

Human Reproduction



VIRTUAL MEETING
5-8 JULY 2020

VOLUME 35, SUPP 1 2020
ABSTRACT BOOK

ESHRE 2020

www.humrep.oxfordjournals.org



European Society of Human
Reproduction and Embryology

OXFORD  OPEN

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Abstracts
36th Virtual Annual Meeting of the
European Society of
Human Reproduction and Embryology

5 to 8 July 2020

Abstracts

36th Virtual Annual Meeting of the
European Society of
Human Reproduction and Embryology,
5 to 8 July 2020

The abstracts are available on-line to all Human Reproduction/Update/Molecular Human Reproduction subscribers and are also freely available to all visitors to the following website www.humrep.oxfordjournals.org, and on the ESHRE website: www.eshre.eu

Copyright Notice: All abstracts together with the programme, for presentation during the 36th Annual Meeting of ESHRE are copyright of ESHRE. These abstracts (or parts thereof) may not be reproduced, stored, printed or transmitted in any form, or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopied, recording, or otherwise without written permission of ESHRE and the author of the abstract.

Note to the media: All abstracts are strictly embargoed until the time and date of presentation at the conference.

The opinions or views expressed in this abstracts supplement are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or recommendations of ESHRE. The abstracts have been reviewed by the Congress Scientific Committee and revised accordingly by the authors. The selection of abstracts is based on the scores given by an international panel of peer reviewers.

Dosages, indications and methods of use for products that are referred to in the abstracts by the authors are not necessarily appropriate for clinical use and may reflect the clinical experience of the authors or may be derived from the professional literature of other clinical sources. Because of differences between in-vitro and in-vivo systems and between laboratory animal models and clinical data in humans, in-vitro and animal data may not necessarily correlate with clinical results.

The investigators of these abstracts have stated in their submission letter that prospective studies where patients are involved have institutional Ethics Committee approval and informed patient consent, and that the studies using experimental animals have institutional approval. The Publishers have endeavoured to reproduce faithfully all of the abstracts as accepted by the Conference Organisers but can accept no responsibility for inaccuracies or omissions caused by the late receipt of abstracts.

human reproduction

Editor-in-Chief

C.B. Lambalk (The Netherlands)

Deputy Editors

C. De Geyter (Switzerland)

K. Kirkegaard (Denmark)

M. van Wely (The Netherlands)

Associate Editors

Jason Abbott (Australia)

Samir Babayev (USA)

Elisabetta Baldi (Italy)

Emily Barrett (USA)

Valerie Baker (USA)

Gurkan Bozdag (Turkey)

Paula Brady (USA)

Pablo Bermejo-Alvarez (USA)

Stephen Brown (USA)

Astrid Cantineau (The Netherlands)

Juan Carlos Castillo (Spain)

Judit Castillo (Spain)

Nicholas Cataldo (USA)

Georgina Chambers (Australia)

Jorge Chavarro (USA)

Anne Delbaere (Belgium)

Isabelle Demeestere (Belgium)

Lucia De Santis (Italy)

Zaira Donarelli (Italy)

Hakan Duran (USA)

Silke Dyer (South Africa)

Arnaud Fauconnier (France)

Elpida Fragouli (United Kingdom)

Thomas Fréour (France)

Sonia Goedeke (New Zealand)

David Handelsman (Australia)

Elizabeth Hatch (USA)

Trine Berit Haugen (Norway)

Patrick Henriët (Belgium)

Anat Hershko-Klement (Israel)

Karla Hutt (Australia)

Vasanti Jadvā (United Kingdom)

Joanna James (New Zealand)

Stine Gry Kristensen (Denmark)

Maris Laan (Estonia)

Susan M Laird (United Kingdom)

William Ledger (Australia)

Jung Ryeol Lee (South Korea)

Hagai Levine (Israel)

Artur Ludwin (Poland)

Katharina Main (Denmark)

Sachiko Matsuzaki (France)

Carmen Messerlian (USA)

Dean Morbeck (New Zealand)

Mariana Moura-Ramos

(Portugal)

Monica Muratori (Italy)

Galia Oron (Israel)

Juliana Pedro (Portugal)

Veerle Provoost (Belgium)

