Protocolo de antagonista de parada de agonista de GnRH versus protocolo de antagonista de GnRH en pacientes con respuesta de ovario deficiente sometidos a FIV

Protocolo STOP-antagonista del agonista de GnRH versus protocolo de antagonista de GnRH en pacientes con pobre respuesta de ovárica sometidos a FIV

Atefeh Khezri. Infertility Ward Arash Women's Hospital Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran, Email: atefehkhezri35@gmail.com,
Ladan Kashani*. Infertility center of arash hospital, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran, Email: kashani_ladan@tums.ac.ir,
Ashraf Moini. Department of Endocrinology and Female Infertility, Reproductive Biomedicine Research Center, Royan Institute for Reproductive Biomedicine, ACECR, Tehran, Iran & Breast Disease Research Center, Cancer Institute, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran & Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Arash Hospital, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran, Email: a_moini@royaninstitute.org,
Maryam Farid Mojtahedi. Infertility Ward Arash Women's Hospital Tehran University of Medical Sciences Tehran Iran, Email: m_fmojtahedi@tums.ac.ir,
Nazila Yamini. IVF Laboratory, Department of ART, Arash Women's Hospital, Tehran University of Medical Science, Tehran, Iran, Email: Nazila.yamini@gmail.com,
Mina Ataee. Assistant Professor, Infertility Fellowship, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Social Determinants of Health, Research Center School of Medical Sciences, Alborz University of Medical Sciences, Karaj, Iran, & Reproductive Biotechnology Research Center, Avicenna Research Institute, ACECR, Tehran, Iran, Email: Ataee.mina@yahoo.com,
Received/Recibido: 11/24/2021 Accepted/Aceptado: 02/19/2022 Published/Publicado: 02/25/2022 DOI: http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6481607

Abstract

Introduction and objective: Can the GnRH agonist STOP-antagonist protocol versus the GnRH antagonist protocol be useful in improving IVF (In vitro fertilization) outcomes in patients with poor ovarian responses candidate for IVF?

Methods: The present study was conducted as a single-blind clinical trial in the infertility ward of Arash Hospital of Tehran University of Medical Sciences. In this study, 133 patients with poor ovarian response (POR) according to Bologna criteria were randomly assigned two groups of GnRH agonist stop-antagonist protocol and GnRH antagonist protocol. The number of dominant follicles and number of oocytes retrieved, the number of embryos and their grade, level of antagonist used, level of gonadotropin used, length of days of stimulation and endometrial thickness, level of estrogen, level of progesterone, trigger day, and fertilization rate were measured.

Results: In the present study, the frequency of dominant follicles in the GnRH agonist stop-antagonist group was significantly higher than that in the GnRH antagonist group (p-value = 0.01). The number of embryos in the GnRH agonist stop_antagonist group was significantly higher than that in the GnRH antagonist group (p-value = 0.02). The percentage of AB embryo agonists in the GnRH agonist stop _anta group was significantly higher than that in the GnRH antagonist group (p-value = 0.003). The number of mature oocytes in the GnRH agonist stop _antagonist group was more than that in the GnRH antagonist group, but the difference between the two groups was not statistically significant. The number of used gonadotropin doses in the GnRH agonist stop _antagonist group was significantly higher than that in the GnRH antagonist group (p-value = 0.01). The number of used antagonists in the GnRH antagonist group was significantly higher than that in the GnRH agonist stop _antagonist group (p-value = 0.02).

Conclusion: The GnRH agonist stop-Anta protocol is a valuable tool for the treatment of poor ovarian responders. However, controlled prospective randomized studies with larger sample sizes are needed.

Keywords: Gonadotropin, Gonadotropin Releasing Hormone (GnRH) agonist; GnRH antagonist; Intracytoplasmic Sperm Injection (ICSI) cycles; Poor Ovarian Response (POR).

