

Endometriosis, especially mild disease: a risk factor for miscarriages

Alexandra Sabrina Kohl Schwartz, M.D.,^{a,b} Monika Martina Wölfler, M.D.,^{c,d} Vera Mitter, M.Sc.,^b Martina Rauchfuss, M.D.,^e Felix Haeberlin, M.D.,^f Markus Eberhard, M.D.,^g Stephanie von Orelli, M.D.,^h Bruno Imthurn, M.D.,^a Patrick Imesch, M.D.,ⁱ Daniel Fink, M.D.,ⁱ and Brigitte Leeners, M.D.^a

^a Department of Reproductive Endocrinology, University Hospital Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland; ^b Division of Gynecological Endocrinology and Reproductive Medicine, Bern University Hospital, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland; ^c Division of Gynecological Endocrinology and Reproductive Medicine, Medical University of Graz, Graz, Austria; ^d Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, RWTH Aachen University Hospital, Aachen, Germany; ^e Department of Psychosomatics, Charité University Hospital Berlin, Berlin, Germany; ^f Women's Hospital, Cantonal Hospital St. Gallen, St. Gallen, Switzerland; ^g Women's Hospital, Cantonal Hospital Schaffhausen, Schaffhausen, Switzerland; ^h Maternité, Stadtspital Triemli, Zurich, Switzerland; and ⁱ Department of Gynecology, University Hospital Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

Objective: To investigate the prevalence of miscarriage in women with endometriosis (WwE) compared with disease-free control women (CW).

Design: Cross-sectional analysis nested in a retrospective observational study (n = 940).

Setting: Hospitals and associated private practices.

Patient(s): Previously pregnant women (n = 268) within reproductive age in matched pairs.

Intervention(s): Retrospective analysis of surgical reports and self-administered questionnaires.

Main Outcome Measure(s): Rate of miscarriage, subanalysis for fertility status (≤ 12 vs. >12 months' time to conception), endometriosis stages (revised American Society of Reproductive Medicine classification [rASRM] I/II vs. III/IV) and phenotypic localizations (superficial peritoneal, ovarian, and deep infiltrating endometriosis).

Result(s): The miscarriage rate was higher in WwE (35.8% [95% confidence interval 29.6%–42.0%]) compared with CW (22.0% [16.7%–27.0%]); adjusted incidence risk ratio of 1.97 (95% CI 1.41–2.75). This remained significant in subfertile WwE (50.0% [40.7%–59.4%]) vs. CW (25.8% [8.5%–41.2%]) but not in fertile WwE (24.5% [16.3%–31.6%]) vs. CW (21.5% [15.9%–26.8%]). The miscarriage rate was higher in women with milder forms (rASRM I/II 42.1% [32.6%–51.4%] vs. rASRM III/IV 30.8% [22.6%–38.7%]), compared with 22.0% [16.7%–27.0%] in CW), and in women with superficial peritoneal endometriosis (42.0% [32.0%–53.9%]) compared with ovarian endometriosis (28.6% [17.7%–38.7%]) and deep infiltrating endometriosis (33.9% [21.2%–46.0%]) compared with CW (22.0% [16.7%–27.0%]).

Conclusion(s): Mild endometriosis, as in superficial lesions, is related to a great extent of inflammatory disorder, possibly leading to defective folliculogenesis, fertilization, and/or implantation, presenting as increased risk of miscarriage.

Clinical Trial Registration Number: NCT02511626. (Fertil Steril® 2017;108:806–14. ©2017 by American Society for Reproductive Medicine.)

Key Words: Endometriosis, infertility, miscarriage, pregnancy outcome, superficial peritoneal endometriosis

Discuss: You can discuss this article with its authors and with other ASRM members at <https://www.fertsterdialog.com/users/16110-fertility-and-sterility/posts/19403-24600>

Endometriosis is a chronic and often progressive disease, which is defined by endometriotic tissue outside the uterine cavity that is sensitive

to cyclic steroid hormone regulation (1–3). With a prevalence of 6%–10% of the female population, it is one of the most important benign

gynecologic diseases in women of reproductive age (4). Endometriosis is associated with dysmenorrhea, dyspareunia, or chronic pelvic pain. Endometriosis is known to reduce female fertility (4–6) and has an impact on the obstetric outcome of affected women (7–10).

In women with endometriosis (WwE) multifactorial reasons result in a reduction in fertility: reduced tubal motility and passage (11, 12), inhibiting inflammatory factors

Received June 29, 2017; revised August 7, 2017; accepted August 14, 2017.

S.v.O. reports personal fees from Pfizer. A.S.K.S. has nothing to disclose. M.M.W. has nothing to disclose. V.M. has nothing to disclose. M.R. has nothing to disclose. F.H. has nothing to disclose. M.E. has nothing to disclose. B.I. has nothing to disclose. P.I. has nothing to disclose. D.F. has nothing to disclose. B.L. has nothing to disclose.

Reprint requests: Alexandra Sabrina Kohl Schwartz, M.D., University Hospital Zurich, Department of Reproductive Endocrinology, 8091 Zurich, Switzerland (E-mail: alexandra.kohlschwartz@usz.ch).

