Anti-Mullerian hormone (AMH) as a predictive marker in assisted reproductive technology (ART)

Human Reproduction Update, Vol.16, No.2 pp. 113–130, 2010

Fellow 洪雅珊 2010-6-29

- AMH on ovarian physiology
- Factors modulating AMH levels in women
- Prediction of quantative ovarian response in ART
- Prediction of qualitative ovarian response in ART
- AMH in ovarian reserve testing
- AMH in testicular physiology
- Value of AMH measurement in infertile men



# • Produced by granulosa cells , from pre-antral and antral follicles

- Main role : the inhibition of the early stages of follicular development .
- Reflect the ovarian follicular pool, follicle  $\downarrow \rightarrow AMH \downarrow$
- Clinical marker of ovarian reserve and response to gonadotrohpins
- Prediction of quantitative and qualitative ovarian response in ART

- Secreted by Sertoli cell, from GA 8wks
- Main role: the paracrine control of testicular function.
- Detected in both serum and seminal fluid →specific marker of Sertioli cell function →may obtain information on spermatogenesis
- May use to diagnostic work-up for OAT and azoospermia
- May use in prediction the successful sperm retrieval in azoospermia.

-

· · · · · · ·

.

•

- In vitro and in vivo study, primordal →growing follicles became enhanced in absence of AMH , leading to early exhaustion of the primordial follicle pool
- Mana analyzing fallialag ware found in AMII pull miga than in wild



#### Figure I AMH is secreted by pre-antral and antral follicles.

It seems to inhibit initial follicle recruitment and FSH-stimulated follicle growth. The role of AMH in the two main compartments of normal ovarian follicle development (the red centre represents the oocyte, the grey area represents the granulosa cell layer and the white area represents follicle fluid in the antrum). AMH is expressed in small and large pre-antral follicles (broken arrows) and in small antral follicles (whole arrow), and the latter mainly contributes to serum levels. Initial recruitment takes place as a continuous process, whereas cyclic recruitment is driven by a rise in FSH serum levels at the end of a previous menstrual cycle. The inhibitory effects of AMH are shown (a) on the initial recruitment of primary follicles from the resting primordial follicle pool and (b) on the sensitivity of antral follicles for FSH (reproduced with permission from Broekmans et *al.*, 2008).



 $\sim$ 



- Increase within 0-4y/o
- Keep stable until adult
- Decrease to undetectable at menopause

• Undetectable 3-5days after bil oophorectomy →solely of ov origin



Figure 2 Left: Mean serum AMH levels show a reduction throughout reproductive life. Undetectable AMH levels after spontaneous menopause have been reported (constructed graphic). Right: Circulatory pattern of AMH during the menstrual cycle of young healthy women aged 18–24 years. Serum AMH levels have been shown to be stable throughout the menstrual cycle. Day 0 = day of LH surge (reproduced with permission from La Marca et al., 2006a).



. . . . .







<u>.</u> . .

- - -

· · · · ·

-

· · · · ·

· · · · · · ~ · · · ·

. . . . . .

· · ·

· · · · ~

.

-

-

•

- Higher in insulin-R PCOS, and in amenorrheic PCOS
- May be more strongly related to PCO than to the full spectrum of the syndrome
  - Prospective, randomized, double blind study (Carlsen, 2009)
    - Pt had diet and lifestyle counselling and metformin
    - Randomized to either dexamethosone or placebo
    - AMH were unaffected by 6 months in all groups

- Sensitivity: 67%; specificity : 92%
- If sono data are not available  $\rightarrow$  used as a diagnostic criteria





• FSH  $\uparrow \rightarrow E2 \uparrow \rightarrow$  down-regulation of AMH and AMHII mRNA (Baarends, 1995)

Author	n	R with oocytes*	AMH better than					
			AFC	Ov. Vol	d3 FSH	d3 E2	d3 inhB	Age
Seifer et al. (2002)	107	0.48			1	$\checkmark$		
Van Rooij et al. (2002)	120		FELS 11		~		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Fanchin et al. (2003a, t H1	gher A	MH in D3 –	→greater r	no. of retr	ieved oocy	ytes.		
Muttukrishna et al. (20 🤈 4	5 fold h	igher with a	least 11	oocytes t	han <6 00	cytes	$\checkmark$	
Hazout et al. (2004)				obeytes a		v v	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Muttukrishna et al. (2005)	108	0.5	=	]	$\checkmark$			
Eldar-Geva (2005)	56	0.64	х	_	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	
Silberstein et al. (2006)	257	0.33			$\checkmark$			
Figicioglu et al. (2006)	50	0.56	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$
Lekamge et al. (2007)	126	0.34	=	AEC and		famo	, il an	
La Marca et ol. (2007)	48	0.7		AFC and	AMH per	10rm sin	mar	
Kwee et al. (2007)	110	0.63	×	power to	predict ov	respons	e J	$\checkmark$
Nakhuda et al. (2007)	77	0.63			$\checkmark$			
McIlveen et al. (2007)	84	0.78	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		=	$\checkmark$
Nelson et al. (2007)	340	0.71		200	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$
Elgindy et al. (2008)	33	0.88	=	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			
Lie Fong et al. (2008)	125	0.47						
Jee et al. (2008)	59	0.53					×	
Jayaprakasan et al. (2008)	135	0.47	=	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$
Wunder et al. (2008)	276	0.35			$\checkmark$		×	

•

 $\sim$ 

.

Table I Studies on AMH as marker of ovarian response to controlled ovarian stimulation (COS)

Comparison with other predictors.

\*R with oocytes: correlation between serum AMH levels and the number of retrieved oocytes;  $\sqrt{}$ , better than; X, worse than; =, equal to,



- compared value of AMH and AFC in prediction ovarian response in IVF
- No significant difference

- No. of developed follicle
- No. of retrieved ooctyes
- Cycle cancellation

Author	n	Study design	Cut-off value	Sens (%)	Spec (%)	Definition of poor response	AMH assay
Van Roolj et al. (2002)	119	Prosp	0.3 µg/l	60	89	<4 oocytes	Immunotech-Beckman- Coulter
Muttukrishna et dl. (2004)	69	Prosp	0.1 ng/ml	87.5*	72.2*	<4 occytes or cancellation	Immunotech-Beckman- Coulter
Muttukrishna et <i>al.</i> (2005)	108	Retro	0.2 ng/ml	87	64	≤4 oo cytes	Immunotech-Beckman- Coulter
Tremelien et al. (2005)	75	Prosp	8.1 pmol/l	80	85	≤4 oo cytes	Immunotech-Beckman- Coulter
Peñarrubla et al. (2005)	80	Prosp	4.9 pmo1/i	53*	96*	cancellation	Immunotech-Beckman- Coulter
Ebner et al. (2006)	141	Prosp	1.66 ng/ml	69	86	<4 oocytes	Immunotech-Beckman-
FRANCISCO STATURARIO I	819.	104675	M.0.542520	2022	11228	101000000000000000000000000000000000000	Coulter
Smeenk et al. (2007)	80	Prosp	1.4 µg/l	62	73	≤4 oocytes	Immunotech-Beckman- Coulter
Mellveen & al. (2007)	84	Prosp	1.25 ng/ml	58	75	≤4 oblytes	Immunotech-Beckman- Couiter
Kwee et al. (2007)	110	Prosp	1.4 µg/i	76	86	<6 oocytes	Diagnostic System Laboratories
Nakhuda et al. (2007)	77	Prosp	0.35 ng/mi	90.1*	81.8*	cancellation	Diagnostic System Laboratories
Lekamge et al. (2007)	126	Retro	14 pmpl/l	73	73	≤4 ookytes	Immunotech-Beckman- Coulter
Nelson et al. (2007)	340	Prosp	5 pmal/l	75†		≤2 obcytes	Diagnostic System Laboratoriles
Gnoth et al. (2008)	132	Prosp	1.26 ng/mi	97	41	≤4 oo cytes	Diagnostic System Laboratories
Nardo et al. (2008)	165	Prosp	1.0 ng/ml	87	67	≤4 follicies on day 8 of COH	Diagnostic System Laboratories
		1.13				5591	

\*For cycle cancellation identification; "percentage of correctly classified poor responder patients; Retro, retrospective study; Prosp, Prospective study.



Figure 3 Sensitivity-specificity points for all studies reporting on the performance for AMH in the prediction of poor response. Reference lines indicate a desired level for sensitivity (0.75) and specificity (0.85).

## • Menstrual cycle - Independent marker

• Stable and very low inter- and intra-cycle variability

#### 

- Immunotech-Beckamn Coulter and DSL
  - Now both produced by a single company
  - Similar AMH values
- Automated system for AMH will be availabe within 2 yrs

- AMH measurement prior to gonadotrophin secretion, may be useful in the prediction of women at risk for poor-response or no response to gonadotrophins .
- AMH is menstrual-independent  $\rightarrow$ a reliable marker of ovarian reserve, measured independently of the day of the cycle.

- Mild and moderate : 15-20%
- Severe :1-3%

•

- Specific risk factors : young age, low BMI, signs of PCOS, previous history of OHSS, high E2 on the day of hCG.
- Key to preventing OHSS: recognize the risk factors

Table III Basal AMH levels in women with normal response, hyper-response to controlled ovarian stimulation (COS) and ovarian hyperstimulation syndrome (OHSS)

Author	Design	n	Mean AMH levels				
			Normal response	Excessive response	OHSS		
Tremellen et al. (2005)	Prosp	75	(5.47 pmol/)	21,53 pmol/l <sup>a</sup>			
Eldar-Geva et al. (2005)	Prosp	56	14.1 pmoi/1	37.8 pmoi/l <sup>b</sup>			
Nakhuda et al. (2006)	Retro	30	0.63 ng/mi		3.6 ng/ml		
La Marca et ol. (2007)	Prosp	48	5.98 ng/mi	10.13 ng/mi <sup>=</sup>			
Nelson et al. (2007)	Prosp	340	10 pmal/l	27 pmol/l <sup>d</sup>			
Nardo et al. (2008)	Prosp	165	3.04 ng/mi	5.56 ng/mi <sup>b</sup>			

<sup>8</sup>Excessive response if  $\geq 18$  cocytes retrieved.

<sup>a</sup>Excessive response if  $\geq 20$  codytes retrieved.

<sup>6</sup>Excessive response if ≥ 16 obcytes retrieved.

<sup>4</sup>Excessive response if ≥21 cocytes retrieved.

. .

-

 $\sim$ 

.

· ·

.

•

.

Author	п	Study design	Cut-off value	Sensitivity (%)	Spedficity (%)	Prediction of hyper-response	Prediction of OHSS
Kwee et al. (2007)	110	Prosp	5 mcg/i	53	91	v*	
Nelson et al. (2007)	340	Prosp	25 pmol/T	60	94.9	×	
Lee et cl. (2008)	262	Prosp	3.36 ng/ml	90.5	81.3		1
Nardo et ol. (2008)	165	Prosp	3.5 ng/m/	88	70	×.	

. .

-

.

-

.

.

#### Table IV AMH cut-off values for the prediction of hyper-response to COS and OHSS

• • ~

~

Prosp. prospective study.

~

\*Excessive response if > 20 pocytes retrieved.

<sup>b</sup>Excessive response if ≥21 pocytes retrieve.

~

~ -

 $\sim$ 



~ · ·



the second se

· · ·





• • • • •

. . .

- AMH in follicular fluid : 3times higher in small than in large follicles
- Positive correlation with the no. of early antral follicles on D3, growing follicles on the day of hCG and oocytes retrieved

→ ∛ ♥♥ ¥■♀¥₥©♠ጢ ■□♠ □■● ▷ ♦≈©♦ ♦≈ጢ ■□@ □↗ ©■♦□©● ↗□●₩₩●Щ• ₩• ₩∎₥□ጢ©•ጢ₽ ☞ ∂♦♦ ©●•□ ♦≈©♦ ጢ©₥≈ ↗□●₩₩●ጢ □□₽♠₥₶• ○□□ጢ ∛●♥♥ ₩■₽₩♦₩₽€©●●▷@

- Embryo implantation, clinical pregnancy and ongoing pregnancy rate increase dramatically from the low to the high follicular fluid AMH groups.
- AMH in follicular fluid may be an additional factor in the selection of the oocyte .

• AMH in follicular fluid were significantly increased who became pregnant in the respective IVF/ ICSI tx cycle.

- Implantation rate, but not pregnancy rate, was higher in the group with high basal AMH levels.
- Lack of correlation between serum AMH and embryo morphology and aneuploidy rate .



- Low serum AMH levels yielded fewer ooctyes and generated fewer embryos
- Higher pregnancy rate with high basal AMH levels



• Basal AMH does not seem to predict pregnancy or non-pregnancy, but simply enables pts to be identified as being at a low or high probability of pregnancy after IVF. • .

-• ~ .

•

-

---· · .

-



- To reduce the cost by denying tx to bad prognosis couples
- To individualize ty strategy

- Accuracy of AMH for poor response  $\rightarrow$  false positive rate 10-20%  $\rightarrow$  should not use AMH to exclude pts from IVF.
- The added value of AMH to age in the identification of poor response may be lower than expected.
- Basal AMH < 0.7ng/ml  $\rightarrow$  live birth rate : 15%
- Serum AMH < 0.1-0.35ng/ml →very high risk for cycle cancellation, very poor prognosis → should refuse tx.
- Age alone would identify the majority of women who will





-

•





AMH and Testosterone serum levels throughout life

Figure 5 Profiles of serum AMH and testosterone (T) in the male.

AMH is not down-regulated by testosterone during fetal life and in the first months after birth due to the lack of expression of the androgen receptor in Sertoli cells. The physiological androgen insensitivity of fetal and neonatal Sertoli cells explains, thus, the transient coexistence of high concentrations of androgens and AMH. During puberal development AMH expression falls coincidently with the increase in androgen secretion by Leydig cells (reproduced with permission from Rey, 2005).



























•



• Healthy men > oligozoospermic > Azoospermic



· · · · ·

•

. . . .

. . .

-

### Table V Comparison of characteristics of the most widely used markers of ovarian reserve

Characteristics for a good marker	Age	АМН	FSH	AFC
Prediction of poor response	+	+++	++	+++
Prediction of hyper response	+	+++	100	++
Low inter-cycle variability	+++	++	-	++
Low intra-cycle variability	+++	++	-	++
Blinded to the operator	+++	+++	+++	-
Applicable to all patients (a)	+++	+++	+	+
Cheapness	+++	54	152	

(a) FSH and antral follicle count (AFC) are not informative in patients on hormonal contraception or GnRH agonist treatment. Moreover the count of antral follicles may be difficult in women with ovarian cysts or with previous pelvic surgery.

- Most centers : FSH starting dose is based on age and BMI
- Some authors: based on AMH
- Daily FSH is tailored based on the pre-IVF AMH, and independently of the age and BMI (Nelson, 2009; Gnoth 2008)



- Predicted negligible response : AMH < 1pmol/l
- Predicted reduced response :  $AMH \ge 1$ , <5pmol/l
- Predicted normal response
- Predicted high response
- - : AMH  $\geq$  5, < 15pmol/l
  - : AMH  $\geq$  15pmol/l
- Different stimulation protocols based on above categories
  - Low AMH $\rightarrow$  high starting FSH + GnRH antagonist
  - Normal AMH  $\rightarrow$  standard long protocol

-

- · · · · ·
  - .. .
  - ~
  - •
  - . .
  - . . .

- -

. .

•

- -
- . .
- . . . .
  - -
  - · ·

    - · ·
    - . . ..
      - .

•

•

•

-



#### and the second second