Effects of hormonal stimulation on the concentration and quality of excreted spermatozoa in the critically endangered Panamanian golden frog (*Atelopus zeteki*)

Gina Della Togna^a, Vance L. Trudeau^b, Brian Gratwicke^a, Matthew Evans^c, Lauren Augustine^c, Han Chia^a, Edward J. Bronikowski^c, James B. Murphy^c, and Pierre Comizzoli^a

ABSTRACT

Knowledge of basic gamete biology is critical to better protect and propagate endangered amphibian species and also to develop reproductive technologies combined with germplasm cryopreservation. The objectives of the study were to test different hormonal stimulations and then characterize the quantity and quality of Panamanian golden frog (*Atelopus zeteki*) spermatozoa. Following intraperitoneal injection of the gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist (des-Gly¹⁰, D-Ala⁶, Pro-NHEt⁹-GnRH 1, 2 or 4 µg/g of body weight), human chorionic gonadotropin (hCG; 5 or 10 IU/gbw), or AmphiplexTM (0.4 µg/gbw GnRH-A + 10 µg/gbw metoclopramide hydrochloride), spermic urine samples from 29 males were collected at different time points (from 0.5 to 24 h post-injection) to analyze the concentration, motility, and morphology of the spermatozoa. Peak of sperm concentration was observed at 3.5 h post injection for all hormonal treatments. AmphiplexTM led to the highest sperm concentrations ($4.45 \pm 0.07 \times 10^6$ cells/mL) followed by 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A ($2.65 \pm 0.21 \times 10^6$ cells/mL). Other stimulation protocols and doses induced sperm production, but at lower levels (ranging from 1.34 to 1.70×10^6 cells/mL). More than 60% of spermatozoa were motile following all treatments but the highest motility (>90%) was obtained from the 10 IU/gbw hCG treatment. Spermic urine samples obtained with all hormone treatments had higher pH (ranging from 7.1 to 7.8) than the urine alone (6.7 to 6.8). Spermatozoa were filiform and elongated with an apical acrosome, a mitochondrial sheath, a small midpiece and a long tail with an undulating membrane. More than 80% of cells were morphologically normal and 50 to 70% had intact DNA. These sperm characteristics were not influenced by hormonal treatments. This first comprehensive characterization of sperm samples following optimized hormonal stimulations in

47 *A. zeteki* lays the foundation for more fundamental studies, reproductive technologies, and future
48 preservation strategies.

49

50 **Keywords:**

51 *Atelopus zeteki*, spermatozoa, hormones, reproductive technologies

52

53

1. Introduction

Amphibian populations around the world are experiencing drastic declines with 31% considered being threatened with extinction (<http://www.iucnredlist.org>). The genus *Atelopus* represents the largest group in the Bufonidae family (Anuran order) found in 11 countries in Central and South America [1,2]. About 80% of *Atelopus* species now are threatened with extinction and 56% of those have probably disappeared from their known habitats [1,3] mainly due to the infectious fungal disease chytridiomycosis, climate change, pollution, habitat destruction and the pet trade [1,4]. The Panamanian golden frog (PGF; *Atelopus zeteki*) is an endemic species from Panama that has not been observed in the wild since 2009, is listed as Critically Endangered (CR) by the IUCN, and is protected under Panamanian law [5,6]. Fortunately, a healthy captive assurance population populations of *A. zeteki*, critical for the preservation of remaining populations, is bred in U.S. zoos and aquaria [7,8].

Improved understanding of reproductive physiology will help successful breeding programs to sustain populations of genetically diverse individuals [9–11]. However, successful unassisted breeding of amphibians in captivity can be difficult because of issues related to poor genetic diversity, unsuccessful or asynchronous spawning, absence of male breeding behavior, dystocia, low survival rates of eggs, embryos and juveniles, as well as diseases [10,12]. Exogenous hormone stimulations to collect spermatozoa and oocytes for artificial fertilization (AF), or for refrigerated or cryopreserved storage, therefore represent a great option to help sustain healthy, genetically viable captive populations over the long term [9].

Males amphibians excrete spermic urine following hormonal stimulations but results vary among species [9,13,14]. Human chorionic gonadotropin (hCG) has been widely used in numerous amphibian species including *Xenopus*, *Bufo* and *Litoria* to collect spermic urine [15–

18]. Additionally, gonadotropin-releasing hormone (GnRH) agonists have been used alone or in combination with dopamine antagonists such as metoclopramide, domperidone or pimozide [11,19,20]. Fresh or frozen–thawed spermic urine has been used to fertilize oocytes in Anurans [9]. However, no reports on sperm collection after hormonal stimulation are available in *Atelopus* sp.

In addition to sperm concentration, essential traits such as motility, cell morphology, osmolality and pH of the spermic urine (even before the fertilizing ability) have to be assessed for an accurate evaluation of the sperm sample [21]. Sperm motility is usually considered an indicator of fertilization success, frequently associated with the type of fertilization and the spawning environment of a given species [22–25]. In anurans as in fish, sperm motility is triggered by osmotic changes in the extracellular environment [24,26,27]. Cells are immotile inside the testicular tissue that has an osmolality of ~300 mOsm/kg [12,25,27]. Hypotonic environments such as urine or fresh water then activate sperm in anurans and fresh water fish. Sperm motility is also affected by the pH of the extracellular medium with a neutral pH providing the best conditions for motility as observed in *X. laevis* [25]. Sperm morphology and DNA integrity are additional important traits to consider when evaluating sperm quality since both are essential for successful fertilization and embryo development [28,29]. Lastly, the only study on the reproductive ecology of *A. zeteki* reports that the species breeds from late November to January, during the start of the dry season [30]. However, no data are available on the seasonality of the spermic urine production under captive conditions.

Based on the current state of knowledge in *A. zeteki*, the objective of this study was to characterize the effect of the repeated hormonal stimulations throughout the year on sperm concentration and quality.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Male husbandry and identification

Adult males *Atelopus zeteki* (>two year old, average weight of 3.81 ± 0.41 g) were obtained from the Species Survival Plan (SSP) ‘Mata Ahogado’ managed sub-population at the Maryland Zoo in Baltimore, MD. Animal Use Protocols were submitted for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) approval from the University of Maryland, the Smithsonian’s National Zoological Park (SNZP) in Washington, D. C., and Maryland Zoo in Baltimore, MD. After obtaining IACUC approvals, the frogs were transferred from the Maryland Zoo to the SNZP and were placed under quarantine for 30 days. For identification purposes, four photographs of each frog were taken to distinguish males utilizing their spot patterns and an alpha-numeric code was assigned to each male.

Up to 5 frogs were housed at 20 to 22 °C in each of 6 tanks (Exo-Terra Terrarium, 24”x18”x24”). Tanks were furnished with live potted plants and live moss as substrate, misted with reverse-osmosis-filtered water once every hour for two minutes and drained through a bulkhead. Tanks were lit on a 12-hour cycle with Zoomed10.0 T5 high output UV-B bulbs to avoid D₃ hypovitaminosis and help with proper bone growth [31]. Frogs were fed *ad libitum* four times per week with live one-week-old crickets dusted with a calcium carbonate powder containing vitamin D₃, wingless fruit flies (*Drosophila melanogaster*) or bean beetles (*Callosobruchus sp.*) on a rotating basis.

2.2. Hormone stimulation

Treatment dose was chosen based on preliminary dose-range experiments with *A. zeteki* and previous successful induction of spawning in other species [9,11,20,21,32]. Hormonal stimulations were administered via intraperitoneal injection (ip) using Terumo Thinpro insulin syringes (30 ga x 3/8"). The different hormonal stimulation were as follows: 1) 1 µg/g of body weight (gbw) of the gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist des-Gly¹⁰, D-Ala⁶, Pro-NHET⁹-GnRH (GnRH-A; Sigma-Aldrich Corporation, St. Louis, MO, USA), 2) 2 µg/gbw GnRH-A 3) 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A, 4) 5 IU/gbw hCG (CG5 Chorionic gonadotropin human; Sigma-Aldrich Corporation), 5) 10 IU/gbw hCG, or 6) AmphiplexTM - a cocktail of 0.4 µg GnRH-A plus 10 µg/gbw metoclopramide hydrochloride (Sigma-Aldrich Corporation) named after the combination of the words 'amphibian' and 'amplexus' [11,20]. All hormones were dissolved in Amphibian Ringer Solution (ARS; Carolina Biological Supply Company, Burlington, NC, USA) and control males received 10 µl/gbw (ip) of ARS or no injection at all.

2.3 Sperm collection

Session of sperm collections were scheduled once a week. For each session, six males were selected to be induced with one of six hormone treatments with two additional individuals as controls. After hormonal and control injections, males were placed inside ventilated plastic containers with water soaked paper towel on the bottom and covered from light to reduce stress. Spermic urine was collected by gently inserting a small catheter (0.6 mm I.D. x 1 mm O.D., Micro Medical Tubing, 85 Durometer Vinyl, Scientific Commodities Inc., Lake Havasu City, AZ, USA) in the cloacae (Figure 1) [33]. Sperm collections were carried out at seven

different time points post injection: 0.5, 1.5, 2.5, 3.5, 4.5, 5.5 and 24 h. Testicular spermatozoa from eleven euthanized males from another study also were collected after dissection and maceration of the testes in 500 μ L ARS, followed by short-term storage at 4 °C until samples were analyzed.

2.4. Sperm processing and analysis

Volume of sample recovered from the catheter was measured with a 200- μ L micropipettor. Sperm concentration was assessed by hemocytometry with 10 μ L spermic urine being added to the chamber. The osmolality and pH of the spermic urine were obtained using a Vapro Osmometer 5520 (Wescor, Inc, South Logan, Utah, USA) and pH indicator strips pH 5.0 - 10.0, EMD Millipore, Billerica, MA, USA), respectively. Percentage of sperm motility was determined by counting all the cells with flagellar movement from a total of 100 cells under an Olympus BX41 microscope at X 400 magnification. Percentage Forward progressive motility (FPM) was obtained by counting all the cells with forward motility relative to 100 cells that were expressing any flagellar movement.

2.5. Sperm morphology analysis

Morphology was assessed by fixing 10 μ L spermic urine in 80 μ L 4% paraformaldehyde solution in PBS. Fixed cell then were stained with Coomassie Blue (0.1% Coomassie Brilliant Blue R-250, 50% methanol and 10% glacial acetic acid) and mounted with Permount™ Mounting Medium (Fisher Scientific, Pittsburgh, PA, USA). Sperm morphology was evaluated at X 1000 magnification under an Olympus BX41 microscope. In a first assessment, a maximum of 100 cells were classified as normal if every morphological parameter of the cell was intact

(acrosome, head, mitochondrial sheath and tail) and as abnormal if at least one of the parameters was not intact. In a second reading, a maximum of 100 cells per sample were evaluated in more details for acrosomal integrity [normal (intact) and abnormal (not intact, missing)], head [normal (intact) and abnormal (bent, broken)] and tail [normal (intact) and abnormal (coiled, with cytoplasmic droplet or broken)]. Images of the cells were acquired with a SPOT RT3TM Color Slider microscope camera and the SPOT Advanced Software (SPOT Imaging Solutions, Sterling Heights, MI, USA). Measurements of the head and tail were obtained from 100 cells from different individuals with the SPOT Advanced Software segmented line measuring tool. Testicular spermatozoa from eleven euthanized males from another study were also used as a comparison for the morphology assessment (as described above).

For DNA staining, an aliquot of 10 μ L of cells previously fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde was stained with 3 μ L of either Hoechst (excitation/emission of 338/505 nm, 50 mg/mL) or PI (absorption 493 nm, 50 mg/mL) and analyzed under a fluorescence Olympus BX41 microscope (X400). For the mitochondrial sheath staining, 1 μ L of 100 nM MitoTracker[®] Green FM (Life Technologies, Grand Island, NY, USA), excitation/emission of 490/516 nm, was added to 10 μ L of fresh spermatozoa. After 15 minutes, cells were fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde and analyzed under fluorescence Olympus BX41 microscope (X1000).