Fertility and Sterility® Vol. 108, No. 5, November 2017 0015-0282/\$36.00
Copyright ©2017 American Society for Reproductive Medicine, Published by Elsevier Inc.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fertnstert.2017.08.025>

deriving from the peritoneal fluid (13), and a diminished quality of the oocytes affect the chances of a successful implantation after natural conception as well as after assisted reproductive technology (ART) (14–17). However, not all the underlying mechanisms are yet fully understood. Over the last few years improvements in pharmacologic, surgical, and ART treatment have led to an increasing number of pregnancies in WwE (18). The success of pregnancy depends on the placentation and the endometrial function later in pregnancy (19, 20). Abnormal local estrogen production and an altered endometrial response to P (P resistance) result in a changed microenvironment. This coats the embryo in early pregnancy (21, 22) possibly affecting the “quality of implantation.” Miscarriage is the most common complication during the first trimester, with an incidence rate of 30%–50% in the general population, depending primarily on the age of the women (23, 24). There is no conclusive answer to the question of whether miscarriage rates are increased in WwE: earlier clinical studies investigated primarily the effect of surgical treatment (ablation of endometriotic lesions) on the prevalence of pregnancy complications; these studies were not adjusted for age (25–27). Some newer studies considering age as a risk factor showed an association of endometriosis with previous pregnancy losses (8, 9, 28, 29), but others did not (7, 30–32). A large Canadian cohort study over 12 years with registry data from 784 WwE and 30,284 control women (CW) reported a significantly higher rate of miscarriages in WwE (odds ratio 1.89, 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.23–2.93); however, the diagnostic quality of endometriosis was limited (8). The most recent study on previously pregnant women with and without endometriosis was conducted at a specialized referral center. It found a higher miscarriage rate in endometriosis-affected women, 29.1% (95% CI 23.9%–34.3%), compared with CW 19.4% (95% CI 16.1%–22.7%) ($P = .001$) (7). Because of the high number of women with progressive disease (several surgeries before inclusion in the study) and severe endometriosis lesions, women with mild or asymptomatic disease were rather underrepresented in this collective.

The primary aim of this study was to evaluate and compare miscarriage rates in a population of women with surgically confirmed endometriosis and a broad variety of clinical manifestations, to reflect the average female population affected by endometriosis. To improve our understanding of the association between endometriosis and miscarriage, we included in the analysis the phenotypical disease localization and the fertility status.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This was a cross-sectional analysis about the prevalence of miscarriages nested in a retrospective observational study ($n = 940$) on the quality of life in WwE.

Questionnaire

We designed a questionnaire focusing on the women's health and obstetric history. We collected sociodemo-

graphic data and asked the women whether they had difficulties conceiving and for how long they tried to become pregnant.

Recruitment

Women from the ages of 18 to 45 years were recruited from women treated between December 2010 and December 2015 at participating hospitals or associated private practices: university hospitals in Switzerland, Germany, and Austria (University Hospital Zurich, Charité–Medical University Berlin, University Hospital of Graz, and RWTH Aachen University), cantonal hospitals in Switzerland (Schaffhausen, Winterthur, St. Gallen, Solothurn), the Stadtspital Triemli Zurich, and in several associated private medical practices. Indication for surgery was made by the treating physician on the basis of pelvic pain symptoms (dysmenorrhea and/or dyspareunia and/or chronic pelvic pain for at least 6 months) and/or endometriosis-suspicious lesions detected by rectovaginal palpation and/or ultrasound examination. Inclusion criteria were defined as not being pregnant and being able to complete the questionnaire (without linguistic, mental, or psychological impairment). Patients having undergone surgery for the diagnosis of endometriosis and fulfilling inclusion criteria were invited to participate and were asked for informed consent. Control women without clinical suspicion of endometriosis (no severe dysmenorrhea, no heavy cyclic abdominopelvic pain) fulfilling the inclusion criteria were recruited during annual check-ups. In total 647 women affected by endometriosis and 666 CW were invited to participate. Of those invited, written consent was received from 505 WwE (78.0%) and 435 CW (65.3%).

Surgical Reports

Surgical reports for each surgical intervention were obtained from the patients' clinics.

From 468 of 505 WwE (92.7%), we obtained surgical reports with sufficient details to do a correct staging and grading of the lesions. In 438 of 468 WwE (93.6%) the diagnosis was confirmed histologically after surgical resection; 30 of 468 WwE (6.4%) were diagnosed surgically, primarily after laser evaporation of light lesions. To avoid bias, all surgical and histologic records were reviewed by two blinded investigators.

The documents reviewed contained the total number of endometriosis-associated surgeries, the histologic confirmation of endometriosis, a description of the localization and size of endometriosis lesions, and the dimensions of adhesions. The revised classification of the American Society for Reproductive Medicine (rASRM) (33) was used to categorize the endometriosis into the four stages. This staging was applied as it was initially developed to define chances for pregnancy (34). Additionally, the lesions were classified into three phenotypes: superficial peritoneal endometriosis (SUP), ovarian endometriosis (OMA), and deep infiltrating endometriosis (DIE), as previously described by other investigators (35, 36). Deep infiltrating endometriosis lesions were classified as

≥5-mm deep invasive endometriotic lesions (2, 37). Because those three different phenotypes often present together, patients were classified according to their most severe lesion, used for grading as follows: DIE > OMA > SUP (35, 38).

Statistical Analysis

We analyzed responses regarding the number of previous miscarriages, the number of pregnancies conducted beyond the 24th gestational week, and the number of deliveries.


All data were stored in a computerized database. Statistical analysis was performed using STATA statistical software, version 14 (StataCorp). Data were presented as absolute numbers (n) and as percentages, with 95% CIs. Differences among groups were analyzed by χ^2 tests for categorical data; the Student *t* test was used for quantitative data. Miscarriage rates were defined as the rate of previous failures relative to the total number of previous pregnancies. We calculated the miscarriage rate for the rASRM stages and the most severe phenotypic endometriosis localization in fertile and subfertile subpopulations. Adjustments were

made for known risk variables: age (≤ 29 , 30–35, ≥ 35 years), body mass index (BMI) (≤ 19 , 20–24, 25–29, and ≥ 30 kg/m²), and smoking (never a smoker, previous smoker, and current smoker) as categorical variables. Because of missing values (18 of 268), multiple imputations were made for “smoking.” “Previous miscarriage” is not independent in our population, because women can have more than one miscarriage. Therefore we applied a hierarchical mixed effect model (Poisson regression) to account for the matched pairs (level I) and for pregnancies within the same woman (level II). We calculated the rate of miscarriages/pregnancies within our population (39). The model was chosen because each event has a defined onset (pregnancy) with a defined endpoint (miscarriage or delivery). The level of significance was set at $P < .05$ and $P < .001$ for multiple testing.

