

Supplemental Materials

Operational definitions and Abbreviations:

Amenorrhea: an absence of menstruation

Infertility: A disease characterized by the failure to establish a clinical pregnancy after 12 months of regular, unprotected sexual intercourse or due to an impairment of a person's capacity to reproduce either as an individual or with his/her partner. Fertility interventions may be initiated in less than 1 year based on medical, sexual and reproductive history, age, physical findings and diagnostic testing. Infertility is a disease, which generates disability as an impairment of function.

Fertility problems: operationally defined for this review as inability to achieve pregnancy or live birth and neonatal death.

Primary female infertility: A woman who has never been diagnosed with a clinical pregnancy and meets the criteria of being classified as having infertility.

Secondary female infertility: A woman unable to establish a clinical pregnancy but who has previously been diagnosed with a clinical pregnancy.

BV: Bacterial vaginosis

CSG: Consanguinity

D&C: Dilatation and curettage

FGM/C: Female genital mutilation/cutting

GTB: Genital tuberculosis

LMIC: Low and middle income countries

PICO: Population, intervention/Indicator, comparison, outcome

PID: Pelvic inflammatory disease

RF: Risk factor

SRF: Selected risk factor

STI: Sexually transmitted infection

WHO: World Health Organization




Table 1.

Summary of Findings from Reviews on the Impact of Original FertiSTAT Risk Factors on Fertility

Risk factor	Summary findings	Type of review	Source
Age, lifestyle and reproductive			
Age	Increasing parental age is a risk factor for reduced fertility.	Narrative Review	Schmidt, 2012
Age	Birth rate starts to decrease when a woman reaches 35 years old. Young women conceive sooner than older women. Infertility increases as the age of the female increase.	Narrative Review	Liu, 2011
Appendectomy	No statistical association between appendectomy and infertility	Systemic Review and meta-analysis of RCTs	Elraiyah, 2014
Pelvic surgery	Adhesions are a common complication of gynaecological surgeries. Adhesions affect the interaction between the fallopian tube and ovaries consequently infertility can occur.	Narrative review	Hirschelmann, 2012
Chlamydia	Inflammatory tissue destruction in response to infection leads to the development of tubal infertility and ectopic pregnancy	Narrative Review	Carey 2010
Endometriosis	Dysfunction of pituitary-ovarian axis altering the feedback pathways, folliculogenesis, lower levels of estrogen and progesteron, altered luteal function and the fact that they ovulate fewer oocytes are all accounted for infertility in women with endometritis	Narrative review	Stilley, 2012
Lifestyle	Fertility is decreases by being overweight and underweight. Folic acid and Vitamin B have been linked to infertility and spontaneous abortions. High alcohol consumption can affect estrogen and progesteron levels leading to anovulation, luteal phase dysfunction and impaired implantation.	Narrative Review (in some cases review of reviews e.g. in smoking several systematic reviews and meta-	Anderson, 2010

	<p>Consumption of caffeine in moderation has no effect on fertility however some evidence suggest that prolongs time to conception. Smoking adversely effects fertility and pregnancy outcomes. Recreational drugs are associated with decrease fertility, some prescription medications such as anti-hypertensives can affect the female reproduction on different levels. Stress can supress the reproductive functions such as causing hypothalamic amenorrhea. Environmental pollutant can cause a negative effect on fertility. Evidence of oxidative stress has been found in women with PCOS, unexplained infertility and endometriosis.</p>	<p>analyses are reviewed here)</p>
<p>Lifestyle</p>	<p>Increasing age of a women increases infertility and time to pregnancy. Consuming more vitamins & proteins and less carbs & trans fats are recommended to preserve fertility. Body weight has significant effect on infertility. Obesity increases the risk of miscarriages however being underweight is associated with ovarian dysfunction and infertility. Vigorous exercise was found to have a negative effect on female reproduction by causing hypothalamic dysfunction and therefore menstrual abnormalities. Physical stress can prolong the time to conceive, however psychological stress is more prominent among women attending the infertility treatment. Smoking decrease the ovarian function and ovarian reserve. Marijuana use increases the risk of primary infertility. Prescription medications such as anti-psychotics, anti-hypertensives and chemotherapy. The amount of alcohol and caffeine consumed significantly affects the fertility of women. Exposure to heavy metals such as lead is reported to alter hypothalamic-pituitary axis and overall fertility.</p>	<p>Narrative review Sharma 2013</p>

Obesity	Obesity increases the risk of anovulatory infertility because of hyperandrogenism through granulosa cell apoptosis, peripheral conversion of androgens to estrogen leading to an increase negative feedback of gonadotropins and adverse effect on theca and granulosa because of increased leptin. PCOS is closely related to obesity but whether obesity causes PCOS is still undetermined	Narrative review of retrospective studies	Metwally, 2007
Smoking	Smoking effects fertility by impairing folliculogenesis and steroidogenesis. The effect of cigarette toxins depends on the amount and duration of exposure.	Systemic review	Dechanet, 2011
Smoking	There is a significant increased risk of infertility in women who smoked. Active cigarette smoking is associated with infertility. In some studies, smoking more than 20 cigarettes per day seem to effect fertility.	Systemic Review and metanalysis of observational studies (case-control and cohort)	Augood, 1998
STIs	Adhesions cause by PID effects the tubes more than the uterus. Most of these pathogens lead to tubal infertility through an ascending infection. M. genitalium cause salphingitis-PID which may account for infertility. Ascending infection from N. gonorrhoea, C. trachomatis, Gradenella vaginalis lead to tubal factor sterility. Genital amoebiasis can cause damage to the female reproductive system and sterility.. HIV adversely effects fertility but it is not understood whether the impact is from the virus or concomitant genital infection or the effect of treatment.	Narrative review	Pellati, 2007
<hr/> Medical conditions <hr/>			
Asthma	The inflammatory immune response caused by asthma was found in the uterus and tubes of asthmatic women. It causes chronic peripheral inflammation that alters the whole body's inflammatory response. The link that metabolic response is a risk factor for asthma implies that PCOS is related to asthma as well. An imbalance of the adaptive immune system is associated with infertility.	Narrative review	Gade, 2014

Cancer	Cancer-directed therapies reduces the ovarian reserve. Many chemotherapy agents have been linked to ovarian failure and radiation can lead to damage to the reproductive organs.	Narrative review	Levine, 2015
Chemotherapy	Female infertility due to ovarian damage from chemotherapy is an inevitable consequence. Chemotherapy causes irreversible and progressive damage to the ovaries and germ cells. Radiotherapy impairs the development of the uterus in young women and increases the risk for ovarian failure.	Narrative review	Lmai, 2007
Celiac Disease	Celiac Disease is relevant in women with unexplained infertility. Delayed menarche and amenorrhoea are also symptoms of Celiac Disease. Secondary amenorrhoea and spontaneous abortions were common in women with Celiac Disease. This can be attribute to deficiency of trace elements and vitamins due to malabsorption associated with Celiac Disease, this are responsible for a healthy reproductive life such as abnormal ovarian axis, p	Narrative review	Ozgor, 2010
Diabetes	Type I diabetes impacts the reproduction in many ways. Women with Type I diabetes have hypogonadotropic hypogonadism which causes amenorrhoea. Disturbed insulin secretion whether high or low impacts ovarian development and function and can aid in the development of PCOS. Studies on young adult women show preserved ovulation however they found fewer pregnancies and live births.	Systemic review	Codner, 2012
Lupus	Hyperandrogenism has also been associated with diabetes, POF in lupus patients can be due to autoimmunity or drug related. Patients with SLE can suffer from menstrual disturbances which has been associated with anti-corpus luteum antibodies which suggests autoimmunity as well	Narrative review	Hickman, 2011
Sickle cell disease	Women with sickle cell disease have lower number of pregnancies and delayed menarche.	Narrative review	Smith-Whitley, 2014
Thyroid diseases	Both hypothyroidism and hyperthyroidism are linked to menstrual abnormalities ranging from amenorrhoea to menorrhagia and subsequently leading to lower pregnancy rate and infertility.	Narrative review	Poppe, 2007

Note. STIs = sexually transmitted infections; PID = pelvic inflammatory disease; PCOS = polycystic ovarian syndrome

Table 2.

Application of Considerations for the Selection of Risk Factors*, as well as Identification and Endorsement Attained in Previous study**

Risk Factor	Primary causes of disease	Prevalent or hazardous^a	Potential causality	Data on exposure available	Potentially modifiable	Found in search in LMIC^b	Endorsed by experts in survey^c
CSG	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
FGM/C	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
HIV	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
GTB	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BV	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
D&C	No	Unknown	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Vit D def	Yes (musculoskeletal)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Waterpipe smoking	Yes (smoking in general)	Yes	Yes	Yes (smoking and equivalence to smoking)	Yes	No	Yes

Note. *World Health Report, WHO, 2002; Ezzati et al., 2002; **Bayoumi et al., 2018.

^aEzzati et al., (2002) suggest that when the risk is not a primary cause of disease, consider the prevalence and or hazardous nature of the RF.

^b Was the RF found in the preliminary search of the literature reported in Bayoumi et al., 2018.

^c Was the RF endorsed by fertility experts in the survey reported in Bayoumi et al., 2018.

CSG = consanguinity; FGM/C = female genital mutilation/cutting; GTB = genital tuberculosis; BV = bacterial vaginosis; D&C = dilatation and curettage; Vit D def = vitamin D deficiency.

Table 3.

Bradford Hill Criteria and Definitions

Criteria	Definition
1. Strength	A larger associations indicates that causality is more likely, but a small association doesn't mean there is no casual effect
2. Consistency	The consistency of findings across different studies in different populations and settings, but also molecular level studies bolster the epidemiological evidence from observational studies, decreasing the need for repetitions of observational studies
3. Specificity	A causal relationship is more likely if the association between a factor and the effect is more specific
4. Temporality	The cause has to occur before the effect
5. Biological gradient	The presence of a dose-response (more exposure-more effect) relationship increases the likelihood of a causal relationship
6. Plausibility	The biological evidence provides a model that helps explain the association of interest
7. Coherence	Consistency between laboratory and epidemiological findings increases likelihood of a causal relationship, similar to 'consistency'
8. Experiment	Evidence from experimental manipulation such that cessation of exposure leads to decrease in disease lends strong support to causal relationship
9. Analogy	Considering the effect of similar factors

Note. Definitions derived from Hill, 1965; Fedak et al., 2015

Genital Tuberculosis

Plausible mechanisms to explain how GTB could be associated with fertility problems




Table 4.

