Li et al. Reproductive Biology and Endocrinology

https://doi.org/10.1186/s12958-025-01390-3

Associations between organophosphate flame retardants metabolites in follicular fluid and reproductive outcomes among women undergoing IVF/ICSI treatment in Southwest China

Xiaohong Li^{1†}, Jiahui Qiu^{1†}, Zhiwei Gan², Shangwei Li¹ and Xun Zeng^{1*}

Abstract

Background Previous studies suggest organophosphate flame retardants (OPFRs) negatively affect fertility, but limited research explores their metabolites in follicular fluid and reproductive outcomes.

Objectives To investigate the associations between concentrations of OPFRs metabolites in follicular fluid and the outcomes of in vitro fertilization/intracytoplasmic sperm injection (IVF/ICSI) among women undergoing treatment.

Methods Women who underwent IVF/ICSI treatment at the Reproductive Center of West China Second University Hospital, Sichuan University, China, from 2017 to 2020 were recruited. The levels of seven OPFRs metabolites were quantified in follicular fluid collected on the day of oocyte retrieval. Reproductive outcomes were assessed, including key IVF/ICSI outcomes.

Results This study included 401 women. After adjusting for relevant confounders, elevated concentrations of BBOEP ($\beta = -0.08, 95\%$ CI: -0.12 to 0 0.05), BEHP ($\beta = -0.11, 95\%$ CI: -0.17 to 0.05), DnBP ($\beta = -0.23, 95\%$ CI: -0.37 to 0.08), and DPhP ($\beta = -0.12, 95\%$ CI: -0.18 to 0.06) in follicular fluid were inversely associated with the number of good embryos on day 3. Elevated BEHP concentrations were negatively associated with the total number of oocytes ($\beta = -0.04$, 95% CI: -0.07 to 0.01). In comparison with the lowest tertile, the highest tertile of DnBP was associated with a 42% reduction in biochemical pregnancy (p-trend=0.05). Furthermore, the BKMR models revealed inverse associations between OPFRs metabolites mixtures and the number of good embryos.

Conclusion Findings suggest OPFRs may negatively affect IVF/ICSI outcomes, warranting further study on environmental impacts on fertility.

Keywords Organophosphate flame retardants, Follicular fluid, Reproductive outcomes

[†]Xiaohong Li, Jiahui Qiu contributed equally to this work.

*Correspondence: Xun Zeng zx657@sina.com

© The Author(s) 2025. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this licence to share adapted material derived from this article or parts of it. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

¹Center for Reproductive Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology & Key Laboratory of Birth Defects and Related Diseases of Women and Children, West China Second University Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China ²College of Architecture and Environment, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China





(2025) 23:54

Open Access

Background

Infertility, a condition marked by the inability to achieve pregnancy following twelve months or more of regular unprotected intercourse, impacts millions worldwide, exerting significant effects on individuals, their families, and the larger community. Roughly one in six individuals of reproductive age are estimated to experience infertility during their lifetime [1]. The reasons behind infertility are complex and not fully understood, with environmental factors serving as potential contributors to the condition [2]. The past few decades have witnessed remarkable advancements in science and industrialization, providing numerous conveniences in daily life. However, along with these advancements, there has been an increasing frequency and intensity of human exposure to chemical substances, raising concerns about potential health risks. Environmental endocrine-disrupting chemicals (EDCs) constitute a group of exogenous chemicals or chemical mixtures that can enter the human body through various environmental media, disrupting the synthesis, secretion, transport, metabolism, and action of endogenous hormones, thereby affecting normal reproductive function and embryo development [3]. Currently, more than 1400 chemical species have been identified as environmental EDCs, among which organophosphate flame retardants (OPFRs), a class of chemicals widely used to enhance the fire resistance of various materials, have emerged as a new class of pollutants of significant concern with studies linking OPFRs exposure to alterations in neurodevelopment, thyroid function, and reproductive toxicity [4-9].

The extensive utilization of OPFRs results in their widespread presence across various environmental mediums, including air, water, sediment, and dust [10, 11]. OPFRs can infiltrate the human body through multiple avenues, such as dietary ingestion, inhalation, dust consumption and dermal contact [12-15]. Commonly studied mediums for assessing human OPFRs exposure comprise blood, breast milk, hair, urine and nails [16]. Monitoring human exposure to OPFRs presents challenges due to the short half-lives (ranging from hours to days) of OPFRs in biological organisms [10]. Following entry into the body, OPFRs undergo degradation as metabolites via five distinct metabolic pathways in humans, including dealkylation, hydroxylation, oxidative dechlorination, oxidation, and conjugation [17]. Due to their rapid metabolization, the metabolites are used as biomarkers for analysis and assessing internal exposure to OPFRs, which are frequently detected in the urine [18]. In vitro fertilization/intracytoplasmic sperm injection (IVF/ICSI) has emerged as an effective therapy for patients with infertility. Previous epidemiological studies have found that OPFRs metabolites levels in urine of women undergoing IVF/ICSI are positively correlated with low fertilization rates, low embryo implantation rates, high pregnancy loss, and other adverse outcomes [19–21]. However, studies investigating the impact of OPFRs metabolites levels in follicular fluid on IVF/ICSI outcomes remain limited. Follicular fluid, which serves as the nurturing medium surrounding developing oocytes, plays a pivotal role in providing essential nutrients, growth factors, and hormones crucial for follicular growth and oocyte quality [22]. Therefore, follicular fluid may offer a more appropriate and biologically relevant matrix for assessing ovarian exposure to OPFRs.

The objective of the present study was to: (1) Report the levels of OPFRs metabolites in follicular fluid in females of childbearing age from southwest part of China. (2) Investigate whether levels of OPFRs metabolites measured directly in follicular fluid were associated with reproductive outcomes among Women Undergoing IVF/ICSI treatment in China.

Methods

Study design and population

This study was established within a reproductive cohort conducted in Chengdu, China. Briefly, women who underwent IVF/ICSI treatment at the Reproductive Center of West China Second University Hospital, Sichuan University, China, from January 2017 to December 2020 were recruited. Biological samples, including follicular fluid, along with clinical characteristics and reproductive outcomes, were collected during the treatment process. Among the participants, 408 individuals underwent IVF/ ICSI treatment and provided follicular fluid samples. We excluded one woman due to missing reproductive outcome data and six women because their embryos underwent further testing for preimplantation genetic testing.

Information on demographic and clinical factors was gathered through medical records at the time of enrollment. BMI was calculated by dividing weight by the square of height. Education was categorized into "college and below" or "bachelor's degree and above," while ethnicity was distinguished between Han and other Chinese minorities. Hormone levels, including AMH, E2, FSH, and LH levels on days 2-3, were assessed. Infertility duration was defined as the length of time (in years) spent attempting to conceive. Infertility type was categorized as primary or secondary, with primary infertility indicating the patient that has never achieved a pregnancy, while secondary infertility refers to the patient who has previously conceived but is struggling to conceive again. Infertility factors were classified into female, male, mixed, or unexplained categories. Female factors include disorders affecting the female reproductive system, such as pelvic issues and ovulation disorders, while male factors involve conditions affecting the male genital system, such as dysspermia and sexual dysfunction. Cases where both male and female factors are present within one couple are classified as mixed factors. Infertility without a definitive diagnosis is categorized as unexplained infertility. Each participant signed an informed consent form upon enrollment. The research protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of West China Second University Hospital, Sichuan University of Science and Technology.

IVF/ICSI protocol and reproductive outcomes

The controlled ovarian stimulation treatment included agonist, antagonist protocols, as well as other approaches such as minimal ovarian stimulation and natural cycle. Upon reaching≥18 mm, 1–3 leading follicles were triggered with 5,000-10,000 IU of HCG (Chorionic Gonadotrophin for Injection, Lizhu Group, Zhuhai, China) or 0.2 mg of Triptorelin (Triptorelin Acetate for Injection, Ipsen Pharma Biotech, Paris, France). Follicular aspiration was performed under sedation 35-36 h later. Fertilization was achieved through either conventional IVF or ICSI, based on semen analysis and prior fertilization results. Embryos were cultured in vitro at the cleavage or blastocyst stage and cryopreserved using vitrification. Luteal support for fresh cycles commenced on the day of oocyte retrieval. Frozen embryo transfer was conducted via either a natural or medicated cycle, tailored to patient characteristics and clinician preferences.