Ethics

The regional ethical review committees as well as the ethic boards of the participating hospitals in Switzerland, Germany, and Austria approved the study. All women

FIGURE 1



Patient inclusion flow chart.

Kohl Schwartz. Endometriosis and the risk for miscarriages. *Fertil Steril* 2017.

provided signed informed consent for study participation, as well as verification of endometriosis diagnosis through their medical charts. The trial was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. It was registered at clinicaltrials.gov under the reference number NCT02511626.

RESULTS

Study Population

For this analysis women with previous pregnancies were selected as shown in Figure 1. In the final analysis we included 143 WwE matched for age with 143 CW, out of 203 (total $n = 286$). Most WwE were born within 12 months of their matching CW (120 pairs); the remaining were born at most 24 months apart (23 pairs). Of the 286 women a total of 508 previous pregnancies were analyzed.

Patient characteristics of 143 WwE and 143 CW were analyzed (Table 1). There were no significant differences in the characteristics of the two groups other than the lower parity in WwE: a total number of 152 children were delivered by WwE, compared with 204 children born of CW; 32 WwE (22.4%) and 13 CW (9.1%) were nulliparous ($P = .001$).

Among WwE, 33 were staged with rASRM I (23.1%), 26 with rASRM II (18.2%), 42 with rASRM III (29.4%), and 42 with rASRM IV (29.4%). The phenotypically most severe endometriosis lesion was a SUP in 48 women (33.6%), an OMA in 47 women (32.8%), and a DIE in 48 women (33.6%). Of the 48 women with DIE, 33 had cul de sac lesions, 11 had an invasive lesion on the sacrouterine ligament, and 4 had invasive peritoneal lesions of other localizations. The mean number of surgical interventions related to endometriosis per WwE was 1.87 (range, 1–9).

Miscarriages

In our analysis 240 pregnancies in WwE and 268 pregnancies in CW were included (Fig. 1). The total number of miscarriages per woman was similar in both groups: 36 WwE and 30 CW had one previous miscarriage; 13 WwE and 8 CW had two previous miscarriages. Recurrent miscarriages, with three or more miscarriages (according to the European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology classification) (40), occurred in a total of 11 of 286 women (3.9%): 7 of 143 WwE (4.9%) and 4 of 143 CW (2.8%) ($P = .874$).

Table 2 and Supplemental Tables 1 and 2 show miscarriage rates in relation to fertility, localization of the most severe lesions, and disease stage, respectively. Generally the miscarriage rate was significantly higher in WwE compared with CW (Table 2). This difference remained significant for subfertile women independent of previous ART, but the miscarriage rate for fertile WwE did not differ from the miscarriage rate for fertile CW.

Mild and severe endometriosis were both associated with a higher prevalence of miscarriages compared with CW. This relationship was stronger in mild endometriosis (rASRM I/II) than in severe endometriosis (rASRM III/IV), compared with CW. The miscarriage rate was highest in women diagnosed with SUP, followed by women diagnosed with DIE, and then by women diagnosed with OMA.

Our regression model confirmed a higher rate of previous miscarriages for WwE compared with CW (Table 3), also after adjustment for risk factors for miscarriage such as age, BMI, subfertility, and smoking habit. The adjusted incidence rate ratio (IRR) for previous miscarriages was significantly increased in subfertile but not in fertile WwE. The adjusted IRR for previous miscarriages was significantly higher in cases of mild and of superficial peritoneal endometriosis compared with CW.

TABLE 1

Patient characteristics.			
Characteristic	Women with endometriosis (n = 143)	Control women (n = 143)	P value
Age (y)	37.34 ± 4.83	37.45 ± 4.78	.898 ^a
BMI (kg/m ²)	23.10 ± 4.24	23.47 ± 3.77	.584 ^a
Smoking habits			.301 ^a
Never smoked	66 (46.1)	77 (53.8)	
Previous smoker	46 (32.2)	37 (25.9)	
Current smoker	23 (16.1)	18 (12.6)	
Not available	8 (5.6)	11 (7.7)	
Gravidity			.071 ^a
1	83 (58)	64 (44.7)	
2	37 (29.5)	52 (36.4)	
≥3	23 (16.1)	27 (23.9)	
Parity			.001 ^a
0	32 (22.4)	13 (9.1)	
1	75 (52.4)	67 (46.8)	
2	31 (21.7)	52 (36.4)	
≥3	5 (3.5)	11 (7.7)	
Immunologic disease	14 (9.8)	7 (4.9)	.890 ^b
Thyroid disease	22 (15.4)	19 (13.3)	.377 ^b

Note: Data reported as mean ± standard deviation or number (percentage).
^a χ^2 test.
^b t test.

Kohl Schwartz. Endometriosis and the risk for miscarriages. Fertil Steril 2017.

DISCUSSION

This study shows a higher rate of previous miscarriages in WwE, especially in women with minimal or mild disease, compared with CW in the adjusted analysis. We show that primarily women with milder forms of endometriosis, as well as subfertile women, are affected by miscarriages. This allows a clearer picture among different types of endometriosis and indicates that the diagnosis of endometriosis should not generally be associated with a higher risk for miscarriage. It also means that young women with early stages of endometriosis, a good ovarian reserve, and tube motility should be reassured and encouraged to try for a spontaneous conception.

A strength of this study is the inclusion of women recruited in secondary and tertiary centers, as well as in private practices: this distribution offers a considerably representative sample of the female population treated for endometriosis. Although many women diagnosed with endometriosis suffer from severe pain symptoms and a decreased quality of life, others experience fewer pain symptoms and a quality of life similar to that of the general population (41). Women with endometriosis treated in secondary and tertiary centers seem to differ in disease symptoms and

TABLE 2

Rates of previous miscarriages according to infertility.

