



Association Between Fertility Treatment and Cancer Risk in Children

¹ Yuliana, ¹ Vera

¹ Faculty of Medicine, Tarumanagara University, Special Region of Jakarta, Indonesia

Correspondence : dr.yuliana102848@gmail.com

Article History :

Received date : 2024/04/12
Revised date : 2024/05/05
Accepted date : 2024/06/18
Published date : 2024/07/03



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

E-ISSN :

ISSN 3048-1368



P-ISSN :

ISSN 3048-1376



ABSTRACT

Background: The association between fertility treatment and cancer risk in children has garnered increasing attention in recent years, as advancements in reproductive technologies have raised important questions regarding the long-term health outcomes of children conceived through these methods.

Literature Review: The literature reveals a complex interplay of factors that contribute to understanding this relationship, as evidenced by the diverse studies reviewed. The foundational work by (Breit, 2014) emphasizes the critical role of fertility preservation in pediatric oncology and underscores the need for healthcare providers to be well-informed about the implications of fertility treatments. This is particularly relevant given the limited empirical evidence available regarding the direct correlation between fertility treatments and cancer risk in pediatric populations. **Conclusion:** In conclusion, the literature illustrates the complex and multifaceted nature of the association between fertility treatment and cancer risk in children. It highlights the need for ongoing research to clarify these relationships and underscores the importance of individualized care and equitable access to fertility preservation options. The findings collectively advocate for a more robust dialogue within the medical community to inform clinical practices and patient counseling regarding the potential risks and benefits associated with fertility treatments.

Keyword: Fertility Treatment, Cancer Risk, Children

INTRODUCTION

The association between fertility treatment and cancer risk in children has garnered increasing attention in recent years, as advancements in reproductive technologies have raised important questions regarding the long-term health outcomes of children conceived through these methods. The literature reveals a complex interplay between fertility treatments and cancer risk, with various studies examining this relationship from multiple perspectives.

(Breit, 2014) provides a foundational overview by reviewing six studies that focus on the attitudes and practices of oncologists regarding sperm banking prior to cancer treatment. This work emphasizes the importance of fertility preservation in pediatric oncology, highlighting the need for healthcare providers to be knowledgeable about these practices to better support young cancer patients.

In the same year, (Tomao et al., 2014) delve deeper into the potential

risks associated with fertility drugs, specifically their link to ovarian cancer. Their review critically assesses the conflicting evidence surrounding this association, noting that many studies have relied on outdated treatment protocols. This highlights the necessity for ongoing research to clarify the implications of modern fertility treatments on cancer risk.

(M Carneiro et al., 2018) shift the focus to young women diagnosed with breast cancer, discussing the delicate balance between fertility preservation and the urgency of cancer treatment. Their narrative review underscores the importance of individualized counseling for patients, as advancements in cancer therapies have improved prognoses, thereby increasing the relevance of fertility concerns.

The review by (Del Pup et al., 2018) further expands the discussion by synthesizing evidence on the cancer risks associated with assisted reproductive technologies. Their findings suggest that while fertility

drugs do not appear to increase the risk of several cancers, including colon and cervical cancer, there remains uncertainty regarding lymphoma risk. This meta-analysis contributes to the ongoing dialogue about the safety of fertility treatments.

(Newton et al., 2019) provide a broader overview of the late effects of cancer treatments on reproductive health, emphasizing the need to consider long-term outcomes for children conceived through assisted reproductive technologies. Their insights into reproductive technologies and the risk of birth defects provide critical context for understanding the implications of these treatments.

(Coker Appiah et al., 2021) address disparities in access to fertility preservation options for pediatric, adolescent, and young adult populations. Their needs assessment highlights the necessity for equitable care and the importance of addressing barriers that may prevent vulnerable groups from receiving appropriate fertility preservation services.

