

# Pregnancies of Unknown Location

Emma Kirk мясод мо Whittington Hospital, London

# Pregnancy of Unknown Location (PUL)

- Positive pregnancy test
- No pregnancy visualised on scan
- Not interchangeable with 'ectopic pregnancy'



# X Pregnancies of Unknown Location







#### 9/40 Heavy bleeding with clots



#### 5/40 Light PV bleeding



#### ?/40 Lower abdominal discomfort



#### 7/40 Moderate vaginal bleeding





# Practical Advice - PULs 1. Assess clinical situation

#### 5/40 Light PV spotting



#### 7/40 Severe lower abdominal pain









# Practical Advice - PULs 2. Expectant Management

- Safe for the majority of asymptomatic haemodynamically stable women with PULs
- No consensus on appropriate intervention rates
- Surgical intervention rates quoted as 0.3-11%

# Practical Advice - PULs Surgical Intervention Laparoscopy



The combination of a positive pregnancy test and the absence of an IUP on TVS is an accepted indication for laparoscopy

#### Curettage



 Serial measurements of hCG and progesterone, TVS and uterine curettage have been combined into various diagnostic algorithms when a pregnancy cannot be seen on TVS

#### **Practical Advice - PULs**

## 3. Predicting outcome

- Hormones
  - Human chorionic gonadotrophin (hCG)
  - Progesterone
  - Other:
- Creatine kinase
- CA 125
- Activin A
- Inhibin A

### Mathematical Models



#### **Practical Advice - PULs**

## 3. Predicting outcome

- Hormones
  - Human chorionic gonadotrophin (hCG)
  - Progesterone
  - Other:
- Creatine kinase
- CA 125
- Activin A
- Inhibin A

### Mathematical Models

Single Levels

#### Serial Levels

Single Levels

Discriminatory Zone

#### Serial Levels



Developed with respect to transabdominal USS
Lower levels of hCG used with TVS
Using a single value of hCG in a PUL population is of limited value:

Many ectopic pregnancies have a low hCG

Clinicians may be falsely reassured



Intrauterine Pregnancies (IUPs)

Kadar et al. (1981) first to describe the minimal rate of rise for an IUP to be 66% over 48hrs
More recently minimal rise reported to be 53%

(Barnhart et al. 2004)

In clinical practice a more conservative cut-off of 35% has been suggested



#### Failing PULs

A decline of 21-35% at 48 hours depending on initial hCG level (↑ levels at presentation –↑ rate of decrease) (Barnhart et al. 2004)

• An hCG decrease of >13% (hCG ratio < 0.87) has been shown to have a sensitivity of 92.7% and a specificity of 96.7% for the prediction of a failing PUL (Condous et al., 2006)



#### **Ectopic Pregnancies (EPs)**

'No single way to characterize the pattern of serum hCG behaviour' (Silva et al., 2006)
hCG profile mimicked IUP in 21% and a spontaneous miscarriage in 8% (Silva et al., 2006)
Sensitivity of 83% for EP when IUP excluded by hCG rise < 35% and failing PUL excluded by hCG decrease > 21-35% (Seeber et al., 2006)

# Evidence based management of PULs Predicting outcome

## Hormones

- Human chorionic gonadotrophin (hCG)
- Progesterone
- Other:
- Creatine kinase
- CA 125
- Activin A
- Inhibin A

## Mathematical Models



ectopic pregnancy with certainty (Mol et al., 1998)

Good at predicting viability but not location

#### **Practical Advice - PULs**

## 3. Predicting outcome

- Hormones
  - Human chorionic gonadotrophin (hCG)
  - Progesterone
  - Other:
- Creatine kinase
- CA 125
- Activin A
- Inhibin A

Mathematical Models

## Mathematical models

#### Prediction of failing PULs

- Probability of spontaneous resolution =1/(1+e<sup>-z</sup>)
- Where z = -2.20 0.15 \* progesterone (nmol/L) + 3.36 \* bleeding score 0.0013 \* serum β-hCG (IU/L) + 0.45 \* endometrial thickness (mm) (Banerjee et al., 2001)
- PPV > 95% for the prediction of pregnancy resolution

#### Prediction of failing PULs, IUPs and EPs

- Logistic regression models based on the hCG ratio (hCG 48hrs/hCG 0 hrs) (Condous et al., 2004, Condous et al., 2007)
- Sensitivities >90% for the detection of EP

						true pred	Fail	IUP	EP	Tot		Sensitivity	Specific	PPV	NPV
	Prior cost	fo each clas	SS		Total	Failing	66	1	26	93	Failing	70.97%	86.21%	######	65.79%
	1: Failing	2: IUP	3: Ectopic		Accurac	IUP	0	64	11	75	IUP	85.33%	73.33%	96.97%	67.54%
Cost(prior)	1.0	1.0	5.00		77.90%	EP	0	1	11	12	EP	91.67%	77.38%	22.92%	98.48%
	* hcoratio=	hca 48hr/h	ica Ohr			Tot	66	66	48	180					
	input		<u></u>	Pos	terior Pr	obability		Probability weighted by cost				Predicted			Real
ID	hcg_0hr	hcg_48hr	hcgratio*	Fail	IUP	EP		Failing	IUP	EP		Prob for	class		Outcom
1	1047	388	0.3706	0.94	0.00	0.05		0.7745	0.0007	0.2248		0.7745	1		1
2	350	750	2.1429	0.00	0.96	0.04		0.0013	0.8327	0.1661		0.8327	2		2
3															3
4															
5															

hCG ratio = hCG 48 hours / hCG 0 hours

						true pred	Foil		ED	Tat		Sonaitivity	Specifici		
	Prior cost	fo each clas	SS		Total	Failing	-aii	101	26	93	Failing	70.97%	86.21%	#######	65.79%
	1: Failing	2: IUP	3: Ectopic		Accurac	IUP	0	64	11	75	IUP	85.33%	73.33%	96.97%	67.54%
Cost(prior)	1.0	1.0	5.00		77.90%	EP	0	1	11	12	EP	91.67%	77.38%	22.92%	98.48%
			- 1			Tot	66	66	48	180					
* hcgratio=hcg_48hr/hcg_0hr															
	input			Posterior Probabili		obability		Probability weighted by cost		by cost		Predicted			Real
ID	hcg_0hr	hcg_48hr	hcgratio*	Fail	IUP	EP		Failing	IUP	EP		Prob for	class		Outcom
1	1047	388	0.3706	0.94	0.00	0.05		0.7745	0.0007	0.2248		0.7745	1		1
2	350	750	2.1429	0.00	0.96	0.04		0.0013	0.8327	0.1661		0.8327	2		2
3	590														3
4															
5															

hCG ratio = hCG 48 hours / hCG 0 hours

						true ored									
							Fail	IUP	EP	Tot		Sensitivity	Specific	i PPV	NPV
Prior cost fo each class				Total	Failing	66	1	26	93	Failing	70.97%	86.21%	######	65.79%	
	1: Failing	2: IUP	3: Ectopic		Accurac	IUP	0	64	11	75	IUP	85.33%	73.33%	96.97%	67.54%
Cost(prior)	) 1.0	1.0	5.00		78.33%	EP	0	1	11	12	EP	91.67%	77.38%	22.92%	98.48%
						Tot	66	66	48	180					
	* hcgratio=hcg_48hr/hcg_0hr		ncg_0hr												
	input			Posterior Probability		obability		Probability weighted by cos		l by cost		Predicted			Real
ID	hcg_0hr	hcg_48hr	hcgratio*	Fail	IUP	EP		Failing	IUP	EP		Prob for	class		Outcom
1	1047	388	0.3706	0.94	0.00	0.05		0.7745	0.0007	0.2248	1	0.7745	1		1
2	350	750	2.1429	0.00	0.96	0.04		0.0013	0.8327	0.1661		0.8327	2		2
3	590	700	1.1864	0.42	0.18	0.40		0.1593	0.0692	0.7716		0.7716	3		
4														1	
5															

hCG ratio = hCG 48 hours / hCG 0 hours

# Practical Advice - PULs 4. Follow-up

- Methods?
- Timing of visits











# Rationalizing the follow-up of PULs Hum Reprod 2007; 22:1744-50







#### \* Condous et al BJOG 2006





#### Rationalizing follow-up of PULs





# Summary

- Expectant management suitable for majority of women
- 2. No consensus on appropriate intervention rates but no routine role for curettage
- **3.** Serum hCG and progesterone levels useful, but no role for single hCG measurement
- 4. Mathematical models may be useful
- Follow-up visits may be rationalised using management algorithms

Thank you