Resumen

Introducción y objetivo: Puede el protocolo STOP-antagonista del agonista de Hormona liberadora de gonadotropina (GnRH) versus el protocolo del antagonista de GnRH ser útil para mejorar los resultados de la FIV (fertilización in vitro) en pacientes con respuestas ováricas deficientes candidatas a FIV?

Métodos: El presente estudio se realizó como un ensayo clínico ciego simple en la sala de infertilidad del Hospital Arash de la Universidad de Ciencias Médicas de Teherán. En este estudio, 133 pacientes con mala respuesta ovárica (POR) según los criterios de Bolonia fueron asignados aleatoriamente a dos grupos de protocolo de antagonista de parada de agonista de GnRH y protocolo de antagonista de GnRH. El número de folículos dominantes y el número de ovocitos recuperados, el número de embriones y su grado, nivel de antagonista utilizado, nivel de gonadotropina utilizado, duración de los días de estimulación y grosor del endometrio, nivel de estrógeno, nivel de progesterona, día de activación y Se midió la tasa de fertilización.

Resultados: En el presente estudio, la frecuencia de folículos dominantes en el grupo de antagonistas de parada del agonista de GnRH fue significativamente mayor que en el grupo de antagonistas de GnRH (valor de p = 0,01). El número de embriones en el grupo de antagonistas de parada del agonista de GnRH fue significativamente mayor que el del grupo de antagonistas de GnRH (valor de p = 0,02). El porcentaje de agonistas de embriones AB en el grupo de agonistas de GnRH stop _anta fue significativamente mayor que en el grupo de antagonistas de GnRH (valor de p = 0,003). El número de ovocitos maduros en el grupo antagonista de parada agonista de GnRH fue mayor que en el grupo antagonista de GnRH / bhn lk, pero la diferencia entre los dos grupos no fue estadísticamente significativa. El número de dosis de gonadotropina utilizadas en el grupo de antagonistas de parada del agonista de GnRH fue significativamente mayor que en el grupo de antagonistas de GnRH (valor de p = 0,01). El número de antagonistas usados en el grupo de antagonistas de GnRH fue significativamente mayor que en el grupo de antagonistas de parada de agonistas de GnRH (valor de p = 0,02).

Conclusión: El protocolo stop-Anta del agonista de GnRH es una herramienta valiosa para el tratamiento de pacientes con respuesta ovárica deficiente. Sin embargo, se necesitan estudios aleatorizados prospectivos controlados con tamaños de muestra más grandes.

Palabras clave: Gonadotropina, agonista de la hormona liberadora de gonadotropina (GnRH); Antagonista de GnRH; Ciclos de inyección intracitoplasmática de espermatozoides (ICSI); Mala respuesta ovárica (POR).

Introduction

Poor response in IVF (In Vitro Fertilization) can be defined as an insufficient number of mature follicles following stimulation with gonadotropin leading to the retrieval of several oocytes or cycle stop[1]. The goal of ovarian stimulation in IVF is multi-follicular, but poor responders fail to achieve this goal[2]. Nine to twenty-four percent of infertile women receiving assisted reproduction have a poor response to ovarian stimulation[3]. Various strategies have been examined to improve the ovarian response, but most of these interventions have shown limited success, and the optimal stimulation protocol for poor responders is still unknown[3]. The ESHRE (The European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology) provides a uniform definition worldwide.

Consensus in 2011 defined POR (Poor Ovarian Response) based on Bologna Criteria[4].

When evaluating the appropriate protocol in patients with poor ovarian responseor, Orvieto et al., recently found that the combination of GnRH agonist Stop- ant protocol with GnRH-ant protocol shows the number of oocytes retrieved and top-quality embryos acceptable clinical pregnancy rate is significantly higher[5]. The rationale for the pre-treatment advantage of the mid-luteal GnRH-agonist in the GnRH agonist stop _ant protocol was modulators of GnRH receptors (internalization) and thus suppressing pituitary LH secretion up to 10 days after the last agonist dose. This effect, combined with immediate suppression of LH by GnRH-Ant (competitive inhibitor), eliminates premature LH surge/progesterone elevation and may improve the produced embryos' quality. At present, we aim to study further the role of the GnRH agonist stop-antagonist protocol versus the GnRH antagonist protocol in improving IVF outcomes in patients with poor ovarian responses candidates for IVF.