Gwendolyn Quinn (USA)

Beverly Reed (USA)

Peter Ruane (United Kingdom)

Geetanjali Sachdeva (India)

Laurel Stadtmayer (USA)

Anne Steiner (USA)

Judy Stern (USA)

Jan-Bernd Stukenborg (Sweden)

Katja Teerds (The Netherlands)

Kristen Upson (USA)

Asli Uyar (USA)

Aafke van Montfoort (The Netherlands)

Corrine Welt (USA)

Carrie Williams (United Kingdom)

Christine Wyns (Belgium)

Statistical Advisory Board

Olga Basso (Canada)

Stephen Roberts (United Kingdom)

Stacey Missmer (USA)

Christos Venetis (Greece)

Lauren Wise (USA)

Founding Editor

R.G. Edwards

Editors Emeriti

D.H. Barlow

A. Van Steirteghem

J.L.H. Evers

Managing Editor

A.C. Williams (United Kingdom)

Assistant Managing Editor

J.M. Hastings (United Kingdom)

K.R. Watkins (United Kingdom)

Editorial Administrator

Emma J Andrew (United Kingdom)

Editorial Office

ESHRE Journals, 5 Mill Yard, Childerley, Cambs CB23 8BA, United Kingdom

Telephone: +44 (0)1954 212404, editorial@humanreproduction.co.uk

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Published for the
European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology
by Oxford University Press,
Oxford, UK



ESHRE COMMITTEES

Executive Committee (2019 – 2021)

Chair

Cristina Magli (Italy)

Chair-elect

Carlos Calhaz-Jorge (Portugal)

Members

Richard Anderson (United Kingdom)
Baris Ata (Turkey)
Basak Balaban (Turkey)
Valerie Blanchet De Mouzon (France)
Edith Coonen (The Netherlands)
Thomas Ebner (Austria)
Anja Pinborg (Denmark)
Karen Sermon (Belgium)
Ioana Adina Rugescu (Romania)
Thomas Strowitzki (Germany)
Snežana Vidakovic (Serbia)
Giovanni Coticchio (Italy) –
(Ex officio SIG Chair)

Immediate Past Chair

Roy Farquharson (United Kingdom)

Special Interest Groups Chair

Giovanni Coticchio (Italy)

Central Office

Christine Bauquis
Lieve Buggenhout
Andres De Nutte
Veerle De Rijbel
Veerle Goossens
Nathalie Le Clef
Karen Maris
Saria Mcheik
Rebecca Nakalema
Catherine Plas
Erika Mar Rodriguez Raes
Heidi Roijemans
Anne-Julie Van Bever
Bruno Van den Eede
Sarah Vandersteen
Titia Van Roy
Ine Van Wassenhove
Nathalie Vermeulen

Committee of National Representatives (2017-2020)

Petya Andreeva (Bulgaria)
Christiana Antoniadou (Cyprus)
Tamar Barbakadze (Georgia)
Raminta Baušytė (Lithuania)
Ursula Bentin – Ley (Denmark)
Wolfgang Biasio (Austria)
Virginia N. Bolton (United Kingdom)
Pierre Boyer (France)
Jean Calleja-Agius (Malta)
Lia Chkonja (Georgia)
Susana M. Chuva de Sousa Lopes
(The Netherlands)
Monica Marina Dascalescu (Romania)
Lucia De Santis (Italy)
Francisco Dominguez (Spain)
Isabel Doria Reis (Portugal)
Petros Drakakis (Greece)
Sozos J. Fasouliotis (Cyprus)
Gianluca Gennarelli (Italy)
Gareth Greggains (Norway)
Marie Louise Groendahl (Denmark)
Mykola Gryshchenko (Ukraine)
Andrew Horne (United Kingdom)
Anna Janicka (Poland)
Lale Karakoc Sokmensuer (Turkey)
Tatyana Kodyleva (Russia C.I.S.)
Péter Kovács (Hungary)
Markus S. Kupka (Germany)
Joaquin Llacer (Spain)
Ana Luisa M.S.Teixeira De Sousa Ramos
(Portugal)
Sirpa Makinen (Finland)
Alice Malenovska (Czech Republic)
Corina Manolea (Romania)
Ieva Masliukaite (The Netherlands)
Laure C. Morin – Papunen (Finland)
Sergei Nikitin (Russia C.I.S.)
Georgi Nikolov (Bulgaria)
Verena Nordhoff (Germany)
Kazem Nouri (Austria)
Øyvind Nyttun (Norway)
Dinka Pavicic Baldani (Croatia)
Michael Pelekanos (Greece)

