Archives of Men's Health. 2024; 8(1): e11

REVIEW ARTICLE

DNA Fragmentation Index and Male Infertility: A Narrative Review of Mechanisms, Clinical Implications, and Diagnostic Relevance

Amir Reza Abedi[1]*, **Sina Samenezhad**[1]

1. Men's Health & Reproductive Health Research Center, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

Received: October 2024; Accepted: November 2024; Published online: December 2024

Abstract: Male infertility accounts for approximately half of all cases in couples unable to conceive. Beyond routine semen analysis, sperm DNA integrity measured by the DNA Fragmentation Index (DFI) is emerging as a key indicator of reproductive potential. DFI represents the percentage of sperm with damaged DNA and is associated with poorer reproductive outcomes, including reduced chances of natural conception, ART failure, and increased miscarriage rates. This narrative review examines the biological mechanisms underlying sperm DNA fragmentation, the clinical relevance of DFI in infertility evaluations, available laboratory methods for DFI assessment, and therapeutic strategies. Although interventions like varicocelectomy and antioxidant therapy show promise, the quality of evidence varies. We conclude by discussing current limitations and future directions in this evolving field.

Keywords: DFI, Male Infertility, Assisted reproductive technology (ART)

Cite this article as: Abedi AR, Samenezhad S. DNA Fragmentation Index and Male Infertility: A Narrative Review of Mechanisms, Clinical Implications, and Diagnostic Relevance. Archives of Men's Health. 2024; 8(1): e11.

1. Introduction

Male infertility affects millions of couples globally and is often underdiagnosed due to the limited scope of conventional semen parameters such as sperm count, motility, and morphology. Recent advances have highlighted the importance of sperm DNA integrity as a vital determinant of male reproductive potential. The DNA Fragmentation Index (DFI), a quantifiable measure of sperm DNA damage, is increasingly used to assess sperm quality. This review explores the role of DFI in evaluating and managing male infertility.

2. Methodology

This narrative review was conducted through a comprehensive search of the scientific literature across PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar databases. The search strategy utilized keywords including "DNA fragmentation index," "sperm DNA damage," "male infertility," "oxidative stress," and "ART outcomes." We included English-language, peer-reviewed studies published between 1990 and 2024, with emphasis on systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and original clinical research. Studies addressing pathophysiology, diagnostic tools, and clinical implications of sperm DNA fragmentation were prioritized. Articles focusing exclusively on animal models or lacking full-text availability were excluded. Additionally, reference lists of key papers were manually reviewed to identify further relevant studies.

3. Mechanisms of Sperm DNA Fragmentation

Sperm DNA fragmentation (SDF) arises from both intrinsic defects during spermatogenesis and extrinsic insults encountered after sperm leave the testis. Classifying these mechanisms as testicular or post-testicular (non-testicular) in origin provides a clearer framework for understanding their pathophysiological relevance and guiding clinical interventions.

3.1. Testicular Causes

Testicular factors typically originate from impaired spermatogenesis or intrinsic sperm defects:

3.1.1. Defective Chromatin Remodeling

* **Corresponding Author:** Amir Reza Abedi; Address: Men's Health and Reproductive Health Research Center, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran. Email: amirezabedi@gmail.com.

Table 1: A comparative summary of diagnostic techniques for assessing sperm DNA fragmentation

Method	Type	Principle	Advantages	Limitations	Typical Cutoff
SCSA [6]	Indirect	Measures chromatin susceptibility to acid denaturation via flow cytometry	High reproducibility, rapid, and widely available	Requires specialized equipment	≥25–30% DFI abnormal [10]
SCD [9]	Indirect	Halo-based visualization of DNA integrity after denaturation	Simple, cost-effective	Operator-dependent, less standardized	Lab-specific
TUNEL [7]	Direct	Labels DNA breaks with fluorescent nucleotides	High sensitivity, direct measurement	Time-consuming, variable results	≥15–20% DFI abnormal
Comet [8]	Direct	Electrophoresis reveals DNA damage per each sperm cell	Detailed analysis, research utility	Labor-intensive, not standardized	20–25% DNA in tail

During spermiogenesis, histones are normally replaced by protamines to achieve tight chromatin packaging. Incomplete or abnormal histone-to-protamine exchange leaves DNA less condensed and more vulnerable to strand breaks and oxidative damage [1].