The reproductive outcomes, encompassing IVF/ICSI parameters, including oocyte number, mature oocyte number rate, fertilization rate, good embryo number, as well as pregnancy outcomes including biochemical pregnancy, clinical pregnancy, and live birth rates, were extracted from the electronic medical records. A mature oocyte was characterized as one exhibiting the first polar body indicative of its readiness for fertilization. Fertilization rate denoted the proportion of zygotes with two pronuclei formed after fertilization, relative to the total oocyte count. Good embryos were defined as those reach the eight-cell stage with less than 20% fragmentation [23]. Biochemical pregnancy was established by a human chorionic gonadotropin level exceeding 30 mIU/mL measured 14 days post-embryo transfer. Clinical pregnancy was confirmed by the presence of an intrauterine gestational sac observed on ultrasound examination after 6-7 weeks of gestation [24]. Live birth signified the delivery of a newborn demonstrating vital signs such as breathing, heartbeat, or observable voluntary muscle movements [25].

Chemicals and reagents

Seven OPFRs metabolites (Supplemental Table 1), including Bis(2-chloroethyl) phosphate (BCEP), Bis(1-chloro-2-propyl) phosphate (BCIPP), Bis(1,3-dichloro-2-propyl) phosphate (BDCIPP), Diphenyl phosphate (DPhP), Bis(2butoxyethyl) phosphate (BBOEP), Di-n-butyl phosphate (DnBP), and Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phosphate (BEHP), and its corresponding internal standard (BCEP-d8, BCIPPd12, BDCIPP-d10, DPhP-d10, BBOEP-d8, BEHP-d34 and DBP-d18) were purchased from Toronto Research Chemicals (Canada). Acetonitrile, n-hexane, toluene, acetone, ethyl acetate, methylene chloride and cyclohexane used in this experiment are all chromatographic grade. Methanol and acetone were obtained from Fisher Scientific (Hanover Park, IL). Ethyl acetate and dichloromethane were provided by Honeywell (Muskegon, MI, USA). N-hexane were purchased from CNW Technologies GmbH (Germany). Ultrapure water was prepared by a MilliQ ultrapure system (Millipore).

Sample collection and analysis

Samples collected from the women during their egg retrieval were subjected to centrifugation at 4000 rpm for 10 min. The supernatant was then transferred to a new tube and stored at -80 °C. Analysis of the samples was conducted using a modified version of a previously published method [26]. After completely thawing the follicular fluid sample and mixing it at room temperature, transfer a measured volume of 1 mL of the follicular fluid into a polypropylene (PP) tube with a capacity of 15 mL. Add 5 μ L of an internal standard mixture with a concentration of 1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ and let it stand overnight at rest. Subsequently, incorporate 5 mL of ethyl acetate, vortex for 20 min, and then centrifuge at 4000 rpm for 20 min to obtain the supernatant. Repeat the extraction process three times, pooling the supernatants from each round. Evaporate the combined supernatants to dryness using nitrogen gas and reconstitute the residue in 0.5 mL of n-hexane. The extract was loaded onto a Sep-Pak cartridge (3 cm/ 200 mg, Waters, Milford, MA, USA). The cartridge was vacuum-dried for 20 min and then eluted with 3 mL of mAcetone: n-hexane (1:1). The eluate was evaporated almost to dryness under a stream of nitrogen, and the residue was reconstituted with 100 µL 50% methanol aqueous solution.

The analysis of OPFRs metabolite was performed using UHPLC-MS/MS (4500 Qtrap, SCIEX, Redwood City, USA). The working conditions can be found in Supplemental Table 2. Multiple reaction monitoring (MRM) parameters of the OPFRs metabolites are listed in Supplemental Table 3. The chromatographic separation of 7 OPFRs metabolites are summarized in Supplemental Fig. 1. The average recoveries of OPFRs metabolites ranged from 75.8 to 90.7%. During sample analysis, every 50 samples are analyzed, a group of samples with quality control is added, and the blank of the same steps is taken as the sample to check whether there is cross-contamination in the pretreatment process. Every 100 samples are analyzed, a group of standard curves is added again to check the reproducibility of the method, and the slope RSD (n = 4) of the standard curves is within 3%.

Statistical analysis

In the descriptive analysis, continuous variables were summarized using means and standard deviations, while categorical variables were presented as frequencies and percentages. Compounds with detection frequencies (DFs) greater than 50% were retained for further analysis. Non-detectable chemical values (<LOD) were replaced by LOD/2, and values between LOD and the Lower Limit of Quantification (LQD) were replaced by 2*LOD. Spearman correlation tests were used to assess correlations between OPFRs metabolites in follicular fluid. The OPFRs metabolites were categorized both as categorical variables (tertiles) and continuous variables, undergoing a natural logarithm transformation to account for their skewed distribution. To examine linear trends across tertiles of OPFRs metabolites, participants were assigned the median value in each tertile and modeled as a continuous variable. Coefficients and their 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were estimated in multivariable generalized linear regression models (GLM) to assess the associations of individual OPFRs metabolites in follicular fluid with IVF/ICSI parameters. The multivariable models included several covariates: age, BMI, AMH, education, COH protocols, infertility factors, and infertility type. For oocyte number and good embryo number, Poisson distribution and log link were used. For mature oocyte number rate and fertilization rate, binomial distribution and probit link were employed. To test the associations with reproduction outcomes, including biochemical pregnancy, clinical pregnancy, and live birth, GLM with a binomial distribution and logit link were adjusted for age, BMI, education, COH protocols, infertility factors, infertility type, number of embryos transferred, embryo type, fertilization method, and stage of embryo transferred. In all models, smoking status was not included as a confounder, given the very low prevalence of smokers in our sample. Two sensitivity analyses were performed. First, recognizing the considerable impact of age on IVF/ ICSI outcomes, analyses were performed in different age layers (<35 and \geq 35). Second, we limited our analysis to couples with female factors to mitigate the influence of other reproductive factors on IVF/ICSI outcomes.

In addition to assessing individual exposure to OPFRs metabolites, we conducted Bayesian Kernel Machine Regression (BKMR) to evaluate the associations between mixtures of OPFRs metabolites and IVF/ICSI outcomes. We utilized the "bkmr" package (version 0.2.2) in R software, employing 10,000 iterations. Confounders, consistent with the analysis of individual OPFRs metabolite exposure, were adjusted in all models. For both the individual and mixure analyses, age and BMI were considered as continuous variables in the analysis. Ethnicity was excluded from consideration due to the limited representation of women from other Chinese minorities.

All statistical analyses were conducted using RStudio software (version 2021.09.1) or STATA 18.0 (Stata Corporation). A two-tailed P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Characteristics of the study participants

Table 1 presents the demographic and clinical characteristics of 401 women undergoing IVF/ICSI treatment. The mean age of participants was 31.92 years with a standard deviation of 3.76, and the mean BMI was 21.31 kg/m² with a standard deviation of 2.67. The majority of participants had a bachelor's degree or above (62.1%) and were of Han ethnicity (97.3%). The average AMH level was 4.63 ng/ml, and the mean E2, FSH, and LH levels on days 2-3 were 33.86 ng/ml, 6.06 mIU/ml, and 3.44 mIU/ ml, respectively. Most participants had primary infertility (61.9%) and female factors were the most common cause of infertility (58.9%). The agonist protocol was more frequently used for controlled ovarian hyperstimulation (60.9%). Among the 401 participants, 2 individuals did not retrieve oocytes, and another 17 individuals did not obtain embryos. In terms of fertilization method, the majority underwent IVF (76.3%). Additionally, 59.1% of transferred embryos were fresh, with an average of 1.69 embryos transferred per cycle. Among outcomes, biochemical pregnancy occurred in 58.1% of cases, while clinical pregnancy and live birth rates were 54.4% and 47.9%, respectively.

