Provenance
REPRODUCTIVE PSYCHOLOGY

Psychological Evaluation — Egg Donor Candidate

SAMPLE REPORT — FICTIONAL CANDIDATE — FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY

Candidate:	Donor Candidate #2027-014 (fictional), age 27
Referred by:	[Fertility Clinic] — third-party reproduction program
Referral question:	Psychological suitability for anonymous egg donation, per ASRM guidance
PAI administered:	January 8, 2027 (PARiConnect, online)
Interview:	January 11, 2027 (telehealth video, 70 minutes)
Report date:	January 15, 2027
Evaluator:	Licensed Psychologist, Provenance Reproductive Psychology (PSYPACT)

NATURE AND LIMITS OF THIS EVALUATION

This evaluation was conducted at the request of the referring clinic to assess the candidate's psychological suitability for egg donation. It is not treatment, and no therapist–patient relationship was created. The candidate was informed, and consented in writing, that the report would be released to the referring clinic and that confidentiality is limited accordingly. Findings rest on the candidate's self-report, her intake history, and objective testing; no independent records were provided or reviewed.

TEST RESULTS — PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT INVENTORY (PAI)

Validity indicators were within acceptable limits. The profile is consistent and interpretable: ICN 52T, INF 47T, NIM 44T. PIM was mildly elevated (59T), indicating a tendency to present herself in a favorable light; this pattern is common among donor candidates and, at this level, does not invalidate the clinical scales. It was weighed in interpreting self-report and is addressed under Alignment, below.

Somatic Complaints (SOM)	**47T**	Anxiety (ANX)	**51T**
Anxiety-Related Disorders (ARD)	**49T**	Depression (DEP)	**45T**
Mania (MAN)	**48T**	Paranoia (PAR)	**50T**
Schizophrenia (SCZ)	**44T**	Borderline Features (BOR)	**46T**
Antisocial Features (ANT)	**43T**	Alcohol Problems (ALC)	**42T**
Drug Problems (DRG)	**40T**	Aggression (AGG)	**45T**
Suicidal Ideation (SUI)	**38T**	Stress (STR)	**54T**
Nonsupport (NON)	**50T**	Treatment Rejection (RXR)	**58T**

No clinical scale was elevated. The profile describes a psychologically stable respondent with no indication of mood, anxiety, psychotic-spectrum, substance-use, or personality pathology on objective testing.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Background and stability. The candidate is a 27-year-old graduate student and part-time research assistant, in a stable relationship of three years, living in the same city for five years. Education and employment are progressing as expected. No legal history. She described consistent routines, adequate finances for her circumstances, and a support

network of partner, family, and friends who know of the donation and support it.

Medical and psychiatric history. No chronic medical conditions; no surgeries relevant to donation. No history of psychiatric diagnosis, treatment, hospitalization, or psychotropic medication. She reported ordinary situational stress around examinations, managed with exercise and sleep. Family history is negative for major mental illness, substance-use disorders, and known heritable conditions beyond a paternal grandfather's late-onset cardiovascular disease. She drinks alcohol socially (2–3 drinks monthly) and has never used tobacco or recreational drugs; testing results are consistent with this report.

Motivation and understanding. Her stated motivations combine compensation for school expenses with a stated wish to help a family have a child; she articulated both without embarrassment and in realistic proportion. She demonstrated accurate understanding of the stimulation and retrieval process, its time demands, its medical risks as presented in the clinic's materials, and the possibility that a cycle may be cancelled or unsuccessful through no fault of hers. She understands that donation is anonymous under her agreement, that she will not be told the outcome, and that genetic offspring may exist whom she will never know. She has thought about donor-conceived people seeking contact as adults and responded thoughtfully: she would not experience such contact as an intrusion and would follow the terms she agreed to.

Coercion and consent screen. No third party is directing this decision. The idea originated with the candidate; compensation, while welcome, was described as a reason, not the reason — a formulation she reached on her own. She understands she may withdraw before retrieval and described no pressure from partner, family, or the program.

ALIGNMENT OF TESTING AND INTERVIEW

Test data and interview presentation converge. The mildly elevated PIM score matches an interview style that was polished and eager to be seen as a good candidate; within that style she was nonetheless candid about ordinary stress, financial motivation, and ambivalence-free but realistic views of anonymity. Nothing in the interview contradicted the objective profile, and nothing in the profile suggests material the interview missed.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

This 27-year-old candidate presents as psychologically stable, well-informed, and freely consenting, with no objective or interview evidence of a condition that would impair her capacity to undertake donation or to tolerate its medical and emotional demands. Her understanding of anonymity, genetics, and possible future contact is accurate and settled.

RECOMMENDATION: RECOMMENDED

Basis: valid and unelevated PAI profile; documented stability of housing, relationship, education, and employment; accurate understanding of the medical process, anonymity terms, and future-contact realities; absence of coercion indicators; supportive personal network aware of the donation. Provenance's recommendations are advisory: the clinic's medical director makes the final determination. Other categories used in Provenance reports are Recommended with Conditions, Deferred, and Not Recommended, each with its basis documented in the same format.

Electronically signed: _____, Psy.D., Licensed Psychologist (PSYPACT APIT)
Quality-assurance review completed prior to release, per Provenance protocol.

Sample report prepared by Provenance Reproductive Psychology. The candidate, all dates, and all test scores are fictional and are shown to illustrate report format, structure, and recommendation language only. No actual person was evaluated.