

ESHRE PGD Consortium Best Practice Guidelines for FISH-Based Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis (PGD)

Harton, GL^{1,8}, Harper, JC^{2,3}, Coonen, E⁴, Pehlivan, T⁵, Vesela, K⁶, and Wilton, L⁷

- 1 Reprogenetics LLC, Livingston, NJ 07039, USA. Formerly Genetics & IVF Institute, Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis Laboratory, Fairfax, VA 22031, USA
- 2 UCL Centre for PG & D, Institute for Women's Health, University College London, UK
- 3 Centre for Reproductive and Genetic Health, UCLH, London, UK
- 4 Department of Clinical Genetics, Maastricht University Medical Centre, Maastricht, the Netherlands
- 5 Instituto Valenciano de Infertilidad –Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey
- 6 Sanatorium REPROMEDA, Vinicni, 235, 615 00 Brno, Czech Republic
- 7 Preimplantation Genetics, Melbourne IVF
- 8 To whom correspondence should be addressed

Abstract:

Abstract: In 2005, the European Society for Human Reproduction and Embryology (ESHRE) PGD Consortium published a set of Guidelines for Best Practice PGD to give information, support, and guidance to potential, existing and fledgling PGD programs (Thornhill et al., 2005). The subsequent years have seen the introduction of a number of new technologies as well as the evolution of current techniques. Additionally, in the light of ESHRE's recent advice (http://www.eshre.com/binarydata.aspx?type=doc/Manual_for_guideline_development_JK_WN_SB_FINAL.pdf) on how practice guidelines should be written and formulated, the Consortium believed it was timely to revise and update the PGD guidelines. Rather than one document that covers all of PGD as in the original publication, these guidelines are separated into four new documents that apply to different aspects of a PGD program i.e. organization of a PGD centre, FISH-based testing, Amplification-based testing and Polar Body and Embryo Biopsy for Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis/Screening (PGD/PGS). Here we have updated the sections that pertain to FISH-based PGD.

Preimplantation genetic screening (PGS) has become a highly controversial technique. Opinions of laboratory specialists and clinicians interested in PGD and PGS have been taken into account in this document. While some do not believe that PGS has a place in clinical medicine, others disagree; therefore, PGS has been included. We hope that this document will assist everyone interested in PGD and PGS to develop the best laboratory and clinical practice possible.

Topics covered in this guideline include inclusion/exclusion criteria for FISH-based PGD testing, referrals and genetic counselling, preclinical validation of tests, FISH-based testing methods, spreading of cells for analysis, set-up of local IVF center and transport PGD centers, quality control/assurance and diagnostic confirmation of untransferred embryos.

Introduction

The rapidly changing nature of PGD/PGS, specifically the technologies associated with its use and increasing patient access, has necessitated review and revision of the original ESHRE PGD Consortium guidelines (Thornhill et al, 2005). As a result, the ESHRE PGD Consortium has prepared four guidelines: one relating to the organisation of the PGD Centre and three relating to the methods used: amplification-based, FISH-based and biopsy/embryology (Harton et al., 2010 a, b, c). The method guidelines should be read in conjunction with the organisation of the PGD Centre guidelines which contains information on personnel, inclusion/exclusion criteria, genetic counselling and informed consent, setting up an IVF centre, transport PGD, QA/QC and accreditation (which is also further discussed in the paper by Harper et al, in press). In this document, the laboratory performing the diagnosis will be referred to as the PGD/PGS Centre and the centre performing the IVF as the IVF Centre. Topics covered in this guideline include general uses of FISH, laboratory issues relating to FISH, pre-examination validation, examination process, and post examination process.

PGD for chromosome rearrangements has become an accepted and routine part of most PGD Centres performing FISH-based testing. PGD for chromosome rearrangements has been developed for patients at high-risk of pregnancy loss, inability to achieve pregnancy and abnormal live-born births due to inheritance of unbalanced products of the rearrangement.

Preimplantation genetic screening (PGS), called 'low-risk PGD' in the original guidelines, has been carried out for infertile patients undergoing IVF with the aim of increasing the IVF pregnancy and delivery rates. Current examples of indications for PGS include advanced maternal age (AMA), repeated implantation failure (RIF), severe male infertility (SMF) and couples with normal karyotypes who have experienced repeated miscarriages (RM). To date, eleven randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have been performed looking at PGS for various indications which have failed to show an improvement in delivery rates for poor prognosis (Staessen et al, 2004, Mastenbroek et al, 2007, Hardarson et al, 2008, Debrock et al, 2008, Blockeel et al., 2008, Schoolcraft et al, 2009) and good

prognosis patients (Staessen et al, 2008, Jansen et al, 2008, Mersereau et al. 2008, Meyer et al, 2009). These publications have led to an open discussion of PGS and its role in IVF (Fritz 2008; Harper et al, 2008a; Simpson 2008; The Practice Committee of the Society for Assisted Reproductive Technology and the Practice Committee of the American Society for Reproductive Medicine, 2008). The general consensus is that since ten of the RCTs have shown no benefit of cleavage stage biopsy/PGS (probably due to the high levels of mosaicism at cleavage stages and the limitations of FISH), further PGS RCTs should concentrate either on polar body or trophectoderm biopsy and a full chromosome count. The ESHRE PGS task force is running a multi-centred RCT to determine whether PGS truly improves IVF outcome in patients of AMA using polar body biopsy and array comparative genomic hybridisation (CGH) (Geraedts et al, in press). Since PGS is still being practiced by some IVF and PGD Centres, the PGD Consortium felt it was important to set forth our opinion on the best practices that should be followed in a PGS lab as well as those for PGD.