Nebojsa Radunovic (Serbia)
Milan Reljic (Slovenia)
Catherine Rongieres (France)
Jesper M.J. Smeenk (The Netherlands)
Robert Spaczynski (Poland)
Patrik Stanic (Croatia)
Oliver Sterthaus (Switzerland)
Martin Stimpfel (Slovenia)
Isabelle Streuli (Switzerland)
Lela Surlan (Serbia)
Mátyás Szabolcs (Hungary)
Greta Verheyen (Belgium)
Kjell Wånggren (Sweden)
Mary Wingfield (Ireland)
Christine Wyns (Belgium)
Hakan Yarali (Turkey)

Current International Scientific Committee

María Isabel Acien (Spain)
Giuliana Baccino (Spain)
Carlos Calhaz-Jorge (Portugal)
Susana M. Chuva de Sousa Lopes
(The Netherlands)
Giovanni Coticchio (Italy)
Roy Farquharson (United Kingdom)
Francesco Fiorentino (Italy)
Nicolás Garrido Puchalt (Spain)
Annick Geril (Belgium)
Georgios Lainas (Greece)
Nicholas Macklon (Denmark)
Cristina Magli (Italy)
Heidi Mertes (Belgium)
Rebecca Nakalema (Belgium)
Anja Pinborg (Denmark)
Heidi Roijemans (Belgium)
Andrea Romano (The Netherlands)
Virginie Rozée (France)
Ioannis Sfontouris (Greece)
Kelly Tilleman (Belgium)
Bettina Toth (Austria)
Kirsten Louise Tryde Macklon (Denmark)
Bruno Van den Eede (Belgium)

human reproduction

Volume 35, Suppl July 2020

<https://academic.oup.com/humrep>

ORAL PRESENTATIONS

Monday, 06 July 2020

08:30 - 09:30	Session 01: Keynote session	Parallel 1
10:00 - 11:30	Session 02: Blastocyst transfer and freezing	Parallel 1
10:00 - 11:30	Session 03: Strategies to improve the outcomes of ovarian stimulation 1.	Parallel 2
10:00 - 11:30	Session 04: Male fertility related predictors and their use	Parallel 3
10:00 - 11:30	Session 05: Endometriosis and uterine disorders. New clinical insights.	Parallel 4
10:00 - 11:30	Session 06: Frozen versus fresh embryo transfer. An ongoing challenge on children's health	Parallel 5
09:50 - 11:40	Session 07: Male and female fertility preservation - clinical aspects	Parallel 6
11:45 - 12:45	Session 08: Novel oocyte and embryo biomarkers	Parallel 2
11:45 - 12:45	Session 09: Data reporting session: the European perspective (EIM and PGT)	Parallel 3
11:45 - 12:45	Session 10: Updated terminology for early pregnancy assessment.	Parallel 4
11:45 - 12:55	Session 11: Patient priorities	Parallel 5
14:00 - 15:00	Session 12: ASRM exchange session - controversies in ART.	Parallel 2
14:00 - 15:00	Session 13: Challenging scenarios in IVF patients	Parallel 3
14:00 - 15:00	Session 14: The way forward for fertility preservation	Parallel 4
14:00 - 15:00	Session 15: In the name of the father.	Parallel 5
14:00 - 15:00	Session 16: Breaking news in current practice	Parallel 6
15:15 - 16:30	Session 17: Cellular characteristics of embryo development	Parallel 1
15:15 - 16:35	Session 18: Cellular and molecular markers of ovarian ageing.	Parallel 2
15:15 - 16:30	Session 19: RIF and endometrial factors: does it matter?	Parallel 3
15:15 - 16:30	Session 20: Reproductive (EPI)genetics 1.	Parallel 4
15:15 - 16:30	Session 21: Impact of new technologies on human reproduction	Parallel 5
15:15 - 16:35	Session 22: Updates on ART outcomes, barriers and predictions: an international overview	Parallel 6
17:00 - 18:00	Session 23: Recent advances in endometriosis	Parallel 2
17:00 - 18:00	Session 24: Promoting fertility awareness in your own backyard.	Parallel 3
17:00 - 18:00	Session 25: The future of andrology	Parallel 4

