

Exploring the ethical and social implications of fertility preservation for young women.

Teresa Wettergren*

Department of Neurobiology, Karolinska Institute, Sweden

Introduction

Fertility preservation for young women, such as egg or ovarian tissue freezing, has become increasingly accessible, offering new possibilities for those facing medical treatments that may compromise fertility or seeking to delay childbearing for personal or professional reasons [1]. While these advancements provide hope and autonomy, they also raise significant ethical and social concerns that warrant careful exploration [2].

One of the primary ethical considerations is the equitable access to fertility preservation. The high cost of procedures often limits availability to economically privileged groups, creating disparities in who can benefit from these technologies [3]. This raises questions about the fairness of medical advancements and whether broader societal efforts should be made to subsidize or regulate such services [4].

Another concern is the potential for false reassurance. While fertility preservation offers a chance at future parenthood, it does not guarantee success [5]. Women may overestimate the likelihood of achieving pregnancy, leading to emotional distress or delayed attempts at natural conception. Transparency about success rates and risks is critical to ensure informed decision-making [6].

Social implications include the pressure on young women to preserve fertility as a means of aligning personal choices with societal expectations, particularly in professional environments [7]. The promotion of fertility preservation as a workplace benefit may inadvertently reinforce these pressures, framing delayed parenthood as a norm rather than a choice [8].

Ethical dilemmas also arise around posthumous use of preserved gametes or embryos, which can lead to disputes about reproductive rights and the intentions of the individual [9]. Additionally, cultural attitudes toward reproduction and motherhood can influence the acceptance and perception of fertility preservation, potentially stigmatizing those who choose or decline it [10].

Conclusion

While fertility preservation offers significant benefits, it presents complex ethical and social challenges. Addressing these issues requires thoughtful policies, improved access, and

transparent communication to ensure that these technologies empower women without reinforcing inequalities or societal pressures.

References

1. Alon I, Bussod I, Golan OC, et al. Mapping ethical, legal, and social implications (ELSI) of fertility preservation. *J Assist Reprod Genet.* 2024;41(9):2495-514.
2. Cheong DY, Pereira TL, Huang Z, et al. Navigating Uncharted Waters: A Mixed Studies Systematic Review of Elective Female Fertility Preservation for Women. *J Clin Nurs.* 2024.
3. Mertes H, Pennings G. Ethical considerations of fertility preservation. *Fem. and Male Fert. Preserv.* 2022;627-40.
4. Anzani A, Lorusso MM, Rucco D, et al. Parental perspectives on fertility preservation for their trans and gender-expansive children: Reflections on complexities of autonomy, support, and societal realities. *Int. J. Transgender Health.* 2024:1-5.
5. Campo-Engelstein L, Chen D, Baratz AB, et al. Fertility preservation for a teenager with differences (disorders) of sex development: an ethics case study. *J Clin Ethics.* 2019;30(2):143-53.
6. Li N, Jayasinghe Y, Kemertzis MA, et al. Fertility preservation in pediatric and adolescent oncology patients: the decision-making process of parents. *J Adolesc Young Adult Oncol.* 2017;6(2):213-22.
7. Mayes C, Williams J, Lipworth W. Conflicted hope: social egg freezing and clinical conflicts of interest. *Biomedicines.* 2018;27(1):45-59.
8. Dryden A, Ussher JM, Perz J. Young women's construction of their post-cancer fertility. *Psychol Health.* 2014;29(11):1341-60.
9. Baldwin K. The biomedicalisation of reproductive ageing: reproductive citizenship and the gendering of fertility risk. *Health, Risk Soc.* 2019;21(5-6):268-83.
10. Zou W, Liu Z, Yang X. Reclaiming Power or Reinforcing Inequities: Exploring Egg Freezing Debates on Social Media. *Health Commun.* 2024:1-1.

*Correspondence to: Teresa Wettergren, Department of Neurobiology, Karolinska Institute, Sweden. E-mail: wettergren@ki.swis.co

Received: 26-Oct-2024, Manuscript No. AAGGS-24-155118; Editor assigned: 28-Oct-2024, Pre QC No. AAGGS-24-155118(PQ); Reviewed: 11-Nov-2024, QC No. AAGGS-24-155118; Revised: 16-Nov-2024, Manuscript No. AAGGS-24-155118(R); Published: 23-Nov-2024, DOI: 10.35841/ajjnr-8.6.240