The study was a single-blind clinical trial study (the patient is not blind, but the physician completes the blind results). The necessary information was collected for the design based on the prepared checklist, patient file, and embryologist's opinion. The code of ethics was IR.TUMS.MEDICINE.REC.1399.694 and the code of clinical trial was IRCT20110731007165N10.

Study participants: Infertile poor ovarian responder (POR) women referred to the infertility clinic of Arash Hospital and had IVF indication.

Inclusion criteria include patients with POR in IVF / ICSI cycles based on Bologna criteria, who met at least two of the following three criteria:

1-Advanced maternal age (40 years and above)

2- Previous POR (≤3 oocytes with normal stimulation protocol)

3-Abnormal ovarian reserve test, for example AFC <5-7 or AMH <0.5-1.1 ng / ml

In addition to these two cases, POR after maximum stimulation is sufficient to introduce a person as POR without the need for other criteria.

Exclusion criteria:

Polycystic ovary syndrome, hypothalamic amenorrhea, congenital anomalies of the uterus and problems of anomalies of the uterine cavity (unicornuate uterus, Asherman's syndrome, myoma, polyps, etc.) and endocrine disorders (diabetes, thyroid disease, antiphospholipid syndrome, cardiovascular and hepatic diseases, repeated IVF failure (more than three consecutive failures), and severe male factor. After examining the patients for inclusion criteria, the patients' informed consent was first obtained, and they completed a questionnaire containing demographic, fertility, medical and pharmacological characteristics. Then, they were divided into two groups based on randomization blind

Group 1 (GnRH Agonist stop Ant. Group):

The injection of GnRH agonist (Sinagen Company) at the dose of 0.5 mg/day continues from the mid-luteal menstrual cycle to the patient's period. On the second day of menstruation and after the measurement of antral follicular count), Human menopausal gonadotropin (HMG) along with FSH recombinant (Cinnal-f and HMG_ PD of Karma or Pooyesh Daroo Company) started with a dose of 300-450 IU / day. The dose starts at 0.25 mg/day until the final maturation of the oocyte and continues until the day of the HCG trigger (Karma or Pooyesh Drug Company), and the patient is monitored for vaginal sonography in terms of follicle size. When the follicle size reaches 12 mm, the GnRH antagonist started at a dose of 0.25 mg/day until the final maturation of oocytes and HCG trigger day (Karma or Pooyesh Daroo Company). When two or more follicles size reaches above 17 mm, HCG is injected at a dose of 10,000 units, and an ovarian puncture is performed 36 hours later.

Group 2: Antagonist GnRH

Ovarian stimulation starts from the second day of menstruation after measurement of AFC (antral follicular count) with HMG gonadotropin along with Recombinant FSH (Menotropin of Karma or Pooyesh Daroo Company) at a dose of 300-450 IU / day, and the patient was monitored through vaginal sonography for follicle size. When the follicle size reaches 12 mm, the GnRH antagonist started at a dose of 0.25 mg/day until the final maturation of oocytes and HCG trigger day (Karma or Pooyesh Daroo Company). When two or more follicles size reaches above 17 mm, HCG is injected at a dose of 10000 units, and an ovarian puncture is performed 36 hours later. Then, primary and secondary outcomes (number of dominant follicles and number of oocytes retrieved, number of embryos and their grade, level of antagonist used, level of gonadotropin used, days of stimulation and endometrial thickness, level of estrogen, level of progesterone trigger day and fertilization rate were recorded and compared.