(continued overleaf)

17:00 - 18:00	Session 26: The day after. Fertility preservation and embryo transfer in patients with cancer diagnosis. Parallel 5
17:00 - 18:00	Session 27: Frontiers in developmental biology Parallel 6

Tuesday 07 July 2020

08:30 - 09:30	Session 28: Revisiting early embryo development Parallel 1
08:30 - 09:30	Session 29: Building bridges towards harmonisation Parallel 2
08:30 - 09:30	Session 30: Nurse or midwife led e-health care interventions. Parallel 3
10:00 - 11:30	Session 31: Predictive algorithms in clinical embryology. Parallel 1
10:00 - 11:30	Session 32: Which are the optimal ovarian stimulation protocol? Parallel 2
10:00 - 11:30	Session 33: Predictors. Technology and processes improving outcomes in andrology. Parallel 3
10:00 - 11:30	Session 34: Endometriosis - pathogenesis and diagnosis Parallel 4
10:00 - 11:30	Session 35: Impact of ART on health outcomes of children Parallel 5
10:00 - 11:30	Session 36: Covid-19 session Parallel 6
11:45 - 12:45	Session 37: MHR symposium - fundamentals on making oocytes Parallel 2
11:45 - 12:45	Session 38: Laboratory session - time-lapse in 2020. Parallel 3
11:45 - 12:55	Session 39: Strategies to improve the outcomes of ovarian stimulation 2. Parallel 4
14:00 - 14:45	Session 40: Global ART monitoring Parallel 2
14:00 - 15:00	Session 41: ALMER exchange session - IVF laboratory automation Parallel 3
14:00 - 15:00	Session 42: Stress and infertility - the chicken or the egg. Parallel 4
15:15 - 16:30	Session 43: ICSI in 2020 Parallel 1
15:15 - 16:30	Session 44: What are the optimal regimes for frozen embryo transfer? Parallel 2
15:15 - 16:30	Session 45: Spermatogenesis subtle regulatory effectors Parallel 3
15:15 - 16:30	Session 46: Reproductive (EPI)genetics 2. Parallel 4
15:15 - 16:35	Session 47: Does emotional balance before being parents and after exist?. Parallel 5
15:15 - 16:30	Session 48: Relating the relevance of biomarkers to infertility. Parallel 6
17:00 - 18:00	Session 49: Embryo metabolism and development Parallel 1
17:00 - 18:00	Session 50: Androgen treatment in fertility management Parallel 2
17:00 - 18:10	Session 51: RM: new diagnostic and therapeutic aspects Parallel 3
17:00 - 18:00	Session 52: AI. A new tool to assess art outcomes and help patients? Parallel 4
17:00 - 18:00	Session 53: Controversies in ART. Parallel 5
17:00 - 18:00	Session 54: Modern techniques promote variety in fertility nursing research Parallel 6

Wednesday 08 July 2020

08:30 - 09:30	Session 55: Cochrane session - better evidence, better policies Parallel 1
08:30 - 09:30	Session 56: Frontiers in andrology Parallel 2
08:30 - 09:30	Session 57: Evidence-based surgical interventions Parallel 3
08:30 - 09:30	Session 58: Improving sperm cryopreservation outcomes. Parallel 4