Variable	Women with endometriosis (total pregnancies = 240)		Control women (total pregnancies = 268)		P value ^a
	N	Rate, % (95% CI)	N	Rate, % (95% CI)	
Total	86/240	35.8 (29.6–42.0)	59/268	22.0 (16.7–27.0)	< .001
Fertile women	32/132	24.5 (16.3–31.6)	51/237	21.5 (15.9–26.8)	.548
Subfertile women	54/108	50.0 (40.7–59.4)	8/31	25.8 (8.5–41.2)	.017
Previous ART	11/20	55.0 (36.5–76.8)	1/19	5.3 (0.1–15.3)	< .001

Note: N = number of miscarriages/pregnancies.

^a χ^2 test.

Kohl Schwartz. Endometriosis and the risk for miscarriages. *Fertil Steril* 2017.

associated quality of life (42) from women treated in primary care centers. Because most studies focus on the presence of disease symptoms, WwE with few symptoms and satisfactory quality of life are underrepresented in most scientific studies conducted at university care centers. Our recruitment strategy was applied to overcome this selection bias and reflect the average female population affected and treated for endometriosis. The main remaining difficulty is the underdiagnosis of endometriosis in the general population because of the characteristics of the disease and/or the necessary diagnostic investigation and not because of the population covered.

Because of the heterogeneity of endometriosis lesions, classification systems often show only weak associations with disease symptoms (41). Another strength of this study is the application of both the well-known rASRM classification system (33) and the surgical phenotypic classification of endometriosis adopting the description of the most severe endometriosis lesion (SUP < OMA < DIE) (36). It has been shown that phenotypic classification corresponds better to the obstetric outcome than the rASRM classification (42, 43). The even distribution of SUP, OMA, and DIE as the most severe localization of the endometriosis disease within our study population allows for a reliable evaluation of the role of different lesion locations in the risk for miscarriage.

Furthermore, the analysis based on the mixed-effects Poisson regression model accounting for the nonindepend-

dence of pregnancies within the same women delivers very reliable results. Recall bias was minimized through the selection of women with previous pregnancies for evaluation within an observational study on quality of life in WwE (e.g., the women were not aware of this particular investigation's hypothesis). The sample size was large and the age ranges particularly narrow: matching in the present study provided a control sample out of the same population. This is particularly important because age is the most important risk factor for miscarriages.

The following limitations have to be taken into consideration: data analysis was based on questionnaire information; besides reporting on endometriosis-related surgery, no other medical records were reviewed; diagnosis of endometriosis was based on surgical and histologic reports. Laparoscopy with or without histologic verification, as done in our study, is widely used to diagnose and rule out the presence of endometriosis. However, the correct diagnosis of endometriosis depends highly on the abilities of the surgeon performing the laparoscopy. We cannot guarantee that women were not included because hidden endometriosis lesions were missed (44). In any case, surgical judgment was proven to be equivalent to histologic diagnosis (45). Surgical and histologic reports did not allow inclusion of possible adenomyotic lesions, because correct diagnosis would need specific ultrasound assessment of the uterine morphology (46).

TABLE 3

IRR of previous miscarriages from the mixed-effects Poisson regression analysis.

Parameter	Unadjusted IRR (95% CI)	P value	Adjusted ^a IRR (95% CI)	P value
CW	Ref		Ref	
All WwE	1.62 (1.17–2.27)	.004	1.97 (1.41–2.75)	< .001
Subfertile CW	Ref		Ref	
Subfertile WwE	1.94 (0.92–4.07)	.081	2.41 (1.01–5.78)	.048
Fertile CW	Ref		Ref	
Fertile WwE	1.13 (0.72–1.75)	.597	1.11 (0.7–7.76)	.657
CW	Ref		Ref	
WwE with rASRM lesion I/II	1.91 (1.29–2.82)	.001	1.57 (1.00–2.44)	.046
WwE with rASRM lesion III/IV	1.40 (0.94–2.08)	.098	1.19 (0.76–1.85)	.446
WwE with SUP lesion	1.98 (1.33–2.95)	.001	1.67 (1.07–2.61)	.024
WwE with OMA lesion	1.32 (0.81–2.14)	.256	1.11 (0.65–1.88)	.703
WwE with DIE lesion	1.49 (0.91–2.43)	.110	1.19 (0.70–2.61)	.515

Note: Surgical phenotypic classification from Chapron et al. (35).

^a Adjusted for age, BMI, smoking habits (imputation for smoking because of missing answers), and subfertility.

Kohl Schwartz. Endometriosis and the risk for miscarriages. *Fertil Steril* 2017.

Uterine adenomyosis is known to frequently coexist with endometriosis (15) and is associated with an increased risk for miscarriages (47).

Acquired information about infertility and reasons for subfertility and ART treatment is based on the patients' answers. Pregnancy, the loss of a pregnancy, and deliveries are life events, so recall is most likely correct and, if biased, then for WwE and CW in the same manner. In women affected with endometriosis, sensitivity to possible infertility might be higher, because it is known and often communicated that endometriosis might affect fertility. This could lead to an information bias and could affect the detection of a pregnancy different from that of CW. As a further limitation, asymptomatic endometriosis in the control group cannot be excluded, because not all of the CW had surgical treatment and were included into the study after the exclusion of symptoms suspicious for endometriosis. This recruitment was the best possible, because women undergoing laparoscopy for gynecologic non-endometriosis reasons, such as tubal ligation or removal of benign ovarian cysts, have an affected fertility, so they impose a selection bias. However, missed diagnoses of endometriosis in the control group would lead to an overestimation of the described effect. The recruitment in different centers reduces selection bias in regard to similarity with the general population, both in WwE and CW.