OPFRs metabolites in follicular fluid

Seven OPFRs metabolites were quantified in follicular fluid samples, and Table 2 presents a summary of their concentration distributions with detection frequencies (DFs) exceeding 50%. BBOEP, BEHP and DPhP were detected with high frequency, 91.8%, 94.8% and 67.3% respectively, while DnBP was detected in all follicular fluid samples. Across percentiles, BBOEP exhibited concentrations ranging from <LOD to 13.22 ng/ mL, while BEHP ranged from <LOD to 15.993 ng/mL. DnBP ranged from 0.062 to 1.488 ng/mL, and DPhP ranged from <LOD to 1.74 ng/mL. Notably, correlations between these metabolites were observed, with DPhP showing a strong positive correlation with BBOEP and DnBP, and BEHP exhibiting moderate negative correlations with BBOEP and DnBP, as revealed by Spearman correlation analysis (all p-values < 0.05, Table 3).

Associations of OPFRs metabolites in follicular fluid with IVF/ICSI outcomes

As shown in Table 4, significant associations between concentrations of individual OPFRs metabolites in follicular fluid and various IVF/ICSI parameters were observed. Elevated tertiles of BEHP metabolites were

 Table 1
 Characteristics of 401 women undergoing IVF/ICSI treatment

Basic informationAge (y)31.92±3.76BM (kg/m2)21.92BM (kg/m2)21.92Education249 (62.1)Ethnicity249 (62.1)Ethnicity11 (2.7)Band below and above249 (62.1)Ethnicity11 (2.7)Smoking status6 (1.5)Smoker395 (98.5)Non-smoker33.86 ±14.44FSH level on D2-3 (mIU/mI)6.06 ± 3.09LH level on D2-3 (mIU/mI)6.06 ± 3.09LH level on D2-3 (mIU/mI)3.44 ± 2.77Cycle information3.24 ± 2.34Infertility duration3.24 ± 2.34Infertility type153 (38.2)Infertility type153 (38.2)Infertility type153 (38.2)Infertility type153 (38.2)Infertility type246 (6.9)Secondary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility249 (37.2)Unexplained20.5)COH protocol230 (75.3)Kit306 (76.3)ICSI306 (76.3)ICSI306 (76.3)ICSI327 (59.1)Frozen145 (36.2)Number of embryos transferred (n = 382)169 ± 0.56Stage327 (59.1)Frozen145 (36.2)Number of endory transferred (n = 382)169 ± 0.56Stage325 (81.1)Blatocyt57 (14.2)Outcome<	Characteristics	Mean±SD or n (%)
Age (y)31.92±3.76BMI (kg/m2)21.31±2.67Education21.31±2.67Education152 (37.9)Bachelor's degree and above249 (62.1)Ethnicity390 (97.3)Ethnicity11 (2.7)Smoking status61.5)Smoking status61.5)Smoker395 (98.5)Non-smoker463±3.88E2 level on D2-3 (mlU/ml)463±3.88E2 level on D2-3 (mlU/ml)60.6±3.09LH level on D2-3 (mlU/ml)60.6±3.09LH level on D2-3 (mlU/ml)3.24±2.34Infertility duration3.24±2.34Infertility type153 (38.2)Vice information153 (38.2)Infertility factors26 (58.9)Male factors20.5)COH protocol20.5)COH protocol244 (60.9)Antagonist244 (60.9)Antagonist244 (60.9)Antagonist244 (60.9)Antagonist24.20.5)IVF + ICSI10.27.1Fmbryo type (n = 382)11.27.1Fresh237 (59.1)Frozen45 (36.2)Number of embryos transferred (n = 382)14.2Victore25.5Stage of embryo transferred (n = 382)25.5Infertility in rate (%)58.5 ± 22.8Number of good embryos23.3 ± 2.60Biochemical pregnancy10.41 ± 5.82Number of good embryos23.3 ± 2.60Biochemical pregnancy10.41 ± 5.82Number of good embryos23.5 (81.1)Biastocys	Basic information	
BMI (kg/m2)21.31 ± 2.67Education152 (37.9)Bachelor's degree and above249 (62.1)Ethnicity11 (2.7)Smoking status61.5)Smoker300 (97.3)other Chinese minorities11 (2.7)Smoking status61.5)Smoker300 (97.3)Other Chinese minorities11 (2.7)Smoking status61.5)Smoker33.86 ± 14.44FSH level on D2-3 (mJ/m1)4.63 ± 3.88E2 level on D2-3 (mJ/m1)33.86 ± 14.44FSH level on D2-3 (mIU/m1)6.06 ± 3.09LH level on D2-3 (mIU/m1)2.42 ± 2.77Cycle information1.42 ± 2.77Cycle information3.24 ± 2.34Infertility duration3.24 ± 2.34Infertility duration3.24 ± 2.34Infertility type153 (38.2)Primary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility2.33 (38.2)Infertility factors70 (17.5)Mixed factors93 (23.2)Unexplained2.00COH protocol2.44 (60.9)Antagonist149 (37.2)Others8 (2.0)Fertilization method (n=389)2.44 (60.9)NF 1CSI11 (2.7)Embryo type (n=382)149 (35.2)Number of embryos transferred (n=382)1.69 ± 0.56Stage of embryos transferred (n=382)1.69 ± 0.56Stage of embryos tra	Age (y)	31.92±3.76
EducationCollege and below152 (37.9)Bachelor's degree and above249 (62.1)Ethnicity300 (97.3)other Chinese minorities11 (2.7)Smoking status6(1.5)Smoker300 (97.3)Other Chinese minorities(1.5)Smoker300 (97.3)Non-smoker300 (97.3)AMH (ng/ml)463.1E2 level on D2-3 (ng/ml)33.86 ± 14.44FSH level on D2-3 (mlU/ml)6.06 ± 3.09LH level on D2-3 (mlU/ml)3.44 ± 2.77Cycle information3.24 ± 2.34Infertility type153 (38.2)Infertility type153 (38.2)Infertility type248 (61.9)Secondary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility236 (58.9)Male factors236 (58.9)Male factors93 (23.2)Unexplained20.0)COH protocol20.0)Cothers93 (23.2)Unexplained244 (60.9)Antagonist149 (37.2)Others93 (23.2)Unexplained20.0)Cothers82 (20.5)IVF + ICSI11 (2.7)Embryo type (n = 382)144 (36.2)IVF + ICSI149 (37.2)Others326 (58.1)ISage of embryos transferred (n = 382)1.69 ± 0.56ISage of embryos transferred (n = 382)1.69 ± 0.56IVF + ICSI1.69 ± 0.56Stage of embryos transferred (n = 382)1.69 ± 0.56Interror1.45 (36.2)Number of ooxyt	BMI (kg/m2)	21.31±2.67
College and below152 (37.9)Bachelor's degree and above249 (62.1)Ethnicity390 (97.3)Han390 (97.3)Smoking status6 (1.5)Smoker395 (98.5)Non-smoker4.63 ± 3.88E2 level on D2-3 (mJ/ml)4.63 ± 1.4.44FSH level on D2-3 (mIU/ml)0.06 ± 3.09LH level on D2-3 (mIU/ml)0.06 ± 3.09LH level on D2-3 (mIU/ml)0.04 ± 2.77Cycle information3.24 ± 2.34Infertility duration3.24 ± 2.34Infertility type70 (17.5)Secondary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility2.32 (0.5)Infertility factors70 (17.5)Mixed factors93 (23.2)Inexplained20.5)COH protocol244 (60.9)Antagonist149 (37.2)Others9.30 (23.2)Infertility factors149 (37.2)Others3.06 (76.3)ICSI2.00Fertilization method (n=399)149 (37.2)VF306 (76.3)ICSI82 (20.5)IVF + ICSI11 (2.7)Embryo type (n=382)159 (36.2)Ivmber of embryos transferred (n=382)169 ± 0.56Stage of embryo transferred (n=382)325 (81.1)Bastocyt325 (81.1)Bastocyt325 (81.1)Bastocyt325 (81.1)Bastocyt168 (41.9)Vumber of good embryos323 ± 2.60Biochemical pregnancy168 (41.9) </td <td>Education</td> <td></td>	Education	
Bachelor's degree and above249 (62.1)EthnicityHan390 (97.3)other Chinese minorities11 (2.7)Smoking status6 (1.5)Smoker395 (98.5)Non-smoker395 (98.5)Non-smoker463 ± 3.88E2 level on D2-3 (mJ/ml)463 ± 3.88E2 level on D2-3 (mIU/ml)6.06 ± 3.09LH level on D2-3 (mIU/ml)3.84 ± 1.4.44FSH level on D2-3 (mIU/ml)3.44 ± 2.77Cycle information11 (2.7)Infertility duration3.24 ± 2.34Infertility type15 (3.8.2)Primary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility236 (58.9)Male factors70 (17.5)Mixed factors93 (23.2)Unexplained20.5)COH protocol244 (60.9)Antagonist149 (37.2)Others20.0)Fertilization method (n=399)149 (37.2)VF306 (76.3)ICSI82 (20.5)IVF + ICSI11 (2.7)Embryo type (n=382)169 ± 0.56Stage of embryo transferred (n=382)169 ± 0.56 <td>College and below</td> <td>152 (37.9)</td>	College and below	152 (37.9)
EthnicityHan390 (97.3)other Chinese minorities11 (2.7)Smoking status6 (1.5)Smoker300 (97.3)Non-smoker4.63 ± 3.88E2 level on D2-3 (ng/ml)33.86 ± 14.44FSH level on D2-3 (ngl/ml)6.06 ± 3.09LH level on D2-3 (ngl/ml)6.06 ± 3.09LH level on D2-3 (ngl/ml)6.06 ± 3.09LH level on D2-3 (ngl/ml)3.24 ± 2.34Infertility duration3.24 ± 2.34Infertility duration3.24 ± 2.34Infertility type153 (38.2)Primary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility248 (61.9)Male factors70 (17.5)Mixed factors93 (23.2)Unexplained20.5)COH protocol20.5)COH protocol20.0)Remain method (n=399)149 (37.2)VF306 (76.3)ICSI82 (20.5)VF+ICSI10 (27.1)Embryo type (n=382)1.69 ± 0.56Stage of embryos transferred (n=382)1.69 ± 0.56Stage of embryos transferred (n=382)1.69 ± 0.56Stage of embryos transferred (n=382)2.32 (81.1)Blastocyst57 (14.2)Outcome2.33 ± 2.60Biochemical pregnancy2.33 ± 2.60Nomber of good embryos2.33 ± 2.60Biochemical pregnancy2.33 ± 2.60Nomber of good embryos2.33 ± 2.60Biochemical pregnancy2.3	Bachelor's degree and above	249 (62.1)
Han390 (97.3)other Chinese minorities11 (2.7)Smoking status6 (1.5)Smoker395 (98.5)Non-smoker463 ± 3.88E2 level on D2-3 (mg/ml)4.63 ± 3.88E2 level on D2-3 (mg/ml)33.86 ± 14.44FSH level on D2-3 (mlU/ml)6.06 ± 3.09LH level on D2-3 (mlU/ml)3.44 ± 2.77Cycle information3.44 ± 2.77Cycle information2.42 ± 2.34Infertility duration3.24 ± 2.34Infertility type153 (38.2)Primary infertility248 (61.9)Secondary infertility153 (38.2)Infertility factors236 (58.9)Male factors236 (58.9)Male factors93 (23.2)Unexplained2 (0.5)COH protocol2 (0.5)Antagonist149 (37.2)Others8 (2.0)Fertilization method (n=399)149 (37.2)VF306 (76.3)ICSI11 (2.7)Embryo type (n=382)11 (2.7)Embryo type (n=382)11 (2.7)Fresh237 (59.1)Frozen145 (36.2)Number of embryos transferred (n=382)10 ± 0.56Stage of embryo transferred (n=382)10 ± 0.56Stage of embryos transferred (n=382)10 ± 0.56Stage of embryos transferred (n=382)10 ± 0.58Cleavage embryo325 (81.1)Blastocyst57 (14.2)Outcome10.41 ± 5.82Mature oocytes rate (%)58.5 ± 22.8Number of good embryos233 (58.1) <td>Ethnicity</td> <td></td>	Ethnicity	
other Chinese minorities 11 (2.7) Smoking status 6 (1.5) Smoker 395 (98.5) Non-smoker 463 ± 3.88 E2 level on D2-3 (ng/ml) 33.86 ± 14.44 FSH level on D2-3 (mlU/ml) 6.06 ± 3.09 LH level on D2-3 (mlU/ml) 3.44 ± 2.77 Cycle information 3.24 ± 2.34 Infertility duration 3.24 ± 2.34 Infertility type 7 Primary infertility 248 (61.9) Secondary infertility 248 (61.9) Infertility factors 70 (17.5) Mike factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 244 (60.9) Antagonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 244 (60.9) IVF + ICSI 11 (2.7)	Han	390 (97.3)
