Storage of sexed boar spermatozoa: Limits and perspectives

M. Spinaci [a,*], S. Perteghella [b], T. Chlapanidas [b], G. Galeati [a], D. Vigo [c], C. Tamanini [a], D. Bucci [a]

[a] *Department of Veterinary Medical SciencesdDIMEVET, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy*
[b] *Department of Drug Sciences, University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy*
[c] *Department of Veterinary Science and Public Health, University of Milan, Milano, Italy*

**Corresponding author. Tel.: þ39 051 2097909; fax: þ39 051 2097899.*
E-mail address: marcella.spinaci@unibo.it (M. Spinaci).

A B S T R A C T

Despite the great potential application of sex-sorted spermatozoa in swine, the technology is not practiced in the pig industry because of technical factors and species-specific issues. The susceptibility of boar spermatozoa to stresses induced by the sorting procedure, the relative slowness of the sex-sorting process together with the high sperm numbers required for routine artificial insemination in pig are some of the main factors limiting the commercial application of this technology in pigs. This review briefly describes the damage to spermatozoa during sex sorting, focusing on an additional limiting factor: increased susceptibility of sexed boar spermatozoa to injuries induced by liquid storage and cryo- preservation that, in turn, impairs sperm quality leading to unsatisfactory results in vivo. Strategies to extend the lifespan of sex-sorted boar spermatozoa and to improve their fertilizing ability after liquid storage or cryopreservation need to be implemented before this technology can be used in pig farms. In this regard, encapsulation in barium alginate membranes could be a promising technique to optimize the in vivo use of sexed boar spermatozoa, by protecting, targeting, and controlling the release of sperm into the female genital tract.

1. Introduction

Flow cytometric sperm sorting based on X and Y sperm DNA difference is currently the only accurate method to predetermine the sex of offspring before fertilization [1].

Even if the sexing technique has already reached a commercial level in the bovine species [2], the use of sexed semen in the swine industry is far from being a routine procedure. Reproductive management in pig production would benefit from sex preselection by accelerating genetic progress and allowing the production of preselected female livestock [3]. Moreover, female production through use of sexed semen may be an alternative to the castration of male piglets to prevent the distasteful “boar taint” [4]. Castration is regarded as an infringement of animal welfare, and in response to these growing concerns, several leading players within the pig and pork industry have agreed to a plan to voluntarily end the practice of surgically castrating pigs in the European Union by January 1, 2018.

In the research field, sex sorting in association with sperm-mediated gene transfer could be strategically useful to shorten the time for producing homozygous transgenic pigs [5] as organ donors for xenotransplantation, as valu- able models for biomedical studies, and in the use of transgenic swine as bioreactors [6–8].

2. Factors limiting the large-scale use of sexed boar spermatozoa

Even if flow cytometric sorting of pig spermatozoa could have great potential for application, the technique is currently under research and it is still unknown whether the use of sex-sorted semen through routine pig artificial insemination (AI) will be economically feasible [3].

As indicated by the flow cytometric sorting index elab- orated by Garner et al. [2], boar spermatozoa are approxi- mately as easy to sort as ram and bull sperm due to both the relatively high difference in the DNA content between X- and Y-chromosome–bearing sperm (3.6%) and the flattened oval heads that tend to be readily oriented in a sperm sorter using hydrodynamics. Therefore, the effectiveness of the sexing technology in this species is not an issue [9]. However, the efficiency of the sex sorting procedure in the porcine species can be influenced by interboar and intra- boar variability in the sortability of spermatozoa due to differences in the ability of ejaculates to exhibit well-defined X and Y peaks in the split on a flow cytometry histogram [10,11]. Alkmin et al. [10], analyzing 67 ejaculates from different boars, found that around 15% failed to exhibit a well-defined split in the first ejaculate (bad sperm sorters; interboar variability). Analyzing five ejaculates from three of the bad sperm sorter boars, the percentage of the ejaculates not exhibiting a well-defined split ranged between 20% and 70% (intraboar variability) [10]. Such variability in pigs, unlike other species (dogs, horses) [12,13], is not influenced by the percentage of non-viable spermatozoa in the semen samples but is closely related to ejaculate sperm concentration. Ejaculates are diluted to achieve the optimal sperm concentration for Hoechst 33342 (Ho) staining; during the staining step, samples from ejaculates with low sperm concentration would have a high proportion of seminal plasma that may alter Ho entrance into the sperm cell thereby affecting the effectiveness of DNA staining [10,11].

2.1. Sperm sorter output

Although there has been significant progress in the throughput of sperm sorters (about 20 million sperm/h), one of the major limiting factors for the broad use of sexed semen in pig farms is the unreasonable sorting time (about 100 hours) necessary to obtain an adequate number of sexed spermatozoa for conventional AI (2–3 billion spermatozoa/ insemination dose). In an attempt to overcome this problem, offspring were produced by a combination of reproductive technologies such as surgical insemination, deep intrauterine insemination (DIUI), IVF-intracytoplasmic sperm injection, and embryo transfer (ET) (Table 1). Fresh sexed boar sper- matozoa have been successfully used for low-dose insemination protocols by nonsurgical DIUI depositing as few as 70 to 140 106 bulk-sorted [19] or 50 106 sex-sorted sper- matozoa in the anterior third of the uterine horn of sows [20,23]. However, the relatively high number of sexed spermatozoa needed and the reduced fertility rates limit the use of sexed semen in

DIUI on a large routine scale [25]. Laparo- scopic insemination with a very low number of sex-sorted sperm (3–6 106 spermatozoa) has been reported to produce satisfactory fertility at the farm level with a farrowing rate of around 80% [24]. Owing to its high cost, routine use of this insemination technique is not feasible in the pig industry but could at best be confined to niche situations such as elite breeding units or nucleus herds [24,25]. In addition, the fertility outcome using these techniques is strictly dependent on proper timing of semen deposition and hormonal treat- ments for accurate prediction of ovulation [25].

In vitro techniques such as IVF or intracytoplasmic sperm injection, which greatly reduce the number of sperm required, combined with surgical or nonsurgical ET offer a more effi- cient use of fresh sorted sperm and have proved a feasible, albeit expensive, alternative to using sexed sperm in pigs [15–17,21].

2.2. Damage to boar spermatozoa during sorting

Another factor limiting the application of sperm-sorting technology in the pig is the susceptibility of boar sperma- tozoa to stress induced by the sorting procedure that seems to be more severe than that in the bull and ram [26,27]. Sex-sorting–induced damage has been extensively docu- mented and reviewed; thus, it is only described briefly focusing on the increased susceptibility to storage for pig spermatozoa sorted by flow cytometry.