2.7. Assessment of sperm DNA integrity

Sperm DNA fragmentation was determined using the terminal deoxynucleotidyl transferase dUTP nick end labeling (TUNEL) technique (DeadEndTM Colorimetric TUNEL System, Promega Corporation, Madison, WI, USA), with an *in situ* cell detection kit, following the manufacturer's instructions. Ejaculated spermatozoa used in this assay were previously fixed

in 4% paraformaldehyde and kept at 4°C until analyzed. Slides were prepared by smearing the samples and letting them air-dry. Slides were then gently rinsed twice with PBS for 5 minutes before the cells were permeabilized with 0.2% Triton X-100 for 5 minutes at room temperature. Slides were again gently rinsed twice with PBS for 5 minutes followed by incubation with the equilibration buffer for 10 minutes at room temperature. Then, 100 µL of previously prepared rTdT reaction mix were added to the slides. After covering with plastic coverslips, slides were incubated at 37°C for 60 minutes in a humidified chamber. The reaction was terminated by removing the coverslips and adding 200 µL of 2X SCC to each slide using a pipette, incubating them for 15 minutes at room temperature. Slides were rinsed twice with PBS for 5 minutes. Endogenous peroxidase activity was blocked with 0.3% hydrogen peroxide for 5 minutes and then the slides were again rinsed twice with PBS for 5 minutes followed by incubation with 200 µL Streptavidin Horseradish Peroxidase for 30 minutes. Slides were rinsed twice with PBS for 5 minutes and developed with 3,3'-diaminobenzidine before being mounted with Permount™ Mounting Medium (Fisher Scientific, Pittsburgh, PA, USA) and analyzed at X 1000 magnification under an Olympus BX41 microscope. One hundred cells were counted per slide and classified as intact (no staining) or fragmented (dark brown staining). Testicular spermatozoa from 11 euthanized males from another study were used as a control for the TUNEL assay as well.

2.8. Seasonality

To assess possible seasonal variations in *A. zeteki* sperm concentration, spermic urine osmolality and pH after hormonal stimulation, we divided the year in four blocks (seasons) of

three months each, starting with season 1 from January to March, season 2 from April to June, season 3 from July to September and season 4 from October to December.

2.9. Statistical analysis

For each hormonal treatment, sperm concentration peaks (time points with the highest sperm concentrations) were determined using a cutoff value that was calculated by averaging the total sperm concentration of all time points for each treatment plus one time the standard deviation (SD). The time points with sperm concentrations equal or above the cutoff were removed (as part of the peak) and a new cutoff value was calculated with the remaining time points. This process was repeated until there was no time point left with a sperm concentration equal or higher than the cutoff. All values equal or higher than the cutoffs were considered the most elevated sperm concentrations and part of the peak of sperm production for each hormone treatment [34] (Table 1).

All statistics were carried out utilizing the GraphPad Prism 6.05 software (GraphPad Software, Inc., La Jolla, CA, USA). All data were examined to determine normality and homogeneity of variance using the Brown-Forsythe test. A one-way ANOVA and Tukey's post-hoc test for multiple comparisons were used to determine differences among the treatments. For the effect of treatments on morphology of cells, we tested for differences using one-Way ANOVA followed by Dunn's and Tukey's test for multiple comparisons, or the Kruskal-Wallis test when variances were not homogeneous. Means were considered statistically different if $P < 0.05$. A Spearman correlation test was used to examine the relationship between osmolality and pH, FPM, and between pH and osmolality, Motility and FPM.

3. Results

3.1. Effect of exogenous hormone treatments on the sperm excretion pattern

Compared to both controls, only hormonal injections led to the production of spermic urine samples (Figures 2A-F). Sperm excretion was obtained as early as 0.5 h post-injection with all GnRH-A treatments, 10 IU/gbw hCG and AmphiplexTM (Figures 2A-C, 2E-F), while no production of sperm was obtained at this time point after treatment with 5 IU/gbw hCG (Figure 2D). However, for all treatments spermatozoa were mainly collected starting at 1.5 h and up to 24 h post-injection (Figures 2A-F). Following hormonal stimulations, sperm concentrations in samples ranged from 0.0 to 8.20×10^6 cells/mL (Table 2). The peak of excretion lasted longer with 2 µg/gbw GnRH-A, followed by 10 IU/gbw hCG and was shorter for 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A and AmphiplexTM treatments (Table 2). Interestingly, all treatments had 3.5 h post-injection as the common time point for peak sperm excretion (Table 2). When comparing the samples obtained during the peaks only, 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A and AmphiplexTM led to higher sperm concentrations ($2.65 \pm 0.21 \times 10^6$ and $4.45 \pm 0.07 \times 10^6$ cells/mL, respectively; $P < 0.05$) than the other hormonal stimulations (Table 2; Figure 3A).

From 0.5 to 24 h post-injection as well as during the excretion peaks, the volume (range, 10 to 270 µL) and the osmolality (range, 56 to 130 mOsm/kg) varied at each time point but were not affected ($P > 0.05$) by the various hormonal treatments. However, the pH was consistently higher ($P > 0.05$) after hormonal stimulation than in the controls. For the spermic urine, pH was

lower after treatment with 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A (7.15 ± 0.07) than 5 IU/gbw hCG (7.86 ± 0.05 ; $P < 0.05$) while no differences in pH were observed with the other treatments (Figure 3B).

For the most successful hormonal treatments (4 µg/gbw GnRH-A, 10 IU/gbw hCG, and AmphiplexTM), sperm concentrations were not significantly affected by the seasons of the year (Figure 4). The concentration of sperm in urine obtained from males injected with AmphiplexTM remained elevated throughout the entire year compared to the other two treatments (Figure 4).

Percentages of sperm motility during the peak of excretion were all above 86% (range, 86.7 to 100 %) regardless of the hormonal treatment. Lowest percentages of motility ($P < 0.05$) were observed with 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A ($87.2 \pm 0.8\%$) while highest sperm motility ($P < 0.05$) was obtained with AmphiplexTM ($99.1 \pm 1.3\%$; Figure 5A). Regarding the sperm motility pattern, lowest percentages of spermatozoa with forward progressive motility were observed after the stimulation with 2 µg/gbw GnRH-A ($68.9 \pm 7.3\%$) while the highest was obtained with 10 IU/gbw hCG ($95.4 \pm 2.1\%$; $P < 0.05$; Figure 5B).

3.2. Effects of exogenous hormonal stimulation on the sperm morphology and DNA Integrity

Spermatozoa of *A. zeteki* have an elongated shape (Figures 6A and 7). The anterior part of the head exhibits a pointy acrosome (Figure 6Aa) at the tip of a long head (24.5 ± 2.9 µm including the acrosome; Figure 6Ab) containing the compacted chromatin (Figures 7F and 7G). The mitochondrial sheath is a cytoplasmic droplet like structure positive to Mito Tracker Green FM staining that is located towards the center of the head (Figures 6Ac, 7B, 7D). A small midpiece at the base of the head (Figure 6Ad) is connecting the head to the sperm tail (8.0 ± 5.6 µm length) and exhibits two filaments joined together by an undulating membrane (Figure 6Ae).

Abnormal morphology including missing acrosomes, missing mitochondrial sheaths or coiled tails were observed in all samples (Figure 6B-E), but the vast majority had normal morphology, regardless of the hormonal treatment (Figure 8). Percentages of normal sperm heads and acrosomes were similar between hormonal stimulations and did not differ from the testicular sperm control (Figures 8A, 8B). Multiple abnormal morphologies including missing acrosomes, missing mitochondrial sheath or coiled tail were observed in the samples (Figure 6B-E). The only difference observed was the lower percentage of normal tail in testicular samples ($P < 0.05$; Figure 8C). Spermatozoa collected after the most effective hormonal stimulations (4 $\mu\text{g/gbw}$ GnRH-A, 10 IU/gbw hCG and AmphiplexTM) were also assessed for their DNA integrity. Percentages of intact DNA ranged from 12.0 to 96.7 % and statistically did not differ between treatments or the testicular sperm control ($P > 0.05$; Figure 8D).

4. Discussion

For the first time, sperm samples from captive *A. zeteki* were successfully collected throughout the entire year using hormonal stimulations. The quantity and quality of the gametes was affected by the various hormone preparations with GnRH-A plus metoclopramide resulting in the best collections.

In this study the effectiveness of the different hormone treatments in inducing spermiation were quite varied, as observed in other anurans [35]. Successful induction using GnRH-A alone was similar to responses observed in other Bufonids [21,32,36]. In our conditions, GnRH-A induced the production of significantly higher concentrations of sperm than hCG as observed in species like the Corroboree frog *Pseudophryne corroboree* [37] but not in other Bufonids. For example, *B. fowleri* responding better to hCG than GnRH [17]. Time-

dependent increases in sperm concentration have also been observed using hCG and GnRH-A in some bufonid species [18,38]. For instance, a study in *Anaxyrus americanus* showed that hCG stimulation produced a peak between 3 and 9 h post-injection and no clear peak of sperm production between 3 and 24 h post-injection of GnRH-A [18]. This is different from what we observed in *A. zeteki* where distinct sperm concentration peaks were obtained after stimulation with GnRH-A as well which is consistent with studies in *Rana temporaria* [38]. Frogs treated with AmphiplexTM reached a sperm production peak at 3.5 h post-injection, with 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A eliciting a more rapid response. In comparison, AmphiplexTM induced the production of significantly higher concentrations of spermatozoa. This is interesting because AmphiplexTM contains only 0.4 µg/gbw GnRH-A, which is 10 times less than the 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A, and this suggests that metoclopramide likely potentiated the effect of the lower GnRH-A concentration present in AmphiplexTM [11]. Metoclopramide might be blocking or attenuating the inhibitory effect of dopamine in *A. zeteki*, or increasing the GnRH-A binding affinity to the receptors, as it has been observed with pimozide and domperidone in fish [39]. This is likely triggering the production of higher concentrations of spermatozoa in the urine, perhaps due to higher luteinizing hormone (LH) release [9,11,15,40,41]. While GnRH-A acts on the pituitary, hCG acts directly on the gonads, since this hormone binds to the same receptors as LH [38,42]. There are several reports on the high species variability of spermiation responses following hCG stimulation [11,15,21,42], with fewer species showing a better response to this hormone than to GnRH-A. This is likely due to the relatively low affinity of hCG to the anuran LH receptor [9,38] or to a possible immune response to this mammalian hormone [43].

Even though all the treatments increased the spermic urine pH, treatment with 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A showed significantly lower pH than 5 IU/gbw hCG and also exhibited lower pH

trending towards significance than 2 µg/gbw GnRH-A, 10 IU/gbw hCG and AmphiplexTM. Nevertheless, pH did significantly differ among treatments, suggesting that the hormone treatments used in the study increased *A. zeteki*'s spermic urine pH, similar to patterns observed in fish species [44]. We also assessed spermic urine osmolality from all the treatments and found no differences among hormones nor between hormones and controls, suggesting that neither hormone treatment affected the osmolality of the spermic urine in *A. zeteki* nor osmolality had an effect on the lower percentage of motility from 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A. Factors such as pH and ionic composition of the extracellular environment have been shown to play an important role in the regulation of sperm motility in *Xenopus* and ranids [25,27,45]. Even though 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A produced high concentrations of spermatozoa with a good percentage of motility, the lower pH associated with this treatment may account for the lower motility observed in *A. zeteki* spermatozoa, an effect that seems to be counterbalanced by lower GnRH-A concentrations, metoclopramide in the AmphiplexTM treatment and absent in the hCG treatment.

We found that the hormone treatments were equally effective at promoting spermiation in *A. zeteki* year-round with no apparent seasonal effects. If this pattern holds true for females, these technologies could be used to produce offspring year-round in captive settings.

The percentage of motile spermatozoa was higher than 85% for all the hormone stimulation. Frogs treated with GnRH-A exhibited the lowest motility compared to the other treatments that exhibited similar percentage motility during the production peaks. The proportions of motile spermatozoa obtained after stimulation is consistent with reports in other species even without hormonal treatments [9,46]. The slight differences in sperm motility observed in the present study are similar to previous reports in frogs and toads [18,38]. However, the specific mechanism by which hormonal stimulation might affect sperm FPM is not

yet understood but others have also observed a dose-dependent relationship between hCG and FPM [18].

A. zeteki sperm has an elongated filiform head with an acrosomal complex on the anterior portion, and a small midpiece at the posterior end of the head. The size and morphology of the spermatozoa were found to be homogeneous in the sperm samples regardless of the hormonal treatments administered. The nucleus has a long, conical structure that occupies most of the head of *A. zeteki* spermatozoa which is similar to the morphology reported for another bufonid and several dendrobatid frogs [47–49]. We also observed the presence of mitochondrial sheaths [13], which are a cytoplasmic droplet-like structure that contains a high concentration of mitochondria, located in the external mid to lower part of the sperm head, sometimes referred as mitochondrial vesicle [50]. The structure is usually present in bufonids and easily damaged by osmotic and temperature changes or handlings [51] making sperm manipulation in *A. zeteki* challenging. The tail is almost twice the length of the head and clearly shows two filaments joined by an undulating membrane, ending in a single filament at the posterior end of the tail. The presence of an undulating membrane and auxiliary fibers in the sperm tail is characteristic of Bufonidae, and other species with aquatic external fertilization modes [23,47,52]. Spermatozoa of *A. spumarius* have an average head size of 19 μm and a tail length of 40 μm [47]. Therefore, the head of *A. zeteki* sperm is slightly bigger while the tail length is similar to *A. spumarius*. To our knowledge, this is the first detailed study on *A. zeteki* sperm morphology. On average about 75% of the cells were normal and did not differ between hormone treatments. Testicular sperm had a lower percentage of normal tails than excreted sperm probably because testicular sperm samples include a mixture of mature and immature cells and tails may have been damaged during maceration.

