Application of RNA-sequencing based predictive model for 1 endometrial WOI in patients with recurrent implantation 2 failure: a prospective cohort study 3 4 Aihua He^{1,2,3†}, Tianli Yang^{1,2†}, Sijia Lu⁴, Yangyun Zou⁴, Cheng Wan⁴, Jing Zhao^{1,2}, 5 Nenghui Liu^{1,2}, Donge Liu^{1,2}, Yumei Li^{1,2}, Yonggang Wang^{1,2}, Bin Xu^{1,2}, Jie Hao^{1,2}, 6 Shi Xie^{1,2}, Jing Fu^{1,2}, Hui Li^{1,2}, Hong Wu⁵, Oiong Zhang^{1,2*}, Yanping Li^{1,2*} 7 8 ¹Reproductive Medicine Center, Xiangya Hospital of Central South University, 9 Changsha, 410008, Hunan, P.R. China. ²Clinical Research Center for Women's 10 Reproductive Health in Hunan Province, Changsha, 410008, Hunan, P.R. China. 11 ³Reproductive Medicine Center, the Third Xiangya Hospital of Central South 12 University, Changsha, 410013, Hunan, P.R. China. ⁴Department of Clinical 13 Research, Yikon Genomics Company, Ltd., Suzhou, 215123, Jiangsu, P.R. China. 14 15 ⁵Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, Xiangya Hospital of Central 16 South University, Changsha, 410008, Hunan, P.R. China. 17 *For correspondence: liyanp@csu.edu.cn and Chuangq@csu.edu.cn. 18 [†]These authors contributed equally to this work. 19

21 Abstract:

Background: Accurate prediction for endometrial window of implantation (WOI)
would maximize the effectiveness of assisted reproductive technology. Previously, we
have established a predictive model for endometrial WOI (rsERT) by three-time
points sampling from the same patient at 48-hour intervals during one menstrual cycle.
However, it is imperative to build a modified rsERT by single time point sampling in
order to prevent multiple sampling and collateral harm.

28 Methods: A two-phase study was conducted. In the first phase, patients with

29 successful clinical pregnancy after personalized embryo transfer (pET) guided by

three-time points rsERT were recruited. Endometrial tissues obtained from single time point were used for the modified rsERT establishment. In the second phase, recurrent implantation failure (RIF) patients were recruited and assigned to experimental group underwent pET guided by modified rsERT' or control group underwent conventional ET. Pregnant outcomes were recorded and analyzed.

Results: The modified rsERT was established using 91 eligible participants and could 35 36 provide hour-based predictive result of endometrial WOI with an average accuracy of 37 94.51% with sensitivity and specificity being 92.73% and 96.27% using 10-fold CV. 38 176 RIF patients were recruited in the second phase (experimental group: n=88; 39 control group: n=88). 40 of 88 (45.45%) patients showed WOI displacement, and 5.00% 40 (2/40) of them were with advanced WOI, and the remaining 95.00% (38/40) with 41 delayed WOI. The β -hCG positive rate, intrauterine pregnancy rate (IPR) and 42 implantation rate (IR) of the experimental group were significantly improved (β -hCG 43 positive rate: 67.05% vs. 39.77%, P=0.000; IPR: 61.36% vs. 31.82%, P=0.000; IR: 44 42.86% vs. 24.66%, P=0.001). While, pregnancy outcomes were not significantly 45 different using different endometrial preparation protocols (β -hCG positive rate: 42.86% 46 vs. 35.90%, P=0.508; IPR: 38.78% vs. 23.08%, P=0.116; IR: 30.12% vs. 17.46%, 47 P=0.085).

48 Conclusions: The modified rsERT allowed WOI prediction using a single time point

- 49 endometrial biopsy and pregnancy outcomes were significantly improved. This could
- 50 provide an enhanced endometrial receptivity test as an alternative, requiring only a
- 51 single time point sampling for RIF patients.
- 52 Funding: Research grants from Hunan Provincial Natural Science Foundation
- 53 General Program (2023JJ30823) and Postdoctoral Fellowship Program of CPSF
- 54 (GZC20233157).
- 55 Keywords: Window of implantation, Endometrial receptivity, RNA-sequencing,
- 56 Recurrent implantation failure, Personalized embryo transfer

58 Introduction

59 A potentially developed embryo, endometrium in the receptive state and the 60 synchronized molecular dialogue between them are three key processes for the successful pregnancy establishment (Teh, McBain, and Rogers 2016). In assisted 61 62 reproductive technology (ART) scenario, about one-third of implantation failures can 63 be ascribed to embryonic factor (Achache and Revel 2006). Maternal factors and endometrial-embryonic dysynchrony should be also considered when embryos fail to 64 65 implant (Garneau and Young 2021). Even though there is heterogeneity in the 66 definition of recurrent implantation failure (RIF), the asynchrony between embryo 67 and endometrium may give rise to RIF (Sebastian-Leon et al. 2018).

68 After ovulation, the human endometrium transits from proliferation to secretory 69 morphology and culminates with a spatially and temporally restricted period called 70 the "window of implantation" (WOI). This self-limited period usually coincides with the 20th to 24th day of a regular menstrual cycle (Achache and Revel 2006), when the 71 72 uterine milieu is favorable to blastocyst acceptance and implantation. However, the 73 optimal duration of WOI is restrictedly short and only continues about 24-48 hours in 74 human (Galliano et al. 2015). Profound evidences demonstrated that 75 blastocyst-endometrial asynchrony would result in defective implantation or 76 implantation failure (Ming et al. 2012; Healy et al. 2017; Omidi et al. 2021). Unsatisfactory pregnancy outcomes among RIF patients might be ascribed to the 77 78 displacement of the WOI, in which embryos were transferred to the non-receptive 79 endometrium at conventional timing (Hashimoto et al. 2017). Hence, accurate 80 identification and prediction of WOI are essential to maximize the effectiveness of 81 ART among infertile women who experienced RIF.

Currently, there are no reliable techniques to determine whether the endometrium is in synchrony with the embryo at the time of embryo transfer (ET). Since the advent of high-throughput "omics" techniques, series of genomic and transcriptomic diagnostic tools aiming to identify WOI have gained in popularity, including

86 endometrial receptivity array (ERA) (Diaz-Gimeno et al. 2011), ER Map/ER Grade 87 (Enciso et al. 2018) and the Win-Test (Haouzi et al. 2021). Previously, we have 88 developed a novel RNA-sequencing-based endometrial receptivity test (rsERT) 89 containing 175 genetic biomarkers to predict the WOI accurately (He et al. 2021). The 90 three-time points sampling method from the same subject at 48-hour intervals during the same menstrual cycle (LH+5/LH+7/LH+9) allows a more precise identification of 91 92 the optimal WOI. Subsequently, personalized embryo transfer (pET) guided by rsERT 93 significantly improved the pregnancy outcomes of patients with RIF, especially those with WOI displacement (He et al. 2021). However, the three-time points sampling 94 95 method can be costly and time-consuming, and more importantly, this invasive 96 method renders patients more sensitive to pain.