Finally, (Cullinane et al., 2022) conduct a meta-analysis examining

the incidence of breast cancer in relation to fertility treatments. Their findings reveal a nuanced relationship, indicating that while there is no significant overall increase in breast cancer risk associated with IVF, certain subgroups, particularly those undergoing multiple cycles, may face heightened risks. This underscores the complexity of the relationship between fertility treatments and cancer risk, necessitating further investigation.

Overall, this literature review illustrates the multifaceted nature of the association between fertility treatment and cancer risk, highlighting the need for ongoing research and careful consideration of individual patient circumstances to inform clinical practice and patient counseling.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Breit (2014) provides a critical examination of the intersection between pediatric oncology and fertility preservation, highlighting a notable gap in research regarding the association between fertility treatment and cancer risk in

children. The article synthesizes findings from six studies that met specific inclusion criteria, comprising both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies.

The quantitative studies included in the review primarily focused on oncologists' attitudes and practices concerning sperm banking prior to cancer treatment. This emphasis on oncologists' perspectives is significant, as it reflects the clinical considerations that may influence the decision-making process surrounding fertility preservation. The use of a general survey to assess these attitudes suggests a systematic approach to understanding the current state of knowledge and practice among healthcare providers in this specialized field.

However, the article underscores the limited empirical evidence available on the direct relationship between fertility treatments and subsequent cancer risk in pediatric populations. This lack of comprehensive data presents a challenge for healthcare providers, as they must navigate the complexities of fertility preservation while being

cognizant of potential long-term health implications for their patients. The findings from the literature review indicate that while there is an awareness of the importance of fertility preservation, there remains a need for further research to elucidate the potential risks associated with these treatments.

Breit's work emphasizes the necessity for continued investigation into the long-term outcomes of children who undergo fertility preservation methods. By identifying the existing gaps in research, the article advocates for a more robust dialogue within the medical community regarding the implications of fertility treatments on cancer risk. This dialogue is essential not only for enhancing clinical practices but also for informing families about the potential risks and benefits associated with fertility preservation in the context of pediatric oncology.

The article "Fertility drugs, reproductive strategies and ovarian cancer risk" by Tomao et al. (2014) presents a thorough examination of the potential association between

fertility treatments, specifically ovulation-stimulating therapies, and the risk of ovarian cancer. The authors highlight the conflicting nature of existing literature regarding this relationship, suggesting that while some studies indicate an increased risk, others do not support this claim. This critical evaluation of relevant studies serves to clarify the complexities surrounding the issue.

The methodology employed by the authors is commendable, as they conducted a comprehensive review of scientific literature by utilizing multiple databases, including Pubmed, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Library. By applying no restrictions on period, language, or study design, the authors aimed to capture a broad spectrum of research findings. Their rigorous selection process involved an initial analysis of 970 papers, leading to the exclusion of 843 based on title and abstract relevance. Ultimately, they focused on 127 studies that were deemed pertinent, allowing for a detailed exploration of the relationship between fertility drug use and ovarian cancer incidence.

The article's findings suggest a nuanced understanding of the risks associated with fertility treatments. While the authors acknowledge that ovulation-stimulating therapies may correlate with an increased risk of ovarian cancer, they also emphasize the variability in study outcomes. This inconsistency may stem from differences in study populations, treatment protocols, and methodologies. Furthermore, the authors note that many studies evaluated older fertility drugs that may not reflect contemporary practices, potentially skewing the perceived risk.

The article "Motherhood after breast cancer: can we balance fertility preservation and cancer treatment? A narrative review of the literature" by Carneiro et al. (2018) provides a comprehensive examination of the delicate balance between cancer treatment and fertility preservation in women diagnosed with breast cancer. The authors highlight the significant advancements in cancer prognosis, which have intensified the focus on fertility issues for survivors.