Chemical, physical, and electrical insults during the sex- sorting process (Ho staining, variations in temperature, high pressure, exposure to the ultraviolet laser beam, electrical charging of droplets containing spermatozoa, projection into the collection tube, high dilution, centrifu- gation) can induce the death of some sperm cells. However, those sperm that survive such processing can undergo sublethal modifications that, in turn, can shorten sperm lifespan after sorting and reduce their fertilizing ability [28–35]. The stressors associated with the sex-sorting procedure seem to primarily affect the sperm surface. After sorting, heat shock protein 70 (Hsp70) has been re- ported to be relocated, without consumption of the protein as evidenced by Western blotting, from the equatorial subsegment toward an equatorial line, and this lateral movement suggests the beginning of a capacitation-like process [33,36]. Likewise, changes in chlortetracycline (CTC) labeling patterns in boar spermatozoa after sex sorting suggest a destabilization of the sperm surface and reflect a capacitation-like state of the sperm membrane [28,37]. This is not surprising as processing steps for sorting (dilution, promotion of protein release from the sperm surface by mechanical forces, presence of BSA in media) can mimic the condition used in vitro to induce sperm capaci- tation [38]. The induction of a capacitation-like process due to the sorting procedure is confirmed by the data on sperm motility patterns obtained immediately after sorting [32] and by the need to reduce the number of spermatozoa for IVF to avoid polyspermic fertilization [17]. However non-membrane parameters considered to be markers of the capacitation processes, such as actin cytoskeleton poly- merization and protein tyrosine phosphorylation, seem to be less affected by the sex-sorting process, and sexed sperm do not completely reflect the changes detected during capacitation in vitro. This suggests that the evolution of capacitation-like changes in sexed spermatozoa probably follows a different pathway to that of true capacitation

[37].

3. Storage of sex-sorted boar spermatozoa

Storage of sexed boar semen is necessary to ship it from sorting facilities to recipient females for use on a wider scale. Moreover, an adequate liquid storage protocol for sexed boar spermatozoa is required when producing sexed boar sperm for DIUI as the time needed for each insemi- nation dose might be longer than 10 hours [26].

Sorted spermatozoa can be either chilled at 15 ◦C to
17 ◦C or frozen; however, this last method is still unsatis- factory in the pig as shown by the promising in vitro results, but poor in vivo outcomes reported by the few studies investigating the survivability of sex-sorted, frozen– thawed boar sperm [18,22,39–41]. Boar sperm are known to be highly sensitive to cold shock leading to membrane damage [42]. This susceptibility is exacerbated in sexed sperm because of the modification induced by the sorting procedure and the need to cool and freeze diluted samples [4]. So far, pig industry has made very limited use of un- sorted frozen boar semen (1%) [43], and it is questionable whether sexed frozen boar semen could meet commercial demand in the future, even with optimization of the procedures.

3.1. Cryopreservation of sexed boar spermatozoa

So far, preservation methods for sorted spermatozoa have differed only marginally from the procedures used for unsorted semen, and few studies have been performed to adjust the standard boar sperm cryopreservation pro- cedures to the specific requirements of sex-sorted boar spermatozoa. A suitable modification of the freezing method was proposed by Parrilla et al. [39] who observed an improvement in post-thaw motility of sex-sorted sper- matozoa frozen at low concentrations with the use of final glycerol concentrations (0.5%–1%) lower than those used in standard boar sperm cryopreservation procedures (Total motility: 10.1%, 21.3%, 27.8% in the presence of 3%, 1%, 0.5% glycerol, respectively). Even if the quality of sexed frozen–thawed semen ap- pears promising, cryopreservation leads to a boar- dependent impairment of sperm parameters such as motility, viability, malondialdehyde generation, and DNA fragmentation, more so than liquid storage [40]. As a consequence, extremely poor results have been achieved in vivo using sex-sorted, frozen–thawed spermatozoa (Table 1). Johnson et al. [18] obtained the first piglets after surgical insemination with sex-sorted, frozen–thawed spermatozoa. Ten sows were inseminated with sorted– frozen sperm, and four litters were born, but the average litter size was nearly half that of controls due to, as concluded by the authors, a reduced developmental po- tential of embryos obtained with boar spermatozoa that had undergone these biotechnical procedures [18]. This hypothesis seems to be confirmed by the studies of Bath- gate et al. [22,41] who obtained only one litter (of five piglets) after nonsurgical DIUI of 12 sows with 50 106 motile, sex-sorted, frozen–thawed boar spermatozoa, whereas in a subsequent study, all pregnancies were lost after achieving an apparent conception rate of nearly 70%. The use of sex-sorted, frozen–thawed sperm in

combi- nation with IVF and ET could permit a more efficient use of sex-sorted sperm because of the large reduction of sperm numbers required and thereby offers one solution to commercialization of this technology in the pig. Bathgate et al. [44] reported that pre-sexed porcine embryos could be successfully produced in vitro using sex-sorted, frozen– thawed sperm and these embryos are capable of initiating pregnancies when non-surgically transferred into recipients at the eight-cell stage. However, they failed to produce piglets of a predetermined sex suggesting a poor
developmental potential of embryos.

One factor that may contribute to the poor outcome achieved with sex-sorted, frozen–thawed boar spermatozoais a deterioration at the DNA level. Boar spermatozoa are considered to have a very stable chromatin structure [45]. The level of DNA damage observed in sex-sorted fresh [46] and frozen–thawed boar spermatozoa [40] seems to be
limited (<5%). Moreover, the sorting procedure has been reported to improve DNA quality in boars, bulls, and stal-
lions [40,46–49]. However, the positive effect of the sorting procedure on stallion sperm DNA integrity was lost after thawing suggesting that the freezing process reduces the DNA quality of sex-sorted sperm. Boar sperm cryopreser- vation has been reported to destabilize the nucleoprotein structure through an increase in the number of disrupted disulphide bridges between cysteines in sperm nucleopro- teins and to induce, probably as a consequence, an increase in DNA fragmentation that does not appear immediately after thawing but only after 2 to 4 hours of post-thawing incubation [50–52]. Similar or more severe sperm chro- matin damage in sex-sorted, frozen–thawed boar sperm could explain the low fertility achieved using spermatozoa that underwent such biotechnical procedures. Subtle sperm chromatin damage can cause reproductive failure occurring with the activation of the embryonic genome without any influence on membrane, motility and fertilizing parameters of spermatozoa, or the cleavage rate of oocytes [53].

