

Comparison Of Maternal Outcomes Of Pregnancy And Perinatal Outcomes In Patients Aged Above 35 Years Following Assisted Reproductive Technology And Spontaneous Conceptions.

Dr. M. Rajani, Dr.Kundavi, Dr. Geetha, Dr. Rashmi, Dr. Nithya, Institute of Reproductive Medicine, Madras Medical Mission Hospital, Chennai, Tamil Nādu, India.

| Date | of | Suhm | ission | 01_03_2023 |
|------|----|------|----------|------------|
| Date | or | Subm | ISSIOII. | 01-03-2023 |

Date of Acceptance: 10-03-2023

ABSTRACT:

Background: Assisted reproductive technology (ART) despite its success, has a higher risk of adverse neonatal and peri-natal outcomes compared to spontaneous conception, even when limited to singleton births. We conducted this study to observe the outcomes and risks of ART in the South Indian population when compared to spontaneous conceptions in patients with maternal age of \geq 35 years.

Materials and Methods: The objective of the present study was to review the maternal outcomes and perinatal complications in pregnancy in patients aged more than 35 years conceived by ART and by spontaneous conception.A retrospective cohort study was doneat our institute, studyincluded patients delivered at our institutebetween May 2017to April 2021, atotal of 272 patients \geq 35 years of agewho conceived by Assisted Reproductive Technology (ART group) (n=127)andwith spontaneous conception (n=146) were included in the study.

Results:This retrospective cohort study conducted at our institutefound more incidence of antenatal, perinatalcomplications in the ART group when compared to the spontaneous conceptiongroup. The incidence of poor neonatal outcomes was also found to be marginally higher.

Keywords: Assisted Reproductive Technology (ART), Peri-natal complications, multiple pregnancy, spontaneous conception, In-vitro Fertilization (IVF).

I. INTRODUCTION:

With advances in technology and provision of services, an increasing number of infants are born as a result of Assisted Reproductive Technology (ART)^[1].Women conceived by ART were at increased risks of several adverse pregnancy outcomes compared with women conceived naturally. Multiple pregnancies due to multiple embryos transferred could partly explain the increased risks. A "good perinatal outcome"

after ART is the live birth of a singleton infant at term (at \geq 37 completed weeks of gestation) and at a normal birth weight (\geq 2,500 g)^[2]. Despite itsability to overcome infertility, there is a concern regarding ART on its safety and effect on maternal and child health. It has been well documented that ART pregnancies have a significantly higher risk of multiple pregnancies and adverse perinatal outcomes (that include preterm delivery, low birth weight, and birth defects)^{[3-5].} Some studies have also suggested an increased risk of preeclampsia, gestational hypertension, placenta previa, and gestational diabetes in ART pregnancies^{[6-8].}

Previous studies reported that pregnancies following ART have a higher risk of adverse neonatal outcomes, including preterm delivery, low birth weight, birth defects, and perinatal mortality ^[9-11] when compared to spontaneous conception, even when limited to singleton births ^[9, 11, 12]. Potential reasons for the poorer perinatal health of ART mothers and children have been related to procedures involving ART, such as medicines used, altered hormonal environment at the time of implantation, and the manipulation of gametes and embryos or a combination of these ^[13, 14].Data from two meta-analyses have confirmed that ART involving in vitro fertilization (IVF) and/or intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI) was associated with an increased risk of adverse perinatal outcomes ^[11, 15].

It has also been suggested that the worse health in infants born is due mainly to the higher risk incidence of multiple pregnancies and not related to ART procedures ^[17, 18]. On the whole, most of the previous estimates of potential adverse health outcomes among ART pregnancies have been based on studies from high-income countries. So, we aimed to observe the potential adverse outcomes among ART pregnancies in the South Indian population.



II. MATERIALS AND METHODS: Study Design:

This retrospective cohort studywas carried out to explore associations between assisted reproductive technology (ART) and maternal and neonatal outcomes in a total of 272patients 127cases (ART) and 146 controls (spontaneous conception). Women above 35 years of age conceived byAssisted Reproductive Technology (ART)and women conceived by spontaneous conception who were delivered at the Institute of (IRM) Reproductive Medicine of Madras MedicalMission (MMM)Hospital Chennai between May 2017 and April 2021were included in this study. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee (EC) of the institution.

