### Myths About Success Rates – Do they truly reflect quality of care

Barry Behr PhD., HCLD Professor and IVF Laboratory Director Division of Reproductive Endocrinology and Infertility Dept OB/GYN Stanford University



### Disclosures

- Founder of Auxogyn (Progyny)
- Founder of lvigen



### Dr Look Good vs. Dr Treat All

Is this what it is all about?



### What does success mean?

Depends on your perspective



### Good fert: Perfect 2PN !





### Good Looking Day 3 Embryos





### Hatching Blastocysts (on time)





# Ultimate (short term) Goal

- Achieve a healthy singleton pregnancy
- Transfer fewer embryos (1 or 2)





# IVF lab cant change the "raw materials"

- Have to consider the "front end" of the process
- The patient never dies in the OR
  - Always the labs "fault"



### The Perspective

- The Patient's
- The IVF Program
- The "Agency"
- What about the child



# Technology

- High vs low complex
  - The ICSI phone call.....
- Does achieving a positive outcome with a lower tech more "successful" than overkill (ie 100% ICSI or PGS)
- Now adding TLM, PGS, freeze all, ERA



# Killing a fly with a sledgehammer

- Is there such a thing as overkill
  - le is it "better" or is one more "successful" if you do more with less?
- How do we interpret success when unnecessary technology is applied?



#### Success vs Success Rate



## **Pregnancy Rate**

- Per cycle start
- Per egg retrieval
- Per embryo transfer
- Confounders:
- Freeze all/PGS
- Banking/batching
- Cycle conversions (to/from IUI)
- Stanford MEDICINE

### Implantation Rate

- Sac
- Heartbeat
- Location: Uterus vs Ectopic



### **Outcome Reporting**

- SART
  - disclaimer
- CDC
- Non Reporters
- Consequences (lack thereof) of non- compliance (fraud)



# What is the background (natural) "success rate"?



Approximate pregnancy rates per cycle in "fertile couples"

- At peak fertility (20s): 20-25%
- Mid 30s: 15%
- Age 40: 5%
- Mid 40s: 1%

The most fertile couples will become pregnant quickly, rates drop the longer a couple has been trying



### **Normal Reproductive Process**





Pregnancy rates for "sub-fertile couples" with no treatment

- Overall 2-3%, lower for older couples
- Depends on
  - Reason for lack of successful pregnancy
  - Age
  - Length of attempting (in general, lower rate if longer)



Why do people consider In Vitro Fertilization (IVF)?

- Simpler treatment is not successful
- The reason for infertility cannot be treated using a simpler treatment (e.g. tubal disease, very poor sperm quality)
- A man and/or woman carriers serious genetic disease that they wish to avoid passing on to children
- Time to pregnancy