The random allocation concealment and blinding were performed so that the randomization list was prepared by a randomized statistician, and the treatments were placed in a special order in pockets with a 10-digit code and were kept by a nurse out of the study ward. Once the patient's eligibility was determined, the procedure was explained, and their satisfaction was obtained. Then, the nurse provided the pockets containing the type of treatment to the physician, and the type of treatment was determined based on the treatment in the pocket. Completing the final information is the person's responsibility who knows the type of treatment and the statistician was unaware of the type of treatment. The collected data will be analyzed using SPSS IBM software under Windows version 20 through descriptive statistics such as tables, central index, dispersion, and statistical analytical tests with 95% confidence interval and $p < 0.05$.

Results

A total of 133 patients were selected for this study, of which 65 patients were randomly assigned to the Agonist stop - Ant group and 68 patients were assigned to the antagonist group. Also, 12 patients (5 in the GnRH Agonist stop – Anta group and 7 in the antagonist group) were excluded from the study after participating in the study. The exclusion reason in the GnRH Agonist stop – Anta group: Three people withdrew, and two people did not respond to treatment. The exclusion reason in the group: Two people withdrew, and five people did not respond to treatment.

According to (Table 1), patients did not differ in terms of demographic characteristics.

In the present study, 133 patients were selected, of which 65 patients were randomly assigned to the LONG group, and 68 patients were assigned to the antagonist group. 12 patients (5 in the LONG group and 7 in the antagonist group) were excluded after participating in the study.

The exclusion reason in the LONG group: Three people withdrew, and two people did not respond to treatment. The exclusion reason in the group: Two people withdrew, and five people did not respond to treatment. As expected, IVF / ICSI (In Vitro Fertilization / Intracytoplasmic Sperm Injection) cycles in GnRH agonist stop – ant versus GNRH ANT cycles with higher gonadotropin doses were 4204.16 ± 1088.79 vs. 3698.36 ± 1221.79, respectively, p-value = 0.01. Higher frequency of dominant follicles (4.71 ± 1.86 vs. 3.95 ± 1.60, respectively, p-value = 0.01) and more embryos (2.82 ± 2.23 vs. 1.97 ± 1.76, respectively, P-value = 0.02), percentage of embryo grade AB (75% versus 49.2%, respectively, and p-value = 0.003) were significantly higher. Also, the number of used antagonists (3.68 ± 1.17 vs. 4.18 ± 1.22, respectively, and P-value = 0.02) and trigger day progesterone (0.504 ± 0.53 vs. 0.940 ± 0.99, respectively, and p-value = 0.003) were significantly lower. The percentage of Grade A embryos (20%) in the GnRH agonist stop-ant group and GnRH ant group was 20% and 19.7%, respectively. The difference was not statistically significant. There was no statistically significant difference between the two groups regarding endometrial thickness and cycle diversion and the total number of retrieved oocytes of puncture day and fertilization rate (Table 2).

Table 1. Patient characteristics

Variables (121)	GnRH Agonist stop – Antagonist group (60)	Antagonist group (61)	P-value
Age in year (mean ± SD)	38.75±4.48	38.26±4.26	0.54
BMI (mean ± SD)	26.76±3.83	26.39±3.30	0.56
Underlying disease (N, %)	9 (15%)	6 (9.8%)	0.38
Type of infertility (N, %) First Second	 43 (71.7%) 17 (28.3%)	 40 (65.6%) 21 (34.4%)	0.47
Causes of infertility Tubal Ovarian Uterine Multifactorial	 1 (1.7%) 46 (76.7%) 1 (1.7%) 12 (20%)	 2 (3.3%) 36 (59%) 1 (1.6%) 22 (36.1%)	0.14
Infertility Duration (year) (Median ± IQR)	4±5.5	2.5±3.5	0.054
Number of pervious IVF (N, %) 0 1 time >2 time	 36 (60%) 17 (28.3%) 7 (11.7%)	 42 (68.9%) 12 (19.7%) 7 (11.5%)	0.51
Result of previous IVF (N=43) Successful Unsuccessful	 1 (4.2%) 23 (95.8%)	 1 (5.3%) 18 (94.7%)	0.99
AMH ng/ml (mean ± SD)	0.96±0.85	0.84±0.63	0.40
Left AFC (mean ± SD)	2.76±1.43	3±1.26	0.34
Right AFC (mean ± SD)	2.78 ± 1.22	2.90 ± 1.36	0.61

