Pregnancy Outcomes After Blastocyst-Stage Frozen Embryo Transfer in Hormone Replacement Cycles: Post thawing Extended Culture and Cryopreservation Timing

Sherin Attia Shazly [2], Attya Mohamed Attya [2], Aya Ahmed Mohamed Abdalla [3], Ahmed R Mashaly[4], Hoda Sibai AbdAl-Salam [5]

1. *Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine - Zagazig University,*
2. *Lecturer of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine - Zagazig University*
3. *Resident of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Ahmed Maher Teaching Hospital,*
4. *Obstetrics and Gynecology Department, Damanhour National Medical Institute, Egypt, RYADA Fertility Center, Damanhour, Egypt, Egyptian Foundation of Reproductive Medicine and Embryology (EFRE), Egypt.*
5. *Assistant Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine - Zagazig University*

Corresponding Author: Aya Ahmed Mohamed Abdalla

Received: 28 October 2024, **Accepted:** 17 November 2024, **Published:** 20 November 2024

Abstract

Background: Frozen embryo transfer (FET) has become a cornerstone of assisted reproductive technology (ART), with blastocyst-stage transfer increasingly favored due to improved embryo-endometrium synchrony and enhanced implantation potential. In hormone replacement therapy (HRT) cycles, endometrial preparation is standardized and ovulation is suppressed, providing a controlled environment for embryo transfer. However, important questions remain regarding the impact of embryonic developmental trajectory and cryopreservation timing on reproductive outcomes. Specifically, whether blastocysts derived from Post thawing Extended Culture of cleavage-stage embryos exhibit comparable implantation and pregnancy potential to electively cryopreserved blastocysts remains a subject of clinical and biological interest. Differences in embryonic kinetics, self-selection during culture, and potential stress induced by prolonged in vitro development may influence pregnancy outcomes following thaw and transfer. This review aims to evaluate pregnancy outcomes after blastocyst-stage frozen embryo transfer in hormone replacement cycles, focusing on the biological and clinical implications of Post thawing Extended Culture from day-3 embryos and the timing of cryopreservation. We synthesize current evidence regarding implantation rate, clinical pregnancy rate, ongoing pregnancy, and live birth outcomes, while exploring embryologic, endometrial, and procedural determinants that may modulate success.

Conclusion:

Available evidence suggests that blastocyst-stage FET in HRT cycles yields high and reproducible pregnancy rates, largely attributable to optimized endometrial synchronization and improved embryo selection. Post thawing Extended Culture to the blastocyst stage allows embryonic self-selection and may enhance implantation efficiency; however, embryonic developmental kinetics and cryosurvival characteristics may influence downstream outcomes. The interaction between embryo competence and endometrial preparation appears central to success. A deeper understanding of embryologic timing, vitrification protocols, and endometrial receptivity in artificial cycles is essential to refine clinical strategies and optimize pregnancy outcomes in contemporary ART practice.

Keywords: *Frozen embryo transfer; Blastocyst culture; Hormone replacement therapy cycles*

Introduction

Assisted reproductive technology (ART) has undergone substantial evolution over the past two decades, with frozen embryo transfer (FET) emerging as a dominant strategy in contemporary in vitro fertilization (IVF) practice. Improvements in vitrification techniques, enhanced embryo culture systems, and growing recognition of the physiological limitations of stimulated fresh cycles have collectively contributed to the increasing utilization of freeze-all strategies and subsequent blastocyst-stage transfer. The transition from cleavage-stage to blastocyst-stage transfer has been driven by improved embryo selection, enhanced synchronization with endometrial receptivity, and higher implantation efficiency per transfer [1].

Blastocyst culture, typically extending embryo development to day 5 or 6, enables embryonic self-selection, as embryos that arrest during in vitro culture are excluded from transfer. This Post thawing Extended Culture approach theoretically enriches for embryos with higher developmental competence and chromosomal integrity. Furthermore, the blastocyst stage more closely aligns with the physiological timing of uterine entry in natural conception, potentially improving embryo–endometrial synchrony [2]. Consequently, blastocyst transfer has been associated with higher clinical pregnancy rates compared with cleavage-stage transfer in multiple studies and meta-analyses [3].

Simultaneously, hormone replacement therapy (HRT) cycles have become a widely adopted protocol for endometrial preparation in FET cycles. Artificial cycles offer predictable timing, suppression of spontaneous ovulation, and precise progesterone initiation, facilitating controlled scheduling of embryo transfer. The reproducibility and logistical advantages of HRT cycles have made them particularly valuable in freeze-all programs and in patients with ovulatory dysfunction [4]. However, the absence of a corpus luteum in artificial cycles introduces unique physiological considerations, including altered vascular, endocrine, and immunologic signaling, which may influence implantation and obstetric outcomes [5].