# No Risk Adjusters for IVF Reporting

- (other than age)
- Other areas of Medicine use modifiers



### Does success rate depend on Diagnosis?

• Problem with combined male and female diagnosis in SART



## Which Diagnosis has the most influence on

#### "success rate"?

👻 🚼 Sei	arch 🔹 🔀 🎇 Sh	nare 🔊 🔹 More »							<u></u> 🔒
sart con	rs		Clinic Su	Immary R	eport				
	All SART Member Clinics								
Filter CSR									
Treatment All Tre	atmont Tupos	Diagoo		c	Voar 2013	N			
Treatment LAI The	aunen: Types	♥ Diagno.	Sis [All Diagnose		✓ Teal 201.	•			
			Apply Filt	ter Clear Fi	ilter				
Total Cucles: 1740	962								
Treatment Type		Procedure Frequency		Diagnosis	s Frequency				
IVE	>99%	ICSI	67%	Tubal Fa	actor	6% 1	Vale Factor	16%	
GIFT	<1%	Unstimulated	1%	Ovulator	ry Dysfunction	7%	Other Factor	7%	
ZIFT	<1%	PGD	6%	Diminish	ned Ovarian Reserve	18 <mark>%</mark> (	Jnknown Factor	13%	
				Endome	etriosis	3% 1	Multiple Female Factor	12%	
				Literine F	Factor	1% F	Completered Male Conten	470/	
Fresh Embryos Fron	n Non-Donor Oocyte	es					emale and Male Pactor	1/ %	
Fresh Embryos Fron	m Non-Donor Oocyte	65		<35 36958	35-37	38-40 16853	41-42 9026	>42	
Fresh Embryos Fron Number of cycles Percentage of cyc	m Non-Donor Oocyte	es gnancies		<35 36958 46.0	35-37 18508 37.8	38-40 16853 28.6	41-42 9026 18.8	>42 5744 8.9	
Fresh Embryos From Number of cycles Percentage of cyc Percentage of cyc	m Non-Donor Oocyte s cles resulting in preg cles resulting in live	es gnancies births		<35 36958 46.0 40.1	35-37 18508 37.8 31.4	38-40 16853 28.6 21.2	41-42 9026 18.8 11.2	>42 5744 8.9 4.5	
Fresh Embryos From Number of cycles Percentage of cyc Percentage of cyc Reliability Range	m Non-Donor Oocyte cles resulting in preç cles resulting in live	es gnancies births	(38	<35 36958 46.0 40.1 9.6 - 40.6)	35-37 18508 37.8 31.4 (30.7 - 32.0)	38-40 16853 28.6 21.2 (20.6 - 21.8)	41-42 9026 18.8 11.2 (10.5 - 11.8)	>42 5744 8.9 4.5 (3.9 - 5.0)	
Fresh Embryos Fron Number of cycles Percentage of cyc Percentage of cyc Reliability Range Percentage of ret	m Non-Donor Oocyte cles resulting in preg cles resulting in live rievals resulting in li	es gnancies births ve births	(35	<35 36958 46.0 40.1 9.6 - 40.6) 42.5	35-37 18508 37.8 31.4 (30.7 - 32.0) 34.5	38-40 16853 28.6 21.2 (20.6 - 21.8) 24.2	41-42 9026 18.8 11.2 (10.5 - 11.8) 13.3	>42 5744 8.9 4.5 (3.9 - 5.0) 5.6	
Fresh Embryos Fron Number of cycles Percentage of cyc Reliability Range Percentage of rett Percentage of rett	m Non-Donor Oocytr cles resulting in prec cles resulting in live rrievals resulting in li nsfers resulting in li	es gnancies births ve births ve births	(35	<35 36958 46.0 40.1 9.6 - 40.6) 42.5 47.7	35-37 18508 37.8 31.4 (30.7 - 32.0) 34.5 39.2	38-40 16853 28.6 21.2 (20.6 - 21.8) 24.2 28.5	41-42 9026 18.8 11.2 (10.5 - 11.8) 13.3 16.3	>42 5744 8.9 4.5 (3.9 - 5.0) 5.6 7.3	
Fresh Embryos Fron Number of cycles Percentage of cyc Percentage of cyc Reliability Range Percentage of ret Percentage of trat Percentage of trat	m Non-Donor Cocytr cles resulting in prec cles resulting in live rievals resulting in li nsfers resulting in li cles with elective sin	es gnancies births ve births ve births ngle embryo transfer	(35	<35 36958 46.0 40.1 2.6 - 40.6) 42.5 47.7 22.5	35-37 18508 37.8 31.4 (30.7 - 32.0) 34.5 39.2 13.9	38-40 16853 28.6 21.2 (20.6 - 21.8) 24.2 28.5 6.6	41-42 9026 18.8 11.2 (10.5 - 11.8) 13.3 16.3 4.1	×42 5744 8.9 4.5 (3.9-5.0) 5.6 7.3 5.3 20.2	