The narrative review underscores the necessity of prioritizing cancer treatment over fertility concerns, as recommended by the FIGO Committee for the Ethical Aspects of Human Reproduction and Women's Health. This perspective is crucial, as delaying cancer treatment for fertility preservation poses considerable risks to patient health. The authors meticulously detail their methodology, indicating a systematic search through PubMed for relevant literature, although they encountered challenges due to the intermingling of data on various female cancers. This methodological rigor is commendable, as it reflects an effort to distill specific insights related to breast cancer and fertility preservation strategies.

Despite the thoroughness of their review, the authors note a significant gap in the literature: the absence of randomized clinical trials on fertility-sparing treatments for breast cancer patients. This lack of high-quality evidence raises concerns regarding the generalizability and safety of fertility preservation techniques in this population. The

authors' decision to exclude articles that conflated breast cancer with other types of female cancers is a critical methodological choice, as it ensures that the findings are directly applicable to the target demographic.

Moreover, the narrative review effectively highlights the complexities involved in making informed decisions about fertility preservation in the context of cancer treatment. By focusing solely on articles that report data specific to breast cancer and fertility preservation strategies, the authors provide valuable insights into the current state of knowledge and the need for further research in this area.

The article titled "Risk of cancer after assisted reproduction: a review of the available evidences and guidance to fertility counselors" by Del Pup et al. (2018) provides a comprehensive examination of the potential relationship between fertility treatments and cancer risk in children conceived through such interventions. The authors systematically analyze existing literature to shed light on the safety of

fertility drugs and assisted reproductive technologies (ART).

A critical evaluation of the material reveals that the authors present a balanced view of the current evidence regarding the association between fertility treatments and various types of cancer. They conclude that there is fair evidence indicating that fertility drugs do not contribute to an increased risk of colon cancer, which is a significant finding that may alleviate concerns among patients undergoing fertility treatments. Furthermore, the article highlights that the evidence regarding lymphoma risk remains insufficient, suggesting a need for further investigation in this area.

The authors also address cervical cancer, asserting that there is fair evidence to support the notion that fertility drugs do not elevate the risk of this type of cancer. This conclusion is particularly relevant for fertility counselors who must provide informed guidance to patients considering ART. The systematic review and meta-analysis concerning breast cancer incidence after hormonal treatments for infertility are

notable contributions to the discourse, as they synthesize data from population-based studies to clarify the potential risks associated with hormonal interventions in fertility treatments.

Despite the strengths of the review, including its thoroughness and the clarity of its conclusions, there are limitations that warrant consideration. The authors acknowledge the need for more robust studies, particularly longitudinal research that could better establish causal relationships and long-term outcomes. The reliance on existing studies, some of which may have methodological limitations, could impact the overall strength of the conclusions drawn.

The article "Survival from cancer in young people: An overview of late effects focusing on reproductive health" by Newton et al. (2019) provides a comprehensive examination of the late effects of cancer treatment in young individuals, particularly emphasizing reproductive health. The authors synthesize findings from various studies, including those that

investigate the implications of assisted reproductive technologies (ART) on the health of offspring, specifically regarding the potential increased risk of birth defects and cancer.

One of the critical evaluations presented in the article is the association between ART and the risk of adverse health outcomes in children conceived through these methods. The authors reference a range of studies, including those that have explored the long-term health outcomes for children born as a result of in vitro fertilization (IVF) and other reproductive technologies. For instance, they highlight that while some studies suggest a potential increase in the risk of birth defects associated with ART (N Engl J Med, 2012), the evidence remains mixed and often context-dependent, varying by the specific techniques used and the underlying factors of the parents.

Furthermore, the article discusses the risk of cancer in children conceived via ART, referencing pivotal research that has attempted to quantify this risk. The authors note that while some studies

indicate a higher incidence of certain cancers in children conceived through ART (Pediatrics, 2016), others have found no significant association. This inconsistency in findings suggests a need for further research to clarify the relationship between ART and long-term health outcomes, particularly cancer risk.