The proportion of cells with DNA fragmentation was not different after the various stimulation protocols and was similar to the proportions observed in the testicular spermatozoa. Studies on sperm DNA fragmentation report lower percentages with a cutoff for infertile men at 20% [28]. While there is no established fertility threshold for anurans, 40% of sperm with fragmented DNA seems high in this species as observed in *Rana temporaria* [53]. Breakage in the nuclear chromatin can be related to the following factors: 1) chromatin is highly compacted inside the sperm nucleus where topoisomerases might relieve torsional stress by inducing nicks in the DNA [28]; 2) amphibian sperm activates after a drop in the osmolality of the extracellular environment, which causes an osmotic shock that might induce DNA fragmentation [25,29,54]; 3) sperm manipulation can increase the DNA susceptibility for damage; 4) the TUNEL assay does not discriminate between viable or dead cells, suggesting that the overall DNA fragmentation value could include non-viable cells [28]. It is possible that after fertilization oocyte-repairing mechanisms may be activated [55] to reduce the impact of sperm DNA damage on embryo development.

In conclusion, our study provides a systematic description of *A. zeteki* sperm characteristics as a reference for other species, and as a baseline to evaluate potential future changes within captive lines. We also describe an optimized, safe and repeatable sperm collection protocol for *A. zeteki*. This is a critical first step in developing reproductive technologies and sperm cryopreservation to manage captive populations.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the Panamanian Golden Frog SSP and The Maryland Zoo in Baltimore, especially Dr. Ellen Bronson and Kevin Barrett, for providing the frogs that

were used in this study. We also thank Richard Quintero for his support maintaining the research colony.

Authors also thank the Secretaría Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología (SENACyT) from Panama, The Wood Tiger Fund, Smithsonian Endowment for Science and the University of Ottawa Research Chairs Program for their financial support.

References

- [1] Puschendorf R, Ib R, Marca E La, Lips KR, Stefan L, Bola F, et al. Catastrophic Population Declines and Extinctions in Neotropical Harlequin Frogs (Bufonidae : Atelopus) 1 2005;37:190–201.
- [2] Mendelson JR, Lips KR, Gagliardo RW, Rabb GB, Collins JP, Diffendorfer JE, et al. Biodiversity. Confronting amphibian declines and extinctions. Science 2006;313:48. doi:10.1126/science.1128396.
- [3] Drenzo G V, Langhammer PF, Zamudio KR, Lips KR. Fungal infection intensity and zoospore output of *Atelopus zeteki*, a potential acute chytrid supershedder. PLoS One 2014;9:e93356. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0093356.
- [4] Lips K, Burrowes P. Amphibian Declines in Latin America: Widespread Population Declines, Extinctions, and Impacts1. Biotropica 2005;37:163–5.
- [5] Zippel KC, Ibáñez R, Lindquist ED, Richards CL, Jaramillo C a, Griffith EJ. Implicaciones en la Conservación de las Ranas Doradas de Panamá, Asociadas con su Revisión Taxonómica. Herpetotropicos 2006;3:29–39.
- [6] Becker MH, Harris RN, Minbiole KPC, Schwantes CR, Rollins-Smith LA, Reinert LK, et al. Towards a Better Understanding of the Use of Probiotics for Preventing Chytridiomycosis in Panamanian Golden Frogs. Ecohealth 2011;8:501–6.

doi:10.1007/s10393-012-0743-0.

[7] Gagliardo R, Crump P, Griffith E, Mendelson J, Ross H, Zippel K. The principles of rapid response for amphibian conservation, using the programmes in Panama as an example. *Int Zoo Yearb* 2008;42:125–35. doi:10.1111/j.1748-1090.2008.00043.x.

[8] Marca E La, Lips KR, Otters S, Puschendorf R, I Ñez R, Vicente Rueda-Almonacid J, et al. Catastrophic Population Declines and Extinctions in Neotropical Harlequin Frogs (*Bufonidae: Atelopus*). *Biotropica* 2005;37:190–201. doi:10.1111/j.1744-7429.2005.00026.x.

[9] Clulow J, Trudeau VL, Kouba AJ. Amphibian declines in the twenty-first century: why we need assisted reproductive technologies. *Adv Exp Med Biol* 2014;753:275–316. doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-0820-2_12.

[10] Kouba A, Vance C, Willis E. Artificial fertilization for amphibian conservation: current knowledge and future considerations. *Theriogenology* 2009.

[11] Trudeau VL, Somoza GM, Natale GS, Pauli B, Wignall J, Jackman P, et al. Hormonal induction of spawning in 4 species of frogs by coinjection with a gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist and a dopamine antagonist. *Reprod Biol Endocrinol* 2010;8:36. doi:10.1186/1477-7827-8-36.

[12] Browne RK, Zippel K. Reproduction and larval rearing of amphibians. *ILAR J* 2007;48:214–34.

[13] Browne RK, Kaurova SA, Uteshev VK, Shishova N V., McGinnity D, Figiel CR, et al. Sperm motility of externally fertilizing fish and amphibians. *Theriogenology* 2015;83:1–13.

[14] Kouba AJ, Lloyd RE, Houck ML, Silla AJ, Calatayud N, Trudeau VL, et al. Emerging

trends for biobanking amphibian genetic resources: The hope, reality and challenges for the next decade. *Biol Conserv* 2013;164:10–21. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2013.03.010.

- [15] Mann RM, Hyne R V, Choung CB. Hormonal induction of spermiation, courting behavior and spawning in the southern bell frog, *Litoria raniformis*. *Zoo Biol* n.d.;29:774–82. doi:10.1002/zoo.20331.

- [16] Kouba AJ, Vance CK. Applied reproductive technologies and genetic resource banking for amphibian conservation. *Reprod Fertil Dev* 2009;21:719–37. doi:10.1071/RD09038.

- [17] Browne RK, Seratt J, Vance C, Kouba A. Hormonal priming, induction of ovulation and in-vitro fertilization of the endangered Wyoming toad (*Bufo baxteri*). *Reprod Biol Endocrinol* 2006;4:34. doi:10.1186/1477-7827-4-34.

- [18] Kouba AJ, delBarco-Trillo J, Vance CK, Milam C, Carr M. A comparison of human chorionic gonadotropin and luteinizing hormone releasing hormone on the induction of spermiation and amplexus in the American toad (*Anaxyrus americanus*). *Reprod Biol Endocrinol* 2012;10:59. doi:10.1186/1477-7827-10-59.

- [19] Browne RK, Li H, Seratt J, Kouba A. Progesterone improves the number and quality of hormone induced Fowler toad (*Bufo fowleri*) oocytes. *Reprod Biol Endocrinol* 2006;4:3. doi:10.1186/1477-7827-4-3.

- [20] Trudeau VL, Schueler FW, Navarro-Martin L, Hamilton CK, Bulaeva E, Bennett A, et al. Efficient induction of spawning of Northern leopard frogs (*Lithobates pipiens*) during and outside the natural breeding season. *Reprod Biol Endocrinol* 2013;11:14. doi:10.1186/1477-7827-11-14.

- [21] Obringer AR, O'Brien JK, Saunders RL, Yamamoto K, Kikuyama S, Roth TL. Characterization of the spermiation response, luteinizing hormone release and sperm

quality in the American toad (*Bufo americanus*) and the endangered Wyoming toad (*Bufo baxteri*). *Reprod Fertil Dev* 2000;12:51–8.

[22] Bernardini G, Andrietti F, Camantini M, Cosson MP. *Xenopus* spermatozoon: correlation between shape and motility. *Gamete Res* 1988;20:165–75.

[23] Byrne PG, Simmons LW, Roberts JD. Sperm competition and the evolution of gamete morphology in frogs. *Proc Biol Sci* 2003;270:2079–86. doi:10.1098/rspb.2003.2433.

[24] Byrne PG, Dunne C, Munn AJ, Silla AJ. Environmental osmolality influences sperm motility activation in an anuran amphibian. *J Evol Biol* 2015;28:521–34. doi:10.1111/jeb.12584.

[25] Christensen JR, Pauli BD, Richardson JS, Bishop CA, Elliott J. Effects of pH and dilution on African clawed frog (*Xenopus laevis*) sperm motility. *Can J Zool* 2004;82:555–63. doi:10.1139/z04-021.

[26] Alavi SMH, Psenicka M, Policar T, Rodina M, Kozak P, Linhart O. Sperm characteristics in *Barbus barbus* as a function of nutrition throughout the reproductive season. *Cybium* 2008;32:200–1.

[27] Inoda T, Morisawa M. Effect of osmolality on the initiation of sperm motility in *Xenopus laevis*. *Comp Biochem Physiol A Comp Physiol* 1987;88:539–42.

[28] Agarwal A, Allamaneni SSR. Sperm DNA damage assessment: a test whose time has come. *Fertil Steril* 2005;84:850–3. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2005.03.080.

[29] Pollock K, Gosálvez J, Arroyo F, López-Fernández C, Guille M, Noble A, et al. Validation of the sperm chromatin dispersion (SCD) test in the amphibian *Xenopus laevis* using in situ nick translation and comet assay. *Reprod Fertil Dev* 2015;27:1168–74. doi:10.1071/RD14070.

- 490 [30] Karraker N, Richards C, Ross H. Reproductive ecology of *Atelopus zeteki* and
491 comparisons to other members of the genus. *Herpetol Rev* 2006.
- 492 [31] Adkins E, Driggers T, Ferguson G, Gehrmann W, Gyimesi Z, Ogle M, et al. *Journal of*
493 *Herpetological Medicine and Surgery* Moderator: Eric Klaphake, DVM n.d.
- 494 [32] Waggener W, Carroll E. A method for hormonal induction of sperm release in anurans
495 (eight species) and in vitro fertilization in *Lepidobatrachus* species. *Dev Growth* 1998.
- 496 [33] Kouba a. J, Vance CK, Willis EL. Artificial fertilization for amphibian conservation:
497 Current knowledge and future considerations. *Theriogenology* 2009;71:214–27.
498 doi:10.1016/j.theriogenology.2008.09.055.
- 499 [34] Mouttham LL, Buhr M, Freeman EW, Widowski TM, Graham LH, Brown JL.
500 Interrelationship of serum testosterone, dominance and ovarian cyclicity status in female
501 African elephants. *Anim Reprod Sci* 2011;126:115–21.
502 doi:10.1016/j.anireprosci.2011.04.006.
- 503 [35] Silla AJ, Roberts JD. Investigating patterns in the spermiation response of eight Australian
504 frogs administered human chorionic gonadotropin (hCG) and luteinizing hormone-
505 releasing hormone (LHRHa). *Gen Comp Endocrinol* 2012;179:128–36.
506 doi:10.1016/j.ygcen.2012.08.009.
- 507 [36] Goncharov BF, Shubravi OI, Serbinova IA, Uteshev VK. The USSR programme for
508 breeding amphibians, including rare and endangered species. *Int Zoo Yearb* 2007;28:10–
509 21. doi:10.1111/j.1748-1090.1989.tb03248.x.
- 510 [37] Byrne PG, Silla AJ. Hormonal induction of gamete release, and in-vitro fertilisation, in the
511 critically endangered southern corroboree frog, *Pseudophryne corroboree*. *Reprod Biol*
512 *Endocrinol* 2010;8:144. doi:10.1186/1477-7827-8-144.

- 513 [38] Uteshev VK, Shishova N V., Kaurova SA, Browne RK, Gakhova EN, Brown PS, et al.
 514 Hormonal induction of spermatozoa from amphibians with *Rana temporaria* and *Bufo*
 515 *bufo* as anuran models. *Reprod Fertil Dev* 2012;24:599. doi:10.1071/RD10324.
- 516 [39] De Leeuw R, Van 't Veer C, Goos HJT, Van Oordt PGWJ. The dopaminergic regulation
 517 of gonadotropin-releasing hormone receptor binding in the pituitary of the African catfish,
 518 *Clarias gariepinus*. *Gen Comp Endocrinol* 1988;72:408–15. doi:10.1016/0016-
 519 6480(88)90163-3.
- 520 [40] Minucci S, Di Matteo L, Baccari GC, Pierantoni R. A gonadotropin releasing hormone
 521 analog induces spermiation in intact and hypophysectomized frogs, *Rana esculenta*.
 522 *Experientia* 1989;45:1118–21. doi:10.1007/BF01950175.
- 523 [41] Loumaye E, Wynn PC, Coy D, Catt KJ. Receptor-binding properties of gonadotropin-
 524 releasing hormone derivatives. Prolonged receptor occupancy and cell-surface localization
 525 of a potent antagonist analog. *J Biol Chem* 1984;259:12663–71.
- 526 [42] Pozzi AG, Rosembliet C, Ceballos NR. Effect of human gonadotropins on spermiation and
 527 androgen biosynthesis in the testis of the toad *Bufo arenarum* (Amphibia, Anura). *J Exp*
 528 *Zool Part A Comp Exp Biol* 2006;305A:96–102. doi:10.1002/jez.a.254.
- 529 [43] Cabrita E, Robles V, Herráez P. Methods in reproductive aquaculture: marine and
 530 freshwater species. 2008.
- 531 [44] Clearwater SJ, Crim LW. Gonadotropin releasing hormone-analogue treatment increases
 532 sperm motility, seminal plasma pH and sperm production in yellowtail flounder
 533 *Pleuronectes ferrugineus*. *Fish Physiol Biochem* 1998;19:349–57.
 534 doi:10.1023/A:1007759620936.
- 535 [45] Mansour N, Lahnsteiner F, Patzner RA. Motility and cryopreservation of spermatozoa of

536 European common frog, *Rana temporaria*. *Theriogenology* 2010;74:724–32.
537 doi:10.1016/j.theriogenology.2010.03.025.

538 [46] Kouba AJ, Vance CK, Alexander MA, Eischeid JK, Alford RA, Dixon PM, et al. Applied
539 reproductive technologies and genetic resource banking for amphibian conservation.
540 *Reprod Fertil Dev* 2009;21:719. doi:10.1071/RD09038.

541 [47] Siqueira S, Junior OA, Lima AP, Recco-Pimentel SM. Cytogenetics and sperm
542 ultrastructure of *Atelopus spumarius* (Anura, Bufonidae) from the Brazilian Amazon n.d.

543 [48] Lipke C, Meinecke-Tillmann S, Meyer W, Meinecke B. Preparation and ultrastructure of
544 spermatozoa from Green Poison Frogs, *Dendrobates auratus*, following hormonal induced
545 spermiation (Amphibia, Anura, Dendrobatidae). *Anim Reprod Sci* 2009;113:177–86.
546 doi:10.1016/j.anireprosci.2008.06.005.

547 [49] Veiga-Menoncello ACP, Lima AP, Recco-Pimentel SM. Sperm morphology of five
548 species of *Colostethus* (Anura, Dendrobatidae) from Brazil, with phylogenetic comments.
549 *Acta Zool* 2006;87:147–57. doi:10.1111/j.1463-6395.2006.00229.x.

550 [50] Kouba AJ, Vance CK, Frommeyer M a, Roth TL. Structural and functional aspects of
551 *Bufo americanus* spermatozoa: effects of inactivation and reactivation. *J Exp Zool A*
552 *Comp Exp Biol* 2003;295:172–82. doi:10.1002/jez.a.10192.

553 [51] Shishova NR, Uteshev VK, Kaurova SA, Browne RK, Gakhova EN. Cryopreservation of
554 hormonally induced sperm for the conservation of threatened amphibians with *Rana*
555 *temporaria* as a model research species. *Theriogenology* 2011;75:220–32.
556 doi:10.1016/j.theriogenology.2010.08.008.

557 [52] Garda AA, Costa GC, Colli GR, Báo SN. Spermatozoa of Pseudinae (Amphibia, Anura,
558 Hylidae), with a test of the hypothesis that sperm ultrastructure correlates with

reproductive modes in anurans. J Morphol 2004;261:196–205. doi:10.1002/jmor.10238.

[53] Shishova N V., Uteshev VK, Sirota NP, Kuznetsova EA, Kaurova SA, Browne RK, et al.

The quality and fertility of sperm collected from European common frog (*Rana*

temporaria) carcasses refrigerated for up to 7 days. Zoo Biol 2013;32:400–6.

doi:10.1002/zoo.21070.

[54] Costanzo JP, Mugnano JA, Wehrheim HM, Lee RE. Osmotic and freezing tolerance in

spermatozoa of freeze-tolerant and -intolerant frogs. Am J Physiol - Regul Integr Comp

Physiol 1998;275.

[55] Fernández-Díez C, González-Rojo S, Lombó M, Herráez MP. Impact of sperm DNA

damage and oocyte-repairing capacity on trout development. Reproduction 2016;152:57–

67. doi:10.1530/REP-16-0077.

Figure legends

Fig. 1. Handling of Panamanian golden frog (A) and catheter positioning for the collection of spermic urine (B).

Fig. 2. Sperm concentration at each post-injection time point for each hormone treatment (n = 24 males) and two controls (n = 12 males): 1 µg/gbw GnRH-A (A), 2 µg/gbw GnRH-A (B), 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A (C), 5 IU/gbw hCG (D), 10 IU/gbw hCG (E), AmphiplexTM (0.4 µg/gbw GnRH-A+ 10 µg/gbw metoclopramide; F). Values are expressed as mean ± SD.

Fig. 3. Sperm concentrations (A) and spermic urine pH (B) measured during peaks of excretion after different hormonal treatments (n = 24 males) and two controls (n = 12 males). Values are expressed as mean ± SD. Bars with different letters are statistically different (P < 0.05).

Fig. 4. Sperm concentration during the 4 seasons of the year after treatment with 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A (A), 10 IU/gbw hCG (B) and AmphiplexTM (C). Values are expressed as mean ± SD.

Fig 5. Percentage sperm motility (A) and sperm forward progressive motility (FPM; B) measured during the peak of excretion after different hormone treatments (n = 24 males). Values are expressed as mean ± SD. Bars with different letters are statistically different (P < 0.05).

Fig. 6. Micrographs of Panamanian golden frog spermatozoa stained with Coomassie Blue (X 1000 magnification). Normal spermatozoa (A) with acrosome (a), head (b), mitochondrial sheath

(c), midpiece (d) and tail (e). Abnormal spermatozoon (B) missing the apical acrosome and with a broken sheath. Abnormal spermatozoon (C) with a coiled tail and no mitochondrial sheath. Abnormal spermatozoon (D) with an abnormal acrosome and coiled tail at the posterior end. Abnormal spermatozoon (E) with a broken tail or with a coiled tail and no sheath.

Fig. 7. Panamanian golden frog spermatozoa observed by phase contrast (A, C, and E), after staining the mitochondria with MitoTracker Green (B, D; X 1000 magnification), or the DNA with Hoechst 33342 (F) and Propidium iodide (G; X 400 magnification).

Fig 8. Percentage of normal spermatozoa by morphological feature after each hormone treatment (n = 27 males) and in control testicular spermatozoa (n = 6 males) and percentage of spermatozoa with intact DNA after best hormone treatments. Normal acrosome (A), normal head (B), normal tail (C), intact DNA (D). Values are expressed as mean $\pm$ SD. Bars with different letters are statistically different ($P < 0.05$).

Table 1. Calculation of sperm concentration peaks by hormonal treatment. The symbol (/) indicates no more time points that were selected for a specific cutoff.

Treatment	Overall concentration (x 10 ⁶ cells/mL)	Cutoff 1 cells/mL	Peak	Cutoff 2 cells/mL	Peak	Cutoff 3 cells/mL	Peak	Cutoff 4 cells/mL	Peak	Total # of Time Points/Peak
			Time		Time		Time		Time	
			Point Selected		Point Selected		Point Selected		Point Selected	
1 µg/gbw GnRH –A	0.92 ± 0.76	1.68x10 ⁶	1	1.38x10 ⁶	2	0.50x10 ⁶	0	/	/	3
2 µg/gbw GnRH-A	1.02 ± 0.66	1.68x10 ⁶	2	1.26x10 ⁶	1	0.99x10 ⁶	1	0.68x10 ⁶	0	4
4 µg/gbw GnRH-A	1.94 ± 0.751	2.69x10 ⁶	1	2.45x10 ⁶	1	2.22x10 ⁶	0	/	/	2
5 IU/gbw hCG	1.0 ± 0.65	1.65x10 ⁶	1	1.46x10 ⁶	1	1.31x10 ⁶	1	1.10x10 ⁶	0	3
10 IU/gbw hCG	1.06 ± 0.68	1.74x10 ⁶	1	1.01x10 ⁶	3	0.67x10 ⁶	0	/	/	4
Amphiplex™ (0.4 µg/gbw GnRH- A+ 10 µg/gbw metoclopramide)	2.23 ± 1.81	4.04x10 ⁶	2	2.54x10 ⁶	0	/	0	/	/	2

616 **Table 2.** Characteristics of sperm concentrations according to the hormonal stimulation.

Treatment	Overall Concentration (x 10 ⁶ cells/mL)	Range (x 10 ⁶ cells/mL)	Peak of Concentration (h post-injection)	Average Concentration at Peak (x 10 ⁶ cells/mL)
1 µg/gbw GnRH –A	0.92 ± 0.76	0.010 – 3.72	1.5 to 3.5	1.70 ± 0.26
2 µg/gbw GnRH-A	1.02 ± 0.66	0.007 – 8.20	1.5 to 5.5	1.34 ± 0.39
4 µg/gbw GnRH-A	1.94 ± 0.75	0.031 – 5.30	2.5 to 3.5	2.65 ± 0.21
5 IU/gbw hCG	1.0 ± 0.65	0.000 – 2.80	2.5 to 4.5	1.56 ± 0.20
10 IU/gbw hCG	1.06 ± 0.68	0.010 – 2.26	2.5 to 5.5	1.57 ± 0.26
Amphiplex™ (0.4 µg/gbw GnRH-A+ 10 µg/gbw metoclopramide)	2.23 ± 1.81	0.020 – 7.98	3.5 to 4.5	4.45 ± 0.07

617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630

Figure

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7

Figure 8

ABSTRACT

Knowledge of basic gamete biology is critical to better protect and propagate endangered amphibian species and also to develop ~~assisted~~ reproductive ~~technique~~technologies combined with germplasm cryopreservation. The objectives of the study were to test different hormonal stimulations and then characterize the quantity and quality of Panamanian golden frog (*Atelopus zeteki*) spermatozoa. Following intraperitoneal injection of the gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist (des-Gly¹⁰, D-Ala⁶, Pro-NHEt⁹-GnRH 1, 2 or 4 µg/g of body weight), human chorionic gonadotropin (hCG; 5 or 10 IU/gbw), or ~~the Amphiplex hormone mixture~~AmphiplexTM (0.4 µg/gbw GnRH-A + 10 µg/gbw metoclopramide hydrochloride), spermic urine samples from 29 males were collected at different time points (from 0.5 to 24 h post-injection) to analyze the concentration, motility, and morphology of the ~~sperm-cells~~spermatozoa. Peak of sperm concentration was observed at 3.5 h post injection for all hormonal treatments.

~~Amphiplex~~AmphiplexTM led to the highest sperm concentrations ($4.45 \pm 0.07 \times 10^6$ cells/mL) followed by 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A ($2.65 \pm 0.21 \times 10^6$ cells/mL). Other stimulation protocols and doses induced sperm production, but at lower levels (ranging from 1.34 to 1.70×10^6 cells/mL). More than 60% of spermatozoa were motile following all treatments but the highest motility (>90%) was obtained from the 10 IU/gbw hCG treatment. Spermic urine samples obtained with all hormone treatments had higher pH (ranging from 7.1 to 7.8) than the urine alone (6.7 to 6.8).

~~Sperm-cells~~Spermatozoa were filiform and elongated with an apical acrosome, a mitochondrial ~~vesicles~~sheath, a small midpiece and a long tail with an undulating membrane. More than 80% of cells were morphologically normal and 50 to 70% had intact DNA. These sperm characteristics were not influenced by hormonal treatments. This first comprehensive characterization of sperm

samples following optimized hormonal stimulations in *A. zeteki* lays the foundation for more fundamental studies, ~~assisted reproduction~~reproductive technologies, and future preservation strategies.

Keywords:

~~Golden frog~~*Atelopus zeteki*, spermatozoa, hormones, ~~assisted reproduction~~reproductive technologies

1. Introduction

Amphibian populations around the world are experiencing drastic declines with 31% considered being threatened with extinction (<http://www.iucnredlist.org>). The genus *Atelopus* represents the largest group in the Bufonidae family ([Anuran order](#)) found in 11 countries in Central and South America [1,2]. About 80% of *Atelopus* species now are threatened with extinction and 56% of those have probably disappeared from their known habitats [1,3] mainly due to the infectious fungal disease chytridiomycosis, climate change, pollution, habitat destruction and the pet trade [1,4]. The Panamanian golden frog (PGF; *Atelopus zeteki*) is an endemic species from Panama that has not been observed in the wild since 2009, is listed as Critically Endangered (CR) by the IUCN, and is protected under Panamanian law [5,6].

Fortunately, a healthy captive assurance population populations of *A. zeteki* ~~exists in U.S. zoos and aquaria where conservation breeding programs are,~~ critical for the preservation of remaining populations, is bred in U.S. zoos and aquaria [7,8].

Improved understanding of reproductive physiology will help successful breeding programs to sustain populations of genetically diverse individuals [9–11]. However, successful ~~natural~~ unassisted breeding of amphibians in captivity can be difficult because of issues related to poor genetic diversity, unsuccessful or asynchronous spawning, absence of male breeding behavior, dystocia, low survival rates of eggs, embryos and juveniles, as well as diseases [10,12].

Exogenous hormone stimulations to collect spermatozoa ~~and oocytes for artificial fertilization (AF)),~~ or for ~~eryopreservation~~ refrigerated or cryopreserved storage, therefore represent a great option to help sustain healthy, genetically viable captive populations over the long term [9].

~~It has previously been reported that males~~ Males amphibians excrete ~~sperm in~~ spermic urine following hormonal stimulations ~~-but results vary among amphibian-species-~~ [9,13,14].

Human chorionic gonadotropin (hCG) has been widely used in numerous amphibian species including *Xenopus*, *Bufo* and *Litoria* to collect spermic urine [15–18]. Additionally, gonadotropin-releasing hormone (GnRH) agonists have been used alone or in combination with dopamine antagonists such as metoclopramide, domperidone or pimozide [9,10,19]. [11,19,20]. Fresh or frozen–thawed spermic urine has been used to fertilize oocytes in Anurans [9]. However, no reports on sperm collection after hormonal stimulation are available in *Atelopus* sp.

~~In addition to sperm concentration, essential traits such as motility, cell morphology, osmolality and pH of the spermic urine have to be assessed for an accurate evaluation of the sperm sample [20]. Sperm motility is usually considered an indicator of fertilization success, frequently associated with the type of fertilization and the spawning environment of a given species [21–24]. In anurans as in fish, sperm motility is triggered by osmotic changes in the extracellular environment [23,25,26]. Cells are immotile inside the testicular tissue that has an osmolality of ~300 mOsm/kg [12,24,26]. Hypotonic environments such as urine or fresh water then trigger the sperm cell motility. Sperm motility is also affected by the pH of the extracellular medium with a neutral pH providing the best conditions for motility as observed in *X. laevis* [24]. Sperm morphology and DNA integrity are additional important traits to consider when evaluating sperm quality since both are essential for successful fertilization and embryo development [27,28]. Lastly, the only report on the reproductive ecology of *A. zeteki* suggests the species breeds from late November to January, during the start of the dry season [29]. However, no data are available on the seasonality of the spermic urine production under captive conditions.~~

Based on the current state of knowledge in *A. zeteki*, the objective of this study was to characterize the effect of the repeated hormonal stimulations throughout the year on sperm concentration and quality.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Animal In addition to sperm concentration, essential traits such as motility, cell morphology, osmolality and pH of the spermic urine (even before the fertilizing ability) have to be assessed for an accurate evaluation of the sperm sample [21]. Sperm motility is usually considered an indicator of fertilization success, frequently associated with the type of fertilization and the spawning environment of a given species [22–25]. In anurans as in fish, sperm motility is triggered by osmotic changes in the extracellular environment [24,26,27]. Cells are immotile inside the testicular tissue that has an osmolality of ~300 mOsm/kg [12,25,27]. Hypotonic environments such as urine or fresh water then activate sperm in anurans and fresh water fish. Sperm motility is also affected by the pH of the extracellular medium with a neutral pH providing the best conditions for motility as observed in *X. laevis* [25]. Sperm morphology and DNA integrity are additional important traits to consider when evaluating sperm quality since both are essential for successful fertilization and embryo development [28,29]. Lastly, the only study on the reproductive ecology of *A. zeteki* reports that the species breeds from late November to January, during the start of the dry season [30]. However, no data are available on the seasonality of the spermic urine production under captive conditions.

Based on the current state of knowledge in *A. zeteki*, the objective of this study was to characterize the effect of the repeated hormonal stimulations throughout the year on sperm concentration and quality.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Male husbandry and identification

Adult males *Atelopus zeteki* (>two year old, average weight of 3.81 ± 0.41 g) were obtained from the Species Survival Plan (SSP) ‘Mata Ahogado’ managed sub-population at the Maryland Zoo in Baltimore, MD. Animal Use Protocols were submitted for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) approval from the University of Maryland, the Smithsonian’s National Zoological Park (SNZP) in Washington, D. C., and Maryland Zoo in Baltimore, MD. After obtaining IACUC approvals, the ~~animals~~frogs were transferred from the Maryland Zoo to the SNZP and were placed ~~30 days~~under quarantine for 30 days. For identification purposes, four photographs of each ~~animal~~frog were taken to distinguish males utilizing their spot patterns and an alpha-numeric code was assigned to each male.

Up to 5 frogs were housed at 20 to 22 °C in each of 6 tanks (Exo-Terra Terrarium, 24”x18”x24”). Tanks were furnished with live potted plants and live moss as substrate, misted with reverse-osmosis-filtered water once every hour for two minutes and drained through a bulkhead. Tanks were lit on a 12-hour cycle with Zoomed10.0 T5 high output UV-B bulbs to avoid D₃ hypovitaminosis and help with proper bone growth ~~{30};[31]~~. Frogs were fed *ad libitum* four times per week with live one-week-old crickets dusted with a calcium carbonate powder

containing vitamin D₃, wingless fruit flies (*Drosophila melanogaster*) or bean beetles (*Callosobruchus sp.*) on a rotating basis.

2.2. Hormone stimulation

~~The treatments doses were chosen based on preliminary dose range experiments with *A. zeteki* and previous successful induction of spawning in other species [9,11,20,31,32]. Hormonal stimulations were administered via intraperitoneal injection (ip) using Terumo Thinpro insulin syringes (30 ga x 3/8"). The different hormonal stimulation were as follows: 1) 1 µg/g of body weight (gbw) of the gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist des-Gly¹⁰, D-Ala⁶, Pro-NHET⁹-GnRH (GnRH-A; Sigma-Aldrich Corporation, St. Louis, MO, USA), 2) 2 µg/gbw GnRH-A 3) 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A, 4) 5 IU/gbw hCG (CG5 Chorionic gonadotropin human; Sigma-Aldrich Corporation), 5) 10 IU/gbw hCG, or 6) a cocktail of 0.4 µg GnRH-A plus 10 µg/gbw metoclopramide hydrochloride (Sigma-Aldrich Corporation) in Amphiplex mixture (named after the combination of the words 'amphibian' and 'amplexus') [11,32]. All hormones were dissolved in Amphibian Ringer Solution (ARS) and control males received 10 µl/gbw (ip) of ARS or no injection at all.~~

Treatment dose was chosen based on preliminary dose-range experiments with *A. zeteki* and previous successful induction of spawning in other species [9,11,20,21,32]. Hormonal stimulations were administered via intraperitoneal injection (ip) using Terumo Thinpro insulin syringes (30 ga x 3/8"). The different hormonal stimulation were as follows: 1) 1 µg/g of body weight (gbw) of the gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist des-Gly¹⁰, D-Ala⁶, Pro-NHET⁹-

GnRH (GnRH-A; Sigma-Aldrich Corporation, St. Louis, MO, USA), 2) 2 µg/gbw GnRH-A 3) 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A, 4) 5 IU/gbw hCG (CG5 Chorionic gonadotropin human; Sigma-Aldrich Corporation), 5) 10 IU/gbw hCG, or 6) AmphiplexTM - a cocktail of 0.4 µg GnRH-A plus 10 µg/gbw metoclopramide hydrochloride (Sigma-Aldrich Corporation) named after the combination of the words ‘amphibian’ and ‘amplexus’ [11,20]. All hormones were dissolved in Amphibian Ringer Solution (ARS; Carolina Biological Supply Company, Burlington, NC, USA) and control males received 10 µl/gbw (ip) of ARS or no injection at all.

2.3 Sperm collection

Session of sperm collections were scheduled once a week. For each session, six males were selected to be ~~stimulated~~induced with one of six hormone treatments ~~plus~~with two additional individuals ~~for~~as controls. After hormonal and control injections, males were placed inside ventilated plastic containers with water soaked paper towel on the bottom and covered from light to reduce stress. Spermic urine was collected by gently inserting a small catheter (0.6 mm I.D. x 1 mm O.D., Micro Medical Tubing, 85 Durometer Vinyl, Scientific Commodities Inc., Lake Havasu City, AZ, USA) in the cloacae (Figure 1) [33]. Sperm collections were carried out at seven different time points post injection: 0.5, 1.5, 2.5, 3.5, 4.5, 5.5 and 24 h. Testicular spermatozoa from eleven euthanized males from another study also were collected after dissection and maceration of the testes in 500 µL ARS, followed by short-term storage at 4 °C until samples were analyzed.

2.4. Sperm processing and analysis

Volume of sample recovered from the catheter was measured with a 200- μ L micropipettor. Sperm concentration was assessed by hemocytometry with 10 μ L spermic urine being added to the chamber. The osmolality and pH of the spermic urine were obtained using a Vapro Osmometer 5520 (Wescor, Inc, South Logan, Utah, USA) and pH indicator strips pH 5.0 - 10.0, EMD Millipore, Billerica, MA, USA), respectively. Percentage of sperm motility was determined by counting all the cells with flagellar movement from a total of 100 cells under an Olympus BX41 microscope at X 400 magnification. Percentage Forward progressive motility (FPM) was obtained by counting all the cells with forward motility relative to 100 cells that were expressing any flagellar movement.

2.5. Sperm morphology analysis

Morphology was assessed by fixing 10 μ L spermic urine in 80 μ L 4% paraformaldehyde solution in PBS. Fixed cell then were stained with Coomassie Blue (0.1% Coomassie Brilliant Blue R-250, 50% methanol and 10% glacial acetic acid) and mounted with PermountTM Mounting Medium (Fisher Scientific, Pittsburgh, PA, USA). Sperm morphology was evaluated at X 1000 magnification under an Olympus BX41 microscope. In a first assessment, a maximum of 100 cells were classified as normal if every morphological parameter of the cell was intact (acrosome, head, mitochondrial ~~vesicles~~sheath and tail) and as abnormal if at least one of the parameters was not intact. In a second reading, a maximum of 100 cells per sample were evaluated in more details for acrosomal integrity [normal (intact) and abnormal (not intact, missing)], head [normal (intact) and abnormal (bent, broken)] and tail [normal (intact) and abnormal (coiled, with cytoplasmic droplet or broken)]. Images of the cells were acquired with a SPOT RT3TM Color Slider microscope camera and the SPOT Advanced Software (SPOT

Imaging Solutions, Sterling Heights, MI, USA). Measurements of the head and tail were obtained from 100 cells from different individuals with the SPOT Advanced Software segmented line measuring tool.

Testicular spermatozoa from eleven euthanized males from another study were also used as a comparison for the morphology assessment (as described above).

For DNA staining, an aliquot of 10 μ L of cells previously fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde was stained with 3 μ L of either Hoechst (excitation/emission of 338/505 nm, 50 mg/mL) or PI (absorption 493 nm, 50 mg/mL) and analyzed under a fluorescence Olympus BX41 microscope (X400). For the mitochondrial ~~vesicles~~sheath staining, 1 μ L of 100 nM MitoTracker® Green FM (Life Technologies, Grand Island, NY, USA), excitation/emission of 490/516 nm, was added to 10 μ L of fresh spermatozoa. After 15 minutes, cells were fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde and analyzed under fluorescence Olympus BX41 microscope (X1000).

2.7. Assessment of sperm DNA integrity

Sperm DNA fragmentation was determined using the terminal deoxynucleotidyl transferase dUTP nick end labeling (TUNEL) technique (DeadEnd™ Colorimetric TUNEL System, Promega Corporation, Madison, WI, USA), with an *in situ* cell detection kit, following the manufacturer's instructions. Ejaculated spermatozoa used in this assay were previously fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde and kept at 4°C until analyzed. Slides were prepared by smearing the samples and letting them air-dry. Slides were then gently rinsed twice with PBS for 5 minutes before the cells were permeabilized with 0.2% Triton X-100 for 5 minutes at room temperature. Slides were again gently rinsed twice with PBS for 5 minutes followed by incubation with the equilibration buffer for 10 minutes at room temperature. Then, 100 μ L of previously prepared

rTdT reaction mix were added to the slides. After covering with plastic coverslips, slides were incubated at 37°C for 60 minutes in a humidified chamber. The reaction was terminated by removing the coverslips and adding 200 µL of 2X SCC to each slide using a pipette, incubating them for 15 minutes at room temperature. Slides were rinsed twice with PBS for 5 minutes. Endogenous peroxidase activity was blocked with 0.3% hydrogen peroxide for 5 minutes and then the slides were again rinsed twice with PBS for 5 minutes followed by incubation with 200 µL Streptavidin Horseradish Peroxidase for 30 minutes. Slides were rinsed twice with PBS for 5 minutes and developed with 3,3'-diaminobenzidine before being mounted with Permount™ Mounting Medium (Fisher Scientific, Pittsburgh, PA, USA) and analyzed at X 1000 magnification under an Olympus BX41 microscope. One hundred cells were counted per slide and classified as intact (no staining) or fragmented (dark brown staining). Testicular spermatozoa from 11 euthanized males from another study were used as a control for the TUNEL assay as well.

2.8. Seasonality

To assess possible seasonal variations in *A. zetekii* sperm concentration, spermic urine osmolality and pH after hormonal stimulation, we divided the year in four blocks (seasons) of three months each, starting with season 1 from January to March, season 2 from April to June, season 3 from July to September and season 4 from October to December.

2.9. Statistical analysis

For each hormonal treatment, sperm concentration peaks (time points with the highest sperm concentrations) were determined using a cutoff value that was calculated by averaging the

total sperm concentration of all time points for each treatment plus one time the standard deviation (SD). The time points with sperm concentrations equal or above the cutoff were removed (as part of the peak) and a new cutoff value was calculated with the remaining time points. This process was repeated until there was no time point left with a sperm concentration equal or higher than the cutoff. All values equal or higher than the cutoffs were considered the most elevated sperm concentrations and part of the peak of sperm production for each hormone treatment [34] (Table 1).

All statistics were carried out utilizing the GraphPad Prism 6.05 software (GraphPad Software, Inc., La Jolla, CA, USA). All data were examined to determine normality and homogeneity of variance using the Brown-Forsythe test. A one-way ANOVA and Tukey's post-hoc test for multiple comparisons were used to determine differences among the treatments. For the effect of treatments on morphology of cells, we tested for differences using one-Way ANOVA followed by Dunn's and Tukey's test for multiple comparisons, or the Kruskal-Wallis test when variances were not homogeneous. Means were considered statistically different if $P < 0.05$. A Spearman correlation test was used to examine the relationship between osmolality and pH, FPM, and between pH and osmolality, Motility and FPM.

3. Results

3.1. Effect of exogenous hormone treatments on the sperm excretion pattern

Compared to both controls, only hormonal injections led to the production of spermic urine samples (Figures 2A-F). Sperm excretion was obtained as early as 0.5 h post-injection with all GnRH-A treatments, 10 IU/gbw hCG and ~~Amphiplex~~AmphiplexTM (Figures 2A-C, 2E-F), while no production of sperm was obtained at this time point after treatment with 5 IU/gbw hCG (Figure 2D). However, for all treatments spermatozoa were mainly collected starting at 1.5 h and up to 24 h post-injection (Figures 2A-F). Following hormonal stimulations, sperm concentrations in samples ranged from 0.0 to 8.20×10^6 cells/mL (Table 2). The peak of excretion lasted longer with 2 µg/gbw GnRH-A, followed by 10 IU/gbw hCG and was shorter for 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A and ~~Amphiplex~~AmphiplexTM treatments (Table 2). Interestingly, all treatments had 3.5 h post-injection as the common time point for peak sperm excretion (Table 2). When comparing the samples obtained during the peaks only, 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A and ~~the Amphiplex mixture~~AmphiplexTM led to higher sperm concentrations ($2.65 \pm 0.21 \times 10^6$ and $4.45 \pm 0.07 \times 10^6$ cells/mL, respectively; $P < 0.05$) than the other hormonal stimulations (Table 2; Figure 3A).

From 0.5 to 24 h post-injection as well as during the excretion peaks, the volume (range, 10 to 270 µL) and the osmolality (range, 56 to 130 mOsm/kg) varied at each time point but were not affected ($P > 0.05$) by the various hormonal treatments. However, the pH was consistently higher ($P > 0.05$) after hormonal stimulation than in the controls. For the spermic urine, pH was lower after treatment with 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A (7.15 ± 0.07) than 5 IU/gbw hCG (7.86 ± 0.05 ; $P < 0.05$) while no differences in pH were observed with the other treatments (Figure 3B).

For the most successful hormonal treatments (4 µg/gbw GnRH-A, 10 IU/gbw hCG, and ~~the Amphiplex mixture~~AmphiplexTM), sperm concentrations were not significantly affected by the seasons of the year (Figure 4). The concentration of sperm in urine obtained from males

302 | injected with ~~the Amphiplex mixture~~ Amphiplex™ remained elevated throughout the entire year
303 | compared to the other two treatments (Figure 4).

304 | Percentages of sperm motility during the peak of excretion were all above 86% (range,
305 | 86.7 to 100 %) regardless of the hormonal treatment. Lowest percentages of motility ($P < 0.05$)
306 | were observed with 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A ($87.2 \pm 0.8\%$) while highest sperm motility ($P < 0.05$)
307 | was obtained with ~~Amphiplex~~ Amphiplex™ ($99.1 \pm 1.3\%$; Figure 5A). Regarding the sperm
308 | motility pattern, lowest percentages of spermatozoa with forward progressive motility were
309 | observed after the stimulation with 2 µg/gbw GnRH-A ($68.9 \pm 7.3\%$) while the highest was
310 | obtained with 10 IU/gbw hCG ($95.4 \pm 2.1\%$; $P < 0.05$; Figure 5B).

312 | 3.2. Effects of exogenous hormonal stimulation on the sperm morphology and DNA Integrity

313 | Spermatozoa of *A. zeteki* have an elongated shape (Figures 6A and 7). The anterior part
314 | of the head exhibits a pointy acrosome (Figure 6Aa) at the tip of a long head (24.5 ± 2.9 µm
315 | including the acrosome; Figure 6Ab) containing the compacted chromatin (Figures 7F and 7G).
316 | The mitochondrial ~~vesicles~~ sheath is a cytoplasmic droplet like structure positive to Mito Tracker
317 | Green FM staining that is located towards the center of the head (Figures 6Ac, 7B, 7D). A small
318 | midpiece at the base of the head (Figure 6Ad) is connecting the head to the sperm tail (8.0 ± 5.6
319 | µm length) and exhibits two filaments joined together by an undulating membrane (Figure 6Ae).

320 | Abnormal morphology including missing acrosomes, missing mitochondrial
321 | ~~vesicles~~ sheaths or coiled tails were observed in all samples (Figure 6B-E), but the vast majority
322 | had normal morphology, regardless of the hormonal treatment (Figure 8). Percentages of normal
323 | sperm heads and acrosomes were similar between hormonal stimulations and did not differ from
324 | the testicular sperm control (Figures 8A, 8B). Multiple abnormal morphologies including

missing acrosomes, missing mitochondrial ~~vesicles~~sheath or coiled tail were observed in the samples (Figure 6B-E). The only difference observed was the lower percentage of normal tail in testicular samples ($P < 0.05$; Figure 8C). Spermatozoa collected after the most effective hormonal stimulations (4 $\mu\text{g/gbw}$ GnRH-A, 10 IU/gbw hCG and ~~Amphiplex~~AmphiplexTM) were also assessed for their DNA integrity. Percentages of intact DNA ranged from 12.0 to 96.7 % and statistically did not differ between treatments or the testicular sperm control ($P > 0.05$; Figure 8D).

4. Discussion

For the first time, sperm samples from captive *A. zeteki* were successfully collected throughout the entire year using hormonal stimulations. The quantity and quality of the gametes was affected by the various hormone preparations with GnRH-A plus metoclopramide resulting in the best collections.

~~AI~~In this study the effectiveness of the different hormone treatments ~~used in this study~~stimulated~~inducing~~ spermiation ~~with variable responses were quite varied~~, as observed in other ~~amphibian species~~anurans [35]. Successful ~~collection~~induction using ~~stimulation with~~ GnRH-A alone was similar to responses observed in other Bufonids [20,31,36]. ~~In our conditions, GnRH-A stimulated~~[21,32,36]. In our conditions, GnRH-A induced the production of significantly higher concentrations of sperm than hCG as observed in species like the Corroboree frog *Pseudophryne corroboree* [37] but not in other Bufonids. For example, *B. fowleri* responding better to hCG than GnRH [17]. Time-dependent increases in sperm concentration ~~has~~have also been observed using hCG and GnRH-A in some bufonid species [18,38]. For instance, a study in *Anaxyrus americanus* showed that hCG stimulation produced a peak between 3 and 9 h post-

injection and no clear peak of sperm production between 3 and 24 h post-injection of GnRH-A [18]. This is different from what we observed in *A. zetekii* where distinct sperm concentration peaks were obtained after stimulation with GnRH-A as well which is consistent with studies in *Rana temporaria* [38]. Frogs treated with ~~the Amphiplex mixture~~ AmphiplexTM reached a sperm production peak at 3.5 h post-injection, with 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A eliciting a more rapid response. In comparison ~~the Amphiplex mixture stimulated,~~ AmphiplexTM induced the production of significantly higher concentrations of spermatozoa. This is interesting because ~~the Amphiplex mixture~~ AmphiplexTM contains only 0.4 µg/gbw GnRH-A, which is 10 times less ~~than the~~ 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A. ~~This, and this~~ suggests that metoclopramide likely potentiated the effect of the lower GnRH-A concentration present in AmphiplexTM [11]. Metoclopramide might be blocking or attenuating the inhibitory effect of dopamine in *A. zetekii*, or increasing the GnRH-A binding affinity to the receptors, as it has been observed with pimozide and domperidone in fish [39]. This is likely triggering the production of higher concentrations of spermatozoa in the urine, perhaps due to higher luteinizing hormone (LH) release [9,11,15,40,41]. While GnRH-A acts on the pituitary, hCG acts directly on the gonads, since this hormone binds to the same receptors as LH [38,42]. There are several reports on the high species variability of spermiation responses following hCG stimulation ~~[11,15,20,42], with fewer species showing a better response to this hormone than to GnRH-A. [11,15,21,42], with fewer species showing a better response to this hormone than to GnRH-A.~~ This is likely due to the relatively low affinity of hCG to the anuran LH receptor [9,38] or to a possible immune response to this mammalian hormone [43].

Even though all the treatments increased the spermic urine pH, treatment with 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A showed significantly lower pH than 5 IU/gbw hCG and also exhibited lower pH

trending towards significance than 2 µg/gbw GnRH-A, 10 IU/gbw hCG and ~~Amphiplex~~AmphiplexTM. Nevertheless, pH did significantly differ among treatments, suggesting that the hormone treatments used in the study increased *A. zetekii*'s spermic urine pH, similar to patterns observed in fish species [44]. We also assessed spermic urine osmolality from all the treatments and found no differences among hormones nor between hormones and controls, suggesting that neither hormone treatment affected the osmolality of the spermic urine in *A. zetekii* nor osmolality had an effect on the lower percentage of motility from 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A. Factors such as pH and ionic composition of the extracellular environment have been shown to play an important role in the regulation of sperm motility in *Xenopus* and ranids ~~[24,26,45]. Even though 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A produced high concentrations of spermatozoa with~~[25,27,45]. Even though 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A produced high concentrations of spermatozoa with a good percentage of motility, the lower pH associated with this treatment may account for the lower motility observed in *A. zetekii* spermatozoa, an effect that seems to be counterbalanced by lower GnRH-A concentrations, metoclopramide in the ~~Amphiplex~~AmphiplexTM treatment and absent in the hCG treatment.

We found that the hormone treatments were equally effective at promoting spermiation in *A. zetekii* year-round with no apparent seasonal effects. If this pattern holds true for females, these ~~assisted-reproductive-methods~~technologies could be used to produce offspring year-round in captive settings.

The percentage of motile spermatozoa was higher than 85% for all the hormone stimulation. ~~Animals~~Frogs treated with GnRH-A exhibited the lowest motility compared to the other treatments that exhibited similar percentage motility during the production peaks. The proportions of motile ~~sperm-cells~~spermatozoa obtained after stimulation is consistent with

reports in other species even without hormonal treatments [9,46]. The slight differences in sperm motility observed in the present study are similar to previous reports in frogs and toads [18,38]. However, the specific mechanism by which hormonal stimulation might affect sperm FPM is not yet understood but others have also observed a dose-dependent relationship between hCG and FPM [18].

A. zetekii sperm has an elongated filiform head with an acrosomal complex on the anterior portion, and a small midpiece at the posterior end of the head. The size and morphology of the ~~sperm-cells~~spermatozoa were found to be homogeneous in the sperm samples regardless of the hormonal treatments administered. The nucleus has a long, conical structure that occupies most of the head of *A. zetekii* spermatozoa which is similar to the morphology reported for another bufonid and several dendrobatid frogs ~~[47–49].~~[47–49]. We also observed the presence of mitochondrial ~~vesicles (MV),~~sheaths [13], which are a cytoplasmic droplet-like structure that contains a high concentration of mitochondria, located in the external mid to lower part of the sperm head, sometimes referred as mitochondrial vesicle [50,51]. ~~The MV~~[50]. The structure is usually present in bufonids and easily damaged by osmotic and temperature changes or handlings [51] making sperm manipulation in *A. zetekii* challenging. The tail is almost twice the length of the head and clearly shows two filaments joined by an undulating membrane, ending in a single filament at the posterior end of the tail. The presence of an undulating membrane and auxiliary fibers in the sperm tail is characteristic of Bufonidae, and other species with aquatic external fertilization modes ~~[22,47,52].~~[23,47,52]. Spermatozoa of *A. spumarius* have an average head size of 19 μm and a tail length of 40 μm [47]. Therefore, the head of *A. zetekii* sperm is slightly bigger while the tail length is similar to *A. spumarius*. To our knowledge, this is the first detailed study on *A. zetekii* sperm morphology. On average about 75% of the cells were normal

and did not differ between hormone treatments. Testicular sperm had a lower percentage of normal tails than excreted sperm probably because testicular sperm samples include a mixture of mature and immature cells and tails may have been damaged during maceration.

The proportion of cells with DNA fragmentation was not different after the various stimulation protocols and was similar to the proportions observed in the testicular spermatozoa. Studies on sperm DNA fragmentation report lower percentages with a cutoff for infertile men at 20% [27].[28]. While there is no established fertility threshold for anurans, 40% of sperm with fragmented DNA seems high in this species as observed in *Rana temporaria* [53]. Breakage in the nuclear chromatin can be related to the following factors: 1) chromatin is highly compacted inside the sperm nucleus where topoisomerases might relieve torsional stress by inducing nicks in the DNA [27].[28]; 2) amphibian sperm activates after a drop in the osmolality of the extracellular environment, which causes an osmotic shock that might induce DNA fragmentation [24,28,54][25,29,54]; 3) sperm manipulation can increase the DNA susceptibility for damage; 4) the TUNEL assay does not discriminate between viable or dead cells, suggesting that the overall DNA fragmentation value could include non-viable cells [27].[28]. It is possible that after fertilization oocyte-repairing mechanisms may be activated [55] to reduce the impact of sperm DNA damage on embryo development.

In conclusion, our study provides a systematic description of *A. zeteki* sperm characteristics as a reference for other species, and as a baseline to evaluate potential future changes within captive lines. We also describe an optimized, safe and repeatable sperm collection protocol for *A. zeteki*. This is a critical first step in developing ~~assisted~~ reproductive ~~techniques~~technologies and sperm cryopreservation to manage captive populations.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the Panamanian Golden Frog SSP and The Maryland Zoo in Baltimore, especially Dr. Ellen Bronson and Kevin Barrett, for providing the ~~animals~~frogs that were used in this study. We also thank Richard Quintero for his support maintaining the research colony.

Authors also thank the Secretaría Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología (SENACyT) from Panama, The Wood Tiger Fund, Smithsonian Endowment for Science and the University of Ottawa Research Chairs Program for their financial support.

References

- [1] Puschendorf R, Ib R, Marca E La, Lips KR, Stefan L, Bola F, et al. Catastrophic Population Declines and Extinctions in Neotropical Harlequin Frogs (Bufonidae : Atelopus) 1 2005;37:190–201.
- [2] Mendelson JR, Lips KR, Gagliardo RW, Rabb GB, Collins JP, Diffendorfer JE, et al. Biodiversity. Confronting amphibian declines and extinctions. Science 2006;313:48. doi:10.1126/science.1128396.
- [3] Direnzo G V, Langhammer PF, Zamudio KR, Lips KR. Fungal infection intensity and zoospore output of Atelopus zeteki, a potential acute chytrid supershedder. PLoS One 2014;9:e93356. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0093356.
- [4] Lips K, Burrowes P. Amphibian Declines in Latin America: Widespread Population Declines, Extinctions, and Impacts1. Biotropica 2005;37:163–5.
- [5] Zippel KC, Ibáñez R, Lindquist ED, Richards CL, Jaramillo C a, Griffith EJ. Implicaciones en la Conservación de las Ranas Doradas de Panamá, Asociadas con su Revisión Taxonómica. Herpetotropicos 2006;3:29–39.

- 465 [6] Becker MH, Harris RN, Minbiole KPC, Schwantes CR, Rollins-Smith LA, Reinert LK, et
466 al. Towards a Better Understanding of the Use of Probiotics for Preventing
467 Chytridiomycosis in Panamanian Golden Frogs. *Ecohealth* 2011;8:501–6.
468 doi:10.1007/s10393-012-0743-0.
- 469 [7] Gagliardo R, Crump P, Griffith E, Mendelson J, Ross H, Zippel K. The principles of rapid
470 response for amphibian conservation, using the programmes in Panama as an example. *Int*
471 *Zoo Yearb* 2008;42:125–35. doi:10.1111/j.1748-1090.2008.00043.x.
- 472 [8] Marca E La, Lips KR, Otters S, Puschendorf R, I Ñ Nez R, Vicente Rueda-Almonacid J,
473 et al. Catastrophic Population Declines and Extinctions in Neotropical Harlequin Frogs
474 (Bufonidae: *Atelopus*). *Biotropica* 2005;37:190–201. doi:10.1111/j.1744-
475 7429.2005.00026.x.
- 476 [9] Clulow J, Trudeau VL, Kouba AJ. Amphibian declines in the twenty-first century: why
477 we need assisted reproductive technologies. *Adv Exp Med Biol* 2014;753:275–316.
478 doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-0820-2_12.
- 479 [10] Kouba A, Vance C, Willis E. Artificial fertilization for amphibian conservation: current
480 knowledge and future considerations. *Theriogenology* 2009.
- 481 [11] Trudeau VL, Somoza GM, Natale GS, Pauli B, Wignall J, Jackman P, et al. Hormonal
482 induction of spawning in 4 species of frogs by coinjection with a gonadotropin-releasing
483 hormone agonist and a dopamine antagonist. *Reprod Biol Endocrinol* 2010;8:36.
484 doi:10.1186/1477-7827-8-36.
- 485 [12] Browne RK, Zippel K. Reproduction and larval rearing of amphibians. *ILAR J*
486 2007;48:214–34.
- 487 [13] Browne RK, Kaurova SA, Uteshev VK, Shishova N V., McGinnity D, Figiel CR, et al.

488 Sperm motility of externally fertilizing fish and amphibians. *Theriogenology* 2015;83:1–
 489 13.

490 [14] Kouba AJ, Lloyd RE, Houck ML, Silla AJ, Calatayud N, Trudeau VL, et al. Emerging
 491 trends for biobanking amphibian genetic resources: The hope, reality and challenges for
 492 the next decade. *Biol Conserv* 2013;164:10–21. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2013.03.010.

493 [15] Mann RM, Hyne R V, Choung CB. Hormonal induction of spermiation, courting behavior
 494 and spawning in the southern bell frog, *Litoria raniformis*. *Zoo Biol* n.d.;29:774–82.
 495 doi:10.1002/zoo.20331.

496 [16] Kouba AJ, Vance CK. Applied reproductive technologies and genetic resource banking
 497 for amphibian conservation. *Reprod Fertil Dev* 2009;21:719–37. doi:10.1071/RD09038.

498 [17] Browne RK, Seratt J, Vance C, Kouba A. Hormonal priming, induction of ovulation and
 499 in-vitro fertilization of the endangered Wyoming toad (*Bufo baxteri*). *Reprod Biol*
 500 *Endocrinol* 2006;4:34. doi:10.1186/1477-7827-4-34.

501 [18] Kouba AJ, delBarco-Trillo J, Vance CK, Milam C, Carr M. A comparison of human
 502 chorionic gonadotropin and luteinizing hormone releasing hormone on the induction of
 503 spermiation and amplexus in the American toad (*Anaxyrus americanus*). *Reprod Biol*
 504 *Endocrinol* 2012;10:59. doi:10.1186/1477-7827-10-59.

505 [19] Browne RK, Li H, Seratt J, Kouba A. Progesterone improves the number and quality of
 506 hormone induced Fowler toad (*Bufo fowleri*) oocytes. *Reprod Biol Endocrinol* 2006;4:3.
 507 doi:10.1186/1477-7827-4-3.

508 ~~[20]~~ [Trudeau VL, Schueler FW, Navarro-Martin L, Hamilton CK, Bulaeva E, Bennett A, et al.](#)
 509 [Efficient induction of spawning of Northern leopard frogs \(*Lithobates pipiens*\) during and](#)
 510 [outside the natural breeding season. *Reprod Biol Endocrinol* 2013;11:14.](#)

511 | [doi:10.1186/1477-7827-11-14](https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7827-11-14).

512 | [21] Obringer AR, O'Brien JK, Saunders RL, Yamamoto K, Kikuyama S, Roth TL.

513 | Characterization of the spermiation response, luteinizing hormone release and sperm

514 | quality in the American toad (*Bufo americanus*) and the endangered Wyoming toad (*Bufo*

515 | *baxteri*). *Reprod Fertil Dev* 2000;12:51–8.

516 | [22] Bernardini G, Andrietti F, Camantini M, Cosson MP. *Xenopus* spermatozoon: correlation

517 | between shape and motility. *Gamete Res* 1988;20:165–75.

518 | [23] Byrne PG, Simmons LW, Roberts JD. Sperm competition and the evolution of gamete

519 | morphology in frogs. *Proc Biol Sci* 2003;270:2079–86. doi:10.1098/rspb.2003.2433.

520 | [24] Byrne PG, Dunne C, Munn AJ, Silla AJ. Environmental osmolality influences sperm

521 | motility activation in an anuran amphibian. *J Evol Biol* 2015;28:521–34.

522 | doi:10.1111/jeb.12584.

523 | [25] Christensen JR, Pauli BD, Richardson JS, Bishop CA, Elliott J. Effects of pH and dilution

524 | on African clawed frog (*Xenopus laevis*) sperm motility. *Can J Zool* 2004;82:555–63.

525 | doi:10.1139/z04-021.

526 | [26] Alavi SMH, Psenicka M, Policar T, Rodina M, Kozak P, Linhart O. Sperm characteristics

527 | in *Barbus barbus* as a function of nutrition throughout the reproductive season. *Cybum*

528 | 2008;32:200–1.

529 | [27] Inoda T, Morisawa M. Effect of osmolality on the initiation of sperm motility in *Xenopus*

530 | *laevis*. *Comp Biochem Physiol A Comp Physiol* 1987;88:539–42.

531 | [28] Agarwal A, Allamaneni SSR. Sperm DNA damage assessment: a test whose time has

532 | come. *Fertil Steril* 2005;84:850–3. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2005.03.080.

533 | [29] Pollock K, Gosálvez J, Arroyo F, López-Fernández C, Guille M, Noble A, et al.

534 Validation of the sperm chromatin dispersion (SCD) test in the amphibian *Xenopus laevis*
535 using in situ nick translation and comet assay. *Reprod Fertil Dev* 2015;27:1168–74.
536 doi:10.1071/RD14070.

537 | [2930] Karraker N, Richards C, Ross H. Reproductive ecology of *Atelopus zeteki* and
538 comparisons to other members of the genus. *Herpetol Rev* 2006.

539 | [3031] Adkins E, Driggers T, Ferguson G, Gehrmann W, Gyimesi Z, Ogle M, et al. Journal of
540 Herpetological Medicine and Surgery Moderator: Eric Klaphake, DVM n.d.

541 | [3132] Waggener W, Carroll E. A method for hormonal induction of sperm release in anurans
542 (eight species) and in vitro fertilization in *Lepidobatrachus* species. *Dev Growth* 1998.

