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Objective: To explore the diagnostic value of serum anti-Mullerian hormone (AMH) for patients with premature ovarian insufficiency (POI) and premature ovarian failure (POF). Methods. Totally, 125 women with menstrual disorder treated in the Obstetrics and Gynecology Department of Ningbo Women & Children Hospital between January 2020 and December 2021 were enrolled. Among them, based on the follicle-stimulating hormone (FSH) level, 54 patients (25 IU/L < FSH ≤ 40 IU/L) were assigned to the POI group, and 71 patients (FSH > 40 IU/L) were assigned to the POF group. In addition, 72 individuals who went physical examination in the hospital and showed normal menstrual cycle were selected as the control (CON) group. Serum AMH in each group was quantified via enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) and Beckman Coulter Access active immunoassay analyzer, and the levels of serum neutral hormones [luteinizing hormone (LH), FSH, as well as estradiol (E2)] in each group were detected through the electrochemiluminescence method. The difference between AMH level acquired by the latest automatic method and that acquired by the traditional manual ELISA was compared, and the correlation of serum AMH with sex hormones was analyzed. In addition, receiver-operating characteristic (ROC) curves were drawn for determining the diagnostic value of serum AHM for POI ad POF. Results. Beckman Coulter Access quantified AMH more accurately and fastly (Beckman Coulter Access: 35 minutes; manual quantification: 3-4 hours) and was more sensitive than ELISA, with a requirement to less serum. The levels of serum AMH and E2 in the POF group were 0.04 ± 0.10 ng/mL and 35.16 ± 53.06 ng/mL, respectively, which were notably lower than those in the POI group ((0.69 ± 1.46) ng/mL and (3.96 ± 2.82) ng/mL) and CON group ((76.31 ± 97.84) ng/mL and (113.19 ± 114.84) ng/mL). The LH and FSH levels in the POF group were 37.86 ± 19.44 IU/L and 75.05 ± 35.31 IU/L, which were higher than those in POI group ((22.66 ± 26.15) IU/L and (11.30 ± 17.05) IU/L) and the CON group ((29.81 ± 4.45) IU/L and (6.78 ± 3.45) IU/L) (P < 0.05). The POI group showed a notably lower serum AMH level and notably higher LH and FSH levels than the CON group (P < 0.05), and the POI group was similar to the CON group in the E2 level (P > 0.05). Serum AMH showed a positive correlation with E2 (r = −0.476, P < 0.05) and a negative association with both FSH (r = −0.476, P < 0.05) and LH (r = −0.143, P < 0.1). The optimal cut-off value of serum AMH in predicting POI was 0.83 ng/mL, and the corresponding sensitivity and specificity were 95.8% and 85.2%. The optimal cut-off of serum AMH in predicting POF was 0.075 ng/mL, and the corresponding sensitivity and specificity were 81.7% and 94.4%. The area under ROC curve (AUC) of serum AMH + FSH in the diagnosis of POF was close to 1. Conclusion. Beckman Coulter Access AMH test is the latest automatic electrochemiluminescence sandwich immunoassay, with higher sensitivity and reproducibility than traditional manual ELISA and with ability to produce repeatable results. With the decline of ovarian function, the serum AMH of POI patients decreases gradually, and the serum AMH of POF patients decreases obviously, so serum AMH level has great value in predicting POI and POF and can be used as a sensitive index for early diagnosis of the two. Serum AMH combined with FSH can lift the diagnostic efficiency of POF.
1. Introduction

Due to the aging of society and the delay of childbearing age, it is becoming more and more important to determine the predictors of women’s reproductive period. Premature ovarian failure (POF) is the same as “early menopause,” which means ovarian failure before 40 years old. Its specific symptoms include amenorrhea duration ≥ 4 – 6 months (intervals of more than 4 weeks), follicle stimulating hormone (FSH) > 40 U/L, and estrogen decrease. In recent years, the academic circles generally believe that POF cannot reflect the development process of the disease, so at present, it is more inclined to adopt premature ovarian insufficiency (POI), that is, the clinical syndrome of ovarian activity decline in women before the age of 40, which is featured with menstrual disorder (such as amenorrhea or infrequent menstruation) accompanied by low estrogen and high gonadotropin. It is manifested as menolipsis or infrequent menstruation for 4 months, FSH > 25 U/L twice in a row at an interval of >4 weeks [the diagnostic threshold of European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology (ESHRE)] or FSH > 40 U/L (the diagnostic threshold of International Menopause Association (IMSA)).