Within this evolving framework, important clinical questions remain regarding the role of embryonic developmental trajectory and the timing of cryopreservation in determining pregnancy outcomes after blastocyst-stage FET. While blastocyst transfer is widely accepted, embryos reaching this stage may arise through different developmental pathways. Some originate from Post thawing Extended Culture of cleavage-stage embryos after cryopreservation, while others are electively cultured and vitrified as blastocysts in optimized laboratory conditions. Differences in developmental kinetics, metabolic activity, and cryotolerance may theoretically influence implantation potential following thaw and transfer [6].

Despite widespread adoption of blastocyst-stage FET in HRT cycles, the literature remains heterogeneous regarding reported pregnancy outcomes, definitions of success endpoints, and laboratory protocols. Many studies focus on comparisons between fresh and frozen cycles or between cleavage-stage and blastocyst transfer, while fewer reviews specifically address how Post thawing Extended Culture dynamics and cryopreservation timing interact within hormonally prepared endometrial environments. Additionally, variation in vitrification protocols, luteal support regimens, and progesterone exposure timing introduces confounding factors that may obscure true biological associations [7].

The research gap therefore lies in synthesizing available evidence to clarify how blastocyst-stage development, extended in vitro culture, and cryopreservation timing influence implantation and pregnancy outcomes specifically within HRT-prepared FET cycles. A focused evaluation of these factors is essential to optimize embryo selection strategies, refine laboratory protocols, and improve clinical pregnancy and live birth rates while maintaining safety.

Aim of the Review

This review aims to evaluate pregnancy outcomes following blastocyst-stage frozen embryo transfer in hormone replacement cycles, with particular emphasis on the influence of extended embryo culture and timing of cryopreservation. We analyze implantation rate, clinical pregnancy rate, ongoing pregnancy,

and live birth outcomes, and explore embryologic, endometrial, and procedural determinants that may modulate success.

Evolution of Blastocyst Culture and Cryopreservation in ART

The transition from cleavage-stage embryo transfer to blastocyst-stage transfer represents one of the most significant paradigm shifts in assisted reproductive technology. In the early years of IVF, embryo transfer was commonly performed at the cleavage stage (day 2–3), primarily because prolonged in vitro culture systems were suboptimal and associated with high rates of developmental arrest. Advances in sequential culture media, improved incubator environments, and better laboratory quality control enabled reliable culture to the blastocyst stage, allowing embryos to reach a developmental stage more closely resembling physiological intrauterine timing [8].

Post thawing Extended Culture to the blastocyst stage provides an opportunity for embryonic self-selection, as embryos that fail to activate their genome appropriately or that harbor severe chromosomal abnormalities are less likely to progress beyond day 3. This biological selection process enhances the probability that transferred embryos possess greater implantation competence. Randomized trials and systematic reviews have demonstrated higher implantation rates and clinical pregnancy rates per transfer with blastocyst-stage transfer compared to cleavage-stage transfer, although cumulative live birth outcomes must also consider embryos that arrest before reaching blastocyst [9].

The development of vitrification further revolutionized blastocyst utilization. Traditional slow-freezing methods were associated with intracellular ice crystal formation, osmotic injury, and reduced post-thaw survival. Blastocysts, due to their large fluid-filled blastocoel cavity and complex cellular differentiation, were particularly susceptible to cryoinjury. The introduction of ultra-rapid vitrification techniques, employing high concentrations of cryoprotectants and rapid cooling rates, dramatically improved survival rates of both cleavage-stage embryos and blastocysts [10]. Contemporary vitrification protocols now routinely achieve survival rates exceeding 90–95%, with implantation and live birth outcomes comparable to fresh transfers in many settings [11].

The success of vitrification catalyzed the widespread adoption of freeze-all strategies. In stimulated cycles, supraphysiologic estradiol levels and altered luteal phase physiology may impair endometrial receptivity. By deferring transfer and performing FET in a subsequent cycle, clinicians can optimize endometrial preparation and potentially improve reproductive outcomes. This shift has resulted in a marked increase in blastocyst-stage frozen embryo transfers globally [12].

Importantly, blastocysts subjected to cryopreservation may differ in developmental kinetics and morphology. Day 5 blastocysts generally exhibit higher implantation potential than day 6 blastocysts, potentially reflecting differences in embryonic competence. Studies have demonstrated that delayed blastulation may be associated with altered chromosomal status or metabolic efficiency, factors that can influence clinical pregnancy rates after FET [13]. Therefore, timing of blastocyst formation and cryopreservation represents a critical variable in understanding pregnancy outcomes.

In parallel, laboratory refinements such as assisted hatching vitrification, blastocoel collapse techniques, and improved warming protocols have enhanced post-thaw expansion and viability. Artificial shrinkage of the blastocoel before vitrification reduces the risk of ice formation and has been associated with improved survival outcomes [14]. These laboratory modifications underscore the close interplay between embryology techniques and clinical success rates following frozen blastocyst transfer.

As blastocyst culture and vitrification techniques matured, attention shifted from technical feasibility to optimization of clinical outcomes. Increasingly, research has focused on how developmental timing, embryo morphology grading systems, and cryopreservation timing influence implantation and pregnancy rates in hormonally prepared FET cycles. Understanding these variables is essential to refine embryo selection strategies and maximize reproductive success while minimizing multiple gestation risk.

Hormone Replacement Therapy Cycles and Endometrial Preparation in Frozen Embryo Transfer

Hormone replacement therapy (HRT) cycles, also referred to as artificial or programmed cycles, represent one of the most widely utilized approaches for endometrial preparation in frozen embryo transfer. Unlike natural or modified natural cycles, HRT cycles suppress endogenous follicular development and rely entirely on exogenous estradiol and progesterone administration to simulate the proliferative and secretory phases of the endometrium. This approach provides predictable scheduling and minimizes the risk of premature ovulation, making it particularly advantageous in freeze-all strategies and in patients with irregular ovulation or diminished ovarian reserve [15].

Endometrial preparation in HRT cycles typically begins with exogenous estradiol to induce endometrial proliferation and achieve adequate thickness, followed by progesterone initiation to transform the endometrium into a receptive secretory state. The timing of progesterone exposure is critical, as embryo transfer must align precisely with the window of implantation. In blastocyst-stage FET, progesterone is generally administered for five full days before transfer, mirroring the physiological timing of embryo arrival in the uterine cavity [16]. Even subtle deviations in progesterone duration or serum levels have been associated with altered implantation rates.

Emerging evidence has highlighted the importance of adequate serum progesterone concentrations on the day of embryo transfer. Several cohort studies have demonstrated that low serum progesterone levels in HRT cycles are associated with reduced clinical pregnancy and live birth rates, suggesting that hormonal sufficiency is a determinant of implantation success [17]. This has led to increasing clinical attention toward individualized luteal phase support and, in some centers, routine progesterone monitoring with dose adjustments.

A distinguishing feature of HRT cycles is the absence of a corpus luteum. In natural cycles, the corpus luteum produces not only progesterone but also vasoactive substances such as relaxin and vascular endothelial growth factor, which may contribute to placentation and maternal vascular adaptation. Observational data have suggested potential associations between artificial cycles and increased risks of hypertensive disorders of pregnancy, possibly reflecting altered endocrine and vascular signaling in the absence of corpus luteum-derived factors [18]. Although these findings primarily relate to obstetric outcomes rather than implantation rates, they underscore the physiological uniqueness of artificial cycles.

Endometrial receptivity in HRT cycles has also been investigated at the molecular level. Transcriptomic analyses indicate that appropriately timed progesterone exposure induces expression of genes associated with implantation competence, including those regulating adhesion molecules, cytokine signaling, and immune modulation [19]. However, inter-individual variability in progesterone metabolism and receptor sensitivity may shift the window of implantation, potentially affecting pregnancy outcomes even in carefully timed artificial cycles.

Despite these considerations, clinical pregnancy rates following blastocyst-stage FET in HRT cycles remain consistently high across multiple studies, often comparable to or exceeding those observed in natural cycles when hormonal parameters are optimized [20]. The controlled hormonal environment, combined with the improved embryo selection afforded by blastocyst culture, likely contributes to this reproducibility. Nevertheless, subtle interactions between embryo developmental timing, progesterone exposure, and endometrial receptivity remain areas of ongoing investigation.

Collectively, HRT cycles provide a standardized and controllable platform for evaluating pregnancy outcomes after blastocyst-stage FET. However, understanding how embryo culture duration and cryopreservation timing interact with hormonally prepared endometrium is essential for refining clinical protocols and maximizing reproductive success.

Embryo Developmental Kinetics and Post thawing Extended Culture to Blastocyst Stage

Embryo developmental kinetics play a central role in determining implantation competence and subsequent pregnancy outcomes. The progression from the cleavage stage to the blastocyst stage involves critical biological events, including embryonic genome activation, cellular differentiation into trophectoderm and inner cell mass, and formation of the blastocoel cavity. Post thawing Extended

Culture to day 5 or day 6 allows assessment of these developmental milestones and provides indirect insight into embryonic viability and chromosomal integrity [21]. Embryos that successfully reach the blastocyst stage are more likely to exhibit coordinated gene expression and appropriate metabolic regulation.