PGD/PGS is still relatively unregulated and lacks standardization compared to other forms of diagnostic testing, however, more federal, state and local governments are beginning to take an interest in PGD and some have begun accrediting laboratories that offer PGD (Harper et al, in press). This is a logical step considering the comparative difficulty in achieving the highest levels of accuracy and reliability with single cells as part of PGD/PGS versus more routine genetic testing. Many regulations, laws and voluntary networks exist in the mainstream diagnostic community to maintain the highest quality in diagnostic testing. For example, the European Quality Molecular Network has attempted to improve and standardize molecular diagnostic testing across Europe (Dequeker et al., 2001). One step towards higher quality overall and standardisation for PGD/PGS is to build consensus opinion on best practices within the PGD/PGS community; a component of the mission of the ESHRE PGD Consortium (hereafter referred to as the Consortium - ESHRE PGD Consortium Steering Committee 1999; 2000; 2002; Harper et al., 2006; Sermon et al., 2007; Harper et al., 2008b, Goossens et al., 2008, 2009)

The Consortium recognizes that owing to variations in local or national regulations and specific laboratory practices, there will remain differences in the ways in which PGD/PGS are practiced (from initial referral through IVF treatment, single cell analysis to follow-up of pregnancies, births and children). However, this does not preclude a series of consensus opinions on best practice based upon experience and available evidence. Indeed, the American Society for Reproductive Medicine published a practice committee report for PGD in 2008 (American Society for Reproductive Medicine and

Society for Assisted Reproductive Technology. Practice Committee Report, 2008) essentially reviewing PGD practice in the United States. The PGD International Society (PGDIS), has also drafted guidelines which were recently updated and although more in-depth than the ASRM report, these guidelines are concise and remain so in their recent revised edition (Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis International Society, 2004, 2008). The consensus opinions provided in this document and the accompanying guidelines, not only reflect current use of PGD but also offer consensus-based specific guidance regarding how best to practice clinical PGD based upon clinical experience, and data, both published and unpublished.

The Consortium hopes that a minimum standard might be achieved across all centres actively providing clinical PGD. Achieving this goal could ultimately have the net effect that patients receive the best care possible regardless of the centre at which they are treated. Rather than a drift towards the lowest common denominator, established and fledgling centres alike can learn from global experiences and be guided by consensus opinion.

These opinions are not intended as rules or fixed protocols that must be followed, nor are they legally binding. The unique needs of individual patients may justify deviation from these opinions, and they must be applied according to individual patient needs using professional judgement. However, guidelines and opinions may be incorporated into laws and regulations and practitioners should check the status of clinical practice guidelines in their own countries to determine the status of this document.

1. General uses of FISH

1.1. FISH can be used for embryo sexing for X-linked diseases or social reasons (gender selection/family balancing), inherited chromosome rearrangements and aneuploidy screening (PGS).

1.1.1. Sexing for X-linked diseases and social reasons

1.1.1.1. A probe set containing at least probes specific for the centromere regions of the X and Y chromosomes, and one autosome, is **recommended** (Staessen et al., 1999; Harper and Wilton, 2001).

1.1.1.2. Diagnosis on a single mononucleate cell is **acceptable** for sexing (Kuo et al., 1998).

1.1.1.3. It should be noted that FISH-based PGD for sexing to exclude transmission of X-linked diseases can be less advantageous when compared to PCR-based diagnosis of the disease associated mutation along with gender (Renwick et al., 2006, Renwick

and Olgive 2007). PCR-based diagnosis allows for transfer of unaffected males as well as the ability to select against carrier females.

1.1.1.4. Autosomal probes can be included to check for aneuploidy but if multiple rounds of FISH are being used, the X and Y probes should be included in the first round (Wilton et al, 2009)

1.1.2. Chromosome rearrangements

1.1.2.1. It is **recommended** that the probe set should at least contain sufficient probes to detect all expected unbalanced forms of the chromosomal rearrangement.

1.1.2.2. Where suitable probes are not available, it is **acceptable** to use probe mixes that cannot detect some unbalanced forms of a rearrangement providing they have been assessed to be non-viable in a recognisable pregnancy or to have a very low prevalence (Scriven et al., 1998; Delhanty & Conn, 2001; Munné, 2002; Scriven, 2003).

1.1.2.3. In the latter case, patients should be counselled to this effect. A cytogeneticist or suitably qualified person should determine which probe combination to use.

1.1.2.4. Diagnosis on a single mononucleate cell is **acceptable** for chromosome rearrangements providing there are at least two informative probes for the chromosome imbalance associated with unbalanced forms of the rearrangement that are considered likely to be prevalent or viable in a recognisable pregnancy.

1.1.2.5. Diagnosis based on concordant results from two mononucleate cells is **recommended** where there is only one informative probe available.

1.1.2.6. The use of additional probes to screen for aneuploidies of chromosomes not involved in the rearrangement is **acceptable**

1.1.2.7. For translocation detection, the PGD-FISH report should clearly state that the analysis cannot discriminate between embryos with a normal or a balanced translocation karyotype

1.1.3. Aneuploidy Screening (PGS)

1.1.3.1. For aneuploidy screening a probe set of at least eight chromosome pairs, including chromosomes 13, 16, 18, 21, 22, X and Y is **recommended** (Munné et al., 1999; Magli et al., 2001; Wilton, 2002). The addition of other probes is **acceptable**.

1.1.3.2. Diagnosis on a single mononucleate cell is **recommended** for PGS (Cohen et al., 2007).

1.1.3.3. Rehybridization procedures on single blastomeres (Munné et al., 1998; Bahçe et al., 2000; Magli et al., 2001; Wilton 2002) are acceptable with appropriate validation and written procedures.

1.1.3.4. While PGS remains controversial in clinical practice, the following indications for its use have been reported on:

1.1.3.4.1. Recurrent miscarriage (for example >2 miscarriages (Harper et al., 2006)- exact number to be determined by each centre)

1.1.3.4.1.1. It should be noted that patients with a history of recurrent miscarriage have a high chance of successfully conceiving naturally (Brigham et al., 1999; Carp et al., 2001)

1.1.3.4.2. Repeated implantation failure (for example: > 3 embryo transfers with high quality embryos or the transfer of ≥ 10 embryos in multiple transfers (Harper et al., 2006) - exact numbers to be determined by each centre).

1.1.3.4.2.1. Implantation failure is defined as the absence of a gestational sac on ultrasound at 5 or more weeks post embryo transfer.

1.1.3.4.3. Advanced maternal age (for example >36 completed years - (Harper et al., 2006) exact age to be determined by each centre)

2. Laboratory issues relating to FISH (see Organisation guideline section 1)

2.1 Laboratory Materials

2.1.1. All clinical equipment should meet the criteria set for the intended application, be appropriately maintained and service, with all aspects supported by written standard operating procedures

2.1.2. All batch numbers of reagents should be recorded so that they may be traceable to specific assays

2.1.3. Whenever possible, all solutions should be purchased 'ready to use' and should be of 'molecular biology' grade or equivalent

2.2. Work practice controls-the following recommendations are made

2.2.1. It is essential that an adequate labelling system is used to match the cell diagnostic result with the embryo from which that cell was biopsied.

- 2.2.2. Labelling and sample identification should be confirmed for critical and high risk steps. It is **recommended** that the unique patient identifier and embryo/cell number should be witnessed and signed by two scientists at the following steps
- a) immediately after biopsy to confirm the embryo and cell number match
 - b) at fixation or spreading to confirm that the cell identification matches the labelling on the relevant slide
 - c) when diagnostic FISH results are recorded to ensure accuracy and correlation with the correct cell and/or embryo identification
- 2.2.3. All personnel undertaking FISH diagnosis should be adequately trained and should follow written standard operating procedures.
- 2.2.4. Training for FISH personnel should be documented. It is **recommended** that at least 50 blastomeres are successfully spread or fixed and subjected to FISH by each trainee prior to working on clinical specimens
- 2.2.5. Deviations to SOPs and protocols should be documented
- 2.2.6. Training for FISH should be at least to the standard required for routine testing in a clinical cytogenetic laboratory.

2.3. Fixation protocols

- 2.3.1. It is **recommended** that cumulus cells be removed prior to biopsy as these can contaminate the slide with maternal cells and lead to misdiagnosis.
- 2.3.2. Three methods of spreading and/or fixing single blastomeres have been described; all are **acceptable**:
- 2.3.2.1. methanol/acetic acid (Tarkowski, 1966; Griffin et al., 1992)
 - 2.3.2.2. Tween/HCl (Coonen et al., 1994; Harper et al., 1994),
 - 2.3.2.3. Combined Tween/HCl-methanol/acetic acid (Dozortsev and McGinnis, 2001; Baart et al, 2004).
 - 2.3.2.4. Each of these methods has pros and cons and all work effectively when performed well. The methanol/acetic acid method is rapid but the toxic nature of the solutions involved precludes its use in an embryology laboratory. The Tween/HCl method uses non-toxic solutions and can be done in an embryology laboratory. Some PGD scientists find that the methanol/acetic acid method produces nuclei that are over-spread resulting in stretched FISH signals that are difficult to interpret. Others find that the Tween/HCl method results in nuclei that are too small and condensed thus

increasing the risk signal overlap. Each laboratory should determine which technique produces the best outcomes under their conditions.

2.3.3. The use of hypotonic treatment of cells prior to spreading is **acceptable**.

2.3.4. Spreading and/or fixing of one blastomere per slide is **recommended**.

Spreading and/or fixing of multiple blastomeres on a slide is **acceptable**, provided that sufficient measures are taken to ensure the correct labelling and identification of each blastomere

3. Pre-examination validation

Probe selection

- 3.1. The use of commercial probes is **recommended** since they generally come with quality control (QC) and validation. The use of home-made probes is **acceptable** with appropriate QC/QA and validation.
- 3.2. It is **recommended** that all probe vials should be tested before clinical application, to confirm that they contain the correct chromosome-specific probe labelled with the correct fluorochrome or hapten, that they are informative for the intended PGD couple, and to assess that signal specificity, brightness and discreteness are within acceptable parameters per predetermined individual laboratory criteria (as documented in written procedures).
- 3.3. For each test, it is **recommended** that only appropriately qualified personnel (as documented in written competency lists) authorizes selection of probes with the appropriate chromosome specificity and labeling.
- 3.4. For chromosome rearrangement cases, preliminary work on peripheral blood lymphocytes from both reproductive partners is **recommended** for each different probe and combined probe set, and should include both metaphase spreads and interphase nuclei analysis. It is **acceptable** to study case-unrelated fibroblast or lymphocyte cells; however, use of these unrelated cell types will leave the lab unaware of signal polymorphism(s) in the reproductive partners and thus in the generated embryos.
- 3.5. It is **recommended** that at least 10 metaphase spreads should be examined: (a) to ensure that the probes are specific for the correct chromosomes, (b) to assess chromosome polymorphism and signal cross-hybridization, and (c) with respect to a chromosome rearrangement carriers, to ensure that the probes hybridize as expected to the different segments of the rearrangement (in other words, that they are informative for the intended couple).