A further limitation is the difference in fertility, for example the lower number of prior pregnancies in the WwE vs. the CW. Because WwE are known to be less fertile, there is never a totally ideal control group. To account for it we adjusted for the factor subfertility within our mixed-effect regression model. Adjusting additionally for previous ART treatment does not provide value not already covered by subfertility and was therefore not included into the model.

Because of the number of missing answers for thyroid disease and immunologic disorders we could not include these specific risk factors into our mixed-effect regression model.

Our results are in agreement with large registry-based studies (8, 48), showing a higher prevalence of miscarriages in women diagnosed with endometriosis than in CW. Studies showing no difference in miscarriage rates between women with and without endometriosis focus either on ART-treated women (31, 32) or women with surgically treated septate uteri (30). Both of these conditions might imply a higher impact on miscarriage rates than the endometriosis itself. The following mechanisms support our results indicating an association between endometriosis and miscarriages: pathophysiologically, an impaired folliculogenesis and an insufficient endometrial function in WwE have been postulated. The eutopic endometrium may not function normally in WwE: inflammation processes lead to an increased release of reactive oxygen species and an increased expression of enzymes (17). These enzymes induce an accumulation of free radicals in cells near and in the endometrium, which possibly affect implantation (17). Additionally, reactive oxygen species affect the mitotic spindle as well as the separation of chromosomes and consequently delay completion of meiosis I during fertilization (49, 50); this

could provide an explanation for a lower oocyte quality in endometriosis, as shown in animal studies (51).

Physiologically, P induces the decidualization of stromal cells of the endometrium to become receptive for the embryo (52). As a consequence of P resistance in endometriosis, this process may become dysregulated and lead to suboptimal implantation (6). Endometriosis-affected tissue shows different pathologic features, for example delayed maturation, altered glycosylation, and molecular abnormalities, such as alterations in local steroid biosynthesis, cell growth, apoptosis, immune cell function, angiogenesis, cell adhesion, and cytokine production, all of which might reduce chances of a successful pregnancy outcome (14, 53–55). In the literature the use of anti-inflammatory hormonal (56, 57) and nonhormonal (58) treatments for pain symptoms have been examined. It is recommended that they be investigated further for their potential to improve implantation and reduce miscarriages.

In addition, in endometriosis inadequate uterine contractions occur throughout the menstrual cycle; the frequency, amplitude and basal pressure have been shown to be higher and possibly favor miscarriages (17).

The higher miscarriage rate in lower stages of endometriosis detected in our study is in line with findings from other authors: the recent analysis by Santulli et al. (9) showed a higher rate of miscarriages for all phenotypes of endometriosis (i.e., SUP, OMA, and, DIE) compared with CW. As in our study, the highest miscarriage rate was reported for “mild-est” SUP lesions ($n = 33$ of 87 ; 37.9%) vs. OMA lesions ($n = 28$ of 104 ; 26.9%) vs. DIE lesions ($n = 78$ of 287 ; 27.2%). In both studies the higher rate of previous miscarriages in women with SUP could be the result of a higher pregnancy rate among these women: women with more severe lesions such as OMA or DIE are more likely to have a lower reproductive performance (59, 60) or poor motility of the fallopian tubes (11), with consecutively lower spontaneous overall pregnancy rates.

In contrast, a meta-analysis of reproductive outcomes by Barbosa (60) did not show a significant difference in miscarriages between mild and severe endometriosis-affected women. Only 21 of 92 studies included in this meta-analysis reported rASRM staging of endometriosis, so evidence in relation to ASRM staging was considered low.

Pathophysiologic mechanisms might explain the finding of increased miscarriage rates in WwE but also especially in women with mild endometriosis: early stages of the disease with more active lesions are known to lead to a more inflammatory milieu (61, 62), compared with the more scarring lesions of higher disease stages (63). Fresh endometriosis lesions seem to be associated with an inflammatory response represented by overproduction of prostaglandins, metalloproteinases, cytokines, and chemokines (3). The resulting inflammatory process impairs ovarian, peritoneal, tubal, and endometrial function and may lead to defective folliculogenesis by altered follicular milieu because of increased rates of granulosa cell apoptosis (64) as well as increased concentrations of natural killer cells and lymphocytes within follicular fluid (65), fertilization, and/or implantation (5). However, it has been shown very recently that the rate of aneuploidy in patients

affected by endometriosis is not increased (66). We could speculate that the impact of mild endometriosis on fertility might be due to nongenetic, e.g. metabolic intracellular processes—leading to either insufficient oocyte maturation or insufficient embryonal development. Additionally, altered endometrial receptivity (67) and therefore reduced “supply” of intracellular embryonal metabolism could possibly impact on trophoblast development.

There is an association of miscarriages in subfertile women with and without endometriosis.

Additionally, subfertile women often require ART, an intervention possibly associated with complications later in pregnancy, such as preterm birth and low birth weight (68). Assisted reproductive technology itself does not pose a risk for miscarriages, but the underlying specific reproductive disorders and the increased age, both affecting oocyte quality, are of very high importance when assessing miscarriage risk (69) in these women.

On the basis of this knowledge, our results of highest IRR for subfertile women with endometriosis are not surprising. In contrast, our finding that there is no difference in the prevalence of miscarriages between fertile WwE and fertile CW is very important for counseling.

Our findings are in contrast to the above-mentioned recent study (9), in which the risk for miscarriages in fertile women with endometriosis (67 of 341; 19.6%) was significantly higher than in control women (72 of 583; 12.3%). However, the miscarriage rates in both of these groups were lower compared with our and other studies (70). The reason for the differences in these results might be the older age of women (e.g. the higher risk for miscarriage at the time of inclusion into our study).