To date, no studies have been performed on the mRNA expression pattern of pig embryos derived from sex-sorted spermatozoa. In bovine and ovine species, differential expression of developmentally important genes has been observed between embryos derived from unsorted and sex- sorted sperm [54,55]. In addition, morphologic abnormal- ities have been documented in bovine blastocysts produced with flow cytometrically sex-sorted spermatozoa [56].

The high incidence of pregnancy loss is also observed after DIUI and laparoscopic insemination with non-frozen sex-sorted spermatozoa [19,24] suggesting that DNA al- terations of sexed spermatozoa may negatively affect the developmental potential of embryos. However, the low number of viable embryos and fetuses, which per se impairs pregnancy in this species [57,58], might contribute to the pregnancy loss observed with both frozen and unfrozen sex-sorted spermatozoa [19,24,59].

Taken as a whole, the results obtained to date report that it is still not economically feasible to incorporate frozen–thawed sexed boar semen into the commercial production of pigs, although it has considerable application in breeding programs.

3.2. Liquid storage of sexed boar spermatozoa

Sexed boar semen can be stored in liquid form at 15 ◦C to 17 ◦C even if sorted spermatozoa lose their fertilizing ability with prolonged intervals from sorting to insemination. In fact, the sorting procedure seems to increase boar sperm sensitivity to storage not only in cryopreserved but also in liquid state.

Sexed sperm motility and membrane integrity begin to differ significantly, compared to unsorted sperm, after

10 hours of storage and subsequently worsen with increasing storage time [10,32,60,61]. Moreover, although modifications on sperm tyrosine phosphorylation patterns immediately after sorting are scarce [37], overall percentage of sexed spermatozoa displaying an uncapaci- tated pattern after 72 hours storage was reduced [62]. This suggests a progressive modification toward a capacitation- like state of sexed spermatozoa during liquid storage as also confirmed by CTC results. However, a high sperm quality (viability, >70%) was recently reported for sex-sorted

spermatozoa from boars classified as "good sperm

sorters" after 48 to 120 hours of storage at 15 ◦C to 17 ◦C [10,11]. The commercial application of sex-sorted sperma- tozoa in swine AI programs may therefore be feasible in the future provided that strategies to extend the lifespan and fertilizing ability of sex-sorted spermatozoa could be developed. The selection of semen donors seems to be very important for sorting and for further storage in liquid or frozen form as differences in the ability of spermatozoa from individual boars to withstand semen handling associated with these technologies have been reported. Moreover, the response of spermatozoa to a specific semen-processing technique does not predict the response of spermatozoa from the same boar to other semen- processing techniques [10,40].

Although the sorting procedure does not negatively affect the in vitro functional competence of boar sperma- tozoa compared to unsorted sperm [17,61,63], a significant reduction of fertilizing ability has been recorded starting from 5 hours after sorting [32]. Spinaci et al. [61] observed that fertilization was negatively affected when IVF was performed with sorted boar spermatozoa stored in liquid

state at 15 ◦C to 17 ◦C for 24 hours using a low sper-

m:oocyte ratio (100:1) and a gamete coincubation of 5 hours. However, no differences on fertilization parame- ters were observed when gamete coincubation was per- formed for a shorter time (1 hour) using a higher sperm:oocyte ratio (5000:1). Although these results confirmed the partial loss of fertilizing ability of sexed boar spermatozoa after liquid storage, they suggest the in vitro outcome can be improved by optimizing the parameters of IVF procedure.

Few studies have been performed in vivo using liquid- stored sexed boar spermatozoa. High penetration and monospermy rates were obtained by laparoscopic insemi- nation with deposition directly into the oviductal ampulla

using 0.3 × 106 sexed spermatozoa stored 16 to 18 hours at 17 ◦C, but all the putative zygotes were collected and sows

were not allowed to farrow [60]. Acceptable pregnancy rates (around 90%) and farrowing rates (around 80%) have been obtained by laparoscopic insemination using 3 to 6 106 sexed spermatozoa stored at 22 ◦C for a maximum of

12 hours, but no further information was given on the storage time of the single insemination dose [24].

3.3. Use of additives during storage of sexed boar spermatozoa

Different additives have been tested in the attempt to improve the quality of stored sexed spermatozoa. The addition of seminal plasma to the collection medium during sorting or in the medium after centrifugation has been reported to stabilize the sperm surface and to reverse the capacitation-like status acquired by boar spermatozoa emerging from the flow cytometer by counteracting the removal of beneficial seminal plasma components because of the high dilution [30,33]. For this reason, seminal plasma is routinely included in the collection medium in boar sperm-sorting protocols [23,30–33] and has been added to the liquid storage medium of sexed boar spermatozoa [32,61,64].

A beneficial effect on membrane integrity, motility, and fertilizing ability was obtained by Garcia et al. [60] when sexed spermatozoa were stored for 18 hours in the collection medium containing PSP-I/PSP-II spermadhesins from semi- nal plasma to overcome the variability of the protein content in the different crude seminal plasma in boars [65]. In fact, although heparin-binding spermadhesins from boar seminal plasma have been reported to have a detrimental effect on the in vitro function of spermatozoa diluted to a level mimicking sex sorting, nonheparin–binding proteins, PSP-I/ PSP-II spermadhesins, showed the opposite effect [66]. The protective action of PSP-I/PSP-II was largely preserved in its isolated PSP-II subunit suggesting its potential use as a sup- plement for highly diluted boar spermatozoa [67].

Recent research reported that when boar spermatozoa were collected in 2% egg yolk medium in the absence of seminal plasma, the addition to sheath fluid of EDTA, Ca2þ chelating agent known to prevent plasma membrane destabilization [68], preserved sexed sperm quality and
fertility and maintained good sperm characteristics after prolonged post-sorting liquid storage [11,34].