543 | ~~[32] Trudeau VL, Schueler FW, Navarro Martin L, Hamilton CK, Bulaeva E, Bennett A, et al.~~
544 ~~Efficient induction of spawning of Northern leopard frogs (*Lithobates pipiens*) during and~~
545 ~~outside the natural breeding season. *Reprod Biol Endocrinol* 2013;11:14.~~
546 ~~doi:10.1186/1477-7827-11-14.~~

547 [33] Kouba a. J, Vance CK, Willis EL. Artificial fertilization for amphibian conservation:
548 Current knowledge and future considerations. *Theriogenology* 2009;71:214–27.
549 doi:10.1016/j.theriogenology.2008.09.055.

550 [34] Mouttham LL, Buhr M, Freeman EW, Widowski TM, Graham LH, Brown JL.
551 Interrelationship of serum testosterone, dominance and ovarian cyclicity status in female
552 African elephants. *Anim Reprod Sci* 2011;126:115–21.
553 doi:10.1016/j.anireprosci.2011.04.006.

554 [35] Silla AJ, Roberts JD. Investigating patterns in the spermiation response of eight Australian
555 frogs administered human chorionic gonadotropin (hCG) and luteinizing hormone-
556 releasing hormone (LHRHa). *Gen Comp Endocrinol* 2012;179:128–36.

doi:10.1016/j.ygcen.2012.08.009.

- [36] Goncharov BF, Shubravi OI, Serbinova IA, Uteshev VK. The USSR programme for breeding amphibians, including rare and endangered species. *Int Zoo Yearb* 2007;28:10–21. doi:10.1111/j.1748-1090.1989.tb03248.x.
- [37] Byrne PG, Silla AJ. Hormonal induction of gamete release, and in-vitro fertilisation, in the critically endangered southern corroboree frog, *Pseudophryne corroboree*. *Reprod Biol Endocrinol* 2010;8:144. doi:10.1186/1477-7827-8-144.
- [38] Uteshev VK, Shishova N V., Kaurova SA, Browne RK, Gakhova EN, Brown PS, et al. Hormonal induction of spermatozoa from amphibians with *Rana temporaria* and *Bufo bufo* as anuran models. *Reprod Fertil Dev* 2012;24:599. doi:10.1071/RD10324.
- [39] De Leeuw R, Van 't Veer C, Goos HJT, Van Oordt PGWJ. The dopaminergic regulation of gonadotropin-releasing hormone receptor binding in the pituitary of the African catfish, *Clarias gariepinus*. *Gen Comp Endocrinol* 1988;72:408–15. doi:10.1016/0016-6480(88)90163-3.
- [40] Minucci S, Di Matteo L, Baccari GC, Pierantoni R. A gonadotropin releasing hormone analog induces spermiation in intact and hypophysectomized frogs, *Rana esculenta*. *Experientia* 1989;45:1118–21. doi:10.1007/BF01950175.
- [41] Loumaye E, Wynn PC, Coy D, Catt KJ. Receptor-binding properties of gonadotropin-releasing hormone derivatives. Prolonged receptor occupancy and cell-surface localization of a potent antagonist analog. *J Biol Chem* 1984;259:12663–71.
- [42] Pozzi AG, Rosembliit C, Ceballos NR. Effect of human gonadotropins on spermiation and androgen biosynthesis in the testis of the toad *Bufo arenarum* (Amphibia, Anura). *J Exp Zool Part A Comp Exp Biol* 2006;305A:96–102. doi:10.1002/jez.a.254.

- 580 [43] Cabrita E, Robles V, Herráez P. Methods in reproductive aquaculture: marine and
581 freshwater species. 2008.
- 582 [44] Clearwater SJ, Crim LW. Gonadotropin releasing hormone-analogue treatment increases
583 sperm motility, seminal plasma pH and sperm production in yellowtail flounder
584 *Pleuronectes ferrugineus*. *Fish Physiol Biochem* 1998;19:349–57.
585 doi:10.1023/A:1007759620936.
- 586 [45] Mansour N, Lahnsteiner F, Patzner RA. Motility and cryopreservation of spermatozoa of
587 European common frog, *Rana temporaria*. *Theriogenology* 2010;74:724–32.
588 doi:10.1016/j.theriogenology.2010.03.025.
- 589 [46] Kouba AJ, Vance CK, Alexander MA, Eischeid JK, Alford RA, Dixon PM, et al. Applied
590 reproductive technologies and genetic resource banking for amphibian conservation.
591 *Reprod Fertil Dev* 2009;21:719. doi:10.1071/RD09038.
- 592 [47] Siqueira S, Junior OA, Lima AP, Recco-Pimentel SM. Cytogenetics and sperm
593 ultrastructure of *Atelopus spumarius* (Anura, Bufonidae) from the Brazilian Amazon n.d.
- 594 [48] Lipke C, Meinecke-Tillmann S, Meyer W, Meinecke B. Preparation and ultrastructure of
595 spermatozoa from Green Poison Frogs, *Dendrobates auratus*, following hormonal induced
596 spermiation (Amphibia, Anura, Dendrobatidae). *Anim Reprod Sci* 2009;113:177–86.
597 doi:10.1016/j.anireprosci.2008.06.005.
- 598 [49] Veiga-Menoncello ACP, Lima AP, Recco-Pimentel SM. Sperm morphology of five
599 species of *Colostethus* (Anura, Dendrobatidae) from Brazil, with phylogenetic comments.
600 *Acta Zool* 2006;87:147–57. doi:10.1111/j.1463-6395.2006.00229.x.
- 601 [50] Kouba AJ, Vance CK, Frommeyer M a, Roth TL. Structural and functional aspects of
602 *Bufo americanus* spermatozoa: effects of inactivation and reactivation. *J Exp Zool A*

Comp Exp Biol 2003;295:172–82. doi:10.1002/jez.a.10192.

- [51] Shishova NR, Uteshev VK, Kaurova SA, Browne RK, Gakhova EN. Cryopreservation of hormonally induced sperm for the conservation of threatened amphibians with *Rana temporaria* as a model research species. *Theriogenology* 2011;75:220–32. doi:10.1016/j.theriogenology.2010.08.008.

- [52] Garda AA, Costa GC, Colli GR, Báo SN. Spermatozoa of Pseudinae (Amphibia, Anura, Hylidae), with a test of the hypothesis that sperm ultrastructure correlates with reproductive modes in anurans. *J Morphol* 2004;261:196–205. doi:10.1002/jmor.10238.

- [53] Shishova N V., Uteshev VK, Sirota NP, Kuznetsova EA, Kaurova SA, Browne RK, et al. The quality and fertility of sperm collected from European common frog (*Rana temporaria*) carcasses refrigerated for up to 7 days. *Zoo Biol* 2013;32:400–6. doi:10.1002/zoo.21070.

- [54] Costanzo JP, Mugnano JA, Wehrheim HM, Lee RE. Osmotic and freezing tolerance in spermatozoa of freeze-tolerant and -intolerant frogs. *Am J Physiol - Regul Integr Comp Physiol* 1998;275.

- [55] Fernández-Díez C, González-Rojo S, Lombó M, Herráez MP. Impact of sperm DNA damage and oocyte-repairing capacity on trout development. *Reproduction* 2016;152:57–67. doi:10.1530/REP-16-0077.

Figure legends

Fig. 1. Handling of Panamanian golden frog (A) and catheter positioning for the collection of spermic urine (B).

Fig. 2. Sperm concentration at each post-injection time point for each hormone treatment (n = 24 males) and two controls (n = 12 males): 1 µg/gbw GnRH-A (A), 2 µg/gbw GnRH-A (B), 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A (C), 5 IU/gbw hCG (D), 10 IU/gbw hCG (E), ~~Amphiplex-mixture~~ AmphiplexTM (0.4 µg/gbw GnRH-A+ 10 µg/gbw metoclopramide; F). Values are expressed as mean ± SD.

Fig. 3. Sperm concentrations (A) and spermic urine pH (B) measured during peaks of excretion after different hormonal treatments (n = 24 males) and two controls (n = 12 males). Values are expressed as mean ± SD. Bars with different letters are statistically different (P < 0.05).

Fig. 4. Sperm concentration during the 4 seasons of the year after treatment with 4 µg/gbw GnRH-A (A), 10 IU/gbw hCG (B) and ~~Amphiplex~~ AmphiplexTM (C). Values are expressed as mean ± SD.

Fig 5. Percentage sperm motility (A) and sperm forward progressive motility (FPM; B) measured during the peak of excretion after different hormone treatments (n = 24 males). Values are expressed as mean ± SD. Bars with different letters are statistically different (P < 0.05).

Fig. 6. Micrographs of Panamanian golden frog spermatozoa stained with Coomassie Blue (X 1000 magnification). Normal ~~sperm-cell~~spermatozoa (A) with acrosome (a), head (b), mitochondrial ~~vesicle~~(MV; sheath (c), midpiece (d) and tail (e). Abnormal ~~sperm-cell~~spermatozoon (B) missing the apical acrosome and with a broken MVsheath. Abnormal ~~sperm-cell~~spermatozoon (C) with a coiled tail and no MV-mitochondrial sheath. Abnormal ~~sperm-cell~~spermatozoon (D) with an abnormal acrosome and coiled tail at the posterior end. Abnormal ~~sperm-cell~~spermatozoon (E) with a broken tail or with a coiled tail and no MVsheath.

Fig. 7. Panamanian golden frog spermatozoa observed by phase contrast (A, C, and E), after staining the mitochondria with MitoTracker Green (B, D; X 1000 magnification), or the DNA with Hoechst 33342 (F) and Propidium iodide (G; X 400 magnification).

Fig 8. Percentage of normal ~~sperm-cell~~spermatozoa by morphological feature after each hormone treatment (n = 27 males) and in control testicular spermatozoa (n = 6 males) and percentage of spermatozoa with intact DNA after best hormone treatments. Normal acrosome (A), normal head (B), normal tail (C), intact DNA (D). Values are expressed as mean $\pm$ SD. Bars with different letters are statistically different ($P < 0.05$).

666 **Table 1.** Calculation of sperm concentration peaks by hormonal treatment. The symbol (/)
667 indicates no more time points that were selected for a specific cutoff.

Treatment	Overall concentration (x 10 ⁶ cells/mL)	Cutoff 1 cells/mL	Peak	Cutoff 2 cells/mL	Peak	Cutoff 3 cells/mL	Peak	Cutoff 4 cells/mL	Peak	Total # of Time Points/Peak
			Time		Time		Time		Time	
			Point Selected		Point Selected		Point Selected		Point Selected	
1 µg/gbw GnRH –A	0.92 ± 0.76	1.68x10 ⁶	1	1.38x10 ⁶	2	0.50x10 ⁶	0	/	/	3
2 µg/gbw GnRH-A	1.02 ± 0.66	1.68x10 ⁶	2	1.26x10 ⁶	1	0.99x10 ⁶	1	0.68x10 ⁶	0	4
4 µg/gbw GnRH-A	1.94 ± 0.751	2.69x10 ⁶	1	2.45x10 ⁶	1	2.22x10 ⁶	0	/	/	2
5 IU/gbw hCG	1.0 ± 0.65	1.65x10 ⁶	1	1.46x10 ⁶	1	1.31x10 ⁶	1	1.10x10 ⁶	0	3
10 IU/gbw hCG	1.06 ± 0.68	1.74x10 ⁶	1	1.01x10 ⁶	3	0.67x10 ⁶	0	/	/	4
Amphiplex Amphiplex™ (0.4 µg/gbw GnRH- A+ 10 µg/gbw metoclopramide)	2.23 ± 1.81	4.04x10 ⁶	2	2.54x10 ⁶	0	/	0	/	/	2

668

669

670 **Table 2.** Characteristics of sperm concentrations according to the hormonal stimulation.

Treatment	Overall Concentration (x 10 ⁶ cells/mL)	Range (x 10 ⁶ cells/mL)	Peak of Concentration (h post-injection)	Average Concentration at Peak (x 10 ⁶ cells/mL)
1 µg/gbw GnRH –A	0.92 ± 0.76	0.010 – 3.72	1.5 to 3.5	1.70 ± 0.26
2 µg/gbw GnRH-A	1.02 ± 0.66	0.007 – 8.20	1.5 to 5.5	1.34 ± 0.39
4 µg/gbw GnRH-A	1.94 ± 0.75	0.031 – 5.30	2.5 to 3.5	2.65 ± 0.21
5 IU/gbw hCG	1.0 ± 0.65	0.000 – 2.80	2.5 to 4.5	1.56 ± 0.20
10 IU/gbw hCG	1.06 ± 0.68	0.010 – 2.26	2.5 to 5.5	1.57 ± 0.26
Amphiplex <u>AmphiplexTM</u> (0.4 µg/gbw GnRH-A+ 10 µg/gbw metoclopramide)	2.23 ± 1.81	0.020 – 7.98	3.5 to 4.5	4.45 ± 0.07

671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693