To avoid multiple sampling and build an efficient WOI predictive tool, we first recruited participants to construct and optimize the rsERT and successfully established an estimation method by single time point sampling. Subsequently, a prospective controlled trial was conducted to validate its clinical benefit among RIF patients. This current study aims to provide a simpler and less invasive alternative method to identify the optimal time for embryo transfer among RIF patients.

104 Materials and methods

105 Study design and participants

This study was conducted at the Reproductive Medicine Center at the Xiangya
Hospital of Central South University (CSU) in Changsha, Hunan, People's Republic
of China. All participants were undergoing ART between September 2018 and
December 2021. This study involved two separate phases.

110 In the first phase (September 2018-June 2020), participants were recruited to 111 optimize our previous predictive model for endometrial WOI, i.e., rsERT (He et al. 112 2021). Specifically, the inclusion criteria for allocated populations were as follows: 20-39 years of age; body mass index (BMI) 18-25 kg/m²; more than one 113 114 cryopreserved transplantable cleavage-stage embryo or blastocyst. Endometrial 115 tissues from three-time points sampling on days 5, 7 and 9 after the LH surge (LH+5, 116 LH+7 and LH+9) or days 3, 5 and 7 after progesterone supplementation (P+3, P+5 117 and P+7) respectively were applied for endometrial WOI determination of the 118 participants by our previous rsERT method (He et al. 2021). Patients with intrauterine 119 pregnancy were recruited for the prototype of single time point model construction. 120 Afterwards, we used this prototype model to predict the receptive time of additional 121 participants by single time point sampling at LH+7 or P+5. Those who successfully 122 obtained intrauterine pregnancy after pET were further included to optimize the 123 modified rsERT model. Here, intrauterine pregnancy was defined as the presence of a 124 gestational sac with or without fetal heart activity in uterine cavity as evaluated by 125 ultrasound 4-5 weeks after ET. Flowchart of phase 1 study was depicted in Figure 1. 126 In the second phase (June 2020-December 2021), participants were recruited to 127 validate the clinical efficiency of modified rsERT among patients with RIF. This study

was designed as a prospective controlled trial. Before recruitment, the sample size
calculation in this part was performed under the condition of PASS software (version
15.0.5). Based on the results of the previous study (He et al. 2021), we assumed that
the intrauterine pregnancy rate (IPR) was 60% in the experimental group and 30% in

132 the control group. A two-sided P value is deemed statistically significant at P < 0.05133 and a power of 90%. Therefore, 53 subjects were required in each group. Considering 134 a 10% loss-to-follow-up rate, 60 subjects in each group would be appropriate. The inclusion criteria were as follows: 20-39 years of age; BMI 18-25kg/m²; and 135 136 a history of RIF. RIF was defined as failure to achieve an intrauterine pregnancy after 137 two consecutive cycles of fresh or frozen ET, in which the cumulative number of 138 morphologically high-quality transferred embryos was no less than four for 139 cleavage-stage embryos or two for blastocysts (Polanski et al. 2014). The criteria for 140 high-quality embryos were as follows: cleavage-stage embryos: \geq 7 blastomeres and 141 <20% fragmentation on day 3 after fertilization (Alpha Scientists in Reproductive and 142 Embryology 2011); blastocysts: \geq 3BB on day 5 and day 6, graded based on the 143 Gardner system (Gardner et al. 2019). 144 The exclusion criteria were as follows: endometrial abnormalities (e.g., 145 intrauterine adhesions, endometrial polyps, endometrial hyperplasia, untreated chronic 146 endometritis, and a thin endometrium); severe hydrosalpinx and did not receive tubal 147 ligation or salpingectomy; submucous myoma, intramural hysteromyoma, or 148 adenomyoma protruding towards the uterine cavity; endometriosis (stages III-IV); 149 genital tuberculosis; uterine malformations; and other severe comorbidities (e.g., 150 hypertension, diabetes mellitus, or malignant tumor).

After providing informed consent, patients who chose to receive the modified rsERT and subsequently performed pET were assigned to the experimental group. Those who decided not to receive rsERT and only underwent conventional ET belonged to the control group. Details of the phase 2 study were depicted in Figure 2.

155 Ethical approval

156 The study was approved by the Reproductive Medicine Ethics Committee of Xiangya

157 Hospital, Central South University (CSU) (No. 2017002), and was registered in the

158 Chinese Clinical Trial Registry (No. ChiCTR-DDD-17013375). Written informed

159 consent was obtained from all participants and we conducted it according to the tenets

160 of the Declaration of Helsinki.

161 Endometrial biopsy, sample collection and processing

Written informed consent was obtained before sample collection. Endometrial tissues 162 163 were collected using an endometrial sampler (AiMu Medical Science & Technology Co.; Liaoning, China). Timing of three-time points sampling method in natural cycle 164 165 was on day 5, 7 and 9 after the LH surge (LH+5, LH+7 and LH+9) respectively. For 166 hormone replacement therapy (HRT) cycle, estradiol administration was started on the 167 third day of the menstrual cycle. Progesterone supplementation was started after at 168 least 12 days of estrogen usage if the endometrium was >7mm and the endogenous P 169 serum level was close to zero. The day of starting progesterone supplementation was 170 considered P+0, and endometrial tissue was collected on day 3, 5 and 7 after progesterone supplementation (i.e., P+3, P+5 and P+7) respectively. The endometrium 171 was only collected on LH+7 (nature cycle) or on P+5 (HRT cycle) if patient 172 173 underwent single time point sampling.

Before sampling, the cervix was cleansed with saline. The tip of the endometrial sampler was placed into the uterine fundus, and 5-10mm³ of endometrial tissues were aspirated into the sampler. The collected endometrial tissues were immediately placed into 1.5ml RNAlater buffer (AM7020; Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) for RNA stabilization, sealed, and cryopreserved at -20°C. Sequencing analysis was carried out within 7 days after sampling.

180 RNA extraction, library construction and sequencing

The RNA-sequencing of endometrial biopsy samples was performed following the protocol described in previous study (He et al. 2021). In brief, total RNA extraction, quality control of RNA, reverse transcription and amplification, and (next-generation sequencing) NGS library construction were carried out by using commercial reagent kits. Then, under relevant parameters, single-end sequencing was performed on the HiSeq 2500 platform (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA). The read length was set to 140 bp. The volume of raw data was approximately 5M reads.

188 Candidate marker genes selection and predictive tool construction

Differentially expressed genes (DEGs) in different endometrial receptive conditions were screened according to the method in previous rsERT modeling (He et al. 2021). The expression values of these DEGs were then inputted as features for the random forest machine learning method to train the regression pattern of endometrial WOI time from each sample. Boruta R package (version 7.0.0) was applied to measure the importance of each feature (gene expression) (Kursa 2010). The features (genes) with confirmed importance were used for further model training and construction.

