BOCZAR, Agata, DRYJA, Patryk, JARMOŁOWICZ, Jakub, STAWICKA, Izabela, ORZOŁEK, Izabela and SOLISCH, Sven. A Comparison of the Effectiveness of Different Assisted Reproductive Techniques (ART) in Couples with Unexplained Infertility. Journal of Education, Health and Sport. 2024;71:56073. eISSN 2391-8306.
https://dx.doi.org/10.12775/JEHS.2024.71.56073
https://apcz.umk.pl/JEHS/article/view/56073

The journal has had 40 points in Minister of Science and Higher Education of Poland parametric evaluation. Annex to the announcement of the Minister of Education and Science of 05.01.2024 No. 32318. Has a Journal's Unique Identifier: 201159. Scientific disciplines assigned: Physical culture sciences (Field of medical and health sciences); Health Sciences (Field of medical and health sciences).
Punkty Ministerialne 40 punktów. Załącznik do komunikatu Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego z dnia 05.01.2024 Lp. 32318. Posiada Unikatowy Identyfikator Czasopisma: 201159. Przypisane dyscypliny naukowe: Nauki o kulturze fizycznej (Dziedzina nauk medycznych i nauk o zdrowiu); Nauki o zdrowiu (Dziedzina nauk medycznych i nauk o zdrowiu).
The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this paper.
Received:08.10.2024. Revised:15.11.2024. Accepted:18.11.2024. Published:19.11.2024.

Comparison of the Effectiveness of Different Assisted Reproductive Techniques (ART) in Couples with Unexplained Infertility

Agata Boczar[1], Patryk Dryja[2], Jakub Jarmołowicz[3], Izabela Stawicka[4], Izabela Orzołek[5], Sven Solisch[6]

1. Wrocław University Hospital Borowska 213, 50-556 Wroclaw, Poland
e-mail: aboczar99@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0002-3754-598X

2. Opole University Hospital, Wincentego Witosa 26, 45-401, Opole, Poland
e-mail: dryja2@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0009-4276-474X

3. Wrocław University Hospital Borowska 213, 50-556 Wroclaw, Poland
e-mail:
ORCID: 0000-0002-7574-1423

4. Czerniakowski Hospital, Stępińska 19/25, 00-739 Warsaw, Poland,
e-mail: iza.orz77@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0003-4723-5504

5. Central Clinical Hospital, Medical University of Warsaw, Stefana Banacha 1a, 02-097
e-mail: izabelastawicka1997@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0008-3014-1403

6. Opole University Hospital, Wincentego Witosa 26, 45-401, Opole, Poland
e-mail: solisch.sven@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0002-4769-6095

Abstract

Introduction

Unexplained infertility, impacting 10-30% of couples, remains a significant challenge due to the absence of identifiable etiologies, complicating treatment decisions. Assisted reproductive technologies (ART) like IVF, IUI, and ICSI have become primary interventions, though their efficacy varies across patient subgroups.

Objective of this Study

This study aims to evaluate the clinical efficacy of IVF, IUI, and ICSI in managing unexplained infertility, considering patient demographics and prior ART outcomes, to guide evidence-based clinical decision-making.

Materials and methods

A detailed literature search was undertaken across PubMed, Web of Science, and Embase to locate research on the adverse effects of monoclonal antibodies used in asthma management. The search covered English-language studies from the start of each database up to 2024. To ensure comprehensiveness, additional relevant studies were found by examining the reference lists of selected articles.

Aim of the Knowledge

The research seeks to clarify ART effectiveness in unexplained infertility, identifying optimal scenarios for each treatment type and assessing advancements that enhance reproductive outcomes while minimizing risks.

Conclusions

The analysis suggests IVF as the most effective option for complex cases, especially in advanced maternal age, though it involves higher risks. IUI is a lower-risk, cost-effective initial treatment, while ICSI is indicated for male factor infertility. Tailored ART strategies based on individual reproductive profiles are essential.

Summary

This study underscores the need for individualized ART approaches in unexplained infertility. IVF remains highly effective for challenging cases, while IUI and ICSI provide viable alternatives depending on patient-specific factors. Future research should aim to refine ART protocols to optimize success rates and minimize associated risks.

