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**Introduction.** IVF known as In vitro fertilization, a process by which an egg is fertilized with sperm, creating a very controlled environment outside the body, mostly in vitro. Infertility treatment by IVF is an area where religious, cultural, social and psychological conflicts continue, making this qualitative study relevant. The aim of the study is to discuss and study the ethical aspects, conflicts and concepts for IVF.

**Materials and methods.** In order to conduct the analysis, a qualitative study of information based from literatures, current policies and legislations was reviewed. These were mainly based on the concept of IVF and ethical problems associated with it. The literatures studied mainly focused on frequently occurring conflicts within the sectors of religion, financial affects, medical morality, scientific progression, gender and sexuality relevance and vulnerability exploitation.

**Results of research.**The finding from several literatures showed a great rise in recent years for the use of this treatment, which is usually commercial and is intended for couples who have a problem with fertilization, not allowing them to have children. Although, speaking about the latter, recently there has been an increase in the number of less stereotyped individuals using such facilities, such as single people and homosexual couples. Many criticisms stem from the argument that IVF is contrary to the natural concept, for example, the use of IVF treatment by women post menopause. Couples may also face objections from groups opposing the birth of children from unmarried or samesex couples. Objections to this may be from secular circles who claim that a new-born child needs both a mother and father for his or her healthy development. IVF is not only considered evil for the religious side of society, but it is mainly condemned for

the financial weight of governments, as well as individuals who pay privately. Therefore, the process is often labelled as "exploitation of vulnerable individuals". But on the other hand of IVF you have consumers of this service, for which understanding and concept are completely different. Here the psychological fact has to be understood that for many people, the path of infertility and unsuccessful attempts of conception and the birth of a child can be one that is extremely difficult to go through, along with the mental and physical trauma of infertility, social trauma also hinders the weight layer and can also determine the overall level of human well-being. Many are experiencing severe depression, cultural and social discrimination giving a sense of being out casted due to infertility, and therefore for such people, IVF can mean

the process by which their acceptance in society can occur as well as being the defining factor in having a successful relationship with their partners.

Individuals can also argue that regardless of heterosexuality, homosexuality, stereotyped couples or an individual using an egg donor, their life should be led by their choices and they should be able to decide as to when, where, with whom and how they choose to have children regardless of it being by natural conception or through IVF. For doctors and scientists IVF is an ideal example of progressive medicine, thanks to which life is improved or created. But because of the financial costs associated with the use of such an improved technology, it is economically impossible to offer it for free or at affordable prices, and for its continued provision, financial support from consumers is mandatory.

**Conclusions.** Considering all the scenarios, this discussion seems like an endless argument in favour of the correct ethical status. But the question remains. What is the ethical correct answer? Is this the “exploitation of vulnerable people” or a means to achieve human desires? Is this the greatest scientific development in the field of medicine, or do physicians play "God"?