



Comparison of *in vitro* maturation and *in vitro* fertilization for polycystic ovary syndrome patients—reply letter

Yalan Xu^{1,2,3,4#}, Jie Qiao^{1,2,3,4#}

¹Centre for Reproductive Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Peking University Third Hospital, Beijing, China; ²National Clinical Research Centre for Obstetrics and Gynecology, Beijing, China; ³Key Laboratory of Assisted Reproduction (Peking University), Ministry of Education, Beijing, China; ⁴Beijing Key Laboratory of Reproductive Endocrinology and Assisted Reproductive Technology, Beijing, China

#These authors contributed equally to this work.

Correspondence to: Jie Qiao. Centre for Reproductive Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Peking University Third Hospital, Beijing 100191, China; National Clinical Research Centre for Obstetrics and Gynecology, Beijing 100191, China; Key Laboratory of Assisted Reproduction (Peking University), Ministry of Education, Beijing 100191, China; Beijing Key Laboratory of Reproductive Endocrinology and Assisted Reproductive Technology, Beijing 100191, China. Email: jie.qiao@263.net.

Response to: Wu J, Ge L, Chen Q. Comment on “Comparison of *in vitro* maturation and *in vitro* fertilization for polycystic ovary syndrome patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis”. *Ann Transl Med* 2022;10:530.

Submitted Mar 03, 2022. Accepted for publication Apr 08, 2022.

doi: 10.21037/atm-2022-7

View this article at: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/atm-2022-7>

We thank for comments from Wu *et al.* (1) on our research (2) comparison between *in vitro* maturation (IVM) and *in vitro* fertilization (IVF) for polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS).

Reviewer Wu *et al.* (1) said that we demonstrated that IVM might be a suitable option for PCOS in terms of cost and successful pregnancy rate. Whereas, the study had no results about cost comparison between IVM and IVF. We found this was a careless conclusion, and we suggest to correct discussion part of abstract to “Our study suggests that IVM had similar clinical effects compared to IVF in patients with PCOS”.

Secondly, they said we performed the sensitivity analysis only by removing Shavit *et al.*'s 2014 study (3) and only reported I^2 value. Actually, we conducted sensitivity analysis by removing all the included articles one by one and only reported the biggest change one. According to his advice, we can change the sensitivity analysis to “We performed a sensitivity analysis by removing Shavit *et al.*'s 2014 study (3), and I^2 changed from 48% to 39% and RR changed from 0.93 to 0.95, which indicated that the results of included articles were robust”.

Thirdly, they indicated that we made a mistake of live birth rate heterogeneity analysis. We do appreciate the advice, and we want to correct the heterogeneity analysis

of live birth rate into “For live birth rate, seven studies with 1,234 patients were selected. Meta-analysis showed that, compared with the IVM group, the IVF group had a higher live birth rate (RR =0.82, 95% CI: 0.70–0.94, P=0.007, fixed-effects model), with insignificant heterogeneity ($I^2=26\%$).”

Acknowledgments

Funding: This study was supported by CAMS Innovation Fund for Medical Sciences (No. 2019-I2M-5-001), the National Science Foundation of China (No. 81730038) and the Beijing Municipal Science & Technology Commission (No. Z191100006619073).

Footnote

Provenance and Peer Review: This article was commissioned by the editorial office, *Annals of Translational Medicine*. The article did not undergo external peer review.

Conflicts of Interest: Both authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form (available at <https://atm.amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/atm-2022-7/coif>). The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Ethical Statement: The authors are accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Open Access Statement: This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits the non-commercial replication and distribution of the article with the strict proviso that no changes or edits are made and the original work is properly cited (including links to both the formal publication through the relevant DOI and the license). See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

Cite this article as: Xu Y, Qiao J. Comparison of *in vitro* maturation and *in vitro* fertilization for polycystic ovary syndrome patients—reply letter. *Ann Transl Med* 2022;10(9):531. doi: 10.21037/atm-2022-7

References

1. Wu J, Ge L, Chen Q. Comment on “Comparison of in vitro maturation and in vitro fertilization for polycystic ovary syndrome patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis”. *Ann Transl Med* 2022. doi: 10.21037/atm-22-323.
2. Xu Y, Qiao J. Comparison of in vitro maturation and in vitro fertilization for polycystic ovary syndrome patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Transl Med* 2021;9:1235.
3. Shavit T, Ellenbogen A, Michaeli M, et al. In-vitro maturation of oocytes vs in-vitro fertilization with a gonadotropin-releasing hormone antagonist for women with polycystic ovarian syndrome: can superiority be defined? *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol* 2014;179:46-50.