The expert consensus of hormone replacement therapy for POI in the postmenopausal group of the Obstetrics and Gynecology Branch of Chinese Medical Association adopted the diagnostic threshold of ESHRE and improved the diagnostic criteria of the disease [1, 2]. Anti-Mullerian hormone (AMH) is one dimeric glycoprotein with correlation to ovarian reserve function, which is composed of two identical 72 kDa monomers connected by disulfide bonds. It is mainly secreted by primary follicles, secondary follicles, preantral follicles, and small antral follicles (<4 mm) [3, 4]. Despite many available measurement methods, there are few prediction data about POI and POF at present. In this study, 71 patients with POF, 54 patients with POI, and 72 healthy women (controls) were enrolled to find a better detection method of serum AMH and to determine the cut-off value for POI and POF by the latest automatic AMH detection method.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. General Data. Totally, 125 women with menstrual disorder treated in the Obstetrics and Gynecology Department of Ningbo Women & Children Hospital between January 2020 and December 2021 were enrolled according to the following inclusion and exclusion criteria:

Inclusion criteria are as follows: (1) patients >18 years old but <40 years old; (2) patients with menstruation or infrequent menstruation for 4 months; (3) patients with FSH > 25 U/L twice in a row at an interval of >4 weeks; (4) patients who were willing to cooperate to complete the relevant index inspection.

Exclusion criteria are as follows: (1) patients with a recent history of hormone use; (2) patients with abnormal prolactin, abnormal thyroid, or adrenal function; (3) patients complicated with chronic diseases such as diabetes; (4) patients with a history of smoking or alcoholism [5].

For the POI group, patients enrolled had FSH > 40 IU/L. Seventy-two women under 40 years old with normal menstrual cycle who were examined in the outpatient physical examination center of the hospital were selected as the control (CON) group. The three groups were not greatly different in general data including age and body mass index (P > 0.05, Table 1), so they were comparable.

This research was performed with permission from the Medical Ethics Committee of Ningbo Women & Children Hospital, and the enrolled participants were informed of the research purpose, methods and precautions before signing the informed consent form.

2.2. Detection Method. For the CON group, 3-5 mL fasting venous blood was acquired from each participant in the morning on the 2nd-3rd day of menstruation, and 3-5 mL fasting venous blood was acquired from each patient in POI group and POF group on a randomly selected day, followed by a 3 min high-speed centrifugation (5000 r/min) to collect the upper serum, and the serum was kept in a refrigerator at -80°C for examination. Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA; 620/630 nm dual-wavelength universal microplate reader; test kit from Guangzhou Kangrun Biotechnology Co., Ltd.) and Beckman Coulter Access active immunoassay analyzer were adopted for detecting the serum AMH level of each group. The electrochemiluminescence method (DXI800 chemiluminescence analyzer of Beckman Company and its corresponding kit) was adopted for determining the levels of serum neutral hormones [luteinizing hormone (LH), follicle stimulating hormone (FSH), and estradiol (E2)] in each group [6, 7]. The above measurements were completed by the laboratory and laboratory department of the reproductive medicine center in the hospital under strict instructions, and the indoor quality control data of all projects were under control.

2.3. Outcome Measures

(1) The difference between Beckman Coulter Access active immunoassay analyzer and traditional manual ELISA method in detecting AMH value

(2) The difference of serum AMH and sex hormone levels (LH, FSH, as well as E2) among the POI group, POF group, and CON group

(3) The AMH level with the optimal sensitivity and specificity were selected as the optimal cut-off value for AMH to diagnose POI and POF

(4) Diagnostic efficacy of single index (AMH/FSH) and combination of multiple indexes for POI and POF patients