- 3.6. It is **recommended** that at least 100 interphase nuclei should be scored using appropriate scoring criteria that should include an assessment of signal specificity, brightness and discreteness (see also: scoring clinical FISH results)
- 3.7. It is **recommended** that for probe mixes containing sub-telomeric probes and/or locus-specific probes with known polymorphism and cross-hybridization, preliminary work should be done using (diploid) cells from both reproductive partners.
- 3.8. Since the analytical performance in blastomeres approaches that of peripheral blood lymphocytes and fibroblasts, it is **acceptable** not to test a new probe set on a limited series of blastomeres.
- 3.9. It is **recommended** that scoring criteria should be determined ahead of time (published or 'in-house') and should be adhered to per written procedure.
- 3.10. No probe or combined probe set should be passed for clinical use unless it meets the individual laboratory's predetermined and documented minimum score for intensity, specificity, and minimum background.
- 3.11. It is **recommended** that in every round of FISH each probe must be labelled with a different fluorochrome or combination of fluorochromes so that the colour of different probe signals can be distinguished from each other

Use of intra-assay controls

- 3.12. The use of positive and negative controls for FISH-based PGD assays is contentious.
 - 3.12.1. Suitable positive controls are not readily available for FISH-based tests (i.e. single human blastomeres or other cell types to represent human blastomeres).
 - 3.12.2. Normal human lymphocyte controls can serve to assess that the correct probes are in the mix and that they localize to the appropriately sized chromosome.
 - 3.12.3. It is **recommended** that the individual laboratory's protocol includes checking procedures sufficient to ensure that the correct probes are in the mix.

Assessing FISH efficiency

- 3.13. Each lab should validate and use a control for each FISH hybridization and the control slide should pass QC for each clinical run. Acceptable ranges of FISH hybridization efficiency should be determined in each lab for each FISH probe and combined probe set.

Pre-cycle work-up on individual couples

- 3.14. **Sexing:** If using a probe set previously shown to have a very low polymorphism rate (e.g., Aneuvysion XY, 18) it is **acceptable** to forego any pre-cycle workup. If using DYZ1

(Yq12), pre-cycle testing of peripheral blood lymphocytes from both reproductive partners is **recommended** due to the relatively common occurrence of polymorphism (Hsu et al., 1987). If multiple rounds of FISH are being performed, the X and Y probes should be used in the first round (Wilton et al, 2009).

3.15. **Structural chromosome abnormalities:** It is **recommended** that peripheral blood lymphocytes from both reproductive partners be tested with the specific probe set for clinical use. It is **acceptable** to perform the testing only on the partner who carries the rearrangement. It is **acceptable** to perform testing on blastomeres from embryos donated to research prior to clinical PGD testing. It is **acceptable** to carry out FISH testing on sperm from male translocation carriers to in an attempt to predict the efficacy of PGD for these cases. (Escudero et al., 2003).

3.16. **Aneuploidy screening (PGS):** It is **recommended** that testing with the D15Z1 probe (15p11.2) is performed on peripheral blood lymphocytes from both reproductive partners before treatment since it cross-hybridizes to the short arm of other acrocentric chromosomes in around 15% of normal individuals (Shim et al., 2003; Cockwell et al., 2007).

Reporting pre-examination validation

3.17. A report should be written detailing the protocol and validation steps of the PGD workup (Harper et al, in press).

4. Examination process

FISH protocols

4.1.1. Many variations in FISH methods have been published and all appropriately validated methods are **acceptable** (Harper and Wilton, 2001; Delhanty and Conn, 2001). The method used should have been previously implemented, tested and validated in the PGD Centre

4.1.2. If using prehybridization steps such as pepsin and paraformaldehyde it is **recommended** that steps should be taken to ensure appropriate quality control for these solutions. Creation dates should be recorded and solutions checked prior to use for possible cellular contamination.

4.1.3. Mounting medium containing antifade is **recommended** to allow maintenance of fluorescent signals.

4.1.4. It is **recommended** that prior to each FISH procedure, denaturation, hybridization and wash temperatures are validated and that the temperature of the solution is verified prior to use.

- 4.1.5. Temperature ranges should be validated in individual PGD Centres and instruments serviced and calibrated regularly to ensure accuracy.
- 4.1.6. All critical steps in the FISH lab should be witnessed by an independent observer, preferably one who is trained in FISH. Critical steps include confirmation that the labelling of the biopsied cell and the slide onto which it is spread match and use of the correct FISH probes for the case.
- 4.1.7. The following **recommendations** are made about the physical laboratory space needed for FISH-based PGD:
- 4.1.7.1. The FISH laboratory should be well ventilated to minimise the effect of any noxious fumes. This is particularly important if cells are fixed using methanol and acetic acid
- 4.1.7.2. FISH outcomes including cell spreading and fixation are dependent on humidity. The humidity in the FISH laboratory should be controlled and stable. FISH protocols should be optimised in these conditions.
- 4.1.7.3. FISH signals may be bleached or weakened in bright light. It is **recommended** that the FISH laboratory is fitted with variable intensity incandescent lighting. Fluorescent lighting is **acceptable**.

Existence of and adherence to clinical testing protocol.