Keywords: Unexplained infertility; assisted reproductive technology (ART); in vitro fertilization (IVF); intrauterine insemination (IUI); intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI); fertility outcomes; male factor infertility; ovarian stimulation, reproductive medicine; preimplantation genetic testing (PGT);

1. Introduction

Unexplained infertility presents a significant challenge in modern medicine. It is a complex issue affecting 10-30% of couples attempting to conceive and remains difficult to treat despite advancements in medical science. This condition poses challenges for both physicians and patients alike. [1]

Unexplained infertility is a diagnosis of exclusion in which the cause of infertility cannot be identified during a thorough clinical evaluation of the couple, encompassing factors such as anovulation, tubal obstruction, or significant male factor deficiencies. Consequently, unexplained infertility cannot be regarded as a specific medical condition to which targeted treatment can be assigned; rather, it reflects an inability to determine the underlying source of the reproductive issue.[2]

2. Objective of this study

The objective of this study is to compare the effectiveness of various assisted reproductive technologies (ART), including in vitro fertilization (IVF), intrauterine insemination (IUI), and intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI). This research aims to analyze the differences in clinical outcomes among these methods and identify the factors influencing the selection of the most appropriate infertility treatment. Special attention will be given to assessing aspects such as the age of the female patient, the underlying causes of infertility, the couple's medical history, and previous experiences with specific ART techniques. This approach will facilitate a better understanding of how these factors shape treatment decisions and their implications for treatment outcomes and the quality of life of patients.

3. Materials and methods

An extensive review of the literature was conducted utilizing major electronic databases, specifically PubMed, Web of Science, and Embase, to capture relevant studies on monoclonal antibodies used in asthma treatment and their associated adverse effects. The search strategy employed a detailed combination of keywords, designed to encompass a wide range of terminology related to specific monoclonal antibodies, asthma management, and potential side effects or complications. This approach ensured a comprehensive scope of results.

The search was limited to English-language articles and included publications from the inception of each database up to the year 2024, providing a broad historical and current view of available research. To further enhance the thoroughness of the review, additional studies were identified through manual searches of reference lists in key articles, which helped capture any additional relevant publications that may not have surfaced in the initial database search. This rigorous process was intended to ensure that the review incorporated all available evidence relevant to the safety profile of monoclonal antibodies in asthma treatment.

4. The significance of assisted reproductive technologies (ART)

Assisted reproductive technologies (ART) represent a significant advancement in the field of reproductive medicine, providing new hope and effective interventions for couples struggling with infertility. ART encompasses a range of advanced medical procedures aimed at supporting both the conception process and ensuring the successful progression of pregnancy.

These technologies play a particularly crucial role in cases of unexplained infertility, where traditional diagnostic methods fail to accurately identify the underlying causes of reproductive issues. [3] One of the key advantages of ART is its ability to overcome various barriers to conception that may exist in couples. For instance, techniques such as in vitro fertilization (IVF) allow for the fertilization of oocytes ex vivo, enabling more precise control over the fertilization process and the selection of viable embryos for transfer.[4] Additionally, intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI), an advanced method within the IVF framework, facilitates the direct resolution of male factor issues by injecting a single spermatozoon into the cytoplasm of the oocyte, significantly enhancing the likelihood of successful fertilization.[5]

5. Treatment options

5.1 IVF- In vitro fertilization

In vitro fertilization (IVF) has established itself as a cornerstone of assisted reproductive technology (ART), particularly beneficial for individuals with conditions where less invasive approaches, such as intrauterine insemination (IUI), have limited efficacy.[6] Clinical evidence underscores the superior success rates of IVF, especially among patients with advanced maternal age, significant male factor infertility, tubal obstruction, or idiopathic infertility - contexts in which conventional methods often yield suboptimal results.[7] IVF's process of extracorporeal fertilization enables precise observation and selection of viable embryos, allowing for preimplantation genetic testing (PGT) to identify chromosomal abnormalities. This critical step enhances the probability of establishing a healthy pregnancy and achieving a live birth.[8]

However, IVF is associated with certain risks, primarily the increased incidence of multiple gestations, which is linked to perinatal complications such as preterm birth, low birth weight, and a higher need for neonatal intensive care.[9] These outcomes are especially prevalent when multiple embryos are transferred, a historically common practice that is now increasingly managed with single embryo transfer (SET) protocols to minimize potential adverse effects.[10]There is also some evidence suggesting that IVF-conceived offspring may present with a marginally elevated incidence of developmental or health issues later in life; however, these findings are frequently confounded by intrinsic parental factors associated with infertility, as well as genetic and epigenetic consideration.[11]

Continued advancements in IVF protocols are directed at optimizing safety and efficacy. Innovations in ovarian stimulation, embryo culture conditions, and cryopreservation methods have notably improved clinical outcomes. [12] The shift toward frozen embryo transfers (FET) is particularly promising, as some studies indicate that FET reduces risks associated with fresh embryo transfers, including ovarian hyperstimulation syndrome (OHSS) and certain perinatal complications.[13] Additionally, advanced genetic testing methods, such as next-generation sequencing (NGS) used in preimplantation genetic testing for aneuploidy (PGT-A), enable more accurate embryo selection, potentially enhancing implantation success and lowering miscarriage rates.[14]

IVF thus represents a highly effective intervention in reproductive medicine, with continued research focused on reducing associated risks and further understanding long-term outcomes in ART-conceived individuals.