2.4. Statistical Analyses. This study adopted SPSS25.0 statistical software for data anlayzes. Measurement data were presented by x ± sd. Their multigroup comparison was performed via the one-way ANOVA, and their intergroup comparison was performed via the LSD-t test. P < 0.05 suggests a notable difference [8]. ROC curves was drawn for determining the sensitivity and specificity of single
3. Results

3.1. Comparison of Different Serum AMH Detection Methods.

The traditional ELISA method and Beckman Coulter Access active immunoassay analyzer were used for quantifying AMH. The results showed that Beckman Coulter Access AMH was more accurate and faster (Beckman Coulter Access: 35 minutes; manual quantification: 3-4 hours), more sensitive than ELISA, and needed less serum for analysis. The data obtained by the two methods were in normal distribution, and the differences between groups were statistically significant ($t = 7.772, P < 0.001$, Figure 1).

3.2. Comparison of Serum AMH, FSH, LH, and E2 Levels.

The AMH level detected by new methods in the three groups was selected. According to comparison, the POF group showed lower levels of serum AMH and E2 than the POI and CON groups and notably higher levels of FSH and LH than the POI and CON groups ($P < 0.05$). In addition, the POI group showed a lower serum AMH level than the CON group and showed higher levels of LH and FSH than the CON group ($P < 0.05$), and the POI and CON groups were not greatly different in E2 ($P > 0.05$, Figure 2 and Table 2).

3.3. Correlation of Serum AMH with FSH, LH as well as E2.

Pearson correlation analysis showed negative associations of serum AMH level with FSH level ($r = -0.4761, P < 0.001$) and LH level ($r = -0.140, P < 0.001$) and a positive association of serum AMH level with E2 level ($r = -0.277, P < 0.001$, Figure 3).

3.4. Diagnostic Value of Serum AMH for POI and POF.

With POI and POF as dependent variables, ROC curves were adopted for analyzing the diagnostic value of serum AMH for POI and POF. According to the results, the AUC of serum AMH for diagnosing POI was 0.929 (95% CI: 0.877-0.982, $P < 0.05$), and the optimal cut-off value of serum AMH in diagnosing POI was 0.83 ng/mL. The sensitivity and specificity of diagnosing POI under this cut-off value were 85.19% and 95.83%, respectively, as shown in Figure 4.

The AUC of serum AMH in diagnosing POF was 0.905 (95% CI: 0.863-0.947, $P < 0.05$), and the optimal cut-off value of serum AMH in diagnosing POF was 0.075 ng/mL. Under this cut-off value, the sensitivity and specificity of diagnosing POF were 94.37% and 81.75%, respectively, as shown in Figure 5. The ROC parameters of serum diagnosis for the two groups are summarized in Table 3.

3.5. Diagnostic Value of Serum AMH and FSH in POF. The serum AMH level of 0.075 ng/mL and FSH > 40 IU/L and development of POF were selected as dependent variables, and ROC curves were adopted for analyzing the value of serum AMH combined with FSH for diagnosing POF. The results showed that the AUC of the combination for diagnosing POF was 0.992 (0.979-1.000), which was close to 1, and the corresponding sensitivity and specificity were 81.97% and 81.97% (Figure 6).

4. Discussion

According to many studies, patients with POI have a shorter life span if they are not treated, and the death is mainly caused by cardiovascular disease and obesity. POI negatively compromise patients’ mental health and quality of life. Cohort studies have shown that women with POI before the age of 40 are at risk of early coronary heart disease. Early diagnosis of POI can avoid expensive therapy of infertile women and women susceptible to POF.

The quantity and quality of a woman’s ovarian follicular pool are thought to be bound up with her age and FSH [8],
whereas according to recent research, the number of follicles is strongly bound up with AMH level [9, 10]. Contrary to other hormonal markers of ovarian follicular state (FSH, E2, and inhibin B), AMH has no significant changes within and between menstrual cycles [11, 12]. AMH has higher sensitivity (80% vs. 28.57%) and almost the same specificity (78.89% vs. 78.65%) in the diagnosis of POF in contrast to FSH. The negative predictive values of AMH (98.61%) and FSH (87.5%) are also not similar, but the positive predictive value is the same (17.39%). AMH has a notably higher diagnostic accuracy than FSH [13, 14].

