

# The Environmental Study on Assessing the Infertility and its Risk Factors: a Population-based Study of Married Couples in Iran

Solaiman Afroughi <sup>1\*</sup>, Mehran Pouzesh <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Ph.D., Department of Biostatistics & Epidemiology, Faculty of Health and Nutritional Sciences and Social Determinants of Health Research Centre, Yasuj University of Medical Sciences, Yasuj, IRAN

<sup>2</sup> M.S., Social Determinants of Health Research Centre, Yasuj University of Medical Sciences, Yasuj, IRAN

\* Corresponding author: safroughi@yahoo.com

## Abstract

Concerns about the detrimental effects of occupational and environmental exposure on male reproductive function have been raised by reports of declining sperm quality over the last decades. Infertility is a critical problem of couples during reproductive age around the world. This cross-sectional study was conducted from September 2014 to June 2015 in Kohgiluyeh Va Boyer-Aahmad province, Iran. A total of 2284 couples whose women were 19-49 year old through a multistage sampling were randomly selected. Measurements of age, education, occupation, weight and height of men and women, residential place, weather temperature state of the residence region of the couples and the pregnancy history of the wives were gathered. Data were statistically described. Multiple logistic regression analysis was used to detect risk factors for infertility. Statistical significant level was set at 0.05. The prevalence of current infertility among the couples was 10.9% [95% confidence interval (CI): 9.6-12.2]. Woman's age of 35 years or older [odds ratio (OR)=1.38: 1.03-1.85], resident in regions with hot weather condition (OR=1.47: 1.02-2.11), rural residential state (OR=1.54: 1.13-2.1) and illiteracy of women (OR=1.96: 1.24-3.09) significantly increased the risk of infertility occurrence among the couples. In concluding, Infertility was a concerned health and social problem in the studied population. Rural residential condition, living in regions with hot temperature, illiteracy of woman and the age at 35 years and older in women were detected as the risk factors of infertility presence in the studied couples.

**Keywords:** prevalence, infertility, risk factor, couples, temperature, environmental exposure

Afroughi S, Pouzesh M (2019) The Environmental Study on Assessing the Infertility and its Risk Factors: a Population-based Study of Married Couples in Iran. Ekoloji 28(107): 73-79.

## INTRODUCTION

Infertility is recognized as a critical problem of couples during reproductive age around the world (Datta et al. 2016). It is defined as the failure to conceive after at least 12 months of regular unprotected sexual intercourse (Petraglia et al. 2013). Infertility is an increasingly prevalent health issue, which affects 10-15% of couples worldwide (Bushink et al. 2012). World Health Organization (WHO) has reported that more than 25% of couples in developing countries experience infertility (Webair et al. 2018). Furthermore, numerous studies have revealed that infertility is a major health problem in Asian countries (Zhou et al. 2017, Tak and Ehi 2018). In a systematic analysis of 277 studies around the world, it has been reported that the prevalence of whole infertility among women at childbearing age globally was 12.5%, while the highest infertility

prevalence belonged to the Middle Eastern countries (Mascarenhas et al. 2012).

The experience of infertility significantly affects individual's well-being and quality of life through appearance of depression, anxiety, stress, frustration, sexual dysfunction, social stigma, and low self-esteem (Ardabilly et al. 2011, Omani-Samani et al. 2019, Winkelman et al. 2016). In addition, infertility imposes a high economic burden on involved couples and can lead to violence, isolation and divorce among people experiencing fertility problem (Bell 2010, Izmirli et al. 2014, Schanz et al. 2011). Despite being a major decreasing factor of birth rate and a complicated social-psychiatric problem in populations (Homan et al. 2007, Volgsten et al. 2008), there is a shortage of data on prevalence and influencing factors of infertility in both

developed and developing countries (Babore et al. 2017, Rouchou 2013).

Infertility has been prevalent in more than 20% of married couples and has an increasing trend in Iran (Pakpour et al. 2012, Vahidi et al. 2009). Furthermore, in this country, because of importance of sociocultural, economic and religious aspects of a couple's childbearing status, infertile individuals are faced with serious and hard implications, undesired results and social detriments (Ardabili et al. 20011, Ramazanzadeh et al. 2004). Whereas, regarding the diversity of socio-economic, cultural, ethnic and geographical conditions, information of the prevalence and contributory factors of infertility experience among Iranian couples is limited (Bhattacharya et al. 2009, Pakpour et al. 2012). The objective of this study was to assess prevalence of current infertility and to identify its socio-demographic and environmental risk factors in a sample of couples at childbearing age, Iran.

#### METHODS

This analytical population-based cross-sectional study was conducted at Kohgiluyeh Va Boyer-Ahmad province, southern Iran, from September 2014 to June 2015. Study population consisted of married couples which living together in the same household more than one year at the time of study, couple's woman was at reproductive age 19-49 years and was under the family planning service in urban and rural public health centers throughout the province. The study was approved by the Research and Ethics Committee of the Yasuj University of Medical Sciences.

According to an estimated prevalence rate of infertility attained from published national studies as 10% (Safarinejad 2007, Kasimovskaya et al. 2018) and considering a 95% confident interval around it, the type one error ( $\alpha$ ) as 5%, and a design effect equals 2, the size of a representative sample was enumerated as 2400 couples. A multistage stratified cluster random sampling method was implemented to recruit the sample as bellow. Firstly, according to climatic conditions, the province was divided into three strata include hot, moderate and cold area. Secondly, in each division, a random sample of townships includes urban and rural places were selected and the subsamples of couples attributed to health centers were proportionally allocated. Finally, proportional to the frequencies of age groups, women were taken randomly from health centers' lists. The couples that last year were attempting to be pregnant and were local resident of the region were included in the study. The couples which women

had systemic disease could influence in their fertility status, excluded from the study.

A structured questionnaire was provided and pretested before initiating the study. A team of professional midwives who have been employed in health centers were selected and trained to interview with the husband and the wife of every sampled couple and to fulfill the questionnaire. Iranian couples, especially those with wives in reproductive age are under health care system that serves through governmental urban and rural health centers. At the centers the profiles of couples including fecundity/fertility and child bearing status must be annually checked, updated and completed. The code addresses of sample couples were extracted from documents in the health centers and an informative consent form was developed. Then, cooperators invited the selected couples to participate in the study. Thus, while women referred to health centers, after taking their approval and signed consent forms, interviewers recorded their information in the questionnaires. In cases, such as avoiding to refer to the centers, midwives gathered the data while referring to women's house. The collected data were demographic, socioeconomic and anthropometric characteristics including age, residence, height, weight, education, occupation and marriage statuses for both women and men, pregnancy history of the wives and the weather temperature of the couple's residential region. In this study current infertility was investigated (Bhattacharya et al. 2009). Therefore, a couple was diagnosed as infertile, if during last 12 months, the woman did not become pregnant despite regularly unprotected sexual intercourse. Prevalence of infertility was defined as the number of infertile cases to the total number of couples in each group.

Collected data were entered into an Excel file and analyzed using IBM SPSS software version 22 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). The distribution of the couples according to socio-demographic characteristics of the husbands and wives were provided in contingency tables in terms of frequency (n) and percentage (%). Body mass index (BMI) was computed as weight in kilo grams divided by square of height in meters. Quantitative variables were described by mean and standard deviation statistics. Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) test was used to compare infertility prevalence among groups. Univariate and Multivariate logistic regression analysis were implemented to detect factors significantly associated with the infertility (not present versus present) as dependent variable among the

**Table 1.** Distribution of the couples 's men and women in terms of age groups (n=2284)

Characteristic	n	%
Total couples	2284	100
<b>Woman age (years)</b>		
15-19	37	1.6
20-24	258	11.3
25-29	539	23.6
30-34	495	21.7
35-39	423	18.5
40-44	336	14.7
45-49	194	8.5
<b>Husband's age (years)</b>		
15-24	52	2.3
25-29	311	43.6
30-34	483	21.2
35-39	490	21.5
40-44	413	18.1
45-49	268	11.8
≥50	263	11.5

n: number (count), % : percent

**Table 2.** Distribution of the couples according to socio-demographic characteristics (n=2284)

Characteristic	n	%
<b>Residential place</b>		
rural	758	33.2
urban	1526	66.8
<b>Climatic (weather) condition</b>		
cold	523	22.9
moderate	272	11.9
hot	1489	65.2
<b>Woman's education level</b>		
illiterate	192	8.5
Primary to high school	953	42.4
Complete high school	668	29.7
university	434	19.3
<b>Woman's occupation</b>		
House wife	2036	89.3
Not house wife	244	10.7
<b>Woman's BMI</b>		
<18.5	41	1.9
18.5-24.9	1996	45.5
25-29.9	781	35.7
≥30	372	17
<b>Husband's BMI</b>		
<25	1190	52.1
≥25	1094	47.9
<b>Husband's education</b>		
illiterate	113	5
Primary to high school	786	34.7
complete high school	628	27.7
university	741	32.7
<b>Husband's occupation</b>		
employee	724	32.1
freelancer	1441	63.9
Farmer	90	4

n: number (count), % : percent

couples. The backward stepwise method was used and odds ratio (OR) with 95% confidence interval (CI) were computed to assess the strength of association of risk factors with current infertility. Significant level considered as p value (p) less than 0.05.

## RESULTS

### Characteristics of the Studied Couples

Of the total 2400 couples who had involvement (necessary) conditions, 2284 couples participated in the study such that response rate was 95.2%. The mean (SD) age of women and men of the couples were 33.12(7.54) and 38.59(9.35) years, respectively. While, the women showed a mean (SD) BMI of 25.87 (4.69), the mean (SD) BMI of their husbands was 25.19 (8.67). Furthermore, the couples who have been lived in rural and/or hot regions were 33.2 and 65.2%, respectively. Of the women 41.7% and of the husbands 63.3% were aged greater than or equal 35. Most of the women educated at primary to high school level (42.4%) and/or were house wife (89.3%). In addition, education condition of most of the men (34.7%) was primary to high school and most of the men (63.9%) were freelancers. Socio-economic characteristics of the investigated couples are shown in **Tables 1** and **2**.

### Prevalence of Current Infertility According to the Characteristics of the Couples

Out of 2284 couples who actively trying to be pregnant during last year, 249 couples were infertile. Therefore, the current infertility rate among sampled couples was 10.9% [95% confidence interval (CI): 9.6-12.2]. Bivariate analysis of association of fertility status and socio-demographic characteristics of the couples are demonstrated in **Table 3**. The prevalence of infertility among rural couples was significantly higher than that of urban couples ( $p=0.041$ ). Moreover, the prevalence of infertility significantly decreased as husband's education level and/ or woman's education level increased ( $p=0.001$  and  $p<0.001$ , respectively). In addition, the prevalence of infertility among the couples which woman's age and/or husband's age was greater than 35 years were significantly higher than peers ( $p=0.005$  and  $p=0.016$ , respectively). However, there was not found any significant association between infertility and the occupation of both husbands and women ( $p=0.89$  and  $p=0.35$ , respectively), the BMI of both men and women ( $p=0.103$  and  $p=0.934$ , respectively) and weather condition of residence place of the couples ( $p=0.2$ ) (**Table 3**).

**Table 3.** Prevalence of infertility according to socio-demographic and environmental characteristics of the couples

Characteristic	fertile (n,%)	infertile (n,%)	P value	OR (95% CI)
<b>Residential place</b>				
rural	661(87.2)	97(12.8)	0.041	1.327 (1.012-1.74)
urban	1374(90)	152(10)		1
<b>Climatic (weather) condition</b>				
cold	477(91.2)	46(8.8)	0.20	1
moderate	242(89)	30(11)	0.31	1.285 (0.791-2.088)
hot	1316(88.4)	173(11.6)	0.075	1.363(0.969-1.918)
<b>Woman's age (years)</b>				
<35	1205(90.7)	124(9.3)		1
≥35	830(86.9)	125(13.1)	0.005	1.464(1.124-1.905)
<b>Woman's education level</b>				
illiterate	153(79.7)	39(20.3)	0.001	2.325(1.507-3.588)
Primary to high school	857(89.9)	96(10.1)	0.898	1.022(0.734-1.422)
Complete high school	602(90.1)	66(9.9)		1
university	388(89.4)	46(10.6)	0.70	1.081(0.727-1.609)
<b>Woman's occupation</b>				
House wife	1813(89)	223(11)	0.89	1.031(0.671-1.585)
Not house wife	218(89.3)	26(10.7)		1
<b>Woman's BMI</b>				
<25	938(90.3)	101(9.7)		1
≥25	1023(88.1)	138(11.9)	0.103	1.253(0.955-1.644)
<b>Husband's age (years)</b>				
<35	771(91.1)	75(8.9)		1
≥35	1262(87.9)	174(12.1)	0.016	1.417(1.066-1.885)
<b>Husband's BMI</b>				
<25	643(89.3)	77(10.7)		1
≥25	593(89.4)	70(10.6)	0.934	0.986(0.700-1.386)
<b>Husband's education level</b>				
illiterate	87(77)	26(23)	0.001	2.589(1.558-4.301)
Primary to high school	701(89.2)	85(10.8)	0.778	1.05(0.746-1.478)
complete high school	563(89.6)	65(10.4)		1
university	670(90.4)	71(9.6)	0.636	0.918(0.644-1.31)
<b>Husband's occupation</b>				
employee	653(90.2)	71(9.8)		1
freelancer	1281(88.9)	160(11.1)	0.357	1.149(0.855-1.543)
Farmer	77(85.6)	13(14.4)	0.176	1.553(0.821-2.935)

n: number (count), % : percent

**Table 4.** Associated risk factors of infertility among couples based on the multivariate logistic regression analysis

Independent variables	OR	95% CI	P
<b>Woman's age (year)</b>			
<35	1		
≥35	1.379	1.029-1.848	0.032
<b>Weather condition</b>			
cold	1		
moderate	1.082	(0.646-1.812)	0.766
hot	1.468	1.020-2.113	0.039*
<b>Residence place</b>			
urban	1		
rural	1.539	1.126-2.102	0.007*
<b>Woman's education level</b>			
Complete high school	1		
illiterate	1.957	1.238-3.094	0.004*
Primary to high school	0.923	0.653-1.305	0.649
university	1.190	0.796-1.781	0.397

\*-significant ( p <0.05)

**Risk Factors of Infertility among the Couples**

All the independent variables that in the univariate regression analysis case had an association with

infertility presence in the couples with a p value less than 0.25 were included in a multivariate logistic regression model using Backward Wald method. Woman's age, weather temperature state of living region, residence place and woman's education level were associated with the infertility presence among the couples. women's age of 35 years or older (OR 1.38 95% CI 1.03-1.85 p=0.032), resident in regions with hot weather condition (OR 1.47 95% CI 1.02-2.11 p=0.039), rural residential state (OR 1.54 95% CI 1.13-2.1 p=0.007) and illiteracy of women (OR 1.96 95% CI 1.24-3.09 p=0.004) increased the risk of infertility occurrence among the couples (**Table 4**).

**DISCUSSION**

In the present study, we showed that the prevalence of current infertility in the studied couples was 10.9%. The presented infertility rate is higher than the 12-month prevalence value ranged from 6.9% to 9.3% in less-developed countries reported by Boivin et al.

(2007) and around the estimated global rate as 10.5% by Mascarenhas et al. (2012). Moreover, the current infertility rate found in the present study was larger than the rate has been found in a national study conducted by safarinejad (2007).

Detection and modification the risk factors of infertility incidence in populations have been in the priorities proposed by the health policy-makers (Pakpour et al. 2012). In the present study it was shown that woman's age was associated with infertility prevalence in the studied couples. This result is consisted with the findings of the previous studies (Datta et al. 2016, Gurunath et al. 2011, Macaluso et al 2010). The age of a woman is a factor among others that can affect the fertility of a couple. Due to pursuing to attain a desirable education level or a stable job, many couples plan to postpone childbearing. However, at age 35 years and over the risk of impaired fertility increases in women via secondary amenorrhea, polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS), uterine myomas and endometriosis (Petraglia et al. 2013).

We showed that the risk of infertility occurrence in the couples with illiterate women was higher than that of the couples which women were educated up to complete high school. In accordance with our result, the authors found that the risk of infertility has been decreased as education level of study participants increased (Zhou et al. 2017). However, the internal author Kazemijalish et al. (2015) reported different results. As in the aforementioned study couples were taken only from the urban regions, this inconsistency may be due to the different combination of the participants in this study as compare with ours. Educated women could access to a level of knowledge, attitude and income, which might help them better perceive and control infertility problems. Furthermore, in the present study the risk of infertility presence among rural couples was higher than that of urban residents. To our knowledge, no foreign published studies were found comparing infertility prevalence between rural and urban couples. However, contrary to our study, Safarinejad (2007) reported that infertility rate was higher in urban than rural areas. The difference may be attributed to different settings of the studies. Furthermore, being more exposed to radiation, heat, trauma and exhausting labors as well as having a lower socioeconomic situation than urban counterpart can predispose rural couples to experience more infertility problems (Eisenberg et al. 2015).

In addition, as results show the odds of infertility experience among couples resident in regions with hot (climate) weather condition compared with that resident in cold weather regions was higher. Numerous studies have shown that environmental temperature has influenced on human reproductive physiology (Fisch et al. 2003). The men testes are created outside the body cavity and are surrounded by a regulator heat exchange system resulting in a temperature lower than body core temperature. This situation is seemed to be essential in facilitating spermatogenesis and clears the concept of elevated testicular temperature as a potential risk factor for infertility (Kim et al. 2012). It has been revealed that human testes are sensitive to hot weather condition of the places where they lives and/or works. Increasing of the scrotal temperature has been shown to cause impaired production of sperms which can lead to infertility in men (Barazani et al. 2014). In agreement with our result, Fisch et al. (2003) explored the relationship of global air temperature change and human fertility among 19 industrial countries from 1900 to 1994. They found an inverse relationship between changes in global temperature and birth rates in all countries. Moreover, Barreca (2017) in a study titled "Does hot weather affect human fertility?", reported that hot weather has reduced the fertility frequencies in the investigated countries.

The present study had some limitations. Fearing from stigmatic accusation and threatening consequences, some women might report incorrect data on their infertility status. By giving the women a confidence about privacy of their characteristics, we tried to make them feel free to present correct data. Furthermore, in the present study only socio-demographic and few environmental factors were investigated.

## CONCLUSION

The findings from this study enabled us to identify a link between self-reported occupational exposure, environmental exposure and altered semen parameters. The current study showed that the presented prevalence of infertility was higher than the global and national average rates. Accordingly, the current infertility is a concerned health and social problem in the studied population. Rural residential condition, living in hot temperature places and illiteracy of women as well as the age 35 and older in women were detected as the risk factors of infertility presence in the studied couples.

## REFERENCES

- Ardabili HE, Moghadam ZB, Salsali M, Ramezanzadeh F, Nedjat S (2011) Prevalence and risk factors for domestic violence against infertile women in an Iranian setting. *Int J Gynecol Obstet* 112: 15-17.
- Babore A, Stuppia L, Trumello C, Candelori C, Antonucci I (2017) Male factor infertility and lack of openness about infertility as risk factors for depressive symptoms in males undergoing assisted reproductive technology treatment in Italy. *Fertil Steril* 107(4): 1041-7.
- Barazani Y, Katz BF, Nagler HM, Stember DS (2014) Lifestyle, environment, and male reproductive health. *Urol Clin* 41(1): 55-66.
- Barreca A (2017) Does hot weather affect human fertility?. *IZA World Labor* 357: 1-10.
- Bell AV (2010) Beyond (financial) accessibility: inequalities within the medicalization of infertility. *Social Health Illn* 32: 631-646.
- Bhattacharya S, Porter M, Amalraj E, Templeton A, Hamilton M, Lee AJ, Kurinczuk JJ (2009) The epidemiology of infertility in the North East of Scotland. *Hum Reprod* 24(12): 3096-107.
- Boivin J, Bunting L, Collins JA, Nygren KG (2007) International estimates of infertility prevalence and treatment-seeking: potential need and demand for infertility medical care. *Hum Reprod* 22(6): 1506-12.
- Bushnik T, Cook JL, Yuzpe AA, Tough S, Collins J (2012) Estimating the prevalence of infertility in Canada. *Hum Reprod* 27(3): 738-46.
- Datta J, Palmer MJ, Tanton C, Gibson LJ, Jones KG, Macdowall W, Glasier A, Sonnenberg P, Field N, Mercer CH, Johnson AM (2016) Prevalence of infertility and help seeking among 15 000 women and men. *Hum Reprod* 31(9): 2108-18.
- Eisenberg ML, Chen Z, Ye A, Louis GM (2015) Relationship between physical occupational exposures and health on semen quality: data from the Longitudinal Investigation of Fertility and the Environment (LIFE) Study. *Fertil Steril* 103(5): 1271-7.
- Fisch H, Andrews HF, Fisch KS, Golden R, Liberson G, Olsson CA (2003) The relationship of long term global temperature change and human fertility. *Med Hypotheses* 61(1): 21-8.
- Gurunath S, Pandian Z, Anderson RA, Bhattacharya S (2011) Defining infertility—a systematic review of prevalence studies. *Hum Reprod Update* 17(5): 575-88.
- Homan GF, Davies M, Norman R (2007) The impact of lifestyle factors on reproductive performance in the general population and those undergoing infertility treatment: a review. *Hum Reprod Update* 13(3): 209-23.
- Izmirlı GO, Sonmez Y, Sezik M (2014) Prediction of domestic violence against married women in southwestern Turkey. *Int J Gynecol Obstet* 127(3): 288-92.
- Kasimovskaya, N. A., Fattakhutdinova, E. V., Khuziakhmetov, A. N., Kutlin, N. G., Kostina, Y. A., Kochetkov, I. G (2018) An attributive component of the condition of people with the diagnosis of “Ischemic heart disease. Effort angina”. *Electronic Journal of General Medicine*, 15(6), em87. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejgm/99830>
- Kazemijalish H, Tehrani FR, Behboudi-Gandevani S, Hosseinpanah F, Khalili D, Azizi F (2015) The prevalence and causes of primary infertility in Iran: a population-based study. *Glob J Health Sci* 7(6): 226.
- Kim B, Park K, Rhee K (2012). Heat stress response of male germ cells. *Cell Mol Life Sci* 70(15): 2623-36.
- Macaluso M, Wright-Schnapp TJ, Chandra A, Johnson R, Satterwhite CL, Pulver A, Berman SM, Wang RY, Farr SL, Pollack LA (2010) A public health focus on infertility prevention, detection, and management. *Fertil Steril* 93(1): 16-25.
- Mascarenhas MN, Flaxman SR, Boerma T, Vanderpoel S, Stevens GA (2012). National, regional, and global trends in infertility prevalence since 1990: a systematic analysis of 277 health surveys. *PLoS Med* 9(12): e1001356.
- Omani-Samani R, Amini P, Navid B, Sepidarkish M, Maroufizadeh S, Amir Almasi-Hashiani A (2019) Prevalence of Sexual Dysfunction among Infertile Women in Iran: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Int J Fertil Steril* 12(4): 278-283.
- Pakpour AH, Yekaninejad MS, Zeidi IM, Burri A (2012) Prevalence and risk factors of the female sexual dysfunction in a sample of infertile Iranian women. *Arc Gynecol Obstet* 286(6): 1589-96.
- Petraglia F, Serour GI, Chapron C (2013) The changing prevalence of infertility. *Int J Gynecol Obstet* 123: S4-S8.
- Ramezanzadeh F, Aghssa MM, Abedinia N, Zayeri F, Khanafshar N, Shariat M, et al (2004). A survey of relationship between anxiety, depression and duration of infertility. *BMC Women’s Health* 4(1): 9-15.
- Rouchou B (2013) Consequences of infertility in developing countries. *Perspect Public health* 133(3): 174-9.

- Safarinejad MR (2007) Infertility among couples in a population-based study in Iran: prevalence and associated risk factors. *Inter Jour Andro* 31: 303-14.
- Schanz S, Reimer T, Eichner M, et al. (2011) Long-term life and partnership satisfaction in infertile patients: A 5-year longitudinal study. *Fertil Steril* 96: 416-21.
- Vahidi S, Ardalan A, Mohammad K (2009) Prevalence of primary infertility in the Islamic Republic of Iran in 2004-2005. *Asia Pac J Public Health* 21(3): 287-93.
- Volgsten H, Svanberg AS, Ekselius L, Lundkvist Ö, and I. Sundström Poromaa IS (2008) Prevalence of psychiatric disorders in infertile women and men undergoing in vitro fertilization treatment. *Hum Reprod* 23(9): 2056-63.
- Webair HH, Ismail TAT, Ismail SB (2018) Patient-centered infertility care from an Arab perspective: A review study. *Middle East Fertil Soc J* 23: 8-13.
- Winkelman WD, Katz PP, Smith JF, Rowen TS (2016) The sexual impact of infertility among women seeking fertility care. *Sex Med* 4(3): 190-7.
- Tak AZA, Ehi Y (2018) Assessment of Neurological Diagnoses in Patients Applying to the Health Board. *J Clin Exp Invest*, 9(3):126-30. <https://doi.org/10.5799/jcei.458760>
- Zhou Z, Zheng D, Wu H, Li R, Xu S, Kang Y, Cao Y, Chen X, Zhu Y, Chen Z, Mol BW (2017) Prevalence of infertility in China: a population based study. *Fertil Steril* 108(3): e114.