

# Impact of maternal age on birthweight in frozen embryo transfer cycles: an analysis including 12565 singleton newborns

**Zhexin Ni**

Changhai Hospital

**Shuai Sun**

Changhai Hospital

**Wen Cheng**

Changhai Hospital

**Jin Yu**

Changhai Hospital

**Dongxia Zhai**

Changhai Hospital

**Danying Zhang**

Changhai Hospital

**Zailong Cai**

Navay Medical University

**Yanping Kuang**

Shanghai Ninth People's Hospital

**Chaoqin Yu (✉ [chqyu81@163.com](mailto:chqyu81@163.com))**

Changhai Hospital, Shanghai <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1614-2655>

---

## Research article

**Keywords:** ART / frozen-thawed embryo transfer / vitrification / maternal age / birthweight

**Posted Date:** October 22nd, 2020

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-28453/v2>

**License:**   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

---

# Abstract

**Background:** Previous studies have investigated the effect of maternal age on assisted reproductive technology (ART) success rates. However, little is known about the relationship between maternal age and neonatal birthweight in frozen embryo transfer (FET) cycles. Does maternal age have an impact on singleton birthweight in FET cycles?

**Methods:** This retrospective study was conducted at a tertiary care centre, involving singleton live births born to women undergoing frozen-thawed embryo transfer during the period from January 2010 to December 2017. A total of 12565 women who fulfilled the inclusion criteria were enrolled and were grouped into four groups according to the maternal age: <30, 30–34, 35–39, and  $\geq 40$  years old. Maternal age <30 years old was taken as a reference group. Singleton birthweight was the key outcome measure. A multivariable linear regression analysis was conducted to reveal the relationship between maternal age and neonatal birthweight with controlling for a number of potential confounders.

**Results:** A modest decrease but no significant difference in birthweight and gestational age- and gender-adjusted birthweight (Z-scores) was observed in maternal age over 35 years old as compared with group with <30 years old. The highest proportions of LBW (4.1%), HBW (1.2%), PTB (5.9%) and very PTB (0.9%) were found in group over 40 years old, but no significant difference was observed among four groups. Additionally, the group with 35–39 years old had the highest very LBW (0.6%), while the group with 30–34 years old had the lowest SGA (2.7%). However, multivariate analyses revealed that neonatal outcomes including PTB, LBW and SGA were similar between the different maternal age groups.

**Conclusion:** Grouping with different maternal age was not associated with mean birthweight and Z-scores of singletons resulting from FET.

## Background

In the past decades, many women delay childbearing until after the age of 40. The decline of fertility of elderly women forced them to seek the help of ART. According to statistics by European IVF-monitoring Consortium, the proportion of women over 40 years old pregnant through IVF/ICSI increased in Europe year by year. In the UK, for example, the proportion increased from 12.7% to 26% during 1997 to 2015, and the same trend was observed in other high-income countries [1, 2].

Having a healthy baby is the ultimate goal of ART treatment. Increased risk of adverse neonatal outcomes are believed to appear in *in vitro* fertilization or intracytoplasmic sperm injection (IVF/ICSI) - conceived babies, even singletons, such as preterm birth (PTB), low birthweight (LBW) and small for gestational age (SGA), when compared with peers conceived spontaneously [3]. Maternal age is a frequently-used predictor of PTB, LBW, and perinatal mortality in women who have conceived naturally [4–7], and a number of studies have well revealed the negative correlation between maternal age and neonatal outcomes [8, 9]. Women who have a baby through ART are, on average, older than women who conceive spontaneously, as these techniques are often applied in response to age-related infertility

problems [10]. However, little is known regarding the influence of maternal age on birthweight in vitrified-thawed embryo transfer cycles.

To our knowledge, only few studies have examined the effect of maternal age on birthweight with ART, containing different kinds of treatments without considering enough confounders [11-14]. Further, the published data, except for Lin's study [14], exclusively focused on fresh IVF cycles, without ruling out the possibility of adverse fetal growth caused by a hypoestrogenic milieu. Of note, supraphysiological estrogen levels during ovarian stimulation can create a suboptimal peri-implantation environment for implantation and placentation, thus causing abnormal fetal growth including LBW and SGA [15, 16]. Unlike fresh ovarian stimulation cycles, FET seems to provide a more physiological uterine environment for early fetal development [17]. Thus, the current study aims to explore the effect of maternal age on the birthweight of newborns conceived by embryo transfers during FET cycles.

## Methods

### Study design and population

This retrospective study involved women who had undergone FET during the period from January 2010 to December 2017, which was performed at the Department of Assisted Reproduction of the Ninth People's Hospital of Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine. Women who met the following inclusion criteria were involved in the study: BMI <30 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, the transfer of embryos resulting in a live singleton birth. In all FET cycle, no more than 2 embryos can be transferred. Further, only the first live birth IVF/ICSI cycles were retained for the women who had more than one delivery during the study period. The exclusion criteria were as follows: vanishing twin syndrome, congenital uterine malformations, the presence of submucosal fibroids or polyps and intramural fibroids > 4 cm determined by ultrasound or hysteroscopy. And exclude women with gestational diabetes, pregnancy-induced hypertension and preeclampsia, as these pregnancy-related factors may have bad effect on intrauterine fetal growth. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the hospital and was carried out in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration. Informed consent was not required result from the retrospective nature, and patients' data were used anonymously.