3.1.2. Apoptosis and Spermatogenic Dysfunction

Dysregulated germ cell apoptosis during spermatogenesis can result in the release of endonucleases that induce DNA cleavage. Such mechanisms are frequently implicated in conditions like testicular failure, cryptorchidism, and severe oligospermia [2].

3.1.3. Genetic and Epigenetic Abnormalities

Chromosomal aberrations, Y-chromosome microdeletions, and altered DNA methylation patterns disrupt chromatin integrity and increase DNA fragmentation risk.

3.2. Post-Testicular (Non-Testicular) Causes

Once sperm leave the testis, they are exposed to a range of environmental and biochemical factors that may damage DNA:

3.2.1. Oxidative Stress

Reactive oxygen species (ROS) are a major contributor to DNA strand breaks, especially when seminal antioxidant defenses are overwhelmed. Oxidative stress is prevalent in many infertile men and is closely associated with aging, leukocytospermia, and systemic inflammation [3,4].

3.2.2. Epididymal Transit Damage

Sperm DNA can be compromised during epididymal maturation, particularly in cases of infection or epididymal inflammation, where exposure to ROS and proteolytic enzymes is increased.

3.2.3. Lifestyle and Environmental Exposures

Smoking, alcohol consumption, obesity, air pollution, radiation, and occupational heat exposure are well-established contributors to elevated SDF[5].

3.2.4. Iatrogenic Factors

Laboratory procedures, including sperm cryopreservation and repeated freeze–thaw cycles, may exacerbate DNA damage, especially in men with already poor semen quality.

4. Diagnostic Methods for Assessing DFI

Several laboratory techniques are used to assess sperm DNA fragmentation, including:

Sperm Chromatin Structure Assay (SCSA): a flow cytometry-based method [6].

TUNEL assay: detects both single- and double-strand DNA breaks [7].

Comet assay: measures DNA damage at the single-cell level [8].

Sperm Chromatin Dispersion (SCD) test: based on DNA dispersion patterns [9].

Although no universal cutoff exists, DFI values above 25–30% are typically considered abnormal [10]. A comparative summary of diagnostic techniques for assessing sperm DNA fragmentation is presented in Table 1. The assays are categorized as direct or indirect methods based on whether they measure DNA strand breaks directly or evaluate chromatin stability indirectly. The table highlights each method's principles, advantages, limitations, and widely used clinical cutoffs, offering clinicians a practical reference for test selection.

5. Clinical Relevance of DFI in Male Infertility

A limitation of our study is the inability to perform matching between groups, as it was designed as a case-control study. We recommend conducting future research as a matched, prospective clinical trial to better control for potential confounding factors.

5.1. Natural Conception

Men with high DFI have significantly lower rates of natural conception, even with normal semen parameters [11].

5.2. Intrauterine Insemination (IUI)

High DFI has been correlated with lower IUI success rates and is used as a predictor of treatment failure [12].

5.3. IVF and ICSI

Sperm DNA fragmentation is associated with lower fertilization rates, poor embryo quality, and increased miscarriage in IVF/ICSI [13,14].

5.4. Recurrent Pregnancy Loss

Elevated DFI is seen in male partners of women with recurrent miscarriages [15].

6. Therapeutic and Preventive Strategies

6.1. Lifestyle Modification

Reducing smoking, alcohol, obesity, and stress improves DNA integrity [16].

6.2. Antioxidants

Supplements such as vitamin C, E, CoQ10, and L-carnitine have been shown to reduce DFI in several studies [17].