The following **recommendations** are made (Thornhill et al. 2005; Harper et al. in press):

- 4.1.8. Clinical testing protocols should include explicit instructions including a summary of results from the validation steps of assay development, scoring criteria, reporting procedures as well as a framework for counseling patients in the presence of diagnostic results.
- 4.1.9. Standard operating procedures (SOPs) are required for all protocols, all equipment, and all processes that take place in the PGD Centre and should include selection and validation of examination procedures, clinical relevance, purpose of exam, specimen requirements and means of identification, equipment and special supplies, reagents, standards or calibrations and internal control materials, instructions for performance of the examination, limitations of the examinations, recording and calculation of results, internal quality control procedures and criteria against which examination processes are judged, reporting reference limits, responsibilities of personnel in authorizing, reporting and monitoring reports, hazards and safety precautions assuring the quality of examinations.

- 4.1.10. Risk assessments are required for every stage of the PGD process. These assessments should be integrated to the standard operating procedures. Laboratory staff should understand the SOPs clearly as these are the fundamental back bone to the service.
- 4.1.11. Deviations from protocol should be recorded. If frequent deviations occur, there should be a mechanism in place to change procedures accordingly.
- 4.1.12. Well-structured laboratory forms to report workup, PGD cycle and analysis of untransferred embryo results should be used.
- 4.1.13. In all of the critical stages of the PGD process witnessing and signing is **recommended** (see 2.2.2).

Scoring clinical FISH results

- 4.1.14. The following **recommendations** are made
- 4.1.14.1. Signal scoring criteria should be established in written protocol and adhered to for the interpretation of signals.
- 4.1.14.2. The fluorescence microscope should be equipped with and optimized for the appropriate filter sets for the probes being used
- 4.1.14.3. Signals should be analyzed by two independent observers and discrepancies adjudicated by a third observer (where possible). If no resolution is reached the embryo should not be recommended for transfer, i.e. should be given the diagnosis of uninterpretable or inconclusive.
- 4.1.14.4. It is acceptable to score signals from probes labelled with fluorochromes not detectable to the human eye using an image capture system.
- 4.1.14.5. All single cell images should be captured and recorded for QC purposes and records.
- 4.1.14.6. Different locations around the world have specific laws or guidelines on what should be stored from an individual clinical case and for how long. Local accreditation schemes may also have recommendations along these lines. It is **recommended** that labs should follow local law or guidelines on storage of clinical samples and patient records.
- 4.1.14.7. If no local law or guideline exists, it is **recommended** that:
- 4.1.14.7.1. If there has been an embryo transferred or frozen, all slides from the case should be retained and appropriately stored. This can be at 4°C or dehydrated at room temperature.

- 4.1.14.7.2. If there is no embryo transfer or cryostorage, it is not necessary to keep FISH slides.
- 4.1.14.7.3. If no pregnancy results from fresh or frozen embryos, slides can be discarded.
- 4.1.14.7.4. If a pregnancy results, slides should be retained until the outcome of the pregnancy is known and, where possible, the FISH result confirmed.
- 4.1.14.8. Results should be reviewed and signed by a suitably qualified person
- 4.1.14.9. A written or online electronic report should be given to the IVF Centre to ensure transfer of the correct embryos. Results should not be transmitted verbally.
- 4.1.14.10. Reporting of clinical results to the IVF Centre must follow local guidelines or law, or, if nothing local exists, the guidelines in ISO15189 (Harper et al, in press).

5. Post examination process

5.1. The following **recommendations** are made (ESHRE PGD Consortium Steering Committee 1999; 2000; 2002; Sermon et al.,2005; Harper et al., 2006; Sermon et al., 2007; Harper et al., 2008b Goossens et al.,2008; Goossens et al., 2009; PGDIS, 2008).

- 5.1.1.1. Confirmation of the diagnosis should be performed on embryos not transferred or cryopreserved following diagnosis to provide QA as well as accurate and up to date misdiagnosis rates to prospective PGD/PGS patients. It is **recommended** that this is performed on as many embryos as is practicable. It is **acceptable** to perform this periodically.
- 5.1.1.2. PGD and IVF Centres should make special efforts to follow-up with the parents following prenatal testing or birth, especially if confirmatory testing is not possible.
- 5.1.1.3. Follow-up of pregnancies (including multiple pregnancy rate and outcome), deliveries, and the health of children at birth and beyond should be attempted and maintained along with the cycle data. These data should be used both for internal QC/QA purposes and sent to the ESHRE PGD Consortium during yearly data collections.
- 5.1.1.4. A pediatric follow-up working group has been formed by the ESHRE PGD Consortium for the follow-up of children born after PGD/PGS. PGD centers are encouraged to take part in this project.

5.2. Baseline IVF pregnancy rates for PGD

- 5.2.1. Setting appropriate baseline pregnancy rates should be left up to the individual Centres. However, it is **recommended** that each IVF Centre should compare PGD/PGS pregnancy rates and matched non-PGD/PGS (routine IVF) pregnancy rates within that IVF centre (Thornhill et al. 2005).
- 5.2.2. Comparison of pregnancy rates with those reported by the annual data collections of the ESHRE PGD Consortium can also be done to set benchmarks for continual improvement of the PGD center.

5.3. Appropriate indications for specific tests

- 5.3.1. It is **recommended** that specific indications for PGD/PGS should remain within the purview of individual clinics (Thornhill et al.2005).

5.4. Misdiagnosis rate

- 5.4.1. The ESHRE PGD Consortium makes the following **recommendations**: (Thornhill et al., 2005; PGDIS, 2008; Thornhill and Repping, 2008, Wilton et al., 2009).
- 5.4.1.1. It is **recommended** that misdiagnosis rates should be calculated for each type of assay and for all assays from a particular Centre (Lewis et al., 2001). Such rates include those clinical cases in which affected pregnancies arose and post-transfer confirmation of diagnosis assays that were discordant with the biopsy result.
- 5.4.1.2. It is **recommended** that confirmatory testing should be performed at least periodically as a quality assurance. The ESHRE PGD Consortium is currently preparing a study on the follow-up of untransferred embryos by FISH. The Consortium member centers are encouraged to take part in this study.
- 5.4.1.3. It is **recommended** that the published and in-house estimates of misdiagnosis rates should be available to prospective patients along with pregnancy rates on request to allow informed consent for PGD.
- 5.4.1.4. Following a misdiagnosis, the PGD Centre should investigate the possible causes of the misdiagnosis and make changes to protocols to eliminate the risk in the future (Wilton et al. 2009).
- 5.4.1.5. Misdiagnosis should be reported to the PGD Consortium each year during routine data collection (Thornhill et al.2005).
- 5.4.1.6. Many of the causes of misdiagnosis are avoidable by taking preventative action and following the principles of quality management present in modern accredited diagnostic testing laboratories. The ESHRE PGD Consortium has recently published an article reviewing the possible causes and adverse outcomes of misdiagnosis

(Wilton et al. 2009). It is **recommended** that the suggestions made in this paper for the prevention of specific misdiagnosis causes should be taken into consideration by the PGD center to eliminate the possible causes of misdiagnosis.

6. Transport PGD

6.1. For general recommendations on Transport PGD see the Organisation of a PGD centre guideline (Harton et al., 2010a).

References:

- Baart EB, Martini E, Van Opstal D. Screening for aneuploidies of ten different chromosomes in two rounds of FISH: a short and reliable protocol. *Prenat Diagn.* 2004;**24**;955-961.
- Bahçe M, Escudero T, Sandalinas M, Morrison L, Legator M, Munné S. Improvements of preimplantation diagnosis of aneuploidy by using microwave hybridization, cell recycling and monocolour labelling of probes. *Mol Hum Reprod.* 2000;6;849-854.
- Blockeel C, Schutyser V, De Vos A, Verpoest W, De Vos M, Staessen C, Haentjens P, Van der Elst J, Devroey P, 2008, Prospectively randomised controlled trial of PGS in IVF/ICSI patients with poor implantation. *Reproductive BioMedicine Online* **17**: 848-854.
- Brigham SA, Conlon C, Farquharson RG. A longitudinal study of pregnancy outcome following idiopathic recurrent miscarriage. *Hum Reprod.* 1999;14;2868-2871.
- Carp H, Toder V, Aviram A, Daniely M, Mashlach S, Barkai G. Karyotype of the abortus in recurrent miscarriage. *Fertil Steril.* 2001;**75**;678-82.
- Cockwell AE, Jacobs PA, Crolla JA. Distribution of the D15Z1 copy number polymorphism. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2007;**15**;441-445.
- Cohen J, Wells D, Munné S. Removal of 2 cells from cleavage stage embryos is likely to reduce the efficacy of chromosomal tests that are used to enhance implantation rates. *Fertil Steril.* 2007: **87**;496-503.
- Coonen E, Dumoulin JC, Ramaekers FC, Hopman AH. Optimal preparation of preimplantation embryo interphase nuclei for analysis by fluorescence in-situ hybridization. *Hum Reprod.* 1994 Mar;9(3):533-7.
- Debrock S, Melotte C, Spiessens C, Peeraer K, Vanneste E, Meeuwis L, Meuleman C, Frijns JP, Vermeesch JR, D'Hooghe TM, 2008, Preimplantation genetic screening for aneuploidy of embryos after in vitro fertilization in women aged at least 35 years: a prospective randomized trial. *Fertil Steril* (e-publication).
- Delhanty J and Conn C. Preimplantation genetic diagnosis of chromosome abnormalities: specific chromosomal rearrangements and age-related aneuploidy. In Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis. J. Harper, J Delhanty and A. Handyside (eds.) 2001 John Wiley & Sons, UK. pp 203-224
- Dequeker E, Ramsden S, Grody WW, Stenzel TT, Barton DE. 2001 Quality control in molecular genetic testing. *Nat Rev Genet.* 2:717-23.
- Dozortsev DI, McGinnis KT. An improved fixation technique for fluorescence in situ hybridization for preimplantation genetic diagnosis. *Fertil Steril.* 2001;**76**;186-188.
- Escudero T, Abdelhadi I, Sandalinas M, Munné S. Predictive value of sperm fluorescence in situ hybridization analysis on the outcome of preimplantation genetic diagnosis for translocations. *Fertil Steril.* 2003;**79** Suppl 3;1528-1534.

ESHRE PGD Consortium Steering Committee (1999) ESHRE Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis (PGD) Consortium: preliminary assessment of data from January 1997 to September 1998. *Hum Reprod* 14, 12, 3138-3148.

ESHRE PGD Consortium Steering Committee (2000) ESHRE Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis (PGD) Consortium: Data collection II (May 2000). *Hum Reprod* 15, 12, 2673-2683.

ESHRE PGD Consortium Steering Committee (2002) ESHRE Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis (PGD) Consortium: Data collection III (May 2001). *Hum Reprod* 17(1): 233-246.

Fritz MA 2008. Perspectives on the efficacy and indications for preimplantation genetic screening: where are we now? *Hum Reprod* 23: 2617-21

Geraedts J, Collins, J, Devroey, P, Gianaroli, L, Goossens, V, Handyside, A, Harper, JC, Montag, M, Repping, S, Schmutzler, A, Staessen C and Vesela. K (in press) What next for preimplantation genetic screening? A polar body approach! *Hum Reprod*

Goossens V, Harton G, Moutou C, Scriven PN, Traeger-Synodinos J, Sermon K, Harper JC; European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology PGD Consortium. ESHRE PGD Consortium data collection VIII: cycles from January to December 2005 with pregnancy follow-up to October 2006. *Hum Reprod.* 2008;**23**:2629-2645.