196 For optimal WOI point prediction, we applied the samples from three-time points 197 sampling and single time point samples as training datasets for model construction 198 and optimization. With the timing of endometrial biopsy, the corresponding predictive 199 receptive results and subsequent clinical pregnancy outcomes, numerical value with 200 hour precision of presumably optimal WOI in these training samples was defined. For 201 example, if three samples from LH+5, LH+7 and LH+9 in one patient were predicted 202 as pre-receptive, post-receptive and post-receptive by previous rsERT, blastocyst 203 would be transferred on LH+6 (or day 3 cleavage embryo on LH+4). If patient 204 obtained an intrauterine pregnancy afterwards, in this case, the numerical hour value 205 for these three samples were roughly appointed as 24h, -24h and -72h, respectively. Different combinations lead to 0h, 24h, -24h, 48h, -48h, 72h, -72h, 96h and -96h with 206 207 24-hour intervals. The random forest regression model from ranger R package 208 (version 0.12.1) was therefore used to predict the optimal implantation timing with 209 hour precision (Wright 2017). Infinitesimal jackknife resampling method was used to 210 estimate the standard errors based on out-of-bag predictions of random forest strategy. 211 The R-square value of model fitting and the 10-fold cross-validation approach was 212 used to select model and evaluate the predictive performance of the model.

213 **pET guided by the modified rsERT and outcome measures**

In the experimental group, pET was performed at the optimal WOI hour time

215 predicted by the modified rsERT, corresponding to the timing of blastocysts transfer.

Day 3 cleavage-stage embryos were transferred two days earlier accordingly. In the 216 217 control group, conventional ET was performed as usually routine protocol without 218 endometrial sampling. In this case, frozen-thawed cleavage-stage embryos were 219 transferred on LH+5 or P+3, and blastocysts were transferred on LH+7 or P+5. 220 Patients were followed up to assess pregnancy outcomes as described below. 221 Plasma β -human chorionic gonadotropin (β -hCG) was measured 12 days after ET. 222 The intrauterine pregnancy and number of gestational sacs were assessed by 223 ultrasound visualization 28 days after ET among patients with β -hCG positivity. The 224 primary outcome measure was the IPR. A secondary outcome was the implantation 225 rate (IR). IPR refers to the number of patients with intrauterine pregnancy per ET 226 cycle. IR refers to the number of gestational sacs observed divided by the number of 227 embryos transferred. Biochemical pregnancy was defined as a very early spontaneous 228 abortion after a positive pregnancy had been determined and with a fall in plasma 229 β-hCG concentration before the ultrasonic detection of gestational sacs (Bhatt et al. 230 2021).

231 Statistical analysis

232 Statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS software (version 25.0, IBM 233 Corp.). Continuous variables were described as the mean \pm standard deviation (SD), 234 or median and interquartile range (IQR) according to the distribution. Categorical 235 variables were presented as frequency and percentage. The between-group differences 236 among variables were analyzed by Student's t-test or Mann-Whitney test, and 237 Pearson's chi-squared test or Fisher's exact test for continuous and categorical 238 variables, respectively. Values of P<0.05 for two-sided tests were considered 239 statistically significant.

241 **Results**

242 **Participants**

In the first phase, from September 2018 to June 2020, endometrial biopsies from 91

eligible participants (mean \pm SD, age 31.32 \pm 3.59 years; BMI 20.93 \pm 1.96kg/m²) were

finally recruited to construct and optimize the modified rsERT. The baseline

characteristics of these 91 patients were shown in Table 1.

247 In the second phase, considering the outpatient visit rate for RIF in our clinic, 248 176 eligible patients were finally enrolled during the clinical practice: 88 patients 249 were included in the experimental group and 88 in the control group (Figure 2). The 250 sample size in each group was more than that estimated by the PASS software (i.e., 60 251 vs. 60). Detailed clinical baseline characteristics were portrayed in Table 2. Baseline 252 parameters, including age, BMI, infertility duration, types of infertility, number of 253 previous failed cycles, main aetiology of infertility, the proportion of pre-implantation 254 genetic screening/diagnosis (PGS/PGD) were all comparable in the experimental and 255 control group (P > 0.05). All patients were scheduled for cryopreserved embryo 256 transfer in natural cycle or HRT cycle. There were no significant differences in the 257 types of transferred cycle, endometrial thickness and endometrial types (P > 0.05).

258 Model optimization and validation

259 The cut-off q-value of 0.001 was used to determine the DEGs among different 260 endometrial statuses. After feature selection by random forest model, 201 biomarkers 261 were finally selected for further model training and construction. Using the top 20 262 genes of high correlation between gene expression and different endometrial receptive 263 statuses, we observed gradual (not sharp) genetic expression changes in the secretory 264 phase of menstrual cycle (Figure 3). Therefore, the random forest regression model 265 was fitted to predict optimal WOI time with hour precision. In other words, the 266 modified rsERT could provide hour-based results. For instance, the 14 hours later, 267 which indicates the timing of 14 hours later than endometrial biopsy time might be

appropriate for ET to obtain a relatively higher possibility of embryo implantation. By

adopting infinitesimal jackknife resampling method, the standard error and 95%

270 confidence interval (CI) of predicted WOI time was obtained by the model.

271 Accordingly, the method is available to provide the window or range of optimal

272 implantation time and guide clinical practice.

273 10-fold cross-validation was then applied to assess the performance of modified 274 rsERT. A mean R-squared value of 0.92 was achieved, showing that 92% of the data 275 fit the regression model. We found that the medians of the predicted mean WOI time 276 in pre-receptive, receptive and post-receptive samples are approximately 48 hours, 0 277 hours and -48 hours respectively (Figure 4). Deviation points in Figure 4 are mostly 278 from samples with WOI displacement. These data supported the notion that the 279 modified rsERT had good performance in WOI prediction. With the cut-off values of 280 -24 and 24 hours, we defined samples with predicted WOI time larger than 24 hours 281 and less than -24 hours as pre-receptive and post-receptive status, receptively. 282 Receptive samples were those predicted mean WOI time between -24 and 24 hours. 283 Based on such standard, we obtained a mean 94.51% accuracy of this newly 284 optimized rsERT model with sensitivity and specificity being 92.73% and 96.29%, 285 respectively (Table 3). The current method allowed optimal WOI prediction by 286 endometrial biopsy at single timing, thus avoiding second biopsy in the next 287 menstrual cycle if the endometrial sample did not represent a receptive status. 288 Therefore, compared to the conventional ET, a more patient-friendly and 289 cost-efficient individualized ET could be achieved by single time point sampling. 290 Characteristics of WOI indicated by the modified rsERT and transferred

291 embryos in the experimental and control group

292 During the second phase, a total of 88 NGS were constructed for RNA-sequencing by

using endometrial biopsy samples from RIF patients in the experimental group, with a

qualification rate of 100% (88 of 88). The results indicated WOI displacement in 40

of 88 (45.45%) (Table 4). Among them, advanced WOI occurred in two patients (2/40,

296 5.00%), and delayed WOI occurred in 38 patients (38/40, 95.00%).

There were no significant differences with respect to developmental stage of the transferred embryos (for D3: 37.41% vs. 40.41%; for D5 or D6: 62.59% vs. 59.59%, P=0.599), good-quality embryo transferred rate (53.06% vs. 52.05%, P=0.863) and number of transferred embryos (1.67±0.47 vs. 1.66±0.48, P=0.874) between the two groups (Table 4).