*p<0.05, IQR: Interquartile range

Table 2. Ovarian stimulation outcome			
Variables (121)	GnRH Agonist stop – Antagonist group (60)	GnRH Antagonist group (61)	P-value
Endometrial thickness in mm (mean ± SD)	8.24 ± 1.42	8.03 ± 1.59	0.45
Trigger day estradiol (HCG) (mean ± SD)	467.43±641.05	372.21±765.83	0.46
trigger day progesterone (HCG) (mean ± SD)	0.504±0.53	0.940±0.99	0.003*
Dose of gonadotropin (IU) (mean ± SD)	4204.16±1088.79	3698.36±1221.79	0.01*
Antagonist (mean ± SD)	3.68±1.17	4.18±1.22	0.02 *
Duration (mean ± SD)	11.2 ± 1.98	10.47 ± 2.15	0.057
Number of dominant follicles (mean ± SD)	4.71 ± 1.86	3.95 ± 1.60	0.01*
Number of oocyte retrieved (mean ± SD)	4.46 ± 2.67	4.01 ± 2.60	0.35
Oocyte maturity (M2) (mean ± SD)	3.51 ± 2.51	2.90 ± 2.15	0.15
Mean GV (median ± IQR)	0.001 ± 1	0.001 ± 1	0.07
Oocyte (M1) (mean ± SD)	0.48 ± 0.77	0.36 ± 0.60	0.33
No. of embryos (mean ± SD)	2.82 ± 2.23	1.97 ± 1.76	0.02 *
No. of embryos transferred (mean ± SD)	0.87 ± 1.2	0.62 ± 1.09	0.24
Fertilization %	69.52%	57.82%	0.07
Embryo grades (%) A B AB BC	 15 (20%) 22 (36.7%) 45 (75%) 4 (6.7%)	 12 (19.7%) 15 (24.6%) 30 (49.2%) 0	 0.49 0.14 0.003* 0.057

*p<0.05, IQR: Interquartile range

Grade A embryos had symmetrical or slightly asymmetric blastomeres without fragmentation or occasional small fragments (<5%). Grade B embryos had all the blastomeres intact but had some cytoplasmic fragmentation (5-10%) or cells of unequal size. Grade C embryos had wider asymmetry and fragmentation (10-25%), although all blastomeres remained intact. Moreover, grade D embryos had one or more fragmented blastomeres (more than 25% fragmentation)[6].

Discussion

Reproductive assistance techniques have helped millions of infertile people around the world become fathers or mothers. The poor ovarian response is a major challenge in infertility centers around the world. The present study compared GnRH agonist stop - ant and the GnRH ant group as a pituitary suppression protocol in ICSI cycle management[7, 8]. Based on research conducted by Abd El Naser and Abd El Gaber Ali et al., the reason for using the GnRH Agonist protocol was to reduce base LH and suppress residual ovarian cysts and increase the quality of oocytes retrieved. However, it has the disadvantages of many gonadotropin injections and increasing the duration of gonadotropin stimulation.

Thus, in our study, we used GnRH agonist for a short time in the luteal phase (to overcome the disadvantages above)[9]. GnRH antagonist in weak responders is due to shorter stimulation time and less need for gonadotropin and reducing patient costs[10-12].

