# Gnrh Agonist Stop Antagonist Versus Gnrh Antagonist for Expected Poor Ovarian Response ICSI Cycles. A Randomized Comparative Study

**Abd EI-Naser abd EI-Gaber Ali\*, Mustafa M.khodry[1], Khaled M Abdallah[2]**

[1]ART unit of Obstet. & Gynecol. Department Faculty of Medicine, South Valley University, Egypt

[2]Obstetrics & Gynecology Department, AL-Azhar University, Egypt

## 1. Abstract

**1.1. Study Design:** A Randomized prospective comparable study.

**1.2. Objective:** To compare the efficacy of GnRH agonist stop antagonist and GnRH antagonist in ICSI outcome for women with expected poor ovarian response.

**1.3. Setting:** ART unit of Obstetrics and Gynecology Department of Qena university hospital.

**1.4. Duration:** From September 2016 to December 2017.

**1.5. Patients and Methds:** 88 infertile women with expected poor ovarian response have been included in this study. Patients were randomly classified into 2 groups as regarding to the pituitary suppression protocol (Group I: included 44 women received GnRH agonist stop antagonist protocol and Group II: included 44 women received GnRH antagonist protocol).

**1.6. Results:** 9 cases (4 in group I and 5 in group II) were cancelled due to low follicular growth (< 2). There were no statistically significant differences between the two groups as regarding to the duration or the total doses of gonadotrophins stimulation (p value > 0.05). There were mildly statistically significant differences in the number of retrieved oocytes, endometrial thickness, E2 at date of HCG injection and clinically pregnancy rate per initiated cycles (p value <0.05), but there were highly statistically significant differences between the two groups in oocytes and embryos qualities (p value <0.01).

**1.7. Conclusions:** GnRH agonist stop antagonist protocol was better than GnRH antagonist protocol in expected poor ovarian response infertile women during ICSI cycles (the number of retrieved oocytes and its qualities had increased, enhanced the endometrial thickness and increased E2 at time of HCG injection, increased the embryo quality and increased the clinical pregnancy rate.

**1.8. Recommendation:** GnRH agonist stop antagonist protocolshould have the priority in expected poor responders facing ICSI or IVF procedures.GnRH agonist stop antagonist protocolmay need further many wide randomized trials to verify the precise effect on live birth rate and take home baby.

## 3. Introduction

The success of assisted reproduction technology (ART) is based on many factors including the total number of retrieved ova[1]. The poor ovarian response (POR) incidence in the controlled ovarian hyperstimulation ranged between 9 and 24% as reported in literatures[2]. In PORs, FSH level becomes high in the end of luteal phase this allows the more sensitive and larger antral follicles develop more than the other small follicles and this leads to asynchronization in follicle diameters[3,4] and subsequently the number of follicles ready to be recruited and the number of

*Corresponding Author (s): Obstetrics & Gynecology Department- Faculty of Medicine- South Valley University, Egypt. Email: abdelnaser.abdelgaber@med.svu.edu.eg*

retrieved oocytes will be decreased[5,6]. Inadequate development number of follicles with standardized doses of ovarian stimulation protocols and lower rates of pregnancy are considered the two main POR characteristics[7]. After 2011, a final homogenous definition was proposed by the ESHRE Working Group on Poor Ovarian Response definition called (Bologna Criteria), according to ESHRE new definition, the POR patient must has 2 of 3 following criteria: (a) age ≥ 40 years orpresence of any risk factor for POR other than age as pelvic infection, ovarian surgery, short menstrual cycle, ovarian endometrioma, and or chemotherapy, (b) previous POR (3 or less oocytes) with conventional adequate stimulation protocol; or (c) presence of abnormal ovarian reserve tests as the number of basal antral follicles < 5–7 or AMH < 0.5–1.1 ng/mL) [8]. Various modalities have been suggested in treatment of poor responders in order to improve ovarian response and enhance ART success rate [9]. One of these various protocols (GnRH agonist stop GnRH antagonist protocol) which was introduced by Berger and his associates in 2004 for first time[10], as GnRH agonist used for a short period before gonadotrophins stimulation to ensure pituitary suppression and removal of any residual functional cyst and to prevent premature LH surge, hence decrease cycle cancellation rate[11,12], GnRH antagonist was introduced in assisted reproduction technologies because they were effective in prevention of premature LH surge and could allow a natural recruitment of follicles that developed in the follicular phase[13].Clear verbal counseling and informed written consent had obtained from all participants couples in this study according to the Medical Ethics committee of Faculty of Medicine, South Valley University.

## 4. Methods

Patients were randomly (using a computer generated randomization method) classified into groups as regarding to pituitary suppression protocols (Group I: included 44 women received GnRH agonist hold antagonist protocol) and (Group II: included 44 women received GnRH antagonist protocol). All cases had received combined contraceptive pills in the cycle prior to ICSI cycle. In group I (Agonist stop Antagonist group), GnRH agonist (decapeptyl; Ferring) 0.1 mg injected subcutaneously daily starting in midluteal phase in previous cycle and stopped at time of menstruation before starting gonadotrophins stimulation on day 2 of menstrual cycle (recombinant FSH; Gonal F pen; Serono, Aubonne, Switzerland) or hMG (Menogon; Ferring 75 iu) at 300–450 IU/day was initiated and careful monitoring was done for follicular growth by trans-vaginal ultrasound (every other day) till one follicle or more on both ovaries reached 14mm where GnRH antagonist (Cetrotide; Merck Serono 0.25mg daily) injected subcutaneously till the date of HCG trigger.

## 5. Patients and Methods

This randomly prospective comparative study was conducted on 88 infertile couples with expected poor ovarian response according to presence of (Bologna criteria) from European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology (ESHRE) [8]. Infertile women were defined as poor responders if they had at least 2 of the following 3 criteria: (a) advanced women age (≥40) or presence of any other risk factor for POR; (b) presence of previous poor ovarian response (POR) (≤ 3 oocytes retrieved under a conventional stimulation protocol); (c) presence of any abnormalities in ovarian reserve tests (ORT) (AFC <5–7 or AMH <0.5–1.1 ng/mL). The selected cases underwent ICSI procedure at assisted reproduction unit of Qena university hospital from September 2016 to DecemberIn group II (Antagonist group) gonadotrophins stimulation started on day 2 of menstrual cycle (as in group I) and GnRH antagonist (Cetrotide 0.25 mg) injected subcutaneously daily when one follicle or more on both ovaries reached 14mm, Cetrotide injection continuous till the time of HCG trigger. In both groups when 2 follicles or more had 18 mm (mean diameter) recombinant HCG (Ovitrelle 500 IU) was injected subcutaneously for final follicular maturation. Cycle cancellation was considered if less than 2 follicles were achieved. Oocytes retrieval was done 36 hours post hCG triggering and ICSI procedure was performed for all cases. One to three good quality (A&B) day 3 and day 5 embryos were transferred.

## 6. Outcome Measures

Primary outcome was measuring the number and quality of retrieved oocytes,total doses and duration of gonadotrophins stimulation, E2 levels and endometrial thickness and its pattern on the day of hCG triggering and number of cycle cancellation. The secondary outcome assessed the fertilization rate, number and quality of embryos and pregnancy (chemical and clinical) rate. Serum β-hCG level was assayed 2 weeks post embryo transfer and trans-vaginal ultrasound assessment was done 3 weeks later for positive cases (chemical pregnancy) in order to confirm pregnancy by detection of gestational sac or sacs and fetal viability by observing fetal heart valve movements (clinical pregnancy). Luteal support was achieved with 400 mg cyclogest administered vaginally twice daily for 2 weeks post fertilization for all cases had embryo or embryos transferred, the hormonal support continued in HCG positive cases to the end of first trimester.

## 7. Statistical Analysis

Results of this study were expressed as means± standard deviation (SD), or number (%). Comparison between the 2 categorical data was performed using t test or and χ2. The data was considered significant if p values was ≤ 0.05 and highly significant if p <

0.01. SPSS computer program (version 19 windows) was used in the statistical analysis.

## 8. Results

9 cases (4 in group I and 5 in group II) were cancelled (less 2 follicles had developed during controlled ovarian stimulation). There were no statistically significant differences between group I and II in women age, BMI, AMH, basal AFC, day 2 FSH, day 2 E2, duration or causes of infertility (p value >0.05 **(Table 1)**. Also there were no statistically significant differences between the 2 groups as regarding to the number of cancelled cycles, the duration or the total doses of gonadotrophins stimulation (p value > 0.05). There were mildly statistically significant differences in the number of retrieved oocytes, endometrial thickness and E2 at time of HCG injection (p value <0.05), but there was a highly statistically significant difference between the two groups in quality of retrieved oocytes (p value <0.01) **(Table 2).** There was no significance between group I and II in fertilization rate, number of transferred embryos and chemically positive pregnancy rate, but there was a highly significance in embryos qualities and a mildly significance in the clinically pregnancy rate per initiated cycles (p value <0.05) **(Table 3).**

**Table 1:** Patient characteristics NS= non significant.

| | Group I (N=44) | Group II (N=44) | P value |
|---|---|---|---|
| Age in years (mean ±SD) | 38.3 ± 3.6 | 39.1 ±3.4 | NS |
| BMI Kg/m2 (mean ±SD) | 28.4±3.7 | 27.9 ±3.2 | NS |
| AMH ng/ml (mean ±SD) | 1.0 ±0.3 | 9.7±0.2 | NS |
| Basal AFC (mean ±SD) | 4.6± 2.3 | 4.3± 2.1 | NS |
| Day 2 FSH (mIU/mL) (mean ±SD) | 9.3 ± 3.4 | 9.6 ± 3.2 | NS |
| Day 2 E2 (pg/mL) (mean ±SD) | 34.2 ± 16.2 | 35.6 ± 18.4 | NS |
| Infertility Duration (yrs) (mean ±SD) | 8.7 ± 4.6 | 8.6 ± 4.4 | NS |
| Causes of infertility (%) | | | |
| Male factor | 44.2 | 43.7 | NS |
| Tubal factor | 14.3 | 15.1 | NS |
| Ovarian factor | 10.5 | 10.7 | NS |
| Endometriosis | 7.9 | 8.1 | NS |
| Unexplained | 23.1 | 22.4 | NS |
| Cycle cancellation (no %) | 4 (9.09) | 5 (11.36) | NS |

NS= non significant

**Table 2:** Ovarian stimulation outcome in Group I and Group II

| | Group I (N=40) | Group II (N=39) | P value |
|---|---|---|---|
| Duration of gonadotrophins stimulation (days) (mean ±SD) | 11.7±1.6 | 11.3±1.4 | NS |
| Dose of gonadotrophins (IU) (mean ±SD) | 4743.6±1241.4 | 4675.1±1220.4 | NS |
| Number of oocyte retrieved (mean ±SD) | 8.3±3.2 | 6.4±2.7 | S |
| Oocyte maturity (no %) | | | |
| M2 | 280(66.7) | 190(59.1) | S* |
| M1 | 140 (33.3) | 132(40.9) | |
| Endometrial thickness in mm (mean ±SD) | 10.7 ± 2.3 | 9.8 ± 2.1 | S |
| Estradiol (E2) in day of HCG triggering (mean ±SD) | 1366.3 ± 743.2 | 1123.4 ±691.3 | S |

NS= non significant    S = significant    * = highly significant

**Table 3:** ICSI outcome in Group I and Group II.

| | Group I (N=40) | Group II (N=39) | P- value |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fertilization rate (%) | 71.5% | 69.7% | NS |
| Embryo grades (%) | | | |
| A &B | 65.3% | 53.2% | S* |
| C &D | 34.7% | 56.8% | |
| No. of embryos transferred (mean ±SD) | 1.7±0.6 | 1.8±0.6 | NS |
| Chemical pregnancy rate per initiated cycle (no %) | 18/40 (45.0) | 17/39 (43.0) | NS |
| Clinical pregnancy rate per initiated cycle (no %) | 14/40 (35.0) | 11/39(28.2) | S |

NS= non significant    S = significant    * = highly significant

## 9. Discussion

Assisted reproduction techniques had helped millions of infertile and subinfertile couples all over the world to achieve the dream of the motherhood and fatherhood. Since the time of Louise Brown birth in 1978,[14] assisted reproductive techniques have been evolved dramatically in a great effort in optimization in the probability of pregnancy for subinfertile couples. Although the numerous scientific and technological evolution, however, the poor ovarian response management for *in vitro*fertilization or intracytoplasmic sperm injection is still assessed to be one of the most hard task for the infertility specialists[15,16], where small number of women gametes could be obtained in poor responders and associated with a significantly diminished pregnancy rate. Various modalities have been used over the past few years towards optimal management of poor responders and many modified controlled ovarian hyperstimulation protocols had been implemented without concreting evidence on the compelling advantages for one protocol over the other[17,18]. Poor ovar-

ian response actually is a big challenge in assisted reproduction centers all over the world. In this study we aimed to compare the GnRH agonist stop antagonist and GnRH antagonist as pituitary suppression protocols in management of expected poor ovarian response ICSI cycles, GnRH agonist had known in its ability of suppression any residual ovarian cysts and decline the high basal LH which is associated with oocyte aneuploidy beside it increase the quality of retrieved oocytes but has disadvantages where a large number of gonadotrophins ampoules are needed besides an increase in the duration of gonadotrophins stimulation so in this study we had used GnRH agonist for short period in the luteal phase (to overcome the previous disadvantages) and had stopped immediately when menstruation occurred before starting stimulation with gonadotrophins, the GnRHantagonist was administered in group I later on when one follicle or more achieved 14 mm in mean diameter and compared with GnRH antagonist protocol (alone not proceeded with agonist) in group II. In this study GnRH agonist stop antagonist protocol was significantly better than GnRH antagonist protocol in the increased number and quality of retrieved oocytes, enhanced endometrial thickness and its pattern and increased the levels of estradiol in the day of HCG injection also had statistically significant differences as regarding to quality of embryos and clinically pregnancy rate per initiated cycle, and these results agreed with many results had been reported in literature as Demirol et al. [19] and Yannis et al .[20], Demirol etal. [19] had showed that a agonist microflare protocol had a highly significant rate of implantation in comparison with the antagonist protocol in women with poor ovarian response, in had found no difference in the quality of oocyte in contrary to our results. Our study had demonstrated that the clinical pregnancy rate was significantly higher in the GnRH agonist group than GnRH antagonist group but the total pregnancy rate did not have a significant difference in both groups and these results agreed with what had been reported by Yannis et al. [20] who showed clinical pregnancy rate (35.8% agonist versus 25.6% antagonist with P = 0.03). In contrary to our results what had been reported by Cheung et al. [21], in a prospective randomized trial that compared the long GnRH agonist to the antagonist protocol in poor responders IVF cycles and reported that there was no a statistically significant difference between the 2 groups as regard to stimulation or in the laboratory and the pregnancy outcomes with exception of the transferred embryos number that had a higher significance in the antagonist group (2.32 ± 0.58 versus 1.50 ±0.83 with P value = 0.01). In our study the cancellation rate was similar in both group but in Yanniset al. [18] reported a higher cancellation rate in GnRH antagonist group. In literature there are 2 RCTs had evaluated the effect of a standard nonstop long GnRH agonist protocol (started in luteal phase of previous cycle prior to ICSI cycle) versus a stop GnRH agonist protocol as

regarding to pregnancy rate in poor responder infertile women [22,23], the results of these 2 studies showed that there was no statistically significant difference between nonstop long GnRH agonist and stop GnRH agonist in the clinical pregnancy rate per initiated ICSI cycle (OR=1.17,95% -CI: 0.42–3.24), but any way these two studies reported statistically significant differences in the duration of gonadotrophins stimulation (WMD: −0.4 days; 95% CI: −2.0 to +1.2) and in the total doses gonadotrophins drugs used for controlled ovarian stimulation (WMD: −3.6 ampoules, 95% CI: −18.8 to +11.6), with a similar number of retrieved oocytes in the 2 groups (WMD: +0.64 COCs, 95% CI: −3.1 to+4.3).

## 10. Conclusions

GnRH agonist stop antagonist protocol was superior to GnRH antagonist protocol in; increased number and quality of retrieved oocytes, enhancement of endometrial thickness and increased E2 at time of HCG injection, increased embryo quality and increased the clinical pregnancy rate in expected poor ovarian response infertile women.

## 11. Recommendations

(a) GnRH agonist stop antagonist protocolshould have the priority in expected poor responders facing ICSI or IVF procedures. (b) GnRH agonist stop antagonist protocolmay need further many wide randomized trials to verify the precise effect on live birth rate and take home baby.

## References

1. Temel T, Akpak Y K, ¨un I G, Oral S, Sofuo˘glu K. Impact of paternal age on intracytoplasmic sperm injection cycle results International Journal of Reproduction, Contraception, Obstetrics and Gynecology. 2015; 622-628.

2. Pandian Z, McTavish AR, Aucott L, Hamilton MP, Bhattacharya S. Interventions for 'poor responders' to controlled ovarian hyper stimulation (COH) in in-vitro fertilization (IVF). Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2010; (1): CD004379.

3. Fanchin R1, Salomon L, Castelo-Branco A, Olivennes F, Frydman N, Frydman R. Luteal estradiol pre-treatment coordinates follicular growth during controlled ovarian hyperstimulation with GnRH antagonists. Hum Reprod Hum Reprod. 2003; 18(12): 2698-703.

4. Fanchin R, Cunha-Filho JS, Schonäuer LM, Kadoch IJ, Cohen-Bacri P, Frydman R. Coordination of early antral follicles by luteal estradiol administration provides a basis for alternative controlled ovarian hyperstimulation regimens. Fertil Steril. 2003; 79(2): 316-21.

5. Elassar A, Engmann L, Nulsen J, Benadiva C. gonadotrophins versus luteal estradiol and gonadotropin releasing hormone antagonist protocol in women with a prior low response to ovarian stimulation. Fertil Steril. 2011; 95(7): 2330-4.

6. Hill MJ, McWilliams GD, Miller KA, Scott RT, Jr, Frattarelli JL. A luteal

estradiol protocol for anticipated poor-responder patients may improve delivery rates. Fertil Steril. 2009; 91(3): 739-43.

7. Ubaldi F M, Rienzi L, Ferrero S. Management of poor responders in IVF," Reproductive BioMedicine Online. 2005; 235-246.

8. Ferraretti AP, La Marca A, Fauser BC, Tarlatzis B, Nargund G, Gianaroli L. "ESHRE consensus on the definition of 'poor response' to ovarian stimulation for in vitro fertilization: the Bologna criteria. Hum Reprod. 2011; 26(7): 1616-24.

9. Nikolaos P, Polyzos A, Paul D. A systematic review of randomized trials for the treatment of poor ovarian responders: is there any light at the end of the tunnel. Fertil Steril. 2011; 96(5): 1058-61.

10. Berger B, Ezcurra D, and Alper M: "The agonist-antagonist protocol: a novel protocol for treating the poor responder," Fertility and Sterility, vol. 82, supplement 2, p. S126, 2004.

11. Detti L, Will iams DB, Robinson JC, Maxwell RA , Thomas MA . A comparison of a three down regulation approaches for poor responders undergoing in vitro fertilization. Fertil Steril 2005; 84: 1401- 1403.

12. Surrey ES , Bower J, Hill DM, Ramsey J, Surrey MW. Clinical and endocrine effects of microdose GnRH agonist flare regimen administered to poor responders who are undergoing in vitro fertilization. Fertil Steril 1998; 69: 419-424.

13. The Ganirelix Dose-Finding Study Group: A double-bind, randomized, dose-finding study to assess the efficacy of the gonadotropin-releasing hormone antagonist ganirelix (Org 37462) to prevent premature luteinizing hormone surges in women undergoing ovarian stimulation with recombinant follicle stimulating hormone (Puregon). Hum Reprod 1998; 13: 3023-3031.

14. Steptoe, P.C. & R.G. Edwards. 1978. Birth after the reimplantation of a human embryo. Lancet 2: 366.

15. Tarlatzis, B.C., L. Zepiridis, G. Grimbizis, et al. 2003. Clinical management of lowovarian response to stimulation for IVF: a systematic review. Hum. Reprod. Update 9: 61–76.

16. Kyrou, D., E.M. Kolibianakis, C.A. Venetis, et al. 2009. How to improve the probability of pregnancy in poor responders undergoing in vitro fertilization: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Fertil. Steril. 91: 749–766.

17. Pandian Z1, McTavish AR, Aucott L, Hamilton MP and Bhattacharya S: Interventions for 'poor responders' to controlled ovarian hyper stimulation (COH) in in vitro fertilization (IVF). Cochrane Database Syst Rev 20(1): CD004379, 2010.

18. Polyzos NP and Devroey P: A systematic review of randomized trials for the treatment of poor ovarian responders: Is there any light at the end of the tunnel? Fertil Steril 96: 1058-1061.e7, 2011.

19. Demirol L, Williams DB, Robins JC, Maxwell RA, Thomas MA. Comparison of microdose flare-up and antagonist multiple dose protocols in poor responder patients. Fertil Steril 2005;84:S325.

20. Yannis Prapas, Stamatios Petousis, Themistoklis Dagklis, Yannis Panagiotidis, Achilleas Papatheodorou, Iuliano Assunta, Nikos Prapas: GnRH antagonist versus long GnRH agonist protocol in poor IVF responders: a randomized clinical trial. European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology 166 (2013) 43–46.

21. Cheung LP, Lam PM, Lok IH, et al. GnRH antagonist vs. long GnRH agonist protocol in poor responders undergoing IVF: a randomized controlled trial. Human Reproduction 2005;20:616–21.

22. Dirnfeld,M., O. Fruchter, D. Yshai, et al. 1999. Cessation of gonadotropin-releasing hormone analogue (GnRH-a) upon down-regulation versus conventional longGnRH-a protocol in poor responders undergoing in vitro fertilization. Fertil. Steril. 72: 406–411.

23. Garcia-Velasco, J.A., V. Isaza, A. Requena, et al. 2000. High doses of gonadotrophins combined with stop versus nonstop protocol of GnRH analogue administration in low responder IVF patients: a prospective, randomized, controlled trial. Hum. Reprod. 15: 2292–2296.