10:00 - 11:45	Session 59: New morphokinetic insights of embryo development	Parallel 1
10:00 - 11:45	Session 60: Long term health, obstetrics and neonatal outcomes relating to infertility treatment	Parallel 2
09:50 - 11:55	Session 61: Understanding spermatogenesis beyond histology	Parallel 3
10:00 - 11:45	Session 62: Pathophysiologic aspects of implantation	Parallel 4
10:00 - 11:45	Session 63: Protecting gamete quality	Parallel 5
10:00 - 11:45	Session 64: Prospective carrier screening of ART couples	Parallel 6
12:00 - 13:00	Session 65: Biomarkers of failed pregnancy	Parallel 1
12:00 - 13:00	Session 66: Synthetic embryology: myth or reality?	Parallel 2
12:00 - 13:00	Session 67: COVID-19 - Psychosocial impact of delayed treatment	Parallel 3
12:00 - 13:00	Session 68: Genetic determinants of embryo quality	Parallel 4
14:00 - 15:15	Session 69: Biomarkers of developmental competence.	Parallel 1
14:00 - 15:15	Session 70: Ovarian stimulation strategies in IVF and IUI	Parallel 2
14:00 - 15:15	Session 71: About how sperm quality and male infertility relate to genetics	Parallel 3
14:00 - 15:15	Session 72: Pregnancy loss: what to consider	Parallel 4
14:00 - 15:15	Session 73: Endometriosis and ART	Parallel 5
14:00 - 15:15	Session 74: Oocyte and embryo evaluation	Parallel 6

• **INVITED SESSIONS**

• **SELECTED ORAL COMMUNICATION SESSIONS**

are 52 patients with grade I-III varicoceles and 52 patients without varicocele that were divided into supplementation or placebo groups.

Participants/materials, setting, methods: In accordance with the randomization schedule, subjects received 2 packets of either supplement or placebo daily for 6 months. Semen parameters were evaluated in a standard semen analysis at the beginning of the treatment (V1) and after completing 6 months of therapy (V2). Pregnancy rate was included as a secondary outcome. The present post-hoc analyses were carried out on the samples as categorized by age/BMI and presence/absence of varicocele.

Main results and the role of chance: One of the primary aims of this study was to correlate the results of the semen analysis with BMI and age. In particular, we wanted to see if aging and obesity status would decrease efficacy of the supplementary antioxidant treatment on main sperm parameters (see Tables 1-5). For BMI, a significant difference was observed in the BMI <25 group with varicocele for total sperm count ($p=0.0272$) and progressive motility ($p=0.0159$). No statistical significance was observed in the combined classes. The results were partially confirmed by carrying out the Chi-Square test on the data arranged as "Responder/Non Responder". As for the total sperm count, in both the BMI <25 and the combined varicocele group (i.e. BMI <25 and age <35) a statistical difference was observed ($p=0.0066$ and $p=0.0078$ respectively). These post-hoc analyses suggest that the nutritional supplement seems to be more effective in subjects younger than 35 years with a BMI below 25.

Looking at other parameters, patients treated with compounds obtained a statistically significant improve of sperm parameters for the following items: total count, progressive and total motility, morphology.

As a secondary outcome, 12 pregnancies occurred during the follow-up time: 10 in the supplementation group and 2 in the placebo group.

Limitations, reasons for caution: Even as a double-blind placebo-controlled study with very strict inclusion and exclusion criteria, we did not include sperm DNA fragmentation. Also, an oxidative stress measure such as ORP was not included. There also may be other factors besides aging and obesity involved, including lifestyle, associated disease and fat distribution.

Wider implications of the findings: In addition to earlier findings regarding improved sperm parameters in supplemented patients, these post-hoc analyses suggest that antioxidant supplementation seems to be more effective on improving sperm parameters in subjects aged less than 35 years old and with BMI below 25.

Trial registration number: NCT04177667

P-038 New insights into the physiopathology of teratozoospermia and its association with sperm DNA defects, apoptotic alterations and oxidative stress

O. Ammar¹, M. Mehdi², A. Sallem², M. Muratori³

¹Faculty of Medicine University of Monastir, Laboratory of Histology Embryology and Cytogenetic LR 18-ES 40-, Monastir, Tunisia ;

²Faculty of Medicine- University of Monastir, Laboratory of Histology Embryology and Cytogenetics LR 40 ES 18, Monastir, Tunisia ;

³Center of Excellence DeNothe, Department of Experimental and Clinical Biomedical Sciences "Mario Serio"- Unit of Sexual Medicine and Andrology, Florence, Italy

Study question: This study set out to determine the level of sperm nuclear DNA damage in patients with isolated polymorphic teratozoospermia and examining its relationship with oxidative stress and apoptosis.

Summary answer: Decreased seminal antioxidant profile may be an important factor involved in the mechanism of sperm cell death-mediated DNA breaks in teratozoospermic semen.

What is known already: Sperm morphological defects is associated with apoptosis.

Study design, size, duration: A total of 89 patients was divided into two groups, men with isolated teratozoospermia ($n = 69$) and men with normal semen parameters ($n = 20$) as controls.

Participants/materials, setting, methods: Sperm DNA breaks were evaluated by using acridine orange staining. The proportion of viable spermatozoa with mitochondrial transmembrane depolarization was detected by fluorescence microscopy through the use of MitoPT-JC-1 staining method. Bivariate Annexin V/ 6-CFDA analysis was then carried out to measure the percentage of both viable and dead spermatozoa with phosphatidylserine (PS) externalization.

Seminal antioxidant profile (reduced Glutathione (GSHr); Oxidized Glutathione (GSSG); Glutathione-S-transferase (GST)), and total protein sulfhydryl (P-SH) concentrations were measured spectrophotometrically.

Main results and the role of chance: Patient with isolated teratozoospermia, when compared to fertile donors, showed significantly increased level of single sperm DNA breaks, and higher proportions of spermatozoa with phosphatidylserine externalization and mitochondrial depolarisation. Among the different studied oxidative stress seminal parameters, the rates of seminal GSHr, GST and P-SH were significantly decreased in the patient group. However, the seminal levels of GSSG and GST have decreased, but only GST didn't showed a significant difference. Interestingly, significant relationships were found between the studied apoptotic markers and the rate of atypical sperm forms with the incidences of head abnormalities. Furthermore, positive inter-correlations were found between sperm DNA defects, impaired seminal antioxidant profile and the sperm apoptotic markers.

Limitations, reasons for caution: Further combined analysis of oxidative stress, apoptotic markers and nuclear defects should provide complementary measurements for the evaluation of sperm quality and could contribute to provide adequate reproductive and genetic counselling for hypofertile patients with isolated polymorphic teratozoospermia.

Wider implications of the findings: Sperm DNA defects as well as apoptosis and seminal oxidative stress are interlinked in the context of teratozoospermia, and constitute a unified pathogenic molecular mechanism

Trial registration number: not applicable

P-039 In spermatozoa collected after pellet swim up, when total dna fragmentation is higher than 15%, the normal morphologically spermatozoa population shows an increased dna damage.

G. Ruvo¹, A. Ferrigno², M.C. Roccheri², E. Cittadini¹, A. Pane¹, C. Simonaro¹, B. Ermini³, I. Camera³, A.M. Bruccoleri¹, M. Manno¹, A. Lo bue¹, L. Bosco²

¹Centro di Biologia della Riproduzione, Centro di Biologia della Riproduzione, Palermo, Italy ;

²University of Palermo- Palermo- Italy, Department of Biological- Chemical- and Pharmaceutical Sciences and Technologies STEBICEF-, Palermo, Italy ;

³CIPA- Centro Italiano di Procreazione Assistita, CIPA- Centro Italiano di Procreazione Assistita, Roma, Italy

Study question: We investigated the DNA Fragmentation Index (DFI) in motile normal morphologically spermatozoa comparing samples with total DFI < 15% Vs $\geq 15\%$ collected after pellet swim up

Summary answer: In the case of DFI $\geq 15\%$ the percentage of normal morphologically spermatozoa with fragmented DNA is significantly higher than the population with DFI < 15%

What is known already: Intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI) is widely used in the treatment of male infertility. Only morphologically normal spermatozoa are mainly used by embryologists to fertilize an oocyte. Different papers have reported that spermatozoa with apparently normal morphology may have DNA fragmentation. These evaluations suggest that it is possible that normal-shaped spermatozoa but with DNA fragmentation could be easily selected to fertilize oocytes during ICSI. It is known that the presence of an increased proportion of normal spermatozoa with damaged DNA is negatively associated with embryo quality affecting both pregnancy and implantation outcomes after ICSI.

