

1 SHORT COMMUNICATION

2 **Catalase improves motility, vitality and DNA integrity of**  
3 **1 cryopreserved human spermatozoa**

4 A. E. Moubasher<sup>1</sup>, A. M. E. El Din<sup>2</sup>, M. E. Ali<sup>1</sup>, W. T. El-sherif<sup>2</sup> & H. D. Gaber<sup>1</sup>

5 1 Department of Dermatology, Venereology and Andrology, Faculty of Medicine, Assiut University, Assiut, Egypt;

6 2 Department of Clinical Pathology, Faculty of Medicine, Assiut University, Assiut, Egypt

7 **Keywords**

8 Antioxidant—DNA damage—swim-up

9 **Correspondence**

10 Wafaa Tohamy El-sherif, Department of  
11 Clinical Pathology, Faculty of Medicine,  
12 Assiut University, 71114 Assiut, Egypt

13 **2** Tel.: +xx xxx xxx;

14 fax: +xx xxx xxx;

15 E-mail: wafaa\_elsherif@hotmail-com

16 Accepted: March 20, 2012

17 doi: 10.1111/j.1439-0272.2012.01310.x

18 **Summary**

19 Cryopreservation of human spermatozoa offers a pre-therapeutic possibility of  
20 preserving progeny in patients with testicular tumours. We aimed to investi-  
21 gate effects of cryopreservation and addition of catalase on sperm motility,  
22 vitality and DNA integrity in fresh and swim-up spermatozoa. Semen samples  
23 were collected from 50 fertile men. Each sample was divided into two parts.  
24 First part was subdivided into two equal aliquots: both cryopreserved with and  
25 without catalase. The second part was subdivided into two equal aliquots: both  
26 processed by swim up and then cryopreserved with or without catalase. Semen  
27 analyses, sperm vitality and sperm DNA integrity were performed. Sperm con-  
28 centration showed significant decrease while percentage of progressive motility,  
29 sperm vitality and % of DNA damage showed significant increase in processed  
30 and cryopreserved processed samples when compared with fresh and cryopre-  
31 served fresh samples. There was no significant difference in sperm concentra-  
32 tion while there was significant increase in % of progressive motility and  
33 sperm vitality and % of DNA damage showed significant decrease in samples  
34 with catalase when compared with samples without catalase (either fresh or  
35 processed). Catalase supplementation (fresh and processed) during cryopreser-  
36 vation results in better post-thawing percentage of progressive motility and  
37 percentage of sperm vitality and improved DNA integrity.

38 **3 Introduction**

39 Cryopreservation of spermatozoa is proven to be the only  
40 effective method to circumvent the sterilising effect of  
41 cytotoxic therapy in patients with malignant diseases  
42 (Neal *et al.*, 2007). Nevertheless, the cryopreservation  
43 process can lead to structural and functional alterations  
44 in spermatozoa, impairing fertilisation potential. And  
45 there is still no effective method available for preventing  
46 this cryodamage (Medeiros *et al.*, 2002).

47 Reactive oxygen species has been suggested as a major  
48 contributing factor for cryodamage to spermatozoa  
49 (Anger *et al.*, 2003). Accordingly, a variety of cryoprotective  
50 media, mostly supplemented with antioxidants, have  
51 been employed in an attempt to overcome cryodamage  
52 (Yoshimoto *et al.*, 2008). Antioxidant supplementation  
53 has been shown to yield significantly improved quality of  
54 cryopreserved spermatozoa (Grossfeld *et al.*, 2008). Sperm  
55 DNA is being recognised as an independent measure of  
56 sperm quality that may have better diagnostic and prog-

nostic capabilities than standard sperm parameters  
(Erenpreiss *et al.*, 2006).