In a study conducted by Abd El Naser and Abd El Gaber Ali et al., results showed that the GnRH agonist stop-ant protocol versus GnRH ant was superior in terms of increasing the number of top-quality oocytes, increasing the thickness of the endometrium, and increasing E2 at the time of HCG injection, increasing embryo quality in infertile women with poor ovarian response. In a study conducted by Yannis et al., no difference was seen in oocytes quality. Our research was consistent with the research conducted by Abd El Naser and Abd El Gaber Ali et al. in terms of the number of embryos and high embryo quality and with the research conducted by Yannis et al. in terms of the number of oocytes[13]. In a prospective randomized trial conducted by Cheung et al., long-acting GnRH agonist was compared

with antagonist protocol in poor responders. It did not report any significant difference between the two groups in terms of stimulation and laboratory outcomes and pregnancy outcomes, except for the number of transferred embryos transferred that was higher in the antagonist group (2.32 ± 0.58 versus 1.50 ± 0.83 with p-value = 0.01)[14].

However, in the study conducted by Yannis et al. higher cancellation rate in the GnRH of the antagonist group was reported. In a study conducted by Raoul Orvieto et al., with an increase in progesterone (> 3.1 nmol / L) in the late luteal cycle compared to the conventional IVF / ICSI cycle and combined Stop GnRH-ag with GnRH-ant cycles, progesterone levels were significantly lower in the combined group Stop GnRH-ag with multiple-dose GnRH-ant cycles, which is consistent with our study (2.1±1.3 vs. 10.4± 7.1 nmol/L)[15]. Moreover, they achieved significantly higher rates in terms of endometrial thickness, number of oocytes retrieved, number of mature oocytes, and more top-quality embryos. Only the quality of the embryo in our study was consistent with the above study. The study conducted by Siristatidis et al., showed that the number of oocytes retrieved (NOR) in the GnRH agonist protocol was significantly higher than the short flare protocols[16], which was inconsistent with our study.

In the study conducted by Erhan Demirdağ et al. on 318 patients from 2014 to 2019, IVF results in three protocols of microdose flare, GnRH antagonist, and long protocols in patients with poor ovarian response, total mean number of oocytes retrieved, number of metaphase II oocytes and fertilization rate were similar among the groups. The mentioned study is in line with the present study regarding the number of oocytes retrieved and the number of metaphase II oocytes, but it was not consistent with our study in terms of fertilization rate (fertilization rate was higher in our study)[17].

In the study conducted by Davar and Neghab N et al., the number of metaphase II retrieved oocytes with the GnRH antagonist protocol was superior to the microdose flare GnRH agonist protocol was inconsistent with our study[18]. In general, NOR (number of retrieved oocytes) was reported higher in the GnRH antagonist regimen compared to the long protocol[19,20]. The study conducted by Laura Detti, M.D. et al., comparing the three protocols of stop and microdose and regular dose flare showed that the number of oocytes retrieved increased in the stop protocol, although it was not statistically significant, which is in line with our study. On the other hand, an RCT showed that the long agonist protocol improved the number of oocytes retrieved in poor responders compared to the GnRH antagonist group. In a study conducted by Al-Inany H and Aboulghar M to compare GnrRH antagonists with GnRH agonist protocols in IVF patients, the use of GnRH antagonists was significantly associated with significantly lower gonadotropin use and shorter treatment duration [21]. In the present study, the mean dose of gonadotropin used in the Longstop agonist _ GnRH ant group was higher than that of the anta GnRH _ group, and this difference was also statistically significant (P-value = 0.01). The mean number of antagonists used in the anta group is higher than that in the long group, and this difference was statistically significant (P-value = 0.02). However, controlled prospective randomized studies with larger sample sizes are required.

Due to the simultaneous implementation of this plan with the outbreak of Covid-19 and the limitations of embryo transfer, it was not possible to transfer embryos and assess the rate of clinical pregnancy and birth rate.