Monitoring Procedures:

The antenatal check-ups were performed routinely from theday of early pregnancy. The routine CBC (Complete Blood Count), beta-HCG (human Chorionic Gonadotrophin), early Pregnancy Viability scan and Nuchal Translucency (NT) scans were performed. Double marker and other all investigations were carried out according to the protocol. Anomaly scans and regular growth scans were also performed to check the growth of the foetus. Patients were admitted at 38 weeks for induction or elective LSCS, when the stages of labour failed to progress emergency Caesareansections were done as per protocol.

Complications:

The complications like gestational diabetes, gestational hypertension, pre-eclampsia, and anaemiaduring the pregnancy period were monitored and treated as per the standard protocols. The perinatal complications like Placental abruptions, preterm delivery, premature rupture of membranes (PROM), polyhydramnios, oligohydramn

ios, preterm labour, and low birth weight, we recompared among each age group.

Outcomes:

Maternal health outcomes included mode of delivery (caesarean/vaginal); pregnancy complications (gestational hypertension,gestational diabetes, pre-eclampsia)were extracted from medical records.

Antenatal complications between each group such as anaemia during pregnancy, elective and emergency caesarean section were recorded.

Perinatal complications like placenta previa, placentalabruptions, premature rupture of membranes, post-partumhaemorrhage, polyhydramnios and oligohydramnios were recorded, The number of pre-term labour, low birth weight, foetal macrosomia, small for date infants& infants with congenital anomalies were recorded.

The number of offspring delivered (single or multiple pregnancies) were recorded.

Statistical Analysis:

The categorical variables such as age groups, pregnancy and perinatal complications, mode of conception and delivery and pregnancy outcomes were expressed in numbers (n) and percentages (%). The descriptive analysis of the variables was performed using Microsoft Excel. All the data were double-checked for errors.

III. RESULTS:

Over 4years of study, 272women (age \geq 35 years) delivered and among them 127 were ART conceptions,146 wereSpontaneous conceptions.The study period was between May 2017 to April 2021. The cases were classified into four groups as shown in Table 1. Women in the range of 35-37 years of age group were predominant in both cases and controls. Antenatal, perinatal, and outcomes of pregnancy were analysed.

| Group | Age Range (In years) | No. of cases Patients, n (%) (n=127) | No. of Patients, controls n (%) (n=146) |
|-------|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | 35-37 | 68 (53) | 110 |
| 2 | 38-40 | 39 (31) | 36 |
| 3 | 41-45 | 15 (12) | 0 |
| 4 | >45 | 5 (4) | 0 |

Table. 1Age Distribution



| Antenatal Complications | Age group (in years) ART PREGNANCIES (IUI+FER) | | | | Total, n=127 (%) ART | Spontaneous conception (Total n=146) |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|----|-----------|---------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| | 35-37 38-40 41-4 | | 41-45 | >45 | PREGNANCIES | |
| Gestational Hypertension | 08 | 13 | - | - | 21(17 %) | 6 (3.6%) |
| Gestational Diabetes | 21 | 26 | 05 | 02 | 53 (41%) | 10(6.5%) |
| Hypothyroidism | 34 | 16 | 03 | - | 53 (41%) | - |
| Pre-eclampsia | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8(5.9%) | 4(2.1%) |
| Other Complications | | | | | | |
| Fibroids | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | 1 |
| Endometriosis | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Anaemia | 1 | - | - | - | 17 | 16 |
| Asthma | 1 | 1 | - | - | 2 | 7 |
| Rheumatic Heart Disease | - | 1 | 0 | - | - | - |
| Perinatal Complicati | ons | | | | | |
| Placenta Previa | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8(6%) | 5(3.4%) |
| Placental abruption | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2(1.5%) | 0 |
| Premature rupture of membranes | 9 | 4 | | | 13(9.8%) | 5(3.3%) |
| Postpartum haemorrhage | | | | | 10(7.5%) | 4(2.9%) |
| Oligohydramnios | 03 | - | - | - | 03(3.81%) | 9(6.5%) |
| Polyhydramnios 02 | | - | 02(2.54%) | 2(1.4%) | | |

Table. 2 Antenatal and Perinatal complications

Table.3Outcomes of Pregnancy

| Pregnancy | Age group (in years) | | | | Total, n (%) | Total SPONTANEOUS | |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------|-------|-------|-----|---------------------|----------------------|--|
| Outcomes | 35-37 | 38-40 | 41-45 | >45 | ART | n (%) | |
| Twin Pregnancy | 14 | 20 | 02 | - | 36 (14.17) | 3(2%) | |
| Birth Weight > 2.5 | 106 | 90 | 18 | 10 | 244 (85.9) | 138(94%) | |
| Birth Weight <2.5 | 12 | 28 | - | - | 40 (14.08) | 8(6%) | |
| Abortion | 02 | - | - | - | 02 (0.6) | 2(1%) | |
| Infants with Congenital Anomalies | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | |
| Still Birth | 02 | - | - | - | 02 (0.6) | 1 | |