Goossens V, Harton G, Moutou C, Traeger-Synodinos J, Van Rij M, Harper JC. ESHRE PGD Consortium data collection IX: cycles from January to December 2006 with pregnancy follow-up to October 2007. *Hum Reprod.* 2009;**24**:1786-1810.

Griffin DK, Wilton LJ, Handyside AH, Winston RML and Delhanty JDA (1992). Dual fluorescent in situ hybridisation for simultaneous detection of X and Y chromosome-specific probes for the sexing of human preimplantation embryonic nuclei. *Hum Genet* 89, 18-22.

Hardarson T, Hanson C, Lundin K, Hillensjö T, Nilsson L, Stevic J, Reismer E, Borg K, Wikland M, Bergh C, 2008, Preimplantation genetic screening in women of advanced maternal age caused a decrease in clinical pregnancy rate: a randomised controlled trial. *Human Reproduction* **23**: 2806-2812

Harper J and Wilton L. FISH and embryo sexing to avoid X-linked disease. In Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis. J. Harper, J Delhanty and A. Handyside (eds.) 2001 John Wiley & Sons, UK. pp 191-202

Harper JC, Coonen E, Ramaekers FC, Delhanty JD, Handyside AH, Winston RM, Hopman AH. Identification of the sex of human preimplantation embryos in two hours using an improved spreading method and fluorescent in-situ hybridization (FISH) using directly labelled probes. *Hum Reprod.* 1994 Apr;**9**(4):721-4.

Harper JC, Boelaert K, Geraedts J, Harton G, Kearns WG, Moutou C, Muntjewerff N, Repping S, SenGupta S, Scriven PN, Traeger-Synodinos J, Vesela K, Wilton L, Sermon KD. ESHRE PGD

Consortium data collection V: cycles from January to December 2002 with pregnancy follow-up to October 2003. *Hum Reprod.* 2006;**21**:3-21.

Harper J, Sermon K, Geraedts J, Vesela K, Harton G, Thornhill A, Pehlivan T, Fiorentino F, SenGupta S, de Die-Smulders C, Magli C, Moutou C, Wilton L. (2008a) What next for preimplantation genetic screening? *Hum Reprod* 23: 478-480

Harper JC, de Die-Smulders C, Goossens V, Harton G, Moutou C, Repping S, Scriven PN, SenGupta S, Traeger-Synodinos J, Van Rij MC, Viville S, Wilton L, Sermon KD. ESHRE PGD consortium data collection VII: cycles from January to December 2004 with pregnancy follow-up to October 2005. *Hum Reprod.* 2008b;**23**:741-755.

Harper JC, SenGupta S, Vesela K, Thornhill A, Dequeker. E, Morris MA, Coonen E. (in press) Towards Accreditation of the PGD Laboratory

Harton, G, Braude, P, Lashwood, A, Schmutzler, A, Wilton, L, and Harper, JC (2010a) ESHRE PGD Consortium-Best Practice Guidelines for Organization of a PGD Center for Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis/Screening (PGD/PGS) for Human Reproduction

Harton, G, Anick DeVos, Rachel Levy, Kersti Lundin, Cristina Magli, Markus Montag, Monica Parriego, and Harper, JC (2010c) ESHRE PGD Consortium/Embryology Special Interest Group-Best Practice Guidelines for Polar Body and Embryo Biopsy for Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis/Screening (PGD/PGS). For Human Reproduction

Harton, G, Braude, P, Lashwood, A, Schmutzler, A, Wilton, L, and Harper, JC (2010b) ESHRE PGD Consortium-Best Practice Guidelines for Amplification-based PGD Center for Human Reproduction

Hsu LY, Benn PA, Tannenbaum HL, Perlis TE, Carlson AD. Chromosomal polymorphisms of 1, 9, 16, and Y in 4 major ethnic groups: a large prenatal study. *Am J Med Genet.* 1987;**26**:95-101.

Jansen RPS, Bowman MC, de Boer KA, Leigh DA, Lieberman DB, McArthur SJ, 2008, What next for preimplantation genetic screening (PGS)? Experience with blastocyst biopsy and testing for aneuploidy. *Human Reproduction* **23**: 1476-1478.

Kuo HC, Ogilvie CM, Handyside AH. Chromosomal mosaicism in cleavage-stage human embryos and the accuracy of single cell genetic analysis. *J Assist Reprod Genet.* 1998;**15**:276-280.

Lewis CM, Pinêl T, Whittaker JC, Handyside AH. Controlling misdiagnosis errors in preimplantation genetic diagnosis: a comprehensive model encompassing extrinsic and intrinsic sources of error. *Hum Reprod.* 2001;**16**:43-50.

Mastenbroek S, Twisk M, van Echten-Arends J, Sikkema-Raddatz B, Korevaar JC, Verhoeve HR, Vogel NEA, Arts EGJM, de Vries JWA, Bossuyt PM, Buys CHCM, Jan Heineman M, Repping S, van

der Veen F, 2007, In vitro fertilization with Preimplantation genetic screening. *The New England Journal of Medicine* **357**: 9-17.

Magli MC, Gianaroli L, Ferraretti AP. Chromosomal abnormalities in embryos. *Mol Cell Endocrinol* 2001 **183**(suppl 1); S29-34

Mersereau JE, Pergament E, Zhang X, Milad MP, (2008), Preimplantation genetic screening to improve in vitro fertilization pregnancy rates: a prospective randomized controlled trial. *Fertility and Sterility* **90**: 1287-1288.