Summary of Reproductive Health Consequences of Genital Tuberculosis (GTB) Reported in the Literature

Reproductive Outcome	Effect of GTB	Statistics reported (percentage of GTB patients)	Primary study	Review
Infertility	Infertility is the presenting or most common complaint	40 to 50	Siegler, 1979; Sutherland, 1979; 1983, Bazax-Malik, 1983; Sivanesaratnam, 1986; Punnonen, 1983; Francis 1964; Govan, 1962; Russel, 1951	Varma, 2008
	Infertility	64.2 vs. 22 control	Tripathy & Tripathy, 1987	
		54.4	Ojo & Unuigbe, 1987	
		10 to 85	Schaefer 1976, Krishna, 1977; Tripathy & Tripathy, 2002	Ghosh, 2011
		NR	Arora, 2003; Choudhary, 1996; Bukulmez, 1999; Bapna, 2005; Varma, 1991; Sharma, 2008; Chavan, 2004; Dam, 2006	Ghosh, 2011
		NR	Dhillon, 1990; de Vynck, 1990	Varma, 2008
	Infertility (primary and secondary)	42.5 (78 and 22)	Qureshi et al., 2001	Gatongi, 2005
Tubal blockage (Peritubal adhesions and tuboovarian masses)	47.2	deVynck et al, 1990	Malik, 2003	
Pelvic pain	Is not usually severe and present for many months before presenting	25 to 50	Falk et al., 1980; Francis, 1964; Sutherland, 1979; Sutherland, 1983	Varma, 2008
	Progression of GTB increase severity of pelvic pain and is usually aggravated by coitus, exercise, and menses.	NR	Daly & Monif, 1982	Varma, 2008
	Chronic pelvic pain	42.5	Qureshi et al., 2001	Gatongi, 2005
	Chronic pelvic pain	15.8	Samal et al., 2000	Gatongi, 2005
Menstrual dysfunction	Abnormal uterine bleeding	10 to 40	Simon et al., 1977; Daly & Monif, 1982	Varma, 2008
	menorrhagia (very heavy)	19	Samal et al., 2000	Varma, 2008, Ghosh, 2011; Gatongi, 2005
	Oligohypomenorrhea	54	Samal et al., 2000	Varma, 2008; Gatongi, 2005
	Amenorrhea	NR	Sharma, 2008	Ghosh, 2011

Reproductive Outcome	Effect of GTB	Statistics reported (percentage of GTB patients)	Primary study	Review
	Amenorrhea	14.3	Samal et al., 2000	Varma, 2008; Ghosh, 2011; Gatongi, 2005
		15	Qureshi et al., 2001	Gatongi, 2005
	Dyspareunia (painful sex)	5	Qureshi et al., 2001	
	Dysmenorrhoea (painful period)	12.5	Qureshi et al., 2001	
	Menstrual irregularities found cases of endometrial TB of which Amenorrhea was the most common	85 and 43.6	Tripathy & Tripathy, 1987	Varma, 2008; Gatongi, 2005
Asherman's Syndrome	Uterine adhesions can be the cause of infertility	NR	Sharma, 2008; Bukulmez, 1999	Ghosh, 2011
TB in the neonate	TB can be spread to fetus in utero/delivery from a mother who has GTB (referred to as congenital TB)	NR	Hamadeh,1992; Arora, 2003; Stark, 1997; Cantwell, 1994	

Note: NR=not reported




Figure 3. PRISMA Flow Diagram for GTB. Figure shows the exclusion of studies at different stages and the reasons for exclusion. Records identified through database searching of Medline and Embase includes original search, an update from the time of original search and a search using new MeSH terms. GTB = Genital Tuberculosis

Table 5.

Sample Characteristics of the Seven Included Studies

Study	Location	Sample (n)	GTB (n)	No-GTB (n)	Age Women ^a		
					GTB	No-GTB	
Ali, 2012	Kassala, Sudan	44 women	25	19	Mean (SD)	34.8 (6.9)	34.7 (7.7)
Bhanothu, 2014	India (south)	302 women	202	100	Mean (SD)	28.54 (4.46)	27.59 (4.62)
Sharma, 2011	India	388 women	99	289	Mean (SD)	28.69 (4.83)	29.72 (9.58)
Malhotra, 2012	India	208 women	104	104	Mean (SD)	28.7 (3.9)	28.2 (3.1)
Kitilla, 2002	Ethiopia	268 women	67	201	Range	Percentage (n)	Percentage (n)
					15-19	0	0.5 (1)
					20-24	19.4 (13)	8.5 (17)
					25-29	38.8 (26)	31.3 (63)
					30-34	29.9 (20)	36.3 (73)
					35-39	11.9 (8)	19.9 (40)
					40-44	0	3.0 (6)
45+	0	0.5 (1)					

Note.. ^a Age for women at the beginning of the study; GTB = Genital Tuberculosis, SD=Standard deviation; NR= data not reported

Table 6.

Characteristics of the Design of the Seven Included Studies

	Study design	Data collection	Study period	GTB measure	Infertility outcome measure (duration)
Ali, 2012	Cross-sectional	Maternity Hospital	Jan-Dec 2010	Clinical symptoms and Histology	Infertility defined as failure to become pregnant despite unprotected sexual practice after one year of marriage.
Bhanothu, 2014	Cross-sectional	2 Gynaecology clinics	2006-2014	Clinical symptoms and Histology	Amenorrhea (duration not specified)
Sharma, 2011	Cross-sectional	University Hospital	2007-2010	PCR, Histology, culture, laparoscopy and hysteroscopy	Primary infertility (inability to conceive spontaneously despite one year of regular (3-4 times a week) unprotected intercourse) AND Amenorrhea (duration not specified)
Malhotra, 2012	Cross-sectional	Outpatient Gynaecology clinic	2007-2009	PCR, Histology, culture, laparoscopy and hysteroscopy	Primary infertility Secondary infertility
Kitilla, 2002	Cross-sectional	University Hospital	1995-2000	Surgical and Histology	TFI (tubo-peritoneal) Primary infertility Secondary infertility

Note. PCR = polymerase chain reaction; TFI = tubal factor infertility

Table 7.

Quality Ratings for the Seven Included Studies on the Basis of an Adapted Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale

	Quality Criterion						Overall rating ^g
	Adequacy of GTB (exposed) measure ^a Max 2 points	Adequacy of control (non-exposed), definition and selection ^b Max 2 points	Comparability of control ^c Max 2 points	Confounders adequately assessed Max 2 points ^d	Adequacy of outcome Infertility measure ^e Max 1 point	None response rate or loss to follow-up ^f Max 1 point	
Ali, 2012	2	2	0	0	0	NA	Average
Bhanothu, 2014	2	2	0	2	1	NA	High
Sharma, 2011	2	1	1	1	0	NA	Average
Malhotra, 2012	2	2	0	1	0	NA	Average
Kitilla, 2002	2	1	0	2	0	NA	Average

Note. ^a GTB was adequately assessed when diagnosis was confirmed by medical testing or hospital records, and it was representative of the cohort i.e. drawn from the same population (up to 2 points); ^b Controls were adequately assessed when selection was comparable to cases, and GTB was excluded properly in the control population (up to 2 points); ^c Comparability of controls was achieved if exposed/non-exposed were matched or adjustment during analysis conducted. One point for rural-urban and one point for any other confounder (up to 2 points); ^d Confounders were adequately assessed if they were obtained from records or a blind interview, and one point was given if the same method was used for both groups (up to 2 points); ^e Infertility outcome was adequately assessed if independent or blind assessment was stated in the paper, or confirmation of the outcome by reference to secure records (medical records, etc.) (up to 1 point); ^f Point given if same rate for both groups and <20% loss to follow up reported; ^g The overall quality rating was low (0 to 3 points), average (4 to 6 points), or high (7 to 10 points).

Table 8.

Number and percentage of women with infertility or amenorrhea in the GTB and No-GTB groups in the included studies (k=5)

Outcome	Number of women (%)	
	GTB	No-GTB
Infertility	102/124 (82.3)	127/308 (41.2)
Amenorrhea	24/301 (8.0)	12/389 (3.1)
Type of infertility	Primary	133/171 (77.8)
	Secondary	38/171 (22.2)
		149/305 (48.9)
		156/305 (51.1)

Note. GTB = genital tuberculosis

Results of Meta-analyses




Figure 4. Odds ratio for the women who are infertile (>12 months) in the GTB and No-GTB groups




Figure 5. Odds ratio for the women reporting 'amenorrhea' (duration not specified) in the GTB and No-GTB groups




Figure 6. Odds ratio for 'primary infertility' amongst infertile women in the GTB and No-GTB groups

HIV

Table 9.

WHO Clinical Staging of HIV/AIDS for Adults and Adolescents

Clinical Stage	Clinical Conditions or Symptoms
Primary HIV Infection	Asymptomatic Acute retroviral syndrome
Clinical Stage 1	Asymptomatic Persistent generalized lymphadenopathy
Clinical Stage 2	Moderate unexplained weight loss (<10% of presumed or measured body weight) Recurrent infections (respiratory, Herpes, oral ulceration, Seborrhic dermatitis Fungal nail infections)
Clinical Stage 3	Unexplained severe weight loss (>10% of presumed or measured body weight) Unexplained chronic diarrhea for >1 month Unexplained persistent fever for >1 month (>37.6°C, intermittent or constant) Persistent oral candidiasis (thrush), Oral hairy leukoplakia Pulmonary tuberculosis (current) Severe presumed bacterial infections (e.g., pneumonia, empyema, pyomyositis, bone or joint infection, meningitis, bacteremia) Unexplained anemia (hemoglobin <8 g/dL) Neutropenia (neutrophils <500 cells/μL) Chronic thrombocytopenia (platelets <50,000 cells/μL)
Clinical Stage 4	HIV wasting syndrome Recurrent infections (severe bacterial pneumonia, Chronic herpes, Esophageal candidiasis, Extrapulmonary tuberculosis, Cytomegalovirus infection) Cancer (Kaposi sarcoma, Lymphoma, Invasive cervical carcinoma) Central nervous system toxoplasmosis Other severe infections and cancers

Note. Table adapted from Consolidated Guidelines on the Use of Antiretroviral Drugs for Treating and Preventing HIV Infection: Recommendations for a Public Health Approach. 2nd edition. WHO, 2016. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK374293/> Copyright by WHO [2016]. Reprinted by permission.

Plausible mechanisms to explain how HIV could be associated with fertility problems




Table 10.

Summary of Reproductive Health Consequences of HIV Reported in the Literature

Reproductive outcome	Effect of HIV	Primary study	Statistics reported (where available)	Review
Ovarian function	Change in ovarian reserve in HIV+ women Mixed results	Schoenbaum et al. (2005); Martinet et al. (2006) reported normal ovarian reserve	NR	van Leeuwen et al. (2007)
		Clark et al. (2001); Englert et al. (2004) reported dramatically reduced ovarian function i.e. Primary ovarian insufficiency (POI)	NR	

Reproductive outcome	Effect of HIV	Primary study	Statistics reported (where available)	Review
	FSH level	Clark et al. (2001) report higher rates of elevated FSH	8% of HIV+ women (20-42yrs) had FSH level indicative of menopause	Kushnir and Lewis (2011)
		Cejtin et al. (2006) reported no difference in FSH in women with amenorrhea	NR	Kushnir and Lewis (2011)
		Seifer et al. (2007) found no evidence that HIV infection influences ovarian aging (FSH and AMH levels)	NR	Kushnir and Lewis (2011)
	Ovaries susceptible to HIV and secondary infections	Not well studied but hypothetically i.e. no specific evidence	NR	Lo and Schambelan (2001)
Menstrual cycle	Menstrual irregularities (very short and very long) in HIV+ women without AIDS	Chirgwin et al. (1996)	NR	van Leeuwen et al. (2007); Lo and Schambelan (2001); Waters et al. (2007)
	Increased rate of menstrual irregularities in HIV infected women with AIDS (and the associated wasting).	Harlow et al. (2000)	NR	van Leeuwen et al. (2007)
		Grinspoon et al. (1997)	NR	Lo and Schambelan (2001)
	HIV+ had little effect on menstrual irregularities (cycle length/ menstrual duration)	Harlow et al. (2000)	NR	Lo and Schambelan (2001); Waters et al. (2007)
		Harlow et al. (2000); Chirgwin et al. (1996)	NR	Waters, et al. (2007); van Leeuwen et al. (2007)
	Among HIV+ women, increased cycle variability was associated with higher viral loads and lower CD4 cell counts	Harlow et al. (2000)	NR	Lo and Schambelan (2001); Waters et al. (2007)
		Clark et al. (2001)	NR	Waters et al. (2007)
Amenorrhea	Prolonged amenorrhea without ovarian failure	Cejtin et al. (2006)	HIV+ women 3 times more likely to have prolonged amenorrhea without ovarian failure	Kushnir and Lewis (2011)
	Increased rate of amenorrhea	Chirgwin et al. (1996)	NR	Lo and Schambelan (2001); Kushnir and