Smoking status 6 (1.5) Smoker 395 (98.5) Non-smoker 4 AMH (ng/ml) 4.63 ± 3.88 E2 level on D2-3 (ng/ml) 33.86 ± 14.44 FSH level on D2-3 (mlU/ml) 6.06 ± 3.09 LH level on D2-3 (mlU/ml) 3.44 ± 2.77 Cycle information 3.24 ± 2.34 Infertility duration 3.24 ± 2.34 Infertility type 248 (61.9) Secondary infertility 153 (38.2) Infertility factors 236 (58.9) Male factors 70 (17.5) Mixed factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 2 (0.5) COH protocol 244 (60.9) Antagonist 249 (37.2) Antagonist 249 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n=399) 27 VF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF + ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) 169 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryos transferred (n=382) <td>other Chinese minorities</td> <td>11 (2.7)</td>	other Chinese minorities	11 (2.7)
Smoker 395 (98.5) Non-smoker 4 AMH (ng/ml) 4.63 ± 3.88 E2 level on D2-3 (mlU/ml) 6.06 ± 3.09 LH level on D2-3 (mlU/ml) 3.44 ± 2.77 Cycle information 3.24 ± 2.34 Infertility duration 3.24 ± 2.34 Infertility type 248 (61.9) Secondary infertility 153 (38.2) Infertility factors 7 Female factors 236 (58.9) Male factors 70 (17.5) Mixed factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 2 (0.5) COH protocol 244 (60.9) Antagonist 149 (37.2) Others 8 (20.5) IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF+ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n = 382) 169 ± 0.56 Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n = 382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n = 382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n = 382)	Smoking status	6 (1.5)
Non-smoker 4MH (ng/ml) 4.63 ± 3.88 E2 level on D2-3 (ng/ml) 33.86 ± 14.44 FSH level on D2-3 (mlU/ml) 6.06 ± 3.09 LH level on D2-3 (mlU/ml) 3.44 ± 2.77 Cycle information 3.24 ± 2.34 Infertility duration 3.24 ± 2.34 Infertility factors 2.48 (61.9) State factors 70 (17.5) Miked factors 9.3 (23.2) Unexplained 2.44 (60.9) Antagonist 149 (37.2)<	Smoker	395 (98.5)
AMH (ng/ml) 4.63 ± 3.88 E2 level on D2-3 (ng/ml) 33.86 ± 14.44 FSH level on D2-3 (mIU/ml) 6.06 ± 3.09 LH level on D2-3 (mIU/ml) 3.44 ± 2.77 Cycle information 3.24 ± 2.34 Infertility duration 3.24 ± 2.34 Infertility type Primary infertility Secondary infertility 153 (38.2) Infertility factors 236 (58.9) Male factors 70 (17.5) Mixed factors 70 (17.5) Mixed factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 2 (0.5) COH protocol 244 (60.9) Antagonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 244 (60.9) VF 306 (76.3) ICSI 149 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n=399) VF IVF + ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) Fresh Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382)	Non-smoker	
E2 level on D2-3 (ng/ml) 33.86±14.44 FSH level on D2-3 (mIU/ml) 6.06±3.09 LH level on D2-3 (mIU/ml) 3.44±2.77 Cycle information 3.24±2.34 Infertility duration 3.24±2.34 Infertility type Primary infertility Primary infertility 248 (61.9) Secondary infertility 248 (61.9) Secondary infertility 236 (58.9) Male factors 70 (17.5) Mixed factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 2 (0.5) COH protocol 244 (60.9) Antagonist 244 (60.9) IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF+ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) 57 (59.1) </td <td>AMH (ng/ml)</td> <td>4.63 ± 3.88</td>	AMH (ng/ml)	4.63 ± 3.88
FSH level on D2-3 (mIU/ml) 6.06 ± 3.09 LH level on D2-3 (mIU/ml) 3.44 ± 2.77 Cycle information 3.24 ± 2.34 Infertility duration 3.24 ± 2.34 Infertility type 248 (61.9) Secondary infertility 248 (61.9) Infertility factors 236 (58.9) Male factors 70 (17.5) Mixed factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 2 (0.5) COH protocol 2 (0.5) Antagonist 149 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n=399) IVF IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF+ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) 149 (37.2) Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage o	E2 level on D2-3 (ng/ml)	33.86±14.44
LH level on D2-3 (mIU/ml) 3.44±2.77 Cycle information 3.24±2.34 Infertility duration 3.24±2.34 Infertility duration 3.24±2.34 Infertility type 248 (61.9) Secondary infertility 153 (38.2) Infertility factors 236 (58.9) Male factors 236 (58.9) Male factors 70 (17.5) Mixed factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 2(0.5) COH protocol 244 (60.9) Antagonist 149 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n=399) VF IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF+1CSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) VF Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382) 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382) 50.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 50.56 Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome VI	FSH level on D2-3 (mIU/ml)	6.06 ± 3.09
Cycle information 3.24±2.34 Infertility duration 3.24±2.34 Infertility type 248 (61.9) Secondary infertility 153 (38.2) Infertility factors 236 (58.9) Male factors 236 (58.9) Male factors 70 (17.5) Mixed factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 200.5 COH protocol 244 (60.9) Antagonist 149 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n=399) VF IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF+1CSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) Second Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382) 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382) 505 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 505 Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome Set 5±22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ±2.60 Biochemical pregnancy Set 5±22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ±2.60 </td <td>LH level on D2-3 (mIU/ml)</td> <td>3.44 ± 2.77</td>	LH level on D2-3 (mIU/ml)	3.44 ± 2.77
Infertility duration 3.24±2.34 Infertility type 248 (61.9) Primary infertility 153 (38.2) Infertility factors 236 (58.9) Male factors 236 (58.9) Male factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 2 (0.5) COH protocol 244 (60.9) Antagonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 149 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n=399) VF IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF+ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) VE Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Outcome 235 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 2.33 ± 2	Cycle information	
Infertility type Primary infertility 248 (61.9) Secondary infertility 153 (38.2) Infertility factors 236 (58.9) Male factors 70 (17.5) Mixed factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 2 (0.5) COH protocol 244 (60.9) Antagonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 149 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n=399) VF IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) VF + ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) 237 (59.1) Frozen 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 25 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 2.33 ± 2.60 Mature oocytes retrieved 1.641 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Fertilization rate (%) S.8.5 ± 22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 </td <td>Infertility duration</td> <td>3.24 ± 2.34</td>	Infertility duration	3.24 ± 2.34
Primary infertility 248 (61.9) Secondary infertility 153 (38.2) Infertility factors 236 (58.9) Male factors 70 (17.5) Mixed factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 2 (0.5) COH protocol 244 (60.9) Antagonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 149 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n = 399) VF VF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) VF+ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n = 382) 237 (59.1) Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n = 382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n = 382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n = 382) 25 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 233 (58.1) Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Fertilization rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 233 (58.1) No 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) <	Infertility type	
Secondary infertility 153 (38.2) Infertility factors 236 (58.9) Male factors 70 (17.5) Mixed factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 2 (0.5) COH protocol 244 (60.9) Antagonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 149 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n=399) VF ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF + ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) 149 (37.2) Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryos transferred (n=382) 2.31 ± 0.50 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes retreived 2.33 ± 2.60	Primary infertility	248 (61.9)
Infertility factors 236 (58.9) Male factors 70 (17.5) Mixed factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 2 (0.5) COH protocol 2 (0.5) Agonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 149 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n=399) VF IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF + ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) 169 ± 0.56 Stage of embryos transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 25 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41 ± 5.82 Number of oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Pertilization rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 2.33 ± 2.60 No 168 (41.9) Yes 2.33 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 2.33 (58.1) No 168 (41.	Secondary infertility	153 (38.2)