57 To date, there are some contrasting results about the  
58 value of antioxidants in sperm protection against oxidative  
59 stress. Some studies revealed that *in vitro* antioxidant sup-  
60 plementation can protect against oxidative damage of the  
61 sperm DNA. In support, sperm processing with removal of  
62 seminal plasma (rich in antioxidants) results in injury to  
63 the sperm DNA (Twigg *et al.*, 1998a). Ben Abdallah *et al.*  
64 (2011) reported that dimethoate (pesticides) caused a sig-  
65 nificant induction of oxidative damage in spermatozoa and  
66 a significant decrease in sperm mobility, viability and activ-  
67 ities of catalase and addition of vitamins reduced the dam-  
68 age probably due to its strong antioxidant property. In  
69 contrast, other studies reported that antioxidants (e.g. vita-  
70 min C and, catalase) have limited value in protecting sperm  
71 DNA against ROS production (Taylor *et al.*, 2009). There-  
72 fore, this study was conducted to evaluate the effects of  
73 cryopreservation, processing (swim-up technique) and  
74 catalase supplementation (antioxidant) on the semen

parameters (motility, vitality and DNA integrity, that is, percentage of DNA damage).

## Subjects and methods

### Reagents

#### Swelling solution

- 1 Dissolve 0.735 g sodium citrates dehydrate ( $\text{Na}_3\text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{O}_7 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ) and 1.351 g fructose in 100 ml distilled water. Store aliquots of this solution frozen at  $-20^\circ\text{C}$  and then thaw and mix well before use. Catalase was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich. SpermFreeze is a HEPES-buffered freezing medium for use with human spermatozoa; it contains 15% glycerol and 0.4% human serum albumin to protect the spermatozoa from damage due to the freezing procedure manufactured by FertiPro, Belgium, Lot. FP05S). *Coulter DNA PREP* Reagents Kit, PN 6607055 (100 tests): DNA PREP LPR contains <0.1% potassium cyanide, <0.1%  $\text{NaN}_3$ , nonionic detergents, saline and stabilizers. DNA PREP Stain contains  $50\ \mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$  propidium iodide (PI; <0.5% PI), RNase [Type III-A, Bovine Pancrease ( $4\ \text{KU ml}^{-1}$ )], <0.1%  $\text{NaN}_3$ , saline and stabilizers. Kit was supplied by Coulter (DNA Prep; Beckman Coulter Fullerton, CA, USA).

### Semen preparation and analysis

The semen samples were obtained by masturbation after at least 3 days of sexual abstinence and collected into sterile containers from 50 fertile men (within the last year), who are clinically free and with normal parameters and were recruited from the outpatient clinic of the Department of Dermatology and Andrology, Assiut university hospital from January 2009 to January 2010. All the participants were nonsmokers, and their age ranged between 18 and 54 year with average of  $37.94 \pm 10.35$ . Twenty-six participants were farmers while the remaining had administrative work. Samples were left to liquefy for 30 min at  $37^\circ\text{C}$  and were analysed within an hour. Semen analysis was carried out according to the criteria mentioned in the World Health Organization manual (1999), with volumes  $\geq 2.0\ \text{ml}$ , normal viscosity, normal sperm count, viability  $\geq 60\%$ , grade a motility  $\geq 25\%$  or grade a and b motility  $\geq 50\%$ , and leucocytes  $\leq 1 \times 10^6\ \text{ml}^{-1}$ . The experimental design was approved by the Ethics Committee at the Faculty of Medicine, Assiut University. Informed consents were obtained from all the participants.

### Study design

Each semen sample was equally divided into two parts. The first part of the sample was further divided into two equal

aliquots. Catalase ( $200\ \text{u ml}^{-1}$ ) was added to one aliquot during cryopreservation. The second aliquot was cryopreserved without catalase treatment. The second part of the sample was processed by swim-up technique. The processed sample was divided into two equal aliquots. The first aliquot was cryopreserved with addition of catalase ( $200\ \text{u ml}^{-1}$ ). The second aliquot was cryopreserved without addition of catalase. The antioxidant concentrations in this study were chosen on the basis of published literature (Roca *et al.*, 2005). Cryopreservation in liquid nitrogen for at least 24 h for all samples (fresh and processed) was performed.

### Hypo-osmotic swelling (HOS) test

Warm 1 ml swelling solution in a closed Eppendorf tube at  $37^\circ\text{C}$  for about 5 min. Add 0.1 ml liquefied semen and mix gently with the pipette. Keep at  $37^\circ\text{C}$  for at least 30 min (but not longer than 120 min) and examine the sperm cells with a phase-contrast microscope. Swelling of spermatozoa is identified as changes in the shape of the tail. Count in duplicate the number of swollen cells in a total of 200 spermatozoa counted and calculate the mean percentage (WHO, 1999).