Study design, size, duration: We designed an observational study on 70 male patients. We speculated that the examination of DNA integrity in motile and morphologically normal sperm, collected after pellet swim up, could provide useful information concerning sperm competence, rather than the DFI evaluation in the raw seminal sample. We analyzed data from January 2019 to December 2019. The aim is to demonstrate that DFI in normal morphologically spermatozoa, could be indicated as predictive parameter of ICSI success.

Participants/materials, setting, methods: DFI and traditional semen parameters (WHO, 2010), were evaluated in all patients. DFI was calculated using *in situ* TUNEL assay in at least 250 spermatozoa. By means of NIS-Elements BR 3.10 image analyzer software (Nikon) using images of the same field (light, fluorescence and "merged") it was possible to evaluate sperm morphology associated with DNA fragmentation. Data were analyzed using the Kruskal-Wallis

test, a non-parametric ANOVA, confirmed by restrictive Bonferroni correction using the Dunn's test.

Main results and the role of chance: In this observational study we included 70 oligoasthenospermic patients undergoing ICSI. The patients were classified in 2 groups according to the sperm DFI: Group A (n=35) included those who had a DFI < 15% in the population of sperm collected after swim up. In group B (n= 35) patients with a DFI ≥ 15%. We did not find any statistical difference between the two groups in the traditional sperm parameters like density, motility and morphology.

We observed that, in Group A, the average value of the total of sperm DFI was 9.32% while in Group B was 24.71 % ($p < 0.0001$). When the analysis was restricted only to spermatozoa with normal morphology, it was observed that among patients of Group B the DFI value was 13.6%, while in A Group the average DFI value was 2.2%, with a strong statistical difference ($p < 0.0001$). DFI calculated on motile, normal morphologically spermatozoa can provide an important information on the probability and risk of injecting, during ICSI procedure, a sperm with normal morphology but with fragmented DNA. This risk is higher if the sperm population collected after pellet swim up has a DFI higher than 15%.

Limitations, reasons for caution: This type of analysis only provides a prediction to select a sperm with fragmented DNA, but does not allow the selection of single spermatozoa with intact DNA to be used for ICSI. Further studies are needed to correlate these data with the clinical outcome.

Wider implications of the findings: Our results suggest that the evaluation of DFI in morphologically motile normal sperm selected after pellet swim up appears to be a more accurate strategy to evaluate the sperm competence, with the aim to improve the ICSI outcomes, than the traditional evaluation of sperm DFI in the whole seminal sample.

Trial registration number: not applicable

P-040 The impact of motility, morphology and presence of testicular spermatozoa on fertilization, embryo development and live birth rates, in fresh and frozen testicular samples

C. Oraipoulou¹, A. Vorniotaki¹, E. Taki¹, A. Papatheodorou¹, M. Moissidou¹, N. Christoforidis¹, A. Chatziparasidou¹

¹Embryolab IVF Clinic, Embryolab, Thessaloniki, Greece

Study question: Does cryopreservation or the quality parameters of testicular spermatozoa in fresh or frozen samples have an impact on fertilization rate, embryo development and live birth rate?

Summary answer: Although live birth rate (LBR) is not directly associated to any parameters examined, morphology and motility of testicular spermatozoa influence the number of available embryos.

What is known already: Almost 5% of couples undergoing IVF treatments are confronted with azoospermia and are counseled towards TESE-ICSI cycles. At the same time, it has been reported that there is no influence of the use of cryopreserved testicular sperm in fertilization rate and live birth rate and in the presence of motile spermatozoa, high embryo quality and pregnancy rates are expected. Motility of the spermatozoa during the ICSI procedure has been associated to live birth, while other studies claim that motility of either fresh or frozen/warmed testicular spermatozoa is the only parameter associated to ongoing pregnancy.

Study design, size, duration: A retrospective cohort study between 01/2014 and 12/2017 was performed in Embryolab IVF Clinic, Greece, including 108 TESE-ICSI treatment cycles. Logistic regression analysis was used to explore the influence of variables (fresh-frozen/warmed testicular tissue, presence/motility/morphology of testicular spermatozoa) in fertilization rate, embryonic development and LBR. Women above 38 years old, frozen oocyte cycles, PGT cycles and couples with abnormal karyotypes were excluded from the study.