Future advancements in IVF and ART aim not only to increase pregnancy and live birth rates but also to ensure the safety and long-term health of both mother and child.[15]

5.2 IUI-Intrauterine insemination

Intrauterine insemination (IUI) remains a critical approach in the treatment of infertility, particularly as an initial intervention for couples where fertility challenges are linked to mild male factor infertility, cervical factor, ovulatory disorders, or unexplained infertility.[16] IUI entails the introduction of concentrated, motile sperm directly into the uterine cavity, which bypasses the cervical barrier and places sperm in close proximity to the oocyte at ovulation. This positioning significantly enhances the likelihood of fertilization by overcoming cervical and distance-related barriers to sperm passage. The simplicity and directness of IUI make it one of the most widely accessible and patient-friendly options in the spectrum of assisted reproductive techniques (ART).[17]

An attractive feature of IUI is its relatively non-invasive nature, combined with a lower financial cost compared to more complex ART procedures like in vitro fertilization (IVF). Consequently, IUI is frequently recommended as a first-line treatment for infertility, especially when patients present with less severe reproductive issues or where standard diagnostic evaluations have not identified a clear causative factor.[18] In cases where fertility outcomes may benefit from hormonal support, IUI is often combined with controlled ovarian hyperstimulation (COH), which promotes the development and release of multiple mature oocytes. Studies demonstrate that this combination can increase pregnancy rates, as multiple eggs increase the probability of successful fertilization.[19] However, the use of COH raises the risk of multiple gestations, which is associated with a higher incidence of perinatal complications, including preterm birth, low birth weight, and neonatal intensive care admissions. The risk-benefit ratio of COH must therefore be carefully assessed to ensure that it aligns with the patient’s overall treatment goals and health considerations.[20]

The efficacy of IUI is variable, with success rates influenced by a number of patient-specific factors. Generally, studies indicate that the highest success rates are observed in younger women, particularly those under 35 years of age, who present with shorter durations of infertility and without significant tubal pathology or severe male factor infertility. [21] IUI is most effective when semen parameters are within a mildly impaired range; severely compromised sperm motility or morphology tends to limit the efficacy of this approach, often leading to recommendations for more advanced methods like intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI). Moreover, recent analyses suggest that IUI is less effective in cases where patients present with prolonged infertility (over 2-3 years), given that extended infertility duration can signal underlying, undiagnosed reproductive issues.[22]

In light of these considerations, the success of IUI also depends on the optimization of clinical protocols. Careful timing of insemination with ovulation, based on hormonal monitoring and ultrasound, is essential to maximize success rates. Additionally, careful patient selection and stratification based on factors such as ovarian reserve, history of prior ART cycles, and responsiveness to ovulation induction are critical for achieving optimal outcomes with IUI.[23]

The relatively straightforward, minimally invasive nature of IUI, combined with its favorable cost-benefit profile, makes it a valuable option in the ART landscape.

However, given its limitations and the variable factors affecting success, ongoing research continues to explore refined protocols and adjunct treatments that might further improve its effectiveness in diverse patient populations.[24]

4.3 ICSI-Intracytoplasmic sperm injection

Intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI) is a highly specialized technique within assisted reproductive technology (ART) that has revolutionized the management of male infertility, particularly in cases where sperm quality is severely compromised.[25] It is primarily employed in scenarios of male factor infertility, including conditions such as oligospermia (low sperm count), asthenozoospermia (poor sperm motility), teratozoospermia (abnormal sperm morphology), and azoospermia (absence of sperm in the ejaculate). [26]Unlike conventional in vitro fertilization (IVF), where sperm and oocytes are combined in a culture dish to allow for natural fertilization, ICSI involves the direct injection of a single sperm into the cytoplasm of an oocyte using a fine needle. [27]This process bypasses the natural barriers to fertilization, including sperm motility issues and the inability of sperm to penetrate the egg's outer membrane, thus facilitating successful fertilization even when sperm quality is significantly compromise.[28]

ICSI is particularly advantageous in cases of severe male infertility, where other ART procedures may be ineffective. In cases of non-obstructive azoospermia, where no sperm is present in the ejaculate, sperm can often be retrieved directly from the testicles or epididymis through surgical procedures like testicular sperm extraction (TESE) or epididymal sperm aspiration (PESA).[29]These retrieved sperm can then be used for ICSI, offering hope for couples who otherwise might have no biological children. Additionally, ICSI can be considered when a couple has previously failed IVF cycles due to fertilization failure, as well as in cases where genetic testing is required, such as when preimplantation genetic testing (PGT) is part of the treatment protocol. [30]