### Steps of swim-up technique

Ham's F10 (1.5 ml) is gently layered over semen (1 ml) in a sterile 15-ml conical based centrifuge tube. The tube is inclined at angle of  $45^\circ$  and incubated for 1 h at  $37^\circ\text{C}$ . The tube is then gently returned to the upright position and uppermost 1 ml removed, and 0.5 ml of Ham's F10 medium was added for assessment of sperm quality before using it.

### Sperm cryopreservation

According to the manufacturer's instructions

**Freezing:** One millilitre of liquefied semen mixed with 0.7 ml of SpermFreeze. The mixture was left for 10 min at room temperature for equilibration. The sample/medium mixture sucked into the freezing straws. Shaking was carried out to remove the air bubble to the centre of the straw. The straws were frozen vertically for 15 min, just above the level of the liquid nitrogen. Then, the straws were immersed and stored in liquid nitrogen.

**Thawing:** The straws were removed as required from the liquid nitrogen. The straws were placed in tap water for 5 min. Then, the straws were kept in the incubator (at  $37^\circ\text{C}$  for 5–20 min), and evaluation of the different items was carried out after complete thawing of the samples.

### DNA damage analysis

The sperm DNA damage was performed on flow cytometry model PAS DAKO-Cytomation. Determination of DNA

damage was based on the fluorescence emission from individual sperm cells after staining with PI and excitation with a 488-nm argon laser. The measurement is based upon the ability PI to bind histochemically to DNA under appropriate staining conditions. The liquefied fresh and processed semen samples were diluted with phosphate buffered saline (PBS) (pH 7.4) to  $2 \times 10^6$  sperm  $\text{ml}^{-1}$ . Fifty microlitres (50  $\mu\text{l}$ ) of semen samples was incubated with 100  $\mu\text{l}$  of lysing reagent for 15 s. Two millilitres of DNA Prep stain was added and mixed with tube. Immediately after staining, tube acquisition was performed by flow cytometry. The intensity of the fluorescence emission corresponds to the DNA content. Sperm DNA damage was calculated after acquisition of 5000 cells (spermatozoa). Analysis of human spermatozoa displays a constant and characteristic bimodal nonartificial DNA pattern confirming the existence of two distinct populations. The main population is represented by a peak followed by a shoulder that is the marginal population. The marginal population represents a sperm group altered in the nuclear condensation (DNA damage), yielding unstable chromatin that appears more stainable (Shapiro, 1995).

#### Statistical analysis

Data were analysed using SPSS version 16 program. Values were expressed as mean  $\pm$  standard deviations (SD) and percentages. Comparisons between two groups were analysed by Unpaired *t*-test and chi-square. Pearson correlation test was applied to analyse correlations between different quantitative variables within each group. *P* value  $< 0.05$  was considered significant.

## Results

### Adverse effects of cryopreservation on the semen parameters

As shown in Table 1, the sperm concentration and percentage of progressive motility, as well as sperm vitality, decreased significantly after cryopreservation compared with the fresh ejaculated spermatozoa. Also, the freezing/thawing resulted in highly significant increase in % of DNA damage in cryopreserved fresh compared with the fresh ejaculated spermatozoa. There was positive correlation between sperm vitality and progressive sperm motility ( $r = 0.59$ ,  $P = 0.001$ ) while there was no correlation between sperm vitality, progressive sperm motility and % of DNA damage.

### Effects of swim up (processed) on semen parameters

Table 1 shows statistically significant decrease in sperm concentration and statistically significant increase in percentage of progressive motility, sperm vitality and % of DNA damage in processed (swim up) samples when compared with fresh ejaculated spermatozoa.

### Protective effects of antioxidant (catalase) supplementation on the semen parameters

As shown in Table 1, in the presence of catalase, there was no significant difference in sperm concentration when compared with the samples without catalase (either fresh or swim up). In addition, there was significant increase in % of progressive motility and sperm vitality as

**Table 1** Effects of cryopreservation, swim up (processed) and catalase supplementation on the semen parameters

Sperm	Concentration (mill $\text{ml}^{-1}$ )	Progressive motility (A + B) (%)	Hypo-osmotic swelling-test (%) viability	DNA damage (%)
Fresh ejaculated spermatozoa	90.0 $\pm$ 38.8	56.9 $\pm$ 7.6	74.1 $\pm$ 9.4	9.0 $\pm$ 3.3
Cryopreserved ejaculated spermatozoa without catalase	56.5 $\pm$ 24.5 <sup>a</sup>	23.8 $\pm$ 11.7 <sup>a</sup>	55.6 $\pm$ 11.3 <sup>a</sup>	12.5 $\pm$ 3.4 <sup>a</sup>
Cryopreserved ejaculated spermatozoa with catalase	55.5 $\pm$ 22.3 <sup>NS</sup>	30.5 $\pm$ 12.0 <sup>b</sup>	62.2 $\pm$ 11.9 <sup>c</sup>	10.1 $\pm$ 4.4 <sup>c</sup>
Swim-up spermatozoa	54.0 $\pm$ 23.6 <sup>d</sup>	76.4 $\pm$ 7.2 <sup>d</sup>	90.7 $\pm$ 7.8 <sup>d</sup>	11.7 $\pm$ 3.2 <sup>d</sup>
Cryopreserved swim-up spermatozoa without catalase	32.2 $\pm$ 16.7 <sup>e</sup>	36.5 $\pm$ 15.5 <sup>e</sup>	66.1 $\pm$ 11.7 <sup>e</sup>	14.9 $\pm$ 4.1 <sup>e</sup>
Cryopreserved swim-up spermatozoa with catalase	32.4 $\pm$ 17.3 <sup>NS</sup>	46.6 $\pm$ 17.3 <sup>f</sup>	70.0 $\pm$ 11.1 <sup>g</sup>	12.0 $\pm$ 3.0 <sup>g</sup>

NS, not significant.

<sup>a</sup> $P < 0.001$  (significance of difference from fresh ejaculated spermatozoa).

<sup>b</sup> $P < 0.01$ , <sup>c</sup> $P < 0.05$ , (significance of difference from Cryopreserved ejaculated spermatozoa without catalase).

<sup>d</sup> $P < 0.001$  (significance of difference from fresh ejaculated spermatozoa).

<sup>e</sup> $P < 0.001$ , (significance of difference from swim-up spermatozoa).

<sup>f</sup> $P < 0.01$ , <sup>g</sup> $P < 0.05$ , (significance of difference from cryopreserved swim-up spermatozoa without catalase).

well as significant decrease in % of DNA damage in samples with catalase when compared with samples without catalase (either fresh or swim up).

## Discussion

Although the cryopreservation of human semen is an important technique routinely employed in the clinical management of male infertility, the relevant cryodamage remains a great challenge (Medeiros *et al.*, 2002). Sperm motility and viability are the most commonly affected parameters (Donnelly *et al.*, 2001a).

In this study, there was a statistically significant decrease in sperm concentration, percentage of progressive motility and sperm vitality in cryopreserved fresh samples when compared with fresh samples. These findings are in accordance with previous reports (Li *et al.*, 2010; Zribi *et al.*, 2010). The excessive ROS production during freezing and thawing has been demonstrated to be a significant contributing factor. Generation of ROS induces peroxidation of the plasma lipid membrane of the spermatozoa (Ozkavukcu *et al.*, 2008; Zribi *et al.*, 2010). The freezing/thawing process exposes the spermatozoa to damaging physical and chemical environments including crystal ice formation, which physically affects the cell. Ice formation around the cells concentrates the surrounding matrix rapidly, leaving the cells in fluids containing high solute content (Ozkavukcu *et al.*, 2008). Furthermore, the glycerol, which is used during cryopreservation, had toxic effect on spermatozoa. The rapid changes in osmolarity, which occur during freezing–thawing, cause deformations of the membranous structures (Buhr *et al.*, 2001).

The assessment of sperm DNA damage related to freeze/thawing is very important. This study demonstrated significant increase in percentage of DNA damage in cryopreserved fresh samples when compared with fresh samples. This is in the agreement with Li *et al.* (2010) who reported that ROS increases DNA fragmentation in human spermatozoa. On the contrary, Jiang *et al.* (2005) did not report any adverse effect of cryopreservation on sperm DNA, and Donnelly *et al.* (2001b) reported that only spermatozoa from infertile men demonstrated a significant increase in DNA fragmentation following cryopreservation. Cryopreservation protocols and extender formulations vary among laboratories and among species and may account for the differences observed.

The most commonly used sperm preparation techniques for ARTs are the swim up and density gradient centrifugation. Our results demonstrate significantly lower sperm concentration but significantly higher percentage of progressive motility and sperm vitality in processed (swim up) samples when compared with fresh samples.

This finding is in agreement with Younglai *et al.* (2001) who reported, significant decrease in sperm concentration and significant increase in motility and morphology of spermatozoa after swim-up method. Adiga & Kumar (2001) reported that enhancement of sperm motility after swim up was seen among normal sperm count. A higher recovery rate of total motile spermatozoa was observed in the semen specimens processed by swim-up method. The swim-up method selects the highly motile spermatozoa depending only on its active upward migration through the interface between semen and culture medium (Donnelly *et al.*, 2001a; Jameel, 2008). The recovery of spermatozoa after swim up varies according to the various modifications of the techniques.

We found a significantly higher percentage of DNA damage in the processed (swim up) samples when compared with the fresh samples. These findings are in agreement with Donnelly *et al.* (2001a) and Marchesi *et al.* (2010) and they suggest the use of gentle methods of sperm preparation and centrifugation at 300 g to minimise the production of ROS that damage DNA. The washing step and the separation of spermatozoa from seminal plasma (source of antioxidants) are responsible for harmful ROS production and further DNA damage (Twigg *et al.*, 1998b). On the other hand, Younglai *et al.* (2001) reported that swim-up separation does not increase the level of DNA damage. Techniques revealing sperm DNA damage are numerous and often not equivalent (i.e. not revealing the same kind of DNA damage). Even when the same technique is used, an important pitfall is the lack of standardised protocols to which all users can adhere to minimise inter-laboratory variations.

In recent years, a variety of cryoprotective media, mostly supplemented with antioxidants, have been designed in an attempt to overcome the cellular damage caused by cryopreservation (Chi *et al.*, 2008). In this study, we evaluated the potential benefits of catalase for human sperm cryopreservation. Our results clearly show in agreement with others (Chi *et al.*, 2008; Li *et al.*, 2010) that catalase supplementation is associated with a higher percentage of progressive motility, improved sperm vitality and DNA integrity (i.e. decrease in DNA damage) in fresh and processed semen. Catalase supplementation can inhibit apoptotic DNA damage by protecting the mitochondria. The levels of ROS were significantly reduced by the addition of catalase to the sperm freezing extender reflects that this enzyme may be capable of scavenging the ROS generated during the cryopreservation process, which reduces the damaging effects of oxidative stress and subsequently improves the quality of cryothawed human spermatozoa (Li *et al.*, 2010).

In conclusion, addition of antioxidant (catalase) during cryopreservation (fresh and swim-up semen) results in

1 better post-thawing percentage of progressive motility  
2 and sperm vitality and decreases the percentage of DNA  
3 damage.

## 4 References

5  
6 Adiga SK, Kumar P (2001) Influence of swim-up method on  
7 the recovery of spermatozoa from different types of semen  
8 samples. *J Assist Reprod Genet* 18:160–164.  
9 Anger JT, Gilbert BR, Goldstein M (2003) Cryopreservation of  
10 sperm: indications, methods and results. *J Urol* 170:1079–1084.  
11 Ben Abdallah F, Fetoui H, Zribi N, Fakfakh F, Ammar-Keskes  
12 L (2011) Antioxidant supplementations *in vitro* improve rat  
13 sperm parameters and enhance antioxidant enzyme activities  
14 against dimethoate-induced sperm damages. *Andrologia*  
15 **11** ???-???-???.  
16 Buhr MM, Fiser P, Bailey JL, Curtis EF (2001) Cryopreserva-  
17 tion in different concentrations of glycerol alters boar sperm  
18 and their membranes. *J Androl* 22:961–969.  
19 Chi HJ, Kim JH, Ryu CS, Lee JY, Park JS, Chung DY (2008)  
20 Protective effect of antioxidant supplementation in sperm-  
21 preparation medium against oxidative stress in human sper-  
22 matozoa. *Hum Reprod* 23:1023–1028.  
23 Donnelly ET, McClure N, Lewis SE (2001a) Cryopreservation  
24 of human semen and prepared sperm: effects on motility  
25 parameters and DNA integrity. *Fertil Steril* 76:892–900.  
26 Donnelly ET, Steele EK, McClure N, Lewis SE (2001b) Assess-  
27 ment of DNA integrity and morphology of ejaculated sper-  
28 matozoa from fertile and infertile men before and after  
29 cryopreservation. *Hum Reprod* 16:1191–1199.  
30 Erenpreiss J, Spano M, Erenpreisa J, Bungum M, Giwercman  
31 A (2006) Sperm chromatin structure and male fertility: bio-  
32 logical and clinical aspects. *Asian J Androl* 8:11–29.  
33 Grossfeld R, Sieg B, Struckmann C, Frenzel A, Maxwell WM,  
34 Rath D (2008) New aspects of boar semen freezing strate-  
35 gies. *Theriogenology* 70:1225–1233.  
36 Jameel T (2008) Sperm swim-up: a simple and effective tech-  
37 nique of semen processing for intrauterine insemination.  
38 *J Park Med Assoc* 58:71–74.  
39 Jiang MX, Zhu Y, Zhu ZY, Sun QY, Chen DY (2005) Effects  
40 of cooling, cryopreservation and heating on sperm proteins,  
41 nuclear DNA, and fertilization capability in mouse. *Mol Re-  
42 prod Dev* 72:129–134.  
43 Li ZL, Lin QL, Liu RJ, Xiao WY, Liu WF (2010) Protective  
44 effects of ascorbate and catalase on human spermatozoa  
45 during cryopreservation. *J Androl* 31:437–444.  
46 Marchesi DE, Biederman H, Ferrara S, Hershlag A, Feng HL  
47 (2010) The effect of semen processing on sperm DNA integ-  
48 rity: comparison of two techniques using the novel Tolui-

dine Blue Assay. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*  
151:176–180.  
Medeiros CM, Forell F, Oliveira AT, Rodrigues JL (2002) Cur-  
rent status of sperm cryopreservation: why isn't it better?  
*Theriogenology* 57:327–344.  
Neal MS, Nagel K, Duckworth J, Bissessar H, Fischer MA,  
Portwine C, Tozer R, Barr RD (2007) Effectiveness of sperm  
banking in adolescents and young adults with cancer: a  
regional experience. *Cancer* 110:1125–1129.  
Ozkavukcu S, Erdemli E, Isik A, Oztuna D, Karahuseyinoglu S  
(2008) Effects of cryopreservation on sperm parameters and  
ultrastructural morphology of human spermatozoa. *J Assist  
Reprod Genet* 25:403–411.  
Roca J, Rodriguez MJ, Gil MA, Carvajal G, Garcia EM, Cuello  
C, Vazquez JM, Martinez EA (2005) Survival and *in vitro*  
fertility of boar spermatozoa frozen in The presence of  
superoxide dismutase and/or catalase. *J Androl* 26:15–24.  
Shapiro HM (1995) Practical Flowcytometry. Extrinsic Param-  
eters, 3rd edn. Wiley-Liss, New York, NY, pp 251.  
Taylor K, Roberts P, Sanders K, Burton P (2009) Effect of  
antioxidant supplementation of cryopreservation medium  
on post-thaw integrity of human spermatozoa. *Reprod Bio-  
med Online* 18:184–189.  
Twigg JP, Fulton N, Gomez E, Irvine DS, Aitken RJ (1998a)  
Analysis of the impact of intracellular reactive oxygen spe-  
cies generation on the structural and functional integrity of  
human spermatozoa: lipid peroxidation, DNA fragmentation  
and effectiveness of antioxidants. *Hum Reprod*  
13:1429–1436.  
Twigg JP, Irvine DS, Aitken RJ (1998b) Oxidative damage to  
DNA in human spermatozoa does not preclude pronucleus  
formation at intracytoplasmic sperm injection. *Hum Reprod*  
13:1864–1871.  
World Health Organization (1999) WHO Laboratory Manual  
for the Examination of Human Semen and Sperm-Cervical  
Mucus Interaction, 4th edn. Cambridge University Press,  
Cambridge, UK, pp 1–38.  
Yoshimoto T, Nakamura S, Yamauchi S, Muto N, Nakada T,  
Ashizawa K, Tatemoto H (2008) Improvement of the post-  
thaw qualities of Okinawan native pig spermatozoa frozen  
in an extender supplemented with ascorbic acid 2-O-alpha-  
glucoside. *Cryobiology* 57:30–36.  
YOUNGLAI EV, HOLT D, BROWN P, JURISICOVA A, CASPER RF  
(2001) Sperm swim-up techniques and DNA fragmentation.  
*Hum Reprod* 16:1950–1953.  
Zribi N, Chakroun FN, El Euch H, Gargouri J, Bahloul A,  
Ammar Keskes L (2010) Effects of cryopreservation on  
human sperm deoxyribonucleic acid integrity. *Fertil Steril*  
93:159–166.

## Author Query Form

Journal:        AND  
 Article:        1310

Dear Author,

During the copy-editing of your paper, the following queries arose. Please respond to these by marking up your proofs with the necessary changes/additions. Please write your answers on the query sheet if there is insufficient space on the page proofs. Please write clearly and follow the conventions shown on the attached corrections sheet. If returning the proof by fax do not write too close to the paper's edge. Please remember that illegible mark-ups may delay publication.

Many thanks for your assistance.

Query reference	Query	Remarks
1	AUTHOR: Please submit the Copyright Transfer Agreement (CTA). The download link for the ELF form is <a href="http://media.wiley.com/assets/1540/86/ctaaglobal.pdf">http://media.wiley.com/assets/1540/86/ctaaglobal.pdf</a> .	
2	AUTHOR: Please provide telephone and fax number for corresponding author.	
3	AUTHOR: Please check all the heading levels are correct.	
4	AUTHOR: Ben Abdallah, 2011 has been changed to Ben Abdallah <i>et al.</i> , 2011 so that this citation matches the Reference List. Please confirm that this is correct.	
5	AUTHOR: Please define ROS.	
6	AUTHOR: Please check and confirm whether the term "sodium citrates dehydrate" can be changed as "sodium citrate dihydrate"	
7	AUTHOR: Please give address information for Sigma-Aldrich: town, state (if applicable), and country.	
8	AUTHOR: Please give address information for FertiPro: town.	
9	AUTHOR: Please give manufacturer information for SPSS version 16 program: company name, town, state (if USA), and country.	
10	AUTHOR: Please define ARTs.	
11	AUTHOR: Please provide the volume number, page range for reference Ben Abdallah et al. (2011).	

# MARKED PROOF

## Please correct and return this set

Please use the proof correction marks shown below for all alterations and corrections. If you wish to return your proof by fax you should ensure that all amendments are written clearly in dark ink and are made well within the page margins.

<i>Instruction to printer</i>	<i>Textual mark</i>	<i>Marginal mark</i>
Leave unchanged	... under matter to remain	Ⓟ
Insert in text the matter indicated in the margin	∧	New matter followed by ∧ or ∧ <sup>Ⓢ</sup>
Delete	/ through single character, rule or underline or ┌───┐ through all characters to be deleted	Ⓞ or Ⓞ <sup>Ⓢ</sup>
Substitute character or substitute part of one or more word(s)	/ through letter or ┌───┐ through characters	new character / or new characters /
Change to italics	— under matter to be changed	↵
Change to capitals	≡ under matter to be changed	≡
Change to small capitals	≡ under matter to be changed	≡
Change to bold type	~ under matter to be changed	~
Change to bold italic	≈ under matter to be changed	≈
Change to lower case	Encircle matter to be changed	≡
Change italic to upright type	(As above)	⊕
Change bold to non-bold type	(As above)	⊖
Insert 'superior' character	/ through character or ∧ where required	Υ or Υ under character e.g. Υ or Υ
Insert 'inferior' character	(As above)	∧ over character e.g. ∧
Insert full stop	(As above)	⊙
Insert comma	(As above)	,
Insert single quotation marks	(As above)	Ƴ or ƴ and/or ƶ or Ʒ
Insert double quotation marks	(As above)	ƶ or Ʒ and/or Ʒ or ƶ
Insert hyphen	(As above)	⊥
Start new paragraph	┌	┌
No new paragraph	┐	┐
Transpose	└┘	└┘
Close up	linking ○ characters	Ⓞ
Insert or substitute space between characters or words	/ through character or ∧ where required	Υ
Reduce space between characters or words		↑