6.3. Varicocele Repair

Recent evidence from multiple meta-analyses and reviews indicates that varicocelectomy significantly reduces sperm DNA fragmentation. A 2018 meta-analysis of 19 studies involving approximately 1,153 patients reported an average DFI reduction of 8.3% (95% CI: 10.3% to 6.4%)[18]. Similarly, a 2021 meta-analysis of 19 studies with approximately 1,070 participants found a weighted mean DFI reduction of 7.23% (95% CI: 8.9% to 5.6%), with more pronounced improvements in men whose preoperative DFI exceeded 20%[19]. Supporting these findings, a 2023 focused review on microsurgical varicocelectomy techniques observed a DFI decrease of 5.5% (95% CI: 4.8% to 6.1%) across five recent studies [20]. Collectively, these analyses underscore the therapeutic benefit of varicocele repair in lowering sperm DNA damage, particularly in patients with elevated baseline DFI [21].

Clinically, men with palpable varicocele, abnormal semen parameters, and elevated DFI often benefit most from surgical repair. One pilot RCT reported a 62% spontaneous pregnancy rate post-surgery versus 30% without surgery [22].

6.3.1. Management Strategy Flowchart

Step 1: Identify DFI level and semen parameters.

Step 2: If DFI ≥ 25%, consider the following:

Lifestyle modifications (smoking cessation, weight loss, alcohol reduction).

If unsuccessful, introduce antioxidants and assess response.

Step 3: If DFI remains elevated despite lifestyle changes and antioxidants, proceed to varicocelectomy or advanced sperm selection in ART.

6.4. Advanced Sperm Selection

Methods like MACS, microfluidic sorting, and PICSI may enhance ART success by selecting sperm with intact DNA [23].

7. Limitations and Controversies

7.1. Assay heterogeneity

SCSA, TUNEL, Comet, SCD, and AOT tests differ in sensitivity. Reported "normal" cutoffs (e.g., DFI >25–30%) vary by assay, and multicenter consensus is lacking [19].

7.2. Outcome-focused research gaps

Many antioxidant trials are underpowered and fail to report clinically meaningful endpoints such as live birth or miscarriage rates.

7.3. Timing of varicocelectomy

DFI often improves 4–6 months post-surgery; early postoperative testing may underestimate benefits.

7.4. Inconsistent patient response

Some men show minimal improvement or even worsening DFI post-intervention, reflecting biological variability and potential recurrence. The lack of standardization in DFI testing methods and cutoff values limits its universal adoption. DFI should be considered an adjunct, rather than a replacement, for traditional semen analysis [24].

8. Conclusion

Sperm DNA fragmentation, as quantified by DFI, plays a crucial role in male infertility assessment. It is particularly useful in cases of unexplained infertility, ART failure, and recurrent pregnancy loss. Incorporating DFI into clinical practice can improve diagnostic precision and guide therapy in infertile couples.

9. Appendix

9.1. Acknowledgment

The authors have no acknowledgments to declare.

9.2. Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

9.3. Funding and supports

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

9.4. Authors contributions

All authors were involved in the conception, drafting, and revision of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

