Rewiring of gene expression in PWBC at artificial insemination is predictive of pregnancy

outcome in cattle (*Bos taurus*)

Sarah E. Moorey[1], Bailey N. Walker[2], Michelle F. Elmore[3,4], Joshua B. Elmore[4], Soren P.

Rodning[3] and Fernando H. Biase[2]

[1] Department of Animal Science, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN; [2] Department of

Animal and Poultry Sciences, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg,

VA, USA; [3] Department of Animal Sciences, Auburn University, Auburn, AL, USA; [4] Alabama

Cooperative Extension System, AL, USA.

Corresponding author:

Fernando Biase

175 West Campus Drive, Blacksburg, VA 24061. Phone 540-231-9520. Email fbiase@vt.edu

ORCID ID https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7895-0223

ABSTRACT

Infertility is a disease that affects humans and cattle in similar ways. The resemblance includes
complex genetic architecture, multiple etiology, low heritability of fertility related traits in females,
and the frequency in the female population. Here, we used cattle as a biomedical model to test
the hypothesis that gene expression profiles of protein-coding genes expressed in peripheral
white blood cells (PWBCs), and circulating micro RNAs in plasma, are associated with female
fertility, measured by pregnancy outcome. We drew blood samples from 17 female calves on the
day of artificial insemination and analyzed transcript abundance for 10496 genes in PWBCs and
290 circulating micro RNAs. The females were later classified as pregnant to artificial
insemination, pregnant to natural breeding or not pregnant. We identified 1860 genes producing
significant differential coexpression (eFDR<0.002) based on pregnancy outcome. Additionally,
237 micro RNAs and 2274 genes in PWBCs presented differential coexpression based on
pregnancy outcome. Furthermore, using a machine learning prediction algorithm we detected a
subset of genes whose abundance could be used for blind categorization of pregnancy outcome.
Our results provide strong evidence that bloodborne transcript abundance is highly associated
with fertility in females.

INTRODUCTION

The Word Health Organization considers Infertility to be a "disease of the reproductive system"[1]. Infertility is a common problem in humans and agriculturally important large mammals. For instance, prevalence of infertility may reach 16%[2] and 15%[3] in humans and beef female calves, respectively. Similar to what has been observed in humans[4], the genetic architecture of fertility in beef heifers is very complex[5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12]. In line with this complexity, female reproductive traits have low heritability. The heritability of traits related to female reproductive fitness (i.e.: birth rate and age at last reproduction) in humans ranges from 0.05 to 0.28[13]. Likewise, reproductive related traits in cattle such as heifer pregnancy and first service conception range from 0.07 to 0.20[5,14,15,16,17,18,19] and 0.03 to 0.18[5,14,17], respectively. Due to genetic and physiological resemblance with human, cattle have been identified as an important biomedical model for dissecting female fertility traits[20,21].

Beyond the importance as a biomedical model, cattle production systems provide approximately 28%[22] of the protein supply globally. Improving cattle production efficiency is essential for farmers to attain sustainable production and support the growing demand for animal protein[22]. Infertility is a major factor that hinders efficiency in cattle production, and it starts with limited success of pregnancy in young female calves. First breeding success greatly influences the lifetime efficiency of beef replacement heifers. Heifers that calve early in their first calving season experience increased productivity and longevity than their later calving herd mates[23,24,25,26]. Furthermore, the genetic correlation between yearling pregnancy rate and lifetime pregnancy rate is high (0.92-0.97)[27,28]. Therefore, the ability to identify heifers that experience optimal fertility during the first breeding is essential to the sustainability of beef cattle production systems.

The examination of the genetic components of fertility in beef heifers have yielded several genes potentially associated with fertility traits[5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12], but the effect of these markers are minimal, and there is no clear redundancy in genetic markers identified across breeds. Beyond the genomic profiling, the analysis of multiple layers of an individual's molecular blueprint is likely key for understanding the underlying biology of complex traits[29]. In line with this rationale, expression-trait association studies have emerged as a means to better understand complex traits[30,31]. Specifically related to fertility, there is evidence that circulating micro RNA (miRNA) profiles are indicative of reproductive function[32]. Furthermore, we have previously identified differences in the transcriptome of peripheral white blood cells (PWBC) among heifers of different fertility potential[33].

In the present study, we set out to investigate gene transcripts in PWBCs and circulating

micro RNA (miRNA) profiles in heifers enrolled in fixed time artificial insemination (AI). We utilized

a multi-dimensional approach to investigate differences in coexpression of protein-coding genes

in PWBCs, and coexpression between circulating miRNA and mRNAs in PWBCs. We also show

that transcript abundance in PWBCs can be successfully utilized for the prediction of heifer

reproductive outcome.

RESULTS

Overview of the experiment and data generated

We generated transcriptome data for mRNA from PWBC and small RNA from plasma

collected at the time of AI from heifers that became pregnant to AI (AI-preg, n=6), pregnant later

in the breeding season from natural breeding with bulls NB (NB, NB-preg, n=6), or failed to

become pregnant (not-pregnant, n=5, Fig. 1a). We produced, on average, 25.8 and 7.1 million

reads from mRNA and small RNA, respectively. