



**Citation:** V. J. A, P. J. A, T. M. A, Akhigbe RE (2024) SARS-CoV-2 impairs male fertility by targeting semen quality and testosterone level: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS ONE 19(9): e0307396. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal. pone.0307396

Editor: Stefan Schlatt, University Hospital of Münster, GERMANY

Received: April 26, 2024

Accepted: July 4, 2024

Published: September 9, 2024

**Peer Review History:** PLOS recognizes the benefits of transparency in the peer review process; therefore, we enable the publication of all of the content of peer review and author responses alongside final, published articles. The editorial history of this article is available here: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307396

**Copyright:** © 2024 V. J. et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

**Data Availability Statement:** All data are in the paper and/or Supporting Information files.

**Funding:** The author(s) received no specific funding for this work.

**RESEARCH ARTICLE** 

# SARS-CoV-2 impairs male fertility by targeting semen quality and testosterone level: A systematic review and meta-analysis

# Ashonibare V. J.<sup>1,2</sup>, Ashonibare P. J.<sup>2,3</sup>, Akhigbe T. M.<sup>2,4</sup>, R. E. Akhigbe<sup>2,3</sup>\*

1 Medical Faculty, Department of Cardiovascular Surgery and Research Group for Experimental Surgery, Cardiovascular Regenerative Medicine and Tissue Engineering 3D Lab, Heinrich Heine University, Düsseldorf, Germany, 2 Reproductive Biology and Toxicology Research Laboratory, Oasis of Grace Hospital, Osogbo, Nigeria, 3 Department of Physiology, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomosho, Oyo State, Nigeria, 4 Department of Agronomy, Breeding and Genetic Unit, Osun State University, Osun State, Nigeria

\* akhigberoland@gmail.com, reakhigbe@lautech.edu.ng

# Abstract

# Background

Since the discovery of COVID-19 in December 2019, the novel virus has spread globally causing significant medical and socio-economic burden. Although the pandemic has been curtailed, the virus and its attendant complication live on. A major global concern is its adverse impact on male fertility.

# Aim

This study was aimed to give an up to date and robust data regarding the effect of COVID-19 on semen variables and male reproductive hormones.

# Materials and methods

Literature search was performed according to the recommendations of PRISMA. Out of the 852 studies collected, only 40 were eligible for inclusion in assessing the effect SARS-CoV-2 exerts on semen quality and androgens. More so, a SWOT analysis was conducted.

# Results

The present study demonstrated that SARS-CoV-2 significantly reduced ejaculate volume, sperm count, concentration, viability, normal morphology, and total and progressive motility. Furthermore, SARS-CoV-2 led to a reduction in circulating testosterone level, but a rise in oestrogen, prolactin, and luteinizing hormone levels. These findings were associated with a decline in testosterone/luteinizing hormone ratio.

**Competing interests:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

# Conclusions

The current study provides compelling evidence that SARS-CoV-2 may lower male fertility by reducing semen quality through a hormone-dependent mechanism; reduction in testosterone level and increase in oestrogen and prolactin levels.

# Introduction

Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which is implicated as the causative organism of the Corona-Virus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has remained a global concern since its outbreak [1–3]. SARS-CoV-2 is a sheathed β-coronavirus, which is genetically similar to SARS-CoV-1 (80%) and 96.2% with Bat coronavirus RaTG13 [4]. The S protein contains the S1 sub-unit, which carries the receptor binding domain that tethers to the angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE 2) [5,6], and facilitates binding to and entry into host cells [4,6]. Though quite similar, SARS-CoV-2 spreads more expeditiously than SARS-CoV-1, as it has a higher net reproductive rate. Additionally, SARS-CoV-2 exhibits stronger binding to its host receptor cells and greater host invasion because of its slight structural difference from SARS-CoV-1 [7,8]. However, angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) is the primary host receptor of SARS-CoV [4]. It is liberally present in the epithelial tissue of the lung and small intestine, heart, lungs, kidneys, and testes in humans [9–19], and may contribute possible entry portal for SARS-CoV [20].

As of May 2023, over 766 million COVID- 19 cases, with about 7 million mortalities were reported [9]. Studies have revealed that COVID-19 mainly affects both male and female respiratory systems [4,8]. Studies have also demonstrated that the virus causes damage to multiple organs, including the kidney, heart, liver, brain [10,12], and testes [2,4,6,8,13]. In addition, there is proof that SARS-CoV-1 exerts a more severe impact on males than females [6,14–17]. Also, orchitis has been reported in males recovering from the SARS virus [3,18]. Despite this, findings on the adverse effect of this deadly virus on the male reproductive system are limited and contentious. In a systematic review and meta-analysis by Corona et al. [21], SARS-CoV-2 infection was linked with low semen quality and serum testosterone level. This is in agreement with earlier systematic review and meta-analysis by Tiwari et al. [22]. The study however had some frailties- first, the random-effect model was used irrespective of the level of diversity, which might affect the findings of the meta-analysis. Also, no sensitivity analyses were performed to rule out the influence of diversity. Finally, the authors failed to apply the finding of the quality of the appraised studies to their analysis.

Therefore, the aim of this study is oriented towards providing an overhauling meta-analysis on the consequence of COVID-19 on male fertility. This review gives an insight into how COVID-19 impact semen quality and male reproductive hormones to modulate male fertility. So far as we are aware, this research pioneers the evaluation of the impact of COVID-19 by comparing between infected and non-infected subjects, before and after treatment in infected patients, and infected and pre-COVID state in the same patients. Hence, the present study evinces a robust review and analysis of the influence of SARS-CoV-2 on male fertility.

# Materials and methods

# Protocol and eligibility criteria for inclusion

This study was registered on Prospero (CRD42024533906). This study was conducted on published works that evaluated the influence of SARS-CoV-2 on male fertility. The study adopted



Fig 1. PRISMA flowchart for the strategic identification, screening, and inclusion of eligible studies.

the "Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA)" strategy, which is provided as Fig 1.

This study adopted the Population, Exposure, Comparator/Comparison, and Outcomes (PECO) model. All studies published until October 2023 that were eligible based on set criteria, were collected. The studied populations were male in their reproductive ages, who had an exposure to SARS-CoV-2 and developed COVID 19. The studies were either retrospective or prospective among COVID 19-infected patients with age-matched control who were COVID 19-negative. In cases where there were no COVID 19-negative control groups, outcomes before and after the treatment of COVID 19 or at pre-COVID and COVID 19-infected states should be presented. The outcome measured were conventional semen parameters viz. ejaculate volume, sperm count, concentration, viability, normal morphology, total and progressive

motility, and seminal fluid leukocyte level, and male reproductive hormones namely testosterone (T), oestrogen, prolactin, follicle-stimulating hormone (FSH), and luteinizing hormone (LH) levels. T/LH and FSH/LH were also measured.

Exclusion criteria included absence of a comparator as control, studies in females, *in vitro* studies, commentaries, review articles, letters to editor, editorials, preprint, conference abstracts, retracted papers, and degree thesis. No language or country restriction was applied.

# Search strategy

An organized search using EMBASE, Pubmed/MEDLINE, Scopus, and Web of Science databases was performed. The keywords combined were "COVID", "COVID 19", "coronavirus", "SARS-CoV-2", "semen", "semen analysis", "seminal fluid", "sperm", "sperm cells", "spermatozoa", "sperm parameter", "sperm variable", "sperm count", "sperm concentration", "sperm viability", "sperm vitality", "sperm motility", "total sperm motility", "progressive sperm motility", "sperm morphology", "semen volume", "ejaculate volume", "seminal leukocyte", and "seminal WBC, "luteinizing hormone", "LH", "follicle stimulating hormone", "FSH", "testosterone", "male fertility", "male infertility", "male reproduction". Abstracts and full text of articles collected were independently evaluated for eligibility by AVJ, APJ, and ATM, and differences of opinion were resolved by ARE.

# Data collection, assessment of quality of eligible studies, and meta-analysis

The eligible studies were appraised for quality and data collected by AVJ, APJ, and ATM. Disputes were resolved by ARE. Data gathered from the appropriate studies include the last name of the principal investigator, publication date, country of study origin, study design, method of COVID 19 diagnosis, sample size and ages of patients, duration of infection, and measured outcomes of interest. The outcomes of interest were pull out as mean and standard deviation. When the variables were presented in other forms, the mean and standard deviation were derived from the provided data. In cases where the outcomes were reported in Figs, they were converted to values using Web Plot Digitizer.

The quality of evidence in the eligible papers was evaluated using the ErasmusAGE quality score for systematic reviews, which assigns a number between 0 and 2 to five domains [23]. Furthermore, the "Office of Health Assessment and Translation (OHAT)" methodology was used to evaluate the risk of bias (RoB) [24]. Using the "Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) Working Group" standards as a guide, the "OHAT approach for systematic review and evidence integration for literature-based health assessment was used to assess the certainty of the evidence" [25,26].

Review Manager (version 5.4.1) was used to conduct the quantitative meta-analyses. From the eligible studies, the standardized mean difference (SMD) at 95% confidence intervals (CIs) was calculated. A random-effect model was used when P-value < 0.1 or I2 > 50% which indicates the existence of significant variety; otherwise, a fixed-effect model was utilized. To assess the possible sources of diversity, sensitivity analysis was conducted by excluding the studies with the largest weight, high RoB (< 4), low quality of evidence (< 5) and low certainty of evidence. Also, the generated funnel's plots were visually assessed for publication bias.

# Results

# The selection of studies and the attributes of the relevant studies

Out of the 852 publications screened, only 50 were potentially eligible for evaluation. Finally, 40 studies [27-66] were deemed eligible for inclusion in this study (Fig 1). The eligible papers

were published between 2020 and 2023, and they were from China (7), Germany (1), India (1), Indonesia (1), Iran (6), Iraq (2), Italy (5), Jordan (2), Russia (1), Turkey (12), UK (1), and USA (1). The data collected included the surname of the year of publication, principal investigator, country of study origin, study design, method of diagnosing COVID-19, studied population size, participants'/patients' age range, duration of infection, outcomes measured (Table 1).

# Assessment of the quality of evidence, RoB, and certainty of evidence

A larger part of the studies had good quality of evidence, except 7 of them [27,31,40,48,50,56,64] that had low quality of evidence (<5) (Table 2). Also, the included studies had moderate (4/9-6/9) to low (>6/9) RoB (Table 3). In addition, the certainty of evidence in the included studies were moderate to high, except in 3 studies [29,48,56] with low certainty of evidence (Table 4).

# Meta-analysis and sensitivity analysis

Ejaculate volume. Based on the details of the meta-analysis of the 13 eligible studies that compared ejaculate volume in 591 COVID-positive patients with 722 COVID-negative individuals, SARS-CoV significantly reduced the ejaculate volume of infected patients (SMD -0.38 [95% CI: -0.70, -0.05] P = 0.02). Also, a marked inter-study diversity was noted (I<sup>2</sup> = 85%; X<sup>2</sup> P) < 0.00001). Sensitivity analysis showed that ejaculate volume was still significantly reduced in SARS-CoV-infected patients when compared with the SARS-CoV-negative ones (SMD -0.42 [95% CI: -0.77, -0.07] P = 0.02), and the inter-study diversity was also significant (I<sup>2</sup> = 85%; X<sup>2</sup> P < 0.00001) (Fig 2A). Furthermore, the comparison of 286 COVID-positive patients before treatment with 300 patients after treatment revealed that the ejaculate volume was significantly increased after treatment when compared to before treatment (SMD -0.30 [95% CI: -0.46, -0.14] P = 0.0003), and there was no significant inter-study diversity (I<sup>2</sup> = 36%; X<sup>2</sup> P = 0.13). However, sensitivity analysis demonstrated that the ejaculate volume was not different before and after COVID treatment (SMD -0.24 [95% CI: -0.59, 0.11] P = 0.19). This showed marginal significant inter-study diversity ( $I^2 = 55\%$ ;  $X^2 P = 0.05$ ) (Fig 2B). More so, it was observed that SAR-Cov-2 infection significantly reduced ejaculate volume of patients when compared with their pre-COVID (SMD -0.28 [95% CI: -0.55, -0.01] P = 0.04). There was a significant interstudy diversity ( $I^2 = 67\%$ ;  $X^2 P = 0.004$ ). This significant difference persisted even after a sensitivity analysis (SMD -0.29 [95% CI: -0.55, -0.03] P = 0.03), and there was no significant interstudy diversity ( $I^2 = 35\%$ ;  $X^2 P = 0.20$ ) (Fig 2C). The publication bias is shown in Fig 3.

**Sperm count.** SARS-CoV-2 infection significantly reduced sperm count in contrast to non-infected persons (SMD -0.74 [95% CI: -1.43, -0.06] P = 0.03), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 = 95\%$ ;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ); however after sensitivity analysis, SARS-CoV-2 infection only led to a marginal decline in sperm count (SMD -0.90 [95% CI: -1.91, 0.10] P = 0.08), and we observed a marked heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 = 96\%$ ;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ) (Fig 4A). However, COVID-19 treatment did not significantly improve sperm count when compared with the pre-treatment value (SMD -0.24 [95% CI: -0.66, 0.17] P = 0.24), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 = 83\%$ ;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ), which persisted after sensitivity analysis (SMD -0.20 [95% CI: -0.78, 0.38] P = 0.50) with no marked heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 = 83\%$ ;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ) (Fig 4B). Nonetheless, SARS-CoV-2 infection significantly reduced sperm count when compared with the pre-COVID value of the patients (SMD -0.27 [95% CI: -0.45, -0.10] P = 0.002), and there no substantial inter-study diverseness was found ( $I^2 = 37\%$ ;  $X^2 P = 0.16$ ) (Fig 4C). The funnels' plots showing the publication bias are presented in Fig 5.

References	Study design	Country I	Diagnosis of E	Examined	Age (years)	Duration	Outcomes/variables measured		
			COVID-19	population		of infection (months)	Semen	Hormone	
Abbas et al., 2022 [27]	Cross- sectional	Baghdad/Iraq	-	COVID-19 (70) Control (50)	25-55	-	-	LH, FSH, Prolactin↑	
Aksak et al., 2022 [ <u>28]</u>	Cross- sectional	Adan/Turkey	PCR	COVID-19 (100) Control (100)	20–50	4-12	Semen volume, concentration, motility, morphology	-	
Al-Alami et al, 2022 [29]	Retrospective	Jordan	-	Vaccinated (28) Vaccinated and infected (14) Neither vaccinated nor infected (3) Infected only (4) N = 49 N' = 354	-	-	sperm concentration, sperm progressive motility,semen liquefaction time, ejaculate volume, normal forms existing within the semen, and ejaculate viscosity.	-	
Al-Bashiti et al, 2022 [ <u>30</u> ]	Cross sectional	Amman, Jordan	PCR	COVID(81) Control (76)	54.35±14.46 (COVID) 49.59±15.80 (Control) 20-80	-	-	Testosterone↓ inhibin B↓	
Azzawi and Abdulrahman, 2022 [ <u>31</u> ]	Cross sectional	Fallujah, Iraq	-	Recovered (60) Control (30)	20-49	-	-	PSA, testosterone $\downarrow$ , FSH $\uparrow$ , LH $\uparrow$	
Best et al, 2021 [32]	Prospective	Florida, USA	PCR	COVID (30) Control (30)	40 (IQR = 24.75) (COVID) 42 (IQR = 9.8) (Control) 18-70	90 days follow up	Volume, pH, concentration ↓, total sperm number ↓	-	
Camici et al., 2021 [33]	Retrospective cross-sectional	Rome, Italy	PCR	COVID (24) Control (24)	18- 65YRS Control: (43– 57) COVID: (43– 59)	2months -		androstenedione, 5α- dihydrotestosterone, Oestradiol, sex hormone binding globulin, testosterone	
Cinislioglu et al, 2022 [ <u>34</u> ]	Prospective	Erzurum, Turkey	PCR	COVID (358) Control (92)	64.9 (11.6) (COVID) 67.2 (13.6) (Control)25- 91	7months	-	Testosterone ↓ FSH ↑ LH ↑ TT:LH ↓	
Dipankar et al, 2022 [35]	Prospective/ Longitudinal	Patna, India	PCR	30	19-45	74 days follow up	Volume <sup>↑</sup> , viscosity <sup>↓</sup> , agglutination <sup>↓</sup> , liquefaction time <sup>↓</sup> , pH, volume, progressive motility <sup>↑</sup> , total motility <sup>↑</sup> sperm count <sup>↑</sup> , total sperm count <sup>↑</sup> , total sperm count <sup>↑</sup> , morphology <sup>↑</sup> , tail defect, head defect <sup>↓</sup> , neck defect, DNA Fragmentation Index (DFI) <sup>↓</sup> , cytoplasmic droplet <sup>↑</sup> , vitality <sup>↑</sup> , fructose present <sup>↑</sup> , normal morphology, WBC <sup>↓</sup>	-	

# Table 1. Eligible studies included in the meta-analysis that reported the effects of COVID-19 on semen quality and male sex hormones.

References	Study design	Country D	Diagnosis of E: COVID-19 p	Examined	Age (years)	Duration	Outcomes/variables measured		
			COVID-19	population		of infection (months)	Semen	Hormone	
Enikeev et al, 2022 [36]	Prospective	Moscow, Russia	PCR	COVID on admission (44), COVID at 3 months of follow up (37), Control (44)	46.7±9.9 (COVID) 30.7±9.8 (Control) 18–65	3 months follow up	Concentration ↑, total sperm count volume, (total motility, progressive motility, slow progressive motility, non-progressive motility)↑ rapid progressive motility, no motility ↓immobile sperm ↑ vitality↓ normal morphology↓wbc↑ Agglutination, pH, normal morphology	IIEF-5, Prolactin, FSH, LH ↓, Testosterone ↑	
Erbay et al, 2021 [ <u>37</u> ]	Retrospective, CS	Instabul, Turkey	PCR	COVID-(19) 69	20-45	74 days	Volume, concentration, vitality, sperm number, total motility, progressive motility	-	
Falahieh et al, 2021 [ <u>38</u> ]		Urmia, Iran	PCR	20	20 and 50	14, 120 days	volume, colour, viscosity and pH of the semen sample, sperm concentration, total, progressive motility↑, normal morphology↑ and viability	-	
Gacci et al, 2021 [ <u>39</u> ]	Prospective cross-sectional	-	PCR	43 Nonhospitalzed (mild) Hospitalized (moderate) ICU (severe)	18-65	-	Volume, cell number ↑, concentration, progressive motility, vitality ↓, normal morphology, pH,	-	
Gul et al, 2021 [40]	Cross sectional	Bursa, Turkey	SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid test	29	18-41	?	Semen volume, sperm concentration, total sperm count, total motility, progressive motility	Testosterone, FSH, LH, prolactin	
Guo et al, 2021 [41]	Prospective	Anhui, China	PCR	COVID-19 (41) Control (50)	COVID-19: 26.0 (22.0– 34.0) Control: 26.5 (25.0–34.0)	?	Concentration, volume, total sperm count, abnormal morphology, vitality, sperm motility, progressive motility, motile sperm count	Estradiol, FSH, LH, progesterone, testosterone (T), prolactin, anti Mullerian hormone (AMH) and inhibin B	
Hadisi et al, 2022 [ <u>42</u> ]	Cross sectional	Ahar, Iran	PCR	COVID-19 (60) Control (60)	\$	-	-	estradiol, FSH, LH, prolactin, progesterone, testosterone, cortisol and thyroid stimulating hormone (TSH)	

References	Study design	Country I	Diagnosis of E	Examined	Age (years)	Duration	Outcomes/variables measured		
			COVID-19	population		of infection (months)	Semen	Hormone	
Hamarat et al, 2022 [ <u>43</u> ]	Prospective, longitudinal	Konya, Turkey	PCR	41	22-46	Over 70 days	sperm concentration ↓, total sperm number ↓, semen volume ↓, sperm motility (progressive motility, non- progressive motility, and immotility percentages),normal morphology ↓, head↑, neck, and tail anomaly ↓	-	
Holtmann et al, 2020 [ <u>44</u> ]	Cross sectional	Duesseldorf, Germany	PCR	Control: 14 Mild case: 14 Moderate: 2	Control: 33.4 ±13.1 Mild case: 42.7 ±10.4 Moderate: 40.8±8.7	-	Volume, concentration, total sperm number, sperm number, progressive motility, complete motility, immotility,	-	
Hu et al, 2022 [45]	Prospective	Wuhan, China	PCR	COVID (36) Control (45)	31.75±5.77 31.49±3.10 (NS)	-	PH, volume, sperm concentration, total sperm number, progressive motility and total motility	-	
Kadihasanoglu et al, 2021 [ <u>46</u> ]	Prospective cross sectional	Istanbul, Turkey	PCR	COVID-19 (89), controls (143).	COVID: 49.9 ± 12.5 Control: 50 ± 7.8 20 and 65	-	-	Testosterone, LH, FSH, and prolactin.	
Karkin & Gürlen, 2022 [47]	Cross sectional	Adana, Turkey	PCR	348	20-74	-		TT, LH, FSH	
Koç & Keseroğlu, 2021 [ <u>48</u> ]	Prospective cross sectional	Ankara, Turkey	PCR	COVID (21)	32±6.30	5Days	semen volume, percentage of total motility, percentage of progressive motility, and normal sperm morphology	TT, LH, FSH	
Kumar et al., 2023 [49]	Cross sectional	Patna, India	-	Pre COVID (102 COVID (137).	33.1 (6.7)	-	sperm concentration, total sperm count, percentage of total motility, percentage of cells with residual cytoplasm, and the percentages of head and tail defects		
Li et al, 2020 [50]	Cross sectional	Wuhan, China	PCR	Control (22) COVID(23)	27–55	Control: 40.5§5.9 COVID: 40.8§8.5	Sperm concentration	-	

References	Study design	Country D	Diagnosis of E COVID-19 p	Examined	Age (years)	Duration	Outcomes/variables measured		
			COVID-19	population		of infection (months)	Semen	Hormone	
Livingstone et al, 2022 [51]	Cross sectional	Walsall (United Kingdom)	PCR	Control (25) COVID (85)	Control: 68 (56–85) COVID: 75 (64–85)	-	-	Testosterone	
Ma et al, 2021 [52]	Prospective cross sectional	Zhongnan Hubei Province, China.	PCR	Control (273) COVID (119)	Control: 39 (35.0–42.0) COVID: 39 (35.0–44.0)	3 months	Volume, concentration, vitality, mobile sperm count, non- progressive motility, progressive motility, immotility, normal sperm morphology	Testosterone, oestrogen, FSH, LH, T/ LH, T/E2 and FSH/LH	
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021 [53]	Prospective longitudinal	Tehran, Iran	PCR	Control (84) COVID(105)	20-40	13.2 ± 4.9 days. Till first sampling	semen volume, progressive motility, sperm morphology, sperm concentration, and the number of spermatozoa	-	
Okçelik 2020 [ <u>54]</u>	Prospective	Hacı Bektaş, Turkey	PCR	Control (20) COVID (24)	18–50 (35.5 ± 9.85) years	4Months		FSH, LH and testosterone	
Paoli et al, 2023 [ <u>55]</u>	Retrospective cross sectional	Sapienza, Rome	Nasopharyngeal swab positive for SARS-CoV-2	COVID-19 (80) Control 1 (98) Control 2 (98)	18 to 65 (43.9±11.7)	-	Volume, total sperm number, progressive motility, and morphology	FSH, LH, Testosterone	
Pazir et al, 2021 [56]	Cross sectional	Istanbul, Turkey	PCR	24	18-49 Control: 36.4 ± 13 COVID: 38.2 ± 9.9	-	Volume, concentration, progressive motility, total motility, mobile sperm count	-	
Piroozmanesh et al, 2021 [57]	Cross sectional	Qom, Iran	PCR	COVID-19 (60) Control (40)	20-45	-	sperm concentration, sperm total motility, sperm vitality, sperm normal forms, and TAC	-	
Rafiee & Tabei, 2021 [ <u>58</u> ]	Interventional	Shiraz, Iran	PCR	COVID-19 (100) Control (100)	-	-	sperm concentration, sperm motility, and normal sperm morphology, volume	-	
Ruan et al, 2021 [59]	Cross sectional	Wuhan, China	PCR	COVID-19 (55) Control (145)	20-50 Control: 30.69 ±4.36 COVID: 31.15 ±5.32	-	Semen volumes, sperm concentrations, total sperm counts, motile spermatozoa, morphologically normal spermatozoa, DNA fragmentation index (DFI)	-	

References	Study design	Country D	Diagnosis of E	Examined	Age (years)	Duration	Outcomes/variables measured		
			COVID-19	population		of infection (months)	Semen	Hormone	
Salonia et al., 2021 [60]	Cross sectional	Milan, Italy	PCR	Control: 281 COVID: 286	Control: 46 (35–52) COVID 19: 58 (49–66)	-	-	follicle- stimulating hormone (FSH), luteinizing hormone (LH), tT, and 17β- estradiol (E2)	
Salonia1 et al., 2022 [ <u>61]</u>	Prospective	-	PCR ACE2	121	49-65 years	7months	-	Testosterone, oestradiol, LH, FSH	
Sunnu et al 2022 [62]	Prospective, longitudinal	Surabaya, Indonesia	PCR	14	27-48	6 month follow up	semen volume, pH, sperm concentration, total, progressive, non- progressive, and immotile motility percentage	-	
Temiz et al 2020 [63]	Prospective cross sectional	Istanbul, Turkey	PCR	Control (10) Pre-treatment (10) Post-treatment (10)	18- to 60 Control: 36.64 ± 9.63 Pre-treatment: 38.00 ± 8.28 Post- treatment: 37.00 ± 8.69	4 days	Semen volume, pH, count, concentration, progressive sperm motility, non- progressive sperm motility, total sperm motility, normal morphology	Testosterone, FSH, LH, prolactin, Testosterone/LH, FSH/ LH, prolactin/ testosterone	
Vahidi et al 2022 [64]	Cross sectional	Shahid Sadoughi, Iran	PCR	Acute (20) Recovery (20)	18-45	-	Sperm count, viability, progressive motility, morphology, immotile, non- progressive	-	
Wang et al 2022 [65]	Retrospective,	Wuhan, China	PCR	26	-	-	Volume, concentration, progressive motility, sperm number, total progressive motility, complete motility, total normal form, normal form, immotile, total number of immotile	FSH	
Xu et al 2021 [66]	Retrospective cross-sectional	Wuhan, China	SARS-CoV-2 RNA throat swab	COVID-19 (39) Control (22)	Control: 62 (52, 68.75) COVID: 60.0 (46.5, 65.5)	-	-	(testosterone [T], follicle-stimulating hormone [FSH], luteinizing hormone [LH], prolactin [PRL], and estradiol)	

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307396.t001

**Sperm concentration.** Analysis of the impact of SARS-CoV-2 on sperm concentration revealed that the novel infection significantly reduced sperm concentration when compared with SARS-CoV-2-uninfected individuals (SMD -0.83 [95% CI: -1.46, -0.20] P = 0.010). Again, no substantial heterogeneity between studies was found (I<sup>2</sup> = 95%; X<sup>2</sup> P < 0.00001). After sensitivity analysis, SARS-CoV-2 only marginally reduced sperm concentration when compared with individuals who were not SARS-CoV-2 positive (SMD -1.02 [95% CI: -2.16, 0.12] P = 0.08). There was a significant inter-study variety (I<sup>2</sup> = 97%; X<sup>2</sup> P < 0.00001) (Fig 6A).

Study	Study design	Study size	Method of measuring exposure	Method of measuring outcome	Analysis with adjustment	Total
Abbas et al., 2022 [27]	0	1	0	2	0	3/10
Aksak et al., 2022 [28]	0	2	2	2	2	8/10
Al-Alami et al., 2022 [29]	0	2	1	1	1	5/10
Al-Bashiti et al., 2022 [30]	0	2	2	2	0	6/10
Azzawi and Abdulrahman, 2022 [ <u>31</u> ]	0	1	0	2	0	3/10
Best et al, 2021 [32]	1	1	2	2	0	6/10
Camici et al., 2021 [ <u>33</u> ]	0	0	2	2	1	5/10
Cinislioglu et al., 2022 [34]	1	2	2	2	1	8/10
Dipankar et al., 2022 [ <u>35</u> ]	1	0	2	2	01	6/10
Enikeev et al., 2022 [36]	1	1	2	2	01	7/10
Erbay et al., 2021 [37]	0	1	2	02	0	5/10
Falahieh et al., 2021 [ <u>38</u> ]	1	0	2	2	0	5/10
Gacci et al., 2021 [39]	0	0	2	2	1	5/10
Gul et al., 2021 [ <u>40</u> ]	0	0	1	1	2	4/10
Guo et al., 2021 [41]	1	1	2	2	1	7/10
Hadisi et al., 2022 [42]	0	1	2	2	1	6/10
Hamarat et al., 2022 [43]	1	0	2	2	1	6/10
Holtmann et al., 2020 [44]	0	0	2	2	1	5/10
Hu et al., 2022 [45]	1	1	2	2	1	7/10
Kadihasanoglu et al., 2021 [46]	1	2	2	2	1	8/10
Karkin & Gürlen, 2022 [ <u>47</u> ]	0	2	2	2	1	7/10
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021 [48]	0	0	2	2	0	4/10
Kumar et al., 2023 [49]	1	0	2	2	0	5/10
Li et al., 2020 [50]	0	0	2	2	0	4/10
Livingstone et al., 2022 [51]	0	1	2	2	1	6/10
Ma et al., 2021 [52]	1	2	2	2	1	8/10
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021 [53]	1	2	2	2	1	8/10
Okçelik, 2020 [ <u>54</u> ]	1	0	2	2	2	7/10
Paoli et al., 2023 [55]	0	2	2	2	1	7/10
Pazir et al., 2021 [56]	0	0	2	2	0	4/10
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021 [57]	0	1	2	2	1	6/10
Rafiee and Tabei, 2021 [58]	2	1	2	2	0	7/10
Ruan et al., 2021 [59]	0	2	2	2	1	7/10
Salonia et al., 2021 [60]	0	2	2	2	0	6/10
Salonia1 et al., 2022 [61]	1	2	2	2	2	9/10
Sunnu et al., 2022 [62]	1	0	2	2	0	5/10
Temiz et al., 2020 [63]	2	0	2	2	1	7/10
Vahidi et al., 2022 [64]	0	0	2	2	0	4/10
Wang et al., 2022 [65]	0	0	2	2	1	5/10
Xu et al., 2021 [66]	0	1	2	2	2	7/10

Table 2. Assessment of the quality of evidence of the eligible studies.

However, when compare, we found no significant variability between sperm concentration before and after SARS-CoV-2 treatment (SMD -0.21 [95% CI: -0.53, 0.10] P = 0.19) and there was a significant inter-study diversity (I<sup>2</sup> = 69%;  $X^2 P = 0.001$ ), even after sensitivity analysis (SMD -0.18 [95% CI: -0.59, 0.23] P = 0.39), and there was no marked heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 67%;  $X^2 P = 0.010$ ) (Fig 6B). Notwithstanding, SARS-CoV-2 significantly reduced

			A	Demonstruction	Common Lillion	Commentility	<b>AA</b>	T	A J	T-4-1
Study	exposed cohort	selection of non- exposed cohort	of exposure	of outcome	(basics)	(others)	outcome	of follow-	of follow-up	Totai
Abbas et al., 2022 [27]	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	5/9
Aksak et al., 2022 [28]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	7/9
Al-Alami et al. 2022 [29]	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	5/9
Al-Bashiti et al, 2022 [ <u>30</u> ]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	6/9
Azzawi and Abdulrahman, 2022 [31]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	6/9
Best et al, 2021 [32]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9/9
Camici et al., 2021 [ <u>33]</u>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	6/9
Cinislioglu et al., 2022	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9/9
Dipankar et al., 2022 [ <u>35</u> ]	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8/9
Enikeev et al., 2022 [36]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9/9
Erbay et al, 2021 [37]	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	6/9
Falahieh et al., 2021 [38]	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8/9
Gacci et al., 2021 [39]	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8/9
Gul et al., 2021 [40]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	7/9
Guo et al., 2021 [41]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	8/9
Hadisi et al., 2022 [ <u>42]</u>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	7/9
Hamarat et al., 2022 [43]	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	7/9
Holtmann et al., 2020 [44]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	6/9
Hu et al., 2022 [45]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	8/9
Kadihasanoglu et al., 2021 [46]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	7/9
Karkin and Gürlen, 2022 [47]	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8/9
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021 [48]	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	4/9
Kumar et al., 2023 [ <u>49</u> ]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	6/9
Li et al., 2020 [ <u>50</u> ]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	7/9
Livingstone et al., 2022 [51]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	6/9

# Table 3. Risk of bias assessment of the eligible studies.

Study	Selection of exposed cohort	Selection of non- exposed cohort	Assessment of exposure	Demonstration of outcome (basics)		Comparability (others)	Assessment outcome	Length of follow- up	Adequacy of follow-up	Total
Ma et al., 2020 [52]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	8/9
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021 [53]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	-	7/9
Okçelik, 2020 [54]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	7/9
Paoli et al., 2023 [55]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9/9
Pazir et al., 2021 [56]	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	6/9
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021 [57]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	7/9
Rafiee and Tabei, 2021 [58]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9/9
Ruan et al., 2021 [59]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	8/9
Salonia et al., 2021 [ <u>60]</u>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	7/9
Salonia et al., 2022 [61]	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	7/9
Salonia et al., 2021 [ <u>60]</u>	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	6/9
Sunnu et al., 2022 [62]	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	7/9
Temiz et al., 2020 [63]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9/9
Vahidi et al., 2022 [ <u>64]</u>	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	6/9
Wang et al., 2022 [65]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	6/9
Xu et al., 2021 [66]	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	6/9

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307396.t003

sperm concentration of the patients when compared with the pre-COVID period (SMD -0.42 [95% CI: -0.70, -0.14] P = 0.004), we found no marked heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 69%;  $X^2 P = 0.002$ ). After sensitivity analysis, it was still observed that SARS-CoV-2 significantly reduced sperm concentration when compared with the pre-COVID values of the patients (SMD -0.31 [95% CI: -0.50, -0.12] P = 0.001), and there existed no significant interstudy variability (I<sup>2</sup> = 32%;  $X^2 P = 0.21$ ) (Fig 6C). The publication bias as depicted by the funnels' plots are shown in Fig 7.

**Sperm viability.** SARS-CoV-2 significantly lowered sperm viability in comparison to SARS-CoV-2 uninfected individuals (SMD -1.08 [95% CI: -1.83, -0.33] P = 0.005). There was a notable inter-study diversity (I<sup>2</sup> = 88%;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ). Sensitivity analysis demonstrated that SARS-CoV-2 yet significantly reduced sperm viability when compared to the control (SMD -1.34 [95% CI: -1.95, -0.72] P < 0.0001), and there was a substantial inter-study diversity (I<sup>2</sup> = 73%;  $X^2 P = 0.01$ ) (Fig.8A). Moreover, sperm viability was significantly dropped in SARS-CoV-2 positive individuals before treatment in comparison to after treatment (SMD -0.84

Study	Initial rating	Downgrading?	Upgrading?	Confidence in body of evidence
Abbas et al., 2022 [27]	High	Yes↓	No	Moderate
Aksak et al., 2022 [28]	High	No	No	High
Al-Alami et al., 2022 [29]	Moderate	Yes, 1	Yes, 1	Low
Al-Bashiti et al., 2022 [30]	High	Yes, 1	No	Moderate
Azzawi and Abdulrahman, 2022 [31]	High	Yes, 1	No	Moderate
Best et al, 2021 [32]	High	No	No	High
Camici et al., 2021 [ <u>33</u> ]	High	No	No	High
Cinislioglu et al., 2022 [34]	High	No	No	High
Dipankar et al., 2022 [35]	Moderate	No	No	Moderate
Enikeev et al., 2022 [36]	High	No	No	High
Erbay et al., 2021 [37]	Moderate	Yes, 1	Yes, 1	Moderate
Falahieh et al., 2021 [ <u>38</u> ]	Moderate	No	No	Moderate
Gacci et al., 2021 [39]	High	yes, 1	No	Moderate
Gul et al., 2021 [40]	High	Yes (2)	No	Moderate
Guo et al., 2021 [41]	High	Yes, 1	No	Moderate
Hadisi et al., 2022 [42]	High	Yes, 1	No	Moderate
Hamarat et al., 2022 [43]	High	No	No	High
Holtmann et al., 2020 [44]	High	Yes, 1	No	Moderate
Hu et al., 2022 [45]	High	No	No	High
Kadihasanoglu et al., 2021 [46]	High	Yes, 1	Yes	High
Karkin and Gürlen, 2022 [47]	Moderate	Yes, 1	No	High
Koç & Keseroğlu, 2021 [ <u>48</u> ]	Moderate	Yes,1	No	Low
Kumar et al., 2023 [49]	Moderate	No	Yes, 1	High'
Li et al., 2020 [ <u>50</u> ]	High	No	No	High
Livingstone et al., 2022 [51]	High	Yes, 1	No	Moderate
Ma et al., 2021 [52]	High	Yes, 1	Yes, 1	High
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021 [53]	High	No	No	High
Okçelik, 2020 [54]	High	Yes, 1	No	Moderate
Paoli et al., 2023 [55]	Moderate	No	Yes, 1	High
Pazir et al., 2021 [56]	Moderate	Yes, 1	No	Low
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021 [57]	High	No	No	High
Rafiee and Tabei, 2021 [58]	High	No	No	High
Ruan et al., 2021 [59]	High	No	No	High
Salonia et al., 2021 [60]	High	Yes, 1	Yes, 1	High
Salonia et al., 2022 [61]	High	Yes, 1	Yes, 1	High
Sunnu et al., 2022 [62]	Moderate	No	No	Moderate
Temiz et al., 2020 [63]	High	No	No	High
Vahidi et al 2022 [64]	High	Yes, 1	No	Moderate
Wang et al 2022 [65]	High	Yes, 1	No	Moderate
Xu et al., 2021 [66]	High	Yes (1)	N0	Moderate

Table 4. Assessment of certainty of evidence of the eligible studies.

[95% CI: -1.37, -0.31] P = 0.002), and there was a significant inter-study diversity (I<sup>2</sup> = 75%; X<sup>2</sup> P = 0.003). After sensitivity analysis, there was a significant drop in sperm viability among patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 positive when juxtaposed with the control (SMD -0.53 [95% CI: -0.86, -0.20] P = 0.002), but there existed no significant inter-study variability (I<sup>2</sup> = 0%; X<sup>2</sup> P = 0.53) (Fig 8B). In addition, when colligated with their premorbid state, sperm viability was significantly reduced in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients (SMD -0.85 [95% CI: -1.43,

Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% C1 0.05 [0.22, 0.33] 0.21 [-1.29, 1.72] 0.07 [-0.58, 0.43] -0.12 [-0.54, 0.30] -0.52 [-1.21, 0.18] -0.66 [-1.72, 0.42] -0.02 [-0.43, 0.39] -0.01 [-0.75, 0.73] -1.23 [-2.79, 0.33] -0.39 [-0.83, 0.06] -1.90 [-2.24, 1.55] Study or Subgroup Aksak et al., 2022 Ak-Jami et al., 2022 Best et al., 2021 Enikeev et al., 2021 Gacci et al., 2021 Gacci et al., 2021 Hottmann, et al., 2020 Hu et al., 2021 Hottmann, et al., 2020 Hu et al., 2021 Paoli et al., 2021 Paoli et al., 2021 Tenzie et al., 2021 Tenzie et al., 2021 Tenzie et al., 2021 Tenzie et al., 2020 COVID POSITIVE COVID NEGATIVE Mean SD Total Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI SD 1.62 1.26 1.67 1.5 1.67 1.6 1.6 1.6 1.1 1.1 **Nean** SD 1.42 2.59 0.95 1.71 1.33 1 Tot 
 Mean

 3.42

 2.5

 2.2

 2.8

 2.5

 2.5

 3.03

 2.51

 3.27

 3.9

 3.1

 3.39

 2
 100 4 30 44 26 5 41 14 2 36 84 80 60 55 10 3.5 3.05 2.1 2.6 1.74 1.5 100 8.4% 3.1% 7.4% 6.4% 4.5% 7.8% 6.1% 2.9% 7.7% 8.1% 8.3% 7.9% 8.3% 5.3% 3 30 44 12 50 14 45 105 98 40 145 10 1.22 1 0.9 1.19 0.89 1.3 0.9 1.22 0.97 2.5 1.1 2.86 1.89 3.1 2.8 3.01 1.25 1.1 0.92 1.17 1.5 1 1.64 1.4 -0.39 [-0.83, 0.06] -1.90 [-2.24, -1.55] -0.14 [-0.44, 0.15] -0.32 [-0.72, 0.09] -0.25 [-0.56, 0.07] -0.60 [-1.50, 0.30] Total (95% CI) 591 722 100.0% Heterogeneily: Tau"= 0.31; Chi"= 95.46, df= 14 (P < 0.00001); I"= 85% Test for overall effect Z=2.27 (P = 0.02) -0.38 [-0.70, -0.05] • -4 -2 0 2 COVID POSITIVE COVID NEGATIVE Sensitivity analysis



В.

Α.

	BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT			AFTER COVID 19 TREATMENT				Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Dipankar et al., 2022	2.25	0.796	30	2.92	0.678	30	9.5%	-0.89 [-1.43, -0.36]	
Enikeev et al., 2022	2.6	1.71	44	2.2	1.3	37	14.0%	0.26 [-0.18, 0.70]	
Falahieh et al., 2021	3.8	1.2	20	4.1	1.3	20	7.0%	-0.24 [-0.86, 0.39]	
Gul et al., 2021	2.23	1.11	29	2.58	1.01	29	10.0%	-0.33 [-0.84, 0.19]	
Guo et al., 2021	2.96	1.03	22	3.22	0.79	22	7.6%	-0.28 [-0.87, 0.32]	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	1.07	5.56	21	3.03	0.97	21	7.1%	-0.48 [-1.10, 0.13]	
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021	1.89	0.89	84	2.2	0.66	105	32.1%	-0.40 [-0.69, -0.11]	
Terniz et al., 2020	1.25	0.97	10	1.6	1.4	10	3.5%	-0.28 [-1.16, 0.60]	
Wang et al., 2022	2.78	1.09	26	2.87	1.01	26	9.1%	-0.08 [-0.63, 0.46]	
Total (95% CI)			286			300	100.0%	-0.30 [-0.46, -0.14]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi# = 12.45, d					-				
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.58						BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT			

#### Sensitivity analysis

, 95% CI Total 30 37 20 29 22 21 105 10 26 2.25 2.6 3.8 2.23 2.96 1.07 1.89 1.25 2.78 2.92 2.2 4.1 2.58 3.22 3.03 2.2 1.6 2.87 18.2% 21.0% 15.8% 0.0% 16.5% 0.0% 10.5% 17.9% 44 20 29 22 21 84 10 26 1.3 1.3 1.01 0.79 0.97 0.66 1.4 1.01 1.71 1.2 1.11 1.03 5.56 0.89 0.97 1.09 -0.28 [-1.16, 0.60] -0.08 [-0.63, 0.46] niz et al., 2020 no et al., 2022 the formula of the second sec fotal (95% CI) 145 100.0% -0.24 [-0.59, 0.11] -2 . BEFORE COVID 19 1 2 BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMEN

c.

	COVID	19 POSI	TIVE	PREG	PRECOVID 19			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Erbay et al., 2021 a	3.08	0.8	69	3.24	1.6	69	15.3%	-0.13 [-0.46, 0.21]	
Erbay et al., 2021b	2.74	0.9	69	3.34	1.1	69	15.2%	-0.59 [-0.93, -0.25]	
Gul et al., 2021	2.58	1.01	29	2.23	1.11	29	11.5%	0.33 [-0.19, 0.84]	
Hamarat et al., 2022	2.35	1.03	41	2.61	1.25	41	13.2%	-0.22 [-0.66, 0.21]	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	2.71	0.92	21	3.43	1.85	21	9.8%	-0.48 [-1.10, 0.13]	
Pazir et al., 2021	3.5	1.5	24	3.6	1.6	24	10.7%	-0.06 [-0.63, 0.50]	
Rafiee and Tabei, 2021	2.9	0.6	100	3.5	0.9	100	16.3%	-0.78 [-1.07, -0.49]	
Sunnu et al., 2022	3.1	1.4	14	3.1	1.1	14	8.0%	0.00 [-0.74, 0.74]	
Total (95% CI)			367			367	100.0%	-0.28 [-0.55, -0.01]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.10;	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 21.1	12. df = 1	(P = 0.	004); l <sup>a</sup>	= 67%			-	
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.0	05 (P = 0.0	-2 -1 U 1 2 COVID 19 POSITIVE PRECOVID 19							

#### Sensitivity analysis

	COVID 19 POSITIVE			PREC	COVID	19		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Erbay et al., 2021a	3.08	0.8	69	3.24	1.6	69	33.0%	-0.13 [-0.46, 0.21]	
Erbay et al., 2021b	2.74	0.9	69	3.34	1.1	69	32.3%	-0.59 [-0.93, -0.25]	
Gul et al., 2021	2.58	1.01	29	2.23	1.11	29	0.0%	0.33 [-0.19, 0.84]	
Hamarat et al., 2022	2.35	1.03	41	2.61	1.25	41	24.1%	-0.22 [-0.66, 0.21]	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	2.71	0.92	21	3.43	1.85	21	0.0%	-0.48 [-1.10, 0.13]	
Pazir et al., 2021	3.5	1.5	24	3.6	1.6	24	0.0%	-0.06 [-0.63, 0.50]	
Rafiee and Tabei, 2021	2.9	0.6	100	3.5	0.9	100	0.0%	-0.78 [-1.07, -0.49]	
Sunnu et al., 2022	3.1	1.4	14	3.1	1.1	14	10.6%	0.00 [-0.74, 0.74]	
Total (95% CI)			193			193	100.0%	-0.29 [-0.55, -0.03]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.02; 0	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 4.64	4, df = 3	(P = 0.2)	0); $ ^2 = 3$	35%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.1	5 (P = 0.0	3)				-2 -1 U 1 2 COVID 19 POSITIVE PRECOVID 19			

**Fig 2.** Forest plot of ejaculate volume comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A), before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B), and COVID-19 positive and preCOVID-19 period (C).



Fig 3. Funnel plot of ejaculate volume comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A), before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B), and COVID-19 positive and preCOVID-19 period (C).

-0.26] P = 0.005). There was a substantial heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 82%; X<sup>2</sup> P = 0.02) (Fig 8C). Fig 9 shows the funnels' plots demonstrating the publication bias.

**Total and progressive sperm motility.** The total sperm motility was only marginally diminished in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients when compared with the control (SMD -0.30 [95% CI: -0.61, 0.00] P = 0.05), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 =$ 63%;  $X^2 P = 0.008$ ). After sensitivity analysis, the difference in the total sperm motility remained insignificant (SMD -0.34 [95% CI: -0.86, 0.18] P = 0.20), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 = 82\%$ ;  $X^2 P < 0.0001$ ) (Fig 10A). Also, there was a marginal decline in total sperm motility in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients before, juxtaposed with after treatment (SMD -0.34 [95% CI: -0.86, 0.18] P = 0.20), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 = 82\%$ ;  $X^2 P < 0.0001$ ), even after sensitivity analysis (SMD -0.54 [95% CI: -1.36, 0.28] P = 0.20), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 = 84\%$ ;  $X^2 P =$ 0.0002) (Fig 10B). However, SARS-CoV-2 led to a marked decline in total sperm motility in infected patients when compared with their premorbid values (SMD -0.68 [95% CI: -1.12, -0.24] P = 0.002), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 87%; X<sup>2</sup> P < 0.00001). After sensitivity analysis, the significant difference in total sperm motility persisted in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients between the infected state and premorbid state (SMD -0.73 [95% CI: -1.42, -0.04] P = 0.04), and there was a significant inter-study diversity (I<sup>2</sup> = 90%; X<sup>2</sup> P < 0.00001) (Fig 10C). The funnels' plots showing the publication bias are presented in Fig 11.

When colligated with the controls, progressive sperm motility substantially diminished in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients (SMD -0.48 [95% CI: -0.94, -0.02] P = 0.04), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 86%;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ); although after sensitivity analysis, SARS-CoV-2 only caused a marginal decline in progressive sperm motility when compared with the control (SMD -0.51 [95% CI: -1.09, 0.07] P = 0.08), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 89%;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ) (Fig 12A). In addition, COVID-19 significantly reduced progressive sperm motility in infected patients before treatment when compared with after treatment (SMD -0.41 [95% CI: -0.77, -0.05] P = 0.02), and there was a

	COVI	D POSITI	VE	COVI	D NEGATI	VE		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Al-Alami et al., 2022	66.17	93.37	4	45.83	70.75	3	6.1%	0.20 [-1.30, 1.71]	<del></del>
Best et al., 2021	12.5	40.55	30	59.2	55.87	30	8.1%	-0.94 [-1.48, -0.41]	
Enikeev et al., 2022	349.2	363.7	44	223.5	205.1	44	8.3%	0.42 [-0.00, 0.84]	
Gacci et al., 2021a	57.08	92.78	76	143.35	144.46	12	8.0%	-0.85 [-1.47, -0.23]	
Gacci et al., 2021b	2.72	1.03	5	143.35	154.46	12	7.0%	-1.01 [-2.12, 0.10]	
Guo et al., 2021	154.07	125.99	41	239.36	201.58	50	8.3%	-0.49 [-0.91, -0.07]	
Holtmann, et al., 2020a	243.7	140.4	14	223.1	234.4	14	7.8%	0.10 [-0.64, 0.84]	
Holtmann, et al., 2020b	11.9	13.4	2	223.1	234.4	14	6.0%	-0.88 [-2.41, 0.64]	
Hu et al., 2022	149.78	105.59	36	205.95	132.52	45	8.2%	-0.46 [-0.90, -0.01]	
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021	21.11	4.84	84	214.66	50.59	105	8.0%	-5.09 [-5.68, -4.50]	
Paoli et al., 2023	221.3	151.8	80	278.6	207	98	8.4%	-0.31 [-0.61, -0.01]	+
Ruan et al., 2021	197.4	123.8	55	261.4	189.2	145	8.4%	-0.37 [-0.68, -0.05]	-
Temiz et al., 2020	67.4	29.61	10	48	147.25	10	7.5%	0.17 [-0.70, 1.05]	
Total (95% CI)			481			582	100.0%	-0.74 [-1.43, -0.06]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1.44; (	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 259	.82, df = 1	12 (P <	0.00001	; I <sup>2</sup> = 95%	6			
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.1	2 (P = 0.0	)3)							-4 -2 U Z 4
									CONDITIONINE CONDITIEGATIVE

#### Sensitivity analysis

Α.

\_

	COVI	D POSITIN	/E	COVID	COVID NEGATIVE			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Al-Alami et al., 2022	66.17	93.37	4	45.83	70.75	3	0.0%	0.20 [-1.30, 1.71]	
Best et al., 2021	12.5	40.55	30	59.2	55.87	30	10.3%	-0.94 [-1.48, -0.41]	
Enikeev et al., 2022	349.2	363.7	44	223.5	205.1	44	10.4%	0.42 [-0.00, 0.84]	-
Gacci et al., 2021a	57.08	92.78	76	143.35	144.46	12	10.2%	-0.85 [-1.47, -0.23]	
Gacci et al., 2021b	2.72	1.03	5	143.35	154.46	12	9.4%	-1.01 [-2.12, 0.10]	
Guo et al., 2021	154.07	125.99	41	239.36	201.58	50	10.5%	-0.49 [-0.91, -0.07]	
Holtmann, et al., 2020a	243.7	140.4	14	223.1	234.4	14	10.1%	0.10 [-0.64, 0.84]	
Holtmann, et al., 2020b	11.9	13.4	2	223.1	234.4	14	8.5%	-0.88 [-2.41, 0.64]	
Hu et al., 2022	149.78	105.59	36	205.95	132.52	45	10.4%	-0.46 [-0.90, -0.01]	
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021	21.11	4.84	84	214.66	50.59	105	10.3%	-5.09 [-5.68, -4.50]	-
Paoli et al., 2023	221.3	151.8	80	278.6	207	98	0.0%	-0.31 [-0.61, -0.01]	
Ruan et al., 2021	197.4	123.8	55	261.4	189.2	145	0.0%	-0.37 [-0.68, -0.05]	
Temiz et al., 2020	67.4	29.61	10	48	147.25	10	9.8%	0.17 [-0.70, 1.05]	-
Total (95% CI)			342			336	100.0%	-0.90 [-1.91, 0.10]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 2.45; C	hi² = 248	.65, df = 9	9 (P < 0	.00001);	I² = 96%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.7	7 (P = 0.0	18)							COVID POSITIVE COVID NEGATIVE

в.

	BEFORE CO	VID 19 TREAT	MENT	AFTER COV	ID 19 TREAT	MENT		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Dipankar et al., 2022	53.25	40.9	30	155.53	81.69	30	9.3%	-1.56 [-2.15, -0.98]	
Enikeev et al., 2022	349.2	363.7	44	222.4	222.4	37	10.1%	0.41 [-0.03, 0.85]	
Erbay et al., 2021a	88.65	45.62	18	78.37	48.67	18	8.9%	0.21 [-0.44, 0.87]	
Erbay et al., 2021b	94.53	63.72	8	81.42	62.39	8	6.9%	0.20 [-0.79, 1.18]	
Gul et al., 2021	77.88	75.65	29	100.8	107.01	29	9.7%	-0.24 [-0.76, 0.27]	
Guo et al., 2021	123.29	119.03	22	219.82	147.32	22	9.1%	-0.71 [-1.32, -0.10]	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	326.08	621.71	21	248.91	409.14	21	9.2%	0.14 [-0.46, 0.75]	
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021	21.11	4.84	84	29.03	9.66	84	10.7%	-1.03 [-1.35, -0.71]	
Terniz et al., 2020	67.4	29.61	10	69.9	57.01	10	7.5%	-0.05 [-0.93, 0.82]	
Vahidi et al., 2022	69	34.91	20	69.25	37.09	20	9.1%	-0.01 [-0.63, 0.61]	
Wang et al., 2022	214.86	191.61	26	186.49	111.92	26	9.5%	0.18 [-0.37, 0.72]	
Total (95% CI)			312			305	100.0%	-0.24 [-0.66, 0.17]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.39; C	chi <sup>2</sup> = 58.39, df	= 10 (P < 0.00	0001); I <sup>e</sup> =	83%				C	
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.1	6 (P = 0.24)								BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT AFTER COVID 19 TREATMENT

#### Sensitivity analysis

BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT				AFTER COV	ID 19 TREAT	MENT		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Randon	n, 95% CI	
Dipankar et al., 2022	53.25	40.9	30	155.53	81.69	30	15.0%	-1.56 [-2.15, -0.98]			
Enikeev et al., 2022	349.2	363.7	44	222.4	222.4	37	16.1%	0.41 [-0.03, 0.85]	+		
Erbay et al., 2021a	88.65	45.62	18	78.37	48.67	18	14.4%	0.21 [-0.44, 0.87]		•	
Erbay et al., 2021b	94.53	63.72	8	81.42	62.39	8	11.7%	0.20 [-0.79, 1.18]		•	
Gul et al., 2021	77.88	75.65	29	100.8	107.01	29	0.0%	-0.24 [-0.76, 0.27]			
Guo et al., 2021	123.29	119.03	22	219.82	147.32	22	14.8%	-0.71 [-1.32, -0.10]			
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	326.08	621.71	21	248.91	409.14	21	0.0%	0.14 [-0.46, 0.75]			
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021	21.11	4.84	84	29.03	9.66	84	0.0%	-1.03 [-1.35, -0.71]			
Terniz et al., 2020	67.4	29.61	10	69.9	57.01	10	12.6%	-0.05 [-0.93, 0.82]			
Vahidi et al., 2022	69	34.91	20	69.25	37.09	20	0.0%	-0.01 [-0.63, 0.61]			
Wang et al., 2022	214.86	191.61	26	186.49	111.92	26	15.3%	0.18 [-0.37, 0.72]		•	
Total (95% CI)			158			151	100.0%	-0.20 [-0.78, 0.38]		-	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>a</sup> = 0.49; (	Chi# = 34.97, df	= 6 (P < 0.00	001); I* = 8	33%						1 1	
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.6	8 (P = 0.50)								RECORE COMP 10 TREATMENT	AFTER COMP 10 TREATMENT	

C.

	COVID	19 POSI	TIVE	PRE	COVID 1	9		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Erbay et al., 2021a	75.57	58.53	69	90.72	85.39	69	27.6%	-0.21 [-0.54, 0.13]	
Erbay et al., 2021b	90.38	83.66	69	114.53	93.66	69	27.5%	-0.27 [-0.61, 0.06]	
Gul et al., 2021	100.8	107.01	29	77.88	75.61	29	11.6%	0.24 [-0.27, 0.76]	
Hamarat et al., 2022	39.76	38.66	41	82.3	72.71	41	15.4%	-0.72 [-1.17, -0.28]	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	158.17	156.15	21	217.99	206.13	21	8.3%	-0.32 [-0.93, 0.29]	
Pazir et al., 2021	55.7	47.7	24	77.6	72.4	24	9.5%	-0.35 [-0.92, 0.22]	
Total (95% CI)			253			253	100.0%	-0.27 [-0.45, -0.10]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 7.99, Test for overall effect: Z = 3	df = 5 (P = 06 (P = 0.	= 0.16); l <sup>2</sup> = 002)	37%						-2 -1 0 1 2 COMP 10 POSITIVE PRECOVID 10

**Fig 4.** Forest plot of sperm count comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A), before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B), and COVID-19 positive and preCOVID-19 period (C).





significant inter-study diversity ( $I^2 = 77\%$ ;  $X^2 P < 0.0001$ ). Following sensitivity analysis, it was revealed that SARS-CoV-2 significantly reduced progressive sperm motility in infected patients before treatment when compared with after treatment (SMD -0.53 [95% CI: -1.02, -0.05] P = 0.03), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 = 74\%$ ;  $X^2 P =$ 0.002) (Fig 12B). Furthermore, SARS-CoV-2 caused a significant decline in progressive sperm motility in infected cohorts when compared with their premorbid state (SMD -0.49 [95% CI: -0.80, -0.19] P = 0.002), and there was a significant inter-study variation ( $I^2 = 65\%$ ;  $X^2 P =$ 0.009); however, this was observed to be marginal after sensitivity analysis (SMD -0.18 [95% CI: -0.56, 0.19] P = 0.34), and there was no significant inter-study diversity ( $I^2 = 0\%$ ;  $X^2 P =$ 0.81) (Fig 12C). The funnels' plots showing publication bias are presented in Fig 13.

Sperm morphology. SARS-CoV-2 infection did not significantly alter normal sperm morphology when compared with the COVID-19-negative controls (SMD -0.49 [95% CI: -1.33, 0.34] P = 0.25), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 95%; X<sup>2</sup> P < 0.00001), even after sensitivity analysis (SMD -0.70 [95% CI: -1.83, 0.43] P = 0.23), and there was a significant inter-study variation ( $I^2 = 96\%$ ;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ) (Fig 14A). Similarly, SARS-CoV-2 did not considerably affect sperm morphology in infected patients before treatment in comparison with after treatment (SMD -0.19 [95% CI: -0.58, 0.21] P = 0.36), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 = 84\%$ ;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ), despite sensitivity analysis (SMD -0.25 [95% CI: -0.81, 0.31] P = 0.38), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 = 85\%$ ;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ) (Fig 14B). More so, SARS-CoV-2 caused a decline in normal sperm morphology in infected cohorts when colligated with their pre-morbid states (SMD -0.83 [95% CI: -1.69, 0.03] P = 0.06), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 92%;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ). Nevertheless, there was a substantial reduction in the proportion of sperm with normal morphology after sensitivity analysis in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients when juxtaposed with their pre-COVID states (SMD -0.65 [95% CI: -1.03, -0.26] P = 0.0010), and there was no marked heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 = 0\%$ ;  $X^2 P = 0.50$ ) (Fig 14C). The publication bias as depicted by funnels' plots are presented in Fig 15.

	COVI	D POSIT	IVE	COVIL	) NEGA	IVE		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Aksak et al., 2022	31.78	32.09	100	48.19	36.24	100	7.9%	-0.48 [-0.76, -0.20]	+
Al-Alami et al., 2022	27.18	44.77	4	18.83	25.27	3	5.5%	0.18 [-1.32, 1.69]	
Gacci et al., 2021a	32.06	50.58	26	52.32	39.58	12	7.3%	-0.42 [-1.11, 0.27]	
Gacci et al., 2021b	1.36	3.5	5	52.32	39.58	12	6.3%	-1.43 [-2.60, -0.25]	
Guo et al., 2021	59.6	48.55	41	91.43	56.86	50	7.7%	-0.59 [-1.01, -0.17]	
Holtmann, et al., 2020a	95.9	50.5	14	89.5	69.6	14	7.2%	0.10 [-0.64, 0.84]	
Holtmann, et al., 2020b	32	22.6	2	89.5	69.6	14	5.5%	-0.81 [-2.32, 0.71]	
Hu et al., 2022	62.19	37.59	36	60.63	24.92	45	7.7%	0.05 [-0.39, 0.49]	+
Li et al., 2020	14.87	16.98	23	43.37	27.18	22	7.4%	-1.24 [-1.89, -0.60]	
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021	10.76	2.46	84	54.27	9.12	105	7.3%	-6.19 [-6.89, -5.50]	•
Paoli et al., 2023	72.6	46.4	80	90.2	90.1	98	7.9%	-0.24 [-0.53, 0.06]	-
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021	70.9	63.9	60	105.9	41.1	40	7.7%	-0.62 [-1.03, -0.21]	-
Ruan et al., 2021	66.41	31.82	55	81.34	50.6	145	7.8%	-0.32 [-0.63, -0.01]	
Temiz et al., 2020	57	36.62	10	41	36.3	10	6.9%	0.42 [-0.47, 1.31]	
Total (95% CI)			540			670	100.0%	-0.83 [-1.46, -0.20]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1.30; 0	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 28	3.66, df	= 13 (F	< 0.00	001); I <sup>2</sup> =	95%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.5	8 (P = 0	010)							-4 -2 U 2 4 COVID POSITIVE COVID NEGATIVE

#### Sensitivity analysis

Α.

	COVI	POSIT	IVE	COVIL	NEGAT	IVE		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Aksak et al., 2022	31.78	32.09	100	48.19	36.24	100	0.0%	-0.48 [-0.76, -0.20]	
Al-Alami et al., 2022	27.18	44.77	4	18.83	25.27	3	0.0%	0.18 [-1.32, 1.69]	
Gacci et al., 2021 a	32.06	50.58	26	52.32	39.58	12	11.3%	-0.42 [-1.11, 0.27]	
Gacci et al., 2021b	1.36	3.5	5	52.32	39.58	12	10.5%	-1.43 [-2.60, -0.25]	
Guo et al., 2021	59.6	48.55	41	91.43	56.86	50	0.0%	-0.59 [-1.01, -0.17]	
Holtmann, et al., 2020a	95.9	50.5	14	89.5	69.6	14	11.2%	0.10 [-0.64, 0.84]	
Holtmann, et al., 2020b	32	22.6	2	89.5	69.6	14	9.8%	-0.81 [-2.32, 0.71]	
Hu et al., 2022	62.19	37.59	36	60.63	24.92	45	11.6%	0.05 [-0.39, 0.49]	+
Li et al., 2020	14.87	16.98	23	43.37	27.18	22	0.0%	-1.24 [-1.89, -0.60]	
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021	10.76	2.46	84	54.27	9.12	105	11.3%	-6.19 [-6.89, -5.50]	•
Paoli et al., 2023	72.6	46.4	80	90.2	90.1	98	0.0%	-0.24 [-0.53, 0.06]	
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021	70.9	63.9	60	105.9	41.1	40	11.6%	-0.62 [-1.03, -0.21]	
Ruan et al., 2021	66.41	31.82	55	81.34	50.6	145	11.7%	-0.32 [-0.63, -0.01]	-
Temiz et al., 2020	57	36.62	10	41	36.3	10	11.0%	0.42 [-0.47, 1.31]	
Total (95% CI)			292			397	100.0%	-1.02 [-2.16, 0.12]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 2.88; C	hi <sup>2</sup> = 27	1.05, df	= 8 (P	< 0.000	01); I <sup>2</sup> =	97%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.7	5 (P = 0.	08)							COVID POSITIVE COVID NEGATIVE



#### Sensitivity analysis

	BEFORE CON	ID 19 TREAT	MENT	AFTER COV	ID 19 TREAT	MENT		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI		
Dipankar et al., 2022	36.51	20.74	30	57.87	25.72	30	17.9%	-0.90 [-1.44, -0.37]			
Enikeev et al., 2022	128.9	98.15	44	107.9	98.1	37	19.9%	0.21 [-0.23, 0.65]			
Falahieh et al., 2021	47.6	21.9	20	52.1	24.3	20	16.2%	-0.19 [-0.81, 0.43]			
Gul et al., 2021	39.67	40.45	29	47.52	60.84	29	0.0%	-0.15 [-0.67, 0.37]			
Guo et al., 2021	45.73	34.39	22	73.42	52.93	22	16.5%	-0.61 [-1.22, -0.00]			
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	51.55	38.63	21	44.4	32.41	21	0.0%	0.20 [-0.41, 0.80]			
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021	10.76	2.46	84	12.63	2.81	84	0.0%	-0.70 [-1.02, -0.39]			
Terniz et al., 2020	57	36.62	10	45.1	36.9	10	11.8%	0.31 [-0.57, 1.19]			
Wang et al., 2022	75.33	73.33	26	62.53	51.37	26	17.7%	0.20 [-0.35, 0.74]			
Total (95% CI)			152			145	100.0%	-0.18 [-0.59, 0.23]	•		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.17; 0	Chi# = 15.09, df:	= 5 (P = 0.01)	); P = 679	6							
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.8	5 (P = 0.39)								PECODE COMO 10 TREATMENT, AETER COMO 10 TREATMENT		

C.

в.

	COVID	<b>19 POSI</b>	TIVE	PRE	PRECOVID 19			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Erbay et al., 2021a	28.62	12.4	69	32.24	12.8	69	15.1%	-0.29 [-0.62, 0.05]	
Erbay et al., 2021b	30.63	17.2	69	35.01	14.1	69	15.1%	-0.28 [-0.61, 0.06]	
Gul et al., 2021	47.52	60.84	29	39.67	40.45	29	11.7%	0.15 [-0.37, 0.67]	
Hamarat et al., 2022	16.67	14.51	41	28.94	21.69	41	13.0%	-0.66 [-1.10, -0.21]	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	44.4	32.41	21	51.55	38.63	21	10.2%	-0.20 [-0.80, 0.41]	
Pazir et al., 2021	35.3	20.2	24	42.6	18	24	10.8%	-0.38 [-0.95, 0.20]	
Rafiee and Tabei, 2021	68.7	53.6	100	115.1	35.1	100	15.9%	-1.02 [-1.32, -0.73]	
Sunnu et al., 2022	37.4	55.2	14	78.5	85	14	8.1%	-0.56 [-1.31, 0.20]	
Total (95% CI)			367			367	100.0%	-0.42 [-0.70, -0.14]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.11;	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 22	94, df = 1	7 (P = 0.	.002); I <sup>2</sup>	= 69%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.9	91 (P = 0.	004)							COVID 19 POSITIVE PRECOVID 19

## Sensitivity analysis

	COVID	<b>19 POSI</b>	TIVE	PRE	PRECOVID 19			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference			
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI			
Erbay et al., 2021a	28.62	12.4	69	32.24	12.8	69	31.4%	-0.29 [-0.62, 0.05]				
Erbay et al., 2021b	30.63	17.2	69	35.01	14.1	69	31.4%	-0.28 [-0.61, 0.06]				
Gul et al., 2021	47.52	60.84	29	39.67	40.45	29	13.3%	0.15 [-0.37, 0.67]				
Hamarat et al., 2022	16.67	14.51	41	28.94	21.69	41	17.8%	-0.66 [-1.10, -0.21]				
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	44.4	32.41	21	51.55	38.63	21	0.0%	-0.20 [-0.80, 0.41]				
Pazir et al., 2021	35.3	20.2	24	42.6	18	24	0.0%	-0.38 [-0.95, 0.20]				
Rafiee and Tabei, 2021	68.7	53.6	100	115.1	35.1	100	0.0%	-1.02 [-1.32, -0.73]				
Sunnu et al., 2022	37.4	55.2	14	78.5	85	14	6.2%	-0.56 [-1.31, 0.20]				
Total (95% CI)			222			222	100.0%	-0.31 [-0.50, -0.12]	•			
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 5.88, o	if = 4 (P =	0.21); I <sup>2</sup>	= 32%									
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.2	22 (P = 0.	001)							COVID 19 POSITIVE PRECOVID 19			

**Fig 6.** Forest plot of sperm concentration comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A), before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B), and COVID-19 positive and preCOVID-19 period (C).



Fig 7. Funnel plot of sperm concentration comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A), before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B), and COVID-19 positive and preCOVID-19 period (C).

**Seminal leukocyte count.** Only two studies reported data on seminal fluid leukocyte, comparing COVID-positive and COVID-negative patients, while three studies reported these parameters comparing COVID-pre- and post- treatment status of the infected patients. Unexpectedly, SARS-CoV-2 infection did not alter seminal leukocyte levels when compared with controls (SMD -0.01 [95% CI: -0.46, 0.43] P = 0.95), and there was no marked heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 = 29\%$ ;  $X^2 P = 0.24$ ). In addition, when seminal leukocytes in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients were colligated before and after treatment, there was no marked heterogeneity (SMD 0.34 [95% CI: -0.33, 1.00] P = 0.32), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 = 80\%$ ;  $X^2 P = 0.007$ ) (Fig 16). The funnels' plots showing the publication bias are shown in Fig 17.

**Circulating testosterone, oestrogen, and prolactin levels.** SARS-CoV-2 infection engendered a substantial diminution in serum testosterone level when collocated with covid-19-negative controls (SMD -1.00 [95% CI: -1.49, -0.51] P < 0.0001), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 96%;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ) (Fig 18A). However, SARS-CoV-2 infection did not significantly cause a wane in serum testosterone level in infected patients in comparison before and after treatment (SMD -0.87 [95% CI: -1.90, 0.16] P = 0.10), and there was a significant inter-study diversity (I<sup>2</sup> = 95%;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ). After sensitivity analysis, serum testosterone level did not also show notable distinction between SARS-CoV-2 positive patients before and after treatment (SMD -1.30 [95% CI: -3.27, 0.67] P = 0.20), and there was a significant inter-study diversity (I<sup>2</sup> = 98%;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ) (Fig 18B). More so, circulating testosterone level was not significantly altered in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients in colligation with their premorbid states (SMD -0.51 [95% CI: -1.22, 0.19] P = 0.15), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 88%;  $X^2 P = 0.0003$ ) (Fig 18C). The publication bias using funnels' plots are shown in Fig 19.

In addition, serum concentration of oestrogen was marginally higher in SARS-CoV-2 patients in comparison with uninfected controls (SMD 0.62 [95% CI: 0.18, 1.07] P = 0.006). There was a marked heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 70%;  $X^2 P = 0.04$ ) (Fig 20A). The funnel's plot showing the publication bias is shown in Fig 20B.

	COVI	D POSIT	IVE	COVID	NEGAT	IVE		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Enikeev et al., 2022	47	24.5	44	72.5	15.2	44	22.1%	-1.24 [-1.70, -0.78]	+
Gacci et al., 2021 a	49	28.23	26	62.66	28.51	12	20.0%	-0.47 [-1.17, 0.22]	
Gacci et al., 2021b	3.5	9.05	5	62.66	28.51	12	13.4%	-2.26 [-3.61, -0.90]	(
Guo et al., 2021	77.09	19.2	41	78.87	16.79	50	22.5%	-0.10 [-0.51, 0.31]	
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021	51.52	8.34	60	67.33	9.77	40	22.0%	-1.76 [-2.23, -1.28]	-
Total (95% CI)			176			-1.08 [-1.83, -0.33]	•		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.60; C	Chi <b>²</b> = 34	.49, df=	:4 (P ≺	0.0000	1); I <b>ž</b> = 8	8%		-	
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.8	3 (P = 0	COVID POSITIVE COVID NEGATIVE							

# Sensitivity analysis

	COVI	D POSIT	IVE	COVID	NEGAT	IVE	1	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Enikeev et al., 2022	47	24.5	44	72.5	15.2	44	30.9%	-1.24 [-1.70, -0.78]	+
Gacci et al., 2021a	49	28.23	26	62.66	28.51	12	25.3%	-0.47 [-1.17, 0.22]	
Gacci et al., 2021b	3.5	9.05	5	62.66	28.51	12	13.2%	-2.26 [-3.61, -0.90]	<b>-</b> _
Guo et al., 2021	77.09	19.2	41	78.87	16.79	50	0.0%	-0.10 [-0.51, 0.31]	
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021	51.52	8.34	60	67.33	9.77	40	30.6%	-1.76 [-2.23, -1.28]	+
Total (95% CI)	≏bi8 – 10	DG df-	135	0.043-18	- 720	108	-1.34 [-1.95, -0.72]	◆	
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.2	28 (P < 0	.0001)	= 3 (F =	0.01), 1	-= 7 3 %	-4 -2 0 2 4 COVID POSITIVE COVID NEGATIVE			

# В.

	BEFORE COV	/ID 19 TREAT	MENT	AFTER COV	D 19 TREAT	MENT		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Dipankar et al., 2022	33.867	14.81	30	43.933	14.1	30	21.4%	-0.69 [-1.21, -0.17]	
Enikeev et al., 2022	47	24.5	44	62.8	20.9	37	22.6%	-0.68 [-1.13, -0.23]	
Falahieh et al., 2021	73.1	11.6	20	80.3	11.5	20	19.4%	-0.61 [-1.25, 0.02]	
Guo et al., 2021	75.61	20.6	22	80.35	16	22	20.1%	-0.25 [-0.85, 0.34]	
Vahidi et al., 2022	41.6	12.73 20 69.55 11.54 20						-2.25 [-3.06, -1.45]	_ <b>-</b>
Total (95% CI)	136 1							-0.84 [-1.37, -0.31]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0	.27; Chi² = 16.3	31, df = 4 (P =	0.003); I <sup>z</sup>	= 75%				_	
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.13 (P = 0.0	02)							BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT AFTER COVID 19 TREATMENT

# Sensitivity analysis

	BEFORE COV	ID 19 TREAT	MENT	AFTER COV	ID 19 TREAT	MENT		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Dipankar et al., 2022	33.867	14.81	30	43.933	14.1	30	40.9%	-0.69 [-1.21, -0.17]	
Enikeev et al., 2022	47	24.5	44	62.8	20.9	37	0.0%	-0.68 [-1.13, -0.23]	
Falahieh et al., 2021	73.1	11.6	20	80.3	11.5	20	27.5%	-0.61 [-1.25, 0.02]	
Guo et al., 2021	75.61	20.6	22	80.35	16	22	31.6%	-0.25 [-0.85, 0.34]	
Vahidi et al., 2022	41.6	12.73	20	69.55	11.54	20	0.0%	-2.25 [-3.06, -1.45]	
Total (95% CI)			72			72	100.0%	-0.53 [-0.86, -0.20]	▲
Heterogeneity: lau*=0 Test for overall effect: Z	.00; Chi*=1.25 = 3.11 (P=0.0	5, df = 2 (P = U 102)	J.53); I* = L	1%				-	-4 -2 0 2 4 BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT AFTER COVID 19 TREATMENT

# С.

	COVID 1	9 POSI	TIVE	PREC	OVID	19		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Erbay et al., 2021 a	58.1	7.1	69	62	7	69	50.5%	-0.55 [-0.89, -0.21]	-
Erbay et al., 2021b	57.4	6.8	69	64.6	5.6	69	49.5%	-1.15 [-1.51, -0.79]	•
Total (95% CI)			138			138	100.0%	-0.85 [-1.43, -0.26]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>z</sup> =	0.15; Chi <sup>z</sup>	= 5.61,							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.83 (F	<sup>o</sup> = 0.00:	COVID 19 POSITIVE PRECOVID 19						

**Fig 8.** Forest plot of sperm viability comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A), before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B), and COVID-19 positive and preCOVID-19 period (C).



However, SARS-CoV-2 infection significantly increased serum prolactin concentration when compared with uninfected control (SMD 0.53 [95% CI: 0.11, 0.95] P = 0.01), and there was a notable heterogeneity between studies ( $I^2 = 86\%$ ;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ) (Fig 21A). In comparison with SARS-CoV-2 positive patients after treatment, SARS-CoV-2 infection did not significantly alter serum prolactin level (SMD 0.39 [95% CI: -0.85, 1.64] P = 0.54), and there was a substantial inter-study variation ( $I^2 = 91\%$ ;  $X^2 P < 0.0001$ ) (Fig 21B). The funnels' plots showing the publication bias are shown in Fig 22.

**Serum levels of gonadotropins.** Serum level of LH was significantly elevated in SARS-CoV-2 positive when juxtaposed with the uninfected control (SMD 0.75 [95% CI: 0.19, 1.31] P = 0.009), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 96%;  $X^2 P < 0.0001$ ). After sensitivity analysis, serum LH level remained higher in SARS-CoV-2 positive cohorts in colligation with the negative cohorts (SMD 1.09 [95% CI: 0.10, 2.07] P = 0.03), and there was a substantial heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 97%;  $X^2 P < 0.0001$ ) (Fig 23A). However, serum LH level was not significantly different in SARS-CoV-2 positive before and after treatment (SMD 0.05 [95% CI: -0.28, 0.37] P = 0.78), and there was no significant inter-study diversity (I<sup>2</sup> = 0%;  $X^2 P = 0.76$ ) (Fig 23B). In addition, there was no notable variance in serum LH levels in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients when compared with their pre-COVID state (SMD 0.54 [95% CI: -0.47, 1.56] P = 0.29), and there was a substantial heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 94%;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ) (Fig 23C). The publication bias, using funnels' plots, are shown in Fig 24.

Serum FSH was marginally increased in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients when compared with the control (SMD 0.13 [95% CI: -0.16, 0.43] P = 0.37), and there was a noteworthy heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 90%;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ), which persisted even after sensitivity analysis (SMD 0.13 [95% CI: -0.25, 0.51] P = 0.50), and there was a marked heterogeneity between

	COVI	D POSI	IVE	COVI	D NEGAT	IVE		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference			
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI			
Aksak et al., 2022	46.93	1.83	100	49.09	17.46	100	19.0%	-0.17 [-0.45, 0.10]				
Enikeev et al., 2022	38.8	23.8	44	53.6	13.9	44	15.5%	-0.75 [-1.19, -0.32]				
Holtmann, et al., 2020a	57.5	24.1	14	51.1	18.1	14	9.7%	0.29 [-0.45, 1.04]				
Holtmann, et al., 2020b	43.5	24.7	2	51.1	18.1	14	3.6%	-0.39 [-1.87, 1.10]				
Hu et al., 2022	49.16	16.09	36	54.4	9.28	45	15.3%	-0.41 [-0.85, 0.04]				
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021	48.1	28	60	73.1	27.7	40	15.8%	-0.89 [-1.31, -0.47]	_ <b>-</b>			
Temiz et al., 2020	27.97	14.88	10	18.68	79.06	10	7.9%	0.16 [-0.72, 1.03]	·			
Wang et al., 2022	107.7	130.8	26	87.3	97.7	26	13.2%	0.17 [-0.37, 0.72]	_ <del>_</del>			
Total (95% CI)			292			293	100.0%	-0.30 [-0.61, 0.00]	•			
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.11; Test for overall effect: Z = 1.9	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 18 93 (P = 0	3.97, df= .05)	= 7 (P =	0.008);	I² = 63%	0			-2 -1 0 1 2 COVID POSITIVE COVID NEGATIVE			

#### Sensitivity analysis

Α.

	COVI	D POSIT	IVE	COVI	D NEGAT	IVE		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI		
Aksak et al., 2022	46.93	1.83	100	49.09	17.46	100	0.0%	-0.17 [-0.45, 0.10]	0.0		
Enikeev et al., 2022	38.8	23.8	44	53.6	13.9	44	18.5%	-0.75 [-1.19, -0.32]			
Holtmann, et al., 2020a	57.5	24.1	14	51.1	18.1	14	12.5%	0.29 [-0.45, 1.04]			
Holtmann, et al., 2020b	43.5	24.7	2	51.1	18.1	14	5.1%	-0.39 [-1.87, 1.10]			
Hu et al., 2022	49.16	16.09	36	54.4	9.28	45	18.3%	-0.41 [-0.85, 0.04]			
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021	48.1	28	60	73.1	27.7	40	18.8%	-0.89 [-1.31, -0.47]			
Temiz et al., 2020	27.97	14.88	10	18.68	79.06	10	10.5%	0.16 [-0.72, 1.03]			
Wang et al., 2022	107.7	130.8	26	87.3	97.7	26	16.2%	0.17 [-0.37, 0.72]	- <b>-</b>		
Total (95% CI)			192			193	100.0%	-0.32 [-0.70, 0.06]	-		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.15; 0	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 18	i.80, df=	6 (P=	0.01); F	<sup>2</sup> = 64%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.66 (P = 0.10)									COVID POSITIVE COVID NEGATIVE		

	BEFORE COV	ID 19 TREAT	MENT	AFTER COV	ID 19 TREAT	MENT		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI		
Dipankar et al., 2022	26.4	11.07	30	38.43	13.48	30	15.0%	-0.96 [-1.50, -0.43]			
Enikeev et al., 2022	38.8	23.8	44	52.6	14.5	37	15.7%	-0.68 [-1.13, -0.23]			
Falahieh et al., 2021	32.8	8.9	20	47.5	9.8	20	13.3%	-1.54 [-2.25, -0.82]			
Gul et al., 2021	31.23	15.06	29	33.97	19.07	29	15.2%	-0.16 [-0.67, 0.36]			
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	48.6	22.1	21	34.7	20.7	21	14.2%	0.64 [0.02, 1.26]			
Terniz et al., 2020	27.97	14.88	10	23.54	18.53	10	11.8%	0.25 [-0.63, 1.13]			
Wang et al., 2022	51.16	29.56	26	46.78	27.45	26	14.9%	0.15 [-0.39, 0.70]			
Total (95% CI)			180			173	100.0%	-0.34 [-0.86, 0.18]	•		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.39;	Chi² = 32.97, df	= 6 (P < 0.0)	001); I² = 8	2%							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.2	28 (P = 0.20)								BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT AFTER COVID 19 TREATMENT		

#### Sensitivity analysis

	BEFORE COV	ID 19 TREAT	IMENT	AFTER COV	ID 19 TREAT	MENT		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Dipankar et al., 2022	26.4	11.07	30	38.43	13.48	30	26.6%	-0.96 [-1.50, -0.43]	
Enikeev et al., 2022	38.8	23.8	44	52.6	14.5	37	0.0%	-0.68 [-1.13, -0.23]	
Falahieh et al., 2021	32.8	8.9	20	47.5	9.8	20	24.5%	-1.54 [-2.25, -0.82]	
Gul et al., 2021	31.23	15.06	29	33.97	19.07	29	0.0%	-0.16 [-0.67, 0.36]	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	48.6	22.1	21	34.7	20.7	21	0.0%	0.64 [0.02, 1.26]	
Terniz et al., 2020	27.97	14.88	10	23.54	18.53	10	22.3%	0.25 [-0.63, 1.13]	
Wang et al., 2022	51.16	29.56	26	46.78	27.45	26	26.5%	0.15 [-0.39, 0.70]	
Total (95% CI)			86			86	100.0%	-0.54 [-1.36, 0.28]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.58; (	Chi² = 19.20, df	= 3 (P = 0.0)	002); I <sup>2</sup> = 8-	4%				2X 1 1 1 1	
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.2	(P = 0.20)								BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT AFTER COVID 19 TREATMENT

С.

в.

	COVID 19 POSITIVE			PRE	COVID	19		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Erbay et al., 2021 a	33.41	12.3	69	48.69	12.1	69	13.5%	-1.25 [-1.61, -0.88]	+
Erbay et al., 2021b	31.42	13.3	69	50.74	13.4	69	13.4%	-1.44 [-1.81, -1.06]	
Gul et al., 2021	33.97	19.07	29	31.23	15.06	29	12.4%	0.16 [-0.36, 0.67]	
Hamarat et al., 2022	38.7	16.35	41	42	15.52	41	13.0%	-0.21 [-0.64, 0.23]	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	34.7	20.7	21	48.6	22.1	21	11.5%	-0.64 [-1.26, -0.02]	
Pazir et al., 2021	40.4	10.9	24	45.8	5	24	11.8%	-0.63 [-1.21, -0.05]	
Rafiee and Tabei, 2021	30.1	29.6	100	69.9	32.7	100	13.9%	-1.27 [-1.58, -0.97]	-
Sunnu et al., 2022	60.4	24.6	14	56.6	28.4	14	10.5%	0.14 [-0.60, 0.88]	
Total (95% CI)			367			367	100.0%	-0.68 [-1.12, -0.24]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.34; 0	Chi² = 52	.11, df = 7	(P < 0.	00001);	l <sup>2</sup> = 87	%			-4 -2 0 2 4
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.0	13 (P = 0.	002)						COVID 19 POSITIVE PRECOVID 19	

#### Sensitivity analysis

	COVID	VID 19 POSITIVE			COVID	19		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Erbay et al., 2021 a	33.41	12.3	69	48.69	12.1	69	26.5%	-1.25 [-1.61, -0.88]	-
Erbay et al., 2021b	31.42	13.3	69	50.74	13.4	69	26.4%	-1.44 [-1.81, -1.06]	-
Gul et al., 2021	33.97	19.07	29	31.23	15.06	29	0.0%	0.16 [-0.36, 0.67]	
Hamarat et al., 2022	38.7	16.35	41	42	15.52	41	25.7%	-0.21 [-0.64, 0.23]	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	34.7	20.7	21	48.6	22.1	21	0.0%	-0.64 [-1.26, -0.02]	
Pazir et al., 2021	40.4	10.9	24	45.8	5	24	0.0%	-0.63 [-1.21, -0.05]	
Rafiee and Tabei, 2021	30.1	29.6	100	69.9	32.7	100	0.0%	-1.27 [-1.58, -0.97]	
Sunnu et al., 2022	60.4	24.6	14	56.6	28.4	14	21.5%	0.14 [-0.60, 0.88]	
Total (95% CI)			193			193	100.0%	-0.73 [-1.42, -0.04]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.43;	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 28	61, df = 3	3 (P < 0.	00001);	I <sup>2</sup> = 90 <sup>4</sup>	%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.0	08 (P = 0.	04)							COVID 19 POSITIVE PRECOVID 19

**Fig 10.** Forest plot of total sperm motility comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A), before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B), and COVID-19 positive and preCOVID-19 period (C).



studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 91%;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ) (Fig 25A). In comparison with infected patients after treatment, FSH level in infected patients was not significantly different (SMD -0.36 [95% CI: -1.07, 0.35] P = 0.32), and there was a marked heterogeneity between studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 89%;  $X^2 P <$ 0.0001) (Fig 25C). Also, FSH level did not show any significant difference in SARS-CoV-2 positive when compared with the preCOVID state (SMD 0.11 [95% CI: -0.03, 0.25] P = 0.12), and there was no significant inter-study diversity (I<sup>2</sup> = 0%;  $X^2 P = 0.98$ ) (Fig 25C). The funnels' plot showing the publication bias are presented in Fig 26.

**Reproductive hormone indices.** Serum testosterone/LH and FSH/LH were compared in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients and the uninfected controls. It was observed that SARS-CoV-2 engendered a significant decline in testosterone/LH level when compared with the control (SMD -2.44 [95% CI: -3.69, -1.19] P = 0.0001), and there existed a notable inter-study variation (I<sup>2</sup> = 99%;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ) (Fig 27A). The publication bias is shown in Fig 27B.

Furthermore, SARS-CoV-2 infection resulted in a marginal reduction in FSH/LH level when juxtaposed with the control (SMD -2.06 [95% CI: -4.36, 0.25] P = 0.08), and there was a significant inter-study diversity (I<sup>2</sup> = 98%;  $X^2 P < 0.00001$ ) (Fig 28A). The publication bias is shown in Fig 28B.

# Discussion

Although the achievement of clinical pregnancy and live birth is the true test of infertility, conventional semen analysis remains the cornerstone of the diagnosis and management of male infertility [67]. Evaluation of male sex hormones is also a useful tool in the management of male infertility. Our present data revealed that SARS-CoV-2 caused reductions in ejaculate volume, sperm count, concentration, viability, normal morphology, and total and progressive motility. These findings were associated with SARS-CoV-2-induced decline in serum testoster-one level, and increase in oestrogen, prolactin, LH, and testosterone/LH levels. These data

 
 COUD POSITIVE
 COUD NEGATIVE
 DI Total Meight

 Mean
 SD
 Total Meight

 196
 31.66
 12.07
 31.68
 2
 5.6%

 32.8
 21.7
 44
 44.9
 14.3
 44
 12.6%

 26.43
 22.53
 26
 40.39
 26.83
 12
 10.7%

 37.7
 18
 24
 46.61
 5.05
 50.12.26%
 12.10.7%

 41.2
 14.81.61
 50.50
 50.12.26%
 12.10.7%
 14.03%

 41.2
 11.14
 42.1
 17.8
 14.10.3%
 10.26%

 41.2
 13.84
 45.41
 10.42
 45
 12.5%

 41.2
 13.84
 36.45
 10.42
 45
 12.5%

 42.5
 13.33
 10
 35
 8.38
 10
 9.2%

 39.5
 13.31
 10
 35
 6.38
 10
 9.2%
 Study or Subgroup Ai-Alami et al., 2022 Gacci et al., 2021 Gacci et al., 2021b Guc et al., 2021b Guc et al., 2021b Holtmann, et al., 2020b Holtmann, et al., 2020b Hut et al., 2022 Maleki and Tartbian, 2021 Paoli et al., 2023 Temic et al., 2023 Std. Mean Difference (V, Random, 95% CI 0.20 [-1.30, 1.71] -0.65 [-1.08, -0.22] 0.56 [-1.25, 0.14] Not estimable -0.54 [-0.96, -0.12] 0.20 [-0.54, 0.94] Not estimable -0.29 [-0.73, 0.15] -1.80 [-2.15, -1.46] -0.59 [-0.50, -0.20] 0.39 [-0.50, -0.21] 0.39 [-0.50, -0.21] 0.39 [-0.50, -0.22] 0.30 [-0.50, -0.22] 0.30 [-0.50, -0.22] 0.30 [-0.50, -0.22] 0.30 [-0.50, -0.22] Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.48 [-0.94, -0.02] ò COVID POSITIVE COVID NEGATIVE

#### Sensitivity analysis

Α.

	COVI	D POSI	IVE	COVI	D NEGAT	TIVE		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Al-Alami et al., 2022	19.6	31.66	4	12.07	31.58	3	0.0%	0.20 [-1.30, 1.71]	
Enikeev et al., 2022	32.8	21.7	44	44.9	14.3	44	15.3%	-0.65 [-1.08, -0.22]	
Gacci et al., 2021a	26.43	23.53	26	40.39	26.83	12	13.4%	-0.56 [-1.25, 0.14]	
Gacci et al., 2021b	27	0	5	40.39	26.83	12		Not estimable	
Guo et al., 2021	37.2	18.2	41	46.16	15.03	50	15.3%	-0.54 [-0.96, -0.12]	
Holtmann, et al., 2020a	46.1	21.1	14	42.1	17.8	14	13.1%	0.20 [-0.54, 0.94]	
Holtmann, et al., 2020b	20	0	2	42.1	17.8	14		Not estimable	
Hu et al., 2022	41.2	13.34	36	44.64	10.42	45	15.2%	-0.29 [-0.73, 0.15]	
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021	25.77	5.69	84	53.72	20.05	105	15.8%	-1.80 [-2.15, -1.46]	
Paoli et al., 2023	40.6	15.7	80	47.7	12.7	98	0.0%	-0.50 [-0.80, -0.20]	
Temiz et al., 2020	39.5	13.33	10	35	8.38	10	12.0%	0.39 [-0.50, 1.27]	
Total (95% CI)			262			306	100.0%	-0.51 [-1.09, 0.07]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.52; 0	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 54	.82, df=	6 (P <	0.0000	1); I <sup>2</sup> = 8	9%		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.7	3 (P = 0	COVID POSITIVE COVID NEGATIVE							

	BEFORE COV	ID 19 TREAT	TMENT	AFTER COV	ID 19 TREAT	MENT	1	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI		
Dipankar et al., 2022	20.2	9.05	30	31.03	10.46	30	10.4%	-1.09 [-1.64, -0.55]			
Enikeev et al., 2022	32.8	21.7	44	44.3	14.7	37	11.2%	-0.60 [-1.05, -0.16]			
Falahieh et al., 2021	30.6	8.2	20	44.1	9.9	20	8.9%	-1.46 [-2.16, -0.75]			
Gul et al., 2021	26.62	12.59	29	29.24	15.49	29	10.6%	-0.18 [-0.70, 0.33]			
Guo et al., 2021	32.3	17.11	22	38.97	16.4	22	9.9%	-0.39 [-0.99, 0.21]			
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	35.1	21.7	21	21.8	15.9	21	9.6%	0.69 (0.06, 1.31)			
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021	25.77	5.69	84	30.86	6.95	84	12.3%	-0.80 [-1.11, -0.48]			
Temiz et al., 2020	39.5	13.33	10	32.99	12.68	10	7.4%	0.48 [-0.41, 1.37]			
Vahidi et al., 2022	38.35	14.81	20	45.65	12.25	20	9.6%	-0.53 [-1.16, 0.11]			
Wang et al., 2022	45.41	36.47	20	44.1	27.05	26	10.0%	0.04 [-0.54, 0.62]			
Total (95% CI)			300			299	100.0%	-0.41 [-0.77, -0.05]	•		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.25; 0 Test for overall effect: Z = 2.2	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 38.65, df 5 (P = 0.02)	= 9 (P < 0.00	01); I²= 77	%					4 -2 0 2 BEFORE COVID 10 TREATMENT AFTER COVID 10 TREATMENT		

#### Sensitivity analysis

	ID 19 TREAT	MENT	AFTER COV	ID 19 TREAT	MENT		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI	
Dipankar et al., 2022	20.2	9.05	30	31.03	10.46	30	17.9%	-1.09 [-1.64, -0.55]		
Enikeev et al., 2022	32.8	21.7	44	44.3	14.7	37	19.3%	-0.60 [-1.05, -0.16]		
Falahieh et al., 2021	30.6	8.2	20	44.1	9.9	20	15.5%	-1.46 [-2.16, -0.75]	(	
Gul et al., 2021	26.62	12.59	29	29.24	15.49	29	0.0%	-0.18 [-0.70, 0.33]		
Guo et al., 2021	32.3	17.11	22	38.97	16.4	22	17.1%	-0.39 [-0.99, 0.21]		
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	35.1	21.7	21	21.8	15.9	21	0.0%	0.69 (0.06, 1.31)		
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021	25.77	5.69	84	30.86	6.95	84	0.0%	-0.80 [-1.11, -0.48]		
Temiz et al., 2020	39.5	13.33	10	32.99	12.68	10	13.0%	0.48 [-0.41, 1.37]		
Vahidi et al., 2022	38.35	14.81	20	45.65	12.25	20	0.0%	-0.53 [-1.16, 0.11]		
Wang et al., 2022	45.41	36.47	20	44.1	27.05	26	17.3%	0.04 [-0.54, 0.62]		
Total (95% CI)			146			145	100.0%	-0.53 [-1.02, -0.05]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.27:	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 19.50, df =	= 5 (P = 0.00)	2): IP = 749	6				+		
Test for overall effect: 7 = 2.1	5 (P = 0.03)							-4	-2 0 2 4	
									BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT AFTER COVID 19 TREATMENT	

c.

в.

	COVID 19 POSITIVE PRECOVID 19							Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Erbay et al., 2021a	20.92	9.1	69	28.81	9.7	69	17.9%	-0.83 [-1.18, -0.49]	
Erbay et al., 2021b	21.4	10.1	69	30.16	12.1	69	17.9%	-0.78 [-1.13, -0.44]	
Gul et al., 2021	29.24	15.49	29	26.62	12.59	29	14.0%	0.18 [-0.33, 0.70]	
Hamarat et al., 2022	30.74	14.28	41	33.66	13.59	41	15.9%	-0.21 [-0.64, 0.23]	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	21.8	15.9	21	35.1	21.7	21	11.9%	-0.69 [-1.31, -0.06]	
Pazir et al., 2021	28.9	9.1	24	34.5	1.5	24	12.5%	-0.84 [-1.44, -0.25]	
Sunnu et al., 2022	46.8	25.7	14	49.6	26.5	14	9.9%	-0.10 [-0.85, 0.64]	
Total (95% CI)			267			267	100.0%	-0.49 [-0.80, -0.19]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.11; 0	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 16.		-2 -1 0 1 2						
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.1	5 (P = 0.)	002)							COVID 19 POSITIVE PRECOVID 19

#### Sensitivity analysis

	COVID	<b>19 POSI</b>	TIVE	PRE	COVID	19		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Erbay et al., 2021a	20.92	9.1	69	28.81	9.7	69	0.0%	-0.83 [-1.18, -0.49]	
Erbay et al., 2021b	21.4	10.1	69	30.16	12.1	69	0.0%	-0.78 [-1.13, -0.44]	
Gul et al., 2021	29.24	15.49	29	26.62	12.59	29	0.0%	0.18 [-0.33, 0.70]	
Hamarat et al., 2022	30.74	14.28	41	33.66	13.59	41	74.5%	-0.21 [-0.64, 0.23]	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	21.8	15.9	21	35.1	21.7	21	0.0%	-0.69 [-1.31, -0.06]	202
Pazir et al., 2021	28.9	9.1	24	34.5	1.5	24	0.0%	-0.84 [-1.44, -0.25]	
Sunnu et al., 2022	46.8	25.7	14	49.6	26.5	14	25.5%	-0.10 [-0.85, 0.64]	
Total (95% CI)			55			55	100.0%	-0.18 [-0.56, 0.19]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00;	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.0	6, df = 1	(P = 0.8	1); I <sup>2</sup> = (	0%			-	
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.9	95 (P = 0.	34)							COVID 19 POSITIVE PRECOVID 19

Fig 12. Forest plot of progressive sperm motility comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A), before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B), and COVID-19 positive and preCOVID-19 period (C).



Fig 13. Funnel plot of progressive sperm motility comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A), before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B), and COVID-19 positive and preCOVID-19 period (C).

convincingly demonstrate that SARS-CoV-2 may impede fertility in males by engendering a nadir of semen quality and distorting male reproductive hormone milieu.

The present findings corroborate and form an extension of the previous findings of the meta-analysis of Corona et al. [21], Tiwari et al. [22], and Xie et al [68]. Our present findings provide an update and robust data demonstrating the detrimental sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 on semen quality and male sex hormones. These data also augment the evidence available in the scientific literature that support the grievous consequence which SARS-CoV-2 impacts on male reproductive function.

It is plausible to infer that SARAS-CoV-2 may impair male fertility through multiple pathways. The expression of SARS-CoV-2 virus in the semen of infected patients [69–71] suggests that the virus may exert a local effect on the sperm cells. SARS-CoV-2 virus promotes oxidative stress evinced by heightened reactive oxygen species (ROS) generation, malondialdehyde (MDA) level and decline in total antioxidant capacity (TAC) in the semen fluid of infected patients [38]. Since the sperm cells are rich in polyunsaturated fatty acids that make them highly susceptible to ROS attack, SARS-CoV-2-induced ROS generation in the spermatozoa may cause oxidative sperm damage, leading to reduced sperm count, viability, motility, concentration, and normal morphology.

In addition, studies have shown that SARS-CoV-2 positively modulates cytokines<sup>30</sup> through extracellular-regulated protein kinase (ERK) and p38 mitogen-activated protein kinases (MAPK) activation [3,4,72], thus activating a cascade of immune responses, which lead to a hyper-inflammatory state that compromise the blood-testis-barrier [3,73,74] and increase the susceptibility of the testis and germ cells to SARS-CoV-2-driven ROS attack. This may explain the reduced semen quality and testosterone levels observed in SARS-CoV-2 positive patient. Since LH and FSH levels were not reduced in association with reduced testosterone, it is

в.

	COVI	D POSIT	IVE	COVID	NEGAT	TIVE		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Aksak et al., 2022	46.9	1.8	100	49.1	17.5	100	15.8%	-0.18 [-0.45, 0.10]	-
Al-Alami et al., 2022	6.2	8.7	4	2	2.5	3	10.4%	0.51 [-1.04, 2.06]	
Enikeev et al., 2022	10.9	7.8	44	17.3	14.7	44	15.4%	-0.54 [-0.96, -0.11]	
Gacci et al., 2021a	2.6	2.3	26	3	2.5	12	14.5%	-0.17 [-0.85, 0.52]	
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021	3.35	1.06	84	12.97	5.32	105	15.5%	-2.38 [-2.75, -2.00]	-
Temiz et al., 2020	1.5	1.72	10	3	1.72	10	13.4%	-0.84 [-1.76, 0.09]	
Wang et al., 2022	14.97	18.66	26	8.32	6.66	26	15.0%	0.47 [-0.08, 1.02]	-
Total (95% CI)			294			300	100.0%	-0.49 [-1.33, 0.34]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1.14; C	hi <sup>2</sup> = 11	2.73, df	= 6 (P	< 0.0000	11); I <sup>2</sup> =	95%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.1	6 (P = 0	25)							COVID POSITIVE COVID NEGATIVE

#### Sensitivity analysis

	COVID POSITIVE COVID NEGATIVE					IVE		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference			
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, Random, 95% CI		
Aksak et al., 2022	46.9	1.8	100	49.1	17.5	100	0.0%	-0.18 [-0.45, 0.10]		a construction of the second second second		
Al-Alami et al., 2022	6.2	8.7	4	2	2.5	3	0.0%	0.51 [-1.04, 2.06]				
Enikeev et al., 2022	10.9	7.8	44	17.3	14.7	44	20.6%	-0.54 [-0.96, -0.11]				
Gacci et al., 2021 a	2.6	2.3	26	3	2.5	12	19.7%	-0.17 [-0.85, 0.52]				
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021	3.35	1.06	84	12.97	5.32	105	20.8%	-2.38 [-2.75, -2.00]		-		
Temiz et al., 2020	1.5	1.72	10	3	1.72	10	18.6%	-0.84 [-1.76, 0.09]				
Wang et al., 2022	14.97	18.66	26	8.32	6.66	26	20.2%	0.47 [-0.08, 1.02]				
Total (95% CI)			190			197	100.0%	-0.70 [-1.83, 0.43]				
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1.57; C Test for overall effect 7 = 1.2	$hi^2 = 89$ 1 (P = 0		-4	-2 0 2 4								
		,								COVID POSITIVE COVID NEGATIVE		

	BEFORE COV	D 19 TREAT	TMENT	AFTER COV	ID 19 TREAT	MENT		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Dipankar et al., 2022	6	5.4	30	11.1	5.8	30	11.3%	-0.90 [-1.43, -0.37]	
Enikeev et al., 2022	10.9	7.8	44	12.8	8.3	37	12.1%	-0.23 [-0.67, 0.20]	
Falahieh et al., 2021	1.3	1.1	20	3.2	1.7	20	9.9%	-1.30 [-1.99, -0.61]	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	11.38	16.6	21	8.95	11.92	21	10.7%	0.16 [-0.44, 0.77]	
Kumar et al., 2022	12.5	23.3	102	8.5	5.9	137	13.4%	0.25 [-0.01, 0.51]	
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021	3.35	1.06	84	3.75	1.21	84	13.1%	-0.35 [-0.65, -0.05]	
Temiz et al., 2020	1.5	1.72	10	1	0.86	10	8.3%	0.35 [-0.53, 1.24]	
Vahidi et al., 2022	3	0.79	20	5	3.98	20	10.4%	-0.68 [-1.32, -0.04]	
Wang et al., 2022	6.82	3.37	26	4.35	0.78	26	10.9%	0.99 [0.42, 1.57]	
Total (95% CI)			357			385	100.0%	-0.19 [-0.58, 0.21]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; 0	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 49.08, df =	8 (P < 0.00	1001); F= 8	4%					
Test for overall effect Z = 0.9	92 (P = 0.36)								4 -2 0 2

#### Sensitivity analysis

	BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT AFTER COVID 19 TREATMENT							Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Dipankar et al., 2022	6	5.4	30	11.1	5.8	30	17.1%	-0.90 [-1.43, -0.37]	- <b>-</b> -
Enikeev et al., 2022	10.9	7.8	44	12.8	8.3	37	18.1%	-0.23 [-0.67, 0.20]	
Falahieh et al., 2021	1.3	1.1	20	3.2	1.7	20	15.5%	-1.30 [-1.99, -0.61]	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	11.38	16.6	21	8.95	11.92	21	0.0%	0.16 [-0.44, 0.77]	
Kumar et al., 2022	12.5	23.3	102	8.5	5.9	137	0.0%	0.25 [-0.01, 0.51]	
Maleki and Tartibian, 2021	3.35	1.06	84	3.75	1.21	84	19.2%	-0.35 [-0.65, -0.05]	
Temiz et al., 2020	1.5	1.72	10	1	0.86	10	13.4%	0.35 [-0.53, 1.24]	
Vahidi et al., 2022	3	0.79	20	5	3.98	20	0.0%	-0.68 [-1.32, -0.04]	
Wang et al., 2022	6.82	3.37	26	4.35	0.78	26	16.7%	0.99 (0.42, 1.57)	
Total (95% CI)			214			207	100.0%	-0.25 [-0.81, 0.31]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.40; C	hi <sup>2</sup> = 34.44, df =	5 (P < 0.000	101); P= 8	5%				÷	ttt
Test for overall effect Z = 0.89	9 (P = 0.38)							-4	2 U 2 4 BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT AFTER COVID 19 TREATMENT

C.

	COVID	<b>19 POSI</b>	TIVE	PRE	COVID	19		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI	
Hamarat et al., 2022	2.44	1.04	41	3.16	0.92	41	25.9%	-0.73 [-1.17, -0.28]	-	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	8.9	11.9	21	11.3	16.6	21	24.5%	-0.16 [-0.77, 0.44]		
Rafiee and Tabei, 2021	2	0.9	100	4	1.2	100	26.7%	-1.88 [-2.21, -1.54]	•	
Sunnu et al., 2022	0.7	0.8	14	1.2	1.4	14	23.0%	-0.43 [-1.18, 0.32]		
Total (95% CI)			176			176	100.0%	-0.83 [-1.69, 0.03]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.69;	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 35.	46, df = 3	3 (P < 0.	00001);	l <sup>2</sup> = 92	2%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.88 (P = 0.06)									COVID 19 POSITIVE PRECOVID 19	

#### Sensitivity analysis

	COVID	19 POSI	TIVE	PRE	COVID	19		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Hamarat et al., 2022	2.44	1.04	41	3.16	0.92	41	73.8%	-0.73 [-1.17, -0.28]	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	8.9	11.9	21	11.3	16.6	21	0.0%	-0.16 [-0.77, 0.44]	
Rafiee and Tabei, 2021	2	0.9	100	4	1.2	100	0.0%	-1.88 [-2.21, -1.54]	
Sunnu et al., 2022	0.7	0.8	14	1.2	1.4	14	26.2%	-0.43 [-1.18, 0.32]	
Total (95% CI)			55			55	100.0%	-0.65 [-1.03, -0.26]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.45,	df = 1 (P =	0.50); l <sup>2</sup>	= 0%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.3	30 (P = 0.0	010)							-4 -2 U 2 4



https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307396.g014

credible to infer that SARS-CoV-2-induced testosterone decline is a local effect and not due to the suppression of the hypothalamic-pituitary-testicular axis. The observed rise in circulating oestrogen and prolactin concentrations in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients may also suggest the endocrine-disrupting activity of the viral infection as a pathway of impairing male fertility.



Fig 15. Funnel plot of normal sperm morphology comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A), before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B), and COVID-19 positive and preCOVID-19 period (C).

Beyond semen quality, SARS-CoV-2 infection may also impact on the success of testicular sperm extraction, hence on the outcome of assisted reproductive techniques (ART). Testosterone/LH is a known predictor of sperm concentration and successful sperm retrieval [75,76]; therefore, the reduced testosterone/LH level in SARS-CoV-infected patients explains the reduced sperm concentration found in the patients and also reveals a likelihood of reduced

# Α.

	COVID	POSIT	IVE	COVID	NEGAT	IVE		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference			
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI			
Enikeev et al., 2022	0.3	0.2	44	0.3	0.4	44	55.0%	0.00 [-0.42, 0.42]				
Gacci et al., 2021a	0.03	0.07	26	0.08	0.2	12	30.1%	-0.39 [-1.08, 0.30]				
Gacci et al., 2021b	0.7	1.6	5	0.08	0.2	12	14.9%	0.70 [-0.38, 1.77]				
Total (95% CI)			75			68	100.0%	-0.01 [-0.46, 0.43]	+			
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.05; Ch	i <sup>z</sup> = 2.8	3, df = 0	2 (P = 0.2	24); I² =	29%		-				
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.06	(P = 0.9	95)						COVID POSITIVE COVID NEGATIVE			

# Β.

	BEFORE COVIE	19 TREATM	IENT	AFTER COVID	19 TREAT	MENT		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Dipankar et al., 2022	9.5	5.8	30	6.7	3.3	30	33.6%	0.59 [0.07, 1.10]	
Enikeev et al., 2022	0.3	0.2	44	0.4	0.5	44	36.1%	-0.26 [-0.68, 0.16]	
Falahieh et al., 2021	1.5	1.1	20	0.8	0.6	20	30.2%	0.77 [0.13, 1.42]	
Total (95% CI)			94			94	100.0%	0.34 [-0.33, 1.00]	
Heterogeneity:   au <sup>2</sup> = 0	.27; Chi*= 9.79, i	df = 2 (P = 0.1	UU7); M=	80%				-	-4 -2 0 2 4
l est for overall effect. Z	= 0.99 (P = 0.32)								BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT AFTER COVID 19 TREATMENT

Fig 16. Forest plot of seminal leukocyte count comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A) and before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B).



**Fig 17.** Funnel plot of seminal leukocyte count comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A) and before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B).

success rate of sperm retrieval in them. This implies that SARS-CoV-2 may lower the rate of spontaneous conception as well as reduce the success of ARTs. Since testosterone/LH is also a predictor of Leydig cell function [76,77], it is also credible to infer that SARS-CoV-2 impairs Leydig cell function. This may the reduced testosterone found in SARS-CoV-2 positive men.

It is imperative to note that the duration of the infection and time between infection and semen collection might have an effect on the study outcomes. Findings of Koç and Keseroğlu [48], and Temiz et al.[63] that performed semen analysis after 5 and 4 days of infection respectively showed insignificant changes for most of the sperm variables and testosterone level. It is also worth mentioning that most of the eligible studies were published between 2020 and 2022, indicating that they were likely before the introduction of COVID-19 vaccines and also before the infection by the most recent and less dangerous variants of COVID-19; hence, the impact of the virus may differ. It is likely that COVID-19 vaccination confers protection against sperm-endocrine aberrations induced by the novel virus. More so, the less virulent variants of COVID-19 may exert less adverse effect on the sperm-endocrine system than the virulent variant. Just like other systematic viral infections, SARS-CoV-2 impairs male fertility possibly by upregulating pro-inflammatory cytokines and promoting hyper-inflammation and oxidative stress or direct sperm-endocrine alterations [3]. The peculiarity of SARS-CoV-2 hinges around its novelty.

Despite the fascinating and convincing findings of this study, there are some limitations. First, the effect of SARS-CoV-2 on live-birth rate is not presented, which limits our conclusion

	COVI		VE	COVID NEGATIVE				Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Al-Bashiti et al., 2022	1.53	1.24	81	3.87	1.44	76	6.8%	-1.74 [-2.11, -1.37]	
Azzawi and Abdulrahman, 2022	5.64	1.2	60	8.51	2.24	30	6.6%	-1.76 [-2.27, -1.25]	
Camici et al., 2021	1.65	1.654	24	3.28	1.57	24	6.4%	-0.99 [-1.60, -0.39]	
Cinislioglu et al., 2022	179	136	358	344	115	92	7.0%	-1.25 [-1.49, -1.00]	+
Enikeev et al., 2022	7.3	2.7	44	13.5	5.2	44	6.7%	-1.48 [-1.96, -1.01]	_ <b>_</b>
Guo et al., 2021	3.6	1.22	41	3.5	1.14	50	6.8%	0.08 [-0.33, 0.50]	
Hadisi et al., 2022	240	117	60	268	101	60	6.9%	-0.25 [-0.61, 0.10]	
Kadihasanoglu et al., 2021	185.52	134.97	89	332	88.37	143	6.9%	-1.34 [-1.64, -1.05]	
Livingston et al., 2022	4.36	4.01	85	6.25	5.82	25	6.7%	-0.42 [-0.87, 0.03]	
Ma et al., 2021	4.3	1.95	119	4.39	1.28	273	7.0%	-0.06 [-0.27, 0.16]	+
Okçelik, 2020	12.29	6.22	24	11.25	5.63	20	6.4%	0.17 [-0.42, 0.77]	
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021	3.97	0.77	60	5.79	0.53	40	6.5%	-2.64 [-3.18, -2.09]	
Salonia et al., 2021	2.74	2.75	286	10.64	3.94	281	7.0%	-2.33 [-2.54, -2.11]	+
Temiz et al., 2020	1.13	1.28	10	2.9	1.87	10	5.6%	-1.06 [-2.01, -0.11]	
Xu et al., 2021	3.932	1.081	39	3.838	0.966	22	6.6%	0.09 [-0.43, 0.61]	
Total (05% CI)			1300			1100	100.0%	100[140 051]	
Total (95% CI)									
Heterogeneity: Tauf = 0.87; Chif =	-4 -2 0 2 4								
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.02 (P <	< 0.0001)	COVID 19 POSITIVE COVID 19 NEGATIVE							

## В.

	BEFORE COV	D 19 TREAT	MENT	AFTER COV	ID 19 TREAT	TMENT		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Enikeev et al., 2022	7.3	2.7	44	18.7	4.5	37	16.5%	-3.11 [-3.77, -2.45]	+
Gul et al., 2021	423	100	29	432	123	29	17.0%	-0.08 [-0.59, 0.44]	+
Guo et al., 2021	3.4	0.87	22	3.54	1.74	22	16.8%	-0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]	+
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	350.1	115	21	289.8	103.3	21	16.7%	0.54 [-0.08, 1.16]	++-
Salonia et al., 2022	2.98	2.62	121	10.03	5.02	121	17.5%	-1.76 [-2.05, -1.46]	+
Temiz et al., 2020	1.13	1.28	10	2.26	1.86	10	15.6%	-0.68 [-1.59, 0.23]	
Total (95% CI)			247			240	100.0%	-0.87 [-1.90, 0.16]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1.56;	Chi² = 108.59, d	f= 5 (P < 0.0	0001); I <sup>2</sup> =	95%				-	
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.6	65 (P = 0.10)								BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT AFTER COVID 19 TREATMENT

## Sensitivity analysis

	BEFORE COV	ID 19 TREAT	IMENT	AFTER COV	ID 19 TREA	TMENT		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI	
Enikeev et al., 2022	7.3	2.7	44	18.7	4.5	37	33.6%	-3.11 [-3.77, -2.45]		_
Gul et al., 2021	423	100	29	432	123	29	0.0%	-0.08 [-0.59, 0.44]		
Guo et al., 2021	3.4	0.87	22	3.54	1.74	22	33.9%	-0.10 [-0.69, 0.49]	-	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	350.1	115	21	289.8	103.3	21	0.0%	0.54 [-0.08, 1.16]		
Salonia et al., 2022	2.98	2.62	121	10.03	5.02	121	0.0%	-1.76 [-2.05, -1.46]		
Temiz et al., 2020	1.13	1.28	10	2.26	1.86	10	32.5%	-0.68 [-1.59, 0.23]		
Total (95% CI)			76			69	100.0%	-1.30 [-3.27, 0.67]	-	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 2.88; 0	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 46.71, df	= 2 (P < 0.0	0001); l² = !	96%				+		÷
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.3	0 (P = 0.20)							-1	BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT AFTER COVID 19 TREATMENT	

## С.

	COVID	19 POSI	TIVE	PRE	COVID 1	9		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Gul et al., 2021	432	123	29	423	100	29	32.1%	0.08 [-0.44, 0.59]	
Karkin and Gurlen, 2022	253.85	88.03	348	351.08	106.19	348	38.1%	-1.00 [-1.15, -0.84]	•
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	289.8	103.3	21	350.1	115.5	21	29.9%	-0.54 [-1.16, 0.08]	
Total (95% CI)			398			398	100.0%	-0.51 [-1.22, 0.19]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.33; Test for overall effect: Z = 1.4	Chi² = 16. 44 (P = 0.1	57, df = 2  5)	(P = 0.0	0003); I² :	= 88%				-4 -2 0 2 4 COVID 19 POSITIVE PRECOVID 19

**Fig 18.** Forest plot of serum testosterone level comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A), before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B), and COVID-19 positive and preCOVID-19 period (C).

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307396.g018

on the effect of the viral diseases on male fertility. Also, there were remarkable risk of publication bias in many of the studies. More so, the significant diversity in most of the studies is a major concern, although this was controlled by a sensitivity analysis. Lastly, studies exploring the actual mechanisms on SARS-CoV-2 on semen quality and male sex hormones are lacking and most studies were speculative. Nonetheless, the present meta-analysis provides an update and a robust data delineating the consequences of SARS-CoV-2 on conventional semen



Fig 19. Funnel plot of serum testosterone level comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A), before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B), and COVID-19 positive and preCOVID-19 period (C).

parameters and male sex hormones. Detailed Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis of the current study is shown in Fig 29.