On the other hand, the flow sorting process increased the susceptibility of spermatozoa to the harmful effect of reac- tive oxygen species [69,70], and the high content of unsat- urated fatty acids in the plasma membrane makes boar spermatozoa particularly sensitive to peroxidative damage [71]. Different antioxidants have been tested during liquid storage of sex-sorted boar spermatozoa to minimize the adverse effects of oxidative stress and to improve sexed sperm quality, but the results obtained were sometimes limited or unsatisfactory. Although ascorbic acid-2- glucoside increased the viability of sorted boar spermato-
zoa maintained at 37 ◦C for 4.5 hours, [72], pyruvate, catalase
and mercaptoethanol failed to improve the quality of sex- sorted porcine semen either fresh or after frozen storage [73]. Vallorani et al. [64] tested the effect of different anti- oxidants added to the medium of sexed boar spermatozoa during 24 hours of liquid storage at 15 ◦C, reporting a posi- tive effect of epigallocatechin-3-gallate (EGCG) or super-
oxide dismutase (SOD) plus seminal plasma (SP) (but not Na pyruvate plus catalase) on sexed boar sperm viability (58.2% vs. 58.7% vs. 51.6% in SP

EGCG vs. SP SOD vs. control group, respectively), whereas acrosome status, caspase activation, and Hsp70 pattern were not influenced. It is worth pointing out that the antioxidant protection of sexed sperm seems to differ among species: Vallorani et al. [64] observed a detrimental effect of EGCG on bovine sorted spermatozoa after liquid storage, whereas SOD, Na pyruvate, and catalase had a positive impact. The protective effect of Na pyruvate and catalase on sexed bull spermatozoa was also reported after freeze-thawing [70], whereas the pre-sorting incorporation of catalase into the sorting protocol failed to improve post-thaw ram sperm quality [74]. Therefore, it is not possible to predict whether the beneficial effect exerted on spermatozoa in one species could be

present in another species making it necessary to test each substance in each species.

3.4. Sexing stored boar spermatozoa

As sperm sorting requires a long time to obtain a sperm population large enough to be used in vivo, the possibility of sorting semen after liquid storage could be of great interest to obtain the highest number of sexed spermatozoa from each ejaculate, particularly if it is of high value. Moreover, semen can be collected in AI centers located far from the sorting facilities, and ejac- ulates may have to be shipped overnight to the sorting laboratory. The feasibility of such procedures was re- ported by Alkmin et al. [11] who observed that a holding time as long as 24 hours before sorting does not negatively affect the ability to exhibit well-defined X- and Y-chromosome–bearing boar sperm peaks. The seminal plasma content during presorting storage seems to influence sperm sortability as a higher number of ejaculates stored in the presence of 0% to 10% seminal plasma exhibited a better sorting efficiency than those stored with 50% seminal plasma. Spinaci et al. [63] found that, after 1 day of storage, the whole sorting procedure does not reduce the percentage of viable cells with active mitochondria compared to fresh-sorted semen. Additionally, no significant differences between semen sorted as fresh (52 blastocysts/331 oocytes) or after 24 hours of storage at 17 ◦C (66 blastocysts/476
oocytes) were observed in terms of in vitro blastocyst yield. Blastocysts were also obtained with semen sorted after 48 and 72 hours of storage. Moreover, holding boar spermatozoa 24 hours at 15 ◦C to 17 ◦C before sorting did not negatively influence the ability of sex-sorted spermatozoa to tolerate liquid storage up to 120 hours at 15 ◦C to 17 ◦C in terms of viability, motility, plasma membrane fluidity, and intracellular generation of reactive oxygen species [11].
Even if positive results have been obtained, new stra- tegies to prolong the lifespan of sex-sorted boar sperma- tozoa and to improve their fertilizing ability after liquid storage or cryopreservation are needed before the com- mercial application of sexed semen in the pig industry.

4. Encapsulation as a possible strategy for storing sex- sorted boar spermatozoa

4.1. The evolution of sperm encapsulation technology

In the zootechnical field, encapsulation technology has been developed to control the release of sperm cells into the female genital tract. About 30 years ago, Nebel et al.

[75] first encapsulated bovine spermatozoa in alginate and poly-L-lysine capsules and found that encapsulation could be applied to bovine male gametes with minimum effect on sperm quality. Furthermore, the capsules protected bovine spermatozoa from phagocytosis and promoted the bio- adhesion of polymeric matrix to the uterine cervix pre- venting sperm retroflux. The encapsulation technology proposed by Nebel et al. [75] was not adequate for boar spermatozoa as the dilution of sperm cells during the last phase of the encapsulation pro- cedure and the use of calcium as an alginate gelation agent induced a precocious sperm capacitation [76]. To overcome these problems, a different encapsulation technology was proposed by Conte et al. [77]. A BaCl2 solution was blended with boar seminal material, and the cell suspension was added dropwise to a sodium alginate solution. Barium ions, diffusing out of the drop, reacted with alginate chains which gelled forming a barium alginate semipermeable membrane around a nucleus of the ejaculate. This technology overcame two major limits of Nebel et al.'s procedure: dilution of sem- inal plasma proteins and precocious sperm capacitation. The barium alginate membrane protected spermatozoa from outer stimuli, allowing the diffusion of nutrients, metabolites, and catabolites, at the same time entrapping seminal plasma proteins in the nucleus thereby protecting the plasma mem- brane of encapsulated boar spermatozoa. In addition, substituting Ca2þ with Ba2þ avoided cell activation and pre-

mature capacitation [78].

By modifying some technological parameters, Torre et al. [79] reported the possibility of obtaining capsules with different characteristics. In particular, capsule weight and volume were directly correlated to the gelling ion concentration. In addition, raising the Ba2þ concentration

increased the thickness of the alginate membrane and

hence reduced the velocity of sperm release. A different study found that storage of boar semen in barium alginate capsules, both at 18 ◦C and 38 ◦C, enhanced the quality of spermatozoa in terms of acrosomal membrane integrity and secondary anomalies [80]. The same research group reported that the encapsulation process does not affect motility and plasma membrane integrity of swine sper- matozoa and, moreover, an IVF assay confirmed the pene-

tration potential of boar sperm cells [81].

To optimize the velocity and percentage of boar sper- matozoa released, Chou and Wang [82] performed AI using capsules with different thicknesses. To prevent precocious capacitation, due to the use of calcium, the capsules were suspended in a medium containing fructose and fructose- 6-phosphatase able to inhibit sperm activation. The func- tionality of encapsulated boar spermatozoa during 72 hours of storage at 18 ◦C was confirmed by the study of

their in situ enzymatic activity [83]. In particular, three enzymes were considered an index of sperm integrity: lactate dehydrogenase (LDH), cytochrome oxidase (COX), and glucose 6-phosphate dehydrogenase (G6PDH). Lactate dehydrogenase activity is correlated to acrosomal mem- brane status. Specifically, the acrosomal reaction reduces intracellular LDH, whereas the

release of COX, located in mitochondrial membrane, is generally considered a sign of cell damage. Instead, when the cytoplasmic membrane is damaged, G6PDH is the first enzyme released. The micro- densitometry analyses showed an overall higher enzymatic activity for encapsulated boar spermatozoa with respect to
controls. After 72 hours of storage at 18 ◦C, LDH activity
decreased in diluted semen but not in the encapsulated spermatozoa. The results obtained in terms of COX activity reported that the encapsulation process preserved sperm cells by lipid peroxidation and higher values of G6PDH activity were maintained by encapsulated semen during 24 hours of storage.