In conclusion, our study found that miscarriage rates are higher in endometriosis-affected women, especially in women with mild lesions and those suffering from infertility. Further studies, especially prospective controlled studies, are necessary to confirm our findings. A retrospective study such as this, with the attendant limitations of study design, cannot definitely prove the hypothesis. Analyzing underlying pathophysiologic mechanisms such as the folliculogenesis and the endometrial function may help to better understand the etiology of miscarriages and develop effective treatments to improve chances for successful pregnancy in women with endometriosis.

Acknowledgments: The authors thank Kathryn Imboden for editing of the manuscript; Lukas Buetikofer for statistical consulting; and Brigitte Alvera, Anna Dietlicher, Franka Grischott, Nicole Kuenzle, Judith Kurmann, Christina Liebermann, Karoline Stojanov, Elvira Gross, Lina Looser, Sarah Schaerer, Theodosia Charpidou, Elena Lupi, and Franziska Graf for their assistance in data collection.

REFERENCES

- Practice Committee of the American Society for Reproductive Medicine. Endometriosis and infertility. *Fertil Steril* 2006;86:S156–60.
- Zegers-Hochschild F, Adamson GD, Dyer S, Racowsky C, de Mouzon J, Sokol R, et al. The international glossary on infertility and fertility care. *Fertil Steril* 2017;108:393–406.
- Bulun SE. Endometriosis. *N Engl J Med* 2009;360:268–79.
- Giudice LC. Clinical practice. Endometriosis. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:2389–98.
- Gupta S, Goldberg JM, Aziz N, Goldberg E, Krajcir N, Agarwal A. Pathogenic mechanisms in endometriosis-associated infertility. *Fertil Steril* 2008;90:247–57.
- Vercellini P, Viganò P, Somigliana E, Fedele L. Endometriosis: pathogenesis and treatment. *Nat Rev Endocrinol* 2014;10:261–75.
- Vercellini P, Parazzini F, Pietropaolo G, Cipriani S, Frattaruolo MP, Fedele L. Pregnancy outcome in women with peritoneal, ovarian and rectovaginal endometriosis: a retrospective cohort study. *BJOG* 2012;119:1538–43.
- Aris A. A 12-year cohort study on adverse pregnancy outcomes in Eastern Townships of Canada: impact of endometriosis. *Gynecol Endocrinol* 2014;30:34–7.
- Santulli P, Marcellin L, Menard S, Thubert T, Khoshnood B, Gayet V, et al. Increased rate of spontaneous miscarriages in endometriosis-affected women. *Hum Reprod* 2016;31:1014–23.
- Leone Roberti Maggiore U, Ferrero S, Mangili G, Bergamini A, Inversetti A, Giorgione V, et al. A systematic review on endometriosis during pregnancy: diagnosis, misdiagnosis, complications and outcomes. *Hum Reprod Update* 2016;22:70–103.
- Almeida OD. Microlaparoscopy and a GnRH agonist: a combined minimally invasive approach for the diagnosis and treatment of occlusive salpingitis isthmica nodosa associated with endometriosis. *JLS* 2005;9:431–3.
- Fortier KJ, Haney AF. The pathologic spectrum of uterotubal junction obstruction. *Obstet Gynecol* 1985;65:93–8.
- Lyons RA, Djahanbakhch O, Saridogan E, Naftalin AA, Mahmood T, Weekes A, et al. Peritoneal fluid, endometriosis, and ciliary beat frequency in the human fallopian tube. *Lancet* 2002;360:1221–2.
- Carvalho L, Podgaec S, Bellodi-Privato M, Falcone T, Abrão MS. Role of eutopic endometrium in pelvic endometriosis. *J Minim Invasive Gynecol* 2011;18:419–27.
- Brosens I, Brosens JJ, Fusi L, Al-Sabbagh M, Kuroda K, Benagiano G. Risks of adverse pregnancy outcome in endometriosis. *Fertil Steril* 2012;98:30–5.
- Hauzman EE, Garcia-Velasco JA, Pellicer A. Oocyte donation and endometriosis: what are the lessons? *Semin Reprod Med* 2013;31:173–7.
- Benagiano G, Brosens I, Habiba M. Structural and molecular features of the endomyometrium in endometriosis and adenomyosis. *Hum Reprod Update* 2014;20:386–402.
- de Ziegler D, Borghese B, Chapron C. Endometriosis and infertility: pathophysiology and management. *Lancet* 2010;376:730–8.
- Brosens I, Pijnenborg R, Vercruyse L, Romero R. The “Great Obstetrical Syndromes” are associated with disorders of deep placentation. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2011;204:193–201.
- Marcellin L, Santulli P, Gogusev J, Lesaffre C, Jacques S, Chapron C, et al. Endometriosis also affects the decidua in contact with the fetal membranes during pregnancy. *Hum Reprod* 2015;30:392–405.
- Bulun SE, Cheng YH, Yin P, Imir G, Utsunomiya H, Attar E, et al. Progesterone resistance in endometriosis: link to failure to metabolize estradiol. *Mol Cell Endocrinol* 2006;248:94–103.
- Burney RO, Talbi S, Hamilton AE, Vo KC, Nyegaard M, Nezhat CR, et al. Gene expression analysis of endometrium reveals progesterone resistance and candidate susceptibility genes in women with endometriosis. *Endocrinology* 2007;148:3814–26.
- Knudsen UB, Hansen V, Juul S, Secher NJ. Prognosis of a new pregnancy following previous spontaneous abortions. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol* 1991;39:31–6.
- Nybo Andersen AM, Wohlfahrt J, Christens P, Olsen J, Melbye M. Maternal age and fetal loss: population based register linkage study. *BMJ* 2000;320:1708–12.
- Naples JD, Batt RE, Sadigh H. Spontaneous abortion rate in patients with endometriosis. *Obstet Gynecol* 1981;57:509–12.
- Wheeler JM, Johnston BM, Malinak LR. The relationship of endometriosis to spontaneous abortion. *Fertil Steril* 1983;39:656–60.
- Groll M. Endometriosis and spontaneous abortion. *Fertil Steril* 1984;41:933–5.