At present, several AMH detection methods are available clinically, including Gen II (Beckman Coulter), PICOAMH (Ansh Labs), AMH ELISA (Ansh Labs), ELECSYS (Roche), and Access (Beckman Coulter). Every analytical method has different detection range and sensitivity, which hinders the direct comparison of serum AMH level measured by different analytical methods [15, 16] and the determination of

---

**FIGURE 2:** Comparison of serum AMH, FSH, LH, and E2 levels. Note: FSH: follicle-stimulating hormone; LH: luteinizing hormone; E2: estradiol.

**Table 2:** Comparison of serum AMH, FSH, LH, and E2 levels among the three groups and statistical results.

| Group | n  | AMH (ng/mL) | FSH (IU/L) | LH (IU/L) | E2 (pmol/L) |
|-------|----|-------------|------------|-----------|-------------|
| POI   | 71 | 0.69 ± 1.46<sup>a,b</sup> | 29.81 ± 4.45<sup>a,b</sup> | 22.66 ± 26.15<sup>a,b</sup> | 81.38 ± 95.52<sup>a</sup> |
| POF   | 54 | 0.04 ± 0.10<sup>a</sup> | 75.05 ± 35.31<sup>a</sup> | 37.60 ± 19.46<sup>a</sup> | 43.33 ± 48.23<sup>a</sup> |
| CON   | 42 | 3.96 ± 2.82  | 6.78 ± 3.45  | 11.30 ± 17.05 | 114.14 ± 113.96 |
| F     |    | 79.667      | 126.893     | 20.955     | 9.567       |
| P     |    | <0.001      | <0.001      | <0.001     | <0.001      |

Note: <sup>a</sup> means P < 0.05 vs. POF group; <sup>b</sup> means P < 0.05 vs. the CON Group; FSH: follicle-stimulating hormone; LH: luteinizing hormone; E2: estradiol.
cut-off value. Compare different AMH kits provided in France: three kinds of manual (AMH Gen II, Ultrasensible AL-105i, AL-124i or pico-AMH) and two kinds of automatic (Elecsys AMH, AMH Access DxI) [17, 18]. The two automated means delivered higher accuracy, faster speed (automatic: 18-40 minutes; manual 4-6 hours), with sensitivity 10 times more sensitivity than ELISA analysis, and a need for less serum in analysis, and less variation in laboratories. The Beckman Coulter Access AMH test used in this study was the latest fully automatic electrochemiluminescence sandwich immunoassay, with higher sensitivity and reproducibility than the traditional ELISA and with ability to produce repeatable results.

In the case of suspected POF, the measurement of AMH is crucial, because this parameter is characterized by low sensitivity to hormone therapy such as oral contraceptives as well as hormone replacement therapy [19, 20]. One study conducted in the Netherlands [21, 22] shows that AMH is a better marker for evaluating ovarian function than inhibin B or AFC in females with increased FSH level. The value of ultrasound, laparoscopy, and ovarian biopsy in the diagnosis of POI has not been confirmed. AMH level can indirectly reflect the number of follicles in the ovary and is a more direct indicator of ovarian reserve [23–25]. It is generally believed that the AMH value of 1 ng/mL and lower may translate into a decrease in ovarian reserve [26]. Skalba
roc analysis showed that the optimal cut-off value of AMH in predicting POF was 0.856, with 95% CI of 0.835-0.878, and the sensitivity and specificity were 91.80% and 80.00%, respectively. At this time, the serum AMH level was 1.075 ng/mL, which indicated that serum AMH was of high value in the early diagnosis of POF. In this study, ROC analysis showed that the optimal cut-off value of serum AMH for diagnosis of POI was 0.83 ng/mL, and the corresponding sensitivity and specificity for diagnosis of it were 91.80% and 85.20%, respectively. At this time, the serum AMH level was 0.830 ng/mL, which indicated that serum AMH was of high value in predicting POI and POF and can be used as a sensitive index for early diagnosis of the two. In view of the significant difference of cut-point values between the research results obtained by traditional ELISA methods, with the development and application of new automatic AMH determination methods, it is necessary to report new specific cut-off values to accurately guide the clinical test results.
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