Meyer LR, Klipstein S, Hazlett WD, Nasta T, Mangan P, Karande VC, 2009, A prospective randomized controlled trial of preimplantation genetic screening in the “good prognosis” patients. *Fertility and Sterility* **91**: 1731-1738.

Munné S, Magli C, Bahçe M, Fung J, Legator M, Morrison L, Cohert J, Gianaroli L, 1998, Preimplantation genetic diagnosis of the aneuploidies most commonly found in spontaneous abortions and live births: XY, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22. *Prenatal Diagnosis* **18**: 1459-1466.

Munné S, Magli C, Cohen J, Morton P, Sadowy S, Gianaroli L, Tucker M, Márquez C, Sable D, Ferraretti AP, Massey JB, Scott R, 1999, Positive outcome after preimplantation diagnosis of aneuploidy in human embryos. *Human Reproduction* **14**: 2191-2199.

Munné S, 2002, Preimplantation genetic diagnosis of numerical and structural chromosomal abnormalities. *Reproductive BioMedicine Online* **4**: 183-196.

Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis International Society (PGDIS). Guidelines for good practice in PGD. *Reproductive Biomedicine Online* 2004; 9(4): 430–4.

Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis International Society (PGDIS) 2008. Guidelines for good practice in PGD: programme requirements and laboratory quality assurance. *Reprod Biomed Online* 16:134-47

Renwick P, Ogilvie CM. Preimplantation genetic diagnosis for monogenic diseases: overview and emerging issues. *Expert Rev Mol Diagn.* 2007;**7**:33-43.

Renwick PJ, Trussler J, Ostad-Saffari E, Fassihi H, Black C, Braude P, Ogilvie CM, Abbs S. Proof of principle and first cases using preimplantation genetic haplotyping--a paradigm shift for embryo diagnosis. *Reprod Biomed Online.* 2006;**13**:110-119.

Sermon K, Moutou C, Harper J, Geraedts J, Scriven P, Wilton L, Magli MC, Michiels A, Viville S, De Die C. ESHRE PGD Consortium data collection IV: May-December 2001. *Hum Reprod.* 2005;**20**:19-34.

Sermon KD, Michiels A, Harton G, Moutou C, Repping S, Scriven PN, SenGupta S, Traeger-Synodinos J, Vesela K, Viville S, Wilton L, Harper JC. ESHRE PGD Consortium data collection VI: cycles from January to December 2003 with pregnancy follow-up to October 2004. *Hum Reprod.* 2007;**22**:323-336.

Schoolcraft, WB.,Katz-Jaffe, MG.,Stevens, J., Rawlins, M.,and Munne, S (2009) Preimplantation aneuploidy testing for infertile patients of advanced maternal age: a randomized prospective trial. *Fert and Stert.* 92:157–62

Scriven PN 2003. Preimplantation genetic diagnosis for carriers of reciprocal translocations. *J Assoc Genet Technol* 29: 49-59

Scriven PN, Handyside AH, Olgivie CM, 1998. Chromosome translocations: segregation modes and strategies for preimplantation genetic diagnosis. *Prenat Diagn* 18: 1437-49

Shim SH, Pan A, Huang XL, Tonk VS, Varma SK, Milunsky JM, Wyandt HE. FISH Variants with D15Z1. *J Assoc Genet Technol.* 2003;**29**;146-151.

Simpson JL 2008. What next for preimplantation genetic screening? Randomized clinical trial in assessing PGS: necessary but not sufficient. *Hum Reprod* 23: 2179-81

Staessen C, Van Assche E, Joris H, Bonduelle M, Vandervorst M, Liebaers I, Van Steirteghem A. clinical experience of sex determination by fluorescent in-situ hybridization for preimplantation genetic diagnosis. *Mol Hum Reprod.* 1999;**5**;382-9.

Staessen C, Platteau P, Van Assche E, Michiels A, Tournaye H, Camus M, Devroey P, Liebaers I, Van Steirteghem A, 2004, Comparison of blastocyst transfer with or without preimplantation genetic diagnosis for aneuploidy screening in couples with advanced maternal age: a prospective randomized controlled trial. *Human Reproduction* **19**: 2849-2858.

Staessen C, Verpoest W, Donoso P, Haentjens P, Van der Elst J, Liebaers I, Devroey P, 2008, Preimplantation genetic screening does not improve delivery rate in women under the age of 36 following single-embryo transfer. *Human Reproduction* **23**: 2818-2825.

Tarkowski AK. An air-drying method for chromosome preparations from mouse eggs. *Cytogenetics* 1966 **5**; 394-400

The Practice Committee of the Society for Assisted Reproductive Technology and the Practice Committee of the American Society for Reproductive Medicine 2008. Preimplantation genetic testing: A Practice Committee opinion. *Fertil Steril* 90:S136-43

Thornhill AR, de Die-Smulders CE, Geraedts JP et al. ESHRE PGD Consortium “Best Practice Guidelines for Clinical Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis (PGD) and Preimplantation Genetic screening (PGS).” *Human Reproduction* 2005; 20(1):35–48.

Thornhill AR, Repping S. Quality control and quality assurance in preimplantation genetic diagnosis. In: Harper J (ed). *Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis*. UK: Wiley and Sons, 2008.

Wilton L. Preimplantation genetic diagnosis for aneuploidy screening in early human embryos: a review. *PrenatDiagn* 2002; **22**; 512-518

Wilton L, Thornhill A, Traeger-Synodinos J, Sermon KD, Harper JC. The causes of misdiagnosis and adverse outcomes in PGD. *Hum Reprod.* 2009 May; 24(5):1221-8.