The authors also address the importance of considering confounding factors, such as parental age and underlying infertility issues, which may contribute to the observed health outcomes in children conceived through ART. This nuanced understanding is crucial for interpreting the data accurately and for guiding future research directions.

The article "Disparities in Female Pediatric, Adolescent and Young Adult Oncofertility: A Needs Assessment" by Appiah et al. (2021) provides a comprehensive evaluation of the barriers faced by the pediatric, adolescent, and young adult (AYA) population in accessing oncofertility services. The authors highlight several critical disparities that affect this demographic, including financial constraints, provider biases, and

inequitable referral patterns to reproductive specialists. These barriers are particularly significant in the context of cancer survivorship, where the need for reproductive health care becomes paramount.

One of the key insights of the article is the emphasis on the lack of awareness and knowledge within the medical community regarding assisted reproductive technologies and the reproductive health needs of cancer survivors. This gap in knowledge can lead to inadequate referrals and support for patients who may wish to preserve their fertility post-treatment. The authors argue that oncologists, gynecologists, pediatric subspecialists, and primary care providers must be better educated on the available reproductive options for young cancer survivors to improve access to care and mitigate the disparities identified.

The article also discusses how socioeconomic factors play a significant role in accessing oncofertility services. Cost remains a substantial barrier, as many families may not have the financial resources to pursue fertility preservation

methods. This financial strain can disproportionately affect marginalized populations, further exacerbating existing health disparities. The authors call for systemic changes to address these inequities, advocating for policies that support equitable access to reproductive health care for all patients, regardless of their socioeconomic status.

Furthermore, the authors provide a critical analysis of the referral patterns to reproductive specialists, noting that biases from healthcare providers can lead to inconsistent recommendations for fertility preservation. This inconsistency can result in missed opportunities for young patients who may benefit from such interventions. The authors recommend implementing standardized guidelines for referral to ensure that all patients receive appropriate counseling and support regarding their reproductive options.

The article titled "Fertility treatment and breast-cancer incidence: meta-analysis" by Carolyn Cullinane et al. (2022) provides a

comprehensive examination of the relationship between fertility treatments, particularly in vitro fertilization (IVF), and the risk of breast cancer among women. The authors effectively contextualize the growing prevalence of IVF in response to rising infertility rates and delayed childbearing, noting that approximately 9% of couples face infertility, with a significant portion seeking medical intervention. This backdrop is essential for understanding the implications of fertility treatments on long-term health outcomes, particularly concerning breast cancer, which is the most common malignancy among reproductive-age women globally.

The article critically evaluates existing literature, highlighting a dichotomy in findings regarding the association between fertility treatments and breast cancer risk. The authors reference earlier reviews that failed to establish a clear correlation between IVF and increased breast cancer risk, while also acknowledging studies that suggest a potential protective effect and others that indicate an elevated risk associated

with prolonged follow-up periods. This nuanced perspective is crucial as it underscores the complexity of the relationship between exogenous hormone manipulation during fertility treatments and subsequent cancer risk.

Cullinane et al. (2022) further emphasize the importance of differentiating between various fertility therapies and their respective impacts on breast cancer incidence. They point out that while some large population-based studies indicate no significant difference in breast cancer risk between IVF-treated women and those with subfertility who did not undergo IVF, other cohort studies suggest a heightened risk for those exposed to assisted reproductive technology (ART) over extended follow-up durations. This inconsistency in findings calls for a more granular analysis of the data, considering factors such as age at treatment, duration of exposure to fertility drugs, and individual patient histories.

The updated meta-analysis presented in the article serves as a timely contribution to the ongoing

discourse surrounding fertility treatments and cancer risk. It reflects the authors' commitment to synthesizing recent evidence and addressing gaps in previous research.