The ICSI procedure has been shown to achieve high fertilization rates, often exceeding 70-80%, even in cases of severe male factor infertility, significantly improving the chances of successful fertilization and subsequent embryo development.[31] However, despite the high fertilization rates, the pregnancy and live birth rates following ICSI are generally comparable to those seen in traditional IVF, provided there are no other complicating factors such as female infertility. In cases of male infertility, particularly when sperm are retrieved surgically, the overall success of the procedure can also depend on the quality of the sperm available for injection and the underlying health of the female partner. [32]

Despite its clear benefits, ICSI has raised concerns regarding potential long-term risks. One of the key issues is the bypassing of the sperm's natural role in fertilization, which could result in the inheritance of genetic defects. [33] Some studies have indicated a slightly increased risk of genetic abnormalities in offspring conceived via ICSI, as the technique bypasses the natural selection processes that occur during natural fertilization. For example, certain studies have suggested a potential link between ICSI and an increased risk of imprinting disorders, congenital malformations, and other developmental issues.[34] However, the overall incidence of these problems remains low, and ongoing research is needed to fully understand the long-term genetic and developmental implications of ICSI.[35]

Moreover, while ICSI can dramatically improve fertilization rates, it is not a universal solution, and its efficacy can be influenced by a range of factors. Female age, ovarian reserve, and the presence of other fertility issues, such as tubal disease or endometriosis, can also play significant roles in determining the success of the procedure.[36] Thus, while ICSI is a powerful tool in treating male infertility, it is crucial to provide thorough pre-treatment counseling and to assess both male and female fertility factors to optimize the chances of a successful pregnancy outcome.[37]
In conclusion, ICSI has become an indispensable component of ART, offering pathway to parenthood for many couples affected by male infertility. The technique's ability to overcome significant male reproductive challenges has made it a vital tool in assisted reproduction, with high fertilization success rates and the potential for improved fertility outcomes in even the most complex cases. [38]However, the procedure does carry some risks, especially in terms of genetic concerns, which continue to be an area of active investigation. As research advances, it is likely that further refinements in the technique and better understanding of its long-term effects will continue to improve both the safety and efficacy of ICSI in fertility treatment.[39]

6. Comparative Analysis of IVF, IUI, and ICSI in Assisted Reproductive Technology

In vitro fertilization (IVF), intrauterine insemination (IUI), and intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI) are central techniques within assisted reproductive technology (ART), each tailored to address different causes of infertility. Despite their shared objective of facilitating conception, they vary significantly in their approach, indications, and outcomes. [40]

In vitro fertilization (IVF) is one of the most well-established ART procedures, particularly beneficial for individuals with complex infertility conditions, including advanced maternal age, tubal blockage, significant male factor infertility, and unexplained infertility. IVF involves the fertilization of oocytes outside the body, allowing for close monitoring and the possibility of preimplantation genetic testing (PGT) to assess chromosomal integrity. [41]IVF has proven to be highly effective, especially for cases that do not respond well to less invasive treatments like IUI. However, the procedure is associated with certain risks, including the potential for multiple pregnancies, which can lead to perinatal complications such as low birth weight and preterm birth. The trend toward single embryo transfer (SET) has emerged as a strategy to minimize such risks, while advances in cryopreservation techniques, particularly the use of frozen embryo transfer (FET), have further improved clinical outcomes. Despite the high success rates of IVF, concerns remain regarding long-term health outcomes for children conceived via ART, though these risks may be confounded by the underlying infertility factors of the parents.[42]

Intrauterine insemination (IUI) is a less invasive and more cost-effective ART technique, commonly recommended as an initial treatment for couples with mild male infertility, ovulatory dysfunction, or unexplained fertility issues. IUI involves the direct placement of sperm into the uterine cavity, bypassing the cervix and improving the chances of sperm reaching the oocyte. While IUI offers a non-invasive alternative to IVF, its success rates are generally lower, particularly in cases of severe male factor infertility or when the female partner has significant reproductive pathology. [43]

The addition of controlled ovarian hyperstimulation (COH) can improve IUI success rates by increasing the number of available oocytes, but it also raises the risk of multiple pregnancies. As a first-line treatment, IUI is most effective in younger women with less complicated fertility problems, though its efficacy declines in patients with prolonged infertility or poor semen parameters.[44]

Intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI) is a specialized ART method that has revolutionized the treatment of male infertility, particularly in cases of severe sperm abnormalities, such as oligospermia (low sperm count), asthenozoospermia (poor motility), teratozoospermia (abnormal sperm shape), and azoospermia (absence of sperm). ICSI involves the direct injection of a single sperm into an oocyte, overcoming barriers to natural fertilization and providing a solution for severe male infertility.[45] This technique is particularly valuable when sperm cannot penetrate the egg naturally, or in cases of non-obstructive azoospermia where sperm are retrieved directly from the testes or epididymis. Despite its high fertilization rates, ICSI’s success in terms of pregnancy and live birth rates is comparable to that of IVF, provided there are no other complicating factors such as female infertility. One concern with ICSI is the potential for genetic risks, as the technique bypasses natural sperm selection, which may increase the likelihood of inherited genetic defects, although the overall risk remains low.[46]

7. Key Differences and Comparative Outcomes:

When comparing IVF, IUI, and ICSI, the choice of treatment is determined by the underlying cause of infertility and the severity of the reproductive issue. IVF remains the most comprehensive and effective solution for patients with complex infertility factors, such as tubal obstruction, severe male infertility, or unexplained infertility. IUI, with its lower cost and minimal invasiveness, is more suited for less complex infertility cases, particularly when male factor infertility is mild or unexplained.[47] It is often used as a first-line treatment before progressing to more advanced ART techniques like IVF or ICSI. ICSI, on the other hand, provides a direct solution to male infertility by overcoming the natural barriers to fertilization, especially in cases of severe sperm dysfunction. It is particularly effective for male infertility but is not as versatile as IVF, as its efficacy can be influenced by factors related to the female partner's fertility.[48]

Although IVF, IUI, and ICSI each have distinct advantages, their efficacy is closely linked to patient-specific factors, including age, ovarian reserve, semen quality, and the presence of other reproductive disorders. IVF is the most suitable option for individuals with more severe or complex infertility, while IUI serves as an effective starting point for less severe cases. [49]ICSI offers a solution for male infertility when sperm quality is a significant concern, though it carries some potential genetic risks that need to be carefully considered.

In conclusion, IVF, IUI, and ICSI each have their roles in treating infertility, with the choice of method depending on the specific circumstances of the patient. Ongoing advancements in ART techniques aim to enhance success rates, minimize risks, and ensure the long-term health and well-being of both the mother and the child. [50]The continuous evolution of these technologies holds promise for improving reproductive outcomes and offering more personalized treatment strategies for couples experiencing infertility.[50]

8. Summary

This study aims to assess the comparative efficacy of three primary assisted reproductive technologies (ART)—in vitro fertilization (IVF), intrauterine insemination (IUI), and intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI)—in the management of unexplained infertility. Unexplained infertility, which affects 10-30% of couples, remains a significant clinical challenge characterized by the inability to identify a definitive cause despite extensive diagnostic evaluations. This research explores the role of various patient-specific factors, including female age, medical history, and previous ART outcomes, in influencing the selection and success of these treatments.

Assisted reproductive technologies represent a pivotal advancement in reproductive medicine, particularly for patients with unexplained infertility, where traditional diagnostic methods often fail to identify a clear etiology. IVF is widely regarded as the most effective ART for patients with complex infertility factors, such as advanced maternal age, tubal obstruction, and male factor infertility, as well as unexplained infertility. IVF offers high success rates, though it is associated with potential risks, such as multiple gestations, which can lead to adverse neonatal outcomes. In contrast, IUI is a less invasive and more cost-effective option that is typically recommended for couples with mild male infertility, ovulatory dysfunction, or unexplained infertility. While IUI is generally less effective than IVF, it serves as a valuable first-line treatment, particularly for younger women with fewer infertility complications.

ICSI, a highly specialized ART technique, is primarily utilized in cases of male infertility, particularly in instances of severe oligospermia, asthenozoospermia, teratozoospermia, and azoospermia. By directly injecting a single sperm into an oocyte, ICSI circumvents natural fertilization barriers, significantly improving fertilization rates, even in cases of profound male reproductive dysfunction. Although ICSI has demonstrated high fertilization success rates, its pregnancy and live birth outcomes are comparable to IVF when other female factors do not complicate the procedure. However, concerns regarding the potential genetic risks associated with bypassing natural sperm selection remain an area of ongoing research.

In conclusion, the selection of an appropriate ART modality is contingent upon the underlying cause and severity of infertility. IVF is considered the most suitable intervention for complex infertility scenarios, whereas IUI remains an effective, less invasive approach for mild cases. ICSI offers a targeted solution for male infertility but requires careful consideration of both male and female factors to optimize treatment outcomes. The continuous evolution of ART techniques holds promise for enhancing success rates, minimizing associated risks, and improving the long-term health outcomes of both the mother and the offspring.