On the basis of these results, Vigo et al. [84] conducted the first large-scale in vivo trial evaluating the fertilizing potential of boar spermatozoa vehiculated in barium algi- nate capsules. About 4000 sows were divided into two treatment groups: the first group was artificially insemi- nated through a traditional procedure using 5 billion spermatozoa per dose for two or three interventions, whereas the second group was inseminated using a single insemination (5 billion of spermatozoa) with encapsulated semen. The same results were obtained with control and encapsulated semen in terms of successful delivery (96.1% vs. 95.6%) and mean number of live-born piglets (11.9 vs. 11.6). The encapsulation treatment did not influence pregnancy rates and at the same time significantly reduced the number of spermatozoa necessary for fertilization. These results suggest that encapsulation technology could be a valid strategy to enhance the in vivo performance of boar sperm cells. The barium alginate capsules reduce the loss of spermatozoa after insemination because of the protective effect from phagocytosis and retroflux. At the same time, the controlled release of male gametes into the female genital tract reduces the number of sperm for a good fertilization rate.

4.2. Encapsulation of sex-sorted boar spermatozoa

On the basis of the positive results reported previously, studies have been conducted to assess the impact of the encapsulation process on sexed boar sperm to evaluate the feasibility of using barium alginate capsules as an alterna- tive method for storing sex-sorted pig spermatozoa and potentially controlling their release into the sow genital tract. The results obtained reported that the encapsulation technique does not damage sorted boar semen. During 72 hours of storage, no differences were observed between diluted and encapsulated sorted spermatozoa in terms of membrane and acrosome integrity [85]. Although the sorting procedure reduced sperm viability, encapsulation limited the damage to sorted spermatozoa. The difference in membrane integrity was 27% between diluted unsorted and sorted spermatozoa, whereas the discrepancy was only 11% between the encapsulated unsorted and sorted group. The evaluation of capacitation status, by CTC staining and immunolocalization of tyrosine phosphorylated proteins, revealed that the encapsulation process does not induce any further capacitation-like modification to sorted boar spermatozoa. In fact, no differences between liquid-stored and encapsulated sexed spermatozoa were recorded in the percentage of cells displaying different CTC and tyro- sine

phosphorylation patterns at 72 hours of storage [62]. Moreover, encapsulation during 72 hours of storage seems to protect sorted semen on the basis of percentage of sperm cells displaying the Hsp70 immunolocalization pattern typical of fresh semen being higher in the encapsulated sorted group (24.3%) compared with liquid-stored semen (2.8%) [62].

The IVF assays performed after 24, 48, and 72 hours of storage at 15 ◦C to assess the impact of the encapsulation
process on the fertilizing potential of sorted spermatozoa confirmed the progressive and time-dependent reduction of the fertilizing ability of flow cytometrically sorted spermatozoa [85]. Although the combination of sorting and encapsulation techniques did not lead to a reduction of membrane integrity (plasmalemma and acrosome), a decrease in penetration rates was observed after storage. Despite this, sorted spermatozoa stored in barium alginate capsules showed a total fertilizing efficiency (normosper- mic oocyte/total inseminated) similar to that achieved with diluted sorted sperm. This reported that the handling associated with encapsulation technology does not induce any additional damage to the quality of sorted spermatozoa during 72 hours of storage and does not negatively affect their IVF yield.

These encouraging results suggest that encapsulation in barium alginate capsules could be an alternative method for storing sex-sorted boar spermatozoa. Moreover, encapsulation may be a promising technique to maximize the in vivo use of sexed spermatozoa in the pig, by pro- tecting, targeting, and controlling the release of sexed semen into the female genital tract and lowering numbers of sperm required.

4.3. Conclusions

More than 20 years after the production of the first lit- ters of pigs from sexed semen [14], the application of sex sorting in the porcine production system still presents several major challenges. Many efforts have been made to increase the sorting efficiency in terms of yield and sperm quality. In parallel, the development of new instruments and insemination strategies has reduced the number of sexed sperm needed per dose. At this point, further research aimed at optimizing the liquid storage and cryo- preservation of sex-sorted boar sperm should be per- formed to achieve field application of sexed spermatozoa in the pig. Particular attention should be paid to protocols and the use of additives that could permit safe and prolonged storage for spermatozoa either in liquid state or frozen form. From the genetic point of view, the selection of males of high genetic value should be coupled with the selection of boars producing spermatozoa that are not only easy to sort but also have a reduced sensitivity to storage in cry- opreserved or in liquid state.

In this context, encapsulation technology could be a possible future strategy, preferably in association with deep insemination techniques, to increase the fertility of stored sexed boar spermatozoa and to control their release into the sow uterus.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Anne Collins for the linguistic revi- sion of the article.

References

[1] Johnson LA. Sexing mammalian sperm for production of offspring: the state-of-the-art. Anim Reprod Sci 2000;60-61:93–107.

[2] Garner DL. Flow cytometric sexing of mammalian sperm. Ther- iogenology 2006;65:943–57.

[3] Rath D, Johnson LA. Application and commercialization of flow cytometrically sex-sorted semen. Reprod Domest Anim 2008;43: 338–46.

[4]

Johnson LA, Rath D, Vazquez JM, Maxwell WM, Dobrinsky JR. Preselection of sex of offspring in swine for production: current status of the process and its application. Theriogenology 2005;63: 615–24.

[5] De Cecco M, Spinaci M, Zannoni A, Bernardini C, Seren E, Forni M, et al. Coupling sperm mediated gene transfer and sperm sorting techniques: a new perspective for swine transgenesis. Ther- iogenology 2010;74:856–62.

[6] Chu CR, Szczodry M, Bruno S. Animal models for cartilage regen- eration and repair. Tissue Eng Part B Rev 2010;16:105–15.

[7] Klymiuk N, Aigner B, Brem G, Wolf E. Genetic modification of pigs as organ donors for xenotransplantation. Mol Reprod Dev 2009;77: 209–21.

[8] Van der Windt DJ, Bottino R, Casu A, Campanile N, Smetanka C, He J, et al. Long-term controlled normoglycemia in diabetic non-human primates after transplantation with hCD46 transgenic porcine is- lets. Am J Transplant 2009;9:2716–26.