Female factors 236 (58.9) Male factors 70 (17.5) Mixed factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 2 (0.5) COH protocol 2 (0.5) Agonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 149 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n=399) VF IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF+ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryos transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 25 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome V Number of oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 233 (58.1) No 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 233 (58.1) No 168 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Infertility factors	
Male factors 70 (17.5) Mixed factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 2 (0.5) COH protocol 244 (60.9) Antagonist 149 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n=399) 149 (37.2) IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF + ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) 145 (36.2) Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 225 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Fertilization rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 233 (58.1) No 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Female factors	236 (58.9)
Mixed factors 93 (23.2) Unexplained 2 (0.5) COH protocol 2 (0.5) Agonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 149 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n=399) VF IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF + ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) 145 (36.2) Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 225 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Fertilization rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 233 (58.1) No 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 233 (58.1) No 183 (45.6) <	Male factors	70 (17.5)
COH protocol 2 (0.3) Agonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 149 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n=399) VF IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF + ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) 145 (36.2) Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 225 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome V Number of oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Pertilization rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy Vo No 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy Val (54.4)	Mixed factors	93 (23.2)
Agonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 149 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n=399) IVF IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF+ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) 11 (2.7) Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 2.5 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 2.33		2 (0.3)
Agonist 244 (60.9) Antagonist 149 (37.2) Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n=399) IVF IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF+ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n=382) 11 (2.7) Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of opt opt oransferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of opt opt oransferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of opt opt oransferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of opt opt oransferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of opt opt oransferred (n=382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 2.5 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41 ± 5.82 Nature oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy	Agenist	244 ((0.0)
Nintegonist $(45, 65, 2)$ Others 8 (2.0) Fertilization method (n = 399) VF IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF + ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n = 382) 11 (2.7) Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n = 382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n = 382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n = 382) 225 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Pertilization rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy No No 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Agonist	244 (00.9) 1/10 (37.2)
Fertilization method $(n = 399)$ IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF + ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type $(n = 382)$ 11 (2.7) Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred $(n = 382)$ 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred $(n = 382)$ 1.69 ± 0.56 Cleavage embryo 325 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Pertilization rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Others	8 (2.0)
IVF 306 (76.3) ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF + ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n = 382) 5 Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n = 382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n = 382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Cleavage embryo 325 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Pertilization rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Fertilization method $(n = 399)$	- ()
ICSI 82 (20.5) IVF + ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n = 382) 7 Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n = 382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n = 382) 225 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Fertilization rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	IVE	306 (76 3)
IVF + ICSI 11 (2.7) Embryo type (n = 382) 237 (59.1) Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n = 382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n = 382) 25 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 233 (58.1) Ves 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 168 (41.9) Yes 218 (54.4)	ICSI	82 (20.5)
Embryo type (n = 382) Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n = 382) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n = 382) 255 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 233 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 2.33 ± 2.60 No 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	IVF + ICSI	11 (2.7)
Fresh 237 (59.1) Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382) 1.69±0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 225 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41±5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41±5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 2.33±2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 2.33±2.60 No 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Embryo type ($n = 382$)	
Frozen 145 (36.2) Number of embryos transferred (n=382) 1.69±0.56 Stage of embryo transferred (n=382) 325 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41±5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41±5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 58.5±22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33±2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Fresh	237 (59.1)
Number of embryos transferred ($n = 382$) 1.69 ± 0.56 Stage of embryo transferred ($n = 382$) 325 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 2.33 ± 2.60 No 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Frozen	145 (36.2)
Stage of embryo transferred ($n = 382$) Cleavage embryo 325 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41 ± 5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Fertilization rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Number of embryos transferred ($n = 382$)	1.69±0.56
Cleavage embryo 325 (81.1) Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41±5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41±5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5±22.8 Fertilization rate (%) 58.5±22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33±2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Stage of embryo transferred ($n = 382$)	
Blastocyst 57 (14.2) Outcome 10.41±5.82 Mature oocytes retrieved 10.41±5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5±22.8 Fertilization rate (%) 58.5±22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33±2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Cleavage embryo	325 (81.1)
Outcome 10.41±5.82 Number of oocytes retrieved 10.41±5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5±22.8 Fertilization rate (%) 58.5±22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33±2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 2.33±2.60 No 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Blastocyst	57 (14.2)
Number of oocytes retrieved 10.41±5.82 Mature oocytes rate (%) 58.5±22.8 Fertilization rate (%) 2.33±2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 2.33±2.60 No 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Outcome	
Mature oocytes rate (%) Fertilization rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 8 No 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Number of oocytes retrieved	10.41 ± 5.82
Fertilization rate (%) 58.5 ± 22.8 Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Mature oocytes rate (%)	
Number of good embryos 2.33 ± 2.60 Biochemical pregnancy 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Fertilization rate (%)	58.5±22.8
Biochemical pregnancy No 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Number of good embryos	2.33 ± 2.60
No 168 (41.9) Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Biochemical pregnancy	
Yes 233 (58.1) Clinical pregnancy 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	No	168 (41.9)
Clinical pregnancy No 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Yes	233 (58.1)
No 183 (45.6) Yes 218 (54.4)	Clinical pregnancy	
Yes 218 (54.4)	No	183 (45.6)
	Yes	218 (54.4)