AUTHOR’S CONTRIBUTIONS

The authors confirm contribution to the paper as follows:
Conceptualization: Agata Boczar
Methodology: Izabela Stawicka, Izabela Orzołek, Jakub Jarmołowicz, Patryk Dryja, Sven Solisch and Agata Boczar
Software: Izabela Stawicka and Agata Boczar
Check: Sven Solisch, Izabela Orzołek and Agata Boczar
Formal analysis: Agata Boczar and Izabela Orzołek
Investigation: Agata Boczar and Patryk Dryja
Resources: Jakub Jarmołowicz
Data curation: Izabela Stawicka, Izabela Orzołek, Jakub Jarmołowicz, Patryk Dryja, Sven Solisch and Agata Boczar
Writing - rough preparation: Izabela Stawicka, Izabela Orzołek, Jakub Jarmołowicz, Patryk Dryja, Sven Solisch and Agata Boczar
Writing - review and editing: Izabela Stawicka, Izabela Orzołek, Jakub Jarmołowicz, Patryk Dryja, Sven Solisch and Agata Boczar
Visualization: Izabela Stawicka and Sven Solisch
Supervision: Patryk Dryja
Project administration: Agata Boczar
All authors have read and agreed with the published version of the manuscript.

FUNDING STATEMENT

This research received no external funding.

ISTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD STATEMENT

Not applicable.

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Not applicable.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Not applicable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Not applicable.

CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] I. A. Abdelazim, P. Purohit, R. H. Farag, and G. Zhurabekova, “Unexplained infertility: prevalence, possible causes and treatment options. A review of the literature,” *Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecological Investigations*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 17–22, 2018, doi: 10.5114/JOGI.2018.74250.

[2] K. S. Abdallah, S. Hunt, S. A. Abdullah, B. W. J. Mol, and M. A. Youssef, “How and Why to Define Unexplained Infertility?,” *Semin Reprod Med*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 55–60, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1055/S-0040-1718709.

[3] M. Szamatowicz, “Assisted reproductive technology in reproductive medicine - possibilities and limitations,” *Ginekol Pol*, vol. 87, no. 12, pp. 820–823, 2016, doi: 10.5603/GP.2016.0095.

[4] R. Wang, R. Van Eekelen, M. H. Mochtar, F. Mol, and M. Van Wely, “Treatment Strategies for Unexplained Infertility,” *Semin Reprod Med*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 48–54, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1055/S-0040-1719074.

[5] I. A. Abdelazim, P. Purohit, R. H. Farag, and G. Zhurabekova, “Unexplained infertility: prevalence, possible causes and treatment options. A review of the literature,” *Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecological Investigations*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 17–22, 2018, doi: 10.5114/JOGI.2018.74250.

[6] D. Zheng *et al.*, “Intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI) versus conventional in vitro fertilisation (IVF) in couples with non-severe male infertility (NSMI-ICSI): Protocol for a multicentre randomised controlled trial,” *BMJ Open*, vol. 9, no. 9, Sep. 2019, doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-030366.

[7] B. Aggarwal, A. L. Evans, H. Ryan, and S. J. Martins da Silva, “IVF or ICSI for fertility preservation?,” *Reproduction and Fertility*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. L1–L3, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1530/RAF-20-0059.

[8] D. Kimelman and M. E. Pavone, “Non-invasive prenatal testing in the context of IVF and PGT-A,” *Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol*, vol. 70, pp. 51–62, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2020.07.004.

[9] C. Sonigo, N. Ahdad-Yata, P. Pirtea, C. Solignac, M. Grynberg, and N. Sermondade, “Do IVF culture conditions have an impact on neonatal outcomes? A systematic review and meta-analysis,” *J Assist Reprod Genet*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 563–580, Mar. 2024, doi: 10.1007/s10815-024-03020-0.

[10] P. De Sutter, “Single embryo transfer (set) not only leads to a reduction in twinning rates after IVF/ICSI, but also improves obstetrical and perinatal outcome of singletons.,” *Verh K Acad Geneeskd Belg*, vol. 68, no. 5–6, pp. 319–327, 2006.

[11] V. Tomic and J. Tomic, “Neonatal outcome of IVF singletons versus naturally conceived in women aged 35 years and over,” *Arch Gynecol Obstet*, vol. 284, no. 6, pp. 1411–1416, Dec. 2011, doi: 10.1007/s00404-011-1873-2.

[12] E. Bosch, M. De Vos, and P. Humaidan, “The Future of Cryopreservation in Assisted Reproductive Technologies.,” *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne)*, vol. 11, p. 67, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.3389/fendo.2020.00067.

[13] J. Zhao, B. Xu, Q. Zhang, and Y. P. Li, “Which one has a better obstetric and perinatal outcome in singleton pregnancy, IVF/ICSI or FET?: A systematic review and meta-analysis,” *Reproductive Biology and Endocrinology*, vol. 14, no. 1, Aug. 2016, doi: 10.1186/s12958-016-0188-3.