Conclusions

A clear advantage was seen in the dose of gonadotropin in the GnRH-ant group, but the duration of stimulation did not differ between the two groups. Although there was no significant difference between the two groups regarding the number of oocytes retrieved, the quality of oocytes in the GnRH agonist stop - ant group was higher. One result of this protocol may be useful for our clinical practice.

LIMITATION: Due to the coronavirus conditions and the unwillingness of many patients to transfer embryos, they were frozen to be transferred in better conditions.

Acknowledgments: The authors of this study hereby appreciate the Infertility center of arash hospital, IVF Laboratory Arash, Arash Women's Hospital, Research Development Center (RDC) of Arash women's Hospital for his sincere cooperation in editing this text.

RECOMMENDATIONS: A larger multicenter randomized trial should be conducted to confirm the real benefits of the GnRH agonist.

References

1. Gorgy A, Naumann N, Bates S, Craft IL. Assisted conception following poor ovarian response to gonadotrophin stimulation. Br J Obstet Gynaecol. 1997 Dec;104(12):1420-1. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0528.1997.tb11020.x. PMID: 9422028.

2. Macklon NS, Stouffer RL, Giudice LC, Fauser BC. The science behind 25 years of ovarian stimulation for in vitro fertilization. Endocr Rev. 2006 Apr;27(2):170-207. doi: 10.1210/er.2005-0015. Epub 2006 Jan 24. PMID: 16434510.

3. Ubaldi F, Vaiarelli A, D'Anna R, Rienzi L. Management of poor responders in IVF: is there anything new? Biomed Res Int. 2014;2014:352098. doi: 10.1155/2014/352098. Epub 2014 Jul 20. PMID: 25136579; PMCID: PMC4127291.

4. Sallam HN, Ezzeldin F, Agameya AF, Rahman AF, El-Garem Y. Defining poor responders in assisted reproduction. International Journal of Fertility and Women's Medicine. 2005 May-Jun;50(3):115-120. PMID: 16279504.

5. Orvieto R, Kirshenbaum M, Galiano V, Haas J, Nahum R (2020) Stop GnRH-agonist combined with multiple-dose GnRH-antagonist protocol for patients with IVF failures due to poor embryo quality-A proof of concept. Clin Obstet Gynecol Reprod Med 6: DOI: 10.15761/COGRM.1000321

6. Dawson KJ, Conaghan J, Ostera GR, Winston RM, Hardy K. Delaying transfer to the third day post-insemination, to select non-arrested embryos, increases development to the fetal heart stage. Hum Reprod. 1995 Jan;10(1):177-82. doi: 10.1093/humrep/10.1.177.

7. Tarlatzis BC, Zepiridis L, Grimbizis G, Bontis J. Clinical management of low ovarian response to stimulation for IVF: a systematic review. Hum Reprod Update. 2003 Jan-Feb;9(1):61-76. doi: 10.1093/humupd/dmg007. PMID: 12638782.

8. Kyrou D, Kolibianakis EM, Venetis CA, Papanikolaou EG, Bontis J, Tarlatzis BC. How to improve the probability of pregnancy in poor responders undergoing in vitro fertilization: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Fertil Steril. 2009 Mar;91(3):749-66. doi: 10.1016/j.fertnstert.2007.12.077. Epub 2008 Jul 21. PMID: 18639875.

9. Ali AENAGA, Khodry MM, Abdallah KM, Gnrh Agonist Stop Antagonist Versus Gnrh Antagonist for Expected Poor Ovarian Response ICSI Cycles. A Randomized Comparative Study. United Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology. 2018; 1(2): 1-5.

10. Mahutte NG, Arici A. Role of gonadotropin-releasing hormone antagonists in poor responders. Fertil Steril. 2007 Feb;87(2):241-9. doi: 10.1016/j.fertnstert.2006.07.1457. Epub 2006 Nov 16. PMID: 17113088.