Fresh Embryos From Number of cycles Percentage of cyc Percentage of cyc Reliability Range Percentage of rett Percentage of trat Percentage of cyc Percentage of car	m Non-Donor Oocytr cles resulting in preg cles resulting in live rievals resulting in li nsfers resulting in lin cles with elective sin ncellations	es gnancies births ve births ve births rgle embryo transfer	(38	<35 36958 46.0 40.1 9.6 - 40.6) 42.5 47.7 22.5 5.8 30.5	35-37 18508 37.8 31.4 (30.7 - 32.0) 34.5 39.2 13.9 9.1 30.0	38-40 16853 28.6 21.2 (20.6 - 21.8) 24.2 28.5 6.6 12.6 12.6	41-42 9026 18.8 11.2 (10.5 - 11.8) 13.3 16.3 4.1 15.8 10.2	×42 5744 8.9 4.5 (3.9-5.0) 5.6 7.3 5.3 20.2 4.5	
Fresh Embryos From Number of cycles Percentage of cyc Percentage of cyc Reliability Range Percentage of retr Percentage of trat Percentage of cyc Percentage of cyc	m Non-Donor Oocytr cles resulting in prec cles resulting in live rrievals resulting in li nsfers resulting in li nsfers resulting in li cles with elective sin ncellations	es gnancies births ve births ve births regle embryo transfer	(36	<35 36958 46.0 40.1 3.6 - 40.6) 42.5 47.7 22.5 5.8 39.5 1.8	35-37 18508 37.8 31.4 (30.7 - 32.0) 34.5 39.2 13.9 9.1 30.0 1.9	38-40 16853 28.6 21.2 (20.6 - 21.8) 24.2 28.5 6.6 12.6 12.6 19.3 2,3	41-42 9026 18.8 11.2 (10.5 - 11.8) 13.3 16.3 4.1 15.8 10.2 2.7	>42 5744 8.9 4.5 (3.9-5.0) 5.6 7.3 5.3 20.2 4.5 2.8	
Fresh Embryos Fron Number of cycles Percentage of cyc Percentage of cyc Reliability Range Percentage of retr Percentage of trai Percentage of trai Percentage of cyc Percentage of cyc	m Non-Donor Oocyte cles resulting in preg cles resulting in live rievals resulting in liv cles with elective sin ncellations of embryos transferr e births with twins	es gnancies births ve births ve births ngle embryo transfer red	(35	<35 36958 46.0 40.1 8.6 - 40.6) 42.5 47.7 22.5 5.8 39.5 1.8 28.3	35-37 18508 37.8 31.4 (30.7 - 32.0) 34.5 39.2 13.9 9.1 30.0 1.9 25.5	38-40 16853 28.6 21.2 (20.6-21.8) 24.2 28.5 6.6 12.6 12.6 19.3 2.3 19.9	41-42 9026 18.8 11.2 (10.5 - 11.8) 13.3 16.3 4.1 15.8 10.2 2.7 13.5	>42 5744 8.9 4.5 (3.9-5.0) 5.6 7.3 5.3 20.2 4.5 2.8 8.2	
Fresh Embryos From Number of cycles Percentage of cyc Percentage of cyc Reliability Range Percentage of retr Percentage of tran Percentage of cyc Percentage of cyc Percentage of live Percentage of live Percentage of live Percentage of live	m Non-Donor Oocytr cles resulting in preg cles resulting in live rrievals resulting in li nsfers resulting in li nsfers resulting in li cles with elective sin ncellations of embryos transfer e births with twins e births with triplets (	es gnancies births ve births ve births red red	(36	<35 36958 46.0 40.1 36 - 40.6) 42.5 47.7 22.5 5.8 39.5 1.8 28.3 0.9	35-37 18508 37.8 31.4 (30.7 - 32.0) 34.5 39.2 13.9 9.1 30.0 1.9 25.5 1.0	38-40 16853 28.6 21.2 (20.6 - 21.8) 24.2 28.5 6.6 12.6 19.3 2.3 19.9 1.0	41-42 9026 18.8 11.2 (10.5 - 11.8) 13.3 16.3 4.1 15.8 10.2 2.7 13.5 0.2	×42 5744 8.9 4.5 (3.9-5.0) 5.6 7.3 5.3 20.2 4.5 2.8 8.2 0.4	
Fresh Embryos From Number of cycles Percentage of cyc Percentage of cyc Reliability Range Percentage of retr Percentage of tran Percentage of tran Percentage of of cyc Percentage of live Percentage of live Percentage of live Percentage of live Percentage of live	m Non-Donor Oocyte cles resulting in preg cles resulting in live rrievals resulting in line cles with elective sin ncellations of embryos transferr e births with twins e births with twins e births with triplets of	es gnancies births ve births ve births red or more eytes	(36	<35 36958 46.0 40.1 40.6 42.5 47.7 22.5 5.8 39.5 1.8 28.3 0.9	35-37 18508 37.8 31.4 (30.7 - 32.0) 34.5 39.2 13.9 9.1 30.0 1.9 2.5.5 1.0	38-40 16853 28.6 21.2 (20.6 - 21.8) 24.2 28.5 6.6 12.6 19.3 2.3 19.9 1.0	41-42 9026 18.8 11.2 (10.5 - 11.8) 13.3 16.3 4.1 15.8 10.2 2.7 13.5 0.2	×42 5744 8.9 4.5 (3.9-5.0) 5.6 7.3 5.3 20.2 4.5 2.8 8.2 0.4	