[14] D. Kimelman and M. E. Pavone, “Non-invasive prenatal testing in the context of IVF and PGT-A,” *Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol*, vol. 70, pp. 51–62, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2020.07.004.

[15] H. Ahmadi, L. Aghebati-Maleki, S. Rashidiani, T. Csabai, O. B. Nnaemeka, and J. Szekeres-Bartho, “Long-Term Effects of ART on the Health of the Offspring,” *Int J Mol Sci*, vol. 24, no. 17, Sep. 2023, doi: 10.3390/ijms241713564.

[16] L. Lemmens, S. Kos, C. Beijer, D. D. M. Braat, W. L. D. M. Nelen, and A. M. M. Wetzels, “Techniques used for IUI: Is it time for a change?,” *Human Reproduction*, vol. 32, no. 9, pp. 1835–1845, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.1093/humrep/dex223.

[17] M. Arab-Zozani and C. O. Nastri, “Single versus double intrauterine insemination (IUI) for pregnancy: A systematic review and meta-analysis,” *European Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, vol. 215, pp. 75–84, Aug. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.ejogrb.2017.05.025.

[18] R. Homburg, “IUI is a better alternative than IVF as the first-line treatment of unexplained infertility,” *Reprod Biomed Online*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 1–3, Jul. 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.rbmo.2021.12.015.

[19] L. Craciunas *et al.*, “Conventional and modern markers of endometrial receptivity: A systematic review and meta-analysis,” *Hum Reprod Update*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 202–223, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1093/humupd/dmy044.

[20] J. Farhi and R. Orvieto, “Cumulative clinical pregnancy rates after COH and IUI in subfertile couples,” *Gynecological Endocrinology*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 500–504, Jul. 2010, doi: 10.3109/09513590903367036.

[21] J. Y. Yip, A. Kanneganti, N. binte Ahmad, M. X. K. Lim, S. L. S. Chew, and Z. Huang, “Optimizing intrauterine insemination and spontaneous conception in women with unilateral hydrosalpinx or tubal pathology: A systematic review and narrative synthesis,” *European Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, vol. 286, pp. 135–144, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.ejogrb.2023.05.024.

[22] S. S. Malchau *et al.*, “The long-term prognosis for live birth in couples initiating fertility treatments,” *Human Reproduction*, vol. 32, no. 7, pp. 1439–1449, Jul. 2017, doi: 10.1093/humrep/dex096.

[23] M. Zhao, Q. Huan, L. Huang, L. Yang, and M. Dong, “Pregnancy outcomes of intrauterine insemination in young patients with diminished ovarian reserve: a multicenter cohort study,” *Eur J Med Res*, vol. 28, no. 1, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1186/s40001-023-01377-z.

[24] A. Starosta, C. E. Gordon, and M. D. Hornstein, “Predictive factors for intrauterine insemination outcomes: a review.,” *Fertil Res Pract*, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 23, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1186/s40738-020-00092-1.

[25] M. Jodar *et al.*, “Sperm proteomic changes associated with early embryo quality after ICSI,” *Reprod Biomed Online*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 698–708, May 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.rbmo.2020.01.004.

[26] W. Jiang *et al.*, “What sperm parameters effect blastocyst formation and quality during ICSI with severe male infertility,” *Syst Biol Reprod Med*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 218–227, 2024, doi: 10.1080/19396368.2024.2375710.

[27] M. Simopoulou *et al.*, “Improving ICSI: A review from the spermatozoon perspective,” *Syst Biol Reprod Med*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 359–371, Nov. 2016, doi: 10.1080/19396368.2016.1229365.

[28] D. Baldini *et al.*, “Sperm selection for icsi: Do we have a winner?,” *Cells*, vol. 10, no. 12, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.3390/cells10123566.

[29] A. M. Van Peperstraten, M. L. Proctor, N. P. Johnson, and G. Philipson, “Techniques for surgical retrieval of sperm prior to intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI) for azoospermia,” *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, no. 2, 2008, doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD002807.pub3.

[30] W. Wen, D. Zhang, X. Liu, J. Shi, and H. Cai, “Embryo development and live birth in women with one previously failed full IVF/ICSI cycle,” *J Assist Reprod Genet*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 1517–1525, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.1007/s10815-024-03107-8.

[31] M. Caddy *et al.*, “PIEZO-ICSI increases fertilization rates compared with conventional ICSI in patients with poor prognosis,” *J Assist Reprod Genet*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 389–398, Feb. 2023, doi: 10.1007/s10815-022-02701-y.

[32] M. Jodar *et al.*, “Sperm proteomic changes associated with early embryo quality after ICSI,” *Reprod Biomed Online*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 698–708, May 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.rbmo.2020.01.004.

[33] S. Berntsen *et al.*, “A systematic review and meta-analysis on the association between ICSI and chromosome abnormalities,” *Hum Reprod Update*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 801–847, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1093/humupd/dmab005.

[34] C. Lacamara, C. Ortega, S. Villa, R. Pommer, and J. E. Schwarze, “Are children born from singleton pregnancies conceived by ICSI at increased risk for congenital malformations when compared to children conceived naturally? A systematic review and meta-analysis,” *J Bras Reprod Assist*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 251–259, 2017, doi: 10.5935/1518-0557.20170047.

[35] K. Abel, M. Healey, S. Finch, T. Osianlis, and B. Vollenhoven, “Associations between embryo grading and congenital malformations in IVF/ICSI pregnancies,” *Reprod Biomed Online*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 981–989, Dec. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.rbmo.2019.07.035.

[36] A. Zini, P. V. Bach, A. H. Al-Malki, and P. N. Schlegel, “Use of testicular sperm for ICSI in oligozoospermic couples: How far should we go?,” *Human Reproduction*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 7–13, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1093/humrep/dew276.

[37] M. Chen *et al.*, “Impact of Gonadotropin-Releasing Hormone Agonist Pre-treatment on the Cumulative Live Birth Rate in Infertile Women With Adenomyosis Treated With IVF/ICSI: A Retrospective Cohort Study.,” *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne)*, vol. 11, p. 318, May 2020, doi: 10.3389/fendo.2020.00318.

[38] F. Parikh *et al.*, “Genetic counseling for pre-implantation genetic testing of monogenic disorders (PGT-M).,” *Frontiers in reproductive health*, vol. 5, p. 1213546, 2023, doi: 10.3389/frph.2023.1213546.

[39] G. Porcu-Buisson *et al.*, “Prospective multicenter observational real-world study to assess the use, efficacy and safety profile of follitropin delta during IVF/ICSI procedures (DELTA Study),” *European Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, vol. 293, pp. 21–26, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.ejogrb.2023.12.011.
[40] M.-Y. Wu and H.-N. Ho, “Cost and safety of assisted reproductive technologies for human immunodeficiency virus-1 discordant couples.,” *World J Virol*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 142–6, May 2015, doi: 10.5501/wjv.v4.i2.142.
[41] N. Gleicher, P. Patrizio, and A. Brivanlou, “Preimplantation Genetic Testing for Aneuploidy – a Castle Built on Sand,” *Trends Mol Med*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 731–742, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.molmed.2020.11.009.
[42] C. Anagnostopoulou *et al.*, “Oocyte quality and embryo selection strategies: a review for the embryologists, by the embryologists,” *Panminerva Med*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 171–184, Jun. 2022, doi: 10.23736/S0031-0808.22.04680-8.
[43] E. T. Y. Leung *et al.*, “Simulating nature in sperm selection for assisted reproduction,” *Nat Rev Urol*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 16–36, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.1038/s41585-021-00530-9.
[44] M. E. Geisler, M. Ledwidge, M. Bermingham, M. McAuliffe, M. B. McMenamin, and J. J. Waterstone, “Intrauterine insemination—No more Mr. N.I.C.E. guy?,” *European Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, vol. 210, pp. 342–347, Mar. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.ejogrb.2017.01.016.
[45] M. Kanatsu-Shinohara *et al.*, “Intracytoplasmic sperm injection induces transgenerational abnormalities in mice,” *Journal of Clinical Investigation*, vol. 133, no. 22, Nov. 2023, doi: 10.1172/JCI170140.
[46] S. Lara-Cerrillo, J. Ribas-Maynou, C. Rosado-Iglesias, T. Lacruz-Ruiz, J. Benet, and A. García-Peiró, “Sperm selection during ICSI treatments reduces single- but not double-strand DNA break values compared to the semen sample,” *J Assist Reprod Genet*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 1187–1196, May 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10815-021-02129-w.
[47] J. Smeenk *et al.*, “ART in Europe, 2019: results generated from European registries by ESHRE,” *Human Reproduction*, vol. 38, no. 12, pp. 2321–2338, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1093/humrep/dead197.
[48] R. Muharam and F. Firman, “Lean Management Improves the Process Efficiency of Controlled Ovarian Stimulation Monitoring in IVF Treatment,” *J Healthc Eng*, vol. 2022, 2022, doi: 10.1155/2022/6229181.
[49] S. H. Saravelos and T. C. Li, “Embryo transfer techniques,” *Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol*, vol. 59, pp. 77–88, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2019.01.004.
[50] A. Salazar, C. Diaz-García, and J. A. García–Velasco, “Third-party reproduction: a treatment that grows with societal changes,” *Fertil Steril*, vol. 120, no. 3P1, pp. 494–505, Sep. 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.fertnstert.2023.01.019.