CONCLUSION

The association between fertility treatment and cancer risk in children is a multifaceted issue that has been the subject of extensive research. The literature reveals a complex interplay of factors that contribute to understanding this relationship, as evidenced by the diverse studies reviewed. The foundational work by (Breit, 2014) emphasizes the critical role of fertility preservation in pediatric oncology and underscores the need for healthcare providers to be well-informed about the implications of fertility treatments. This is particularly relevant given the limited empirical evidence available regarding the direct correlation between fertility treatments and cancer risk in pediatric populations.

(Tomao et al., 2014) delve into the potential risks associated with fertility drugs, specifically their link

to ovarian cancer. Their findings highlight the conflicting nature of existing research, necessitating ongoing investigations to clarify the implications of modern fertility treatments on cancer risk. (M Carneiro et al., 2018) further explore the delicate balance between fertility preservation and the urgency of cancer treatment in young women diagnosed with breast cancer, emphasizing the importance of individualized counseling in light of improved cancer prognoses.

The review by (Del Pup et al., 2018) expands the discussion by synthesizing evidence on the cancer risks associated with assisted reproductive technologies (ART). Their findings suggest that while fertility drugs do not appear to increase the risk of certain cancers, uncertainty remains regarding lymphoma risk. This highlights the necessity for further research to address these gaps in understanding. (Newton et al., 2019) contribute to this dialogue by examining the late effects of cancer treatments on reproductive health, particularly in children conceived through ART, and

noting the potential risks of birth defects and cancer.

(Coker Appiah et al., 2021) address disparities in access to fertility preservation options for pediatric populations, emphasizing the need for equitable care and the importance of addressing barriers that prevent vulnerable groups from receiving appropriate services. Finally, the meta-analysis by (Cullinane et al., 2022) provides a nuanced perspective on the relationship between fertility treatments and breast cancer incidence, indicating that while there is no significant overall increase in risk, certain subgroups may face heightened vulnerabilities.

In conclusion, the literature illustrates the complex and multifaceted nature of the association between fertility treatment and cancer risk in children. It highlights the need for ongoing research to clarify these relationships and underscores the importance of individualized care and equitable access to fertility preservation options. The findings collectively advocate for a more robust dialogue within the medical

community to inform clinical practices and patient counseling regarding the potential risks and benefits associated with fertility treatments.

REFERENCES

1. Breit, E., 2014. Education for Pediatric Oncology Nurses on Fertility Preservation of Pediatric Oncology Patients. [PDF]
2. Tomao, F., Lo Russo, G., Paolo Spinelli, G., Stati, V., Anna Prete, A., Prinzi, N., Sinjari, M., Vici, P., Papa, A., Stefania Chiotti, M., Benedetti Panici, P., & Tomao, S., 2014. Fertility drugs, reproductive strategies and ovarian cancer risk. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
3. M Carneiro, M., M Cota, A., C Amaral, M., L Pedrosa, M., O Martins, B., H Furtado, M., M Lamaita, R., & C F Ferreira, M., 2018. Motherhood after breast cancer: can we balance fertility preservation and cancer treatment? A narrative

- review of the literature.
ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
4. Del Pup, L., A Peccatori, F., E Levi-Setti, P., Codacci-Pisanelli, G., & Patrizio, P., 2018. Risk of cancer after assisted reproduction: a review of the available evidences and guidance to fertility counselors. [PDF]
 5. Newton, H. L., Friend, A. J., Feltbower, R., Hayden, C. J., Picton, H. M., & Glaser, A. W., 2019. Survival from cancer in young people: An overview of late effects focusing on reproductive health. [PDF]
 6. Coker Appiah, L., Frances Fei, Y., Olsen, M., R. Lindheim, S., & M. Puccetti, D., 2021. Disparities in Female Pediatric, Adolescent and Young Adult Oncofertility: A Needs Assessment. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
 7. Cullinane, C., Gillan, H., Geraghty, J., Evoy, D., Rothwell, J., McCartan, D., W. McDermott, E., & S. Prichard, R., 2022. Fertility treatment and breast-cancer incidence: meta-analysis. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov