Assessment of Ovarian Reserve by Hormonal and Ultrasound Markers among Fertile and Infertile Women

Ban Hadi Hameed* FICOG, Shaymaa Abdul Sattar Nayyef** FICOG, Yasmin Najim Abdulla** DGO, Miami Abdul Hassan Ali* FICOG

ABSTRACT

Background: Infertility of an ovarian origin is one of the most distressing conditions to both the gynecologist and the partners which necessitate the use of markers that can predict the ovarian reserve and the response for infertility treatment.

Objective: To assess the ovarian reserve in the infertile women by means of hormonal and ultrasound markers and compare them with fertile women.

Methods: A prospective case control study was carried out on 60 infertile women (study group) and 60 healthy fertile women (control group) for a period of one year from January 2012 till January 2013 at Al Yarmouk teaching hospital in Baghdad. We compared the ultrasound and hormonal markers as predictors of ovarian reserve in both groups.

Results: The mean serum inhibin B level was lower in the study group in comparison to the control group. The difference was statistically significant. There was no significant difference in the mean serum estradiol level in the study group in comparison to the control group. The mean serum follicle stimulating hormone level was significantly higher in the study group. The ovarian volume was larger in the control group than the study group. The difference was statistically significant. The mean number of large size antral follicles was significantly higher in the control group than the study group. The mean number of small size antral follicles was significantly higher in the control group than the study group.

Conclusion: This study suggests that higher number of the small size antral follicles, higher serum inhibin B and lower serum follicle stimulating hormone might be considered as good predictors of ovarian reserve.

Keywords: Ovarian reserve, Ultrasound and hormonal markers.

Iraqi Medical Journal Vol. 64, No. 2, July 2018; p.175-180.

Tests for ovarian reserve (OR) have been used to predict the ovarian response to stimulation as part of infertility treatment. Observational studies have demonstrated an association between factors such as serum follicle-stimulating hormone (FSH), serum inhibin, anti-mullarian hormone (AMH), antral follicles count (AFC) and subsequent ovarian response stimulation⁽¹⁾. Measurement of FSH levels in the early follicular phase is a simple predictor of ovarian reserve, a value greater than 10 mIU/mL indicates poor ovarian reserve and necessitates a thorough further evaluation and possibly higher treatment $doses^{(2,3)}$

Early follicular phase serum inhibin B may be a suitable marker of ovarian follicle reserve and fertility potential⁽⁴⁾. The use of transvaginal sonography to ovarian volume and obtain an early follicular phase antral follicle count and size is one of the best validated tests to detect ovarian reserve. The number of small antral follicles reflects the size of the resting follicular pool, less than 10 antral follicles predict poor response to gonadotropin stimulation⁽⁵⁾.

Studies demonstrated that the number of pre-antral or small antral follicles (2-6 mm) declined with age and the number of larger follicles (7-10 mm) remained constant, suggesting that the number of small AFCs represents the functional OR⁽⁶⁾.

AMH is an early and reliable ovarian reserve. predictor of represents the quantity of the ovarian

^{*}Dept. of Gynecology and Obstetrics, College of Medicine, Al Mustansiriyah

^{**}Dept. of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Alyarmuk Teaching Hospital, Baghdad.

follicle pool and has been found to indicate a problem before an increase baseline follicle-stimulating in hormone (FSH) is seen^(7,8).

From the review analysis it was clear that the AFC and AMH are superior to the other tests of ovarian reserve (9)

-Methods

A prospective case control study was carried out in the Infertility Department at Al-Yarmouk Teaching Hospital in Baghdad, Iraq for a period of one year from January 2012 till January 2013. A total of 120 participants were enrolled in this study, the study group (60 infertile women) were collected from the infertility clinic while the control group (60 fertile women) were collected from the outpatient clinic. A detailed history was obtained and physical examination was done to all women in this work.

The inclusion criteria for the study group were: Women with primary or secondary infertility, both ovaries are present, no current or past diseases affecting the ovaries or gonadotropin or sex steroid secretion or excretion, adequate visualization of the ovaries by transvaginal ultrasound scan and ovarian cause of infertility. All the patients agreed to participate in this study and verbal consents were obtained from all infertile and fertile women before enrolling them in the study.

Each woman had been given an appointment to come in the early follicular phase of menstrual cycle (day 3 of the cycle) underwent blood sampling for serum inhibin B, estradiol (E2) and FSH hormones and transvaginal ultrasound scan for measurement of the size and number of the antral follicles in both ovaries and the size of both ovaries. Collected blood venipuncture was allowed to clot, and the serum had been separated centrifugation at room temperature. The serum then frozen at -80C⁰ by liquid nitrogen prior to assay by enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) tests. Using inhibin B, E2 kits each one contains 60 strips and the results were expressed by (pg/mL) and FSH kit contains 60 strips and the results were expressed by mIU/mI in the laboratory of Al-Yarmouk Teaching Hospital.

-Results

The current study showed the mean women's age was 31.45±6.39 (years) for the study group and 32.07±6.66 (years) for the control group, this difference was not significant statistically since P value was 0.094, there was a larger ovarian volume in the control group than the study group and this was statistically significant since p value was 0.0001, (Table 1).

The mean number of large size antral follicles in both ovaries in the study and the control groups was 0.70 ± 0.62 and 1.08 ± 0.70 respectively and this was statistically significant as P value was 0.007, the mean number of small size antral follicles in both ovaries in the study and the control groups was 7.48 ± 1.69 and 11.17± 2.58. respectively and this was statistically significant as P value was 0.0001, (Table 2).

Concerning the hormonal markers, the mean serum inhibin B for the study group was 62.34 ± 9.68 (pg/ml) which was lower than the control group which was 76.40 ± 8.11 and the difference was statistically significant since the p value was 0.0001, the mean serum E2 for the study group was 40.37 ± 6.28 compared with the mean serum E2 in control group which was 42.24 ± 4.68, this difference was statistically not significant since the p value was 0.067, the mean serum FSH for the study group was 8.54 ± 1.30 (mIU/mI) which was significantly higher than the control group which was 6.27 ± 1.20 since the p value was 0.0001, (Table 3).

Serum inhibin B was inversely correlated with women's age in the study and the control groups, it was directly correlated with the number of the large size and small size antral follicles in both ovaries in the study and the control groups, it was directly correlated with the serum E2 and inversely correlated with the serum FSH in the study and the control groups, (Table 4).

The current study showed that serum FSH was directly correlated with the women's age in the study and the control groups, it was inversely correlated with the

number of the large size and small size antral follicles in both ovaries in the study and the control groups. However, it was inversely correlated with the serum inhibin B and serum E2 in the study and the control groups, (Table 5).

Table 1: The distribution of women's age, volume of both ovaries in the study and the control

| | | Study group | | Control group | | P value |
|--|----------------------|-------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------|
| | | No. | % | No. | % | |
| Age (years) | 20-24 | 10 | 16.7 | 9 | 15.0 | |
| | 25-29 | 8 | 13.3 | 12 | 20.0 | |
| | 30-34 | 26 | 43.3 | 15 | 25.0 | |
| | 35-39 | 8 | 13.3 | 18 | 30.0 | |
| | ≥40 | 8 | 13.3 | 6 | 10.0 | |
| | Mean ±SD (range) | 31.45±6. | 39 (20-42) | 32.07±6.0 | 66 (19-41) | 0.094 |
| Rt ovary volume | Small (<2.5x2x2) | 14 | 23.3 | 15 | 25.0 | 0.0001* |
| | Medium (2.5- <3x2x2) | 44 | 73.3 | 25 | 41.7 | |
| | Large (≥3x2x2) | 2 | 3.3 | 20 | 33.3 | |
| Lt ovary volume | Small (<2.5x2x2) | 3 | 5.0 | 10 | 16.7 | 0.0001* |
| | Medium (2.5- <3x2x2) | 45 | 75.0 | 21 | 35.0 | |
| | Large (≥3x2x2) | 12 | 20.0 | 29 | 48.3 | |
| *Significant using Pearson Chi-square test at 0.05 level of significance | | | | | | |

Table 2: The distribution of number of large and small size antral follicles in both ovaries for the

study and the control groups.

| | | Study group | | Control group | | P value |
|--|------------------|------------------------------|------|------------------|------|---------|
| | | No. | % | No. | % | |
| Large size antral | 0 | 23 | 38.3 | 12 | 20.0 | 0.007* |
| follicle(≥7mm) number in both ovaries | 1 | 32 | 53.3 | 31 | 51.7 | |
| | 2 | 5 | 8.3 | 17 | 28.3 | |
| | 3 | - | - | - | - | |
| | Mean ±SD (Range) | 0.70±0.62 (0-2) | | 1.08±0.70 (0-2) | | |
| Small size antral follicle (2-6 | 5-6 | 22 | 36.7 | 3 | 5.0 | 0.0001* |
| mm) number in both ovaries | 7-8 | 17 | 28.3 | 10 | 16.7 | |
| | 9-10 | 21 | 35.0 | 7 | 11.7 | |
| | 11-12 | - | - | 19 | 31.7 | |
| | ≥13 | - | - | 21 | 35.0 | |
| | Mean ±SD (Range) | ±SD (Range) 7.48±1.69 (5-10) | | 11.17±2.58(5-15) | | |
| *Significant using Pearson Chi-square test at 0.05 level of significance | | | | | | |

Table 3: The mean serum inhibin B, serum E₂ and serum FSH for both the study and the control groups.

| y | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------|--|--|
| | Study group | Control group | P value | | |
| | Mean ±SD (Range) | Mean ±SD (Range) | | | |
| Serum Inhibin B (pg/ml) | 62.34±9.68 (47.10-73.60) | 76.40±8.11 (63.20-90.40) | 0.0001* | | |
| Serum Estradiol (pg/ml) | 40.37±6.28 (30.10-49.40) | 42.24±4.68 (31.10-50.20) | 0.067 | | |
| Serum FSH (mIU/ml) | 8.54±1.30 (7.10-10.50) | 6.27±1.20 (4.00-8.10) | 0.0001* | | |
| *Significant using Students-t-test for difference between two independent means at 0.05 level of significance. | | | | | |

Table 4: The correlation of serum inhibin B with the women's age, ultrasound and hormonal markers in the study and the control groups.

| | | Serum Inhibin B (pg/ml) | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| | | Ctudy group | Control group | |
| | | Study group | Control group | |
| Age (years) | r | -0.783** | -0.637** | |
| | Р | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | |
| Large size antral follicle number in both ovaries | r | 0.892** | 0.529** | |
| | Р | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | |
| Small size antral follicle number in | | 0.830** | 0.727** | |
| both ovaries | Р | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | |
| Serum estradiol (pg/ml) | | 0.955** | 0.363** | |
| | Р | 0.0001 | 0.004 | |
| Serum FSH (mIU/ml) | r | -0.965** | -0.814** | |
| | | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | |

Table 5: The correlation of serum FSH with the women's age, ultrasound and hormonal markers in the study and the control groups.

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

| | | Serum F | FSH (MIU/ml) | |
|--|---|---|---------------|--|
| | | | | |
| | | Study group | Control group | |
| Age (years) | | 0.758** | 0.750** | |
| | | 0.0001 | 0.000 | |
| Large size antral follicle number in | r | -0.889** | -0.219 | |
| both ovaries | Ρ | 0.0001 | 0.093 | |
| Small size antral follicle number in | | -0.810** | -0.846** | |
| both ovaries | Р | 0.0001 | 0.000 | |
| Serum inhibin B (pg/ml) | r | -0.965** | -0.814** | |
| | Р | 0.0001 | 0.000 | |
| Serum estradiol (pg/ml) | r | -0.947** | -0.079 | |
| | | 0.0001 | 0.548 | |
| *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level. | | **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. | | |

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

-Discussion

A spectrum of prognostic markers of OR were validated in the infertile population. These included biochemical markers (FSH. estradiol (E₂), inhibin B, anti-Mullerian hormone, FSH-LH ratio)(10) and ovarian morphometric markers like ovarian volume. antral follicles count (small and large size antral follicles) and mean ovarian diameter that were assessed in the early follicular phase of the menstrual cycle(11). Studies showed that the lower antral follicles count (less than five per ovary) at base line, low ovarian volume (less than 2 ml), low base line serum E2, elevated serum FSH and low serum inhibin B levels were all associated with diminished ovarian reserve (DOR)⁽¹²⁾.

The goal of ovarian reserve testing is to add more prognostic information to the counseling and planning process so as to help couples choose among treatment options(13).

The current study showed that the mean serum inhibin B was significantly higher in the control group than the study group. The mean E2 was not significantly different in the study and the control groups. Mean FSH was significantly higher in the study group as compared with the control group. Ultrasound markers showed that the control group had a larger ovarian volume than the study group. These results agreed with the study done by Stacea Bowen et al who showed that there is a statistically significant decrease in three ovarian size parameters accompanied advancing age (ovarian width, ovarian length and the mean overall ovarian diameter). Levels of FSH demonstrated a significant and linear correlation with age, increasing levels of FSH (and hence declining OR) were associated with a statistically significant decline in the mean ovarian width, length, and overall mean ovarian diameter(11).

In consistent with the current study, Shachi Shukla et al found that with increasing age (> 35 vrs) hormonal markers of ovarian reserve i.e., s.FSH increases while sonographic markers of ovarian

reserve i.e.. AFC and ovarian volume decreases thus decreasing the chances of conception and there was a highly significant negative correlation between s.FSH and ovarian volume and s.FSH and AFC⁽¹⁴⁾

Frattarelli et al demonstrated that mean diameter (length ovarian + width/2) comparable provided а dearee predictability of OR as the ovarian volume in the infertile women undergoing assisted reproductive technology⁽¹⁵⁾.

There is a study demonstrated that the number of pre-antral or small antral follicles (2-6 mm) declined with age and the number of larger follicles (7-10 mm) remained constant, suggesting that the number of small AFCs represents the functional OR⁽⁶⁾.

And this is consistent with Grynberg et al. who reported that large follicles showed much poorer correlation to FSH and Inhibin B than smaller antral follicles⁽¹⁶⁾.

In another study done by Yomna Islam et al to determine the value of mean ovarian volume, AFC, maternal age, FSH and AMH in infertile patients undergoing ovulation induction or IVF cycles showed that the total AFC and AMH are found to correlate significantly with the ovarian response with p values < 0.001 and 0.03 respectively, indicating that they are good predictors of ovarian reserve. The basal FSH and ovarian volume did not correlate with the ovarian response indicating their poor value as predictors of ovarian reserve⁽¹⁷⁾.

The current study did not agree with Marzieh et al who stated that neither follicular phase **FSH** nor estradiol concentrations are reliable predictors of ovarian reserve(18) and Maheshwari et al stated that the available tests for ovarian reserve do not have enough predictive power to justify their routine clinical use⁽¹⁹⁾.

Yarali et al considered poor ovarian reserve and poor responders as those patients who have a day 3 FSH > 10 mIU/ml, day 3 E > 60 pg/ml or bilateral antral follicle count <6(20).

In conclusion: ovarian reserve can be assessed by hormonal and ultrasound marker (FSH, serum inhibin. serum estrogen, ovarian volume, AFC and size) to predict ovarian response to stimulation as part of infertility treatment.

We recommend further prospective studies with larger sample size to confirm these finding. Also, further studies required to know the role of anti mullarin hormone (AMH) as marker of ovarian reserve.

-References

- 1. Siladitya Bhattacharya. Infertility. In: Davison J, Dornhorst A, S Arulkumaran, Adam H., Bennett P, Farthing A (eds.). Dewhurst's Textbook of Obstetrics and Gynecology. 8th edition. Blackwell. 2012. P. 567-79.
- 2. Lisa M Halvorson, John O Schorge, Joseph I Schaffer, Barbara L Hoffman, Karen D Bradshaw, F Gary Cunningham, (eds). Reproductive Endocrinology. Williams Gynecology. 3rd edition. McGraw- Hill's. 2016. P. 334-68.
- 3. Barry O'Reilly, Cecilia Bottomley, Janice Rymer. The menstrual cycle, menstrual disorders, infertility and the menopause. Essentials of Obstetrics and Gynaecology. 2nd edition. Elsevier; 2012, 19-51,
- 4. Fan Zhang, Xiao-ling Liu, Nan Rong, Xiaowen Huang. Clinical value of serum anti-mullerian hormone and inhibin B in prediction of ovarian response in patients with polycystic ovary syndrome. Journal of Huazhong University of Science and Technology 2017; 37 (1):70-73.
- 5. Last Updated January 2011 Guide to referencing the Australian Medicines Handbook publications AMH BOOK Harvard Rossi, S (ed), 2011, Australian Medicines Handbook 2011.
- 6. Shivi Jain. Antral follicle count as predictor of ovarian reserve. ARC Journal of Radiology and Medical Imaging 2017; 2 (1): 1-3.
- 7. Priya Bhide, Amit Shah, Anil Gudi, Roy Homburg. The role of anti-müllerian hormone as a predictor of ovarian function. Journal of Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists 2012; 14(3): 161-6.
- 8. Susan Bewley, Ying Cheong, Sarah M Creighton. Subfertility. Gynecology by Ten Teacher. 19th edition 2011. P. 85-92.
- 9. Isabelle Roux, Togas Tulandi, Peter Chan, Hananel Holzer. Initial investigation of infertile

- couple. Textbook of Assisted Reproductive Techniques. 4th edition. Taylor & Francis Group. 2012. P. 31-40.
- 10. Ho JY, Guu HF, Yi YC, Chen MJ, Ho ES. The serum follicle-stimulating hormone -to-luteinizing hormone ratio at the start of stimulation with gonadotropins after pituitary down-regulation is inversely correlated with a mature oocyte vield and can predict "low responders". Fertil Steril 2005: 83: 883-8.
- 11. Stacea Bowen, John Norian, Nanette Santoro, Lubna Pal. Simple tools for assessment of ovarian reserve: individual ovarian dimensions are reliable predictors of ovarian reserve. Fertility Sterility 2007; 88(2): 390-4.
- 12. Coccia ME, Rizzello F. Ovarian reserve. Ann NY Aca Sci 2008;1127:27-30.
- 13. Kaur M, Arora M. Diminished ovarian reserve, causes, assessment and management. Int J Infertility Fetal Med 2013; 4(2): 45-55.
- 14. Shachi Shukla, Rakesh Pratap Khuteta, Rajeev Yadav, Kshitij Sharma. Study the correlation of hormonal and sonographic markers of ovarian reserve in Indian woman with primary infertility. Int J Res Med 2016; 5(2);147-9.
- 15. Levi AJ, Frattarelli JL, Miller BT. A prospective novel method of determining ovarian size during in vitro fertilization cycles. J Assist Reprod Genet 2002;19:39-41.
- 16. Grynberg M, Genro V, Gallot V, El-Ali A, Frydman R, Fanchin R. Early follicle development during luteal-follicular transition affects predictability serum follicle-stimulating of hormone but not anti-mullerian hormone levels on cycle day 3. Fertil Steril 2010; 94(5):1827-31.
- 17. Yomna Islam, Mona M.Aboulghar, Alaa El-Din Al Ebrashy, Omar Abdel-Aziz. The value of different ovarian reserve tests in the prediction of ovarian response in patients with unexplained infertility. Middle East Fertility Society Journal 2016; 21 (2): 69-74.
- 18. Marzieh Farimani, Iraj Amiri, Sedigheh Hoseini. Day 3 serum inhibin-B level is not predictive of ovarian assisted reproductive technologies outcome. Iranian Journal of Reproductive Medicine 2006; 4(1);1-5.
- 19. Maheshwari A, Gibreel A, Bhattacharya S, Johnson NP. Dynamic tests of ovarian reserve: a systematic review of diagnostic accuracy. Reprod Biomed Online 2009; 18(5): 717-34.
- 20. Yarali H, Esinler I, Polat M, Bozdag G, Tiras B. Antagonist/letrozole protocol in poor ovarian responders for intracytoplasmic sperm injection: a comparative study with the microdose flare-up protocol. J Fertil Steril 2009; 92(1):231-5.

- IMJ 2018;64(2):175-180.