The egg donors' preparation: sufficiency and effectiveness.

<u>Kushniruk Nataliya, M.D.</u> Butenko V., M.D., PhD, Strelko G., M.D., PhD **Reproductive Genetics Clinic "Victoria",** Kiev, Ukraine May 27-28, 2010 Kiev, Ukraine

Objectives

BIKTOPI

To study the possibility of optimization of the Egg donation program:

•Safety and comfort for both : egg donor and patient

• Influence of the ovarian response predictors on stimulation protocol, oocytes' count and quality, as well as blastocysts formation rate

•*Cut the expenses*

This program must be safe for both: Patient –recipient and Egg Donor (standard donor exam)

Provide patients' safety:

To exclude the infections transmission from Egg donor to Recipient by careful scan for: (HIV ½ types, Syphilis, Hepatitis B and C, CMV and STD).

Actual transmission percentage is extremely low, less than 1 %. HIV 0.12%, Hepatitis B 0.8% Hepatitis C 1% (N.Garrido, J.L.Zuzuarregui, 2002)

BIKTOP

- Karyotype check: is it really necessary for all Egg Donors despite their successful previous childbearing?
- It should be done to exclude the presence of balanced chromosomal aberrations. Although, female donors had a low presence of karyotype anomalies, the vast majority of the anomalies was found to be irrelevant, with the transmission risk (1%) (N.Garrido, J.L.Zuzuarregui, 2002).
- ✓ Despite this fact, carrier status check should be recommended for definite ethnic groups to prevent the transmission of Tay–Sachs, Canavan, and Gaucher's disease, breast and ovarian cancer (BRCA-1) mutations, thalassemia, sickle cell anemia, cystic fibroses, fragile-X etc.

P. Devroey et al. Approaches to improve the diagnosisand management of infertility Human Reproduction Update, Vol.0, No.0 pp. 1–18, 2009

BIKTOPI

Donor's safety

- To provide donors' safety:
- Blood type and Rhesus ID, CBC, Blood Glucose, Urine microscopy, Coagulation count, Pelvic ultrasound, GP conclusion.
- To reduce the internal bleeding risk (1-3%) by careful examination of inherited coagulopathy (up to 5% in population Rare Bleeding Disorders database, 2004)
- Check for AMH, levels to predict the OHSS by safe stimulation protocol decrease the OHSS rate under 20% (reduce donor's discomfort and patient's expenses)

TREATMENT vs PROPHYLAXIS What's profitable?

OHSS treatment:

- •Out patient stay
- 5-7days
- Ultrasound 2-3 times
- ■Paracentisis 1-2 times
- ·
- Infusions
- General clinical tests
 Totally: about 5,000 UAH

Conclusions: OHSS prophylaxis saves up to 75% of treatment expenses

OHSS prophylaxis:

• CABERGOLINUM 1 pill daily 4

Infusion of Albumini 10% 100 ml 1day



May Standard Egg Donors 🕮 🔤 investigation predict the oocytes count and quality?

With the help of routine standard investigation protocol for Egg donors, we may only rely on the ultrasound criteria to predict ovarian response:

Is it enough?

- AFC (non accurate) depends on BMI, probe resolution, peritoneal adhesions, BCP, etc.
 Ovarian volume (measurement accuracy depends on the mentioned above items)









Conclusions

There is no strict correlation between baisele AMH and FSH, E2, Inhibin B levels, Functional tests and oocyte quality but statistically proved the decrease of oocyte quality at "extreme" responders period.





BIKTOPIA

| | | | | <u></u> | BINTOPIE | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------------|--------------------|---------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| Predictors : quantity, quality, economy? | | | | | | | | | |
| Index | Protocol | Oocyte count | Ovarian quality | OHSS | Economy | | | | |
| FSH | +/- | +/- | - | - | ? | | | | |
| E2 | +/- | +/- | - | - | ? | | | | |
| Inhibin B | + | + | +/- | + | +/- | | | | |
| AMH | + | + | +/- | + | + | | | | |
| Functional tests | + | + | +/- | +/- | - | | | | |

AMH serum concentration provides us with the most significant quantity correlation, and is less expensive than Inhibin B. Kolibianakis EM et al.(2006)Are endogenous LH levels during ovarian stimulation for IVF usingGnRH analogues associated with the probability of ongoing pregnancy? Asystematic review. Hum Reprod Update 12,3–12





| Let us talk about the QUALITY | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------|--------------------|------|-------------------|--|--|
| AMH pmol/L | 4.9-7.8 7.8-11. | | 4 11.4-17.9 | | | More than 17.9 | | |
| BMI (kg/m2) | 23.4 <i>±3.45</i> | | | | | | | |
| Oocyte count | Up to 21 cells | | | More than 21 cells | | | | |
| Mean Ovarian volume | 5.45±1.15 | | | 8.87 <i>±2.9</i> | | | | |
| Blastocyst rate (%) | 23.7±5.12 | | | 19.3 <i>±5.24</i> | | | | |
| OHSS probability | Low or medium | | n | High | | | | |
| | Agonist GnRH (ampulls) | | HP- GnRH | | 0 | ocyte count | | |
| Short Flare-up protocol | 10.1 <i>±1.45</i> | | 34.2 ±4.6 | | 12.2 | ±2.45 | | |
| Long protocol | 14.1 <i>±1.2</i> | | 35.9± 4.86 | | 15.1 | ±1.98 | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Conclusions

- Optimization (under the MHU direction # 771, it's almost safe from the infections transmission point of view) Despite this fact there still a Big Discussion about the numerous inherited disorders transmission
- From economy and donors comfort point of view its necessary to keep in mind that it's 3 times as cheep to prevent than to cure complications
- There are no significant difference in stimulation protocols in embryological aspect, thus reasonable to choose the plausable protocol: Short Flare-up or Short antogonists (in risk of OHSS)