[9] Johnson LA, Welch GR. Sex preselection: high-speed flowcytometric sorting of X and Y sperm for maximum efficiency. Theriogenology 1999;52:1323–41.

[10] Alkmin DV, Parrilla I, Tarantini T, Parlapan L, Del Olmo D, Vazquez JM, et al. Intra- and interboar variability in flow cytometric sperm sex sorting. Theriogenology 2014;82:501–8.

[11] Alkmin DV, Parrilla I, Tarantini T, Del Olmo D, Vazquez JM, Martinez EA, et al. Seminal plasma affects sperm sex sorting in boars. Reprod Fertil Dev 2014. http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/RD14088. [Epub ahead of print].

[12] Clulow JR, Evans G, Morris LH, Maxwell WM. Factors influencing the "sortability" of stallion spermatozoa into X- and Y-chromosome bearing populations. Anim Reprod Sci 2009;113:220–8.

[13] Rodenas C, Lucas X, Tarantini T, Del Olmo D, Roca J, Vazquez J, et al. The effects of Hoechst 33342 staining and the male sample donor on the sorting efficiency of canine spermatozoa. Reprod Domest Anim 2013;49:115–21.

[14] Johnson LA. Sex selection in swine. Altering sex ratios in offspring following surgical insemination with flow sorted X- and Y-bearing sperm. Reprod Domest Anim 1991;26:195–204.

[15] Rath D, Johnson LA, Dobrinsky JR, Welch GR, Niemman H. Produc- tion of piglets preselected for sex following in vitro fertilization with X and Y chromosome-bearing spermatozoa sorted by flow cytometry. Theriogenology 1997;47:795–800.

[16] Abeydeera LR, Johnson LA, Welch GR, Wang WH, Boquest AC, Cantley TC, et al. Birth of piglets preselected for gender following in vitro fertilization of in vitro matured pig oocytes by X and Y chromosome bearing spermatozoa sorted by high speed flow cytometry. Theriogenology 1998;50:981–8.

[17] Rath D, Long CR, Dobrinsky JR, Schreier LL, Welch GR, Johnson LA. In vitro production of sexed embryos for gender preselection: high speed sorting of X-chromosome bearing sperm to produce piglets after embryo transfer. J Anim Sci 1999;77:3346–52.

[18] Johnson LA, Guthrie HD, Fiser P, Maxwell WMC, Welch GR, Garrett WM. Cryopreservation of flow cytometrically sorted boar sperm: effects on in vivo embryo development. J Anim Sci 2000;78:198.

[19] Vazquez JM, Martinez EA, Parrilla I, Roca J, Gil MA, Vazquez JL. Birth of piglets after deep intrauterine insemination with flow cyto- metrically sorted spermatozoa. Theriogenology 2003;59:1605–14.

[20] Rath D, Ruiz S, Sieg B. Birth of female piglets following intrauterine insemination of a sow using flow cytometrically sexed boar semen. Vet Rec 2003;152:400–1.

[21] Probst S, Rath D. Production of piglets using intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI) with flow cytometrically sorted boar semen and artificially activated oocytes. Theriogenology 2003;59:961–73.

[22] Bathgate R. Studies on the cryopreservation of boar spermatozoa and its integration into assisted reproductive technologies. PhD thesis, The University of Sydney; 2004.

[23] Grossfeld R, Klinc P, Sieg B, Rath D. Production of piglets with sexed semen employing a non-surgical insemination technique. Ther- iogenology 2005;63:2269–77.

[24] del Olmo D, Parrilla I, Sanchez-Osorio J, Gomis J, Angel MA, Tarantini T, et al. Successful laparoscopic insemination with a very low number of flow cytometrically sorted boar sperm in field con- ditions. Theriogenology 2014;81:315–20.

[25] Roca J, Parrilla I, Rodriguez-Martinez H, Gil MA, Cuello C, Vazquez JM, et al. Approaches towards

efficient use of boar semen in the pig industry. Reprod Domest Anim 2011;46(Suppl 2):79–83.
[26] Vazquez JM, Parrilla I, Roca J, Gil MA, Cuello C, Vazquez JL, et al. Sex- sorting sperm by flow cytometry in pigs: issues and perspectives. Theriogenology 2009;71:80–8.

[27] De Graaf SP, Beilby KH, Underwood SL, Evans G, Maxwell WMC. Sperm sexing in sheep and cattle: the exception and the rule. Theriogenology 2009;71:89–97.
[28] Maxwell WM, Johnson LA. Chlortetracycline analysis of boar sper- matozoa after incubation, flow cytometric sorting, cooling, or cryopreservation. Mol Reprod Dev 1997;46:408–18.
[29] Maxwell WM, Johnson LA. Physiology of spermatozoa at high dilution rates: the influence of seminal plasma. Theriogenology 1999;52:1353–62.
[30] Maxwell WM, Welch GR, Johnson LA. Viability and membrane integrity of spermatozoa after dilution and flow cytometric sorting in the presence or absence of seminal plasma. Reprod Fertil Dev 1996;8:1165–78.
[31] Maxwell WM, Long CR, Johnson LA, Dobrinsky JR, Welch GR. The relationship between membrane status and fertility of boar sper- matozoa after flow cytometric sorting in the presence or absence of seminal plasma. Reprod Fertil Dev 1998;10:433–40.
[32] Parrilla I, Vazquez JM, Gil MA, Caballero I, Almiñana C, Roca J, et al. Influence of storage time on functional capacity of flow cytometri- cally sex sorted boar spermatozoa. Theriogenology 2005;64:86–98.
[33] Spinaci M, Volpe S, Bernardini C, De Ambrogi M, Tamanini C, Seren E, et al. Sperm sorting procedure induces a redistribution of Hsp70 but not Hsp60 and Hsp90 in boar spermatozoa. J Androl 2006;27:899–907.
[34] del Olmo D, Parrilla I, Gil MA, Maside C, Tarantini T, Angel MA, et al. Handling of boar spermatozoa during and after flow cytometric sex- sorting process to improve their in vitro fertilizing ability. Ther- iogenology 2013;80:350–6.
[35] Rath D, Barcikowski S, de Graaf S, Garrels W, Grossfeld R, Klein S, et al. Sex selection of sperm in farm animals: status report and developmental prospects. Reproduction 2013;145:R15–30.
[36] Spinaci M, Volpe S, Bernardini C, De Ambrogi M, Tamanini C, Seren E, et al. Immunolocalization of heat shock protein 70 (Hsp 70) in boar spermatozoa and its role during fertilization. Mol Reprod Dev 2005;72:534–41.
[37] Bucci D, Galeati G, Tamanini C, Vallorani C, Rodriguez-Gil JE, Spinaci M. Effect of sex sorting on CTC staining, actin cytoskeleton and tyrosine phosphorylation in bull and boar spermatozoa. Ther- iogenology 2012;77:1206–16.
[38] Leahy T, Gadella BM. Sperm surface changes and physiological consequences induced by sperm handling and storage. Reproduc- tion 2011;142:759–78.
[39] Parrilla I, del Olmo D, Caballero I, Tarantini T, Cuello C, Gil MA, et al. The effect of glycerol concentrations on the post-thaw in vitro characteristics of cryopreserved sex-sorted boar spermatozoa. Reprod Domest Anim 2012;47:965–74.
[40] Parrilla I, del Olmo D, Sijses L, Martinez-Alborcia MJ, Cuello C, Vazquez JM, et al. Differences in the ability of spermatozoa from individual boar ejaculates to withstand different semen-processing techniques. Anim Reprod Sci 2012;132:66–73.
[41] Bathgate R, Grossfeld R, Susetio D, Ruckholdt M, Heasman K, Rath D, et al. Early pregnancy loss in sows after low dose, deep uterine artificial insemination with sex-sorted, frozen-thawed sperm. Anim Reprod Sci 2008;104:440–4.
[42] Johnson LA, Weitze KF, Fiser P, Maxwell WMC. Storage of boar semen. Anim Reprod Sci 2000;62:143–72.
[43] Didion BA, Braun GD, Duggan MV. Field fertility of frozen boar semen: a retrospective report comprising over 2600 AI services spanning a four year period. Anim Reprod Sci 2013;137:189–96.
[44] Bathgate R, Morton KM, Eriksson BM, Rath D, Seig B, Maxwell WM, et al. Non-surgical deep intra-uterine transfer of in vitro produced porcine embryos derived from sex-sorted frozen-thawed boar sperm. Anim Reprod Sci 2007;99:82–92.
[45] Bonet S, Casas I, Holt WV, Yeste M. Boar reproduction: fundamentals and new biotechnological trends. Berlin: Springer-Verlag; 2013.
[46] De Ambrogi M, Spinaci M, Galeati G, Tamanini C. Viability and DNA fragmentation in differently sorted boar spermatozoa. Ther- iogenology 2006;66:1994–2000.
[47] Boe-Hansen GB, Morris ID, Ersbøll AK, Greve T, Christensen P. DNA integrity in sexed bull sperm assessed by neutral Comet assay and sperm chromatin structure assay. Theriogenology 2005;63:1789–802.
[48] Gosálvez J, Ramirez MA, López-Fernández C, Crespo F, Evans KM, Kjelland ME, et al. Sex-sorted bovine spermatozoa and DNA dam- age: I. Static features. Theriogenology 2011;75:197–205.
[49] Mari G, Bucci D, Love CC, Mislei B, Rizzato G, Giaretta E, et al. Effect of cushioned or single layer semen centrifugation before sex sorting on frozen stallion semen quality. Theriogenology 2015;83:953–8.

[50]
Flores E, Ramió-Lluch L, Bucci D, Fernández-Novell JM, Peña A, Rodríguez-Gil JE. Freezing-thawing induces alterations in histone H1-DNA binding and the breaking of protein-DNA disulfide bonds in boar sperm. Theriogenology 2011;76:1450–64.

[51] Yeste M, Flores E, Estrada E, Bonet S, Rigau T, Rodríguez-Gil JE. Reduced glutathione and procaine hydrochloride protect the nucleoprotein structure of boar spermatozoa during freeze-thawing by stabilising disulfide bonds. Reprod Fertil Dev 2013;25:1036–50.

[52] Yeste M, Estrada E, Casas I, Bonet S, Rodríguez-Gil JE. Good and bad freezability boar ejaculates differ in the integrity of nucleoprotein structure after freeze-thawing but not in ROS levels. Theriogenology 2013;79:929–39.

[53] Silva PF, Gadella BM. Detection of damage in mammalian sperm cells. Theriogenology 2006;65:958–78.

[54] Morton KM, Herrmann D, Sieg B, Struckmann C, Maxwell WM, Rath D, et al. Altered mRNA expression patterns in bovine blasto- cysts after fertilisation in vitro using flow cytometrically sex-sorted sperm. Mol Reprod Dev 2007;74:931–40.

[55] Beilby KH, de Graaf SP, Evans G, Maxwell WM, Wilkening S, Wrenzycki C, et al. Quantitative mRNA expression in ovine blasto- cysts produced from X- and Y-chromosome bearing sperm, both in vitro and in vivo. Theriogenology 2011;76:471–81.

[56] Palma GA, Olivier NS, Neumüller Ch, Sinowatz F. Effects of sex- sorted spermatozoa on the efficiency of in vitro fertilization and ultrastructure of in vitro produced bovine blastocysts. Anat Histol Embryol 2008;37:67–73.

[57] Leman AD, Dziuk PJ. Fertilization and development of pig follicular oocytes. J Reprod Fertil 1971;26:387–9.

[58] Polge C, Rowson LE, Chang MC. The effect of reducing the number of embryos during early stages of gestation on the maintenance of pregnancy in the pig. J Reprod Fertil 1966;12:395–7.

[59] Bathgate R. Functional integrity of sex-sorted, frozen-thawed boar sperm and its potential for artificial insemination. Theriogenology 2008;70:1234–41.

[60] Garcia EM, Vazquez JM, Parrilla I, Calvete JJ, Sanz L, Caballero I, et al. Improving the fertilizing ability of sex sorted boar spermatozoa. Theriogenology 2007;68:771–8.

[61] Spinaci M, Vallorani C, Bucci D, Bernardini C, Tamanini C, Seren E, et al. Effect of liquid storage on sorted boar spermatozoa. Ther- iogenology 2010;74:741–8.

[62] Spinaci M, Bucci D, Chlapanidas T, Vallorani C, Perteghella S, Communod R, et al. Boar sperm changes after sorting and encap- sulation in barium alginate membranes. Theriogenology 2013;80: 526–32.

[63] Spinaci M, De Ambrogi M, Volpe S, Galeati G, Tamanini C, Seren E. Effect of staining and sorting on boar sperm membrane integrity, mitochondrial activity and in vitro blastocyst development. Ther- iogenology 2005;64:191–201.

[64] Vallorani C, Spinaci M, Bucci D, Tamanini C, Galeati G. Effects of antioxidants on boar spermatozoa during sorting and storage. Anim Reprod Sci 2010;122:58–65.

[65] Caballero I, Vazquez JM, Centurion F, Rodriguez-Martinez H, Parrilla I, Roca J, et al. Comparative effects of autologous and ho- mologous seminal plasma on the viability of largely extended boar spermatozoa. Reprod Domest Anim 2004;39:370–5.

[66] Centurion F, Vazquez JM, Calvete JJ, Roca J, Sanz L, Parrilla I, et al. Influence of porcine spermadhesins on the susceptibility of boar spermatozoa to high dilution. Biol Reprod 2003;69:640–6.

[67] Garcia EM, Vazquez JM, Calvete JJ, Sanz L, Caballero I, Parrilla I, et al. Dissecting the protective effect of the seminal plasma spermadhesin PSP-I/PSP-II on boar sperm functionality. J Androl 2006;27:434–43.

[68] Aisen EG, Alvarez HL, Venturino A, Garde JJ. Effect of trehalose and EDTA on cryoprotective action of ram semen diluents. Ther- iogenology 2000;53:1053–61.

[69] Leahy T, Celi P, Bathgate R, Evans G, Maxwell WM, Marti JI. Flow- sorted ram spermatozoa are highly susceptible to hydrogen peroxide damage but are protected by seminal plasma and catalase. Reprod Fertil Dev 2010;22:1131–40.

[70] Klinc P, Rath D. Reduction of oxidative stress in bovine spermatozoa during flow cytometric sorting. Reprod Domest Anim 2007;42:63–7.

[71] Cerolini S, Maldjian A, Pizzi F, Gliozzi TM. Changes in sperm quality and lipid composition during cryopreservation of boar semen. Reproduction 2001;121:395–401.

[72] Xia C, Xia W, Yang S, An L, Li X, Wu Z, et al. Effect of antioxidant supplementation on function and fertility of sex-sorted boar sper- matozoa. Anim Reprod Sci 2012;136:108–14.

[73] Grossfeld R. Experiments to improve the quality of sex-sorted fresh and frozen porcine spermatozoa. PhD thesis, The University of Georg-August-University Göttingen; 2007.

[74] de Graaf SP, Evans G, Gillan L, Guerra MM, Maxwell WM, O'Brien JK. The influence of antioxidant, cholesterol and seminal plasma on the in vitro quality of sorted and non-sorted ram spermatozoa. Theriogenology 2007;67:217–27.

[75] Nebel RL, Bame JH, Saacke RG, Lim F. Microencapsulation of bovine spermatozoa. J Anim Sci 1985;60:1631–9.

[76] Esbenhade KL, Nebel RL. Encapsulation of porcine sperma- tozoa in poly-L-lysine microspheres. Theriogenology 1990;33: 499–508.

[77] Conte U, Torre ML, Maggi L, Giunchedi P, Vigo D, Maffeo G, et al. Microcapsules containing seminal material for artificial insemina- tion in pigs 1999. Patent application n◦EP0922451.

[78] Munoz-Garay C, De La Vega-Beltran JK, Delgado R, Labarca P, Felix R, Darszon A. Inwardly rectify K channels in spermatogenic cells: functional expression and implication in sperm capacitation. Dev Biol 2001;234:261–74.

[79] Torre ML, Maggi L, Vigo D, Galli A, Bornaghi V, Conte U. Controlled release of swine semen encapsulated in calcium alginate beads. Biomaterials 2000;21:1493–8.

[80]

Torre ML, Faustini M, Norberti R, Stacchezzini S, Maggi L, Maffeo G, et al. Boar semen controlled delivery system: storage and in vitro spermatozoa release. J Control Release 2002;85:83–9.

[81] Vigo D, Faustini M, Torre ML, Pecile A, Villani S, Asti A, et al. Boar semen controlled-delivery system: morphological investigation and in vitro fertilization test. Reprod Fertil Dev 2002;14:207–14.

[82] Chou KCK, Wang HY. Method of artificial insemination by timed release of sperm from capsules or solid beads 2003. Patent US 6.596.310.

[83] Faustini M, Torre ML, Stacchezzini S, Norberti R, Consiglio AL, Porcelli F, et al. Boar spermatozoa encapsulated in barium alginate membranes: a microdensitometric evaluation of some enzymatic activities during storage at 18◦C. Theriogenology 2004;61:173–84.

[84] Vigo D, Faustini M, Villani S, Orsini F, Bucco M, Chlapanidas T, et al. Semen controlled-release capsules allow a single artificial insemi- nation in sows. Theriogenology 2009;72:439–44.

[85] Spinaci M, Chlapanidas T, Bucci D, Vallorani C, Perteghella S, Lucconi G, et al. Encapsulation of sex sorted boar semen: sperm membrane status and oocyte penetration parameters. Ther- iogenology 2013;79:575–81.

Table 1
Production of piglets from flow cytometrically sorted spermatozoa in combination with other reproductive technologies (in chronological order).

Insemination technique	Type of sorted spermatozoa	Sperm number	No. sows inseminated/ ET recipients	Farrowing rate (%)	Average litter size	Piglets of predicted sex (%)	Reference
Surgical AI (oviduct)	Fresh	3×10^5	18	50	7.8	71	Johnson [14]
IVF, ET	Fresh	4×10^5/mL	2	100	5	100	Rath et al. [15]
IVF, ET	Fresh	2×10^4/mL (57–67 sperm/oocyte)	28	28.6	4.1	97	Abeydeera et al. [16]
IVF, ET	Fresh	35 sperm/oocyte	21	28.6	5.8	97	Rath et al. [17]
Surgical AI (oviduct)	Frozen thawed (sorted)	0.4×10^6	10	40	6.8	D	Johnson et al. [18]
DIUI	Fresh (bulk sorted)	$70–140 \times 10^6$	91	39.1–46.6	8.7–9.2	D	Vazquez et al. [19]
DIUI	Fresh	50×10^6	1	100	11	100	Rath et al. [20]
ICSI, ET	Fresh		4	100	3.3	100	Probst et al. [21]
DIUI	Frozen thawed	50 (motile) $\times 10^6$	12	8	5	40	Bathgate [22]
DIUI	Fresh	50×10^6	12	33.3	7.5	97	Grossfeldetal. [23]
Surgical AI (oviduct and uterine horns)	Fresh	$3–6 \times 10^6$	109	78.9–80.7	9.2–10.8	92	del Olmo et al. [24]

Abbreviations: AI, artificial insemination; DIUI, deep intrauterine insemination; ET, embryo transfer; ICSI, intracytoplasmic sperm injection.