28. Metzger DA, Olive DL, Stohs GF, Franklin RR. Association of endometriosis and spontaneous abortion: effect of control group selection. *Fertil Steril* 1986;45:18–22.
29. Omland AK, Abyholm T, Fedorcsák P, Ertzeid G, Oldereid NB, Bjercke S, et al. Pregnancy outcome after IVF and ICSI in unexplained, endometriosis-associated and tubal factor infertility. *Hum Reprod* 2005; 20:722–7.
30. Gergolet M, Gianaroli L, Kenda Suster N, Verdenik I, Magli MC, Gordts S. Possible role of endometriosis in the aetiology of spontaneous miscarriage in patients with septate uterus. *Reprod Biomed Online* 2010; 21:581–5.
31. Mekaru K, Masamoto H, Sugiyama H, Asato K, Heshiki C, Kinjo T, et al. Endometriosis and pregnancy outcome: are pregnancies complicated by endometriosis a high-risk group? *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol* 2014; 172:36–9.
32. Leonardi M, Papaleo E, Reschini M, Pagliardini L, Benaglia L, Candotti G, et al. Risk of miscarriage in women with endometriosis: insights from in vitro fertilization cycles. *Fertil Steril* 2016;106:386–92.
33. Schenken RS, Guzick DS. Revised endometriosis classification: 1996. *Fertil Steril* 1997;67:815–6.
34. Rock JA, Guzick DS, Sengos C, Schweditsch M, Sapp KC, Jones HW. The conservative surgical treatment of endometriosis: evaluation of pregnancy success with respect to the extent of disease as categorized using contemporary classification systems. *Fertil Steril* 1981;35:131–7.
35. Chapron C, Bourret A, Chopin N, Dousset B, Leconte M, Amsellem-Ouazana D, et al. Surgery for bladder endometriosis: long-term results and concomitant management of associated posterior deep lesions. *Hum Reprod* 2010;25:884–9.
36. Somigliana E, Vercellini P, Gattei U, Chopin N, Chiodo I, Chapron C. Bladder endometriosis: getting closer and closer to the unifying metastatic hypothesis. *Fertil Steril* 2007;87:1287–90.
37. Koninckx PR, Martin DC. Deep endometriosis: a consequence of infiltration or retraction or possibly adenomyosis externa? *Fertil Steril* 1992;58: 924–8.
38. Sibiude J, Santulli P, Marcellin L, Borghese B, Dousset B, Chapron C. Association of history of surgery for endometriosis with severity of deeply infiltrating endometriosis. *Obstet Gynecol* 2014;124:709–17.
39. Raudenbush SW, Bryk AS. Hierarchical linear models: applications and data analysis methods. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 2002.
40. Kolte AM, Bernardi LA, Christiansen OB, Quenby S, Farquharson RG, Goddijn M, et al. Terminology for pregnancy loss prior to viability: a consensus statement from the ESHRE early pregnancy special interest group. *Hum Reprod* 2015;30:495–8.
41. Vercellini P, Fedele L, Aimi G, Pietropaolo G, Consonni D, Crosignani PG. Association between endometriosis stage, lesion type, patient characteristics and severity of pelvic pain symptoms: a multivariate analysis of over 1000 patients. *Hum Reprod* 2007;22:266–71.
42. De Graaff AA, Dirksen CD, Simoons S, De Bie B, Hummelshoj L, D'Hooghe TM, et al. Quality of life outcomes in women with endometriosis are highly influenced by recruitment strategies. *Hum Reprod* 2015;30: 1331–41.
43. Vígano P, Corti L, Berlanda N. Beyond infertility: obstetrical and postpartum complications associated with endometriosis and adenomyosis. *Fertil Steril* 2015;104:802–12.
44. Wykes CB, Clark TJ, Khan KS. Accuracy of laparoscopy in the diagnosis of endometriosis: a systematic quantitative review. *BJOG* 2004;111: 1204–12.
45. Fauconnier A, Chapron C, Dubuisson JB, Vieira M, Dousset B, Bréart G. Relation between pain symptoms and the anatomic location of deep infiltrating endometriosis. *Fertil Steril* 2002;78:719–26.
46. Guerriero S, Condous G, Van den Bosch T, Valentini L, Leone FP, Van Schoubroeck D, et al. Systematic approach to sonographic evaluation of the pelvis in women with suspected endometriosis, including terms, definitions and measurements: a consensus opinion from the International Deep Endometriosis Analysis (IDEA) group. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol* 2016;48: 318–32.
47. Vercellini P, Consonni D, Dridi D, Bracco B, Frattaruolo MP, Somigliana E. Uterine adenomyosis and in vitro fertilization outcome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Hum Reprod* 2014;29:964–77.
48. Hjordt Hansen MV, Dalsgaard T, Hartwell D, Skovlund CW, Lidegaard O. Reproductive prognosis in endometriosis. A national cohort study. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand* 2014;93:483–9.
49. Barcelos ID, Vieira RC, Ferreira EM, Martins WP, Ferriani RA, Navarro PA. Comparative analysis of the spindle and chromosome configurations of in vitro-matured oocytes from patients with endometriosis and from control subjects: a pilot study. *Fertil Steril* 2009;92:1749–52.
50. Mansour G, Sharma RK, Agarwal A, Falcone T. Endometriosis-induced alterations in mouse metaphase II oocyte microtubules and chromosomal alignment: a possible cause of infertility. *Fertil Steril* 2010;94:1894–9.
51. De Broi MG, Malvezzi H, Paz CC, Ferriani RA, Navarro PA. Follicular fluid from infertile women with mild endometriosis may compromise the meiotic spindles of bovine metaphase II oocytes. *Hum Reprod* 2014;29:315–23.
52. Practice Committee of the American Society for Reproductive Medicine. Progesterone supplementation during the luteal phase and in early pregnancy in the treatment of infertility: an educational bulletin. *Fertil Steril* 2008;89:789–92.
53. Jones CJ, Inuwa IM, Nardo LG, Litta P, Fazleabas AT. Eutopic endometrium from women with endometriosis shows altered ultrastructure and glycosylation compared to that from healthy controls—a pilot observational study. *Reprod Sci* 2009;16:559–72.
54. Sharpe-Timms KL, Nabli H, Zimmer RL, Birt JA, Davis JW. Inflammatory cytokines differentially up-regulate human endometrial haptoglobin production in women with endometriosis. *Hum Reprod* 2010;25:1241–50.
55. Miller DL, Jones CJ, Aplin JD, Nardo LG. Altered glycosylation in perimplantation phase endometrium in women with stages III and IV endometriosis. *Hum Reprod* 2010;25:406–11.
56. Nirgianakis K, Bersinger NA, McKinnon B, Kostov P, Imboden S, Mueller MD. Regression of the inflammatory microenvironment of the peritoneal cavity in women with endometriosis by GnRH treatment. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol* 2013;170:550–4.
57. Nirgianakis K, Grandi G, McKinnon B, Bersinger N, Cagnacci A, Mueller M. Dienogest mediates midline suppression in endometriosis. *Hum Reprod* 2016;31:1981–6.
58. Olivares C, Ricci A, Bilotas M, Barañao RI, Meresman G. The inhibitory effect of celecoxib and rosiglitazone on experimental endometriosis. *Fertil Steril* 2011;96:428–33.
59. Jaques AM, Amor DJ, Baker HW, Healy DL, Ukoumunne OC, Breheny S, et al. Adverse obstetric and perinatal outcomes in subfertile women conceiving without assisted reproductive technologies. *Fertil Steril* 2010; 94:2674–9.
60. Barbosa MAP, Teixeira DM, Navarro PAAS, Ferriani RA, Nastro CO, Martins WP. Impact of endometriosis and its staging on assisted reproduction outcome: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol* 2014;44:261–78.
61. Malhotra N, Karmakar D, Tripathi V, Luthra K, Kumar S. Correlation of angiogenic cytokines-leptin and IL-8 in stage, type and presentation of endometriosis. *Gynecol Endocrinol* 2012;28:224–7.
62. Miller JE, Ahn SH, Monsanto SP, Khalaj K, Koti M, Tayade C. Implications of immune dysfunction on endometriosis associated infertility. *Oncotarget* 2017;8:7138–47.
63. Yuge A, Nasu K, Matsumoto H, Nishida M, Narahara H. Collagen gel contractility is enhanced in human endometriotic stromal cells: a possible mechanism underlying the pathogenesis of endometriosis-associated fibrosis. *Hum Reprod* 2007;22:938–9.
64. Nakahara K, Saito H, Saito T, Ito M, Ohta N, Sakai N, et al. Incidence of apoptotic bodies in membrana granulosa of the patients participating in an in vitro fertilization program. *Fertil Steril* 1997;67:302–8.
65. Lachapelle MH, Hemmings R, Roy DC, Falcone T, Miron P. Flow cytometric evaluation of leukocyte subpopulations in the follicular fluids of infertile patients. *Fertil Steril* 1996;65:1135–40.
66. Juneau C, Kraus E, Werner M, Franasiak J, Morin S, Patounakis G, et al. Patients with endometriosis have aneuploidy rates equivalent to their age-

