation was negotiated using the gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist (GnRHa) or the flexible
gonadotropin-releasing hormone antagonist (GnRHant) protocol.

**ET Procedure**

Two senior physicians performed the ETs accompanied ultrasonographic appearance (Logiq 200 Pro, General Electric, Seoul,
South Korea) using an embryo transfer catheter system. A sterile speculum was introduced to the vagina in the lithotomy
position and the vagina and the cervix were cleared using sterile cotton swabs.

An embryologist loaded the embryos into a soft transfer catheter which was advanced to the ET physician who deposited the
embryos approximately 10 mm from the uterine fundus under USG. The catheter was gently removed after 5 seconds. In
cases of ET with external guidance, an initial catheter with inner sheath was inserted into the external cervical os, and then
advanced through the cervical canal and internal os to 10 mm of the uterine fundus using USG. The internal sheath was
withdrawn, and a second catheter loaded with embryos was introduced in its place and advanced to approximately 10 mm
from the uterine fundus where the embryos were deposited. Difficult transfers required the use of a stylet in addition to this
form of external guidance.

All catheters were immediately checked for retained embryos, blood, and the patient remained in the Trendelenburg position
for about 10 minutes. Patients in whom tenaculum were excluded from the study. Luteal phase support was provided with
progesterone in the form of Crinone 8% gel (Serono, Istanbul, Turkey) at a daily dose of 90 mg. Baseline parameters and IVF-
ICSI outcomes were compared between the groups. Biochemical pregnancy was detected with a by hCG levels in venous
blood tests performed 12-14 days after embryo transfer, and clinical pregnancy was accepted as those with a gestational sac
accompanying fetal heart-beat on ultrasound examination at 4-5 weeks after embryo transfer. Live birth was defined as the
birth of a live fetus after 22 weeks of gestational age. The subjects were stratified according to the maternal BMI as Group 1
(BMI<25 kg/m²; n= 394), Group 2 (25 kg/m² ≤ BMI <30 kg/m²; n=303), and Group 3 (BMI ≥25 kg/m²; n=172). Basal
parameters, clinical and laboratory IVF-ICSI outcomes, and reproductive outcome parameters were compared between the
groups.

**Statistical analysis**

The statistical analyses were performed using SPSS 15.0 for Windows (SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA). The Kolmogorov-Smirnov
test was used for examining the continuous variables with normal and non-normal distributions. The one-way analysis of
variance (ANOVA) for normally distributed variables and the Kruskal-Wallis test for not-normally distributed variables were
used to compare groups. Categorical data were examined by Pearson’s chi-square test, and Fisher’s exact test was applied if
the expected frequency was less than 5 in >20% of all cells. The continuous variables were presented as the mean±standard
deviation (SD) and the categorical variables were demonstrated as the number of cases and percentages. The Bonferroni-
adjustment was used to control the type I errors for all possible multiple comparisons. A p<0.05 value was established as
statistically significant.
Results

A total of 51 patients were excluded from the study, specifically those with age >45 (n=19), BMI >35 kg/m² (n=14), systemic disease (n=9), endocrine or metabolic disorders (n=6), and concomitant medication (n=3). The remaining 869 participants were classified into the three groups and their outcomes analyzed (Figure 1).

A comparison of the sociodemographic and stimulation characteristics of the participants is provided in Table 1. While there were no differences between the groups in terms of age, smoking status, etiology of infertility, thyroid-stimulating hormone, prolactin levels, antral follicle count, and stimulation protocol (p>0.05), there was significant statistical difference (p<0.05) in terms of BMI, duration of infertility, baseline follicle-stimulating hormone, luteinizing hormone, estradiol (E₂), duration of stimulation, total gonadotropin dose required, peak E₂ levels, progesterone levels, endometrial thickness on hCG administration, and cycle cancellation rate.

The laboratory and reproductive outcomes of the participants are summarized in Table 2. The numbers of MII oocytes and 2PN retrieved and the rates of clinical pregnancy, live births, and miscarriages were also different between the groups (p<0.05).

Discussion

We found that overweight and obese patients with higher BMIs had worse responder rates, lower peak E₂ levels, and less endometrial thickness and required higher gonadotropin doses than the normal weight group. In addition, lower numbers of MII and 2PN oocytes were retrieved, the clinical pregnancy and live birth rates were lower, and the miscarriage rate was higher.

Obesity has historically been observed more frequently in adult and advanced age groups. It is now a global epidemic and has become an important public health problem in younger age groups, too (2). Infertile women, including obese patients, in the reproductive age group benefit from ART to fulfill their fertility requirements, and so the possible effects of increased BMI on ART are of great importance for the clinician, the patient, and public health (3).

Endocrinological and paracrinological factors play a role in the interaction between embryo and endometrium for successful implantation and live birth (15). Hyperandrogenemia, insulin resistance, and abnormal hormone levels that occur with increased BMI can negatively affect this process (1,16). A higher BMI also affects the levels of inflammatory markers such as insulin-like growth factors, tumor necrosis factor-alpha, and interleukine-6 which play roles in cell differentiation and differentiation, folliculogenesis, oocyte maturation, and embryo development. As a result, embryo implantation can be negatively affected and the risk of miscarriage can increase (17-19). Previous studies have shown that increased BMI is associated with poor IVF-ICSI outcomes through the effect of these endocrinological factors (2,20-21) with one study reporting that a reduction of one BMI unit can increase the chance of pregnancy by 19% (22). It has also been found that advanced maternal age and smoking negatively affect live birth rates (23), although the mean age and smoking rates were similar between the groups in our study.

In the literature, conflicting results exist regarding the effects of increased BMI on ART outcomes. For example, Fedorcsek et al. (13) evaluated 5019 IVF-ICSI cycles and found no significant difference in live birth rates between obese and normal-weight women (41.4% vs 50.3%). Similarly, Wittemer et al. (24) and Dokras et al. (25) show that BMI has no negative effect on rates of clinical pregnancy or live birth. On the other hand, however, Luke et al. (26) evaluated approximately 45,000 embryo transfers and show that an increased BMI decreases clinical pregnancy and live birth rates and that this effect is especially pronounced in women under 35 years of age. A separate meta-analysis of 33 studies and 47,967 IVF-ICSI cycles found that obese and overweight patient groups had poorer outcomes compared to normal weight women and that the obese group was worse than the overweight patient group (1). These findings were in agreement with our results. Sartorius et al. (25) demonstrate that an increased BMI can have other negative perinatal outcomes such as preeclampsia, preterm birth, and surgical delivery, as well as reducing live birth rates. Relatedly, Pinborg et al. (6) evaluate 1,417 IVF-ICSI cycles and show that
the cancellation rate increases with increased BMI, the two key reasons being that obesity makes the oocyte pick-up procedure more difficult and insufficient follicles are developed despite the use of high gonadotropin doses.

The possible negative effects of an increased BMI on ART should be explained to overweight and obese women who are scheduled for IVF-ICSI treatment. Before the process begins, it should also be explained that weight loss can increase the chance of success in terms of pregnancy and live birth. Overweight and obese women should consequently be encouraged to lose weight, and clinicians planning ART should implement weight loss programs involving diet and exercise. In addition, it should be understood that the gonadotropin dose required will increase with higher BMIs meaning that treatment costs will also grow despite the increasingly negative perinatal outcomes.

The strong point of the current study consist of its prospective arrangement, the adequate number of subjects in each group, and the prototypical sample from central Turkey. The results can be generalized to most of the country’s population. However, the potential limitations of the study are that it was conducted in a tertiary single care institution and that the cumulative CPR was not evaluated because no frozen ETs were included.

In conclusion, this study found that an increased BMI has a negative effect on ART outcomes as shown in decreasing clinical pregnancy and live birth rates and increasing miscarriage rates. Further studies with more participants are needed to elucidate this effect.
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Tables

Table 1. Demographic and stimulation characteristics of the patients.
|                          | BMI<25 (Group 1) (n=394) | 25≤BMI<30 (Group 2) (n=303) | BMI≥30 (Group 3) (n=172) | p       | 1 vs 2 | 1 vs 3 | 2 vs 3 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|
| Age (years)              | 30.03±4.55               | 30.31±4.96                  | 30.94±4.56               | 0.109   |        |        |        |
| BMI (kg/m²)              | 21.9±81.99               | 27.23±1.43                  | 32.88±2.38               | <0.001  | <0.001 | <0.001 |        |
| Smoking rate (%)         | 7.4%                     | 7.3%                        | 5.8%                     | 0.775   |        |        |        |
| Duration of infertility (years) | 5.51±3.33               | 6.20±3.78                  | 7.39±3.89               | 0.038   | <0.001 | 0.004  |        |
| Etiology of infertility (%) |                          |                             |                          |         |        |        |        |
| Male factor              | 39.4%                    | 38.1%                       | 29.7%                    |         |        |        |        |
| Tubal factor             | 1.3%                     | 2.6%                        | 1.7%                     |         |        |        |        |
| Unexplained              | 34.4%                    | 36.8%                       | 36.1%                    | 0.116   |        |        |        |
| Poor responder           | 24.9%                    | 22.5%                       | 32.6%                    |         |        |        |        |
| Baseline-FSH (IU/mL)     | 7.45±2.28                | 7.14±2.52                   | 6.74±2.45                | 0.205   | 0.003  | 0.187  |        |
| Baseline-LH (IU/mL)      | 5.93±2.77                | 5.14±2.80                   | 5.08±3.11                | 0.001   | 0.003  | 0.975  |        |
| Baseline-Estradiol (pg/mL) | 46.50±16.65             | 42.69±16.79                 | 42.65±15.28              | 0.007   | 0.027  | 0.996  |        |
| Antral follicle count     | 6.06±2.60                | 6.41±2.72                   | 5.67±2.55                | 0.064   |        |        |        |
| TSH (IU/µIU/mL)          | 2.22±1.12                | 2.09±1.03                   | 2.29±1.23                | 0.144   |        |        |        |
| Prolactin (ng/mL)        | 16.70±9.40               | 16.0±28.01                  | 15.34±9.37               | 0.231   |        |        |        |
| Stimulation protocol (%) |                          |                             |                          |         |        |        |        |
| Long                     | 17.8%                    | 19.5%                       | 20.5%                    |         |        |        |        |
| Antagonist               | 81.4%                    | 80.1%                       | 78.9%                    | 0.875   |        |        |        |
| Microdose                | 0.8%                     | 0.3%                        | 0.6%                     |         |        |        |        |
| Duration of stimulation (days) | 9.76±1.52               | 9.62±1.51                   | 10.17±1.86               | 0.528   | 0.147  | 0.001  |        |
| Gonadotropin dose (IU)   | 1929.63±912.79           | 2008.26±883.51              | 2234.60±1019.92          | 0.511   | 0.001  | 0.030  |        |
| Estradiol levels on day hCG (pg/mL) | 2015.65±1140.77         | 1802.17±1063.92             | 1705.64±1323.19          | 0.043   | 0.010  | 0.660  |        |
| Progesterone levels on day hCG (pg/mL) | 0.89±0.39              | 0.79±0.37                   | 0.69±0.37                | 0.002   | <0.001 | 0.031  |        |
| Endometrial thickness on day hCG (mm) | 10.3±91.62             | 10.28±1.74                  | 9.86±1.65                | 0.651   | 0.002  | 0.028  |        |
| Endometrial thickness on transfer day (mm) | 10.52±1.66             | 10.44±1.83                  | 10.02±1.74               | 0.042   | 0.006  | 0.019  |        |
| Cyle cancellation rate (%) | 1.7%                   | 2.6%                        | 6.9%                     | 0.444   | 0.004  | 0.031  |        |