302 Clinical efficiency of the modified rsERT-guided pET on pregnancy outcomes

303 Participants from the experimental group underwent pET according to the modified

- 304 rsERT results and those from the control group conducted conventional ET
- respectively (Table 4). The β -hCG positive rate, IPR and IR of the experimental group
- 306 were significantly higher than those in the control group (for β -hCG positive rate:
- 307 67.05% vs. 39.77%, P=0.000; for IPR: 61.36% vs. 31.82%, P=0.000; for IR: 42.86%
- vs. 24.66%, P=0.001). Biochemical pregnancy rate and ectopic pregnancy rate were
- comparable between the two groups (for biochemical pregnancy rate: 5.68% vs.
- 310 6.82%, P=0.755; for ectopic pregnancy rate: 0.00% vs.1.14%, P=1.000) (Table 4).

311 Effects of endometrial preparation protocols on pregnancy outcomes of pET

312 guided by the modified rsERT

313 To determine whether the natural cycle is superior to the HRT cycle, we performed a 314 subgroup analysis of the experimental group. There were 40 populations in the natural 315 cycle group and 48 in the HRT group. Baseline characteristics and pregnancy 316 outcomes of these women are shown in Table 5. Age, BMI, infertility duration, types 317 of infertility, number of previous failed cycles, main aetiology of infertility, the 318 proportion of PGS or PGD, endometrial thickness, endometrial types, transferred 319 embryo stage, good-quality embryo transferred and number of transferred embryos 320 were comparable between the two groups (P > 0.05). Moreover, there was no 321 statistically significant difference regarding pregnancy outcomes between the two 322 groups (P > 0.05).

323 Genetic expression patterns were also explored between samples obtained from 324 the natural and HRT cycles. With the same cut-off q-value as 0.001, no DEGs were

- 325 observed (Figure 5), implying little influences of endometrial preparation protocols on
- the efficiency of this modified model.

327 Effects of endometrial preparation protocols on pregnancy outcomes of

328 conventional ET

- 329 We further evaluated the effects of different endometrial preparation regimens on
- 330 pregnancy outcomes after conventional ET. There were 39 participants who
- underwent FET in the natural cycle and 49 in the HRT cycle. Baseline characteristics
- including age, BMI, infertility duration, types of infertility, number of previous failed
- 333 cycles, main aetiology of infertility, and others were comparable between the two
- groups (P > 0.05, Table 6). With respect to individuals who performed conventional
- ET without endometrial sampling, the β -hCG positive rate, IPR and IR in the HRT
- 336 group were slightly higher than those in the natural cycle group, whereas differences
- were not statistically significant (for β -hCG positive rate: 42.86% vs. 35.90%,
- 338 P=0.508; for IPR: 38.78% vs. 23.08%, P=0.116; for IR: 30.12% vs. 17.46%, P=0.085;
- 339 Table 6).

341 **Discussion**

342 For nearly 20 years, transcriptomic analysis on ER has been developed drastically 343 (Messaoudi et al. 2019). Several diagnostic tools for endometrial dating have been commercialized to personalize the FET, e.g., ERA (Diaz-Gimeno et al. 2011), ER 344 345 Map/ER Grade (Enciso et al. 2018) and the Win-Test (Haouzi et al. 2021). Previously, 346 we established an RNA-sequencing-based endometrial receptivity test (rsERT) via 347 three-time points sampling and demonstrated its clinical effectiveness afterwards (He 348 et al. 2021). However, either multiple time points sampling of previous rsERT or 349 potential second sampling risk in another menstrual cycle of other WOI predictive 350 models may impede their clinical applications. In order to identify endometrial WOI 351 more simply and accurately, this current study modified the rsERT which recently 352 allows optimal WOI estimation via single time point endometrial sampling.

353 Based on classifications of rsERT from three-time points biopsies and their 354 corresponding clinical outcomes, we constructed an endometrial WOI diagnostic tool 355 (i.e., the modified rsERT) for single time point sampling. The three-time points' 356 sequencing data in the same cycle showed varied endometrial transcriptomic profiles 357 from pre-receptive to the post-receptive phase, providing a fundamental basis for 358 available predictive results which were accurate to the hour. By adopting 359 RNA-sequencing and random forest algorithm, 201 biomarker genes were selected for 360 the modified rsERT model. Interestingly, the variation trend of these genes during the 361 sampling period was mainly continuous. Only a tiny number of genes showed abrupt 362 change. According to the single-cell transcriptomic study, human endometrial WOI 363 opens with an abrupt and discontinuous transcriptomic activation, and closes with 364 continuous transitions (Wang et al. 2020). The discrepancies might be due to the 365 varied interval of endometrial biopsy and interference from other types of cells in our 366 tissue samples.

367 Herein, we listed top 20 genes among the 201 biomarkers as they revealed368 significant differences in expression among different endometrial receptivity statuses.

369 Those genes are mainly involved in immune response and inflammatory process

370 (PAEP, CXCL14, OPRK1 and NUPR1)(Pathare, Zaveri, and Hinduja 2017; Yu et al.

371 2020), anti-oxidative stress (GPX3), cellular proliferation, apoptosis and

differentiation (G0S2, CSRP2)(Welch et al. 2009; Kihara et al. 2011), osteogenesis

373 (ALPL, GREM2)(Wang et al. 2017), cytoskeletal anchor activity (ANK3)(Wang et al.

2016) and glutamate transportation (SLC1A1). Half of the top 20 genes, namely

375 ALPL, ANK3, CSRP2, CXCL14, GPX3, GREM2, IER3, SLC1A1, OPRK1 and

PEAP, overlap with the 238 biomarkers identified by the study of ERA (Diaz-Gimeno

et al. 2011). This result showed that there was biologically significant consistency of

biomarkers identified in both ERA and the modified rsERT.

379 It is acknowledged that there are differences between ERA and rsERT with 380 respect to the study design, sample collection and detection methods as we previously 381 described (He et al. 2021). For example, samples were obtained from the same patient 382 at 48-hour intervals within the same menstrual cycle to build the rsERT model, in 383 contrast to the ERA where samples were obtained from different women on different cycle days (Diaz-Gimeno et al. 2011). Besides, we defined the receptive period as day 384 385 LH+7 or P+5 combining with a subsequent intrauterine pregnancy, which is more 386 reliable than the previous determination with LH+7 or P+5 alone. In this case, the 387 DEGs and biomarkers might vary from different studies, and their biological 388 functions have not been fully explained yet. Much effort will put into the functional 389 investigation of these genes by using cutting-edge technologies (e.g., single-cell RNA 390 sequencing) in the near future.

Aiming to demonstrate its clinical efficiency, the modified rsERT-guided pET was performed among RIF patients. The proportion of a displaced WOI identified by the modified rsERT was 45.45% (40/88), similar to the result determined by ERA reported elsewhere (Saxtorph et al. 2020), indicating a higher WOI displacement rate in this specific populations. Moreover, the modified rsERT model also enables predictive statement accurate to hours for blastocyst transfer, e.g., the recommended optimal time for ET is 36 (95% CI 30-42) hours after sampling. As such, β -hCG

398 positivity rate, IPR, and IR were significantly higher in the experimental group 399 compared with the control group. Although some studies challenged the clinical utility 400 of pET among patients with a history of failed transfers or RIF (Cozzolino et al. 2020; 401 Eisman et al. 2021), significantly improved pregnancy rate and implantation rate were 402 observed when the timing of ET was properly adjusted according to the displaced 403 WOI (Ruiz-Alonso et al. 2013; He et al. 2021; Haouzi et al. 2021). Some aspects 404 including experimental design, inclusion and exclusion criteria of the recruitment and 405 the testing platform may explain the inconsistencies.

406 In addition, it is worth noting that differential expression analysis of biomarker 407 genes reveals no significant difference between the endometrial samples from natural 408 and HRT cycles (Figure 5). This suggests that the feature selection using a machine 409 learning algorithm could eliminate the discrepancy between these two groups. Altmäe 410 et al. demonstrated that when compared to the HRT-FET cycle among women with 411 RIF, the whole endometrial gene expression profile of RIF patients at the WOI in 412 natural cycle was more similar to the pattern of the fertile controls (Altmae et al. 413 2016). One possible reason for yielding a contradictory result is that the cutoff value 414 in Altmäe's study is 0.05, whereas ours is stricter, i.e., 0.001. Besides, Altmäe et al. 415 did not report the clinical results of the two groups. Interestingly, in the present study, 416 pregnancy outcomes did not differ significantly between natural cycle and HRT cycle 417 among RIF patients. Therefore, this predictive model would be appropriate for 418 patients undergoing both natural and HRT cycles. Meanwhile, we noticed a slightly 419 higher rates of β -hCG positivity, clinical pregnancy and embryo implantation among 420 participants underwent an HRT-FET protocol in the control group, and the 421 between-group difference was not significant partly due to the relatively small sample 422 size.

Even though the mechanism of embryo implantation during WOI remains a "black box" (Franasiak et al. 2016), rsERT provides an optimal timing for pET strategy. In fact, except for WOI displacement, the duration of WOI is a critical but easily overlooked factor. For people with narrower WOI, the endometrium allows a

427	shorter time window for embryo implantation, in which case the timing of ET seems
428	more crucial. For patients with an extremely narrow WOI, the modified rsERT could
429	provide an optimal timing (to the hour) for ET, in case embryos were transferred
430	beyond the duration of their WOI. In other words, rsERT offered individualized ET
431	according to their personal WOI, whether it was displaced or not.
432	Nevertheless, caution is warranted due to the non-randomized design and limited
433	sample size. Even though baseline characteristics and other parameters were
434	comparable between the two cohorts, a more valid conclusion should be drawn from
435	the randomized controlled trial (RCT) accomplishment. Our preliminary clinical
436	results from this prospective cohort study would lay the foundation of future RCT.
437	Besides, embryonic factors should be taken into consideration as well. In fact, we
438	have already designed a multi-center RCT of the modified rsERT in combination with
439	PGT to validate its clinical application value further.

441 Conclusions

To sum up, we modified our previous predictive model for endometrial WOI (rsERT), allowed WOI prediction via single time point endometrial biopsy. When compared to the RIF participants underwent conventional ET, pregnancy outcomes had been improved among patients after pET guided by the modified rsERT. The results indicate that we could provide patients with an improved effective endometrial receptivity test that only requires single time point sampling.

448

449 Abbreviations

450 ART: assisted reproductive technology; AMH, anti-Mullerian hormone; AFC, antral

451 follicle count; BMI, body mass index; CI: confidence interval; DEGs: differentially

452 expressed genes; ER: endometrial receptivity; ERA: endometrial receptivity array; ET:

453 embryo transfer; E2, estradiol; FSH, follicle-stimulating hormone; FET: frozen

454 embryo transfer; HRT: hormone replacement therapy; IPR: intrauterine pregnancy

455 rate; IR: implantation rate; IQR: interquartile range; IVF: in vitro fertilization; LH:

456 luteinizing hormone; P: progesterone; pET: personalized embryo transfer; PSM:

457 propensity score matching; PGS: pre-implantation genetic screening; PGD:

458 pre-implantation genetic diagnosis; RIF: recurrent implantation failure; rsERT:

459 RNA-sequencing based endometrial receptivity test; SD: standard deviation; T:

460 testosterone; WOI: window of implantation; β -hCG: β -human chorionic

461 gonadotropin.

463 Acknowledgements

464 The authors are extremely grateful to all the volunteers for participation in this study.

465 Authors' contributions

- 466 QZ and YL designed research and carefully revised the manuscript; AH and TY wrote
- the paper; SL, YZ and CW participated in the model optimization; JZ, NL, DL, YL,
- 468 YW, BX, JH and SX executed the trial. JF, HL and HW collected and analyzed the
- data. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

470 Funding

- 471 This study was supported by the Hunan Provincial Natural Science Foundation
- 472 General Program (2023JJ30823) and Postdoctoral Fellowship Program of CPSF
- 473 (GZC20233157).

474 Availability of data and materials

- 475 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the
- 476 corresponding author upon reasonable request.

477 **Declarations**

478 Ethics approval and consent to participate

- 479 The study was approved by the Reproductive Medicine Ethics Committee of Xiangya
- 480 Hospital, Central South University (CSU) (No. 2017002), and was registered in the
- 481 Chinese Clinical Trial Registry (No. ChiCTR-DDD-17013375). Written informed
- 482 consent was obtained from all participants and we conducted it according to the tenets
- 483 of the Declaration of Helsinki.

484 **Consent for publication**

485 Not applicable.

486 **Competing interests**

487 The authors declare that they have no potential conflicts of interest.

489 **References**

- Achache, H., and A. Revel. 2006. 'Endometrial receptivity markers, the journey to successful embryo
 implantation', *Hum Reprod Update*, 12: 731-46.
- Alpha Scientists in Reproductive, Medicine, and Eshre Special Interest Group of Embryology. 2011.
 The Istanbul consensus workshop on embryo assessment: proceedings of an expert meeting', *Hum Reprod*, 26: 1270-83.
- Altmae, S., K. Tamm-Rosenstein, F. J. Esteban, J. Simm, L. Kolberg, H. Peterson, M. Metsis, K.
 Haldre, J. A. Horcajadas, A. Salumets, and A. Stavreus-Evers. 2016. 'Endometrial
 transcriptome analysis indicates superiority of natural over artificial cycles in recurrent
 implantation failure patients undergoing frozen embryo transfer', *Reprod Biomed Online*, 32:
 597-613.
- Bhatt, S. J., N. M. Marchetto, J. Roy, S. S. Morelli, and P. G. McGovern. 2021. 'Pregnancy outcomes
 following in vitro fertilization frozen embryo transfer (IVF-FET) with or without
 preimplantation genetic testing for aneuploidy (PGT-A) in women with recurrent pregnancy
 loss (RPL): a SART-CORS study', *Hum Reprod*, 36: 2339-44.
- Cozzolino, M., P. Diaz-Gimeno, A. Pellicer, and N. Garrido. 2020. 'Evaluation of the endometrial
 receptivity assay and the preimplantation genetic test for aneuploidy in overcoming recurrent
 implantation failure', *J Assist Reprod Genet*, 37: 2989-97.
- 507 Diaz-Gimeno, P., J. A. Horcajadas, J. A. Martinez-Conejero, F. J. Esteban, P. Alama, A. Pellicer, and C.
 508 Simon. 2011. 'A genomic diagnostic tool for human endometrial receptivity based on the
 509 transcriptomic signature', *Fertil Steril*, 95: 50-60, 60 e1-15.
- Eisman, L. E., M. D. Pisarska, S. Wertheimer, J. L. Chan, A. L. Akopians, M. W. Surrey, H. C. Danzer,
 S. Ghadir, W. Y. Chang, C. J. Alexander, and E. T. Wang. 2021. 'Clinical utility of the
 endometrial receptivity analysis in women with prior failed transfers', *J Assist Reprod Genet*,
 38: 645-50.
- Enciso, M., J. P. Carrascosa, J. Sarasa, P. A. Martinez-Ortiz, S. Munne, J. A. Horcajadas, and J.
 Aizpurua. 2018. 'Development of a new comprehensive and reliable endometrial receptivity
 map (ER Map/ER Grade) based on RT-qPCR gene expression analysis', *Hum Reprod*, 33:
 220-28.
- Franasiak, J. M., M. Ruiz-Alonso, R. T. Scott, and C. Simon. 2016. 'Both slowly developing embryos
 and a variable pace of luteal endometrial progression may conspire to prevent normal birth in
 spite of a capable embryo', *Fertil Steril*, 105: 861-6.
- Galliano, D., J. Bellver, C. Diaz-Garcia, C. Simon, and A. Pellicer. 2015. 'ART and uterine pathology:
 how relevant is the maternal side for implantation?', *Hum Reprod Update*, 21: 13-38.
- Gardner, D. K., M. Lane, J. Stevens, T. Schlenker, and W. B. Schoolcraft. 2019. 'Reprint of: Blastocyst
 score affects implantation and pregnancy outcome: towards a single blastocyst transfer', *Fertil Steril*, 112: e81-e84.