International Journal Dental and Medical Sciences Research

Volume 5, Issue 2, Mar - Apr 2023 pp 102-109 www.ijdmsrjournal.com ISSN: 2582-6018

| | 35-37 | 38-40 | 41-45 | >45 | TOTAL TOTAL | | | |
|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------------|--------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | ART(n=127) | SPONTANEOUS(n=146) | | |
| Pre-term | 25 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 50(40%) | 15(10.5%) | | |
| labour, & | | | | | | | | |
| Infants with | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5(4.35%) | 4(3.0%) | | |
| low APGAR | | | | | | | | |
| score | | | | | | | | |
| Foetal | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4(3.3%) | 10(7.2%) | | |
| macrosomia | | | | | | | | |
| Small for | | | | | 5(3.8%) | 2(1.2%) | | |
| date infants | | | | | | | | |

Figure. 1Prevalence of Hypertension and Diabetes and pre-eclampsiain ART and spontaneous conception





Figure 2 Perinatal complication of pregnancy.





| | | Age group (in years) | | | | Total, | Total spontaneous |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| | | 35-37 | 38-40 | 41-45 | >45 | n=127(100%) | n=146(100%) |
| 1. | Mode of Delivery: Normal Caesarean • Emergency • Elective | 01 66 04 62 | - 39 04 35 | - 15 - 15 | - 05 - 05 | 2(1.6%) 125(98.4%) 8 (6.3%) 117(83.6%) | 98(67.2%) 48(32.8%) 8(5.5%) 40(27.4%) |
| 2. | Mode of ConceptionFER(Frozenreplacement)IUI(Intrauterineinsemination) | 20 03 40 | 21 - 33 | 03 - 02 | 05 - - | 52 (40.9%) 03 (3.8%) 75(59.05%) | - |

Table. 3Mode of Delivery and Conception

Hypothyroidism was observed in 41% of cases and in 5 % of the controls. Diabetes was found in 41% (58% gestational diabetes and 42 % overt diabetes) of the cases and in 6.5% of the controls. Hypertension was present in 17% of cases (PIH in 58%, Chronic Hypertension in 47% and impending eclampsia in 14%) and in 3.6% of the controls.

Normal deliveries were 13.3 % and 86.6% were caesarean deliveries (elective caesarean: 56% and emergency caesarean: 43%) in the ART group while spontaneous conception group 67% of the

deliveries were normal vaginal and 33% were caesarean section.Birth weight of more than 2.5 kg was observed in 86% and lessthan 2.5kg in 14% ofnew-borns in the ART group and 94% of the new-borns in the spontaneous conceptions group weighed more than 2.5 kg and 6% below 2.5 kg. Stillbirthin 0.6% of babies was observed in ART group.

Perinatal complications like Placenta Previawere found in 6% of the ART group and 3.4 % of the spontaneous conception group.Placental abruption was found in 1.5 % of the cases in the



ART group andno cases in the spontaneous conception group. Premature rupture of membranes was found in 9.8% of the 3.3% of the spontaneous conception group. Postpartumhaemorrhage was found in 7.5% of the ART group and 2.9% of the spontaneous conception group. Polyhydramnioswas found in2.54 % of the ART group and 1.4% of the spontaneous conception group.Oligohydramnios was found in3.81 percent of the ART group and 6.5% of the spontaneous conception group. Preterm labour was more prevalent in the ART group and small for age infants and infants with low 1 minute Apgar score were more prevalent in the ART group.

IV. DISCUSSION:

Although ART procedures have helped many women to overcome infertility, the concern is growing regarding the possible negative effects of these procedures on maternal and child health. In this paper, we have compared maternal and neonatal outcomes after ART technologies relative to natural conception in South Indian Population. Several studies have been performed to address this issue. While some studies have reported that ART pregnancies compared with those conceived naturally, whether singleton or multiple, have an increased risk of maternal complications [11, 19, 20] and a higher risk of preterm birth, low birth weight, birth defects, malformations, and perinatal mortality ^[14, 21], in contrast, other studies have shown that these outcomes are similar between ART and spontaneous conception ^[22, 23].

Although success with ART treatment is surely associated with the number of embryos transferred, a higher number of embryos transferred has been strongly associated with adverse perinatal outcomes such as preterm birth and low birth weight^[24, 25].

