

Reproductive Medicine in African Americans' Disparities in Health

F. Butts Samantha

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Division of Reproductive Endocrinology and Infertility, Pennsylvania State Hershey Medical Center, Hershey, Pennsylvania

Corresponding author:

F. Butts Samantha,
Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Division of Reproductive Endocrinology and Infertility, Pennsylvania State Hershey Medical Center, Hershey, Pennsylvania

Received Date: 01 April 2024

Accepted Date: 16 April 2024

Published Date: 22 April 2024

Citation:

F. Butts Samantha. Reproductive medicine in African Americans' disparities in health. *New American Journal of Medicine* 2024

1. Abstract:

More than 20 years ago, the first publication establishing a relationship between the prevalence of infertility among African Americans and the results of fertility treatments was published. This paper brought attention to the disparities in the experiences, diagnoses, and treatments of infertility among African Americans. Numerous more studies have examined African American race and its correlation with various aspects of the reproductive spectrum since that initial publication; these differences have persisted throughout time. This review aims to give a broad overview of the development of parts of the study with an emphasis on the results of infertility treatments and access constraints. This paper will examine the challenges to reproductive health equality posed by system-based practice difficulties that interact with timely fertility evaluation and treatment. In 2021, *Fertil Steril* 116:287–91.

2. Introduction:

Less than 25% of infertile people in the US are thought to have access to the resources needed to meet their treatment needs (1). There are significant obstacles to reproductive medicine equity, as seen by the numerous barriers to care that have been reported. These include, but are not limited to, geographic location, socioeconomic status, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, questioning, queer status, and ethnicity. Reproductive disparity research has also focused on the relationship between African American race and fertility outcomes for more than 20

years. The American Society for Reproductive Medicine (ASRM) has designated reducing inequities in access to and results from reproductive care a strategic objective in response to this rising recognition. This review's main objectives are to summarise some of the research on the causes of racial differences in infertility and to talk about training methods that support systemic changes in the quality of reproductive healthcare received by African Americans.

3. Results of African American and Immunity Treatment:

Published data points to a correlation between African American ethnicity and higher rates of infertility, lower use of infertility treatment services, and lower expectations that those services—particularly in vitro fertilisation [IVF]—will be successful in treating African American couples' infertility (2–10). Nonetheless, the body of research on the racial makeup of African Americans and fertility is inconsistent in terms of methodological approaches as well as conclusions. While numerous extensive registry-based studies have consistently shown that African American White some research from particular clinics have found that race is associated with a lower live birth rate following fresh nondonor IVF, other studies have not reached this similar conclusion [11–13]. Certain aspects of the published literature have been the target of methodological criticisms. On the one hand, the studies based on IVF registries have a large enough sample size to examine relationships with statistical power while taking multiple factors' confounding into consideration. However, there is a risk of misclassification bias and challenges to the validity of some study findings due to the incomplete and inconsistent characterisation of race across clinics [2, 3, 5, 14]. In assessing African American race and fresh nondonor IVF cycle outcomes from the Society for Assisted Reproductive Technology Clinical Outcomes Reporting System database, Seifer et al. (2–4) addressed this limitation by limiting the analysis to those clinics in which race data was 95% complete or better. A persistent treatment gap between African American and White patients was documented in three studies that used the Society for Assisted Reproductive Technology Clinical Outcomes Reporting System database to evaluate fresh nondonor IVF outcomes at three different time points—1999–2000, 2004–2006, and 2015–2016. African Americans were 30 percent less likely than Whites to give birth to a live child in the first group of patients studied in 1999–2000 (18.7% and 26.3%, respectively) (2)

Furthermore, in all US cycles throughout that time period, the live birth rate for African Americans reported in this research was lower than the lower bound of the 95% confidence interval for the fresh nondonor live birth rate (2). Similar discrepancies in treatment outcomes were shown more than 15 years later; in the cohort from 2015–2016, African American patients had a 36% lower chance of achieving a live birth than White

patients (comparison of cumulative live birth rates) (4). Given that many infertile couples are unable to obtain IVF and instead seek alternative treatments, it is important to examine the racial disparities in the outcomes of all reproductive treatment options. Regrettably, there is a dearth of information about racial differences in the success of non-IVF infertility treatments. A retrospective cohort study assessing the outcomes of IUI cycles (using gonadotropins or clomiphene citrate) did not find a correlation between the clinical pregnancy rate or the spontaneous pregnancy loss rate (15). Of the 1,495 subjects, 50 were African Americans, and they contributed 140 cycles to the study. A significant correlation between African American race and live birth was also not found in secondary analyses of infertility randomised controlled trials (RCTs) comparing ovulation induction strategies for PCOS (Pregnancy in Polycystic Ovary Syndrome I and II RCTs) (16, 17) and unexplained infertility (ovarian stimulation with letrozole, clomiphene citrate, or gonadotropins in combination with IUI, the Assessment of Multiple Intrauterine Gestations from Ovarian Stimulation RCT). Considering that 293 African Americans in all were assessed across the three trials, sample size constraints might have contributed to these null findings.

4. Availability Of Care And Treatment Analysis:

A general and constant pattern emerges from data with varying results regarding the relationships between race and treatment outcomes: African Americans have a longer and more difficult journey through infertility therapy, even when it appears to be high-quality care. One of the main ways to represent this in the literature has been to report on racial disparities in the length of infertility before seeking treatment. African American patients begin infertility treatments (IVF and non-IVF) on average 6–15 months later than White patients, according to a number of articles that have reported on this (2, 10, 19, 20). A primary discovery from the secondary analysis of the Assessment of Multiple Intrauterine Gestations from Ovarian Stimulation clinical trial was that individuals who were successful in achieving conception (30.4 vs. 37.2 months, $P < .001$), clinical pregnancy (30.4 vs. 36.5 months, $P < .001$), and live birth (30.2 vs. 36.5 months, $P < .001$) had a significantly shorter duration of infertility. Studies of ovarian stimulation/IUI and IVF outcome over the past 20 years have consistently shown that increased duration of infertility prior to initiation of care is a poor predictive indication for treatment effectiveness (2, 18, 21, 22). Due to the variable timing of IVF cycle initiation for African Americans, a greater percentage of them are over 35 at cycle initiation and are more likely to be diagnosed with decreased ovarian reserve (2, 3). It has been demonstrated that there are racial differences in the length of time it takes to seek IVF therapy, even in areas where comprehensive insurance coverage for infertility treatment is required—laws that are meant to supposedly “level the playing field” and provide greater access to care for all (10, 20, 23). The truth is that due to a number of significant restrictions on their authority, state mandates do not apply to small employers, self-insured businesses, businesses based in nonmandated states, or businesses receiving government or Medicaid assistance. As a result, many potential patients are unable to benefit from the coverage they are granted (1). Mandates have generally made it easier

for White, well-educated, and affluent people to get healthcare (20, 23).

4.1. Acknowledging The Risks To Reproductive Health And Filling In The Gaps:

After putting this background information together, we may think about the initiatives that could be taken to significantly enhance the outcomes and accessibility for African Americans who are infertile. To help more African American patients and those without treatment coverage and wealth better afford infertility care, some basic solutions can be suggested, but they must centre on reducing treatment costs (29). This would include lowering the cost of some infertility treatments and providing lower cost evidence, as well as expanding state mandates (although mandates may benefit African Americans less than other groups; IVF utilisation is higher for African Americans residing in mandated compared with nonmandated states) (4), depending on the kind of treatment (30). The final response will be as intricate, multifaceted, and nuanced as this inequality itself. Like any significant task, it will take careful work and patience. I believe that addressing systemic problems that have led to healthcare delivery patterns for African American women who are infertile and have created conditions for poor treatment outcomes and/or refractory infertility is a necessary component of the answer. Acknowledging the need for methodical advancements in the early detection and triage of reproductive problems would be a good place to start. This problem, in my opinion, stems in part from women’s health practitioners’ inadequate exposure to and training in the assessment of basic reproductive endocrinopathies and the basic workup of infertility, starting from the very beginning of their careers. Take into consideration as evidence the increasing corpus of research highlighting serious shortcomings in the REI training that obstetrics and gynaecology residents receive—deficits acknowledged by patients, staff, and trainees alike. The results of a survey that was given to residents at the 2008 Council of Resident Education in Obstetrics and Gynaecology test, asking them about their experiences with REI rotations and their general understanding of REI, were published ten years ago by Steiner et al. (31). Merely 1% of the 4,515 local respondents rated their knowledge of REI issues as great, while 84% of respondents classified their understanding as adequate to poor. Forty percent of senior residents assessed their knowledge of REI issues to be between adequate and poor (31).

The findings of an additional survey conducted and published by Chemerinski et al. support this conclusion, indicating a mediocre level of learner understanding of PCOS diagnosis criteria. Only 10% of residents could correctly identify every clinical aspect in the Rotterdam criteria, even though 85% of residents supported using them to diagnose PCOS (32). Roberts et al. (33) found that most residents significantly overestimated the success rates associated with ART, the majority of residents incorrectly estimated the rate of spontaneous miscarriages, and nearly 20% of residents felt uncomfortable responding to patients’ questions about fertility when using the Fertility and Infertility Treatment Knowledge Score, a validated instrument of fertility assessment. In this sample, knowledge gaps did not change considerably during training years, indicating that interns and senior residents alike performed similarly

in these domains (33). Following training, there is evidence of a cascading effect of these deficits on the clinical experiences that patients report. When asked which PCOS diagnostic criteria they frequently employed, approximately 40% of independently practicing physicians appeared to be unable to identify the gaps in their knowledge that trainees had (34). These shortcomings are thought to be linked to considerable delays in PCOS diagnosis (more than two years on average), which force patients to see two or more providers on average before a diagnosis is made. This considerably lowers patient satisfaction with the care they receive (34). Unfortunately, there is a dearth of published research evaluating the expertise of advanced practice doctors and physicians in other specialties, such as family and community medicine and internal medicine, when it comes to diagnosing reproductive endocrine and infertility diseases. Early detection of reproductive risk factors, even before a patient begins trying to conceive, improves our patients' comprehension of their potential obstacles to fertility and gives them the power to seek treatment in a timely manner. Furthermore, it is consistent with recommendations made by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists committee opinion Infertility workup for the women's health specialist and the American College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, which state that women over the age of 35 should be offered an expedited evaluation of infertility, and that women over the age of 40 should receive immediate evaluation and treatment.

Prompt examination is particularly necessary for conditions such as stage III or IV endometriosis, known or suspected male infertility, oligomenorrhea/amenorrhea, and uterine, tubal, or peritoneal illness (35). One might anticipate how variable adherence to these criteria contributes to delayed assessment and/or infertility referral and potentially promotes reproductive health inequalities when a high-risk condition impacts African Americans differently. Ectopic pregnancy is one example of this phenomena; it is identified in African American women twice as often as in White women (36, 37). Data from two metropolitan academic medical institutions' distinct cohorts showed that healthcare use was subpar both throughout and after the medical therapy of an ectopic pregnancy was completed (38, 39). After starting methotrexate, only 20% of the women in one cohort finished all treatment surveillance components, and the majority were lost to follow-up (39). In the second, it was discovered that women who received effective treatment used healthcare services only occasionally three and twelve months after stopping methotrexate (38). These results highlight lost chances to counsel patients with the danger of ectopic pregnancy recurrence, the risk of tubal factor infertility (which is said to be two to three times higher in African American women than in White women 2-4, 9, 40), and the resources that can be used to If we wish to reduce the dangers associated with reproduction for our patients, we should better address in our training programmes the recognition of the causes and effects of disorders such as ectopic pregnancy. Wong et al. (41) expounded on these kinds of obstacles in their JAMA Viewpoint Achieving Equity by Design, coming to the conclusion that healthcare organisations ought to "expand the expectation of what a healthcare system can do to include redesigning services to achieve health equity."

5. Conclusion:

In conclusion, expanding access to reproductive services and creating cost-effective options for them are crucial components of a multifaceted strategy to lessen racial disparities in reproduction. African Americans' reproductive requirements, preferences, and potential obstacles must be taken into consideration in order to balance the odds and prevent therapeutic delays that could worsen the prognosis. For African American women, there is still more work to be done in order to provide prompt, high-quality reproductive care. Bringing to light some of the obstacles African American women encounter when it comes to reproductive health should not be a pointless exercise in talking about inequalities; rather, it should inspire us all to use the knowledge gained to strategies—no matter how small—that enhance clinical outcomes. It is true that in order to lessen racial disparities in reproduction, our efforts must be supported by evidence, meaning that they must be grounded in studies that shed light on current obstacles and provide results from initiatives aimed at removing them. Recognising that many training programmes lack direct access to faculty members in REI, we should leverage the capabilities of precision learning, simulation, and online curriculum (such as ASRM modules) to advance gynecologic and early prenatal ultrasound training. In addition to mitigating inequities, efforts to enhance the quality of treatment we provide will also help large groups of women with reproductive problems by improving their outcomes. Lastly, interprofessional curricula that highlights and tackles the causes of inequities in reproductive health expand the conversation about possible remedies to which we can all participate to better accomplish the task of advancing reproductive health equity.

References:

1. Ethics Committee of the American Society for Reproductive Medicine. Disparities in access to effective treatment for infertility in the United States: an Ethics Committee opinion. *Fertil Steril* 2015;104:1104–10.
2. Seifer DB, Frazier LM, Grainger DA. Disparity in assisted reproductive technologies outcomes in Black women compared with White women. *Fertil Steril* 2008;90:1701–10.
3. Seifer DB, Zackula R, Grainger DA, Society for Assisted Reproductive Technology Writing Group Report. Trends of racial disparities in assisted reproductive technology outcomes in Black women compared with White women: Society for Assisted Reproductive Technology 1999 and 2000 vs. 2004–2006. *Fertil Steril* 2010;93:626–35.
4. Seifer DB, Simsek B, Wantman E, Kotlyar AM. Status of racial disparities between Black and White women undergoing assisted reproductive technology in the US. *Reprod Biol Endocrinol* 2020;18:113.
5. Fujimoto VY, Luke B, Brown MB, Jain T, Armstrong A, Grainger DA, et al. Racial and ethnic disparities in assisted reproductive technology outcomes in the United States. *Fertil Steril* 2010;93:382–90.

6. Bitler M, Schmidt L. Health disparities and infertility: impacts of state-level insurance mandates. *Fertil Steril* 2006;85:858–65.
7. Stephen EH, Chandra A. Declining estimates of infertility in the United States: 1982–2002. *Fertil Steril* 2006;86:516–23.
8. Feinberg EC, Larsen FW, Catherino WH, Zhang J, Armstrong AY. Comparison of assisted reproductive technology utilization and outcomes between Caucasian and African American patients in an equal-access-to-care setting. *Fertil Steril* 2006;85:888–94.
9. Butts SF, Seifer DB. Racial and ethnic differences in reproductive potential across the life cycle. *Fertil Steril* 2010;93:681–90.
10. Sharara FI, McClamrock HD. Differences in in vitro fertilization (IVF) outcome between White and Black women in an inner-city, university-based IVF program. *Fertil Steril* 2000;73:1170–3.
11. Dayal MB, Gindoff P, Dubey A, Spitzer TL, Bergin A, Peak D, et al. Does ethnicity influence in vitro fertilization (IVF) birth outcomes? *Fertil Steril* 2009;91:2414–8.
12. Bendikson K, Cramer DW, Vitonis A, Hornstein MD. Ethnic background and in vitro fertilization outcomes. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 2005;88:342–6.
13. Matalliotakis I, Cakmak H, Arici A, Goumenou A, Fragouli Y, Sakkas D. Epidemiological factors influencing IVF outcome: evidence from the Yale IVF program. *J Obstet Gynaecol* 2008;28:204–8.
14. Humphries LA, Chang O, Humm K, Sakkas D, Hacker MR. Influence of race and ethnicity on in vitro fertilization outcomes: systematic review. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2016;214:212.e1–17.
15. Dimitriadis I, Batsis M, Petrozza JC, Souter I. Racial disparities in fertility care: an analysis of 4537 intrauterine insemination cycles. *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities* 2017;4:169–77.
16. Kuang H, Jin S, Hansen KR, Diamond MP, Coutifaris C, Casson P, et al. Identification and replication of prediction models for ovulation, pregnancy and live birth in infertile women with polycystic ovary syndrome. *Hum Reprod* 2015;30:2222–33.
17. Rausch ME, Legro RS, Barnhart HX, Schlaff WD, Carr BR, Diamond MP, et al. Predictors of pregnancy in women with polycystic ovary syndrome. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2009;94:3458–66.
18. Hansen KR, He AL, Styer AK, Wild RA, Butts S, Engmann L, et al. Predictors of pregnancy and live-birth in couples with unexplained infertility after ovarian stimulation-intrauterine insemination. *Fertil Steril* 2016;105:1575–83.e2.
19. Missmer SA, Seifer DB, Jain T. Cultural factors contributing to health care disparities among patients with infertility in Midwestern United States. *Fertil Steril* 2011;95:1943–9.
20. Jain T. Socioeconomic and racial disparities among infertility patients seeking care. *Fertil Steril* 2006;85:876–81.
21. Nuojua-Huttunen S, Tomas C, Bloigu R, Tuomivaara L, Martikainen H. Intrauterine insemination treatment in subfertility: an analysis of factors affecting outcome. *Hum Reprod* 1999;14:698–703.
22. Guzik DS, Carson SA, Coutifaris C, Overstreet JW, Factor-Litvak P, Steinkampf MP, et al. Efficacy of superovulation and intrauterine insemination in the treatment of infertility. National Cooperative Reproductive Medicine Network. *N Engl J Med* 1999;340:177–83.
23. Jain T, Hornstein MD. Disparities in access to infertility services in a state with mandated insurance coverage. *Fertil Steril* 2005;84:221–3.
24. Vega T. Infertility, endured through a prism of race. In: *The New York Times*, 2014:12–5.
25. Howell EA, Egorova NN, Janevic T, Brodman M, Balbierz A, Zeitlin J, et al. Race and ethnicity, medical insurance, and within-hospital severe maternal morbidity disparities. *Obstet Gynecol* 2020;135:285–93.
26. Howell EA, Janevic T, Blum J, Zeitlin J, Egorova NN, Balbierz A, et al. Double disadvantage in delivery hospital for Black and Hispanic women and highrisk infants. *Matern Child Health J* 2020;24:687–93.
27. Price JT, Zimmerman LD, Koelper NC, Sammel MD, Lee S, Butts SF. Social determinants of access to minimally invasive hysterectomy: reevaluating the relationship between race and route of hysterectomy for benign disease. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2017;217:572.e1–10.
28. Alexander AL, Strohl AE, Rieder S, Holl J, Barber EL. Examining disparities in route of surgery and postoperative complications in Black race and hysterectomy. *Obstet Gynecol* 2019;133:6–12.
29. Kelley AS, Qin Y, Marsh EE, Dupree JM. Disparities in accessing infertility care in the United States: results from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 2013–16. *Fertil Steril* 2019;112:562–8.
30. Reindollar RH. Increasing access to infertility care- What will it take? *Fertil Steril* 2017;108:600–1.
31. Steiner AZ, Fritz M, Sites CK, Coutifaris C, Carr BR, Barnhart K. Resident experience on reproductive endocrinology and infertility rotations and perceived knowledge. *Obstet Gynecol* 2011;117:324–30.
32. Chemerinski A, Cooney L, Shah D, Butts S, Gibson-Helm M, Dokras A. Knowledge of PCOS in physicians-in-training: identifying gaps and educational opportunities. *Gynecol Endocrinol* 2020;36:854–9.
33. Roberts LM, Kudesia R, Zhao H, Dolan S, Rose M. A cross-sectional survey of fertility knowledge in obstetrics and gynecology residents. *Fertil Res Pract* 2020;6:22.
34. Dokras A, Saini S, Gibson-Helm M, Schulkin J, Cooney L, Teede H. Gaps in knowledge among physicians regarding diagnostic criteria and management of polycystic ovary syndrome. *Fertil Steril* 2017;107:1380–6.e1.
35. Infertility workup for the women's health specialist: ACOG committee opinion, Number 781. *Obstet Gynecol* 2019;133:e377–84.
36. Goldner TE, Lawson HW, Xia Z, Atrash HK. Surveillance for ectopic pregnancy—United States, 1970–1989. *MMWR CDC Surveill Summ* 1993;42: 73–85.
37. Butts SF, Gibson E, Sammel MD, Shaunik A, Rudick B, Barnhart K. Race, socioeconomic status, and response to methotrexate treatment of ectopic pregnancy in an urban population. *Fertil Steril* 2010;94:2789–92.
38. Holder S, Koelper NC, Sammel MD, Barnhart KT, Butts SF. Barriers to utilization of gynecologic services after ectopic pregnancy. *Fertil Steril* 2018;110:e270.
39. Jaspan D, Giraldo-Isaza M, Dandolu V, Cohen AW. Compliance with methotrexate therapy for presumed ectopic pregnancy in an inner-

- city population. *Fertil Steril* 2010;94:1122–4.
40. Gorwitz RJ, Wiesenfeld HC, Chen PL, Hammond KR, Sereday KA, Haggerty CL, et al. Population-attributable fraction of tubal factor infertility associated with chlamydia. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2017;217:336.e1–16.
 41. Wong WF, LaVeist TA, Sharfstein JM. Achieving health equity by design. *JAMA* 2015;313:1417–8.
 42. Goldman KN, Tiegs AW, Uquillas K, Nachtigall M, Fino ME, Winkel AF, et al. Interactive case-based learning improves resident knowledge and confidence in reproductive endocrinology and infertility. *Gynecol Endocrinol* 2017;33:496–9.
 43. Blakemore JK, Maxwell SM, Hodes-Wertz B, Goldman KN. Access to infertility care in a low-resource setting: bridging the gap through resident and fellow education in a New York City public hospital. *J Assist Reprod Genet* 2020;37:1545–52.
 44. Herndon CN, Anaya Y, Noel M, Cakmak H, Cedars MI. Outcomes from a university-based low-cost in vitro fertilization program providing access to care for a low-resource socioculturally diverse urban community. *Fertil Steril* 2017;108:642–9.e4.