526 527	Garneau, A. S., and S. L. Young. 2021. 'Defining recurrent implantation failure: a profusion of confusion or simply an illusion?', <i>Fertil Steril</i> , 116: 1432-35.
528 529 530 531 532	 Haouzi, D., F. Entezami, A. Torre, C. Innocenti, Y. Antoine, C. Mauries, C. Vincens, S. Bringer-Deutsch, A. Gala, A. Ferrieres-Hoa, J. Ohl, B. Gonzalez Marti, S. Brouillet, and S. Hamamah. 2021. 'Customized Frozen Embryo Transfer after Identification of the Receptivity Window with a Transcriptomic Approach Improves the Implantation and Live Birth Rates in Patients with Repeated Implantation Failure', <i>Reprod Sci</i>, 28: 69-78.
533 534 535	Hashimoto, T., M. Koizumi, M. Doshida, M. Toya, E. Sagara, N. Oka, Y. Nakajo, N. Aono, H. Igarashi, and K. Kyono. 2017. 'Efficacy of the endometrial receptivity array for repeated implantation failure in Japan: A retrospective, two-centers study', <i>Reprod Med Biol</i> , 16: 290-96.
536 537 538 539	He, A., Y. Zou, C. Wan, J. Zhao, Q. Zhang, Z. Yao, F. Tian, H. Wu, X. Huang, J. Fu, C. Hu, Y. Sun, L. Xiao, T. Yang, Z. Hou, X. Dong, S. Lu, and Y. Li. 2021. 'The role of transcriptomic biomarkers of endometrial receptivity in personalized embryo transfer for patients with repeated implantation failure', <i>J Transl Med</i> , 19: 176.
540 541 542	Healy, M. W., M. Yamasaki, G. Patounakis, K. S. Richter, K. Devine, A. H. DeCherney, and M. J. Hill. 2017. 'The slow growing embryo and premature progesterone elevation: compounding factors for embryo-endometrial asynchrony', <i>Hum Reprod</i> , 32: 362-67.
543 544 545	Kihara, T., S. Shinohara, R. Fujikawa, Y. Sugimoto, M. Murata, and J. Miyake. 2011. 'Regulation of cysteine-rich protein 2 localization by the development of actin fibers during smooth muscle cell differentiation', <i>Biochem Biophys Res Commun</i> , 411: 96-101.
546	Kursa, MB, Rudnicki, WR. 2010. 'Feature selection with the Boruta package', J. Stat. Softw, 36: 1-13.
547 548 549	Messaoudi, S., I. El Kasmi, A. Bourdiec, K. Crespo, L. Bissonnette, C. Le Saint, F. Bissonnette, and I. J. Kadoch. 2019. '15 years of transcriptomic analysis on endometrial receptivity: what have we learnt?', <i>Fertil Res Pract</i> , 5: 9.
550 551 552	Ming, L., P. Liu, J. Qiao, Y. Lian, X. Zheng, X. Ren, J. Huang, and Y. Wu. 2012. 'Synchronization between embryo development and endometrium is a contributing factor for rescue ICSI outcome', <i>Reprod Biomed Online</i> , 24: 527-31.
553 554 555 556	Omidi, M., I. Halvaei, F. Akyash, M. A. Khalili, A. Agha-Rahimi, and L. Heydari. 2021. 'The exact synchronization timing between the cleavage embryo stage and duration of progesterone therapy-improved pregnancy rates in frozen embryo transfer cycles: A cross-sectional study', <i>Int J Reprod Biomed</i> , 19: 227-34.
557 558 559	Pathare, A. D. S., K. Zaveri, and I. Hinduja. 2017. 'Downregulation of genes related to immune and inflammatory response in IVF implantation failure cases under controlled ovarian stimulation', <i>Am J Reprod Immunol</i> , 78.
560 561 562	Polanski, L. T., M. N. Baumgarten, S. Quenby, J. Brosens, B. K. Campbell, and N. J. Raine-Fenning. 2014. 'What exactly do we mean by 'recurrent implantation failure'? A systematic review and opinion', <i>Reprod Biomed Online</i> , 28: 409-23.
563	Ruiz-Alonso, M., D. Blesa, P. Diaz-Gimeno, E. Gomez, M. Fernandez-Sanchez, F. Carranza, J. Carrera,

564 F. Vilella, A. Pellicer, and C. Simon. 2013. 'The endometrial receptivity array for diagnosis 565 and personalized embryo transfer as a treatment for patients with repeated implantation 566 failure', Fertil Steril, 100: 818-24. 567 Saxtorph, M. H., T. Hallager, G. Persson, K. B. Petersen, J. O. Eriksen, L. G. Larsen, T. V. Hviid, and N. 568 Macklon. 2020. 'Assessing endometrial receptivity after recurrent implantation failure: a 569 prospective controlled cohort study', Reprod Biomed Online, 41: 998-1006. 570 Sebastian-Leon, P., N. Garrido, J. Remohi, A. Pellicer, and P. Diaz-Gimeno. 2018. 'Asynchronous and 571 pathological windows of implantation: two causes of recurrent implantation failure', Hum 572 Reprod, 33: 626-35. 573 Teh, W. T., J. McBain, and P. Rogers. 2016. What is the contribution of embryo-endometrial 574 asynchrony to implantation failure?', J Assist Reprod Genet, 33: 1419-30. 575 Wang, C. L., F. Xiao, C. D. Wang, J. F. Zhu, C. Shen, B. Zuo, H. Wang, D. Li, X. Y. Wang, W. J. Feng, 576 Z. K. Li, G. L. Hu, X. Zhang, and X. D. Chen. 2017. 'Gremlin2 Suppression Increases the 577 BMP-2-Induced Osteogenesis of Human Bone Marrow-Derived Mesenchymal Stem Cells Via 578 the BMP-2/Smad/Runx2 Signaling Pathway', J Cell Biochem, 118: 286-97. 579 Wang, T., H. Abou-Ouf, S. A. Hegazy, M. Alshalalfa, K. Stoletov, J. Lewis, B. Donnelly, and T. A. 580 Bismar. 2016. 'Ankyrin G expression is associated with androgen receptor stability, 581 invasiveness, and lethal outcome in prostate cancer patients', J Mol Med (Berl), 94: 1411-22. 582 Wang, W., F. Vilella, P. Alama, I. Moreno, M. Mignardi, A. Isakova, W. Pan, C. Simon, and S. R. 583 Quake. 2020. 'Single-cell transcriptomic atlas of the human endometrium during the menstrual 584 cycle', Nat Med, 26: 1644-53. 585 Welch, C., M. K. Santra, W. El-Assaad, X. Zhu, W. E. Huber, R. A. Keys, J. G. Teodoro, and M. R. 586 Green. 2009. 'Identification of a protein, GOS2, that lacks Bcl-2 homology domains and 587 interacts with and antagonizes Bcl-2', Cancer Res, 69: 6782-9. 588 Wright, M, Ziegler, A. 2017. 'ranger: A Fast Implementation of Random Forests for High Dimensional 589 Data in C++ and R', J. Stat. Softw, 77: 1–17. Yu, J., H. Zhu, R. Li, Q. Jiang, W. Luan, J. Shi, and P. Liu. 2020. 'Oncogenic Role of NUPR1 in 590 591 Ovarian Cancer', Onco Targets Ther, 13: 12289-300. 592

Characteristics	The first phase study	
Characteristics	N=91	
Age, mean±SD, y	31.32±3.59	
BMI, mean \pm SD, kg/m ²	20.93±1.96	
Infertility duration, mean±SD, y	4.01±3.12	
Types of infertility, n (%)		
Primary infertility	46/91 (50.55%)	
Secondary infertility	45/91 (49.45%)	
AMH, median (IQR), ng/ml	3.22 (1.98, 4.68)	
FSH, mean±SD, mIU/ml	5.84±1.16	
LH, mean±SD, mIU/ml	5.59±2.17	
E2, median (IQR), pg/ml	38.51 (30.87, 56.99)	
T, median (IQR), ng/ml	0.22 (0.17, 0.30)	
AFC, median (IQR), n	14 (11, 19.25)	
Endometrial thickness, mean±SD, mm	10.20 ± 1.90	
IVF indication, n (%)		
Tubal factor	40/91 (43.96%)	
Male factor	51/91 (56.04%)	

Table 1. Demographic clinical characteristics of the participants for the modified 593 594 rsERT establishment.

595

luteinizing hormone; E2, estradiol; T, testosterone; AFC, antral follicle count; IVF, in vitro 596

597 fertilization; SD: standard deviation; IQR: interquartile range.

Characteristics	Experimental group	Control group	P value
	N=88	N=88	
Age (y)	31.17±3.54	32.01±3.42	0.111
BMI (kg/m ²)	20.71±1.82	21.25±2.24	0.078
Infertility duration (y)	4.69±3.12	4.85±3.45	0.749
Types of infertility n (%)			0.216
Primary infertility	58/88 (65.91%)	50/88 (56.82%)	
Secondary infertility	30/88 (34.09%)	38/88 (43.18%)	
No. of previous failed cycles (n)	2.92±1.10	2.75±1.02	0.287
Main aetiology of infertility n (%)			0.158
Tubal	48/88 (54.55%)	64/88 (72.73%)	
Ovulation disorder	7/88 (7.95%)	4/88 (4.55%)	
Endometriosis	6/88 (6.82%)	3/88 (3.41%)	
Diminished ovarian reserve	7/88 (7.95%)	8/88 (9.09%)	
Male	15/88 (17.05%)	7/88 (7.95%)	
Unexplained	2/88 (2.27%)	0/88 (0.00%)	
Recurrent spontaneous abortion	0/88 (0.00%)	0/88 (0.00%)	
Chromosomal or genetic	3/88 (3.41%)	2/88 (2.27%)	
abnormalities			
PGS or PGD n (%)	7/88 (7.95%)	3/88 (3.41%)	0.329
Types of transferred cycle n (%)			0.880
Natural cycle	40/88 (45.45%)	39/88 (44.32%)	
HRT cycle	48/88 (54.55%)	49/88 (55.68%)	
Endometrial thickness (mm)	9.58±1.92	9.89±1.67	0.265
Endometrial types n (%)			0.286
А	21/88 (23.86%)	28/88 (31.81%)	
В	64/88 (72.73%)	54/88 (61.36%)	
С	3/88 (3.41%)	6/88 (6.83%)	

Table 2. Baseline characteristics of RIF patients in the experimental and controlgroup.

601 BMI, body mass index; PGS, pre-implantation genetic screening; PGD, pre-implantation genetic

602 diagnosis; HRT, hormone replacement therapy.

603

Table 3. The performance of modified rsERT model with classification standard.

Receptive status	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity
Pre-receptivity	94.53%	89.06%	100.00%
Receptivity	93.56%	95.70%	91.43%
Post-receptivity	95.44%	93.42%	97.45%

Characteristics	Experimental group	Control group	P value
	N=88	N=88	
WOI n (%)			/
Advanced	2/88 (2.27%)	/	
Delayed	38/88 (43.18%)	/	
On-time	48/88 (54.55%)	/	
Transferred embryo stage n (%)			0.599
D3 cleavage-stage embryos	55/147 (37.41%)	59/146 (40.41%)	
D5 or D6 blastocysts	92/147 (62.59%)	87/146 (59.59%)	
Good-quality embryo transferred rate	78/147 (53.06%)	76/146 (52.05%)	0.863
n (%)			
No. of transferred embryo n	1.67 ± 0.47	1.66 ± 0.48	0.874
β -hCG positive rate n (%)	59/88 (67.05%)	35/88 (39.77%)	0.000
Biochemical pregnancy rate n (%)	5/88 (5.68%)	6/88 (6.82%)	0.755
IPR n (%)	54/88 (61.36%)	28/88 (31.82%)	0.000
IR n (%)	63/147 (42.86%)	36/146 (24.66%)	0.001
Ectopic pregnancy rate n (%)	0/88 (0.00%)	1/88 (1.14%)	1.000

Table 4. Characteristics of WOI indicated by modified rsERT and pregnancy outcomes in the experimental and control group.

608 WOI, window of implantation; β-hCG, β-human chorionic gonadotropin; IPR, intrauterine

609 pregnancy rate; IR, implantation rate.