The transfer of single embryo of high quality should be promoted. However, ART singleton pregnancy still showed higher risks of several adverse pregnancy outcomes compared with naturally pregnancy, suggesting ART itself is also significantly correlated with pathological pregnancy. Therefore, policies related to ART indications should be strictly formulated to reverse the high rate of ART pregnancy. Given our findings, prenatal and intrapartum monitoring should be strengthened, and neonatal outcomes should be closely observed for ART pregnancy.

Since 1998 the Society for Assisted Reproductive Technology (SART) and American Society for Reproductive Medicine (ASRM) has published updated guidelines to assist ART programs and patients in determining the appropriate limit to the number of cleavage-stage embryos or blastocysts to transfer, aiming to promote singleton gestations, reduce twin gestation, and eliminate high-order multiple gestations^[26]. A policy of single-embryo transfer in stimulated cycles becomes more popular and is currently the most effective measure to reduce the incidence of multiple pregnancies^[27].

In our study, even though the ART involved single-embryo transfer in all cases, outcomes of multiple pregnancies were observed in 14 % (n=36) of the cases. With the increasing implementation of a policy of single-transfer embryos, multiple pregnancies have reduced dramatically ^[28], but is still an outcome of ART that is undesirable.

V. CONCLUSION:

While there seems to be a higher risk of adverse perinatal outcomes with some of the ART procedures, the absolute risk increase is generally low. It is important for clinicians to have this knowledge to better counsel and care for their patientsin cases with high-risk pregnancies, good outcomes can be achieved by the provision of standardized and good ante-natal, intra-natal and post-natal careto avoid pregnancy and perinatal complications in ART therapy.

REFERENCE:

- Talaulikar, V. S. &Arulkumaran, S. Reproductive outcomes after assisted conception. ObstetGynecolSurv 67, 566– 583 (2012).
- [2]. Joshi, N. et al. Trends and correlates of good perinatal outcomes in assisted reproductive technology. ObstetGynecol 120, 843–851 (2012).
- [3]. Hansen, M., Bower, C., Milne, E., de Klerk, N. &Kurinczuk, J. J. Assisted reproductive technologies and the risk of birth defects–a systematic review. Hum Reprod 20, 328–338 (2005).
- [4]. Rimm, A. A., Katayama, A. C., Diaz, M. & Katayama, K. P. A meta-analysis of controlled studies comparing major malformation rates in IVF and ICSI infants with naturally conceived children. J Assist Reprod Genet 21, 437–443 (2004).
- [5]. Wen, J. et al. Birth defects in children conceived by in vitro fertilization and intracytoplasmic sperm injection: a metaanalysis. FertilSteril 97, 1331-1337 e1331-e1334 (2012).



- [6]. Yang, X., Li, Y., Li, C. & Zhang, W. Current overview of pregnancy complications and live-birth outcome of assisted reproductive technology in mainland China. FertilSteril 101, 385–391 (2014).
- [7]. Sun, L. M. et al. Assisted reproductive technology and placenta-mediated adverse pregnancy outcomes. ObstetGynecol 114, 818–824 (2009).
- [8]. Jackson, R. A., Gibson, K. A., Wu, Y. W. &Croughan, M. S. Perinatal outcomes in singletons following in vitro fertilization: a metaanalysis. ObstetGynecol 103, 551– 563 (2004).
- [9]. Hansen M, Kurinczuk JJ, de Klerk N, Burton P, Bower C. Assisted reproductive technology and major birth defects in Western Australia. Obstet Gynecol. 2012;120(4):852–63. <u>https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0b013e3182</u> <u>69c282</u>.
- [10]. Helmerhorst FM, Perquin DA, Donker D, Keirse MJ. Perinatal outcome of singletons and twins after assisted conception: a systematic review of controlled studies. BMJ. 2004;328(7434):261. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.37957.560278 .EE.
- [11]. Jackson RA, Gibson KA, Wu YW, Croughan MS. Perinatal outcomes in singletons following in vitro fertilization: a meta-analysis. Obstet Gynecol. 2004;103(3):551–63. <u>https://doi.org/10.1097/01.aog.000011498</u> <u>9.84822.51</u>.
- [12]. Schieve LA, Meikle SF, Ferre C, Peterson HB, Jeng G, Wilcox LS. Low and very low birth weight in infants conceived with use of assisted reproductive technology. N Engl J Med. 2002;346(10):731–7. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa010806.
- [13]. Hansen M, Kurinczuk JJ, Bower C, Webb S. The risk of major birth defects after intracytoplasmic sperm injection and in vitro fertilization. N Engl J Med. 2002;346(10):725–30. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa010035.
- [14]. Hansen M, Kurinczuk JJ, de Klerk N, Burton P, Bower C. Assisted reproductive technology and major birth defects in Western Australia. Obstet Gynecol. 2012;120(4):852–63. <u>https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0b013e3182</u> <u>69c282</u>.