BMI: body mass index; FSH: follicle stimulating hormone; LH: luteinizing hormone; TSH: thyroid stimulating hormone; hCG: human chorionic gonadotropine

p<0.05 is statistically significant
Table 2. Laboratory and reproductive outcome parameters of the patients.

| Parameter                        | BMI<25 (Group 1, n=387) | 25≤BMI<30 (Group 2, n=295) | BMI≥30 (Group 3, n=160) | p       |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
|                                  |                          |                            |                         | 1 vs 2  |
| Number of oocytes retrieved      | 9.41±6.01                | 8.97±5.11                  | 7.90±5.50               | 0.576   |
|                                  |                          |                            |                         | 1 vs 3  |
|                                  |                          |                            |                         | 0.011   |
|                                  |                          |                            |                         | 0.126   |
|                                  |                          |                            |                         | 2 vs 3  |
|                                  |                          |                            |                         | 0.712   |
|                                  |                          |                            |                         | 0.017   |
|                                  |                          |                            |                         | 0.115   |
| Number of MII oocytes            | 7.46±4.45                | 7.19±4.22                  | 6.33±4.58               | 0.868   |
|                                  |                          |                            |                         | 0.010   |
|                                  |                          |                            |                         | 0.030   |
| 2 Pronucleus                     | 5.11±3.42                | 4.98±3.24                  | 4.06±2.88               |         |
| Fertilization rate (%)           | 68.48±24.5               | 68.80±23.67                | 67.09±25.17             | 0.768   |
| Grade I embryo (%)               | 67.2%                    | 66.5%                      | 65.1%                   | 0.231   |
| Number of embryo transfers (%)   |                          |                            |                         | 0.105   |
|                                  | Single                   | 82.7%                      | 78.2%                   |         |
|                                  | Multiple                 | 17.3%                      | 21.8%                   |         |
|                                  |                          |                            | 24.8%                   |         |
| The days of embryo transfer (%)  |                          |                            |                         | 0.117   |
|                                  | 2                        | 3.9%                       | 5.1%                    |         |
|                                  | 3                        | 84.8%                      | 85.6%                   |         |
|                                  | 5                        | 11.3%                      | 9.3%                    |         |
|                                  |                          |                            | 10.0%                   |         |
| The embryo transfer technique (%)|                          |                            |                         | 0.173   |
|                                  | Easy transfer with a soft catheter | 22.1% | 21.5% | 16.8% |
|                                  |                          |                            |                         |         |
|                                  | After external guidance transfer | 71.9% | 69.1% | 78.5% |
|                                  | Difficult transfer with a stylet | 6.0% | 9.4% | 4.7% |
| Clinical pregnancy rate (%)      | 40.1%                    | 33.2%                      | 23.8%                   | 0.042   |
|                                  |                          |                            |                         | <0.001  |
|                                  |                          |                            |                         | 0.041   |
| Live birth rate (%)              | 33.6%                    | 23.7%                      | 13.9%                   | 0.005   |
|                                  |                          |                            |                         | <0.001  |
|                                  |                          |                            |                         | 0.017   |
| Miscarriage rate (%)             | 17.7%                    | 28.6%                      | 44.7%                   | 0.045   |
|                                  |                          |                            |                         | 0.001   |

BMI: Body mass index

p<0.05 is statistically significant

Figures
Figure 1

Flowchart of the Study. Enrollment and follow-up of the study subjects.