JIVFww

Al-Asmar Piñar N, Hsu PY. The role of the ERA test in implantation failure - a debate. *Journal of IVF-Worldwide*. 2024;2(4.1):11. doi:10.46989/001c.126624

Conference Materials

The role of the ERA test in implantation failure - a debate

Nasser Al-Asmar Piñar[1], Pei-Yang Hsu[2]

[1] Igenomix, [2] National Cheng Kung University Hospital

Keywords: Endometrial Receptivity Analysis, ERA, endometrial microbiome, maternal embryonic crosstalk, implantation, frozen embryo transfer

https://doi.org/10.46989/001c.126624

Journal of IVF-Worldwide

Vol. 2, Issue 4.1, 2024

URL: https://www.youtube.com/embed/nZtZ4vuQq-c

In this comprehensive video discussion titled "**The role of the ERA test in implantation failure - a debate**", the role of the Endometrial Receptivity Analysis (ERA) test in cases of implantation failure within In Vitro Fertilization (IVF) is thoroughly debated. **Dr. Nasser Al-Asmar Piñar** from Spain advocates for the ERA test's use to augment implantation rates, citing factors like the endometrial microbiome and maternal embryonic crosstalk as key considerations. Positive publications and studies indicating enhanced clinical outcomes with personalized embryo transfer guided by the ERA test support his stance.

Contrastingly, **Dr. Pei-Yang Hsu** expresses skepticism about the claims made regarding the ERA test and raises methodological concerns regarding certain studies. He cites studies demonstrating no significant difference in pregnancy outcomes between personalized embryo transfer and standard embryo transfer, prompting the need for additional research before definitive conclusions can be drawn regarding the ERA test's role in implantation failure.

The discussion delves into the clinical conditions necessitating an ERA test, particularly for patients with recurrent implantation failure, where timing is crucial for successful transfer. Studies and meta-analyses are presented, comparing conventional frozen embryo transfer with personalized embryo transfer guided by ERA, emphasizing improved clinical pregnancy rates for patients with a history of recurrent implantation failure.

However, concerns are also voiced regarding study methodologies and missing data, highlighting the importance of critically evaluating the available data. Criticisms of certain studies are brought to light, where adjustments in transfer timing beyond 24 hours resulted in worsened clinical pregnancy rates and higher biochemical pregnancy loss rates.

Various studies and meta-analyses evaluating the effectiveness of the ERA test in improving pregnancy outcomes are discussed. While some suggest a significant improvement, concerns are raised regarding study clarity and quality, leading to a consensus on the necessity for more focused research to address implantation failure effectively.

Furthermore, the discussion underscores the need for solid studies to validate the effectiveness of the ERA test, particularly in recurrent implantation failure patients. The presence of success stories in clinics without published data emphasizes the urgency of conducting conclusive research, aiding clinicians in making informed decisions and ensuring patient care is optimized.

In conclusion, the ongoing debate surrounding the ERA test underscores the necessity for further rigorous research to substantiate its efficacy and standardize its application, especially in recurrent implantation failure cases. Only through a comprehensive understanding of its benefits and limitations can the ERA test be effectively utilized to enhance the success rates of IVF procedures.

Submitted: November 27, 2024 CST, Accepted: November 27, 2024 CST