lable 1 (continued

Characteristics	Mean ± SD or <i>n</i> (%)
Live birth	
No	209 (52.1)
Yes	192 (47.9)
Note: SD, Standard Deviation: BM	, Body Mass Index: AMH, Anti-Müllerian

Hormone; E2, Estradiol; FSH, Follicle Stimulating Hormone; LH, Luteinizing Hormone; COH, Controlled Ovarian Hyperstimulation; IVF, In Vitro Fertilization; ICSI, Intracytoplasmic Sperm Injection

significantly associated with a decrease in the number of retrieved oocytes, exhibiting a notable decreasing trend across tertiles (p=0.01). Similarly, concentrations of BBOEP, DnBP, and DPhP showed a significant negative trend with the number of good embryos, with all p-values less than 0.001. Additionally, an increase in the logarithm of BEHP was negatively associated with the number of good embryos, with a coefficient of -0.11 (-0.17, -0.05). The analysis of associations between OPFRs metabolite concentrations in follicular fluid and pregnancy outcomes, as detailed in Table 5, largely revealed null associations. except, the highest tertile of DnBP was associated with a 42% reduction in biochemical pregnancy in comparison with the lowest tertile (p-trend = 0.05). In sensitive analysis, the primary findings remained unchanged and retained their significance after restricted the analysis to couples with female factors (Supplemental Tables 5-8). In the BKMR models, we observed that mixtures of OPFRs metabolites in follicular fluid were negatively associated with the number of good embryo (Fig. 1). The univariate exposure-response relationships were linear when other compounds were fixed at median values. No evidence of obvious interaction effects between the **OPFRs** metabolites.

Discussion

OPFRs are widely distributed in various environmental media and their reproductive toxicity has attracted increasing attention in recent years. However, research on the distribution of these chemicals in the human body, particularly in women undergoing IVF/ICSI remains relatively limited. Our study represents, to the best of our knowledge, the first report on the concentrations of OPFRs metabolites in follicular fluid and pregnancy outcomes. In the current study, we observed that four out of seven OPFRs metabolites were detected in more than 50.0% of follicular fluid samples, indicating these chemicals could pass through the blood–follicle barrier, enter the intra-ovarian environment, and directly affect the oocytes. The observed correlations between OPFRs metabolites suggest potential co-exposure or common sources of contamination.

In this study, we further investigated the associations between OPFRs metabolites in follicular fluid and reproductive outcomes among women undergoing IVF/ICSI

seeking ie										
Analytes	DFs (%)	LOD (ng/ml)	Arithmetic mean (ng/mL)	Percent	iles (ng/mL	.)				
				min	5th	25th	50th	75th	95th	max
BBOEP	91.8	0.048	1.872	< LOD	< LOD	0.096	0.933	3.152	5.933	13.220
BEHP	94.8	0.059	0.865	< LOD	< LOD	0.363	0.587	0.993	2.127	15.993
DnBP	100	0.084	0.200	0.062	0.076	0.139	0.176	0.214	0.322	1.488
DPhP	67.3	0.056	0.167	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	0.130	0.232	0.405	1.740

Table 2 The summary of OPFRs metabolites concentrations with detection frequencies (DFs) > 50% in follicular samples from females seeking for IVF/ICSI treatment

Note: DFs, Detection frequencies; LOD, Limit of detection; BBOEP, Bis(2-butoxyethyl) phosphate; BEHP, Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phosphate; DnBP, Di-n-butyl phosphate; DPhP, Diphenyl phosphate

Table 3 The correlation among the concentrations of the OPFRs metabolites in the follicular samples (n = 401)

Correlation coefficient	BBOEP	BEHP	DnBP	DPhP
BBOEP	1			
BEHP	-0.333**	1		
DnBP	0.439**	-0.101*	1	
DPhP	0.740**	-0.186**	0.520**	1

Note: BBOEP, Bis(2-butoxyethyl) phosphate; BEHP, Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phosphate; DnBP, Di-n-butyl phosphate; DPhP, Diphenyl phosphate

* means the correlation is significant at the 0.05 level;

** means the correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

Tab	le 4	Associations	between OPF	Rs metabolite	concentrations in f	follicular	fluid ar	nd IVF/ICSI	parameters ((n=401)
-----	------	--------------	-------------	---------------	---------------------	------------	----------	-------------	--------------	---------

	Number of oocytes retrieved	Mature oocytes rate (%)	Fertilization rate (%)	Number of good embryos
OPFR metabolites	Coefficient (95% CI)	Coefficient (95% CI)	Coefficient (95% CI)	Coefficient (95% CI)
BBOEP				
Log	0 (-0.02, 0.02)	-0.01 (-0.09, 0.06)	-0.01 (-0.08, 0.06)	-0.08 (-0.12, -0.05)
Q1	ref	ref	ref	ref
Q2	-0.01 (-0.09, 0.07)	0.05 (-0.29, 0.38)	-0.02 (-0.33, 0.29)	-0.24 (-0.40, -0.08)
Q3	0.02 (-0.06, 0.10)	-0.07 (-0.41, 0.26)	-0.06 (-0.37, 0.25)	-0.37 (-0.54, -0.21)
p for trend	0.50	0.57	0.68	< 0.001
BEHP				
Log	-0.04 (-0.07, -0.01)	-0.02 (-0.16, 0.11)	0.01 (-0.12, 0.13)	-0.11 (-0.17, -0.05)
Q1	ref	ref	ref	ref
Q2	0.01 (-0.06, 0.08)	0.14 (-0.19, 0.48)	0 (-0.31, 0.30)	0.07 (-0.09, 0.22)
Q3	-0.09 (-0.16, -0.01)	0.15 (-0.18, 0.48)	-0.07 (-0.37, 0.24)	-0.1 (-0.26, 0.07)
p for trend	0.01	0.45	0.63	0.15
DnBP				
Log	-0.02 (-0.08, 0.05)	-0.02 (-0.31, 0.27)	-0.04 (-0.31, 0.22)	-0.23 (-0.37, -0.08)
Q1	ref	ref	ref	ref
Q2	-0.02 (-0.09, 0.06)	0.04 (-0.29, 0.38)	0.12 (-0.19, 0.42)	0.06 (-0.09, 0.21)
Q3	-0.03 (-0.10, 0.05)	0.12 (-0.21, 0.45)	-0.08 (-0.39, 0.22)	-0.31 (-0.48, -0.15)
p for trend	0.49	0.48	0.60	< 0.001
DPhP				
Log	0 (-0.03, 0.03)	-0.01 (-0.14, 0.12)	0 (-0.12, 0.12)	-0.12 (-0.18, -0.06)
Q1	ref	ref	ref	ref
Q2	-0.04 (-0.12, 0.03)	-0.05 (-0.37, 0.28)	-0.01 (-0.32, 0.30)	-0.16 (-0.32, -0.01)
Q3	0.03 (-0.05, 0.10)	-0.05 (-0.39, 0.28)	0.01 (-0.30, 0.32)	-0.30 (-0.46, -0.14)
p for trend	0.38	0.76	0.93	< 0.001

Note: Generalized linear regression models were adjusted for age, BMI, AMH, education, COH protocols, infertility factors, infertility type. IVF, In Vitro Fertilization; ICSI, Intracytoplasmic Sperm Injection; BBOEP, Bis(2-butoxyethyl) phosphate; BEHP, Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phosphate; DnBP, Di-n-butyl phosphate; DPhP, Diphenyl phosphate

treatment in China. Specifically, elevated BEHP concentrations were negatively associated with the total number of retrieved oocytes, suggesting a possible impact on ovarian function or follicular development. Additionally, higher levels of BBOEP, BEHP, DnBP, and DPhP in follicular fluid were inversely correlated with the number of good embryos on day 3, indicating potential impairment of embryo quality. We also observed a significant

	Biochemical pregnancy	Clinical pregnancy	Live birth		
OPFRs metabolites	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)		
BBOEP					
Log	0.97 (0.87, 1.10)	0.98 (0.87, 1.10)	0.98 (0.87, 1.10)		
Q1	ref	ref	ref		
Q2	1.04 (0.61, 1.79)	1.16 (0.68, 1.98)	1.32 (0.77, 2.26)		
Q3	0.97 (0.57, 1.67)	0.96 (0.57, 1.64)	0.88 (0.52, 1.50)		
p for trend	0.87	0.72	0.34		
BEHP					
Log	0.86 (0.69, 1.08)	0.84 (0.68, 1.05)	0.89 (0.72, 1.11)		
Q1	ref	ref	ref		
Q2	0.85 (0.50, 1.45)	0.88 (0.52, 1.50)	0.98 (0.58, 1.67)		
Q3	0.67 (0.39, 1.13)	0.73 (0.43, 1.23)	0.74 (0.43, 1.25)		
p for trend	0.14	0.23	0.22		
DnBP					
Log	0.59 (0.37, 0.9)	0.72 (0.45, 1.15)	0.70 (0.44, 1.13)		
Q1	ref	ref	ref		
Q2	0.88 (0.51, 1.52)	1.10 (0.65, 1.88)	1.14 (0.67, 1.93)		
Q3	0.58 (0.34, 0.99)	0.69 (0.41, 1.16)	0.67 (0.39, 1.14)		
p for trend	0.046	0.16	0.14		
DPhP					
Log	0.92 (0.75, 1.14)	0.94 (0.77, 1.16)	0.98 (0.80, 1.21)		
Q1	ref	ref	ref		
Q2	1.07 (0.62, 1.83)	1.24 (0.73, 2.11)	1.20 (0.70, 2.04)		
Q3	0.78 (0.46, 1.33)	0.82 (0.49, 1.40)	0.86 (0.50, 1.46)		
p for trend	0.31	0.37	0.48		

Table 5 Associations between OPERs metabolite concentrations in follicular fluid and pregnancy outcome ($n = 38$)	Tabl	e 5	Associations	between	OPFRs	metabolite	concen	itrations	in f	ollicu	lar fl	uid ar	nd pre	gnanc	y outcome ((n = 38	2)
--	------	-----	--------------	---------	-------	------------	--------	-----------	------	--------	--------	--------	--------	-------	-------------	---------	----

Note: Generalized linear regression models were adjusted for age, BMI, education, COH protocols, infertility factors, infertility type, number of embryos transferred, embryo type, fertilization method and Stage of embryo transferred. IVF, In Vitro Fertilization; ICSI, Intracytoplasmic Sperm Injection; BBOEP, Bis(2-butoxyethyl) phosphate; BEHP, Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phosphate; DnBP, Di-n-butyl phosphate; DPhP, Diphenyl phosphate



Fig. 1 A. Estimate effects (95% credible intervals) of the mixtures of OPFRs metabolites on good embryo number by BKMR models when log-transformed metabolite concentrations at particular percentiles were compared with all the OPFRs metabolites at their 50th percentile. B. Univariate exposure-response relationships and 95% credible intervals between log-transformed concentrations of individual OPFRs metabolite. C. Qualitative interaction assessment of OPFRs metabolites. The BKMR models were adjusted same as generalized linear regression

negative association between higher tertiles of DnBP and biochemical pregnancy rates underscoring the potential influence of OPFRs exposure on early pregnancy outcomes. The BKMR analysis further supported our findings, revealing a negative association between mixtures of OPFRs metabolites in follicular fluid and the number of good embryos. Infertility remains a significant public health concern globally, with an increasing number of couples resorting to IVF/ICSI to achieve conception. Our findings shed light on the potential impact of environmental exposures on IVF/ICSI success rates and highlight the importance of considering chemical pollutants in reproductive health research.

Although the precise mechanism remains not fully elucidated, emerging evidence and previous studies provide potential explanations. The observed associations between OPFRs exposure and reproductive outcomes could be explained by the endocrine-disrupting effects of OPFRs on hormone levels and folliculogenesis. Epidemiologic study found that serum OPFRs levels in reproductive-age women are correlated with reproductive and thyroid hormone levels and are significantly associated with the risk of decreased ovarian reserve function [4]. Animal models have demonstrated that OPFRs exposure can affect the levels of estradiol and progesterone, thereby influencing folliculogenesis [27]. Moreover, in vitro experiments have shown that OPFRs can modulate the expression of estrogen, androgen, and glucocorticoid receptors, and interfere with the expression of steroid synthesis-related genes in adrenal cortical cells, testicular interstitial cells, and KGN ovarian granulosa cells [28-30]. Furthermore, OPFRs can act as endocrine disruptors by disrupting cholesterol homeostasis. Studies have indicated that OPFRs exposure is associated with a significant increase in lipid droplets in KGN ovarian granulosa cells and can induce lipid accumulation in ovarian stromal tissue in animals [31].

Despite the significance of our findings, several limitations should be acknowledged. Firstly, while utilizing FF as a biological matrix offers the advantage of directly measuring the exposure on ovary, it doesn't negate the possibility of exposure through other routes or potential contamination during sampling and handling. However, it's worth noting that if contamination had indeed occurred, one would expect consistent high concentration levels of these chemicals across all samples, which was not observed in the study. Moreover, the associations observed in this study could be influenced by other chemicals that were not specifically measured, as humans are constantly exposed to a multitude of chemicals simultaneously. Furthermore, FF samples provide only a snapshot of exposure during the specific follicular development stage when collected. Longitudinal studies should be done in future. Lastly, it is important to note that our study did not collect or analyze data on the concentrations of OPFRs in the semen of male partners. We are unable to determine whether OPFRs in semen influenced the reproductive outcomes observed. This limitation underscores the necessity for future studies to incorporate comprehensive analyses of OPFR concentrations in both male and female reproductive samples. Overall, while this study provides valuable insights, its findings must be interpreted within the context of these inherent limitations.

Conclusions

In conclusion, our findings highlight the significance of environmental exposures, such as OPFRs, as potential modifiable factors influencing IVF/ICSI outcomes. Addressing environmental contaminants through regulatory measures and lifestyle modifications may offer opportunities to improve IVF/ICSI success rates and mitigate the impact of environmental factors on reproductive health. Further research is needed to prove and elucidate the mechanisms underlying the observed associations.

Abbreviations

OPFRs	Organophosphate Flame Retardants
IVF/ICSI	In Vitro Fertilization/Intracytoplasmic Sperm Injection
EDCs	Endocrine-Disrupting Chemicals
BMI	Body Mass Index
АМН	Anti-Mullerian Hormone
E2	Estradiol
FSH	Follicle-Stimulating Hormone
LH	Luteinizing Hormone
СОН	Controlled Ovarian Hyperstimulation
UHPLC-MS/MS	Ultra-High Performance Liquid Chromatography-Tandem
	Mass Spectrometry
MRM	Multiple Reaction Monitoring
BCEP	Bis(2-chloroethyl) phosphate
BCIPP	Bis(1-chloro-2-propyl) phosphate
BDCIPP	Bis(1,3-dichloro-2-propyl) phosphate
DPhP	Diphenyl phosphate
BBOEP	Bis(2-butoxyethyl) phosphate
DnBP	Di-n-butyl phosphate
BEHP	Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phosphate
LOD	Limit of Detection
LQD	Lower Limit of Quantification
GLM	Generalized Linear Model
CI	Confidence Interval
BKMR	Bayesian Kernel Machine Regression
RCT	Randomized Controlled Trial
DFs	Detection Frequencies
p-trend	Trend Test p-value
RSD	Relative Standard Deviation

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.or g/10.1186/s12958-025-01390-3.

Supplementary Material 1

Acknowledgements

The authors thank all the study participants, the doctors, and the nurses for their support.

Author contributions

Xiaohong Li: investigation, methodology, data curation, writing—review and editing, and funding acquisition. Jiahui Qiu: formal analysis, validation, writing of original draft, and writing—review and editing. Zhiwei Gan: methodology, and writing—review and editing. Shangwei Li: investigation, data curation, resources, and writing—review and editing. Xun Zeng: project administration, conceptualization, supervision, writing—review and editing, funding acquisition.

Funding

This study was supported by grants from the Department of Science and Technology of Sichuan Province, with grant number 2024YFFK0328 and 2024YFFK0366.

Data availability

The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The research protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of West China Second University Hospital, Sichuan University of Science and Technology. The study was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Each participant signed an informed consent form upon enrollment.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Clinical trial number

Not applicable.

Received: 1 January 2025 / Accepted: 29 March 2025 Published online: 08 April 2025

References

- 1. WHO, Infertility. 2023 [Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-s heets/detail/infertility
- Bala R, Singh V, Rajender S, Singh K. Environment, lifestyle, and female infertility. Reproductive Sci. 2021;28(3):617–38.
- Kahn LG, Philippat C, Nakayama SF, Slama R, Trasande L. Endocrine-disrupting chemicals: implications for human health. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2020;8(8):703–18.
- Liu Y, Li Y, Xiao N, Liu M, Wang Y, Luo H, et al. Serum organophosphate flame retardants and plasticizers in Chinese females of childbearing age: association with serum reproductive and thyroid hormones. Chemosphere. 2023;337:139237.
- Luo K, Liu J, Wang Y, Aimuzi R, Luo F, Ao J, et al. Associations between organophosphate esters and sex hormones among 6–19-year old children and adolescents in NHANES 2013–2014. Environ Int. 2020;136:105461.
- Patisaul HB, Behl M, Birnbaum LS, Blum A, Diamond ML, Rojello Fernández S et al. Beyond cholinesterase Inhibition: developmental neurotoxicity of organophosphate ester flame retardants and plasticizers. Environ Health Perspect. 2021;129(10).
- Wang X, Hales BF, Robaire B. Effects of flame retardants on ovarian function. Reprod Toxicol. 2021;10–23.
- Green MP, Harvey AJ, Finger BJ, Tarulli GA. Endocrine disrupting chemicals: impacts on human fertility and fecundity during the peri-conception period. Environ Res. 2021;194:110694.
- Percy Z, Vuong AM, Xu Y, Xie C, Ospina M, Calafat AM, et al. Maternal urinary organophosphate esters and alterations in maternal and neonatal thyroid hormones. Am J Epidemiol. 2021;190(9):1793–802.
- 10. vdV l, dB J. Phosphorus flame retardants: properties, production, environmental occurrence, toxicity and analysis. Chemosphere. 2012;88(10).
- Hou R, Xu Y, Wang Z. Review of OPFRs in animals and humans: absorption, bioaccumulation, metabolism, and internal exposure research. Chemosphere. 2016;153:78–90.
- Yang F, Ding J, Huang W, Xie W, Liu W. Particle Size-Specific distributions and preliminary exposure assessments of organophosphate flame retardants in office air particulate matter. Environ Sci Technol. 2014;48(1):63–70.
- Kademoglou K, Xu F, Padilla-Sanchez JA, Haug LS, Covaci A, Collins CD. Legacy and alternative flame retardants in Norwegian and UK indoor environment: implications of human exposure via dust ingestion. Environ Int. 2017;102:48–56.
- Guo Y, Chen M, Liao M, Su S, Sun W, Gan Z. Organophosphorus flame retardants and their metabolites in paired human blood and urine. Ecotoxicol Environ Saf. 2023;268:115696.

- Ding J, Deng T, Xu M, Wang S, Yang F. Residuals of organophosphate esters in foodstuffs and implication for human exposure. Environ Pollut. 2018;233:986–91.
- Alves A, Covaci A, Voorspoels S. Method development for assessing the human exposure to organophosphate flame retardants in hair and nails. Chemosphere. 2017;168:692–8.
- Wang X, Zhu Q, Liao C, Jiang G. Human internal exposure to organophosphate esters: A short review of urinary monitoring on the basis of biological metabolism research. J Hazard Mater. 2021;418:126279.
- Sun Y, Gong X, Lin W, Liu Y, Wang Y, Wu M, et al. Metabolites of organophosphate ester flame retardants in urine from Shanghai, China. Environ Res. 2018;164:507–15.
- Carignan CC, Mínguez-Alarcón L, Williams PL, Meeker JD, Stapleton HM, Butt CM, et al. Paternal urinary concentrations of organophosphate flame retardant metabolites, fertility measures, and pregnancy outcomes among couples undergoing in vitro fertilization. Environ Int. 2018;111:232–8.
- Messerlian C, Williams PL, Mínguez-Alarcón L, Carignan CC, Ford JB, Butt CM, et al. Organophosphate flame-retardant metabolite concentrations and pregnancy loss among women conceiving with assisted reproductive technology. Fertil Steril. 2018;110(6):1137–e441.
- 21. Carignan CC, Mínguez-Alarcón L, Butt CM, Williams PL, Meeker JD, Stapleton HM, et al. Urinary concentrations of organophosphate flame retardant metabolites and pregnancy outcomes among women undergoing < i > in vitro fertilization. Environ Health Perspect. 2017;125(8):087018.
- 22. Dumesic DA, Meldrum DR, Katz-Jaffe MG, Krisher RL, Schoolcraft WB. Oocyte environment: follicular fluid and cumulus cells are critical for oocyte health. Fertil Steril. 2015;103(2):303–16.
- Volpes A, Sammartano F, Coffaro F, Mistretta V, Scaglione P, Allegra A. Number of good quality embryos on day 3 is predictive for both pregnancy and implantation rates in in vitro fertilization/intracytoplasmic sperm injection cycles. Fertil Steril. 2004;82(5):1330–6.
- 24. Qiu J, Luo S, Bai Y, Zeng X, Li X. Human menopausal gonadotropins in combination for stimulation does not improve IVF outcomes in POSEIDON group 4 patients, when compared to Recombinant follicle stimulating hormone alone: A prospective randomized, Non-Blinded, controlled pilot trial. Clin Exp Obstet Gynecol. 2023;50(11):235.
- 25. Organization WH. Health status statistics: mortality. 2012.
- He C, English K, Baduel C, Thai P, Jagals P, Ware RS, et al. Concentrations of organophosphate flame retardants and plasticizers in urine from young children in Queensland, Australia and associations with environmental and behavioural factors. Environ Res. 2018;164:262–70.
- Young AS, Zoeller T, Hauser R, James-Todd T, Coull BA, Behnisch PA et al. Assessing indoor dust interference with human nuclear hormone receptors in Cell-Based luciferase reporter assays. Environ Health Perspect. 2021;129(4).
- 28. Wang X, Lee E, Hales BF, Robaire B. Organophosphate esters disrupt steroidogenesis in KGN human ovarian granulosa cells. Endocrinology. 2023.
- Liu X, Ji K, Choi K. Endocrine disruption potentials of organophosphate flame retardants and related mechanisms in H295R and MVLN cell lines and in zebrafish. Aquat Toxicol. 2012;114–115:173–81.
- Schang G, Robaire B, Hales BF. Organophosphate flame retardants act as Endocrine-Disrupting chemicals in MA-10 mouse tumor Leydig cells. Toxicol Sci. 2016;150(2):499–509.
- Wang X, Luu T, Beal MA, Barton-Maclaren TS, Robaire B, Hales BF. The effects of organophosphate esters used as flame retardants and plasticizers on granulosa, Leydig, and spermatogonial cells analyzed using High-Content imaging. Toxicol Sci. 2022;186(2):269–87.

Publisher's note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.