Characteristics	Natural cycle	HRT cycle	P value
	N=40	N=48	
Age (y)	31.90±3.51	30.56±3.49	0.078
BMI (kg/m^2)	20.49±1.89	20.89±1.75	0.311
Infertility duration (y)	4.65±3.45	4.73±2.86	0.908
Types of infertility n (%)			0.870
Primary infertility	26/40 (65.00%)	32/48 (66.67%)	
Secondary infertility	14/40 (35.00%)	16/48 (33.33%)	
No. of previous failed cycles (n)	3.08±1.23	2.79±0.97	0.240
Main aetiology of infertility n (%)			0.504
Tubal	23/40 (57.50%)	25/48 (52.08%)	
Ovulation disorder	2/40 (5.00%)	5/48 (10.42%)	
Endometriosis	2/40 (5.00%)	4/48 (8.33%)	
Diminished ovarian reserve	2/40 (5.00%)	5/48 (10.42%)	
Male	7/40 (17.50%)	8/48 (16.67%)	
Unexplained	1/40 (2.50%)	1/48 (2.08%)	
Recurrent spontaneous abortion	0/40 (0.00%)	0/48 (0.00%)	
Chromosomal or genetic	3/40 (7.50%)	0/48 (0.00%)	
abnormalities			
PGS or PGD n (%)	5/40 (12.50%)	2/48 (4.17%)	0.238
Endometrial thickness (mm)	10.01 ± 2.20	9.23±1.59	0.065
Endometrial types n (%)			0.778
А	11/40 (27.50%)	10/48 (20.83%)	
В	28/40 (70.00%)	36/48 (75.00%)	
С	1/40 (2.50%)	2/48 (4.17%)	
Transferred embryo stage n (%)			0.069
D3 cleavage-stage embryos	30/66 (45.45%)	25/81 (30.86%)	
D5 or D6 blastocysts	36/66 (54.55%)	56/81 (69.14%)	
Good-quality embryo transferred	39/66 (59.09%)	39/81 (48.15%)	0.186
rate n (%)			
No. of transferred embryo n	1.65 ± 0.48	1.69±0.47	0.102
β -hCG positive rate n (%)	26/40 (65.00%)	33/48 (68.75%)	0.709
Biochemical pregnancy rate n	2/40 (5.00%)	3/48 (6.25%)	1.000
(%)			
IPR n (%)	24/40 (60.00%)	30/48 (62.50%)	0.810
IR n (%)	28/66 (42.42%)	35/81 (43.21%)	0.924

Table 5. Baseline characteristics and pregnancy outcomes of natural and HRT cycle in the experiment group.

BMI, body mass index; PGS, pre-implantation genetic screening; PGD, pre-implantation genetic

614 diagnosis; β -hCG, β -human chorionic gonadotropin; IPR, intrauterine pregnancy rate; IR,

615 implantation rate.

Characteristics	Natural cycle	HRT cycle	P value
Characteristics	N=39	N=49	i vulu
Age (v)	32.67+3.18	31.49+3.54	0.109
BMI (kg/m^2)	20.95+2.20	21 50+2 27	0.254
Infertility duration (v)	4 39+2 92	5 22+3 80	0.258
Types of infertility n (%)	1.07_2.72	0.22_0.00	0.945
Primary infertility	22/39 (56.41%)	28/49 (57,14%)	019 10
Secondary infertility	17/39 (43.59%)	21/49 (42.86%)	
No. of previous failed cycles (n)	2.67+0.93	2.82+1.09	0.497
Main aetiology of infertility n			0.123
(%)			01120
Tubal	30/39 (76.92%)	34/49 (69.39%)	
Ovulation disorder	0/39 (0.00%)	4/49 (8.17%)	
Endometriosis	0/39 (0.00%)	3/49 (6.12%)	
Diminished ovarian reserve	3/39 (7.69%)	5/49 (10.20%)	
Male	4/39 (10.26%)	3/49 (6.12%)	
Unexplained	0/39 (0.00%)	0/49 (0.00%)	
Recurrent spontaneous abortion	0/39 (0.00%)	0/49 (0.00%)	
Chromosomal or genetic	2/39 (5.13%)	0/49 (0.00%)	
abnormalities			
PGS or PGD n (%)	3/39 (7.69%)	0/49 (0.00%)	0.083
Endometrial thickness (mm)	10.05 ± 1.82	9.76±1.55	0.424
Endometrial types n (%)			0.271
А	11/39 (28.21%)	17/49 (34.69%)	
В	27/39 (69.23%)	27/49 (55.10%)	
С	1/39 (2.56%)	5/49 (10.21%)	
Transferred embryo stage n (%)			0.402
D3 cleavage-stage embryos	23/63 (36.51%)	36/83 (43.37%)	
D5 or D6 blastocysts	40/63 (63.49%)	47/83 (56.63%)	
Good-quality embryo transferred	33/63 (52.38%)	43/83 (51.81%)	0.945
rate n (%)			
No. of transferred embryo n	1.62 ± 0.49	1.69 ± 0.47	0.446
β -hCG positive rate n (%)	14/39 (35.90%)	21/49 (42.86%)	0.508
Biochemical pregnancy rate n	5/39 (12.82%)	1/49 (2.04%)	0.084
(%)			
IPR n (%)	9/39 (23.08%)	19/49 (38.78%)	0.116
IR n (%)	11/63 (17.46%)	25/83 (30.12%)	0.085

617 Table 6. Baseline characteristics and pregnancy outcomes of natural and HRT

BMI, body mass index; PGS, pre-implantation genetic screening; PGD, pre-implantation genetic

620 diagnosis; β-hCG, β-human chorionic gonadotropin; IPR, intrauterine pregnancy rate; IR,

621 implantation rate.

623 Figure Legends

624 Figure 1. The flowchart of phase 1 study. Endometrial tissues from three-time 625 points sampling on days 5, 7 and 9 after the LH surge (LH+5, LH+7 and LH+9) or 626 days 3, 5 and 7 after progesterone supplementation (P+3, P+5 and P+7) respectively 627 were applied for endometrial WOI determination of the participants by our previous 628 rsERT method. Then, personalized embryo transfer guided by rsERT was conducted 629 for each participant and 70 patients with intrauterine pregnancy were recruited for the 630 prototype of single time point model construction. Then, 21 additional participants by 631 single time point sampling at LH+7 or P+5 we used by this prototype model to predict 632 the receptive time and those who successfully obtained intrauterine pregnancy after 633 pET were further included to optimize the modified rsERT model. 634 Figure 2. The flowchart of phase 2 study. 412 patients with RIF were initially 635 recruited during June 2020-December 2021. Following careful inclusion criteria, 180 636 RIF patients were eligible to participate in the second phase to validate the clinical efficiency of modified rsERT. Then, the 180 patients were nonrandomized grouping 637 638 into subgroup based on patient's intention: the experimental group with 88 patients 639 underwent modified rsERT and personalized embryo transfer (pET) and the control 640 group with 88 patients underwent conventional embryo transfer (ET).

Figure 3. Gene expression pattern of the top 20 DEGs among different

642 **endometrial statuses.** Gradual genetic expression changes were observed in the

643 secretory phase of menstrual cycle.

Figure 4 Correlation between predicted WOI time distribution and the

- 645 corresponding endometrial receptive statuses. Medians of the predicted mean WOI
- time in pre-receptive, receptive and post-receptive samples are approximately 48
- hours, 0 hour and -48 hours respectively. Deviation points are mostly from samples
- 648 with WOI displacement.
- **Figure 5. Volcano plot of differential transcriptomic profile between samples**

650 obtained from the natural cycle and HRT cycle. No differentially expressed genes

were observed between samples obtained from natural and HRT cycle.



Phase 1







