



Embryos cultured in a time-lapse system result in superior treatment outcomes; a strict matched pair analysis.

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>Human Fertility</i> |
| Manuscript ID | THUF-2016-0015 |
| Manuscript Type: | Original Manuscripts |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 26-Jan-2016 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Barrie, Amy; Liverpool Womens NHS Foundation Trust, The Hewitt Fertility Centre Homburg, Roy; Liverpool Womens NHS Foundation Trust, The Hewitt Fertility Centre McDowell, Garry; Manchester Metropolitan University Brown, Jeremy; Edge Hill University Kingsland, Charles; Liverpool Womens NHS Foundation Trust, The Hewitt Fertility Centre Troup, Stephen ; Liverpool Womens NHS Foundation Trust, The Hewitt Fertility Centre |
| Keywords: | In-vitro fertilization (IVF), embryo culture, Reproductive technology |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Title Page**
4
5
6

7 **Title**

8
9
10 **Embryos cultured in a time-lapse system result in superior treatment outcomes; a**
11 **strict matched pair analysis.**
12
13

14
15
16 **Authors**

17 Corresponding author:

18
19 amy.barrie@lwh.nhs.uk
20
21

22
23 A Barrie

24
25 The Hewitt Fertility Centre, Liverpool Women's NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK
26
27

28
29 R Homburg

30
31 The Hewitt Fertility Centre, Liverpool Women's NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK
32
33

34 G McDowell

35
36 Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, UK
37
38

39 J Brown

40
41 Edge Hill University, Ormskirk, UK
42
43

44 C Kingsland

45
46 The Hewitt Fertility Centre, Liverpool Women's NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK
47
48

49 S Troup

50
51 The Hewitt Fertility Centre, Liverpool Women's NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK
52
53

54 Word count excluding references: 2629
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

A retrospective, strict matched-pair analysis on 728 treatment cycles between January 2011 and September 2014 was performed. 364 treatment cycles, where all embryos were cultured and examined in EmbryoScope®, were matched to treatment cycles where all embryos were cultured in a standard incubator with conventional morphological examination. Matching was performed for patient age, number of oocytes collected, treatment type and date of oocyte collection (\pm six months). The clinical (CPR), implantation (IR), live birth (LBR) and miscarriage rates (MR) were calculated and considered significant at $p < 0.05$ (Chi-square test). CPR, IR and LBR were found to be statistically significantly higher in the time-lapse system (TLS) group compared to the standard incubation group (CPR; 44.8% versus 36.5%, $p < 0.03$. IR; 39.3% versus 32.2%, $p < 0.03$. LBR; 43.1% versus 33.8%, $p < 0.01$). Although there was a 5.5% decrease in the MR for the TLS group when compared to the standard incubation group, this result was not statistically significant (18.9% versus 24.4%, $p > 0.1$). There is a paucity of well-designed studies to confirm that embryos cultured and examined in TLS can result in superior treatment outcomes, and this strict-matched pair analysis with a large cohort of treatment cycles indicates the advantage of using TLS.

Key words: IVF, time-lapse, EmbryoScope, matched-pair

Introduction

The first application of time-lapse systems (TLS) in embryology was recorded in 1968 where chick embryos exposed to teratogenic doses of hypoxia were analysed (Grabowski and Schroeder, 1968). Following this studies relating to preimplantation embryonic development were published (Colly-d'Hooghe, Valleron, Malaise, 1977; Milligan, Harris, Dennis, 1978; Lueck and Aladjem, 1980; Massip and Mulnard, 1980; Milligan, Harris, Dennis, 1980; Schatten and Schatten, 1980; Alexandre and Mulnard, 1988). The first clinically relevant application of TLS for use in the embryology laboratory was reported in 1994 where the events of fertilisation were studied using a custom-made imaging system comprising a microscope, enabled with Nomarski DIC optics, a video recorder and a switching box (Inoué and Inoué, 1994). Regarding preimplantation embryonic development, the first report of internalisation of fragments was published (Hardarson *et al.*, 2002) followed by a report of mouse embryo collapse analysed using time-lapse photography (Niimura, 2003). Focus turned to the use of TLS in a clinical setting, quite abruptly, in 2008 with a number of publications exclusively studying preimplantation embryonic development using TLS and how the information these systems provided could be used to determine embryo viability (Arav *et al.*, 2008; Lemmen, Agerholm, Ziebe, 2008; Mio and Maeda, 2008). The first commercially available TLS began installations in Europe in 2011. TLS for clinical application have now been readily adopted worldwide with instruments installed in numerous countries. The body of evidence suggests that TLS can increase the chances of a pregnancy for many undergoing assisted reproduction. However, contradictory evidence exists. The use of TLS in clinical laboratories allows for a detailed analysis of embryos contained within it giving over 700 images per embryo compared to the conventional snap-shot observations translated into a

1
2
3 written series of numbers and letters open to interpretation by other members of the
4
5 scientific team. The wealth of information that TLS provides inevitably creates the need
6
7 to modify how embryos are selected for use and as such there are many reports linking
8
9 time-lapse parameters (termed morphokinetics) to an embryos ability to create a
10
11 pregnancy.
12

13
14
15
16 A recent Cochrane review retrieved 33 articles relating to the use of TLS with only ten
17
18 studies being potentially eligible for inclusion (Armstrong *et al.*, 2014). After further
19
20 evaluation, three studies were included as true RCTs. These trials totalled 994 couples
21
22 with the majority contributed by one study (856) (Rubio *et al.*, 2012). Following analysis
23
24 it was concluded that for all types of TLS, with or without cell-tracking, embryo-scoring
25
26 algorithms, versus standard embryo incubation there was no conclusive evidence of a
27
28 difference in clinical pregnancy, miscarriage, live birth, and stillbirth rates per couple
29
30 randomised. The aim of the following investigation was to examine whether TLS can be
31
32 considered superior to standard incubation systems when considering CPR, IR, LBR and
33
34 MR by performing a strict matched-pair analysis with a large cohort of patients.
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Methods**

41 ***Study Design***

42
43 A retrospective, observational, matched pair data analysis was designed and approved by
44
45 the NHS Research Ethics Committee in the North West (ref: 14/NW/1043). Data for this
46
47 research were obtained from 728 treatment cycles between January 2011 and September
48
49 2014. This data comprised 364 patients having embryos cultured in a standard incubator
50
51 (Sanyo Multigas MCO-18M, 37°C, 6% carbon dioxide (CO₂)) (group 1) and 364 having
52
53 their embryos cultured in a time-lapse enabled incubator, the EmbryoScope® (Vitrolife,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Gothenburg, 37°C, 6% CO₂, 5% oxygen (O₂)) (group 2). Although in group 1 218 were
4
5 cultured in 20% O₂ and 150 in 5% O₂, a thorough statistical examination of the primary
6
7 outcome of this investigation showed no significant differences between these groups
8
9 which were then pooled. All treatments included in this analysis were from known
10
11 implantation embryos i.e. a single embryo transfer or a double embryo transfer where
12
13 transfer of two embryos resulted in either a negative pregnancy test or two fetal
14
15 heartbeats. Clinical pregnancy (CPR), implantation (IR), live birth (LBR) and miscarriage
16
17 (MR) rates were calculated.
18
19

20 21 22 23 ***Patient criteria***

24
25 All patients with embryos cultured in the EmbryoScope® with known outcome were
26
27 matched to patients having embryos cultured in a standard incubator for patient age
28
29 (exact), number of oocytes collected (exact), treatment type and date of treatment (± six
30
31 months). Patients were not included twice. Patients were allocated to either standard or
32
33 TLS culture randomly, based on availability. In February 2014 the laboratory became
34
35 100% time-lapse enabled meaning all patients had all embryos cultured in a TLS.
36
37
38
39

40 41 42 ***Ovarian stimulation***

43
44 Pituitary down-regulation was achieved with either a gonadotrophin releasing hormone
45
46 agonist (buserelin, Suprecur®, Sanofi-Aventis, UK) or antagonist (cetrotirelix acetate,
47
48 Cetrotide®, Merck Serono, Germany). Ovarian stimulation was performed using urine
49
50 derived or recombinant follicle stimulating hormone (Progynova (Bayer, Germany),
51
52 Fostimon, Merional (IBSA, Switzerland), Menopur® (Ferring Fertility, Switzerland),
53
54 Gonal-f® (Merck Serono). Doses were adjusted based on patient demographic and
55
56 response.
57
58
59
60

Oocyte retrieval and embryology

Ultrasound guided oocyte collection was performed transvaginally under sedation (Diprivan, Fresenius Kabi, USA). Collected oocyte-cumulus complexes were cultured in 4-well dishes (Nunc™, Thermo Scientific, USA) containing 0.65ml G-IVF™ (Vitrolife) covered with 0.35ml OVOIL™ (Vitrolife) in a standard incubator. Sperm preparation was performed using a standard gradient separation at 0.3 relative centrifugal force for ten minutes (ISolate®, Irvine Scientific, USA) followed by two washes at 0.6rcf for ten minutes using G-IVF™. Those oocytes destined for ICSI were prepared using enzymatic (HYASE-10X™, Vitrolife) and mechanical digestion. ICSI was performed approximately four hours following collection after which time all injected oocytes were placed in individual culture drops of G-1™ (Vitrolife) and cultured in either the EmbryoScope® or a standard incubator. Those oocytes destined for standard insemination had this performed approximately four hours after collection and replaced into a standard incubator until fertilisation check the following day. Oocytes were then checked for fertilisation approximately 16-18 hours post-insemination (hpi) and all fertilised oocytes along with all unfertilised metaphase II oocytes were placed in individual culture drops of G-1™ and cultured in either the EmbryoScope® or a standard incubator. Where culture to day five was undertaken, a media change was performed on day three. For those embryos cultured in the EmbryoScope®, 20µl from each well was aspirated and replaced with 20µl of G-2™ (Vitrolife). For those embryos cultured in standard incubation, all embryos were moved to a new culture dish comprising individual 20µl drops of G-2™. Embryo selection for those cultured in the EmbryoScope® was performed using the national grading scheme (ACE/BFS guidelines, Cutting, Morroll, Roberts, Pickering, Rutherford, 2008) along with an internally derived embryo-scoring, time-lapse algorithm. Embryo

1
2
3 selection for those cultured in the standard incubator was performed using the national
4 grading scheme only. Embryo transfer was performed using the highest-grade embryo(s)
5 either three or five days post collection depending on the number of good quality embryos
6 the patient had on day three as well as how many were to be transferred. Selected
7 embryos were cultured in EmbryoGlue® (Vitrolife) prior to embryo transfer.
8
9
10
11
12

13 14 15 16 ***Statistical analyses***

17 CPR was calculated as the number of patients having a fetal heart beat (fhb) at 6-7 weeks
18 gestation confirmed by ultrasound scan (regardless of number of fhb) out of the number
19 of embryo transfers performed. IR was calculated as the total number of fhb (i.e. inclusive
20 of higher order pregnancies) out of the number of embryos transferred. LBR was
21 calculated as the number of all live births out of the number of embryo transfers. Finally,
22 MR was calculated as the number of positive human chorionic gonadotrophin (hCG) tests
23 that did not result in a fhb at ultrasound scan at 6-7 weeks gestation. Results were
24 analysed using the Chi-square test (GraphPad Software Inc).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Results**

40 A total of 728 treatment cycles were analysed and the CPR, IR, LBR and MR calculated
41 (see table 1 for data breakdown). CPR, IR and LBR were found to be statistically
42 significantly different between the two groups (table 2). The CPR for group 1 (control,
43 standard incubation) when compared to group 2 (TLS) was 36.5% versus 44.8%,
44 respectively, $p < 0.03$. The IR for group 1 when compared to group 2 was 32.2% versus
45 39.3%, respectively, $p < 0.03$. The LBR for group 1 when compared to group 2 was
46 33.8% versus 43.1%, respectively, $p < 0.01$. However, although there was a 5.5% increase
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in the MR for group 1 when compared to group 2, this result was not statistically
4
5 significant (24.4% versus 18.9%, respectively, $p > 0.1$).
6

7
8 **[table 1 near here]**

9
10 **[table 2 near here]**

11 12 13 14 **Discussion**

15
16 The results of this matched pair analysis reveal that embryos cultured and examined in the
17
18 EmbryoScope® incubator result in superior treatment outcomes. These results are in
19
20 concordance with others (Rubio *et al.*, 2014; Yang *et al.*, 2014; Adamson *et al.*, 2015;
21
22 Basile *et al.*, 2015) but have been contradicted elsewhere (Nakahara *et al.*, 2010; Cruz *et*
23
24 *al.*, 2011; Kirkegaard *et al.*, 2012; Kahraman *et al.*, 2013; Kovacs *et al.*, 2013; Armstrong
25
26 *et al.*, 2014; Park *et al.*, 2015). A recent Cochrane review (Armstrong *et al.*, 2014)
27
28 suggested that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that TLS with or without cell
29
30 tracking technology would be beneficial to patients undergoing ART. Included in this
31
32 were three eligible RCTs the first of which contributed most of the data for the review.
33
34 This study was a multi-centre RCT of patients undergoing ICSI, using donated or
35
36 autologous oocytes. 856 couples were randomised in this analysis; 444 to TLS and 412 to
37
38 standard incubation. The CPR and MR were calculated as end-points. Although this
39
40 analysis revealed a significant increase in treatment outcomes, considerable reasons for
41
42 bias were identified. Firstly, patients could request the intervention (TLS) therefore
43
44 allocation was, in fact, non-random. Secondly, the study was classed as ‘double-blinded’
45
46 due to the gynaecologist and statistician being unaware of the arm to which the patients
47
48 had been randomised. However, the patients and embryologists were given this
49
50 information. Although unlikely to create a significant bias, this detail could invalidate the
51
52 results. Finally, the heterogeneity of the sample was considerable including the use of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 donated, and thus both fresh and frozen oocytes (Rubio *et al.*, 2014). The remaining two
4
5 RCTs included in the review were conducted on a small number of couples, one being
6
7 interim results only, leaving a combined total of 61 to 65 in each arm (Kahraman *et al.*,
8
9 2013; Kovacs *et al.*, 2013). The reviewers reported a high risk of attrition bias in one of
10
11 these studies due to the principal investigator undertaking the randomisation and also
12
13 because there was no blinding. Overall, the reviewers stated that there was no conclusive
14
15 evidence of a difference between standard incubation and TLS when considering CPR,
16
17 MR, LBR and stillbirth rates. Further analyses, not included in this Cochrane review,
18
19 have also shown no significant differences in treatment outcomes between embryos
20
21 cultured in standard incubation versus TLS (Nakahara *et al.*, 2010; Cruz *et al.*, 2011;
22
23 Kirkegaard *et al.*, 2012; Park *et al.*, 2015).
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 Differences in results found thus far in the matter of TLS could be attributed to a number
31
32 of factors. Firstly, a benefit of TLS that one laboratory might enjoy may not be so with
33
34 another due to the conditions of the laboratory in the first instance. In brief, a well-
35
36 designed, stable culture environment (TLS) introduced into what was a relatively unstable
37
38 culture condition may elicit an immediate uplift in treatment outcomes. Whereas, to place
39
40 this technology into an already optimal culture environment, may not reveal such results.
41
42 There are many factors that vary between laboratories that could impact this; the type of
43
44 culture media (single or sequential), culture dish type, volume of media used for culturing
45
46 embryos, volume of oil overlay, the type of incubator and the embryo grading and embryo
47
48 transfer policies. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that some laboratories may benefit
49
50 from TLS more than others.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Secondly, during the culture of embryos in the EmbryoScope® in this analysis an in-
4
5 house derived embryo-scoring algorithm was used. This indicates that the analysis
6
7 presented here does not distinguish between the two, commonly stated, major benefits of
8
9 TLS; the undisturbed nature of the systems or the use of embryo-scoring algorithms.
10
11 Whilst the authors acknowledge that this could create ambiguity, it can also be defended.
12
13 This detail means that this analysis addresses TLS as a whole in the manner in which it
14
15 should be utilised; using the information provided by the images. It also gives further
16
17 explanation for the heterogeneity of success of TLS. Some laboratories utilising TLS have
18
19 access to large amounts of data meaning in-house derivation and validation of predictive
20
21 models can be performed; a method much preferred to utilising a published embryo-
22
23 scoring algorithm developed externally. In these laboratories, where internally derived
24
25 models are used, although not proven, a greater benefit to using TLS would be expected.
26
27 Naturally, in those laboratories that do not have access to a data-set allowing in-house
28
29 derivation of predictive models, externally developed versions may be adopted, a decision
30
31 which has been cautioned (Kirkegaard *et al.*, 2013a; Yalçinkaya *et al.*, 2014). Evidence of
32
33 the benefits to using embryo-scoring algorithms can be seen clearly in the literature where
34
35 the earliest publications regarding TLS aimed to assess the safety of the systems
36
37 (Nakahara *et al.*, 2010; Cruz *et al.*, 2011; Freour *et al.*, 2012; Kirkegaard *et al.*, 2012).
38
39 Many of these studies randomised oocytes or embryos between two culture systems
40
41 (standard and TLS) and found no differences in treatment outcomes of embryo quality
42
43 parameters. The use of an embryo-scoring algorithm in these studies is not mentioned,
44
45 thus these analyses assessed the effectiveness of the incubator itself, not the information it
46
47 provided. Once satisfaction with the safety of the system had been reached attention was
48
49 then turned to how the information from the TLS could be utilised. Further reports were
50
51 then published that revealed an uplift in outcome parameters (Rubio *et al.*, 2014;
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 VerMilyea *et al.*, 2014; Yang *et al.*, 2014; Basile *et al.*, 2015; Milewski *et al.*, 2015;
4
5 Siristatidis *et al.*, 2015) with one obvious difference; these analyses included the use of an
6
7 embryo-scoring algorithm. A particular study, that evidences the above notion,
8
9 randomised 843 couples undergoing ICSI in a double-blinded manner to either standard
10
11 incubation or TLS. Those embryos cultured in a standard incubator were assessed for
12
13 selection based on morphology alone whereas those in TLS were selected using an
14
15 internally derived, multivariable model. A significantly higher ongoing pregnancy rate
16
17 was found in TLS compared to standard incubation (51.4% versus 41.7% per cycle and
18
19 54.5% versus 45.3% per embryo transfer, respectively) as well as a significantly
20
21 decreased early pregnancy loss in TLS (16.6% versus 25.8%). In addition, the
22
23 implantation rate was significantly increased in the TLS group (44.9% versus 37.1%)
24
25 (Rubio *et al.*, 2014). A further investigation sought to select the most competent
26
27 blastocysts for transfer by combining TLS and array comparative genomic hybridisation
28
29 (aCGH) for patients undergoing preimplantation genetic screening (PGS) designed as a
30
31 prospective study with sibling oocytes. 1163 metaphase II oocytes from 138 PGS patients
32
33 were included and oocytes were randomised to two groups after ICSI; group A were
34
35 cultured in TLS and group B in standard incubation. Array CGH using trophoctoderm
36
37 biopsy on both groups was carried out and one or two euploid blastocysts either within the
38
39 morphokinetic ranges (group A) or morphological grades (group B) were transferred. The
40
41 clinical pregnancy and implantation rates were found to be significantly higher in group A
42
43 when compared to group B (CPR; 71.1% versus 45.9%, IR; 66.2% versus 42.4%,
44
45 respectively) demonstrating that when embryo-scoring algorithms are used as an adjunct
46
47 to select embryos for transfer, superior treatment outcomes can be achieved (Yang *et al.*,
48
49 2014). These investigations address TLS as an incubator whilst also using the data it
50
51 provides, synonymous with the current analyses, indicating that embryo-scoring
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 algorithms derived using TLS are able to select embryos more effectively than standard
4 morphology assessments. It is not surprising that an increase in treatment outcomes is
5 seen in these cases owing to the wealth of information that is available to the user of TLS
6 to do basic, but powerful, embryo de-selection.
7
8
9
10

11
12
13 Literature regarding TLS now predominantly concerns development of embryo-scoring
14 algorithms or reviews concluding that further evidence for its (TLS) superiority is
15 required. The authors believe that predictive models can be very useful, in the first
16 instance for de-selection of embryos undergoing abnormal cleavage events such as direct
17 cleavage and reverse cleavage shown to have a significantly reduced chance of creating a
18 pregnancy (Rubio *et al.*, 2012; Liu *et al.*, 2014) but also, if developed effectively, to select
19 the best embryo from a cohort for a specific patient demographic. Patient characteristics
20 including infertility diagnosis (Sundvall *et al.*, 2015) and maternal age (Hampl and
21 Stephan, 2013; Chawla *et al.*, 2015) as well as treatment characteristics including
22 treatment type and culture conditions (Lemmen *et al.*, 2008; Wale and Gardner, 2010;
23 Cirayet *et al.*, 2012; Cruz *et al.*, 2013; Kirkegaard *et al.*, 2013b) have been shown to affect
24 an embryo's morphokinetic profile and the resulting subtle differences may be used to
25 identify which embryo has the highest implantation potential. Herein lies a further reason
26 for possible variation in success of TLS between laboratories; patient and treatment
27 characteristics.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Conclusion**

50 This matched pair analysis indicates that treatment cycles where embryos are cultured and
51 examined in TLS result in superior outcomes including clinical pregnancy, implantation,
52 live birth and miscarriage rates. Although the notion is novel, the authors believe that the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 real benefit of TLS lies in the development of patient specific embryo-scoring algorithms.
4
5 Literature thus far indicates that there is likely to be no difference in treatment outcomes
6
7 when an embryo-scoring algorithm is not used and future research should be geared
8
9 towards developing effective embryo-scoring algorithms to aid in embryo selection.
10
11

12 13 14 **Declaration of interest**

15
16 The authors report no declaration of interest.
17
18
19

20 21 **References**

22
23 Adamson GD, Abusief ME, Palao L, Witmer J, Palao LM, Gvakharia M. Improved
24
25 implantation rates of day 3 embryo transfers with the use of an automated time-lapse-
26
27 enabled test to aid in embryo selection. *Fertil Steril.* (2015)18. pii: S0015-0282(15)02041-
28
29 5.
30

31
32
33 Alexandre H, Mulnard J. Time-lapse cinematography study of the germinal vesicle
34
35 behaviour in mouse primary oocytes treated with activators of protein kinases A and C.
36
37 *Gamete Res.* (1988) 21(4): 359-65.
38

39
40 Arav A, Aroyo A, Yavin S, Roth Z. Prediction of embryonic developmental competence
41
42 by time-lapse observation and 'shortest-half' analysis. *Reprod Biomed Online.* (2008)
43
44 17(5): 669-75.
45

46
47
48 Armstrong S, Arroll N, Cree LM, Jordan V, Farquhar C. Time-lapse systems for embryo
49
50 incubation and assessment in assisted reproduction. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* (2015)
51
52 27; 2: CD011320.
53

54
55
56 Basile N, Vime P, Florensa M, Aparicio Ruiz B, García Velasco JA, Remohí J, Meseguer
57
58 M. The use of morphokinetics as a predictor of implantation: a multicentric study to
59
60

1
2
3 define and validate an algorithm for embryo selection. *Hum Reprod.* (2015) 30(2): 276-
4
5 83.

6
7
8
9
10 Chawla M, Fakih M, Shunnar A, Bayram A, Hellani A, Perumal V, Divakaran J, Budak
11
12 E. Morphokinetic analysis of cleavage stage embryos and its relationship to aneuploidy in
13
14 a retrospective time-lapse imaging study. *J Assist Reprod Genet.* (2015) 32(1): 69-75.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Ciray HN, Aksoy T, Goktas C, Ozturk B, Bahceci M. Time-lapse evaluation of human
embryo development in single versus sequential culture media--a sibling oocyte study. *J
Assist Reprod Genet.* (2012) 29(9): 891-900.

Colly-d'Hooghe M, Valleron AJ, Malaise EP. Time-lapse cinematography studies of cell
cycle and mitosis duration. *Exp Cell Res.* (1977) 106(2): 405-7.

Cruz M, Gadea B, Garrido N, Pedersen KS, Martinez M, Perez-Cano I *et al.* Embryo
quality, blastocyst and ongoing pregnancy rates in oocyte donation patients whose
embryos were monitored by time-lapse imaging. *J of Assist Reprod and Genet* (2011) 28:
569–73.

Cruz M, Garrido N, Gadea B, Muñoz M, Pérez-Cano I, Meseguer M. Oocyte
insemination techniques are related to alterations of embryo developmental timing in an
oocyte donation model. *Reprod Biomed Online.* (2013) 27(4): 367-75.

Cutting R, Morroll D, Roberts SA, Pickering S, Rutherford A. Elective single embryo
transfer: guidelines for practice British Fertility Society and Association of Clinical
Embryologists; BFS and ACE. *Hum Fertil (Camb).* (2008) 11(3): 131-46.

Freour T, Lammers J, Spingart C, Jean M, Barriere P. Time lapse (Embryoscope®) as a
routine technique in the IVF laboratory: a useful tool for better embryo selection?
Gynecol Obstet Fertil. (2012) 40(9): 476-80.

1
2
3
4
5 Grabowski CT, Schroeder RE. A time-lapse photographic study of chick embryos
6 exposed to teratogenic doses of hypoxia. *Exp Hematol.* (1968)19(3): 347-62
7
8

9
10
11 Hampl R, Stěpán M. Variability in timing of human embryos cleavage monitored by time-
12 lapse system in relation to patient age. *Ceska Gynekol.* (2013) 78(6):531-6.
13

14
15 Hardarson T, Löfman C, Coull G, Sjögren A, Hamberger L, Edwards RG. Internalization
16 of cellular fragments in a human embryo: time-lapse recordings. *Reprod Biomed Online.*
17 (2002); 5(1): 36-8.
18
19

20
21
22 Inoué S, Inoué TD. Through-focal and time-lapse stereoscopic imaging of dividing cells
23 and developing embryos in DIC and polarization microscopy. *Biol Bull.* (1994) 187(2):
24 232-3.
25
26
27

28
29
30 Kahraman S, Cetinkaya M, Pirkevi C, Yelke H, Kumtepe Y. Comparison of blastocyst
31 development and cycle outcome in patients with eSET using either conventional or time
32 lapse incubators. A prospective study of good prognosis patients. *J of Reprod and Stem*
33 *Cell Biotech.* (2013) 3:55–61.
34
35
36
37

38
39
40 Kirkegaard K, Hindkjaer JJ, Grondahl ML, Kesmodel US, Ingerslev HJ. A randomized
41 clinical trial comparing embryo culture in a conventional incubator with a time- lapse
42 incubator. *J of Assist Reprod and Genet.* (2012) 29:565–72.
43
44
45
46

47
48 Kirkegaard K. Time-lapse parameters as predictors of blastocyst development and
49 pregnancy outcome in embryos from good prognosis patients: a prospective cohort study.
50 *Hum Reprod.* (2013a) 28(10): 2643–2651
51
52
53

54
55
56 Kirkegaard K, Hindkjaer JJ, Ingerslev HJ. Hatching of in vitro fertilized human embryos
57 is influenced by fertilization method. *Fertil Steril.* (2013b) 100(5):1277-82.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Kovacs P, Matyas S, Forgacs V, Sajgo A, Rarosi F, Pribenszky C. Time-lapse embryo
6 selection for single blastocyst transfer - results of a multicentre, prospective, randomized
7 clinical trial. *ASRM Abstracts* (2013) 100(3): S90.
8
9

10
11
12 Lemmen JG, Agerholm I, Ziebe S. Kinetic markers of human embryo quality using time-
13 lapse recordings of IVF/ICSI-fertilized oocytes. *Reprod Biomed Online*. (2008) 17(3):
14 385-91.
15
16
17

18
19 Liu Y, Chapple V, Roberts P, Matson P. Prevalence, consequence, and significance of
20 reverse cleavage by human embryos viewed with the use of the Embryoscope time-lapse
21 video system. *Fertil Steril*. (2014) 102(5): 1295-1300.
22
23
24

25
26 Lueck J, Aladjem S. Time-lapse study of normal human trophoblast in vitro. *Am J Obstet*
27 *Gynecol*. (1980) 138(3): 288-92.
28
29
30

31
32 Massip A, Mulnard J. Time-lapse cinematographic analysis of hatching of normal and
33 frozen-thawed cow blastocysts. *J Reprod Fertil*. (1980) 58(2): 475-8.
34
35
36

37
38 Milewski R, Kuć P, Kuczyńska A, Stankiewicz B, Łukaszuk K, Kuczyński W. A
39 predictive model for blastocyst formation based on morphokinetic parameters in time-
40 lapse monitoring of embryo development. *J Assist Reprod Genet*. (2015) 32(4): 571-9.
41
42
43

44
45 Milligan MP, Harris SJ, Dennis KJ. The effect of temperature on the velocity of human
46 spermatozoa as measured by time-lapse photography. *Fertil Steril*. (1978) 30(5): 592-4.
47
48

49
50 Milligan MP, Harris S, Dennis KJ. Comparison of sperm velocity in fertile and infertile
51 groups as measured by time-lapse photography. *Fertil Steril*. (1980) 34(5): 509-11.
52
53

54
55 Mio Y, Maeda K. Time-lapse cinematography of dynamic changes occurring during in
56 vitro development of human embryos. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. (2008) 199(6): 660. e1-5.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Nakahara T, Iwase A, Goto M, Harata T, Suzuki M, Ienaga M, Kobayashi H, Takikawa S,
4
5 Manabe S, Kikkawa F, Ando H. Evaluation of the safety of time-lapse observations for
6
7 human embryos. *J Assist Reprod Genet.* (2010) 27(2-3): 93-6.

8
9
10 Niimura S. Time-lapse videomicrographic analyses of contractions in mouse blastocysts.
11
12 *J Reprod Dev.* (2003) 49(6): 413-23.

13
14
15 Park H, Bergh C, Selleskog U, Thurin-Kjellberg A, Lundin K. No benefit of culturing
16
17 embryos in a closed system compared with a conventional incubator in terms of number
18
19 of good quality embryos: results from an RCT. *Hum Reprod.* (2015) 30(2): 268-75.

20
21
22 Rubio I, Galán A, Larreategui Z, Ayerdi F, Bellver J, Herrero J, Meseguer M. Clinical
23
24 validation of embryo culture and selection by morphokinetic analysis: a randomized,
25
26 controlled trial of the EmbryoScope. *Fertil Steril.* (2014) 102(5): 1287-1294.

27
28
29 Rubio I, Kuhlmann R, Agerholm I, Kirk J, Herrero J, Escribá MJ, Bellver J, Meseguer M.
30
31 Limited implantation success of direct-cleaved human zygotes: a time-lapse study. *Fertil*
32
33 *Steril.* (2012) 98(6): 1458-63.

34
35
36 Schatten H, Schatten G. Surface activity at the egg plasma membrane during sperm
37
38 incorporation and its cytochalasin B sensitivity. *Scanning electron microscopy and time-*
39
40 *lapse video microscopy during fertilization of the sea urchin Lytechinus variegatus.* *Dev*
41
42 *Biol.* (1980) 78(2): 435-49.

43
44
45 Siristatidis C, Komitopoulou MA, Makris A, Sialakouma A, Botzaki M, Mastorakos G,
46
47 Salamalekis G, Bettocchi S, Palmer GA. Morphokinetic parameters of early embryo
48
49 development via time lapse monitoring and their effect on embryo selection and ICSI
50
51 outcomes: a prospective cohort study. *J Assist Reprod Genet.* (2015) 32(4): 563-70.

52
53
54 Sundvall L, Kirkegaard K, Ingerslev HJ, Knudsen UB. Unaltered timing of embryo
55
56 development in women with polycystic ovarian syndrome (PCOS): a time-lapse study. *J*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Assist Reprod Genet. (2015) 32(7): 1031-42.

4
5 VerMilyea MD, Tan L, Anthony JT, Conaghan J, Ivani K, Gvakharia M, Boostanfar R,
6
7 Baker VL, Suraj V, Chen AA, Mainigi M, Coutifaris C, Shen S. Computer-automated
8
9 time-lapse analysis results correlate with embryo implantation and clinical pregnancy: a
10
11 blinded, multi-centre study. *Reprod Biomed Online*. (2014) 29(6): 729-36.

12
13
14 Wale PL, Gardner DK. Time-lapse analysis of mouse embryo development in oxygen
15
16 gradients. *Reprod Biomed Online*. (2010) 21(3): 402-10.

17
18
19 Yalçınkaya E, Ergin EG, Çalışkan E, Oztel Z, Ozay A, Özörnek H. Reproducibility of a
20
21 time-lapse embryo selection model based on morphokinetic data in a sequential culture
22
23 media setting. *J Turk Ger Gynecol Assoc*. (2014) 8;15 (3):156-60.

24
25 Yang Z, Zhang J, Salem S, Liu X, Kuang Y, Salem R, Liu J. Selection of competent
26
27 blastocysts for transfer by combining time-lapse monitoring and array CGH testing for
28
29 patients undergoing preimplantation genetic screening: a prospective study with sibling
30
31 oocytes. *BMC Med. Genomics* (2014) 7: 38.

| | Group 1 (Standard) | Group 2 (EmbryoScope®) | p-value |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|
| Single embryo transfers (SET, n) | 300 | 283 | 0.11 |
| Double embryo transfers (DET, n) | 64 | 81 | |
| Cleavage stage transfers (n) | 116 | 101 | 0.20 |
| Blastocyst stage transfers (n) | 248 | 263 | |
| Previous attempts (mean \pm st.dev.) | 1.35 (\pm 0.92) | 1.45 (\pm 0.95) | 0.64 |
| Embryos transferred (n) | 428 | 445 | |

Table 1; baseline data indicating the number of SET and DET, proportion of cleavage and blastocyst transfers, number of previous attempts and the number of embryos transferred in group 1 and group 2. Data were analysed using the Chi-square test.

| | Group 1 (Standard) | Group 2 (EmbryoScope®) | p-value |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| Clinical pregnancy rate (%) | 133/364 (36.5) | 163/364 (44.8) | <0.03* |
| Implantation rate (%) | 138/428 (32.2) | 175/445 (39.3) | <0.03* |
| Live birth rate (%) | 123/364 (33.8) | 157/364 (43.1) | <0.01* |
| Miscarriage rate (%) | 43/176 (24.4) | 38/201 (18.9) | >0.1 |

Table 2; data end point results. CPR, IR, LBR and MR for both standard and EmbryoScope® incubation. All results were considered to be statistically significantly different between the two groups where $p < 0.05$ (Chi-square test).