References

1. Sakkas D, Alvarez JG. Sperm DNA fragmentation: mechanisms of origin, impact on reproductive outcome, and analysis. Fertil Steril. 2010;93(4):1027–36.
2. Said TM, Gaglani A, Agarwal A. Implication of apoptosis in sperm cryoinjury. Reprod Biomed Online. 2010 Oct;21(4):456-62. doi: 10.1016/j.rbmo.2010.05.011. Epub 2010 Jun 1. PMID: 20800544.
3. Aitken RJ, Clarkson JS. Significance of reactive oxygen species and antioxidants in defining the efficacy of sperm preparation techniques. J Androl. 1988;9(6):367–76.
4. Agarwal A, Saleh RA, Bedaiwy MA. Role of reactive oxygen species in the pathophysiology of human reproduction. Fertil Steril. 2003;79(4):829–43.
5. Hammadeh ME, et al. Smoking and male infertility: evidence for DNA fragmentation in spermatozoa. Andrologia. 2010;42(6):305–10.
6. Evenson DP. Sperm chromatin structure assay (SCSA®): 30 years of experience with the SCSA. Reprod Biomed Online. 2016;33(6):684–97.
7. Gorczyca W, et al. Detection of DNA strand breaks in individual apoptotic cells by the in situ terminal deoxynucleotidyl transferase and nick translation assays. Cancer Res. 1993;53(8):1945–51.
8. Sikka SC, Rajasekaran M, Hellstrom WJ. Role of oxidative stress and antioxidants in male infertility. J Androl. 1995 Nov-Dec;16(6):464-8. PMID: 8867595.
9. Fernández JL, et al. The sperm chromatin dispersion test: a simple method for the determination of sperm DNA fragmentation. J Androl. 2003;24(1):59–66.
10. Bungum M. Sperm DNA integrity assessment: a new tool in diagnosis and treatment of infertility. Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol. 2012;24(3):194–200.
11. Farkouh A, Salvio G, Kuroda S, Saleh R, Vogiatzi P, Agarwal A. Sperm DNA integrity and male infertility: a narrative review and guide for the reproductive physicians. Transl Androl Urol. 2022;11(7):1023-1044. doi:10.21037/tau-22-149.
12. Boushaba S, Belaaloui G. Sperm DNA fragmentation and standard semen parameters in algerian infertile male partners. World J Mens Health. 2015;33(1):1-7. doi:10.5534/wjmh.2015.33.1.1
13. Zini A, Sigman M. Are tests of sperm DNA damage clinically useful? Pros and cons. J Androl. 2009;30(3):219–29.
14. Simon L, et al. Sperm DNA damage measured by the TUNEL assay as a predictor of pregnancy after IVF and ICSI: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Hum Reprod. 2010;25(7):1608–17.
15. Lewis SE, Aitken RJ. DNA damage to spermatozoa has impacts on fertilization and pregnancy. Cell Tissue Res. 2005;322(1):33–41.
16. Sharma R, et al. Lifestyle factors and reproductive health: taking control of your fertility. Reprod Biol Endocrinol. 2013;11:66.
17. Showell MG, et al. Antioxidants for male subfertility. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2014;(12):CD007411.
18. Qiu D, Shi Q, Pan L. Efficacy of varicocelectomy for sperm DNA integrity improvement: A meta-analysis. Andrologia. 2021 Feb;53(1):e13885. doi: 10.1111/and.13885. Epub 2020 Oct 28. PMID: 33118219.
19. Marinaro JA, Schlegel PN. Sperm DNA Damage and Its Relevance in Fertility Treatment: A Review of Recent Literature and Current Practice Guidelines. Int J Mol Sci. 2023;24(2):1446. Published 2023 Jan 11. doi:10.3390/ijms24021446.
20. Soetandar A, Noegroho BS, Siregar S, Adriansjah R, Mustafa A. Microsurgical varicocelectomy effects on sperm DNA fragmentation and sperm parameters in infertile male patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis of more recent evidence. Arch Ital Urol Androl. 2022 Sep 27;94(3):360-365. doi: 10.4081/aiua.2022.3.360. PMID: 36165486.
21. Esteves SC, et al. Effect of varicocelectomy on sperm DNA fragmentation: a prospective study. Andrology. 2014;2(5):640–7.
22. Fathi A, Mohamed O, Mahmoud O, Alsagheer GA, Reyad AM, Abolyosr A, Abdel-Kader MS, Saber-Khalaf M. The impact of varicocelectomy on sperm DNA fragmentation and pregnancy rate in subfertile men with normal semen parameters: A pilot study. Arab J Urol. 2021 Feb 14;19(2):186-190. doi: 10.1080/2090598X.2021.1889746. PMID: 34104495; PMCID: PMC8158247.
23. Mei J, Chen LJ, Zhu XX, Yu W, Gao QQ, Sun HX, Ding LJ, Wang JX. Magnetic-activated cell sorting of nonapoptotic spermatozoa with a high DNA fragmentation index improves the live birth rate and decreases transfer cycles of IVF/ICSI. Asian J Androl. 2022 Jul-Aug;24(4):367-372. doi: 10.4103/aja202161. PMID: 34708718; PMCID: PMC9295468.
24. Barratt CL, et al. The diagnosis of male infertility: an analysis of the evidence to support the development of global WHO guidelines. Hum Reprod Update. 2017;23(6):660–80.