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that SARS-CoV-2 may diminish fertility in male by reducing semen quality viz. ejaculate volume, sperm count, concentration, viability, motility, and normal morphology through a hormone-dependent mechanism (reduction in testoster-one level and increase in oestrogen and prolactin levels). It is also likely that the induction of oxidative stress and inflammatory injury play significant roles. More well-designed studies which accommodate larger sample size should be conducted to validate these findings, evaluate the long term effect of SARS-CoV-2 on sperm function and testosterone concentration, establish the associated mechanisms, and address the weaknesses highlighted are recommended.



https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307396.g020

	COVID	19 POSI	TIVE	COVID	19 NEGA	TIVE	:	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Abbas et al., 2022	9.93	4.9	70	7.63	3.72	50	15.4%	0.51 [0.14, 0.88]	
Enikeev et al., 2022	277.06	102.69	44	136.58	45.98	44	14.1%	1.75 [1.26, 2.24]	
Guo et al., 2021	14.57	7.83	41	11	4.57	50	14.9%	0.57 [0.15, 0.99]	_ <b></b>
Hadisi et al., 2022	208.23	111.56	60	221.52	65.07	60	15.5%	-0.14 [-0.50, 0.21]	
Kadihasanoglu et al., 2021	9.6	4.21	89	7.57	1.39	143	16.3%	0.72 [0.44, 0.99]	
Temiz et al., 2020	5.44	2.54	10	5.71	1.44	10	10.0%	-0.13 [-1.00, 0.75]	
Xu et al., 2021	14.594	5.154	39	13.196	4.955	22	13.8%	0.27 [-0.25, 0.80]	
Total (95% CI)			353			379	100.0%	0.53 [0.11, 0.95]	<b>•</b>
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.27; C	hi <sup>z</sup> = 41.8	8, df = 6 (	P < 0.00	001); l² =	86%				
Test for overall effect. $Z = 2.45$	) (F = 0.0	9							COVID 19 POSITIVE COVID 19 NEGATIVE

## В.

	BEFORE COV	ID 19 TREAT	MENT	AFTER COVI	D 19 TREAT	MENT		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Enikeev et al., 2022	277.06	102.69	44	144.71	58.61	37	34.9%	1.53 [1.03, 2.03]	+
Guo et al., 2021	17.67	12.04	22	15.15	8.08	22	34.2%	0.24 [-0.35, 0.83]	
Temiz et al., 2020	5.44	2.54	10	8.31	4.65	10	30.9%	-0.73 [-1.65, 0.18]	
Total (95% CI)			76			69	100.0%	0.39 [-0.85, 1.64]	
Heterogeneity: Tau² =	1.09; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 22	.42, df = 2 (P	< 0.0001);	I² = 91%					-4 -2 1 2 4
Test for overall effect: J	Z = 0.62 (P = 0.	54)							BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT AFTER COVID 19 TREATMENT

Fig 21. Forest plot of serum prolactin level comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A) and before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B).





Fig 22. Funnel plot of serum prolactin level comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A) and before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B).

\_

	COVID	19 POSI	TIVE	COVID	19 NEGA	TIVE		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Abbas et al., 2022	4.51	2.28	70	3.9	1.44	50	8.5%	0.31 [-0.06, 0.67]	
Azzawi and Abdulrahman, 2022	9.52	2.92	60	5.26	1.69	30	8.2%	1.64 [1.14, 2.14]	
Cinislioglu et al., 2022	7.3	4.35	358	3.75	1.72	92	8.7%	0.90 [0.66, 1.13]	-
Enikeev et al., 2022	3.34	1.22	44	2.85	1.22	44	8.4%	0.40 [-0.02, 0.82]	
Guo et al., 2021	3.81	1.38	41	3.6	1.52	50	8.4%	0.14 [-0.27, 0.56]	+
Hadisi et al., 2022	6.46	3.93	60	3.644	1.42	60	8.4%	0.95 [0.57, 1.32]	
Kadihasanoglu et al., 2021	5.67	3.4	89	4.1	1.96	143	8.6%	0.60 [0.33, 0.87]	-
Ma et al., 2021	6.45	2.8	119	3.46	1.52	273	8.6%	1.50 [1.26, 1.73]	
Okçelik, 2020	6.57	7.88	24	5.71	6.38	20	8.0%	0.12 [-0.48, 0.71]	- <del></del>
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021	6.07	0.054	60	3.2	0.06	40	0.6%	50.44 [43.30, 57.58]	•
Salonia et al., 2021	4.8	2.75	286	4.17	1.78	28	8.4%	0.23 [-0.15, 0.62]	+
Temiz et al., 2020	2.94	1.419	10	4.46	1.77	10	7.1%	-0.91 [-1.84, 0.02]	
Xu et al., 2021	5.519	2.705	39	8.051	6.048	22	8.1%	-0.59 [-1.13, -0.06]	
Total (95% CI)			1260			862	100.0%	0.75 [0.19, 1.31]	◆
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.93$ ; $Chi^2 = Taut for every ll effects T = 2.62 (D =$	302.87, d	-4 -2 0 2 4							
restructoverali effect: Z = 2.63 (P =	0.009)								COVID 19 POSITIVE COVID 19 NEGATIVE

# Sensitivity analysis

	COVID	19 POSI	TIVE	COVID	COVID 19 NEGATIVE			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Abbas et al., 2022	4.51	2.28	70	3.9	1.44	50	0.0%	0.31 [-0.06, 0.67]	
Azzawi and Abdulrahman, 2022	9.52	2.92	60	5.26	1.69	30	12.4%	1.64 [1.14, 2.14]	
Cinislioglu et al., 2022	7.3	4.35	358	3.75	1.72	92	0.0%	0.90 [0.66, 1.13]	
Enikeev et al., 2022	3.34	1.22	44	2.85	1.22	44	12.5%	0.40 [-0.02, 0.82]	
Guo et al., 2021	3.81	1.38	41	3.6	1.52	50	12.5%	0.14 [-0.27, 0.56]	
Hadisi et al., 2022	6.46	3.93	60	3.644	1.42	60	12.5%	0.95 [0.57, 1.32]	
Kadihasanoglu et al., 2021	5.67	3.4	89	4.1	1.96	143	0.0%	0.60 [0.33, 0.87]	
Ma et al., 2021	6.45	2.8	119	3.46	1.52	273	0.0%	1.50 [1.26, 1.73]	
Okçelik, 2020	6.57	7.88	24	5.71	6.38	20	12.2%	0.12 [-0.48, 0.71]	- <del>-</del>
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021	6.07	0.054	60	3.2	0.06	40	1.6%	50.44 [43.30, 57.58]	•
Salonia et al., 2021	4.8	2.75	286	4.17	1.78	28	12.5%	0.23 [-0.15, 0.62]	+
Temiz et al., 2020	2.94	1.419	10	4.46	1.77	10	11.5%	-0.91 [-1.84, 0.02]	
Xu et al., 2021	5.519	2.705	39	8.051	6.048	22	12.3%	-0.59 [-1.13, -0.06]	
Total (95% CI)			624			304	100.0%	1.09 [0.10, 2.07]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1.97; Chi <sup>2</sup> =	243.63. c	f = 8 (P =	< 0.0000	1); <b> </b> ² = 9)	'%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.17 (P =	0.03)								
									COVID 19 POSITIVE COVID 19 NEGATIVE

# Β.

	BEFORE COVI	D 19 TREAT	MENT	AFTER COV	ID 19 TREAT	MENT	1	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Enikeev et al., 2022	3.34	1.22	44	3.09	1.92	37	55.6%	0.16 [-0.28, 0.59]	
Guo et al., 2021	3.7	1.03	22	3.8	1.1	22	30.5%	-0.09 [-0.68, 0.50]	
Temiz et al., 2020	2.98	1.41	10	3.22	3.29	10	13.9%	-0.09 [-0.97, 0.79]	
Total (95% CI)			76	~~		69	100.0%	0.05 [-0.28, 0.37]	
Test for overall effect:	0.00; Cni* = 0.5: Z = 0.28 (P = 0.7	o, ατ= 2 (P= '8)	0.76); I*=	0%				_	BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT AFTER COVID 19 TREATMENT

# С.

	COVID	19 POSIT	TIVE	PREC	COVID	19		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Gul et al., 2021	4.62	1.68	29	4.46	1.62	29	32.8%	0.10 [-0.42, 0.61]	+
Karkin and Gurlen, 2022	9.72	3.27	348	5.72	2.5	348	35.5%	1.37 [1.21, 1.54]	
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	3.1	1.3	21	3	1.2	21	31.8%	0.08 [-0.53, 0.68]	
Total (95% CI)			398			398	100.0%	0.54 [-0.47, 1.56]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; ( Test for overall effect: Z = 1.0	Chi² = 34.9 15 (P = 0.2	99, df = 2 (9)	! (P < 0.	00001);	<sup>2</sup> = 94	1%		-	-4 -2 0 2 4 COVID 19 POSITIVE PRECOVID 19

**Fig 23.** Forest plot of serum luteinizing hormone (LH) level comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A), before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B), and COVID-19 positive and preCOVID-19 period (C).





	COVID	19 POSI	TIVE	COVID	19 NEGAT	IVE	1	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Abbas et al., 2022	7.18	6.74	70	5.57	3.58	50	8.1%	0.28 [-0.08, 0.65]	++
Azzawi and Abdulrahman, 2022	11.2	2.28	60	6.08	2.97	30	7.1%	2.01 [1.48, 2.54]	
Cinislioglu et al., 2022	7.52	6.69	358	4.64	2.05	92	8.7%	0.48 [0.24, 0.71]	
Enikeev et al., 2022	5.14	2.91	44	3.31	1.83	44	7.7%	0.75 [0.31, 1.18]	
Guo et al., 2021	4.63	1.45	41	4.7	1.9	50	7.8%	-0.04 [-0.45, 0.37]	
Hadisi et al., 2022	7.47	5.13	60	4.71	6.31	60	8.1%	0.48 [0.11, 0.84]	
Kadihasanoglu et al., 2021	6.01	4.64	89	6.05	3.63	143	8.6%	-0.01 [-0.27, 0.25]	
Ma et al., 2021	4.8	2.64	119	4.85	2.13	273	8.8%	-0.02 [-0.24, 0.19]	-+-
Okçelik, 2020	3.4	1.79	24	3.14	1.33	20	6.7%	0.16 [-0.43, 0.75]	
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021	4.51	0.66	60	5.13	0.45	40	7.7%	-1.05 [-1.48, -0.62]	
Salonia et al., 2021	6.08	3.5	286	6.2	2.75	281	9.0%	-0.04 [-0.20, 0.13]	+
Temiz et al., 2020	2.04	1.36	10	3.92	2.35	10	4.8%	-0.94 [-1.87, -0.00]	
Xu et al., 2021	8.763	4.952	39	14.407	12.918	22	7.1%	-0.64 [-1.18, -0.11]	
Total (95% CI)			1260			1115	100.0%	0.13 [-0.16, 0.43]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.24; Chi <sup>2</sup> =	118.46, c	_	-2 -1 0 1 2						
lest for overall effect: Z = 0.89 (P =	0.37)								COVID 19 POSITIVE COVID 19 NEGATIVE

# Sensitivity analysis

	COVID	19 PO SI	TIVE	COVID	19 NEGA	TIVE		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Abbas et al., 2022	7.18	6.74	70	5.57	3.58	50	0.0%	0.28 [-0.08, 0.65]	
Azzawi and Abdulrahman, 2022	11.2	2.28	60	6.08	2.97	30	8.7%	2.01 [1.48, 2.54]	
Cinislioglu et al., 2022	7.52	6.69	358	4.64	2.05	92	10.1%	0.48 [0.24, 0.71]	
Enikeev et al., 2022	5.14	2.91	44	3.31	1.83	44	9.3%	0.75 [0.31, 1.18]	
Guo et al., 2021	4.63	1.45	41	4.7	1.9	50	9.4%	-0.04 [-0.45, 0.37]	
Hadisi et al., 2022	7.47	5.13	60	4.71	6.31	60	9.6%	0.48 [0.11, 0.84]	
Kadihasanoglu et al., 2021	6.01	4.64	89	6.05	3.63	143	10.0%	-0.01 [-0.27, 0.25]	
Ma et al., 2021	4.8	2.64	119	4.85	2.13	273	10.2%	-0.02 [-0.24, 0.19]	
Okçelik, 2020	3.4	1.79	24	3.14	1.33	20	8.4%	0.16 [-0.43, 0.75]	
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021	4.51	0.66	60	5.13	0.45	40	9.3%	-1.05 [-1.48, -0.62]	_ <b></b>
Salonia et al., 2021	6.08	3.5	286	6.2	2.75	281	0.0%	-0.04 [-0.20, 0.13]	
Temiz et al., 2020	2.04	1.36	10	3.92	2.35	10	6.4%	-0.94 [-1.87, -0.00]	
Xu et al., 2021	8.763	4.952	39	14.407	12.918	22	8.7%	-0.64 [-1.18, -0.11]	<b>-</b>
			004			704	400.00	0.401.005.0541	
Total (95% CI)			904			184	100.0%	0.13 [-0.25, 0.51]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.35; Chi <sup>2</sup> =	113.71, 0	#f = 10 (P	< 0.000	01); I <sup>2</sup> = 1	91%			-	-2 -1 0 1 2
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.68 (P =	: 0.50)								COVID 19 POSITIVE COVID 19 NEGATIVE

# Β.

	BEFORE COV	D 19 TREAT	MENT	AFTER COV	ID 19 TREAT	MENT		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Enikeev et al., 2022	5.14	2.91	44	5.21	3.47	37	26.7%	-0.02 [-0.46, 0.42]	
Guo et al., 2021	4.99	1.66	22	4.6	1.9	22	24.6%	0.21 (-0.38, 0.81)	
Salonia et al., 2022	4.85	2.13	121	8.22	3.9	121	28.5%	-1.07 [-1.34, -0.80]	+
Temiz et al., 2020	2.04	1.36	10	3.15	2.7	10	20.2%	-0.50 [-1.39, 0.40]	
Total (95% CI)			197			190	-0.36 [-1.07, 0.35]		
Heterogeneity: Tau* =	0.44; Chi* = 25.	49, df = 3 (P	< 0.0001)	-4 -2 0 2 4					
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.99 (P = 0.3	(2)			BEFORE COVID 19 TREATMENT AFTER COVID 19 TREATMENT				

# С.

	COVID 19 POSITIVE			PRECOVID 19				Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Gul et al., 2021	4.15	2.22	29	3.92	1.97	29	7.3%	0.11 [-0.41, 0.62]	<b>-</b>
Karkin and Gurlen, 2022	6.24	2.84	348	5.93	2.55	348	87.4%	0.11 [-0.03, 0.26]	<b></b>
Koç and Keseroğlu, 2021	4.7	1.6	21	4.6	1.8	21	5.3%	0.06 [-0.55, 0.66]	
Total (95% CI)			398			398	100.0%	0.11 [-0.03, 0.25]	<b>•</b>
Heterorganeity: Chi2=0.03 df = 7 (P = 0.98): P = 0.96									
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.57 (P = 0.12)									-2 -1 0 1 2 COVID 19 POSITIVE PRECOVID 19

**Fig 25.** Forest plot of serum follicle-stimulating hormone (FSH) level comparing between COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative patients (A), before COVID-19 treatment and after COVID-19 treatment (B), and COVID-19 positive and preCOVID-19 period (C).





	COVID 1	9 POSIT	IVE	COVID 1	9 NEGA	IVE		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Cinislioglu et al., 2022	34.8	47.1	358	116	74	92	26.8%	-1.51 [-1.76, -1.26]	+
Ma et al., 2021	0.69	0.39	119	1.33	0.68	273	26.9%	-1.05 [-1.28, -0.82]	+
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021	0.65	0.15	60	1.8	0.17	40	22.5%	-7.21 [-8.31, -6.12]	←
Temiz et al., 2020	0.42	0.36	10	0.6	0.25	10	23.8%	-0.56 [-1.45, 0.34]	
Total (95% CI)			547			415	100.0%	-2.44 [-3.69, -1.19]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1.50; (	Chi² = 121.0	19, df = 3	(P ≤ 0.	00001); P	°= 98%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.8	3 (P = 0.00	01)							COVID 19 POSITIVE COVID 19 NEGATIVE
3.									
n- <sup>SE(SMD)</sup>									
~									
					00	D			
0.2+									
0.4+									
						0			
~									
<sup>0.0</sup> T									
				1					
n 8+									
0.0									
									SMD
1		+		<u> </u>			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
		-4		-2			0	2	4
ig 27. Forest (A) and fu	nnel (B) p	olots of	serun	n testost	erone/l	uteiniz	zing hor	mone (T/LH) ratio c	omparing between COVID-19 positive and
OVID-19 negative patie	nts.								-

	COVID	19 POSI	TIVE	COVID 1	19 NEGA	TIVE		Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, Random, 95% Cl	
Ma et al., 2021	0.78	0.38	111	1.46	0.67	273	34.2%	-1.13 [-1.36, -0.89]			
Piroozmanesh et al., 2021	0.74	0.17	60	1.6	0.19	40	33.0%	-4.79 [-5.57, -4.00]		* _	
Temiz et al., 2020	0.87	0.36	10	0.97	0.35	10	32.7%	-0.27 [-1.15, 0.61]		•	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity Tau? - 4 02: 0	•hiZ− 075	0 df-2	<b>181</b> /₽ < 0.0	10001\·IZ-	- 0.0%	323	100.0%	-2.06 [-4.36, 0.25]	+	•	_
Test for overall effect: 7 = 1.7	5 (P = 0 02.5	3, ur - 2 3)	(1 ~ 0.0	10001),1 -	- 30 /0				-20	-10 0 10 20	I
	ο (i = 0.0t	-,								COVID 19 POSITIVE COVID 19 NEGATIVE	
В.											
$0 + \frac{SE(SMD)}{T}$						T.					
						1					
0.1 +						10	n –				
							<i>.</i>				
0.2+						1					
						1					
						1					
						1					
0.5						1					
						1					
						- i					
0.4+					0	1					
						1					
						i	0				



https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307396.g028

0.5

-20

SMD

20

THREATS

<ul> <li>An update of meta-analyses, presenting a more robust data with the largest pooled sample</li> <li>Conducted by experts in Andrology and microbiology</li> <li>Fixed-effect model and/or random-effect model were used appropriately</li> <li>Thorough appraisal of RoB and certainty of evidence are provided</li> <li>Data on hormonal mechanism is provided</li> <li>Independently analyzed and disputes rsolved by experts</li> </ul>	.A tool for relevant scientific societies to make a firm position on the impact of SARS-CoV-2 on male fertility .A guide for Andrologists/Urologists/Reproductive Health Practitioners in the management of male infertility .More well-designed studies with larger sample size should be conducted to: >validate these findings >evaluate the long term effect of SARS-CoV-2 >establish the associated mechanisms
STRENGTHS	>address the weaknesses highlighted OPPORTUNITIES

.Slow dissemination of the present findings

# WEAKNESSES

Fig 29. The Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis of the current study.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307396.g029

# Supporting information

**S1 Checklist. PRISMA 2020 checklist.** (DOCX)

**S1 Raw data.** (ZIP)

# **Author Contributions**

Conceptualization: R. E. Akhigbe.
Data curation: R. E. Akhigbe.
Formal analysis: Akhigbe T. M., R. E. Akhigbe.
Funding acquisition: R. E. Akhigbe.
Investigation: Ashonibare V. J., Ashonibare P. J., Akhigbe T. M., R. E. Akhigbe.
Methodology: Akhigbe T. M., R. E. Akhigbe.
Project administration: Ashonibare V. J., Ashonibare P. J., Akhigbe T. M., R. E. Akhigbe.
Resources: R. E. Akhigbe.
Supervision: Akhigbe T. M., R. E. Akhigbe.

Validation: R. E. Akhigbe.

Writing – original draft: Ashonibare V. J., Ashonibare P. J., R. E. Akhigbe.

Writing - review & editing: Ashonibare V. J., Ashonibare P. J., Akhigbe T. M., R. E. Akhigbe.