11. Fasouliotis SJ, Laufer N, Sabbagh-Ehrlich S, Lewin A, Hurwitz A, Simon A. Gonadotropin-releasing hormone (GnRH)-antagonist versus GnRH-agonist in ovarian stimulation of poor responders undergoing IVF. J Assist Reprod Genet. 2003 Nov;20(11):455-60. doi: 10.1023/b:jarg.0000006707.88826.e7. PMID: 14714824; PMCID: PMC3455641.

12. Malmusi S, La Marca A, Giulini S, Xella S, Tagliasacchi D, Marsella T, Volpe A. Comparison of a gonadotropin-releasing hormone (GnRH) antagonist and GnRH agonist flare-up regimen in poor responders undergoing ovarian stimulation. Fertil Steril. 2005 Aug;84(2):402-6. doi: 10.1016/j.fertnstert.2005.01.139. PMID: 16084881.

13. Prapas Y, Petousis S, Dagklis T, Panagiotidis Y, Papatheodorou A, Assunta I, Prapas N. GnRH antagonist versus long GnRH agonist protocol in poor IVF responders: a randomized clinical trial. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol. 2013 Jan;166(1):43-6. doi: 10.1016/j.ejogrb.2012.09.008. Epub 2012 Sep 26. PMID: 23020996.

14. Cheung LP, Lam PM, Lok IH, Chiu TT, Yeung SY, Tjer CC, Haines CJ. GnRH antagonist versus long GnRH agonist protocol in poor responders undergoing IVF: a randomized controlled trial. Hum Reprod. 2005 Mar;20(3):616-21. doi: 10.1093/humrep/deh668. Epub 2004 Dec 17. PMID: 15608037.

15. Orvieto R, Kirshenbaum M, Galiano V, Haas J, Nahum R (2020) Stop GnRH-agonist combined with multiple-dose GnRH-antagonist protocol for patients with IVF failures due to poor embryo quality-A proof of concept. Clin Obstet Gynecol Reprod Med 6: DOI: 10.15761/COGRM.1000321

16. Siristatidis CS, Gibreel A, Basios G, Maheshwari A, Bhattacharya S. Gonadotrophin-releasing hormone agonist protocols for pituitary suppression in assisted reproduction. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2015 Nov 9;(11):CD006919. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD006919.pub4. PMID: 26558801.

17. Demirdağ E, Akdulum MFC, Guler I, Oguz Y, Erdem A, Erdem M. IVF Outcomes of Microdose Flare-up, GnRH Antagonist, and Long Protocols in Patients having a Poor Ovarian Response in the First Treatment Cycle. J Coll Physicians Surg Pak. 2021 May;30(5):523-527. doi: 10.29271/jcpsp.2021.05.523. PMID: 34027862.

18. Davar R, Neghab N, Naghshineh E. Pregnancy outcome in delayed start antagonist versus microdose flare GnRH agonist protocol in poor responders undergoing IVF/ICSI: An RCT. Int J Reprod Biomed. 2018 Apr;16(4):255-260. PMID: 29942933; PMCID: PMC6004594.

19. Pandian Z, McTavish AR, Aucott L, Hamilton MP, Bhattacharya S. Interventions for 'poor responders' to controlled ovarian hyper stimulation (COH) in in-vitro fertilisation (IVF). Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2010 Jan 20;(1):CD004379. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD004379.pub3. PMID: 20091563.

20. Lai-Ping Cheung, Po-Mui Lam, Ingrid Hung Lok, Tony Tak-Yu Chiu, Sum-Yee Yeung, Ching-Ching Tjer, Christopher John Haines, GnRH antagonist versus long GnRH agonist protocol in poor responders undergoing IVF: a randomized controlled trial, Human Reproduction, Volume 20, Issue 3, March 2005, Pages 616–621, https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/deh668

21. Al-Inany H, Aboulghar M. GnRH antagonist in assisted reproduction: a Cochrane review. Hum Reprod. 2002 Apr;17(4):874-85. doi: 10.1093/humrep/17.4.874. PMID: 11925376