- matched peers in the in vitro fertilization population. *Fertil Steril* 2017;108:284–8.
67. Garrido N, Navarro J, García-Velasco J, Remoh J, Pellicer A, Simon C. The endometrium versus embryonic quality in endometriosis-related infertility. *Hum Reprod Update* 2002;8:95–103.
68. Pandey S, Shetty A, Hamilton M, Bhattacharya S, Maheshwari A. Obstetric and perinatal outcomes in singleton pregnancies resulting from IVF/ICSI: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Hum Reprod Update* 2012;18:485–503.
69. Schieve LA, Tatham L, Peterson HB, Toner J, Jeng G. Spontaneous abortion among pregnancies conceived using assisted reproductive technology in the United States. *Obstet Gynecol* 2003;101:959–67.
70. Pittaway DE, Vernon C, Fayez JA. Spontaneous abortions in women with endometriosis. *Fertil Steril* 1988;50:711–5.

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE 1

Rates of previous miscarriages according to localization of the most severe lesions.

SUP		OMA		DIE		Controls		P value ^a
N	Rate, % (95% CI)	N	Rate, % (95% CI)	N	Rate, % (95% CI)	N	Rate, % (95% CI)	
34/79	43.0 (32.0–53.9)	22/77	28.6 (17.7–38.7)	20/59	33.9 (21.2–46.0)	59/268	22.0 (16.7–27.0)	.005

Note: Surgical phenotypic classification from Chapron et al. (35). N = number of miscarriages/pregnancies.

^a χ^2 test.

Kohl Schwartz. Endometriosis and the risk for miscarriages. *Fertil Steril* 2017.

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE 2

Rates of previous miscarriages according to disease stage.

rASRM I/II		rASRM III/IV		Controls		P value ^a
N	Rate, % (95% CI)	N	Rate, % (95% CI)	N	Rate, % (95% CI)	
45/107	42.1 (32.6–51.4)	41/133	30.8 (22.6–38.7)	59/268	22.0 (16.7–27.0)	< .001

Note: N = number of miscarriages/pregnancies.

^a χ^2 test.

Kohl Schwartz. Endometriosis and the risk for miscarriages. *Fertil Steril* 2017.