Participants/materials, setting, methods: Morphology, presence and motility were graded as: good/motile(1 grade), average/twitcher(2 grades), low/immotile(3 grades) and the sum of grades represented the total quality score for the testicular spermatozoa used for ICSI. Group A included cases with up to total grade 4, while Group B included cases with total grade 5 or higher. Embryo quality was evaluated up to day 3 (good quality: more than 5 blastomeres, less than 20% fragmentation). LBR was calculated per first transfer.

Main results and the role of chance: Fertilization rate was comparable ($p > 0.05$) among fresh and frozen samples for both group A (fresh: n=24, 67% fertilization rate / frozen: n=33, 62% fertilization rate) and group B (fresh: n=23, 47% fertilization rate / frozen: n=38, 43% fertilization rate), with group A spermatozoa (n=27, 64% fertilization rate) performing significantly better compared to group B spermatozoa (n=91, 51% fertilization rate), $p < 0.05$.

Group A spermatozoa produced significantly more good day 3 embryos compared to Group B ($p < 0.05$), in particular 1,56 additional good quality embryos.

Interestingly, fresh Group B spermatozoa performed better than frozen Group B spermatozoa, resulting in significantly more good quality embryos on day 3 ($p < 0.05$).

Furthermore, there was a significant decrease in good quality day 3 embryos, if both morphology and motility were graded as low/immotile (0.75 and 0.45 less good quality embryos respectively, $p < 0.05$).

Although there was a trend for higher cycle cancellation rate in group B comparing to Group A, either fresh or frozen, the difference was not statistically significant.

Overall, although LBR was not affected by any parameter examined, the number of good quality embryos available for transfer was affected by both the quality of testicular spermatozoa used for ICSI and cryopreservation in low quality samples.

Limitations, reasons for caution: The evaluation of "presence" and "morphology" as good/average/bad could have a subjective complexion. However, this variation is eliminated through the grouping of samples.

Accumulative LBR was not calculated, as LBR was based only on the first transfer.

Wider implications of the findings: Since there is cryopreserved testicular tissue of good quality, there is no added value in proceeding to another surgery. However, in low quality samples, the use of fresh testicular spermatozoa could alter the final outcome, since cryopreservation affects the number of available good quality embryos.

Trial registration number: Not applicable

P-041 The effect of prolonged incubation of sperm at testis temperature (35°C) versus room temperature (26°C) on semen parameters

M. Mehrafza¹, C. Ostadian², A. Hosseini³, A. Eftekhari³, A. Asgharnia¹, S. Aghajani³, H. Vahabzadeh³, M. Gholami³, A. Raoufi⁴, S. Samadnia⁴, E. Hosseinzadeh⁴

¹Mehr Fertility Research Center- Guilan University of Medical Sciences- Rasht- Iran, Gynaecology, Rasht, Iran ;

²Mehr Fertility Research Center- Guilan University of Medical Sciences- Rasht- Iran, Andrology, Rasht, Iran ;

³Mehr Fertility Research Center- Guilan University of Medical Sciences- Rasht- Iran, Embryology, Rasht, Iran ;

⁴Mehr Fertility Research Center- Guilan University of Medical Sciences- Rasht- Iran, Research, Rasht, Iran

Study question: Does prolonged incubation of sperm at 35° C versus room temperature (26 ° C) affect semen parameters and DNA fragmentation index (DFI)?

Summary answer: The concentration and motility of spermatozoa were significantly higher in room temperature than 35°C. However, Temperature had no effect on DFI after 24 h.

What is known already: Currently, cryopreservation is used routinely for prolonged storage of sperm even for one day, which, despite its high cost, can affect the quality of sperm samples. If long-term incubation of sperm in the laboratory environment is possible without affecting its quality, it will be possible to manage the patient's treatment with higher quality and with greater choice.

Study design, size, duration: In the present experimental study, sperm samples were collected from 40 participants referred to Mehr Medical Institute, Rasht, Iran, from September 2019 to December 2019.

Participants/materials, setting, methods: Each semen sample was divided into two equal parts and was subjected to swim-up procedures. One group was incubated at 35°C and the other at room temperature, in the darkness. Both groups were evaluated for number, motility (Grade A and B) and morphology at 45 min, 24 h and 48 h intervals. Statistical analysis was