- [15]. Pandey S, Shetty A, Hamilton M, Bhattacharya S, Maheshwari A. Obstetric and perinatal outcomes in singleton pregnancies resulting from IVF/ICSI: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Hum Reprod Update. 2012;18(5):485–503. https://doi.org/10.1093/humupd/dms018.
- [16]. Wang JX, Norman RJ, Kristiansson P. The effect of various infertility treatments on the risk of preterm birth. Hum Reprod. 2002;17(4):945–9.
- [17]. Qin J, Wang H, Sheng X, Liang D, Tan H, Xia J. Pregnancy-related complications and adverse pregnancy outcomes in multiple pregnancies resulting from assisted reproductive technology: a metaanalysis of cohort studies. FertilSteril. 2015;103(6):1492–1508.e1491-1497. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fertnstert.2015.03</u>. .018.
- [18]. Wisborg K, Ingerslev HJ, Henriksen TB. IVF and stillbirth: a prospective follow-up study. Hum Reprod. 2010;25(5):1312–6. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/deq023</u>.
- [19]. Martin AS, Monsour M, Kissin DM, Jamieson DJ, Callaghan WM, Boulet SL. Trends in severe maternal morbidity after assisted reproductive Technology in the United States, 2008-2012. Obstet Gynecol. 2016;127(1):59–66. https:// doi.org/10.1097/aog.000000000001197.
- [20]. Thomopoulos С, Tsioufis С, Michalopoulou Τ. H. Makris Papademetriou V, Stefanadis C. Assisted reproductive technology and pregnancyrelated hypertensive complications: a systematic review. J Hum Hypertens. 2013; 27(3):148-57. https://doi.org/10.1038/jhh.2012.13.
- [21]. Schieve LA, Meikle SF, Ferre C, Peterson HB, Jeng G, Wilcox LS. Low andvery low birth weight in infants conceived with use of assisted reproductivetechnology. N Engl J Med. 2002;346(10):731–7. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa010806.
- [22]. Kuivasaari-Pirinen P, Raatikainen K, Hippelainen M, Heinonen S. Adverseoutcomes of IVF/ICSI pregnancies vary depending on Aetiology of infertility.ISRN Obstet Gynecol. 2012;2012:451915. https://doi.org/10.5402/2012/451915.
- [23]. Marino JL, Moore VM, Willson KJ, Rumbold A, Whitrow MJ, Giles LC, DaviesMJ. Perinatal outcomes by mode of assisted conception and sub-fertility inan



3.

Australian data linkage cohort. PLoS One. 2014;9(1):e80398.https://doi.org/10.1371/j ournal.pone.0080398.

- da Silva, S.G., da Silveira, M.F., Bertoldi, [24]. A.D. et al. Maternal and childhealthoutcomes in pregnancies following Assisted Reproductive Technology (ART): aprospective cohort study. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth 20, 106 (2020).https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-020-2755-z.
- [25]. Luke B, Stern JE, Kotelchuck M, Declercq ER, Hornstein MD, Gopal D, et al.Adverse pregnancy outcomes after in vitro fertilization: effect of number ofembryostransferred and plurality at conception. FertilSteril. 2015;104(1):79-86.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fertnstert.2015 .04.006.
- [26]. SART. Guidance on the limits to the number of embryos to transfer: a committee opinion. Practice Committee of the Society for assisted reproductive technology. FertilSteril. 2017;107(4):901-

https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.fertnstert.2017.02.107.

- [27]. Moini A, Shiva M, Arabipoor A, Hosseini R, Chehrazi M, Sadeghi M. Obstetric and neonatal outcomes of twin pregnancies conceived by assisted reproductive technology compared with twin pregnancies conceived spontaneously: a prospective follow-up study. Eur J ObstetGynecolReprod Biol. 2012;165(1):29-32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejogrb.2012.07.0 08.
- [28]. Qin JB, Sheng XQ, Wu D, Gao SY, You YP, Yang TB, Wang H. Worldwide prevalence of adverse pregnancy outcomes among singleton pregnancies after in vitro fertilization/intracytoplasmic sperm injection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Arch Gynecol Obstet. 2017;295(2):285-301. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00404-016-4250-3