# References

- Wu Z., McGoogan J. M. Characteristics of and Important Lessons from the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in China: summary of a report of 72 314 cases from the Chinese center for disease control and prevention. *JAMA*. 2020; 323:1239–1242. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.2648 PMID: 32091533
- Abdel-Moneim A. COVID-19 Pandemic and Male Fertility: Clinical Manifestations and Pathogenic Mechanisms. Biochemistry (Mosc). 2021 Apr; 86(4):389–396. <u>https://doi.org/10.1134/</u> S0006297921040015 PMID: 33941061
- Akhigbe RE, Dutta S, Hamed MA, Ajayi AF, Sengupta P and Ahmad G (2022) Viral Infections and Male Infertility: A Comprehensive Review of the Role of Oxidative Stress. Front. Reprod. Health 4:782915. https://doi.org/10.3389/frph.2022.782915 PMID: 36303638
- 4. Akhigbe RE, Hamed MA. Possible links between COVID-19 and male fertility. Asian Pac J Reprod 2020; 9(5): 211–214.
- Renhong Y., Yuanyuan Z., Yaning L., Lu X., Yingying G., Qiang Z. (2020. Structural basis for the recognition of SARS-CoV-2 by full-length human ACE2. *Science* 367,1444–1448. <u>https://doi.org/10.1126/ science.abb2762</u> PMID: 32132184
- Adeyemi DH, Odetayo AF, Hamed MA, Akhigbe RE. Impact of COVID 19 on erectile function. The Aging Male. 2022 Dec 31; 25(1):202–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/13685538.2022.2104833 PMID: 35924485
- Cevik M., Bamford C. G. G., & Ho A. (2020). COVID-19 pandemic-a focused review for clinicians. *Clinical microbiology and infection: the official publication of the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases*, 26(7), 842–847. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.04.023.
- 8. Ajayi AF, Akhigbe RE, Ram SK, Kuku A, Bamidele JO. Management of COVID-19 among health care givers: an Afro-Asian perspective. Asian J. Epidemiol. 2021; 14 (1): 11–21.
- 9. World Health Organization (2020) WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. Data last updated: 2021/3/12, URL: https://covid19.who.int.
- Sun J. The hypothesis that SARS-CoV-2 affects male reproductive ability by regulating autophagy. Med Hypotheses. 2020; 143:110083. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2020.110083 PMID: 32679425
- Yang M, Chen S, Huang B, et al. Pathological findings in the testes of COVID-19 patients: clinical implications. *Eur Urol Focus*. 2020; 6:1124–1129. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euf.2020.05.009</u> PMID: 32563676
- Seymen CM. The other side of COVID-19 pandemic: Effects on male fertility. J Med Virol. 2021 Mar; 93 (3):1396–1402. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.26667 PMID: 33200417
- Wang T., Du Z., Zhu F., Cao Z., An Y., et al. Comorbidities and multi-organ injuries in the treatment of COVID-19. Lancet. 2020; 395:e52. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30558-4 PMID: 32171074
- Guan W. J., Ni Z. Y., Hu Y., Liang W. H., Ou C. Q., He J. X., et al, ... China Medical Treatment Expert Group for Covid-19 (2020). Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *The New England journal of medicine*, 382(18), 1708–1720. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2002032 PMID: 32109013
- Karlberg J., Chong D. S., & Lai W. Y. (2004). Do men have a higher case fatality rate of severe acute respiratory syndrome than women do?. *American journal of epidemiology*, 159(3), 229–231. https://doi. org/10.1093/aje/kwh056 PMID: 14742282
- Khalili M. A., Leisegang K., Majzoub A., Finelli R., Panner Selvam M. K., Henkel R., et al. (2020). Male Fertility and the COVID-19 Pandemic: Systematic Review of the Literature. *The world journal of men's health*, 38(4), 506–520. https://doi.org/10.5534/wjmh.200134 PMID: 32814369
- Zhou P., Yang X. L., Wang X. G., Hu B., Zhang L., Zhang W., et al. (2020). A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature*, 579(7798), 270–273. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7</u> PMID: 32015507
- Xu J., Qi L., Chi X., Yang J., Wei X., Gong E., et al. (2006). Orchitis: a complication of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS). *Biology of reproduction*, 74(2), 410–416. <u>https://doi.org/10.1095/ biolreprod.105.044776 PMID: 16237152</u>

- Verdecchia P., Cavallini C., Spanevello A., & Angeli F. (2020). The pivotal link between ACE2 deficiency and SARS-CoV-2 infection. *European journal of internal medicine*, 76, 14–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejim.2020.04.037 PMID: 32336612
- Hamming I., Timens W., Bulthuis M. L., Lely A. T., Navis G., & van Goor H. (2004). Tissue distribution of ACE2 protein, the functional receptor for SARS coronavirus. A first step in understanding SARS pathogenesis. *The Journal of pathology*, 203(2), 631–637. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/path.1570</u> PMID: 15141377
- Corona G, Vena W, Pizzocaro A, Pallotti F, Paoli D, Rastrelli G, et al. Andrological effects of SARS-Cov-2 infection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of endocrinological investigation. 2022 Dec; 45(12):2207–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40618-022-01801-x PMID: 35527294
- 22. Tiwari S, Kc N, Thapa S, Ghimire A, Bijukchhe S, Sah GS, et al. Semen parameters in men recovered from COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Middle East Fertility Society Journal. 2021 Dec; 26:44. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43043-021-00089-w PMID: 34876801
- Hamilton O. Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies. Hamilton, Ontario: National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools (2008). Available at: <a href="http://dev.nccmt.ca/resources/search/14">http://dev.nccmt.ca/resources/search/14</a> (accessed on 13th March, 2024).
- 24. OHAT (Office of Health Assessment and Translation) and NTP (National Toxicology Program). OHAT Risk of Bias Rating Tool for Human and Animal Studies. Institute for Environmental Health Sciences, US Department of Health and Human Services 2015. Available at: https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/sites/ default/files/ntp/ohat/pubs/riskofbiastool\_508.pdf (accessed on 13th March, 2024).
- 25. OHAT (Office of Health Assessment and Translation) and NTP (National Toxicology Program). Handbook for Conducting a Literature-Based Health Assessment Using OHAT Approach for Systematic Review and Evidence Integration. Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, US Department of Health and Human Services 2019. Available at: https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/sites/default/files/ntp/ohat/pubs/handbookmarch2019\_508.pdf (accessed on 13th March, 2024).
- GRADE (Grading of Recommendations Assessment Development and Evaluation Working Group). GRADE guidelines—Best Practices Using the GRADE Framework 2014. Available at: https://training. cochrane.org/resource/grade-handbook (accessed on 13th March, 2024).
- 27. Abbas MA, Al-Shakir NM, Amal H. Influence of COVID-19 infections on LH, FSH and prolactin level in group of males recovered from COVID-19 in Baghdad. Al-Nisour J Med Sci. 2022; 4(1).
- Aksak T, Satar DA, Bağci R, Gultekin EO, Coşkun A, Demirdelen U. Investigation of the effect of COVID-19 on sperm count, motility, and morphology. J Med Virol. 2022; 94:5201-5205.
- Al-Alami ZM, Albeitawi S, ALNatsheh MS, Albakri K, Qublan H, Muhaidat N, et al. COVID-19 and semen fluid parameters, a retrospective study from infertility clinics. Life. 2022 Dec 10; 12(12):2076. https://doi.org/10.3390/life12122076 PMID: 36556441
- Al-Bashiti AI, Ahmed KA, Alqaisi KM. Relationship of inflammatory mediators and sex-related parameters in Jordanian adult men patients with Covid-19. Journal of Medical Biochemistry. 2022 Oct 10; 41 (4):474. https://doi.org/10.5937/jomb0-35601 PMID: 36381078
- Azzawi A. T. H. and Abdulrahman M. A. (2022). The effect of some hormonal variables on the blood serum of men recovered from COVID-19 in Fallujah city. International Journal of Health Sciences, 6 (S2): 13983–13989.
- 32. Best JC, Kuchakulla M, Khodamoradi K, Lima TF, Frech FS, Achua J, et al. Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 in human semen and effect on total sperm number: a prospective observational study. The world journal of men's health. 2021 Jul; 39(3):489. https://doi.org/10.5534/wjmh.200192 PMID: 33663031
- 33. Camici M, Zuppi P, Lorenzini P, Scarnecchia L, Pinnetti C, Cicalini S, et al. Role of testosterone in SARS-CoV-2 infection: A key pathogenic factor and a biomarker for severe pneumonia. International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2021 Jul 1; 108:244–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2021.05.042 PMID: 34023492
- Cinislioglu AE, Cinislioglu N, Demirdogen SO, et al. The relationship of serum testosterone levels with the clinical course and prognosis of COVID-19 disease in male patients: A prospective study. Andrology. 2022; 10:24–33. https://doi.org/10.1111/andr.13081 PMID: 34288536
- Dipankar SP, Kumar T, Itagi AB, Naik BN, Kumar Y, Sharma M, et al. Semen quality in males suffering from COVID-19: a pilot study. Cureus. 2022 Nov 22; 14(11). https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.31776 PMID: 36569699
- **36.** Enikeev D, Taratkin M, Morozov A, et al. Prospective two-arm study of testicular function in patients with COVID-19. Andrology. 2022;1–10.
- Erbay G, Sanli A, Turel H, Yavuz U, Erdogan A, Karabakan M, et al. Short-term effects of COVID-19 on semen parameters: a multicenter study of 69 cases. Andrology. 2021 Jul; 9(4):1060–5. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1111/andr.13019">https://doi.org/10.1111/andr.13019</a> PMID: 33851521

- Falahieh FM, Zarabadipour M, Mirani M, Abdiyan M, Dinparvar M, Alizadeh H, et al. Effects of moderate COVID-19 infection on semen oxidative status and parameters 14 and 120 days after diagnosis. Reproduction, Fertility and Development. 2021 Jul 30; 33(12):683–90. https://doi.org/10.1071/RD21153 PMID: 34324827
- Gacci M, Coppi M, Baldi E, Sebastianelli A, Zaccaro C, Morselli S, et al. Semen impairment and occurrence of SARS-CoV-2 virus in semen after recovery from COVID-19. Human Reproduction. 2021 Jun 1; 36(6):1520–9. https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/deab026 PMID: 33522572
- 40. Gul A, Zengin S, Dundar G, Ozturk M. Do SARS-CoV-2 infection (COVID-19) and the medications administered for its treatment impair testicular functions?. Urologia internationalis. 2021 Oct 29; 105 (11–12):944–8. https://doi.org/10.1159/000517925 PMID: 34433173
- Guo TH, Sang MY, Bai S, Ma H, Wan YY, Jiang XH, et al. Semen parameters in men recovered from COVID-19. Asian journal of andrology. 2021 Sep 1; 23(5):479–83. <u>https://doi.org/10.4103/aja.aja\_31\_</u> 21 PMID: 33975987
- Hadisi N, Abedi H, Shokoohi M, Tasdemir S, Mamikhani S, Meshgi S, et al. COVID-19 and endocrine system: a cross-sectional study on 60 patients with endocrine abnormality. Cell Journal (Yakhteh). 2022 Apr; 24(4):182. https://doi.org/10.22074/cellj.2022.8079 PMID: 35674019
- Hamarat MB, Ozkent MS, Yilmaz B, Aksanyar SY, Karabacak K. Effect of SARS-CoV-2 infection on semen parameters. Canadian Urological Association Journal. 2022 Mar; 16(3):E173. <u>https://doi.org/10.5489/cuaj.7292</u> PMID: 34672932
- 44. Holtmann N, Edimiris P, Andree M, Doehmen C, Baston-Buest D, Adams O, et al. Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 in human semen—a cohort study. Fertility and sterility. 2020 Aug 1; 114(2):233–8. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fertnstert.2020.05.028</u> PMID: 32650948
- 45. Hu B, Liu K, Ruan Y, Wei X, Wu Y, Feng H, et al. Evaluation of mid-and long-term impact of COVID-19 on male fertility through evaluating semen parameters. Translational andrology and urology. 2022 Feb; 11(2):159. https://doi.org/10.21037/tau-21-922 PMID: 35280660
- Kadihasanoglu M, Aktas S, Yardimci E, Aral H, Kadioglu A. SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia affects male reproductive hormone levels: a prospective, cohort study. The journal of sexual medicine. 2021 Feb; 18 (2):256–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsxm.2020.11.007 PMID: 33468445
- Karkin K, Gürlen G. Does COVID-19 cause testicular damage? A cross-sectional study comparing hormonal parameters. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci. 2022:3745–50. https://doi.org/10.26355/eurrev\_ 202205\_28871 PMID: 35647857
- Koc E, Keseroğlu BB. Does COVID-19 worsen the semen parameters? Early results of a tertiary healthcare center. Urologia internationalis. 2021 Sep 1; 105(9–10):743–8. <u>https://doi.org/10.1159/000517276</u> PMID: 34265771
- 49. Kumar T, Jha K, Zabihullah M, Neelu K, Kumar Y, Siddharth K. Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on semen quality in male partners of infertile couples: a hospital-based observational study. Asian Journal of Andrology. 2023 Mar 1; 25(2):240–4. https://doi.org/10.4103/aja202278 PMID: 36348579
- Li H, Xiao X, Zhang J, Zafar MI, Wu C, Long Y, et al. Impaired spermatogenesis in COVID-19 patients. EClinicalMedicine. 2020 Nov 1; 28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100604 PMID: 33134901
- Livingston M, Ramachandran S, Hartland A, Plant A, Kirby M, Hackett G. Low testosterone on hospital admission with COVID-19 infection is associated with increased mortality. Androgens: Clinical Research and Therapeutics. 2022 Mar 1; 3(1):14–21.
- Ma L, Xie W, Li D, et al. Evaluation of sex-related hormones and semen characteristics in reproductiveaged male COVID-19 patients. J Med Virol. 2021; 93:456–462. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.26259</u> PMID: 32621617
- Maleki BH, Tartibian B. COVID-19 and male reproductive function: a prospective, longitudinal cohort study. Reproduction. 2021 Mar 1; 161(3):319–31. <u>https://doi.org/10.1530/REP-20-0382</u> PMID: 33522983
- Okçelik S. COVID-19 pneumonia causes lower testosterone levels. Andrologia. 2020; 00:e13909. https://doi.org/10.1111/and.13909 PMID: 33210743
- Paoli D, Pallotti F, Anzuini A, Bianchini S, Caponecchia L, Carraro A, et al. Male reproductive health after 3 months from SARS-CoV-2 infection: a multicentric study. Journal of Endocrinological Investigation. 2023 Jan; 46(1):89–101.
- Pazir Y., Eroglu T., Kose A., Bulut T. B., Genc C., & Kadihasanoglu M. (2021). Impaired semen parameters in patients with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection: A prospective cohort study. Andrologia, 53, e14157. https://doi.org/10.1111/and.14157 PMID: 34268784
- Piroozmanesh H, Cheraghi E, Naserpoor L, Aghashahi M, Jannatifar R. The effect of COVID-19 infection on sperm quality and male fertility. Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology. 2021 Jun 30;12(2).

- Rafiee B, Tabei SM. The effect of N-acetyl cysteine consumption on men with abnormal sperm parameters due to positive history of COVID-19 in the last three months. Archivio Italiano di Urologia e Andrologia. 2021 Dec 21; 93(4):465–7. https://doi.org/10.4081/aiua.2021.4.465 PMID: 34933532
- Ruan Y, Hu B, Liu Z, et al. No detection of SARS-CoV-2 from urine, expressed prostatic secretions, and semen in 74 recovered COVID-19 male patients: A perspective and urogenital evaluation. Andrology. 2021; 9:99–106. https://doi.org/10.1111/andr.12939 PMID: 33150723
- Salonia A, Pontillo M, Capogrosso P, Gregori S, Tassara M, Boeri L. Severely low testosterone in males with COVID-19: A case-control study. Andrology 2021; 9: 1043–1052. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/</u> andr.12993 PMID: 33635589
- Salonia A, Pontillo M, Capogrosso P, et al. Testosterone in males with COVID-19: A 7-month cohort study. Andrology. 2022; 10:34–41. https://doi.org/10.1111/andr.13097 PMID: 34409772
- Sunnu C. C., Tribowo J. A., Juwita W., Rezano A., l'tishom R., Supardi S., et al. (2022). The long-term impact of COVID-19 infection on semen quality of the COVID-19 survivors. International Journal of Health Sciences, 6(S6), 925–936.
- 63. Temiz MZ, Dincer MM, Hacibey I, et al. Investigation of SARS-CoV-2 in semen samples and the effects of COVID-19 on male sexual health by using semen analysis and serum male hormone profile: A cross-sectional, pilot study. Andrologia. 2020; 00:e13912. https://doi.org/10.1111/and.13912 PMID: 33244788
- Vahidi S, Nabi A, Alipoor H, Karami H, Rahavian A, Ayatollahi A, et al. Effect of Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) on human semen: No evidence of coronavirus in semen of patients. BioMed Research International. 2022 Sep 12;2022. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/6204880 PMID: 36132075
- 65. Wang M, Hu J, Huang B, Yang Q, Liu S, Li Z, et al. Investigating the impact of SARS-CoV-2 infection on basic semen parameters and in vitro fertilization/intracytoplasmic sperm injection outcomes: a retro-spective cohort study. Reproductive Biology and Endocrinology. 2022 Mar 8; 20(1):46. <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/s12958-022-00918-1</u> PMID: 35260151
- Xu H, Wang Z, Feng C, et al. Effects of SARS-CoV-2 infection on male sex-related hormones in recovering patients. Andrology. 2021; 9:107–114. https://doi.org/10.1111/andr.12942 PMID: 33152165
- Akhigbe RE, Hamed MA, Dutta S, Sengupta P. Influence of ejaculatory abstinence period on semen quality of 5165 normozoospermic and oligozoospermic Nigerian men: a retrospective study. Health Sci. Rep. 2022; 5:e722. https://doi.org/10.1002/hsr2.722 PMID: 36032514
- Xie Y, Mirzaei M, Kahrizi MS, Shabestari AM, Riahi SM, Farsimadan M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 effects on sperm parameters: a meta-analysis study. Journal of Assisted Reproduction and Genetics. 2022 Jul; 39 (7):1555–63. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10815-022-02540-x PMID: 35716338
- Saylam B., Uguz M., Yarpuzlu M., Efesoy O., Akbay E., & Çayan S. (2021). The presence of SARS-CoV-2 virus in semen samples of patients with COVID-19 pneumonia. Andrologia, 53, e14145. <u>https:// doi.org/10.1111/and.14145</u> PMID: 34115405
- 70. Machado B, Barcelos Barra G, Scherzer N, Massey J, dos Santos Luz H, Henrique Jacomo R, et al. Presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Semen—Cohort Study in the United States COVID-19 Positive Patients. Infect. Dis. Rep. 2021, 13, 96–101. https://doi.org/10.3390/idr13010012 PMID: 33557147
- Delaroche L, Bertine M, Oger P, Descamps D, Damond F, Genauzeau E, et al. (2021) Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 in semen, seminal plasma, and spermatozoa pellet of COVID19 patients in the acute stage of infection. PLoS ONE 16(12): e0260187. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0260187</u> PMID: 34905541
- Aitken RJ. COVID-19 and human spermatozoa—Potential risks for infertility and sexual transmission? Andrology. (2020) 2020:12859. https://doi.org/10.1111/andr.12859 PMID: 32649023
- Li D, Jin M, Bao P, Zhao W, Zhang S. Clinical characteristics and results of semen tests among men with coronavirus disease 2019. JAMA Netw Open. (2020) 3:e208292. <u>https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.8292</u> PMID: 32379329
- Bhattacharya K, Mukhopadhyay LD, Goswami R, Dutta S, Sengupta P, Irez T, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection and human semen: possible modes of contamination and transmission. Middle East Fertility Soc J. (2021) 26:1–7. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43043-021-00063-6 PMID: 34177252
- 75. Kim TJ and Koo KC. Testosterone to luteinizing hormone ratio as a potential predictor of sperm retrieval in non-obstructive azoospermia patients. Yonsei Med J 2023; 64 (7): 443–439. <u>https://doi.org/10.3349/ ymj.2023.0054</u> PMID: 37365737
- 76. Naelitz BD, Jiang T, Munoz-Lopez C, Sigalos JT, Modiri N, Cannarella R, et al. Testosterone and luteinizing hormone predict semen parameter improvement in infertile men treated with anastrozole. Fertility and Sterility. 2023 Oct 1; 120(4):746–54. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fertnstert.2023.06.032</u> PMID: 37392782
- 77. Akhigbe R, Ajayi A (2020) Testicular toxicity following chronic codeine administration is via oxidative DNA damage and up-regulation of NO/TNF-α and caspase 3 activities. PLoS ONE 15 (3): e0224052.