Gonadotropin-releasing hormone analogue as sole luteal support in antagonist-based assisted reproductive technology cycles

Itai Bar Hava, M.D.,[a] Moran Blueshtein, Ph.D.,[b] Hadas Ganer Herman, M.D.,[a] Yeela Omer, M.D.,[a] and Gila Ben David, M.D.[a]

[a] The Fertility Center from A to Z, Assuta Medical Centre, Ramat Aviv, Tel-Aviv, Israel; and [b] Naveen Jindal School of Management, University of Texas at Dallas, Dallas, Texas

Objective: To evaluate the efficacy of GnRH agonists (GnRH-a) as sole luteal phase support in patients undergoing IVF in antagonist-based cycles compared with standard vaginal P preparations.
Design: Retrospective cohort.
Setting: Private fertility clinic.
Patient(s): Patients who underwent antagonist-based cycles performed at our clinic between 2009 and 2015.
Intervention(s): Intranasal GnRH-a or vaginal P as luteal support.
Main Outcome Measure(s): Live birth rates.
Result(s): A total of 2,529 antagonist-based cycles from 1,479 women were available for analysis, in which GnRH-a were used in 1,436 cycles (56.7%) and P supplementation in 1,093 cycles (43.2%). Significantly higher live birth rates were demonstrated for the entire GnRH-a group compared with the P group. This result was even more prominent when women older than 35 years were considered separately. Furthermore, after adjustment for age, body mass index (BMI), past obstetric history, number of IVF cycles, oocyte retrieved and embryos transferred, GnRH-a was still associated with a higher rate of live birth (odds ratio 1.46, 95% confidence interval 1.10–1.94). Once a positive β-hCG was achieved, chemical pregnancy rates (PRs) and miscarriage rates were not statistically different between the GnRH-a and the P supplementation group, and GnRH-a was associated with a higher rate of live births (odds ratio 1.59, 95% confidence interval 1.07–2.36).
Conclusion(s): This large retrospective study suggests that repeated intranasal GnRH-a for luteal phase support is associated with a higher live birth rate compared with standard P supplementations. (Fertil Steril® 2017;107:130–5. ©2016 by American Society for Reproductive Medicine.)
Key Words: GnRH analogue, luteal phase support, in vitro fertilization (IVF), pregnancy, live birth rate

Discuss: You can discuss this article with its authors and with other ASRM members at https://www.fertstertdialog.com/users/16110-fertility-and-sterility/posts/12555-22443

Luteal phase deficiency is an unfavorable sequel of assisted reproduction technology (ART). To compensate for this lack, luteal phase support is routinely incorporated in ART cycles with supplementation in various forms and doses. Progesterone is the hallmark of luteal supplementation and is commonly used as the sole preparation for support, or in combination with hCG preparations, E_2 preparations, or both.

In addition to the standard luteal phase support, the administration of a single or multiple boluses of luteal GnRH agonists (GnRH-a) has gained popularity in ART protocols in recent years. It has been found to improve pregnancy and live birth results (1).

In 2005 Pirard et al. (2) investigated the use of GnRH-a as a substitute to P for luteal phase support. They conducted a feasibility study followed by a pilot study in 2006 (3) and a prospective randomized comparative study in 2015 (4). All three studies demonstrated that continued luteal intranasal administration of GnRH-a as a sole preparation for luteal phase support is effective in nondown-regulated cycles.

To our knowledge, this is the first large study (2,529 ART cycles)

Received May 17, 2016; revised October 2, 2016; accepted October 5, 2016; published online October 27, 2016.
I.B.H. has nothing to disclose. M.B. has nothing to disclose. H.G.H. has nothing to disclose. Y.O. has nothing to disclose. G.B.D. has nothing to disclose.
Reprint requests: Hadas Ganer Herman, M.D., The fertility center A to Z, affiliated with Assuta Medical Centre, 43, Brodetsky Street, Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv, Israel (E-mail: hadassganer@yahoo.com).

Fertility and Sterility® Vol. 107, No. 1, January 2017 0015-0282/$36.00

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fertnstert.2016.10.011

investigating the administration of daily, repeated intranasal GnRH-a as a sole preparation for luteal phase support. We retrospectively evaluated GnRH-a for luteal support in patients undergoing IVF and/or intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI) in antagonist-based cycles, and compared its efficacy to that of standard vaginal P preparations.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study is a retrospective evaluation of 2,529 antagonist-based cycles performed in 1,479 women aged 25–45 years in our clinic between December 2009 and May 2015 (The Fertility Clinic from A to Z, Ramat Aviv, Tel-Aviv, Israel). Oocyte pickup and ET procedures were performed in Assuta Medical Centre Rishon LeZion.

Stimulation in these patients was initiated on day 3 of the menstrual cycle with either recombinant FSH (Gonal-F, Puregon, Pergoveris, Elonva) or hMG (Menogone, Menogpur HP). A flexible approach for antagonist co-treatment (Orgalutran or Cetrotide) was initiated whenever the leading follicle reached 15 mm or the E_2 level was >1,000 pmol/L, and was continued until, and including, the day of ovulation induction. Final oocyte maturation was triggered with a single double bolus of Ovitrelle (0.250 mg each). Oocyte pick-up was performed 36 hours later.

Patients were presented upon initiation of every cycle with a choice of luteal support—GnRH-a inhaler or traditional vaginal P tablets—in light of new research published before their treatment during the study period (3). It was stated that according to this new research they seem to have comparable efficacy and the ease of use seems to be in favor of the inhaler. No attempt was done to convince the patients to use either one of these luteal support methods. Subsequently, luteal support patients were treated with either nasal inhaler (GnRH-a group) or common vaginal preparations (P supplementation group). Cycles during which luteal support was switched from the inhaler to vaginal route were excluded from analysis. There were two reasons for switching: patient inconvenience or low midluteal P levels (<30 mmol/L). Switching from vaginal preparation to the inhaler was not performed due to what we assumed as the presumed mechanism. In cases of low midluteal P levels, we doubled the vaginal dosage.

In the GnRH-a group luteal support was initiated on the evening of oocyte retrieval (one puff of 200 μg of nafareline [Synarel]) followed by 200 μg twice daily (total, 400 μg/d). Gonadotropin-releasing hormone administration was terminated 2 weeks after oocyte pickup. In cases with a positive hCG result no additional luteal support was provided (5). In the P supplementation group our patients received either Endometrin (200 mg twice a day) or Crinone 8% (1 application twice a day) starting the morning after egg retrieval. This support was also terminated 2 weeks after oocyte pickup in cases with a positive hCG results.

In both groups, P and E_2 levels were evaluated in the midluteal phase to confirm satisfactory luteal support levels. Satisfactory levels were considered as 30 mmol/L for P and 300 mmol/L for E_2, the SD cutoff calculated from previous cycles performed at our clinic. Progesterone and E_2 levels were also evaluated with positive pregnancy tests.

All of our patients have electronic charts using Clicks software, where baseline characteristics and current treatment outcomes are registered. The baseline variables used were age, body mass index (BMI), previous IVF cycles, number of children, and number of previous pregnancies. Current treatment outcomes used were number of oocytes retrieved, number of embryos transferred, implantation rate (calculated as number of sacs on ultrasound divided by number of embryos transferred), midluteal P and E_2 levels, positive pregnancy test (defined as a β-hCG level of $\geq$40 mIU/mL), chemical pregnancy (β-hCG <1,000 mIU/mL), miscarriage (after demonstration of a intrauterine gestational sac), and live birth (>24 weeks gestation) outcomes.

A detailed statistical analysis was performed using STATA, version 12.0. Differences between mean values were assessed by *t* tests and Pearson χ^2 tests. Logistic regressions were used to estimate the effect of GnRH-a on several pregnancy outcomes, and odd ratios were obtained. Multivariable models simultaneously adjusted for age, BMI, number of cycle, number of children, number of previous pregnancies, number of oocytes retrieved, and number of embryos transferred. In further analysis we also controlled for midluteal P and E_2 levels. When midluteal P and E_2 levels were considered, the values of their natural logs were used to normalize their distributions. Regression analysis was conducted with robust standard errors to adjust for patients having multiple IVF treatments. All *P* values were two-sided and a probability of <.05 was considered to be statistically significant. An Institutional Review Board approval for the study was provided by the Assuta Medical Center Institutional Review Board committee.

RESULTS

Between December 2009 and May 2015, a total of 2,529 ART cycles from 1,479 women aged 25 to 45 years at treatment time were available for analysis. In 1,436 treatment cycles (56.7%) GnRH-a was used, whereas traditional P supplementation was used in 1,093 treatment cycles (43.2%).

Women in the GnRH-a group were younger (37.7 $\pm$ 4.8 vs. 39.6 $\pm$ 3.9 years old; $P<.001$) and had fewer IVF cycles (1.6 $\pm$ 1.1 vs. 1.9 $\pm$ 1.4; $P<.001$). Number of children, number of previous pregnancies, and BMI were not significantly different between groups (Table 1). After treatment they had a higher number of oocytes retrieved (9.7 $\pm$ 7.6 vs. 4.7 $\pm$ 5.3; $P<.001$) and embryos transferred (2.0 $\pm$ 1.0 vs. 1.9 $\pm$ 1.0; $P<.001$), and a higher implantation rate (12.9% vs. 9.8%; $P<.001$). Positive β-hCG was achieved in 27.9% of the GnRH-a cycles compared with 19.8% of P cycles ($P<.001$). In cases of a positive β-hCG, chemical pregnancy rates (PRs) were not statistically different between the GnRH-a and the P supplementation groups, compared with miscarriage rates, which were significantly lower, and live birth rates, which were significantly higher among women treated with GnRH-a.

Women treated with GnRH-a had significantly higher levels of midluteal P and E_2 levels (194.3 $\pm$ 146.0 vs 134.0