### SART not for comparing programs

							, 0 -
(=) (=) (=) https://www.sartcorsonline.com/rptCSP	R_PublicMultYear.aspx?ClinicPKID=2344		오 두 🔒 🖒 🏈 Clinic Summary Report	×		( <b>3</b> 29)	6
× Google	👻 🚼 Search 🕶	🛛 🔀 Share 👰 🔹 More ≫				🔔 🞴 Bai	rry Behr 🕶
	sant cors	c	Clinic Summary Report				
		inford Medicine -Fertility & Reproduct					
	Treatment All Treatment	Types 🗸 Diagnosis 🗚	Il Diagnoses V Year [2013 V]				
			Apply Filter   Clear Filter				
	Total Cycles: 949						
			Tubal Factor Male	Factor			
				Factor			
			Diminished Ovarian Reserve Unkno	own Factor			
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Endometriosis Multip	le Female Factor			
				🗙 e Factor			
		practices which may inflate Please discuss this with yo	e or lower pregnancy rates relative to another clinic. our doctor.				
					542		
	Number of cycles			Ok			
	Percentage of cycles resu	ulting in pregnancies					
		ulting in live births					
	(Reliability Range)						
	Percentage of retrievals re	esulting in live births					
		esulting in live births					
	Percentage of cycles with	elective single embryo transfer					
	Percentage of cancellation						
	Implantation Rate						
			226 36.27	CA FA 0A 05	543		

P≌

# Why?



## Effects of PGD/S on outcomes

Sex selection

Mutation avoidance

Real aneuploidy risk (age)



# Does Euploidy level the playing field?(across the ages)

So again, how to interpret success: is it only the pregnancy rate?



# Advances in PGD

- Embryo biopsy techniques
  - Move from Day 3 to Day 5 biopsy
- Single cell genetics

FISH

Snps

Arrays

Sequencing

- Cryopreservation
- Higher implantation rates



### What a difference a decade makes

		2000*	2015*
	Implantation Rate (live birth per embryo transferred)	10-20%	30-50+%
	Number of embryos transferred	2-4	1-2
	Error rates	2-11%	1-2%
Stanfor	Miscarriage rate d F	20+%	5-10%

Fertility and Reproductive Health

# Conclusions regarding statistics

- Statistics provide an estimate, but outcome for individuals can't be precisely predicted based on statistics for a group
- We want to provide as accurate an estimate as possible to help patients make informed decisions
- At Stanford, for example, we have no "cut-offs" for treatment based on success, regardless of what the statistics may predict



# Conclusions

- IVF Reporting is unique for Medicine
- National Data Summaries show trends
- Patients are the primary dictators of success
- PGS utility has and impact
- Preg per ER vs ET vs Total cycle potential