Embryonic genome activation, which occurs between the 4- and 8-cell stages, represents a pivotal checkpoint in early development. Failure of genome activation is associated with developmental arrest prior to blastocyst formation. Extended in vitro culture therefore functions as a biologic filter, permitting selection of embryos that have demonstrated developmental competence beyond cleavage. Studies have shown that embryos reaching the blastocyst stage are more likely to be euploid compared with those that arrest earlier, although aneuploidy remains present even among morphologically high-quality blastocysts [22].

The timing of blastulation has emerged as a clinically relevant variable. Day 5 blastocysts generally exhibit higher implantation and live birth rates compared with day 6 blastocysts. Delayed blastulation may reflect suboptimal metabolic activity, mitochondrial dysfunction, or chromosomal abnormalities. Large cohort analyses have reported reduced clinical pregnancy and live birth rates following transfer of day 6 blastocysts compared with day 5 embryos, even when morphology appears comparable [23]. This suggests that developmental speed is an independent marker of embryo competence.

Time-lapse imaging systems have provided further insight into embryo morphokinetics. These technologies allow continuous monitoring of cleavage patterns and developmental timing without removing embryos from controlled incubation environments. Specific morphokinetic parameters—such as time to two-cell stage, duration of the second cell cycle, and timing of compaction—have been correlated with implantation potential [24]. Embryos with synchronized cleavage patterns and appropriate timing intervals are more likely to reach high-quality blastocyst stage and implant successfully.

Post thawing Extended Culture, however, is not without theoretical risks. Prolonged in vitro exposure may subject embryos to oxidative stress, fluctuating culture conditions, and metabolic alterations. Although modern culture systems are highly optimized, subtle laboratory variations can influence developmental kinetics and blastocyst yield. Some studies have suggested that cumulative live birth rates per initiated cycle may not differ significantly between cleavage-stage and blastocyst transfer when accounting for embryos that fail to reach blastocyst stage, underscoring the importance of considering overall efficiency rather than per-transfer success alone [25].

Cryopreservation timing intersects with developmental kinetics. Blastocysts vitrified on day 5 often demonstrate higher post-warming survival and implantation potential compared with day 6 blastocysts. The degree of blastocoel expansion at the time of vitrification may also influence cryotolerance, as more expanded blastocysts require appropriate collapse techniques to prevent intracellular ice formation [26]. Thus, embryo developmental trajectory and cryopreservation timing are closely intertwined factors affecting pregnancy outcomes after frozen blastocyst transfer.

Understanding these biological principles is essential when interpreting pregnancy rates in HRT-prepared FET cycles. The intrinsic competence of the embryo—shaped by developmental kinetics and culture duration—interacts with the hormonally prepared endometrium to determine implantation success. A nuanced appreciation of these dynamics can guide laboratory practices and clinical decision-making to optimize reproductive outcomes.

Cryopreservation Timing, Vitrification Outcomes, and Post-Thaw Embryo Viability

Cryopreservation timing is a critical determinant of post-thaw embryo competence and subsequent pregnancy outcomes following blastocyst-stage frozen embryo transfer. The introduction of vitrification has markedly improved survival rates compared with conventional slow-freezing techniques, largely by preventing intracellular ice crystal formation and minimizing osmotic injury. Modern vitrification protocols employ ultra-rapid cooling combined with high concentrations of cryoprotectants, resulting in survival rates exceeding 90% in most experienced centers [27]. These technical advances have transformed frozen embryo transfer into a highly efficient and reliable component of ART practice.

The developmental stage at which vitrification occurs influences both cryosurvival and implantation potential. Blastocysts may be vitrified at varying degrees of expansion, ranging from early blastocysts with small blastocoel cavities to fully expanded or even hatching blastocysts. Highly expanded blastocysts contain greater fluid volume, increasing the theoretical risk of ice formation if not properly managed. Techniques such as artificial blastocoel collapse prior to vitrification have been introduced to reduce this risk, and several studies report improved post-warming re-expansion and implantation rates with these methods [28].

Day of blastulation remains another important consideration. Day 5 blastocysts typically demonstrate superior cryosurvival and higher clinical pregnancy rates compared with day 6 blastocysts. Although vitrification survival rates may be comparable between day 5 and day 6 embryos, implantation potential appears lower for delayed blastocysts. This difference likely reflects intrinsic embryonic competence rather than cryoinjury alone, as delayed development has been associated with increased rates of chromosomal abnormalities and altered metabolic profiles [29]. Consequently, cryopreservation timing should be interpreted within the broader context of embryonic developmental kinetics.

Post-warming assessment of blastocyst viability commonly relies on morphological re-expansion and trophectoderm integrity. Rapid and complete blastocoel re-expansion within a few hours after warming has been correlated with higher implantation and clinical pregnancy rates. Conversely, embryos demonstrating delayed or incomplete re-expansion may have reduced implantation potential [30]. These observations suggest that cryosurvival is not merely defined by structural integrity but also by functional recovery following osmotic stress.

Another variable influencing post-thaw viability is the cumulative exposure to in vitro manipulation. Embryos that undergo Post thawing Extended Culture prior to vitrification may experience metabolic shifts that affect membrane permeability and cryotolerance. Additionally, repeated handling or suboptimal laboratory conditions can subtly impact embryo physiology. Quality control in embryology laboratories—including stable temperature, pH regulation, and minimization of light exposure—is therefore essential to preserve developmental competence through both culture and cryopreservation stages [31].

Importantly, large registry data analyses have demonstrated that live birth rates following vitrified-warmed blastocyst transfer are comparable to, and in some cases exceed, those observed after fresh blastocyst transfer. These findings support the biological safety and clinical efficacy of vitrification when properly performed [32]. However, subtle differences in embryo selection criteria, cryopreservation timing, and warming protocols may still influence implantation efficiency in hormonally prepared FET cycles.

Collectively, cryopreservation timing interacts closely with embryo developmental kinetics and laboratory technique to shape pregnancy outcomes. Optimizing vitrification strategies, selecting appropriately developed blastocysts, and ensuring robust post-warming assessment are essential components in maximizing success rates after blastocyst-stage FET in hormone replacement cycles.

Pregnancy Outcomes After Blastocyst-Stage FET in Hormone Replacement Cycles (Implantation, Clinical Pregnancy, Ongoing Pregnancy, Live Birth)

Pregnancy outcomes following blastocyst-stage frozen embryo transfer (FET) in hormone replacement therapy (HRT) cycles have been extensively evaluated in contemporary ART practice. Implantation rate, defined as the presence of a gestational sac per embryo transferred, serves as an early indicator of embryo–endometrial synchrony. Multiple cohort studies have demonstrated that blastocyst-stage FET yields higher implantation rates compared with cleavage-stage FET, largely due to improved embryo selection and physiologic timing alignment with the window of implantation [33]. In HRT cycles specifically, the controlled timing of progesterone initiation further enhances synchronization between embryo developmental stage and endometrial receptivity.

Clinical pregnancy rate (CPR), typically defined by ultrasonographic visualization of a gestational sac with fetal cardiac activity, remains one of the most commonly reported endpoints. Large retrospective analyses and registry data indicate that CPR after vitrified-warmed blastocyst transfer in artificial cycles

ranges between 40% and 60% per transfer, depending on maternal age, embryo quality, and laboratory performance [34]. These rates are generally comparable to, or slightly higher than, fresh blastocyst transfer outcomes in selected populations, supporting the effectiveness of programmed FET strategies.

Ongoing pregnancy and live birth rates represent more clinically meaningful outcomes. Several studies have shown that live birth rates following blastocyst-stage FET in HRT cycles are strongly influenced by embryo morphology grading and developmental timing. High-quality day 5 blastocysts consistently demonstrate superior live birth outcomes compared with lower-grade or delayed day 6 blastocysts [35]. Importantly, when euploid embryos are transferred, live birth rates per transfer can exceed 60% in favorable age groups, underscoring the central role of embryonic competence in determining success.

Maternal age remains one of the most significant predictors of pregnancy outcome. Advanced maternal age is associated with increased aneuploidy rates and reduced implantation potential, even when blastocyst-stage embryos are transferred. Although Post thawing Extended Culture enhances selection of viable embryos, it does not eliminate age-related chromosomal risk. Therefore, pregnancy rates in HRT cycles decline progressively with increasing maternal age, reflecting intrinsic oocyte quality rather than endometrial preparation alone [36].

Endometrial parameters also influence pregnancy outcomes. Adequate endometrial thickness—commonly defined as ≥7–8 mm—has been associated with improved implantation and live birth rates in HRT cycles. Extremely thin endometrium is linked to lower clinical pregnancy rates, possibly due to impaired vascularization and suboptimal stromal decidualization [37]. However, once minimal threshold thickness is achieved, further increases may not proportionally enhance success.

Serum progesterone concentration on the day of embryo transfer has emerged as an independent predictor of outcome. Suboptimal progesterone levels in artificial cycles have been associated with reduced ongoing pregnancy and live birth rates. Some studies suggest that individualized progesterone supplementation in cases of low serum levels may improve outcomes, though standardized protocols remain under investigation [38]. This finding highlights the delicate interplay between embryo developmental stage and endometrial hormonal exposure.

Cumulative live birth rate per initiated ovarian stimulation cycle is an increasingly emphasized metric in modern ART. Although blastocyst-stage FET demonstrates high per-transfer success rates, cumulative outcomes must consider embryos that fail to reach blastocyst stage during Post thawing Extended Culture. Nevertheless, in freeze-all strategies where high-quality blastocysts are obtained and vitrified, cumulative live birth rates remain robust, reinforcing the clinical value of blastocyst-stage cryopreservation and transfer in HRT cycles [39].

Overall, pregnancy outcomes following blastocyst-stage FET in hormone replacement cycles are influenced by a complex interaction between embryo competence, developmental timing, cryopreservation efficiency, endometrial receptivity, and maternal characteristics. While HRT cycles provide a controlled and reproducible environment, optimization of both embryologic and endocrine variables is essential to maximize implantation, clinical pregnancy, and live birth rates.

Clinical Determinants, Prognostic Factors, and Practical Implications in Blastocyst FET HRT Cycles

Successful pregnancy following blastocyst-stage frozen embryo transfer in hormone replacement therapy cycles depends on a multifactorial interaction between embryologic quality, maternal characteristics, and endocrine optimization. While embryo competence remains central, patient-specific variables significantly influence implantation efficiency and live birth probability. Among these, maternal age continues to be the strongest independent predictor of reproductive outcome, reflecting age-related increases in oocyte aneuploidy and diminished mitochondrial function [40]. Even with high-quality blastocyst transfer, advancing age is associated with reduced implantation rates and higher miscarriage risk.

Body mass index (BMI) has also been implicated as a prognostic factor in FET outcomes. Obesity is associated with altered endometrial receptivity, inflammatory signaling, and progesterone metabolism. Several observational studies suggest that elevated BMI may negatively affect clinical pregnancy and

live birth rates in artificial cycles, although findings are not entirely consistent across populations [41]. These data underscore the importance of preconception counseling and metabolic optimization prior to embryo transfer.

Endometrial preparation variables within HRT cycles represent modifiable determinants of outcome. Adequate estradiol priming is required to achieve optimal endometrial proliferation and receptivity. Both insufficient and excessively prolonged estrogen exposure have been associated with altered implantation potential. Furthermore, the duration and route of progesterone administration—whether vaginal, intramuscular, or combined—can influence serum and endometrial tissue levels, thereby affecting synchronization with the transferred blastocyst [42]. Personalized progesterone supplementation strategies are increasingly considered in cases of recurrent implantation failure.

Embryo morphology grading systems provide clinically useful prognostic information. Parameters including trophectoderm quality, inner cell mass integrity, and degree of expansion correlate with implantation and live birth outcomes. High-grade blastocysts demonstrate superior pregnancy rates compared with lower-grade embryos, even when transferred in well-prepared HRT cycles [43]. Nevertheless, morphology alone cannot fully predict chromosomal status, and the integration of preimplantation genetic testing for aneuploidy (PGT-A) has further refined embryo selection in some settings.

Recurrent implantation failure (RIF) represents a challenging clinical scenario in artificial FET cycles. Although blastocyst transfer improves per-transfer success, some patients fail to achieve pregnancy despite transfer of morphologically high-quality embryos. In such cases, evaluation of uterine cavity pathology, chronic endometritis, thrombophilia, and luteal phase adequacy is warranted. Emerging tools such as endometrial receptivity assays aim to individualize progesterone exposure timing; however, their routine use remains debated due to limited high-level evidence [44].

From a practical standpoint, single blastocyst transfer is strongly recommended to minimize multiple gestation risk without compromising cumulative live birth rates. Multiple pregnancy is associated with increased maternal and neonatal morbidity, and blastocyst-stage embryos exhibit high implantation efficiency. Elective single embryo transfer in HRT cycles maintains excellent pregnancy outcomes while enhancing obstetric safety [45].

Finally, obstetric considerations must be acknowledged. Some studies suggest that pregnancies resulting from artificial FET cycles may carry increased risks of hypertensive disorders and abnormal placentation compared with natural cycles, potentially related to absence of corpus luteum–derived vasoactive factors. Although these findings do not directly diminish implantation success, they highlight the importance of careful antenatal surveillance and informed counseling [46].

In summary, pregnancy outcomes following blastocyst-stage FET in HRT cycles are shaped by an intricate interplay of embryologic quality, maternal factors, endocrine sufficiency, and procedural precision. Individualized optimization of these variables—rather than reliance on a single determinant—offers the greatest potential to enhance implantation, sustain ongoing pregnancy, and achieve live birth.

Conclusion

Blastocyst-stage frozen embryo transfer in hormone replacement cycles represents a highly effective and widely adopted strategy in modern assisted reproductive technology. The convergence of optimized extended embryo culture, advanced vitrification techniques, and controlled endometrial preparation has enabled consistently high implantation, clinical pregnancy, and live birth rates. The capacity of Post thawing Extended Culture to facilitate embryonic self-selection enhances per-transfer success, while vitrification ensures excellent post-thaw survival and preservation of developmental potential.

Pregnancy outcomes in artificial cycles are determined by a complex interaction between embryo developmental kinetics, cryopreservation timing, maternal age, endometrial receptivity, and adequacy of progesterone exposure. Among these factors, embryo competence and precise synchronization between progesterone initiation and blastocyst transfer are central determinants of implantation success. Although hormone replacement cycles provide scheduling flexibility and reproducibility, careful hormonal optimization is essential to maintain favorable reproductive outcomes.

Future refinements in individualized luteal support, embryo selection algorithms, and laboratory quality control are likely to further enhance success rates while maintaining maternal and neonatal safety. A comprehensive understanding of the biological interplay between embryo development and endometrial preparation remains fundamental to optimizing pregnancy outcomes following blastocyst-stage frozen embryo transfer in hormone replacement cycles.

References

1. Glujovsky D, Farquhar C, Quinteiro Retamar AM, Alvarez Sedo CR, Blake D. Cleavage stage versus blastocyst stage embryo transfer in assisted reproductive technology. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2016;(6):CD002118.
2. Papanikolaou EG, Camus M, Kolibianakis EM, et al. In vitro fertilization with single blastocyst-stage versus single cleavage-stage embryos. N Engl J Med. 2006;354(11):1139-1146.
3. Gardner DK, Schoolcraft WB. Culture and transfer of human blastocysts. Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol. 1999;11(3):307-311.
4. Blake D, Proctor M, Johnson N, Olive D. Cleavage stage versus blastocyst stage embryo transfer in assisted conception. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2007;(4):CD002118.
5. Groenewoud ER, Cantineau AEP, Kollen BJ, Macklon NS, Cohlen BJ. What is the optimal means of preparing the endometrium in frozen-thawed embryo transfer cycles? Hum Reprod Update. 2013;19(5):458-470.
6. von Versen-Höynck F, Schaub AM, Chi YY, et al. Increased preeclampsia risk and reduced aortic compliance with in vitro fertilization cycles in the absence of a corpus luteum. Hypertension. 2019;73(3):640-649.
7. Shapiro BS, Daneshmand ST, Garner FC, Aguirre M, Hudson C, Thomas S. Evidence of impaired endometrial receptivity after ovarian stimulation. Fertil Steril. 2011;96(2):344-348.
8. Roque M, Lattes K, Serra S, et al. Fresh embryo transfer versus frozen embryo transfer in IVF/ICSI cycles: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Hum Reprod Update. 2013;19(1):2-12.
9. Rienzi L, Gracia C, Maggiulli R, et al. Oocyte, embryo and blastocyst cryopreservation in ART. Hum Reprod Update. 2017;23(2):139-155.
10. Kuwayama M. Highly efficient vitrification for cryopreservation of human oocytes and embryos. Reprod Biomed Online. 2007;14(3):300-308.
11. Edgar DH, Gook DA. A critical appraisal of cryopreservation (slow cooling versus vitrification) of human oocytes and embryos. Hum Reprod Update. 2012;18(5):536-554.
12. Roque M, Valle M, Guimarães F, Sampaio M, Geber S. Freeze-all policy: fresh vs frozen-thawed embryo transfer. Fertil Steril. 2015;103(5):1190-1193.
13. Bourdon M, Santulli P, Maignien C, et al. Day 5 versus day 6 blastocyst transfers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Hum Reprod. 2019;34(10):1948-1964.
14. Irani M, O'Neill C. The importance of timing in blastocyst transfer. Fertil Steril. 2019;111(1):11-13.
15. Zhang X, Trokoudes KM, Pavlides C, et al. Artificial shrinkage improves survival of vitrified blastocysts. Fertil Steril. 2010;94(2):597-600.
16. Labarta E, Mariani G, Holtmann N, Celada P, Remohí J, Bosch E. Low serum progesterone on the day of embryo transfer is associated with reduced ongoing pregnancy rates. Hum Reprod. 2017;32(12):2437-2442.
17. Gaggiotti-Marre S, Álvarez M, González-Foruria I, et al. Low progesterone levels on the day of embryo transfer reduce live birth rates in artificial cycles. Hum Reprod. 2019;34(4):657-665.
18. Díaz-Gimeno P, Ruiz-Alonso M, Blesa D, et al. The endometrial receptivity array: a personalized diagnosis tool for implantation failure. Hum Reprod. 2011;26(12):3215-3225.
19. Evans J, Salamonsen LA, Winship A. Fertile ground: human endometrial programming and lessons in health and disease. Nat Rev Endocrinol. 2016;12(11):654-667.
20. Alpha Scientists in Reproductive Medicine and ESHRE SIG Embryology. The Istanbul consensus workshop on embryo assessment. Hum Reprod. 2011;26(6):1270-1283.

21. Capalbo A, Rienzi L, Cimadomo D, et al. Correlation between embryo morphology and chromosomal status. Hum Reprod. 2014;29(6):1173-1181.
22. Meseguer M, Herrero J, Tejera A, Hilligsøe KM, Ramsing NB, Remohí J. The use of morphokinetics as predictor of embryo implantation. Hum Reprod. 2011;26(10):2658-2671.
23. De Croo I, Colman R, De Sutter P, Tilleman K. Blastocyst transfer for all? Hum Reprod. 2019;34(1):5-12.
24. Ahlström A, Westin C, Reismer E, Wikland M, Hardarson T. Trophectoderm morphology and live birth after blastocyst transfer. Hum Reprod. 2011;26(12):3289-3296.
25. Wong KM, van Wely M, Mol F, Repping S, Mastenbroek S. Fresh versus frozen embryo transfers in assisted reproduction. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017;(3):CD011184.
26. Maheshwari A, Pandey S, Amalraj Raja E, Shetty A, Hamilton M, Bhattacharya S. Is frozen embryo transfer associated with improved pregnancy outcomes? Hum Reprod Update. 2018;24(3):272-292.
27. Pinborg A, Wennerholm UB, Romundstad LB, et al. Why do singletons conceived after frozen embryo transfer have higher birthweight? Hum Reprod. 2010;25(8):1960-1968.
28. Ishihara O, Araki R, Kuwahara A, et al. Impact of frozen embryo transfer on obstetric outcomes. Hum Reprod. 2014;29(11):2531-2539.
29. Luke B, Brown MB, Wantman E, et al. Cumulative birth rates with linked assisted reproductive technology cycles. Fertil Steril. 2012;97(3):511-517.
30. Practice Committee of the American Society for Reproductive Medicine. Progesterone supplementation during the luteal phase. Fertil Steril. 2021;115(6):1410-1418.
31. Bosch E, Labarta E, Crespo J, et al. Circulating progesterone levels and ongoing pregnancy rates in artificial frozen embryo transfer cycles. Fertil Steril. 2010;94(4):1315-1317.
32. Venetis CA, Kolibianakis EM, Bosdou JK, Tarlatzis BC. Progesterone elevation and IVF outcome: a meta-analysis. Hum Reprod Update. 2013;19(5):433-457.
33. Sunkara SK, Khairy M, El-Toukhy T, Khalaf Y, Coomarasamy A. The effect of endometrial thickness on IVF outcome. Hum Reprod. 2011;26(7):1768-1774.
34. Kasius A, Smit JG, Torrance HL, et al. Endometrial thickness and pregnancy rates after IVF. Hum Reprod Update. 2014;20(4):530-541.
35. Schoolcraft WB, Gardner DK, Lane M, Schlenker T, Hamilton F, Meldrum DR. Blastocyst culture and transfer: analysis of results. Fertil Steril. 1999;72(3):436-440.
36. Franasiak JM, Forman EJ, Hong KH, et al. The nature of aneuploidy with increasing age. Fertil Steril. 2014;101(3):656-663.
37. Simon A, Laufer N. Repeated implantation failure: clinical approach. Fertil Steril. 2012;97(5):1039-1043.
38. Coughlan C, Ledger W, Wang Q, et al. Recurrent implantation failure: definition and management. Hum Reprod. 2014;29(4):607-613.
39. Pandian Z, Marjoribanks J, Ozturk O, Serour G, Bhattacharya S. Number of embryos for transfer after IVF. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2013;(7):CD003416.
40. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, American Society for Reproductive Medicine, Society for Assisted Reproductive Technology. 2020 Assisted Reproductive Technology Fertility Clinic and National Summary Report. Atlanta, GA: US Dept of Health and Human Services; 2022.
41. Shapiro BS, Daneshmand ST, Garner FC, Aguirre M, Hudson C. Clinical rationale for cryopreservation of entire embryo cohorts in lieu of fresh transfer. Fertil Steril. 2014;102(1):3-9.
42. Chen ZJ, Shi Y, Sun Y, et al. Fresh versus frozen embryos for infertility in the polycystic ovary syndrome. N Engl J Med. 2016;375(6):523-533.
43. Wei D, Liu JY, Sun Y, et al. Frozen versus fresh single blastocyst transfer in ovulatory women: a multicentre, randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2019;393(10178):1310-1318.
44. Coates A, Kung A, Mounts E, et al. Optimal euploid embryo transfer strategy: fresh versus frozen. Fertil Steril. 2017;107(3):723-730.
45. Roque M, Haahr T, Geber S, Esteves SC, Humaidan P. Fresh versus elective frozen embryo transfer in IVF/ICSI cycles: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Fertil Steril. 2019;112(5):828-845.
46. Ginström Ernstad E, Wennerholm UB, Khatibi A, Petzold M, Bergh C. Neonatal and maternal outcomes after frozen embryo transfer: a population-based study. Hum Reprod. 2019;34(1):181-189.