### Laboratory protocols

The procedures of ovarian stimulation, oocyte retrieval and IVF/ICSI have been described in previous studies [18, 19]. In brief, IVF or ICSI was conventionally carried out according to semen parameters and previous fertilization histories. For IVF, oocytes were inseminated in human tubal fluid (HTF; Irvine Scientific) which was supplemented with 10% serum substitute supplement (SSS; Irvine Scientific) and ~300 000 progressively motile spermatozoa. For ICSI, oocytes were transferred into dishes immediately after microinjection with HTF+10% SSS. The assessment of fertilization was performed 16-18 h after insemination/injection. A dish containing preequilibrated culture medium was then prepared for the transfer of zygotes. Before 2013, embryos were cultured in early cleavage medium (Irvine Scientific)

before Day 3 and then in multiblast medium (Irvine Scientific). However, a continuous single culture medium (Irvine Scientific) was introduced after January 2013. All embryos were cultured under mineral oil and grew in the incubator at 37 °C, under 5% O<sub>2</sub> and 6% CO<sub>2</sub> concentration (the balance gas was nitrogen). Except for the change of culture medium types, no change was made for the other laboratory conditions and IVF protocols throughout the study period..

### **Endometrial preparation and vitrification**

Protocols of endometrial preparation for FET have been previously described [20]. Briefly, a natural cycle FET was suitable for women having regular menstrual cycles with the use of hCG for triggering ovulation. Artificial cycles were offered for women with irregular cycles according to the discretion of treating physicians. The procedure of vitrification and thawing were previously described [19]. In short, Cryotop carrier system with dimethylsulfoxide–ethylene glycol–sucrose was used as cryoprotectants for embryo vitrification. Dilution solution in a sequential manner (1 mol/L to 0.5 mol/L to 0 mol/L sucrose) was used for embryos thawing. All embryos were thawed on the day of transfer.

### **Maternal age**

Maternal age at the birth of the child was the key explanatory variable, which was divided into the following categories: <30, 30–34, 35–39, and ≥40 years old. The age group <30 years old was set as the reference category in our analyses.

### **Outcome measures**

The primary neonatal outcomes focused on live singleton birthweight, including Z-scores, birthweight categories and birthweight percentiles. Secondary outcome measures were associated with neonatal outcomes, including gestational age at birth and newborn gender. The definition for live singleton birth was a delivery of a singleton viable infant after the 24th gestational week. Gestational age (GA) in FET cycles was calculated from the day of embryo transfer (Day 17 for cleavage-stage embryo transfer and Day 19 for blastocysts embryo transfer ) [21]. The definitions for PTB and very PTB were live births at <37 and <32 completed gestational weeks, respectively. Z-scores were calculated according to gestational age and newborn gender on birthweight based on the national birthweight reference as previously described [22,23]. A birth weight <2500 g was defined as LBW and <1500 g was defined as very LBW. Birthweight of infant was divided as follows: LBW (<2500 g), very LBW (<1500 g), high birthweight (HBW) (>4500 g) and normal birthweight. Birthweight percentiles were also based on the national birthweight reference [23] and were divided into the following categories as: SGA defined as birthweight <10th percentile, very SGA defined as birthweight <3rd percentile, large for gestational age (LGA) defined as birthweight >90th percentile and very LGA defined as birthweight >97th percentile.

### **Statistical analysis**

One-way analysis of variance was performed for continuous data, while Pearson's chi-squared test or Fisher's exact test were applied for categorical data. A post hoc Bonferroni correction was performed for multiple comparisons. The association between maternal age and neonatal outcomes was detected by multivariable logistic regression analysis, while the independent effect of maternal age on neonatal outcomes was analyzed by a multiple linear regression.

The multivariable analyses included the following confounders: maternal BMI, paternal age, parity, infertility cause and duration, insemination method, the type of endometrial preparation, endometrial thickness, the year of treatment and newborn gender. In multivariable models, continuous covariates (maternal BMI, paternal age, infertility duration, endometrial thickness and the year of treatment) and categorical covariates were indicated in Table 1. Maternal age <30 years old was taken as a reference group in multivariable analyses. For the development of IVF techniques over time [24], a sensitivity analysis was performed on treating the year of treatment as a categorical variable. All analyses were conducted with SPSS Statistics (version 21.0) and  $P < 0.05$  was considered to be statistically significant.

## Results

The final dataset included 12565 women who fulfilled the inclusion criteria, with no loss to follow-up. Baseline demographic and cycle characteristics are presented in Table 1. Comparison between the reference group and other three groups revealed significant difference for maternal BMI, infertility cause, parity, infertility duration, FET cycle rank, fertilization method, the number of embryo transferred, FET endometrial preparation, endometrial thickness and year of treatment. Infertility duration and embryo developmental stage at transfer did not differ significantly among maternal age categories.

Neonatal outcomes stratified by maternal age are listed in Table 2. There was no significant difference on gestational age, mean birthweight and gestation-adjusted Z-scores varied significantly according to maternal age categories. The group with 30-34 years old had the highest birthweight and Z-scores ( $3355.8 \pm 483.3$  g,  $0.38 \pm 1.03$ ). With the increase of maternal age, a modest decrease of birthweight was observed, and group over 40 years old had the lowest birthweight values as  $3321.6 \pm 503.9$  g. Additionally, no significant differences were found between any two groups by Post hoc analysis on birthweight and Z-scores. The highest proportions of LBW (4.1%), HBW (1.2%), PTB (5.9%) and very PTB (0.9%) were found in group over 40 years old, but no difference was observed among four groups. Interestingly, the group with 35-39 years old had the highest very LBW (0.6%), while the group with 30-34 years old had the lowest SGA (2.7%). Furthermore, there was no difference in very LGA, LGA, very SGA, and newborn gender between groups.

In multivariate analyses (Table 3), the neonatal outcomes including PTB, LBW, HBW, SGA and LGA were similar between the different maternal age groups. The odds of PTB and LBW was lower in group over 40 years old as compared with the reference group, not reaching significant difference. Although the analysis of very PTB (<32 weeks), very LBW (<1500 g) were performed, the number of cases in the two

categories was too small to make any meaningful comparisons. In addition, no significant difference were found on birthweight percentiles categories between the reference and other three groups.

Multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to assess the relationship between maternal age and birthweight (Table 4). Even after correction for a number of potential confounders, no significant correlation was found between maternal age and neonatal birthweight. Moreover, maternal BMI ( $P<0.001$ ), parity ( $P<0.001$ ), FET cycle rank ( $P=0.001$ ), number of embryos transferred ( $P=0.034$ ), embryo developmental stage at transfer ( $P<0.001$ ), endometrial thickness (8-11mm,  $P=0.018$ ; >11mm,  $P=0.001$ ), year of treatment ( $P<0.001$ ), gestational age ( $P<0.001$ ) and newborn gender ( $P<0.001$ ) were all independent predictors for birthweight.

## Discussion

Recent years, much attention has been paid to the impact of maternal age on ART success rates, and several studies have revealed that a high maternal age (over 40 years old) has a negative effect on pregnancy outcomes [11, 13]. However, our study showed that no significant association existed between maternal age and singleton birthweight in FET cycles with considering related confounders. Furthermore, linear regression indicated that maternal age was not an independent predictor of singleton birthweight in FET cycles.

Four studies, as we know, have been interested in the potential relationship between maternal age and neonatal birthweight. Wennberg *et al.* investigated maternal age influencing adverse maternal and neonatal outcomes following ART treatment, suggesting that the risk of LBW and very LBW was significantly higher in ART than in spontaneous conception (SC) singletons in all ages up to maternal age 40 years (LBW: aORs 1.44-2.35; VLBW: aORs 1.67-3.44). Additionally, when the analysis was restricted to maternal age >35 years, an increased risk of LBW existed for SC pregnancies, but not for ART pregnancies [11]. Due to medical, educational and socioeconomic reasons, women who conceive through ART with >35 years old may pay more attention to their state of health and seek medical assistance more often than SC women, which could result in increased detection of complications and decreased risk of LBW. Secondly, Moaddab *et al.* found that maternal age did not predict newborns' birthweight in pregnancies with maternal age grouping as <40, 40-44, 45-49,  $\geq 50$  years old [12]. However, maternal age group with <40 years old per se have an inadequate analysis on birthweight and miss important information. There may be some interesting findings among groups at ages <25, 26-30, 31-34, 35-40 years old and the increased risk of LBW may appear at age of 35 years old, but this study seemed to miss these potential information. Many studies have set up more detailed groups with maternal age under 40 years old to assess the influence of maternal age on neonatal outcomes and gained the more credible results [13, 14]. Another study reported that the risk of LBW was increased only at maternal ages over 40 years old (6 percentage points, 95% CI: 0.2, 12) with medically assisted reproduction (MAR) compared to the risk of LBW at ages 30–34 years old [13]. However, a limited number of confounders were included in the study, and the effect of different kinds of MAR treatments could not be reliably distinguished, which included less invasive treatments such as ovulation induction only that were less strongly associated

with adverse birth outcomes [25]. A recent study based on 4,958 infertile women using a freeze-all strategy observed that maternal age grouping was not related with increased risks of LBW, very LBW, preterm LBW and macrosomia [14]. Yet only 1450 singleton live birth was involved for the analysis of LBW, and the 44–50 year old group of singleton live births was very small (n=9), which may limit the power of statistical analyses between groups.

Our study aimed to improve on the flaws of abovementioned studies, and focused on the exact role of maternal age in the singleton birthweight after FET cycles. The current study based on 12565 singleton newborns born after FET cycles, demonstrated that maternal age itself had no impact on singleton birthweight and neonatal outcomes including PTB, LBW and SGA were similar between the different maternal age groups. Due to so many confounding factors, direct comparability across different age group has very limited clinical significance in table 2. Because of strict exclusion criteria, generality of this finding may be, to some extent, restricted. The reason why no significant correlation existed between maternal age and birthweight in our study is likely complex. It is generally known that with aging comes a reduction in ovarian function, resulting in the decrease of ovarian response to ovulation promoting drugs and the low number of oocytes retrieved [26]. Additionally, the decreased quality of oocytes [27, 28], abnormal endometrial function and degeneration of multiple organs function will appear in women with advanced maternal age [22, 29]. All the above mentioned factors would affect the development of embryo and cause adverse effects on the newborn, leading to LBW. However, with the popularization of education, many women tend to choose late marriage and late childbearing and enjoy a simple single life before marriage. In this kind of life, they are less stressed and have more opportunities to get in touch with life freedom than the women who are married and have children. Meanwhile, these knowledge women tend to choose a healthy and regular life, and possess good habits, physical quality and economic conditions, thus having a better choice on ART treatment [11]. Aging leads to an irreversible decline in fertility, forcing older women to pay more attention on pregnancy and to seek medical help more actively than the young. In addition, the spouse's income also increase with age to guarantee maternity. Most importantly, the development of ART has well fulfilled the reproductive needs of women with different ages to improve the quality of newborns.

In this study, results from multiple linear regression analysis indicated that maternal BMI, embryo developmental stage at transfer, parity, number of embryos transferred, endometrial thickness, year of treatment, gestational age and newborn gender, were the independent predictors for neonatal birthweight, which was consistent with previous results [22, 30, 31]. Z-scores were calculated and compared across the four groups in order to reduce bias caused by newborn gender and gestational age, and no significant difference on Z-scores was found among different maternal age groups. In addition, there were significant differences between the maternal age groups in baseline and cycle characteristics including infertility duration, infertility cause and fertilization method. However, these confounders had no impact on neonatal birthweight based on the linear regression model.

There are limitations in our study. The biggest one is its retrospective design, so we strictly checked the database with strict criteria. Secondly, due to personal privacy restrictions, we were unable to obtain the

education and economic background of patients. Thirdly, there are many confounding factors strongly associated with birthweight in linear regression analysis, data bias during the experimental design cannot be all corrected by regression equations. Further, embryo quality and paternal BMI were important factor that may affect neonatal outcomes, yet these data were missed in this manuscript. However, The large number of singleton live births from a single centre can assure the practice consistency, which is the main strength of the current study. Additionally, aside from the change of culture medium types, all other laboratory conditions and protocols remained invariant throughout the study period. Further, maternal age was recorded according to the identification card, and endometrial thickness was measured by the same trained sonographers, reducing the recorder variability. Importantly, a number of potential confounders were included in our study, which may minimize their impact on the findings.

## **Conclusions**

This study expands the current knowledge about association between maternal age and neonatal outcomes, especially indicated that maternal age was not associated with mean birthweight and Z-scores. This important finding should be adequately applied for women over 40 years old prior to FET and strengthen their confidence. A large prospective study, of course, are needed to verify our findings in future.

## **Declarations**

### **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Ninth People's Hospital of Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine. Trial registration number was not applicable.

### **Consent for publication**

Not applicable.

### **Availability of data and materials**

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the Ninth People's Hospital of Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine, but restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under guidelines for the current study, and so are not publicly available.

### **Competing Interest**

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

### **Funding**

the National Natural Science Foundation of China (81774352, 81573755, 81503604, 81703874).

## Authors' contributions

C.Q.Y and Y.P.K. conceived and designed this study. Z.X.N. and S.S. contributed to data acquisition, analysis and interpretation and drafted the manuscript. W.C., J.Y., D.Z, D.Y.Z., and Z.L.C. were responsible for the collection of data. All authors interpreted the data.

## Acknowledgements

The authors thank the nurses and laboratory staff of the Department of Assisted Reproduction for their contribution to this work. Moreover, the authors thank the infertile couples who participated in this study.

## Abbreviations

**ART** assisted reproductive technology

**FET** frozen embryo transfer

**BMI** body mass index

**IVF** in vitro fertilization

**ICSI** intracytoplasmic sperm injection

**PTB** preterm birth

**LBW** low birthweight

**SGA** small for gestational age

**GA** gestational age

**HBW** high birthweight

**LGA** large for gestational age

**OR** odds ratios

**CI** confidence interval

**SC** spontaneous conception

**MAR** medically assisted reproduction

## References

1. Nygren KG, Andersen AN: Assisted reproductive technology in Europe, 1997. Results generated from European registers by ESHRE. European IVF-Monitoring Programme (EIM), for the European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology (ESHRE). *Human reproduction* (Oxford, England) 2001, 16(2):384-391.
2. De Geyter C, Calhaz-Jorge C, Kupka MS, Wyns C, Mocanu E, Motrenko T, Scaravelli G, Smeenk J, Vidakovic S, Goossens V: ART in Europe, 2015: results generated from European registries by ESHRE. 2020, 2020(1):hoz038.
3. Berntsen S, Soderstrom-Anttila V, Wennerholm UB, Laivuori H, Loft A, Oldereid NB, Romundstad LB, Bergh C, Pinborg A: The health of children conceived by ART: 'the chicken or the egg?'. *Human reproduction update* 2019, 25(2):137-158.
4. Kawwass JF, Badell ML: Maternal and Fetal Risk Associated With Assisted Reproductive Technology. *Obstetrics and gynecology* 2018, 132(3):763-772.
5. Budak A, Pinheiro RL, Areia AL, Mota Pinto A, Donato H: Advanced Maternal Age: Adverse Outcomes of Pregnancy, A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of obstetrics and gynaecology : the journal of the Institute of Obstetrics and Gynaecology* 2019, 32(3):219-226.
6. Leader J, Bajwa A, Lanes A, Hua X, Rennicks White R, Rybak N, Walker M: The Effect of Very Advanced Maternal Age on Maternal and Neonatal Outcomes: A Systematic Review. *Journal of obstetrics and gynaecology Canada : JOGC = Journal d'obstetrique et gynecologie du Canada : JOGC* 2018, 40(9):1208-1218.
7. Lean SC, Derricott H, Jones RL, Heazell AEP: Advanced maternal age and adverse pregnancy outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS one* 2017, 12(10):e0186287.
8. Wu Y, Chen Y, Shen M, Guo Y, Wen SW, Lanes A, White RR, Adanlawo A, Walker M, Hua X: Adverse maternal and neonatal outcomes among singleton pregnancies in women of very advanced maternal age: a retrospective cohort study. *BMC pregnancy and childbirth* 2019, 19(1):3.
9. Koshida S, Arima H, Fujii T, Ito Y, Murakami T, Takahashi K: Impact of advanced maternal age on adverse infant outcomes: A Japanese population-based study. *European journal of obstetrics, gynecology, and reproductive biology* 2019, 242:178-181.
10. Luke B, Brown MB: Elevated risks of pregnancy complications and adverse outcomes with increasing maternal age. *Human reproduction* (Oxford, England) 2007, 22(5):1264-1272.
11. Wennberg AL, Opdahl S, Bergh C, Aaris Henningsen AK, Gissler M, Romundstad LB, Pinborg A, Tiitinen A, Skjaerven R, Wennerholm UB: Effect of maternal age on maternal and neonatal outcomes after assisted reproductive technology. *Fertility and sterility* 2016, 106(5):1142-1149.e1114.
12. Moaddab A, Chervenak FA, McCullough LB, Sangi-Haghpeykar H, Shamshirsaz AA, Schutt A, Arian SE, Fox KA, Dildy GA, Shamshirsaz AA: Effect of advanced maternal age on maternal and neonatal outcomes in assisted reproductive technology pregnancies. *European journal of obstetrics, gynecology, and reproductive biology* 2017, 216:178-183.
13. Barbuscia A, Martikainen P, Myrskylä M, Remes H, Somigliana E, Klemetti R, Goisis A: Maternal age and risk of low birth weight and premature birth in children conceived through medically assisted

- reproduction. Evidence from Finnish population registers. *Human reproduction (Oxford, England)* 2020, 35(1):212-220.
14. Lin J, Huang J, Zhu Q, Kuang Y, Cai R, Wang Y: Effect of Maternal Age on Pregnancy or Neonatal Outcomes Among 4,958 Infertile Women Using a Freeze-All Strategy. *Frontiers in medicine* 2019, 6:316.
  15. Pereira N, Elias RT, Christos PJ, Petrini AC, Hancock K, Lekovich JP, Rosenwaks Z: Supraphysiologic estradiol is an independent predictor of low birth weight in full-term singletons born after fresh embryo transfer. *Human reproduction (Oxford, England)* 2017, 32(7):1410-1417.
  16. Imudia AN, Awonuga AO, Doyle JO, Kaimal AJ, Wright DL, Toth TL, Styer AK: Peak serum estradiol level during controlled ovarian hyperstimulation is associated with increased risk of small for gestational age and preeclampsia in singleton pregnancies after in vitro fertilization. *Fertility and sterility* 2012, 97(6):1374-1379.
  17. Jarvela IY, Pelkonen S, Uimari O, Makikallio K, Puukka K, Ruukonen A, Tekay A, Martikainen H: Controlled ovarian hyperstimulation leads to high progesterone and estradiol levels during early pregnancy. *Human reproduction (Oxford, England)* 2014, 29(11):2393-2401.
  18. Kuang Y, Chen Q, Hong Q, Lyu Q, Ai A, Fu Y, Shoham Z: Double stimulations during the follicular and luteal phases of poor responders in IVF/ICSI programmes (Shanghai protocol). *Reproductive biomedicine online* 2014, 29(6):684-691.
  19. Kuang Y, Chen Q, Fu Y, Wang Y, Hong Q, Lyu Q, Ai A, Shoham Z: Medroxyprogesterone acetate is an effective oral alternative for preventing premature luteinizing hormone surges in women undergoing controlled ovarian hyperstimulation for in vitro fertilization. *Fertility and sterility* 2015, 104(1):62-70.e63.
  20. Du T, Chen H, Fu R, Chen Q, Wang Y, Mol BW, Kuang Y, Lyu Q: Comparison of ectopic pregnancy risk among transfers of embryos vitrified on day 3, day 5, and day 6. *Fertility and sterility* 2017, 108(1):108-116.e101.
  21. Nelissen EC, Van Montfoort AP, Coonen E, Derhaag JG, Geraedts JP, Smits LJ, Land JA, Evers JL, Dumoulin JC: Further evidence that culture media affect perinatal outcome: findings after transfer of fresh and cryopreserved embryos. *Human reproduction (Oxford, England)* 2012, 27(7):1966-1976.
  22. Zhang J, Liu H, Mao X, Chen Q, Si J, Fan Y, Xiao Y, Wang Y, Kuang Y: Effect of endometrial thickness on birthweight in frozen embryo transfer cycles: an analysis including 6181 singleton newborns. *Human reproduction (Oxford, England)* 2019, 34(9):1707-1715.
  23. Dai L, Deng C, Li Y, Zhu J, Mu Y, Deng Y, Mao M, Wang Y, Li Q, Ma S et al: Birth weight reference percentiles for Chinese. *PloS one* 2014, 9(8):e104779.
  24. Castillo CM, Horne G, Fitzgerald CT, Johnstone ED, Brison DR, Roberts SA: The impact of IVF on birthweight from 1991 to 2015: a cross-sectional study. *Human reproduction (Oxford, England)* 2019, 34(5):920-931.
  25. De Geyter C, Calhaz-Jorge C, Kupka MS, Wyns C, Mocanu E, Motrenko T, Scaravelli G, Smeenk J, Vidakovic S, Goossens V: ART in Europe, 2014: results generated from European registries by ESHRE:

- The European IVF-monitoring Consortium (EIM) for the European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology (ESHRE). *Human reproduction* (Oxford, England) 2018, 33(9):1586-1601.
26. Yang X, Zhang J, Wu J, Huang J, Chen Q, Lu X, Lyu Q, Kuang Y, Wang Y: Association between the number of oocytes retrieved and neonatal outcomes after freeze-all IVF cycles. *Human reproduction* (Oxford, England) 2019, 34(10):1937-1947.
  27. Pacella L, Zander-Fox DL, Armstrong DT, Lane M: Women with reduced ovarian reserve or advanced maternal age have an altered follicular environment. *Fertility and sterility* 2012, 98(4):986-994.e981-982.
  28. Pella R, Suarez-Cunza S, Orihuela P, Escudero F, Perez Y, Garcia M, Zorrilla I, Berrio P, Romero S: Oxidative balance in follicular fluid of ART patients of advanced maternal age and blastocyst formation. *JBRA assisted reproduction* 2020.
  29. Gibson DA, Simitsidellis I, Kelepouri O, Critchley HOD, Saunders PTK: Dehydroepiandrosterone enhances decidualization in women of advanced reproductive age. *Fertility and sterility* 2018, 109(4):728-734.e722.
  30. Zhang J, Wang Y, Liu H, Mao X, Chen Q, Fan Y, Xiao Y, Kuang Y: Effect of in vitro culture period on birth weight after vitrified-warmed transfer cycles: analysis of 4,201 singleton newborns. *Fertility and sterility* 2019, 111(1):97-104.
  31. J Z, H L, X M, Q C, Y F, Y X, Y W, Y K: Effect of body mass index on pregnancy outcomes in a freeze-all policy: an analysis of 22,043 first autologous frozen-thawed embryo transfer cycles in China. *BMC medicine* 2019, 17(1):114.

## Tables

**Table 1 Patient treatment and demographic characteristics according to maternal age.**

	<30 y n=3586	30-34 y n=5461	35-39 y n=2861	≥40 y n=657	P value <sup>a</sup>	P value <sup>b</sup>	P value <sup>c</sup>
<b>Maternal Age (years)</b>	27.29±1.63	31.93±1.40	36.47±1.34	41.31±1.53	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
<b>Maternal BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>					<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
<18.5	534 (14.9)	615 (11.3)	270 (9.4)	37 (5.6)			
18.5-22.9	2218 (61.9)	3448 (63.1)	1791 (62.6)	414 (63.0)			
23-27.4	729 (20.3)	1254 (23.0)	719 (25.1)	194 (29.5)			
≥27.5	105 (2.9)	144 (2.6)	81 (2.8)	12 (1.8)			
<b>Paternal Age (years)</b>	29.69±3.53	33.74±3.68	38.03±4.29	42.62±5.15	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
<b>Infertility cause</b>					<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Tubal factors	2126 (59.3)	3226 (59.1)	1788 (62.5)	321 (48.9)			
PCOS	391 (10.9)	425 (7.8)	97 (3.4)	12 (1.8)			
Endometriosis	255 (7.1)	466 (8.5)	280 (9.8)	57 (8.7)			
Diminished ovarian reserve.	61 (1.7)	121 (2.2)	117 (4.1)	142 (21.6)			
Uterine factors	52 (1.5)	112 (2.1)	65 (2.3)	17 (2.6)			
Male	513 (14.3)	675 (12.4)	294 (10.3)	67 (10.2)			
Unexplained	188 (5.2)	436 (8.0)	220 (7.7)	41 (6.2)			
<b>Parity</b>					<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
0	3489 (97.3)	5159 (94.5)	2478 (86.6)	471 (71.7)			
>0	97 (2.7)	302 (5.5)	383 (13.4)	186 (28.3)			
<b>Infertility duration (years)</b>	2.53±1.82	3.29±2.42	4.11±3.41	4.70±4.55	0.058	0.067	0.11
<b>FET cycle rank</b>					<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
First	2332 (65.0)	3112 (57.0)	1444 (50.5)	298 (45.4)			
High order	1254 (35.0)	2349 (43.0)	1417 (49.5)	359 (54.6)			
<b>Fertilization method</b>					0.118	<0.001	<0.001
IVF	2210 (61.6)	3425 (62.7)	1871 (65.4)	414 (63.0)			
ICSI	990 (27.6)	1407 (25.8)	762 (26.6)	225 (34.2)			
IVF+ICSI	386 (10.8)	629 (11.5)	228 (8.0)	18 (2.7)			
<b>Number of embryos transferred</b>					0.002	<0.001	<0.001
1	555 (15.5)	985 (18.0)	569 (19.9)	145 (22.1)			
≥2	3031 (84.5)	4476 (82.0)	2292 (80.1)	512 (77.9)			
<b>Embryo developmental stage at transfer</b>					0.815	0.607	0.200
Day 3	3010 (83.9)	4573 (83.7)	2415 (84.4)	565 (86.0)			
Day 5/6	576 (16.1)	888 (16.3)	446 (15.6)	92 (14.0)			
<b>FET endometrial preparation</b>					<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Natural cycle	737 (20.6)	1338 (24.5)	750 (26.2)	176 (26.8)			
Artificial cycle	2849 (79.4)	4123 (75.5)	2111 (73.8)	481 (73.2)			
<b>Endometrial thickness (mm)</b>					0.040	<0.001	<0.001
<8	232 (6.5)	399 (7.3)	270 (9.4)	83 (12.6)			

8-11	1958 (54.6)	3067 (56.2)	1610 (56.3)	369 (56.2)			
>11	1396 (38.9)	1995 (36.5)	981 (34.3)	205 (31.2)			
<b>Year of treatment</b>					0.380	0.001	<0.001
2010-2012	276 (7.7)	465 (8.5)	218 (7.6)	33 (5.0)			
2013-2014	1693 (47.2)	2561 (46.9)	1219 (42.6)	250 (38.1)			
2015-2017	1617 (45.1)	2435 (44.6)	1424 (49.8)	375 (56.9)			

a30-34 years old vs. <30 years old

b35-39 years old vs. <30 years old

c≥40 years old vs. <30 years old

Data are presented as mean ± SD for continuous variables and n (%) for dichotomous variables

**Table 2 Neonatal outcomes of live born singletons by maternal age.**

	<30 y n=3586	30-34 y n=5461	35-39 y n=2861	≥40 y n=657	P value <sup>a</sup>	P value <sup>b</sup>	P value <sup>c</sup>
<b>Gestational age</b>					0.779	0.324	0.487
≥37 weeks	3367 (93.9)	5117 (93.7)	2694 (94.2)	612 (93.2)			
preterm birth (<37 weeks)	198 (5.5)	316 (5.8)	143 (5.0)	39 (5.9)			
very preterm birth (<32 weeks)	21 (0.6)	28 (0.5)	24 (0.8)	6 (0.9)			
<b>Birthweight (g)</b>	3352.2±485.7	3355.8±483.3	3334.2±493.6	3321.6±503.9	0.976	0.336	0.335
<b>Z-scores</b>	0.36±1.04	0.38±1.03	0.35±1.06	0.38±1.10	0.754	0.984	0.939
<b>Birthweight categories</b>					0.761	0.464	0.240
Very low birthweight (<1500 g)	12 (0.3)	19 (0.3)	17 (0.6)	2 (0.3)			
Low birthweight (<2500 g)	107 (3.0)	181 (3.3)	90 (3.1)	27 (4.1)			
High birthweight (>4500 g)	27 (0.8)	48 (0.9)	22 (0.8)	8 (1.2)			
<b>Birthweight percentiles</b>					0.186	0.498	0.937
Very small for gestational age (<3rd percentile)	48 (1.3)	83 (1.5)	35 (1.2)	9 (1.4)			
Small for gestational age (<10th percentile)	126 (3.5)	150 (2.7)	100 (3.5)	20 (3.0)			
Large for gestational age (>90th percentile)	369 (10.3)	583 (10.7)	326 (11.4)	74 (11.3)			
Very large of gestational age (>97th percentile)	258 (7.2)	354 (6.5)	183 (6.4)	46 (7.0)			
<b>Newborn gender</b>					0.667	0.564	0.393
Female	1881 (52.5)	2839 (52.0)	1522 (53.2)	349 (53.1)			
Male	1705 (47.5)	2622 (48.0)	1339 (46.8)	308 (46.9)			

a30-34 years old vs. <30 years old

b35-39 years old vs. <30 years old

c≥40 years old vs. <30 years old

Data are presented as mean ± SD for continuous variables and n (%) for dichotomous variables

**Table 3 Odds Ratios for gestational age and birth weights by maternal age.**

	<30 y n=3586	30-34 y n=5461	35-39 y n=2861	≥40 y n=657
<b>Gestational age between &lt; 37 weeks</b>				
Crude OR	Reference	0.952 (0.793-1.143)	1.108 (0.888-1.382)	0.923 (0.648-1.315)
Adjusted OR	Reference	0.951 (0.749-1.209)	1.096 (0.779-1.542)	0.947 (0.586-1.530)
<b>Gestational age &lt; 32 weeks</b>				
Crude OR	Reference	1.140 (0.646-2.010)	0.700 (0.389-1.260)	0.636 (0.256-1.583)
Adjusted OR	Reference	1.015 (0.476-2.163)	0.825 (0.301-2.257)	0.741 (0.206-2.668)
<b>Very low birthweight (&lt;1500 g)</b>				
Crude OR	Reference	0.957 (0.464-1.974)	0.561 (0.267-1.176)	1.081 (0.241-4.844)
Adjusted OR	Reference	1.132 (0.470-2.728)	0.701 (0.222-2.217)	1.211 (0.203-7.228)
<b>Low birthweight (&lt;2500 g)</b>				
Crude OR	Reference	0.896 (0.703-1.142)	0.944 (0.710-1.255)	0.715 (0.465-1.100)
Adjusted OR	Reference	0.959 (0.703,1.309)	1.029 (0.662-1.599)	0.787 (0.435-1.423)
<b>High birthweight (&gt;4500 g)</b>				
Crude OR	Reference	0.836 (0.521-1.339)	0.975 (0.554-1.716)	0.610 (0.276-1.350)
Adjusted OR	Reference	0.961 (0.537-1.716)	0.965 (0.413-2.256)	0.846 (0.256-2.791)
<b>Very small for gestational age (&lt;3rd percentile)</b>				
Crude OR	Reference	0.891 (0.623-1.275)	1.092 (0.704-1.694)	0.973 (0.474-1.995)
Adjusted OR	Reference	0.890 (0.571-1.388)	0.824 (0.432-1.570)	0.653 (0.253-1.685)
<b>Small for gestational age (&lt;10th percentile)</b>				
Crude OR	Reference	1.294 (1.016-1.648)	1.003 (0.767-1.312)	1.149 (0.710-1.859)
Adjusted OR	Reference	1.217 (0.877-1.260)	1.015 (0.655-1.573)	1.066 (0.564-2.017)
<b>Large for gestational age (&gt;90th percentile)</b>				
Crude OR	Reference	0.975 (0.849-1.120)	0.901 (0.769-1.056)	0.910 (0.696-1.188)
Adjusted OR	Reference	1.051 (0.877-1.260)	1.026 (0.799-1.316)	1.034 (0.721-1.483)
<b>Very large of gestational age (&gt;97th percentile)</b>				
Crude OR	Reference	1.123 (0.950-1.328)	1.122 (0.921-1.367)	1.023 (0.737-1.420)
Adjusted OR	Reference	1.071 (0.856-1.339)	1.052 (0.769-1.439)	0.983 (0.623-1.549)

Data are Odds Ratios (OR) with 95% confidence interval (CI). Analyses were adjusted for maternal BMI, paternal age, infertility cause, parity, infertility duration, FET cycle rank, infertility cause, fertilization method, number of embryos transferred, embryo developmental stage at transfer, the type of endometrial preparation, endometrial thickness, year of treatment, and newborn sex.

**Table 4 Results of multiple regression analysis of singleton birthweight.**

	Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	t	P value
	B	Std. error	Beta		
(Constant)	-3532.855	99.754		-35.416	<0.001
<b>Maternal age</b>					
<30 (reference)					
30-34	-4.313	9.513	-0.004	-0.453	0.650
35-39	-14.879	13.020	-0.013	-1.143	0.253
≥40	-13.387	21.706	-0.006	-0.617	0.537
<b>Maternal BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>					
<18.5	-109.739	11.516	-0.072	-9.530	<0.001
18.5-22.9 (reference)					
23-27.4	86.312	8.825	0.075	9.781	<0.001
≥27.5	157.905	22.417	0.053	7.044	<0.001
<b>Paternal age</b>	1.556	0.932	0.017	1.669	0.095
<b>Parity, high order (versus 0)</b>	62.961	13.955	0.034	4.512	<0.001
<b>Infertility duration (years)</b>	1.282	1.364	0.007	0.940	0.347
<b>FET cycle rank, High order (versus First)</b>	26.116	7.516	0.027	3.474	0.001
<b>Infertility cause</b>					
Tubal factors (reference)					
PCOS	9.216	14.497	0.005	0.636	0.525
Endometriosis	2.194	13.273	0.001	0.165	0.869
Diminished ovarian reserve.	-10.895	20.651	-0.004	-0.528	0.598
Uterine factors	-10.179	26.186	-0.003	-0.389	0.697
Male	-14.409	12.591	-0.010	-1.144	0.252
Unexplained	-7.991	14.833	-0.004	-0.539	0.590
<b>Fertilization method</b>					
IVF (reference)					
ICSI	-18.255	9.320	-0.017	-1.959	0.050
VF+ICSI	4.260	12.769	0.003	0.334	0.739
<b>Number of embryos transferred, ≥2 (versus 1)</b>	22.384	10.540	0.018	2.124	0.034
<b>Embryo developmental stage at transfer, Day 5/6 (versus Day 3)</b>	71.030	11.139	0.053	6.377	<0.001
<b>FET endometrial preparation, Artificial cycle (versus Natural cycle)</b>	-15.143	8.558	-0.013	-1.769	0.077
<b>Endometrial thickness (mm)</b>					
<8 (reference)					
8-11	32.475	13.757	0.033	2.361	0.018
>11	45.989	14.243	0.045	3.229	0.001
<b>Year of treatment</b>					
2010-2012 (reference)					
2013-2015	-61.556	13.940	-0.063	-4.416	<0.001
2016-2017	-77.498	14.127	-0.079	-5.486	<0.001
<b>Gestational age (week)</b>	178.687	2.429	0.548	73.556	<0.001
<b>Newborn gender, female (versus male)</b>	-137.516	7.200	-0.141	-19.098	<0.001