Reproductive outcome	Effect of HIV	Primary study	Statistics reported (where available)	Review
	Being HIV+ had little overall impact on amenorrhea	Harlow et al. (2000)	NR	Lewis (2011); Waters et al. (2007) Lo and Schambelan (2001); Waters et al. (2007)
		Ellerbrock et al. (2007); Harlow et al. (2000)	NR	Kushnir and Lewis (2011)
Comorbid STIs	A high incidence of comorbid STIs in HIV+	Paxton et al. (1998); Gray et al. (1998); Wawer et al. (1998)	NR	Kushnir and Lewis (2011)
		Frankel et al. (1997); Sobel (2000)	NR	van Leeuwen et al. (2007)
Tubal blockage	Higher rates of tubal blockage	Frodsham et al. (2006)	NR	Waters et al. (2007)
	Higher STIs suggesting that women who are HIV+ may be at increased risk of tubal damage.	Frankel et al. (1997); Sobel (2000)	NR	van Leeuwen et al. (2007)
	Tubal occlusion	Coll et al. (2007)	27.8% among HIV+ women	Kushnir and Lewis (2011)
Pregnancy rate	Lower pregnancy rate in HIV+ women	Zaba et al. (1998) [Africa]	fertility was 25% to 40% lower in HIV+ women in Sub-Saharan Africa	Kushnir and Lewis (2011)
		Massad et al. (2004) [USA]	NR	
		Stephenson et al. (1996); Thackway et al. (1997); De Vincenzi et al. (1997)	NR	Lo and Schambelan (2001)
		Zaba and Gregson (1998) (Regardless of STIs)	NR	van Leeuwen et al. (2007)
	Dramatic decline in pregnancy rate in HIV+ women with increased progression of the disease	Sedgh et al. (2005)	NR	van Leeuwen et al. (2007)
Birth rate	Lower birth rate in HIV+ women	Stephenson et al. (1996); Thackway et al. (1997); De Vincenzi et al. (1997)	NR	Lo and Schambelan (2001)
Abortions/mi scarring	Pregnancy loss was more common among HIV+ women	Gray et al. (1998)	HIV+ vs. HIV- (18.5% vs.12.2%)	Kushnir and Lewis (2011)
	Before HAART pregnancy loss was much more common among HIV+ women	D'Ulbaldo et al. (1998)	67% higher among HIV+	Kushnir and Lewis (2011)

Reproductive outcome	Effect of HIV	Primary study	Statistics reported (where available)	Review
	Miscarriage rate remained constant from 1990 through 2006 despite evolution of therapy during this period	Townsend et al. (2008)	Miscarriage rate of 4%	Kushnir and Lewis (2011)
	Higher rates of abortion	Stephenson et al. (1996); Thackway et al. (1997); De Vincenzi et al. (1997)	NR	Lo and Schambelan (2001)

Note. NR = not reported; POI = Primary Ovarian Insufficiency; FSH = Follicle-Stimulating Hormone; AMH = Antimullerian hormone; CD4 = Type of white blood cell; STIs = Sexually Transmitted Infections; PID = Pelvic Inflammatory Disease




Figure 8. PRISMA Flow Diagram for HIV. Figure shows the exclusion of articles at the different stages and the reasons for exclusion. Records identified through database searching of Medline and Embase includes original search, an update from the time of original search and a search using new MeSH terms.

Table 11.

Sample Characteristics Reported in the Ten Included Studies

Study	Location	Sample (n)	N			Age ^a Women	
			HIV	No-HIV		HIV	No-HIV
Cohort/cross-sectional studies							
Cejtin, 2006	USA	1431 women	1145 women	286 women	Range	Percentage (n)	Percentage (n)
					16–39	59.1 (677)	63.6 (182)
					40–44	25.2 (288)	25.5 (73)
					45–49	11.4 (131)	8 (23)
					50–55	4.3 (49)	2.8 (8)
Chirgwin, 1996	USA	330 women	248 women	82 women	Mean (SD)	32.7 (6.2)	34.5 (6.9)
Gray, 1998	Uganda	4497 women	953 women	3544 women	Range	Percentage (n)	Percentage (n)
					15–19	23.9 (847)	7.1 (68)
					20–24	26.5 (938)	30.7 (293)
					25–29	16.3 (578)	30.6 (292)
					30–39	21.9 (775)	26.1 (249)
					>40	11.5 (406)	5.4 (51)
Linan, 2011	USA	1412 women	941 women	471 women	NR	NR	NR
Willems, 2013	Burkina Faso	93 women	54 women	39 women	Mean (SD)	35 (5)	29 (6.5)
Ross 2003	Uganda	216 women	81 women	135 women	NR	NR	NR
Yaro 2001	Burkina Faso	912 women	63 women	849 women	Mean (SD)	16.7 ±2	16.9±2
Ezechi 2010	Markurdi, Nigeria	3473 women	2549 women	924 women	Mean age	32.7± 4.9	33.2±5.7
Case-control studies			Infertile^b	Fertile (control)		Infertile	Fertile
De Muylder, 1990	Zimbabwe	331 women	227	104	Mean (SD)	28.4 (4.8) tubal 27.1 (4.9) non-tubal	NR
Dhont, 2010	Rwanda	595 women	312	283	Median (IQR)	30 (27–35)	27 (24–31)

Note. ^a Age for women at the beginning of the study; ^b Unable to become pregnant after at least 12 months of unprotected intercourse; NR= data not reported; SD=Standard deviation; IQR=inter-quartile range

Table 12.

Characteristics of the Design of the Ten Included Studies

Study	Study design	Data collection	Study period	HIV self-report or Blood test	Fertility Problems outcome measure (duration)
Cejtin, 2006	Cross-sectional data embedded in a Cohort study	Interagency HIV Study Hospital/clinic based	1994-1997	Blood test (type not specified)	Amenorrhea > 12 months And/or FSH > 25 (mUI/ml)
Chirgwin, 1996	Cross-sectional data embedded in a Cohort study	Hospital/clinic based	1991-1994	Blood test (type not specified)	Amenorrhea > 3 months
Gray, 1998	Cross-sectional data embedded in a Cohort study	Community based	1994-1995	Blood test (Western-blot)	Pregnancy rate per woman (we converted to no-pregnancy)
Linan, 2011	Cohort	Interagency HIV Study Hospital/clinic based	2002-2009	Blood test (HIV RNA, CD4 count and Serology)	Pregnancy rate per woman (we converted to no-pregnancy)
Willems, 2013	Cross-sectional data	Hospital/clinic based	2008	Blood test (ELISA and Western-blot)	FSH > 40 (mUI/ml)
De Muylder, 1990	Case-control	Hospital based	1985-1987	Blood test (ELISA and Western-blot)	More than 18 months unprotected sex
Dhont, 2010	Case-control	Hospital based & community	2007-2009	Blood test (Rapid test)	More than 12 months unprotected sex
Ross 2003	Cohort study	Clinic based	1990-2001	Records (CD4 count & WHO staging)	Foetal loss- spontaneous abortion and still birth
Yaro 2001	Cross-sectional	Clinic based	1988	Blood test (type not specified)	Live birth, still birth, abortion
Ezechi 2010	Cross-sectional	Research institute & medical centre	2005-2007	Blood test (ELISA, Western bolt, CD4 count and viral load)	Amenorrhoea > 90 days

Note. HIV = Human Immunodeficiency Virus; CD4 = cluster of differentiation 4; RNA = Ribonucleic Acid ; FSH = Follicle Stimulating Hormone; ELISA = Enzyme-linked Immunosorbent Assay

Table 13.

Quality Ratings for the Ten Included Studies on the Basis of an Adapted Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale

Study	Quality Criterion						Overall rating ^g
	Adequacy of HIV (exposed) measure ^a Max 2 points	Adequacy of control (non-exposed), definition and selection ^b Max 2 points	Comparability of control ^c Max 2 points	Confounders adequately assessed Max 2 points ^d	Adequacy of outcome Fertility Problems measure ^e Max 1 point	None response rate or loss to follow-up ^f Max 1 point	
Cejtin, 2006	2	2	1	2	1	0	High
Chirgwin, 1996	2	2	1	1	1	NA	High
Gray, 1998	2	2	1	2	1	NA	High
Linas, 2011	2	2	1	2	0	NR	High
Willems, 2013	2	2	1	2	1	NA	High
De Muylder, 1990	2	2	0	1	1	NA	Average
Dhont, 2010	2	2	1	2	1	NA	High
Ross 2003	2	1	1	2	0	NR	Average
Yaro 2001	2	2	1	1	0	NA	Average
Ezechi 2010	2	2	1	1	1	NA	High

Note. NA = not applicable; NR = not reported; ^a HIV was adequately assessed when independent validation of the diagnosis (e.g. blood testing and/or hospital/medical records) and it was representative of the cohort i.e. drawn from the same population (up to 2 points); ^b Controls were adequately assessed when selection was comparable to cases, and HIV was excluded properly in the control population (up to 2 points); ^c Comparability of controls was achieved if exposed/non-exposed were matched or adjustment during analysis conducted. One point for *age* and one point for any other confounder (up to 2 points); ^d Confounders were adequately assessed if they were obtained from records or a blind interview, and one point was given if the same method was used for both groups (up to 2 points); ^e Fertility problems outcome was adequately assessed if independent or blind assessment was stated in the paper, or confirmation of the outcome by reference to secure records (medical records, etc.) (up to 1 point); ^f Point given if same rate for both groups and <20% loss to follow up reported; ^g The overall quality rating was low (0 to 3 points), average (4 to 6 points), or high (7 to 10 points).

Table 14.

Number and Percentage of Women with a Specific Outcome in the HIV+ and HIV- Groups in the Included Studies (k=9)

Outcome	Number of women (%)	
	HIV+	HIV-
Pregnancy	532 of 1894 (28.1)	1120 of 4015 (27.9)
Amenorrhoea	173 of 3942 (4.4)	22 of 1292 (1.7)
FSH >25 IU/l	60 of 1194 (5.0)	10 of 317 (3.2)
Infertile > 12 months	107 of 146 (73.3)	432 of 780 (55.4)
Miscarriage	26 of 155 (16.8)	99 of 948 (10.4)

Note. FSH = follicle-stimulating hormone

Results of Meta-analyses




Figure 9. Odds ratio for women reporting ‘pregnancy’ in the HIV+ and the HIV- groups




Figure 10. Odds ratio for the proportion of women who have amenorrhea (>3 months) in HIV+ vs HIV- women






Figure 11. Odds ratio for proportion of women who have ‘Level of FSH >25 IU/l’ (indicative of POI) in the HIV+ and HIV- groups



Bacterial Vaginosis

Table 15.

Clinical and Laboratory Approaches, Criteria and Evaluation for the Diagnosis of Bacterial Vaginosis

Approach	Criteria	Evaluation
Amsel criteria (clinical)	(1) Thin, white, homogeneous discharge (2) Clue cells on microscopy of wet mount 5 (3) pH of vaginal fluid >4.5 (4) Release of a fishy odour on adding alkali (10% KOH)	At least three of the four criteria are present for the diagnosis to be confirmed
Gram stained vaginal smear (laboratory)	Grade 1 (Normal): Lactobacillus morphotypes predominate Grade 2 (Intermediate): Mixed flora with some Lactobacilli present, but Gardnerella or Mobiluncus morphotypes also present Grade 3 (BV): Predominantly Gardnerella and/or Mobiluncus morphotypes. Few or absent Lactobacilli	To be evaluated with the Nugent criteria or the Hay/Ison criteria

Note. BV = bacterial vaginosis; UK guidelines for the management of BV (Hay, Patel & Daniels, 2012)

Plausible mechanisms to explain how BV could be associated with fertility problems




Figure 14. Proposed pathways describing potential impact of Bacterial Vaginosis (BV) on fertility. Solid line = Recent evidence (molecular level laboratory); Dashed line = Proposed pathway/historic evidence; Dashed and dotted = Well established

Table 16.

Summary of Reproductive Health Consequences of Bacterial Vaginosis Reported in the Literature

Reproductive outcome	Effect of BV	Primary study	Statistics reported	Review
Preterm labour/delivery	Women with BV at increased risk of preterm birth	Hillier, et al., 1995	ORs between 1.8 and 6.9	Hay, (2004)
		McGregor, et al., 1995 Hay, et al., 1994 Hillier, et al. 1995 Hauth, Goldenberg, Andrews, DuBard & Copper, 2001	Attributable risks between 2-10 for BV in pregnancy leading to preterm delivery (women with no previous history) and over 30 (women with a history of a previous preterm birth)	Hay, (2004) Hay, et al., (2012) Morris et al., (2001)
	The strong association between BV and loss before 20 weeks was confirmed in women examined at less than 14 weeks' gestation (Belgium)	Donders, et al., 2000	RR= 5.4	Hay, (2004)
	The overall risk of preterm birth for women with BV was determined in meta-analysis of 20 232 pregnancies	Leitich, et al., 2003	Studies that screened before 16 weeks' gestation OR= 7.55, Studies that screened before 20 weeks gestation OR= 4.20	Hay, (2004)
	Preterm labour due to chorioamnionitis found to be related to organisms associated with BV	Hillier, et al., 1988 Heller, Moorehouse-Moore, Skurnick & Baergen, 2003 Sebire, 2001 Goldenberg, Hauth & Andrews, 2000	NR	Hay, (2004) Hay, et al., (2012)
	Release of enzymes by bacteria, allowing penetration of mucus and weakening of the membranes, leading to preterm labour Alterations in vaginal microbiology associated with late miscarriage and premature birth	Howe, et al., 1999 Koumans, Markowitz & Hogan, 2002	NR NR	Hay, (2004) Mastromarino, et al., (2014)
Miscarriage	Higher risk for preclinical pregnancy loss in women who had BV than those who didn't (conceived by IVF)	van Oostrum, et al., (2013) Meta-analysis	(OR 2.36, 95% CI 1.24 to 4.51).	van Oostrum, et al., (2013)
	Even if BV resolves during pregnancy, that doesn't reduce risk of miscarriage and preterm labour	Riduan, et al., 1993 Lamont, Duncan, Mandal & Bassett, 2003	NR	Hay, (2004)
	More first trimester miscarriage in women with BV in a sample of women who conceived with IVF treatment, even after adjusting for factors known to increase risk of miscarriage	Ralph, Rutherford & Wilson, 1999	First trimester miscarriage was 31.6% for those with BV compared with 18.5% for those with normal vaginal flora (crude odds ratio 2.49, 1.21 to 5.12)	Hay, (2004) Morris et al., (2001)
	In study on natural conception BV was associated with miscarriage early in the second trimester 13-15 weeks, but not at 10-12 weeks	Oakeshott, et al., 2002	13-15 weeks' gestation (OR 3.5; 1.2-10.3) 10 and 12 weeks gestation (OR 1.32; 0.67-2.62)	Hay, (2004)

Reproductive outcome	Effect of BV	Primary study	Statistics reported	Review
PID	BV found to be more common in women with PID.	Moi, 1990 Taylor, 1997 Soper, Brockwell, Dalton & Johnson, 1994 Larsson, Platz-Christensen, Thejls, Forsum & Pahlson, 1992	NR	Morris, et al., (2001) Hay, et al., (2012)
	BV related organisms have been isolated from the endometrium and fallopian tubes of women with PID	Sweet, 1987	NR	Hay, (2004)
	Increased risk of PID in women with BV (using only clinical diagnosis for PID)	Eschenbach, et al., 1988	Nine-fold	Morris, et al., (2001)
	Increased risk of PID in women with BV (using gold standard laparoscopy to diagnose PID)	Peipert, Montagno, Cooper & Sung, 1997	Three-fold	Morris, et al., (2001)
	BV associated with a markedly increased risk for development of PID	Ness, et al., 2005	NR	Hay, et al., (2012)
Endometritis	Endometritis more in women with BV than without	Hillier, et al., 1996	(OR 15, 95% CI 2-686)	Morris, et al., (2001)
	Microorganisms associated with BV were isolated more from the endometria of women with than without plasma cell endometritis	Korn, et al., 1995	(OR 12.4)	Morris, et al., (2001) Hay, (2004)
	BV associated with post-partum endometritis	Watts, Krohn, Hillier & Eschenbach, 1990	NR	Hay, et al., (2012)
Infertility	Significantly more BV in women attending infertility clinic than attending antenatal clinic	van Oostrum, 2013 Meta-analysis	(OR 3.32, 95% CI 1.53 to 7.20)	van Oostrum, et al., (2013)
	In women undergoing IVF more BV in women with TFI than those with non-TFI	Gaudoin, Rekha, Morris, Lynch & Acharya, 1999 Liversedge, et al., 1999	NR	Morris, et al., (2001)
	Preclinical pregnancy loss following IVF higher in infertility patients with BV than those with no BV	van Oostrum, et al., (2013)	(OR 2.36, 95% CI 1.24 to 4.51).	van Oostrum, et al., (2013)
	BV more common in women with TFI than other types of infertility in sample of women undergoing IVF	Liversedge, et al., 1999	BV more common in women with TFI (31.5%) than non-TFI (19.7%) infertility (OR 1.87)	Hay, (2004)
		Wilson, Ralph & Rutherford, 2000.	Compared with endometriosis (OR 3.63, 95% CI 1.52–8.67), male factor (OR 2.98, 95% CI 1.80–4.90), and unexplained infertility (OR 2.20, 95% CI 1.35–3.59) [adjusted ORs]	Morris, et al., (2001) Hay, (2004)
	Significantly more BV in women with TFI as compared to other causes of infertility in sample of women undergoing IVF	van Oostrum, et al., (2013)	(OR 2.77, 95% CI 1.62 to 4.75)	van Oostrum, et al., (2013)
	Significantly more BV in women with anovulation than other types of infertility (but less than TFI) in sample of women undergoing IVF	Wilson, Ralph & Rutherford, 2000.	Compared with endometriosis (OR 3.77, 95% CI 1.28–11.08), male factor (OR 3.09, 95% CI 1.37–6.96), and unexplained infertility (OR 2.29, 95% CI 1.02–5.12) [adjusted ORs]	Morris, et al., (2001) Hay, (2004)
A correlation between bacterial vaginosis, immune response and idiopathic infertility demonstrated in sample of women undergoing IVF	Spandorfer, Neuer, Giraldo, Rosenwaks & Witkin, 2001	NR	Mastromariano, et al., (2014)	

Reproductive outcome	Effect of BV	Primary study	Statistics reported	Review
Increased susceptibility to infections	More HIV+ in women with severe BV (score of 9-10 on a Gram stain) than those with normal vaginal flora in Uganda	Wawer, et al., 1999 Sewankambo, et al., 1997	(OR 2.08, 95% CI 1.48-2.94)	Morris, et al., (2001)
	Women with BV significantly more likely to seroconvert before giving birth and after giving birth (Malawi)	Taha et al., 1998	(OR 3.7, P = 0.03) before giving birth (OR 2.3, P = 0.04) after giving birth	Morris, et al., (2001) Hay, et al., (2012)
	Women with abnormal flora on Gram's stain at increased risk of HIV acquisition (Kenya)	Martin, et al., 1999	(HR = 1.9, 95% CI 1.1-3.1)	Morris, et al., (2001)
	Absence of lactobacilli, characteristic of BV and associated with an increased risk of HIV	Martin, et al., 1999	(HR = 2.0; 95% CI 1.2-3.5)	Morris, et al., (2001) Mastromariano, et al., (2014)
	Pregnant women with abnormal vaginal flora at increased risk of HIV seroconversion (North Carolina, USA)	Royce, Thorp, Granados & Savitz, 1999	(RR 4.0, 95% CI 1.1-14.9)	Morris, et al., (2001)
	BV is associated with a markedly increased risk for acquisition of HIV	Cu-Uvin, et al., 2001 Schwebke, 2003 Atashili, Poole, Ndumbe, Adimora & Smith, 2008	NR	Hay, et al., (2012)
	BV risk factor for female to male HIV transmission	Cohen, et al., 2012	adjusted OR (3.06, 1.35-6.95)	Hay, et al., (2012)
	BV associated with a markedly increased risk for acquisition STIs	Martin, et al., 1999 Cherpes, Meyn, Krohn, Lurie & Hillier, 2003 Harmanli, Cheng, Nyirjesy, Chatwani & Gaughan, 2000	NR	Mastromariano, et al., (2014)
	Abnormal vaginal flora lacking lactobacilli facilitates infection by parasites e.g. Trichomonas vaginalis and bacteria e.g. Neisseria gonorrhoea and Chlamydia trachomatis	Wiesenfeld, Hillier, Krohn, Landers & Sweet, 2003	NR	Mastromariano, et al., (2014)
	Absence of vaginal lactobacilli, is an independent risk factor for acquisition of herpes simplex virus	Cherpes, Meyn, Krohn, Lurie & Hillier, 2003	NR	Mastromariano, et al., (2014)
Cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (changes in the squamous cells of the cervix.)	Association between BV and CIN (suggested to be caused by nitrosamines produced by the abnormal vaginal microflora)	Hudson, Tidy, McCulloch & Rogstad, 1997 Pavic, 1984	NR	Morris, et al., (2001)
	Significantly more BV in women with CIN	Uthayakumar, Boyle, Barton, Nayagam & Smith, 1998	NR	Morris, et al., (2001)

Note: BV = bacterial vaginosis; OR = odds ratio; RR = risk ratio; NR = not reported; IVF = in vitro fertilization; PID = pelvic inflammatory disease; TFI = tubal factor infertility; HIV = human immunodeficiency virus; STIs=sexually transmitted infections; CIN = Cervical intraepithelial neoplasia




Figure 15. PRISMA Flow Diagram for BV. Figure shows the exclusions of articles at the different stages and the reasons for exclusion. Records identified through database searching of Medline and Embase includes original search, an update from the time of original search and a search using new MeSH terms. BV = Bacterial Vaginosis

Table 17.

Sample Characteristics Reported in the Eleven Included Studies

Study	Location	Sample (n)	N		Age ^a Women		
			Infertile ^b	Fertile (control)	Infertile	Fertile	
Case-control studies							
Aboul Enien, 2005	Egypt	60 women	40	20	Mean (SD)	NR	NR
Adamson, 2011	India	897 women	113	784	Mean (SD)	24.0 (3.4)	26.1 (3.0)
Almanza, 2011	Cuba	189 women	89	100	Mean	30.4	24.3
Dhont, 2010	Rwanda	571 women	307	264	Median (IQR)	30 (27–35)	27 (24–31)
Dhont, 2011	Rwanda	396 women	177	219	Median (IQR)	32 (28-37)	28 (25-32)
Durugbo, 2015	Nigeria	356 women	178	178	Mean (SD)	28 (5)	NR
					<20	0	6 (3.4)
					20-24	20 (11.2)	20 (11.2)
					25-29	77 (43.3)	66 (37.1)
					30-35	60 (33.7)	60 (33.7)
					>35	21 (11.8)	26 (14.6)
Kildea, 2000	Australia (Indigenous Women)	342 women	241	101	Mean (CI)	30.4 (95% CI, 29.7-31.1)	
Mania-Pramanik, 2009	India	214 women	112	102	Mean (SD)	In BV+ women 27.7 (5.2)	
Morgan, 1997	UK	1578 women	199	1379		NR	NR
Salah, 2013	Egypt	1256 women	874	382	Mean (SD)	27.1 (2.2)	25.8 (3.1)
Tomusiak, 2013	Poland	161 women	101	60	Range	20-40	

Note. ^a Age for women at the beginning of the study; ^b Unable to become pregnant after 1 or 2 years of unprotected intercourse, a specific diagnosis e.g. idiopathic, female factor; NR = not reported; SD = Standard deviation; IQR = inter-quartile range

Table 18.

Characteristics of the Design of the Eleven Included Studies

Study	Study design	Recruitment and data collection	Study period	BV self-report or lab test	Fertility Problems outcome measure (duration)	Control
About Enien, 2005	Case-control	Hospital based		Gram staining for the presence of BV using Nugent's scoring system	Diagnosed idiopathic infertility	Fertile women
Adamson, 2011	Case-control	Hospital based	2005-2006	Gram staining for the presence of BV using Nugent's scoring system	Primary infertility: married (or partnered) for more than two years, sexually active, not using modern contraception, and without children	Sexually active, not using modern contraception fertile women (not explicitly stated that they have a child, but only that they are fertile)
Almanza, 2011	Case-control	Hospital based	2009	Bacteriological culture techniques	Diagnosed tubal obstruction	Currently pregnant women about to deliver
Dhont, 2010	Case-control	Hospital based	2007-2009	Gram staining for the presence of BV using Nugent's scoring system and Amsel criteria	Infertility: having regular unprotected intercourse for 1 year or more without conception with at least one regular partner, and included both primary and secondary infertility. TFI subcategory	Non-pregnant women recently delivered (within past 6 to 18 months)
Dhont, 2011	Case-control	Hospital based	2007-2009	Gram staining for the presence of BV using Nugent's scoring system and Amsel criteria	Secondary infertility: having regular unprotected intercourse for one year or more with at least one regular partner without conception in women who conceived at least once before	Non-pregnant women recently delivered (between 6 and 18 months ago)
Durugbo, 2015	Case-control	Hospital based	2014	Visual assessment of discharge, then pH test, then 'whiff test' then microscopic examination ('fourth Amsel criteria')	TFI previously diagnosed by hysterosalpingography	Fertile women attending the family planning clinic
Kildea, 2000	Cross-sectional	Medical records	1996	Culture or microscopy	Primary infertility: never given birth to a live child despite 36 months of unprotected sexual intercourse. Secondary infertility: given birth to one or more live children in the past but now unable to become pregnant after 36 months of unprotected intercourse	Women who had been able to conceive within 36 months of unprotected intercourse
Mania-Pramanik, 2009	Case-control	Hospital based	NR	Gram staining for the presence of BV using Nugent's scoring system	Women who did not conceive within two years of marriage but were trying to conceive	Currently pregnant antenatal cases (first trimester, 2-3 months)
Morgan, 1997	Case-control	Clinic based		Gram staining for the presence of BV using Nugent's scoring system	Women attending at a specialist infertility clinic (trying to conceive for at least one year)	Currently pregnant (antenatal clinic)
Salah, 2013	Case-control	Hospital based	2009-2011	Gram staining for the presence of BV using Spiegel's criteria	Women diagnosed with female factor infertility	Attending family planning
Tomusiak, 2013	Case-control	Hospital/clinic based	NR	Gram staining for the presence of BV confirmed based on pH, Nugent score and quantitative culture results	Women in the infertile group had been treated for infertility for at least one year. Anatomical, hormonal abnormalities, endometriosis and abnormal sperm parameters ruled out	Women who had no history of fertility problems and at least one child

Note. BV = Bacterial vaginosis; TFI = tubal factor infertility; NR = not reported

Table 19.

Quality Ratings for the Eleven Included Studies on the Basis of an Adapted Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale

Study	Quality Criterion						Overall rating ^g
	Adequacy of infertility (exposed) measure ^a Max 2 points	Adequacy of control (non-exposed), definition and selection ^b Max 2 points	Comparability of control ^c Max 2 points	Confounders adequately assessed Max 2 points ^d	Adequacy of outcome BV measure ^e Max 1 point	Loss to follow-up ^f Max 1 point	
Aboul Enien, 2005	2	1	0	0	1	NA	Average
Adamson, 2011	1	1	1	2	1	NA	Average
Almanza, 2011	1	1	1	1	1	NA	Average
Dhont, 2010	1	2	1	2	1	NA	High
Dhont, 2011	1	2	1	1	1	NA	Average
Durugbo, 2015	2	1	2	1	0	NA	Average
Kildea, 2000	2	2	2	2	0	NA	High
Mania-Pramanik,2009	1	2	0	0	1	NA	Average
Morgan, 1997	0	2	0	0	1	NA	Low
Salah, 2013	2	1	0	0	1	NA	Average
Tomusiak, 2013	2	1	0	0	1	NA	Average

Note. NA= not applicable; ^a Infertility was adequately assessed when independent validation of (e.g. laboratory testing and/or hospital/medical records) and it was representative of the cohort i.e. drawn from the same population (up to 2 points); ^b Controls were adequately assessed when selection was comparable to cases, and infertility was excluded properly in the control population (up to 2 points); ^c Comparability of controls was achieved if exposed/non-exposed were matched or adjustment during analysis conducted. One point for *STIs* and one point for any other confounder (up to 2 points); ^d Confounders were adequately assessed if they were obtained from records or a blind interview, and one point was given if the same method was used for both groups (up to 2 points); ^e Fertility problems outcome was adequately assessed if independent or blind assessment was stated in the paper, or confirmation of the outcome by reference to secure records (medical records, etc.) (up to 1 point); ^f Point given if same rate for both groups and <20% loss to follow up reported; ^g The overall quality rating was low (0 to 3 points), average (4 to 6 points), or high (7 to 10 points).

Table 20.

Number and Percentage of Infertile Women in BV and No-BV Groups in the Included Studies (k=11)

Studies included	Number of women (%)	
	BV	No-BV
All studies k=11	846 of 1421 (59.5)	1443 of 4597 (31.4)
Exclusively TFI (subgroup) k=2	114 of 159 (71.7)	153 of 386 (39.6)
Not only TFI (subgroup) k=9	732 of 1262 (58.0)	1290 of 4211 (30.6)

Note. BV = bacterial vaginosis; TFI = tubal factor infertility

Results of Meta-analyses




Figure 16. Odds ratio for women who are infertile in the BV and No-BV groups




Figure 17. Sensitivity analysis by outcome (removed one study reporting childlessness and compared only studies reporting inability to become pregnant) for the comparison ‘Odds ratio for women who are infertile in the BV and No-BV groups’




Figure 18. Subgroup analysis by outcome (with studies that are exclusively TFI, and studies that are not only TFI) for the comparison ‘Odds ratio for women who are infertile in the BV and No-BV groups’

Publication bias assessment.




Figure 19. Funnel plot with trim and fill procedure to impute ‘missing’ studies (missing studies in red) for the ‘odds ratio for women who are infertile in the BV and No-BV groups’

STIs and Sexual History Reported in the Included Studies

Data were not available to enable a subgroup analysis of women with STIs and those without. Only a summary of percentages of women with STIs in the BV and No-BV groups was possible, see Table 3.5.7.

Table 21.

Percentage of Women with Comorbid STIs or a History of STIs in Infertile Versus Fertile Women in Eight of the Eleven Included Studies (k=8)

Study	Type of infection	Percentage of STIs			
		Infertile (%)		Fertile (control) (%)	
Adamson, 2011	HSV	22/113 (19.5)		81/784 (10.3)	
Almanza, 2011	Chlamydia	41/89 (46)		2/100 (2)	
	Mycoplasma hominis	15/89 (16.9)		10/100 (10)	
	Ureaplasma urealyticum	38/89 (42.7)		2/100 (2)	
Dhont, 2010	HIV	98/312 (32)		39/283 (14)	
	HSV	180/312 (59)		115/283 (41)	
Dhont, 2011	Chlamydia	57/312 (19)		44/283 (16)	
	HIV	74/177 (42)		35/219 (16)	
	HSV	121/177 (70)		99/219 (45)	
Kildea, 2000	Chlamydia	31/177 (18)		33/219 (15)	
	Chlamydia	36/101 (36)		68/241 (28)	
	Gonorrhoeae	42/101 (42)		51/241 (21)	
Tomusiak, 2013	Trichomonas vaginalis	64/101 (63)		95/241 (39)	
	Chlamydia	0/101 (0)		2/60 (3)	
	Mycoplasma hominis	4/101 (4)		0/60 (0)	
Durugbo, 2015	Ureaplasma urealyticum	9/101 (9)		5/60 (8)	
	History of STIs	64/178 (36)		35/178 (19.7)	
		Infertile/BV	Infertile/no-BV	Fertile/BV	Fertile/no-BV
Mania-Pramanik,2009	Chlamydia and HPV	38/50 (74)	26/128 (20.3)	11/14 (79)	24/164 (14.6)
		5/29 (17.2)	NR	0/6 (0)	NR

Note: HSV = herpes simplex virus; HIV = human immune deficiency virus; HPV = human papilloma virus; STIs = sexually transmitted infections; NR = not reported

Consanguinity

Plausible Mechanisms to explain how consanguinity could be associated with fertility problems




Figure 20. Proposed pathways for the impact of Consanguinity (CSG) on fertility. Solid line = Recent evidence (primary studies); Double solid line = meta-analytic evidence; Dashed line =Proposed pathway/historic evidence; Dashed-Dotted line = Well established

Table 22.

Summary of reproductive health consequences of CSG reported in the literature

Reproductive outcome	Effect of CSG	Statistics reported (where available)	Review
Positive effect			
Live birth rate	Statistically significant in the first cousin only but not in other categories of CSG	First cousins had 0.26 more children	Bittles et al., 2002
	Higher live birth rate in first cousin marriages compared to non-CSG marriages	Mean live births range in first cousins (2.26-7.48) in non-CSG (2.14-5.83)	Hussain and Bittles, 2004
Negative effect			
Mortality of offspring	More mortality in progeny of first cousins compared to non-CSG progeny	Meta-analysis showed significant mean excess mortality of 3.5% in the CSG progeny ($r^2 = 0.70$; $P < 0.00001$)	Bittles & Black, 2010
Mortality and morbidity of offspring	Higher rates of infant morbidity and mortality in offspring of CSG couples than non-CSG couples where reported	Range of infant morbidity 1.34-42% in CSG and 0.81-25% in non-CSG, mortality 0.95-8.6% in the CSG and 0.63-5.3% in non-CSG	Bhasin & Shampa, 2012
Recessive genes in offspring	Probability of inheriting recessive gene increases with the increase in the proximity of the relationship between parents	NR	Hamamy, 2012

Note. NR = not reported; CSG = consanguinity/consanguineous




Figure 21. PRISMA Flow Diagram for consanguinity. Figure shows the exclusion of articles at the different stages and the reasons for exclusion. Records identified through database searching of Medline and Embase includes original search, an update from the time of original search and a search using new MeSH terms.

Table 23.

Sample characteristics of the 24 included Studies

Study	Location	Sample (n)	CSG (n)	Non- CSG (n)	Mean age at marriage			
					Women		Men	
					CSG	Non-CSG	CSG	Non-CSG
Edo, 1985	Spain	965 couples	272	693	25.74	26.02	28.9	29.2
Hann, 1984	Karnataka State in South India	1885 women	722	1163	NR			
Tanaka, 1977	Fukuoka, Japan	1450 couples	346	1104	NR			
Yamaguchi, 1975	Fukuoka, Japan	4026 couples	2173	1853	NR			
Bittles, 1993	Punjabi Provence of Pakistan	9520 women	4784	4736	18.97	19.74	23.81	25.97
Rao, 1979	Southern India District of Tamil Nadu	15, 926 women	6379	9547	NR			
Shami, 1990	Punjabi Provence of Pakistan	3329 women	2227	1102	18.95	19.93	23.7	26
Al-Kandari 2007	Kuwait	7315 women	4009	3306	NR			
Bener 2006	Qatar	1515 women	818	687	NR			
Blanco 2006	Leon, Spain	2670 women	474	2196	25.63	26.70	28.81	30.39
Ciceklioglu 2013	Bayrakli, suburb of Izmir, Turkey	170 women	85	85	NR			
Devi 1981	Karnataka, South India	3254 women	920	2301	NR			

Study	Location	Sample (n)	CSG (n)	Non- CSG (n)	Mean age at marriage			
					Women		Men	
					CSG	Non-CSG	CSG	Non-CSG
Fuster 2003	Los Nogales, Galicia, Spain	1581	132	1449	24.58			
Khlat 1988	Beirut, Lebanon	2801	705	2096	NR			
Khoury 2000	Jordan	1867	947	920	24.6	25.8		
Luna 1990	La Alpujarra, Andalusia, Spain	647	75	572	NR			
Abdulrazzaq 1997	Alain & Dubai, UAE	2033	1026	100	NR			
Al Husain 1996	Riyadh, KSA	2001 couples	1022	979	NR			
Asha 1981	South India	377 women	156	211	NR			
Gharyeb 2014	Yatta, Palestine	500 women	305	195	NR			
Islam 2013	Oman	2037 women	1052	985	NR			
Saha 1990	Khartoum, Sudan	926 women	586	340	NR			
Verma 1992	Pondicherry, India	1000 women	308	692	NR			
Yuksel 2009	Malatya, Turkey	409 women	116	293	NR			

Note: CSG = consanguineous/consanguinity; ^aMean age for women at the beginning of the study; NR= data not reported

Table 24.

Characteristics of the design of the 24 included studies

Study	Study design	Data collection	Study period	CSG measure	Fertility Problems outcome measure (duration)
Edo, 1985	Retrospective cohort	Extracted from parish records and civil registries	1900-1974	1 st and 2 nd degree cousins	Childless marriages at the end of reproductive life (age 45)
Hann, 1984	Cross-sectional	Household interviews	Not reported	1 st degree cousin and Uncle-niece	Primary sterility defined as never having conceived in (1) women who have completed reproduction (over 40, menopausal or widowed) or (2) after 10 years without contraception in women of reproductive age
Tanaka, 1977	Retrospective cohort	Household interviews in 2 rural villages and cross-checked with records	Not reported	CSG between spouse, between husband's parents and between wife's parents	Infertility defined as never been pregnant after living with husband for more than 5 years
Yamaguchi, 1975	Retrospective cohort	Household interviews in rural villages and cross-checked with records	Not reported	CSG between spouse, between husband's parents and between wife's parents	Sterility defined as no pregnancy after more than 5 years of marriage
Bittles, 1993	Cross-sectional	Household & hospital interviews in 11 cities	1979-1985	Mixed, double 1 st cousin, 1 st cousin, double second cousin, second cousin,	Time to first delivery from start of marriage in years
(not in 71) Rao, 1979	Cross-sectional	Household interviews in 14 rural and urban districts	1969-1975	Mixed, uncle-niece, first cousin, beyond first cousin	Primary sterility defined as a married woman who has not had a live-born baby after consummation of marriage and unprotected sexual activity (duration in 5 year intervals)
Shami, 1990	Cross-sectional	from general hospital and labour wards, as well as door-to-door interviews	1980-1983	Mixed, double first cousin, first cousin, first cousin once removed, second Cousin.	Time to first birth from start of marriage in years
Al-Kandari 2007	Cross-sectional	Questionnaires filled by women attending 10 different PHC	2002	Double cousin, first cousin, second cousin, third cousin	Number of births per women

Study	Study design	Data collection	Study period	CSG measure	Fertility Problems outcome measure (duration)
Bener 2006	Cross-sectional	Questionnaires filled by face-to-face interviews from 10 health centres mostly visited and women's hospital	2004	Double cousin, first cousin, first cousin once removed, second cousin, less than second cousin	Number of pregnancies and live births
Blanco 2006	Cross-sectional	La Cabrera parish registers	1880-1959	Up to third degree	Live births
Ciceklioglu 2013	Cross-sectional	Community based in-person interviews from 3 neighbourhoods in Bayraklu	2009	First and second degree cousins	Number of pregnancies and deliveries
Devi 1981	Cross-sectional	17 hospitals, maternity homes and health centres from records or interviews by staff	1971	Beyond second cousin, second cousin, first cousin, uncle-niece	Mean number of live born
Fuster 2003	Cross-sectional	Biodemographic data from parish and Lugo bisphoric records	1871-1977	Uncle-niece, first cousin, first cousin once removed, second cousin, second cousin once removed, third cousin	Mean birth
Khlat 1988	Cross-sectional	2752 household were interviewed	1983-1984	First cousin and more distant than first cousin	Mean number of pregnancies, live births
Khoury 2000	Cross-sectional	Community based, 7200 households	1980	Double first cousins, first cousin 1,2,3 and 4, first cousins once removed, from the family	Number of pregnancies
Luna 1990	Cross-sectional	Community based. 8 villages in an isolated mountain population	NR	Level of CSG NR	Average number of pregnancies, live births
Abdulrazzaq 1997	Cross-sectional	Antenatal, postnatal and immunization centres based interviews and questionnaires	1994-1995	Double first degree, first cousin, first cousin once removed, second cousin, less than second cousin	Number of abortions and still births

Study	Study design	Data collection	Study period	CSG measure	Fertility Problems outcome measure (duration)
Al Husain 1996	Cross-sectional	PHC and antenatal care clinic interviews	1993	Double first cousin, first cousin, second cousin, more distant relative	Abortion, still birth and neonatal death
Asha 1981	Prospective cohort study	NR	NR	Uncle-niece, first cousin, first cousin once removed, second cousin, second cousin once removed, third cousin	Abortion (termination =<28 weeks), still birth (born with no heart beat), neonatal death (within first 28 days of life)
Gharyeb 2014	Cross-sectional	Community based, personally interviewed by structured questionnaires	NR	First degree, second degree, third degree	Abortion (at or before 28 weeks), still births
Islam 2013	Cross-sectional	ONHS data, 2013 household were interviewed	2000	First cousin; father's side, first cousin; mother's side, other; second cousin and beyond	Mean number of pregnancies, live births, number of miscarriage, number of still birth
Saha 1990	Cross-sectional	ANC clinic in the OBGYN department, faculty of Medicine, U of K	NR	First cousins; mother's brother & sister, father's brother & sister, Other type of CSG marriages	Abortion, Still birth, neonatal deaths
Verma 1992	Cross-sectional	Interview in maternity ward in JIPMER hospital	1978	First cousin; MBD or FSD, uncle-niece, other; beyond first cousin	Neonatal death
Yuksel 2009	Cross-sectional	Household interviews, face to face questionnaires	NR	First cousin, others; half first cousin and second degree cousin, distant CSG marriages	Spontaneous abortions, still births

Note. CSG = consanguineous/consanguinity; NR = not reported; PHC = primary health care

Table 25.

Quality ratings for the 24 included studies on the basis of an adapted Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale

Study	Quality Criterion						Overall rating ^g
	Adequacy of CSG(exposed) measure ^a Max 2 points	Adequacy of control (non-exposed), definition and selection ^b Max 2 points	Comparability of control ^c Max 2 points	Confounders adequately assessed Max 2 points ^d	Adequacy of outcome Fertility Problems measure ^e Max 1 point	None response rate or loss to follow-up ^f Max 1 point	
Edo, 1985	1	2	1	1	1	NR	Average
Hann, 1984	2	2	0	0	0	NA	Average
Tanaka, 1977	2	2	1	0	1	NR	Average
Yamaguchi, 1975	2	2	1	0	1	NR	Average
Bittles, 1993	2	2	1	1	0	NA	Average
Rao, 1979	2	2	1	1	0	NA	Average
Shami, 1990	2	2	0	1	0	NA	Average
Al-Kandari 2007	1	2	1	1	0	NA	Average
Bener 2006	1	2	0	1	0	NA	Low
Blanco 2006	1	2	1	2	1	NA	High
Ciceklioglu 2013	2	2	1	2	1	NA	High
Devi 1981	2	2	0	2	1	NA	High
Fuster 2003	1	2	0	2	1	NA	Average
Khlat 1988	1	2	1	2	0	NA	Average
Khoury 2000	2	1	1	2	0	NA	Average

Study	Quality Criterion						Overall rating ^g
	Adequacy of CSG(exposed) measure ^a Max 2 points	Adequacy of control (non-exposed), definition and selection ^b Max 2 points	Comparability of control ^c Max 2 points	Confounders adequately assessed Max 2 points ^d	Adequacy of outcome Fertility Problems measure ^e Max 1 point	None response rate or loss to follow-up ^f Max 1 point	
Luna 1990	1	1	2	0	0	NA	Low
Abdulrazzaq 1997	1	2	1	2	0	NA	Average
Al Husain 1996	2	2	1	1	0	NA	Average
Asha 1981	2	1	1	2	0	NR	Average
Gharyeb 2014	1	2	1	1	0	NA	Average
Islam 2013	1	2	0	2	0	NA	Average
Saha 1990	1	2	1	2	0	NA	Average
Verma 1992	2	2	1	2	0	NA	High
Yuksel 2009	2	2	1	2	0	NA	High

Note. CSG = consanguineous/consanguinity; NR = not reported; NA = not applicable

^a CSG was adequately assessed when independent validation of the degree of relatedness was assessed or coefficient of CSG(F) calculated, (e.g. >1 person/record/time/process to extract information, or reference to primary record source such as medical/hospital records) and it was representative of the cohort i.e. drawn from the same population (up to 2 points); ^b Controls were adequately assessed when selection was comparable to cases, and CSG was excluded properly in the control population (up to 2 points); ^c Comparability of controls was achieved if exposed/non-exposed were matched or adjustment during analysis conducted. One point for age at marriage and one point for any other confounder (e.g. education) (up to 2 points); ^d Confounders were adequately assessed if they were obtained from records or a blind interview, and one point was given if the same method was used for both groups (up to 2 points); ^e Fertility problems outcome was adequately assessed if independent or blind assessment was stated in the paper, or confirmation of the outcome by reference to secure records (medical records, etc.) (up to 1 point); ^f Point given if same rate for both groups and <20% loss to follow up reported; ^g The overall quality rating was low (0 to 3 points), average (4 to 6 points), or high (7 to 10 points).

Table 26.

Proportion of specific outcome in CSG and non-CSG couples in the included studies, (k=24)

Outcome	CSG	Non-CSG
Outcome (number of studies)	Number (%)	Number (%)
Never pregnant (k=3)	92 of 3241 (2.8)	186 of 4120 (4.5)
Childless (K=5)	380 of 6651 (5.7)	717 of 10,240 (7.0)
Miscarriages (k=7)	1069 of 3372 (31.7)	1030 of 3485 (29.6)
Stillbirths (k=7)	243 of 3372 (7.2)	211 of 3485 (6.1)
Neonatal death (k=7)	151 of 2072 (7.3)	144 of 2232 (6.5)
Outcome (number of studies)	Mean (SD), total	Mean (SD), total
Mean time to first birth in years (k=2)	1.8 (24.8), 7011	1.6 (9.4), 2608
Mean number of pregnancies (k=5)	5.0 (3.0), 2735	4.6 (2.9), 4435
Mean number of live births (k=7)	3.9 (2.5), 7433	3.7 (2.3), 10142

Note. CSG = Consanguineous; Non-CSG = none consanguineous

Results of Meta-analyses




Figure 22. Odds ratio for ‘time-to-first-birth’ (in years) in the CSG and non-CSG groups




Figure 23. Odds ratio for proportion of couples who were ‘never-pregnant’ in the CSG and non-CSG groups







Figure 24. Sensitivity analysis by duration for the comparison odds ratio for proportion of couples who were ‘never-pregnant’ in the CSG and non-CSG groups






Figure 28. Mean Difference for ‘Number of live births’ in the CSG and non-CSG groups




Figure 29. Sensitivity analysis for the Mean Difference for ‘Number of live births’ in the CSG and non-CSG groups (without DEVI, 1981)




Figure 30. Odds ratio for proportion of ‘miscarriages’ in the CSG and non-CSG groups




Figure 31. Odds ratio for proportion of ‘stillbirths’ in the CSG and non-CSG groups




Figure 32. Odds ratio for proportion of ‘neonatal deaths’ in the CSG and non-CSG groups

Publication bias assessment.




Figure 33. Funnel plot with trim and fill procedure to impute ‘missing’ studies (missing studies in red) for the percentage ‘never-pregnant’ analysis




Figure 34. Funnel plot with trim and fill procedure to impute ‘missing’ studies (missing studies in red) for the percentage ‘childless’ analysis




Figure 35. Funnel plot with trim and fill procedure to impute ‘missing’ studies (missing studies in red) for the Mean Difference for ‘Number of Pregnancies’ analysis




Figure 36. Funnel plot with trim and fill procedure to impute ‘missing’ studies (missing studies in red) for the Mean Difference for ‘Number of live births’ analysis






Figure 37. Funnel plot with trim and fill procedure to impute ‘missing’ studies (missing studies in red) for the percentage ‘Miscarriage’ analysis




Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting

Table 27.

WHO classification of FGM/C

Type	Definition
Type I	Clitoridectomy; partial or total removal of the clitoris (a small sensitive and erectile part of the female genitals) or, in rare cases, only the prepuce (the fold of skin surrounding the clitoris)
Type II	Excision; partial or total removal of the clitoris and labia minora with or without removal of the labia majora (the labia are “the lips” that surround the vagina)
Type III	Infibulation; narrowing of the vaginal opening through the creation of a covering seal. The seal is formed by cutting and repositioning the labia minora or majora with or without removal of the clitoris
Type IV	Other; all other harmful procedures to the genital for non-medical reasons e.g. pricking, piercing, incision, scraping and cauterising the genital area

Note. WHO = World Health Organization; FGM/C = Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting



Plausible Mechanisms to explain how FGM/C could be associated with fertility problems




Table 28.

Summary of Reproductive Health Consequences of FGM/C Reported in the Literature

Reproductive outcome	Effect of FGM/C	Statistics reported (where available)		Review
		Percentage	Odds ratio	
Short-term				
	Traumatic bleeding, infection, damage to other adjacent organs, incomplete healing and death		NR	Reisel & Creighton, 2015
Long-term				
Infertility	Childless for more than seven years		2-7 vs 2-6	Obermeyer, 2005
	Primary infertility		1.4-3.3 vs 1.7	
	Secondary infertility		12.7-17.3 vs 15.5	

Reproductive outcome	Effect of FGM/C	Statistics reported (where available)		Review
		Percentage	Odds ratio	
Gynaecological (Infection)	Bacterial vaginosis		1.7	RCOG, 2015; Obermeyer, 2005; Morison et al., 2001
	Herpes		4.7	
	Urinary infections	11 vs 6		De Silva, 1989; Jones, 1999
	Genital infections		1.7	
	Chronic genital abscesses, vaginal infections, Hepatitis B and HIV	NR		Reisel & Creighton, 2015
	Discharge		1.7-2.8	Obermeyer, 2005
	Genital ulcers		4.4	
	Lesions	7 vs 5		El Dareer, 1982 Okonofua, 2002; Obermeyer, 2005 Elmusharaf, 2006
	Damaged perineum	62 vs 56		
	Cysts	3 vs 2		
	Chronic pelvic infection	13 vs 6		
Abdominal pain		1.5		
STIs	NR			
Sexual	No sexual desire	42 vs 16		Obermeyer, 2005
	no orgasm	43 vs 18		
	Reduced arousal, lubrication, orgasm, satisfaction, sexual quality of life, and dyspareunia and absence of sexual desire	NR		Reisel and Creighton (2015)
Obstetric	Prolonged labour		1.69	WHO, 2000; Reisel & Creighton, 2015; Berg & Underland, 2013
	Obstetric/post-partum haemorrhage (PPH)		2.04	
			RR: Type I (1.03), Type II (1.21), Type III (1.69)	WHO, 2006
	Emergency C-section	15.4 vs 6.5		Obermeyer, 2005; Reisel & Creighton, 2015 WHO, 2006
			RR: Type I (1.03), Type II (1.29), Type III (1.31)	
	Difficulty in delivery		2.28-2.57	Obermeyer, 2005; Berg & Underland, 2013
	Foetal distress		2.6	
	Still birth	15 vs 11		WHO, 2006
			RR: Type I (1.15), Type II (1.32), Type III (1.55)	
	Pre-labour foetal death		2.5	WHO, 2000; Obermeyer, 2005

Reproductive outcome	Effect of FGM/C	Statistics reported (where available)		Review
		Percentage	Odds ratio	
Early neonatal death		NR		Berg & Underland, 2013
Obstetric lacerations			1.38	
Instrumental delivery			1.65	
Pain during and after deinfibulation (anterior episiotomy), maternal death postpartum, postnatal genital wound infection and fistulae formation		NR		WHO, 2000
Episiotomies and perineal trauma		NR		WHO, 2000; Reisel & Creighton, 2015
Obstetric complications		NR		RCOG, 2015

Note. NR= data not reported




Table 29.

Sample Characteristics Reported in the Seven Included Studies

	Location	Sample (n)	N	N		Age ^a Women	
Cross-sectional Studies			FGM/C	No-FGM/C (control)		FGM/C	No-FGM/C
Klouman, 2005	Tanzania	969 women	670	299	Mean age (SD)	27 (8)	
Larsen, 2000	Central African Republic, Cote d'Ivoire, and Tanzania	16361 women	6124	10237	NR	NR	NR
Larsen, 2002	Sudan	4218 women	3747	471	NR	NR	NR
Morrison, 2001	Gambia	776 women	420	356	NR	NR	NR
Yount, 2006	Egypt	1729 women	1700	29	Range	Percentage (n)	
					< 25	9.2 (156)	
					25-34	39.1 (664)	
					35-44	34.9 (593)	
					45 +	16.9 (287)	
Case-control studies			Infertile ^b	Fertile (control)		Infertile ^b	Fertile
Almroth, 2005	Sudan	279 women	99	180	Mean age (SD)	27.2 (3.9)	24.7 (4.4)
					Range	Percentage (n)	Percentage (n)
Inhorn, 1993	Egypt	125 women	39	86	0-19	2.2 (2)	2 (2)
					20-29	41.4 (37)	47 (47)
					30-39	49.5 (44)	40 (40)
					40+	7.1 (6)	11 (11)

Note: ^a Age for women at the beginning of the study; ^b Unable to become pregnant after 12 months of unprotected intercourse; FGM/C=women who have undergone Female Genital Mutilation. SD=Standard deviation NR= data not reported

Table 3.2.4.

Characteristics of the Design of the Seven Included Studies

Study design	Data collection	Study period	FGM/C assessment	FGM/C self-report or clinical examination	Fertility Problems outcome measure (and duration, where relevant)
--------------	-----------------	--------------	------------------	---	---

Klouman, 2005	Cross-sectional	Community-based survey in rural area	1991-1992	Type I and II	Self-report & Clinical examination	Not able to become pregnant after 1 year living together (primary) Subsequent infertile (secondary) not being able to become pregnant after 1 year from last birth In the analysis combined
Larsen, 2000	Cross-sectional	Demographic and Health Survey (Household interviews)	1995, 1995, 1997	Type I, II and III for Tanzania only. For others only cut v uncut	Self-report	Childless after more than 7 years of marriage, and subsequent infertile defined as still childless 5 years from last birth
Larsen, 2002	Cross-sectional	Demographic and Health Survey (Household interviews)	1989-1990	Type I, II and III	Self-report	Childless after more than 7 years of marriage and subsequent infertile (5 years from last birth)
Morrison, 2001	Cross-sectional	Community based survey in 17 villages (3 tribes)	Jan-July 1999	Type I, II and III	Self-report & Clinical examination	1 year trying to conceive
Yount, 2006	Cross-sectional	Household interviews in rural area	1995-1997	Type I, II and IV	Self-report	Never had live birth after 5 years of marriage
Almroth, 2005	Case-control	Hospital based (urban)	2003-2004	Anatomical extent and Type I, II and III	Clinical examination	2 years trying to become pregnant (TFI subcategory)
Inhorn, 1993	Case-control	Hospital based (urban and rural)	1988-1989	Type I, II and III	Self-report & medical records	1 year trying to become pregnant, (TFI only)

Note. FGM/C = female genital mutilation/cutting; TFI = tubal factor infertility

Table 30.

Quality Ratings for the Seven Included Studies on the Basis of an Adapted Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale

Study	Quality Criterion						Overall rating ^g
	Adequacy of FGM/C (exposed) assessment ^a Max 2 points	Adequacy of control (non-exposed), definition and selection ^b Max 2 points	Comparability of control ^c Max 2 points	Confounders adequately assessed Max 2 points ^d	Adequacy of outcome Fertility Problems measure ^e Max 1 point	None response rate or loss to follow-up ^f Max 1 point	
Klouman, 2005	2	2	0	2	1		High
Larsen, 2000	1	2	1	2	1		High
Larsen, 2002	1	2	1	1	1		Average
Morrison, 2001	2	2	1	1	1		High
Yount, 2006	1	2	2	2	1		High
Almroth, 2005	2	2	2	1	1		High
Inhorn, 1993	1	2	2	2	1		High

Note. a FGM/C was adequately assessed when independent validation of the degree of cutting was assessed (e.g. clinical examination and/or hospital/medical records) and it was representative of the cohort i.e. drawn from the same population (up to 2 points)

b Controls were adequately assessed when selection was comparable to cases, and FGM/C was excluded properly in the control population (up to 2 points)

c Comparability of controls was achieved if exposed/non-exposed were matched or adjustment during analysis conducted. One point for circumciser and one point for any other confounder (up to 2 points)

d Confounders were adequately assessed if they were obtained from records or a blind interview, and one point was given if the same method was used for both groups (up to 2 points)

e Fertility problems outcome was adequately assessed if independent or blind assessment was stated in the paper, or confirmation of the outcome by reference to secure records (medical records, etc.) (up to 1 point)

f Point given if same rate for both groups and <20% loss to follow up reported

g The overall quality rating was low (0 to 3 points), average (4 to 6 points), or high (7 to 10 points).

Table 31.

Number and Percentage of Women with Infertility Childlessness and TFI (n) in the FGM/C and No-FGM/C groups in the included studies (k=7)

Outcomes	Number of women (%)	
	FGM/C	Non-FGM/C
Infertile (>12 months no pregnancy)	117 of 1090 (10.7)	61 of 655 (9.3)
Childlessness	352 of 9903 (35.5)	251 of 7760 (32.3)
TFI (infertile, >12 months no pregnancy)	Type II and III 72 of 276 (26.1)	Non-FGM/C and Type I 15 of 76 (19.7)

Note. FGM/C = Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting; TFI = Tubal Factor Infertility

Results of Meta-analyses




Figure 43. Odds ratio for proportion of ‘infertile > 12 months’ in the FGM/C and non-FGM/C groups




Figure 44. Odds ratio for proportion of ‘childless’ women in the FGM/C and non-FGM/C groups




Figure 45. Odds ratio for proportion of women with TFI in the severe FGM/C and mild FGM/C groups

Publication bias assessment.




Figure 46. Funnel plot with trim and fill procedure to impute ‘missing’ studies (missing studies in red) for the proportion ‘childless’ analysis

Dilatation and Curettage






Table 32.

Summary of Long-term Negative Reproductive Outcomes Reported as a Consequence of D&C in the Literature

Reproductive outcome	Long-term negative reproductive outcome	Primary study or review
Historical literature (up to 2000)		
Single D&C	Intrauterine adhesions (IUAs), Asherman's syndrome (30.9% of women who had D&C after miscarriage)	Schenker & Margalioth, 1982; Schenker, 1996
	Secondary infertility (after spontaneous miscarriage as a complication of the intrauterine surgery)	Schenker & Margalioth, 1982; Schenker, 1996
	Recurrent miscarriages (after spontaneous miscarriage as a complication of the intrauterine surgery)	Schenker & Margalioth, 1982; Schenker, 1996
	Negative pregnancy outcomes* after D&C (e.g. higher rates of spontaneous abortion), incompetent cervix**, preterm labour, preterm rupture of membranes, early neonatal death, and ectopic pregnancy)	Madore, Hawes, Many & Hexter, 1981; Linn et al., 1983; Kalish, Chasen, Rosenzweig, Rashbaum & Chervenak, 2002
Repeated D&C	Negative pregnancy outcomes after repeated D&C (e.g. first trimester bleeding, abnormal presentations, placenta abruption, foetal distress, low birth weight, short gestation, and major malformations)	Linn, 1983
	Primigravida abortion was only associated with infertility in cases where infection was present and consequently PID occurred	Hogue et al., 1983 (review)
	D&C as compared to vacuum aspiration was associated with negative reproductive outcomes (ectopic pregnancy, mid-trimester spontaneous abortion and low birth weight)	Hogue, 1986 (review)
Current literature (2000-present)		
Single D&C	Significantly more IUAs were found after D&C compared with hysteroscopic resection*** (30% vs. 13%)	Hooker et al., 2016 (review)
	More postpartum haemorrhage in pregnancy following D&C (as compared to the literature)	Lohmann-Bigelow et al., 2007
Repeated D&C	Odds of developing IUAs after repeated (>1) D&C were greater than after one D&C (OR 2.05, 95% CI 1.35–3.12, P=0.0008)	Hooker et al., 2014 (review)

Note: D&C= dilatation and curettage, IUAs= intrauterine adhesions, PID=pelvic inflammatory disease, *Negative pregnancy outcomes are all the outcomes of a pregnancy that do not lead to a live birth (e.g. gestational problems, stillbirth) **incompetent cervix = cervical insufficiency i.e. weak cervical tissue contributes to premature birth. ***hysteroscopic resection is the removal of tissue from the uterus using a hysteroscope.

Plausible mechanisms to explain how D&C could be associated with fertility problems






Table 33.

Sample Characteristics Reported in the Four Included Studies

Study	Country	Sample (n)	N			Age ^a Women	
			D&C	No-D&C ^x		D&C	No-D&C
Ben-Ami, 2014	Israel	177 women	94 women	83 women	Mean (SD)	30.4 (6.3)	30.5 (5.9)
Sotnikova, 1986	Moscow	650 women	350 women	300 women	NR	NR	NR
Taylor, 1982	N/A	195 women	53 women	142 women	NR	NR	NR
Ben-Baruch, 1991	Israel	86 women	52 women	35 women	Mean (SD)	28.6 (6.1)	29.2 (5.0)

Note. ^x type of control group described in Table 3. ^a Age for women at the beginning of the study; ^b Unable to become pregnant after at least 12 months of unprotected intercourse; D&C= dilatation and curettage; NR= data not reported; SD=Standard deviation; Shaded study from search of reference list

Table 34.

Characteristics of the Design of the Four Included Studies

Study	Study design	Data collection	Study period	Control Group (no-D&C)	Indication for procedure	Fertility Problems: outcomes reported in primary studies
Ben-Ami, 2014	Retrospective cohort study	Hospital based	2000-2010	Hysteroscopic resection	RPOC	Infertility, time to conception in months, conception rate
Sotnikova, 1986	Retrospective cohort study	NR	NR	PG & vacuum suction	Induced abortion	Gynaecological diseases (e.g. salpingophitis, endometriosis), menstrual dysfunction (e.g. biphasic menstrual cycle, insufficient luteal phase)
Taylor, 1982	Cross-sectional study	Hospital based	NR	Did not undergo D&C	Routine investigation for infertility	PID, endometriosis and fibroid
Ben-Baruch, 1991	Prospective cohort study	Hospital based	1993-1988	Expectant management	Spontaneous abortion (miscarriage)	Infertility (attempted conception > 12) months after abortion or stopping contraception. Future pregnancy, miscarriage and normal delivery.

Note: D&C= dilatation and curettage; NR= data not reported; RPOC = retained products of conception; PG = prostaglandins; PID = pelvic inflammatory disease. Shaded study from search of reference list

Table 35.

Quality Ratings for the Four Included Studies on the Basis of an Adapted Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale

Study	Quality Criterion						Overall rating ^g
	Adequacy of D&C (exposed) measure ^a Max 2 points	Adequacy of control (non-exposed), definition and selection ^b Max 2 points	Comparability of control ^c Max 2 points	Confounders adequately assessed Max 2 points ^d	Adequacy of outcome Fertility Problems measure ^e Max 1 point	None response rate or loss to follow-up ^f Max 1 point	
Ben-Ami, 2014	2	2	2	2	0	0	High
Sotnikova, 1986	0	0	0	0	1	0	Low
Taylor, 1982	1	2	1	1	2	NA	High
Ben-Baruch, 1991	2	2	1	0	0	0	Average

Note. ^a D&C was adequately assessed when hospital/medical records were available and sample was drawn from the same population (up to 2 points); ^b Controls were adequately assessed when selection was comparable to cases, and D&C was excluded properly in the control population (up to 2 points); ^c Comparability of controls was achieved if exposed/non-exposed were matched or adjustment during analysis conducted. One point for 'obstetric history' and one point for any other confounder (up to 2 points); ^d Confounders were adequately assessed if they were obtained from records or a blind interview, and one point was given if the same method was used for both groups (up to 2 points); ^e Fertility problems outcome was adequately assessed if independent or blind assessment was stated in the paper, or confirmation of the outcome by reference to secure records (medical records, etc.) (up to 1 point); ^f Point given if same rate for both groups and <20% loss to follow up reported, NA: not applicable; ^g The overall quality rating was low (0 to 3 points), average (4 to 6 points), or high (7 to 10 points). Shaded from search of ref list

Table 36.


Summary of Methodological Considerations and Results of the Four Included Studies

Study	Indication for procedure	Control Group (no-D&C)	Other factors	Follow up period	Results: Outcomes reported in primary studies	
					Significant difference	No significant difference
Ben-Ami, 2014	RPOC after birth, spontaneous or induced abortion	Hysteroscopic resection (HR)	More HR after birth and more D&C after abortion D&C group more abdominal pain (before procedure), HR group longer time from birth/abortion to RPOC	NR	More infertility in the D&C group Longer time to pregnancy (months) in the D&C group	Desire for pregnancy Achieve pregnancy
Ben-Baruch, 1991	Spontaneous abortion (miscarriage)	Conservative management (waiting)	Which treatment would be performed was decided by treating physician	28 months (range 12-68) in the D&C group 26 months (range 12-72) in the control group		Achieve pregnancy, miscarriage and normal delivery. Infertility (including existing and new cases)
Sotnikova, 1986	Induced abortion	Group 1- PG OR vacuum suction Group 2 - PG	Gynaecological history (e.g. age at menarche, genital inflammation) was reported	One year 5 years	More gynaecological diseases (e.g. inflammation of fallopian tubes, endometriosis) in the D&C group More menstrual dysfunction (e.g. anovulation, oligomenorrhea, insufficient luteal phase) in the D&C group	
Taylor, 1982	Routine investigation for infertility	Did not undergo D&C	Excluded women with history of PID, pelvic surgery abnormal menstruation	History of D&C or no-D&C	More PID in the D&C group	Endometriosis and fibroid

Note: D&C = dilatation and curettage; RPOC = retained products of conception; HR = Hysteroscopic resection; PG = prostaglandins; PID = pelvic inflammatory disease; NR = not reported.

Vitamin D deficiency

Plausible mechanisms to explain how vitamin D deficiency could be associated with fertility problems



Applicable to all RFs

Table 37.

Summary of evidence reviewed, outcomes reported, number of studies in each meta-analysis and pooled effects estimate.

RF	Evidence reviewed	Outcome reported	Number of studies included in MA	Pooled effect estimates
				OR (95% CI)/ Mean Difference (95% CI)
CSG	451 records retrieved, 24 studies included in MA	Time to first birth	2	MD 0.24 (-0.39-0.87) p=0.46
		Miscarriage	5	1.1 (0.93-1.30) p=0.25
		Never-pregnant	3	0.66 (0.45-0.98) p=0.04
		Childlessness	5	0.83 (0.67-1.03) p=0.09
		Mean # pregnancies	5	MD 0.40 (0.10-0.71) p=0.009
		Mean # live-births	7	MD 0.24 (0.05-0.43) p=0.01
		Stillbirth	5	1.28 (1.04-1.57) p=0.02
		Neonatal Death	4	1.57 (1.22-2.02) p=0.0005
FGM/C	244 records retrieved, 7 studies included in MA	Infertile > 12 months no pregnancy	2	1.17 (0.84-1.63) p=0.36
		Childlessness	3	1.22 (0.99-1.52) p=0.07
		Infertile 2 yrs (TFI)*	2	2.06 (1.03-4.15) p=0.04
HIV	741 records retrieved, 9 included in MA	Cumulative Pregnancy rate	2	0.36 (0.15-0.89) p=0.03
		Miscarriage	2	0.03 (-0.03-0.09) p=0.35
		Amenorrhea	3	2.44 (1.56-3.81) p<0.00001
		FSH >25 IU/l	2	1.51 (0.77-2.94) p=0.23
		Infertile > 12 months no pregnancy*	2	2.93 (1.95-4.42) p<0.00001
GTB	451 records retrieved, 5 included in MA	Infertile >12 months no pregnant	2	8.91 (1.89-42.12) p=0.006
		Amenorrhea	2	4.24 (0.23-78.14) p=0.33
		Primary infertility	2	2.94 (1.89-4.37) p<0.00001
BV	184 records retrieved, 11 included in MA	Infertile > 12 months no pregnancy*	11	2.81 (1.85-4.27) p<0.00001
Narrative reviews				

RF	Evidence reviewed	Outcome reported	Number of studies included in MA	Pooled effect estimates
				OR (95% CI)/ Mean Difference (95% CI)
D&C	347 records retrieved, 4 included in narrative review	Infertile > 12 months no pregnancy	1	Significantly more than hysteroscopy group
		Time to pregnancy	1	Significantly longer than hysteroscopy group
		Gynaecological diseases (e.g. inflammation of fallopian tubes, endometriosis) PID	1	More in the D&C than vacuum aspiration of prostaglandins. More in the D&C than no treatment group
Vitamin D Deficiency	No review necessary	NA	0	NA
Water-pipe	No review necessary	NA	0	NA

Note. * = data converted from case-control studies. RF = risk factor; OR = odds ratio; NA = not applicable; MA = meta-analysis; CSG = consanguinity; FGM/C = female genital mutilation/cutting; GTB = genital tuberculosis; BV = bacterial vaginosis; D&C = dilatation and curettage; PID = pelvic inflammatory disease.

Table 38.

Summary of which Bradford-Hill Criteria were met for each of the six Risk Factors included in Systematic Review

Criteria	Risk Factor					
	CSG	FGM/C	HIV	GTB	BV	D&C
Strength				X	X	
Consistency				X	X	X
Specificity		X				X
Temporality	X	X				
Biological gradient	X	X			X	X
Plausibility	X	X		X	X	
Coherence				X	X	
Experiment						
Analogy						

Note. Bradford-Hill Criteria from Hill, 1965. CSG = consanguinity; FGM/C = female genital mutilation/cutting; GTB = genital tuberculosis; BV = bacterial vaginosis; D&C = dilatation and curettage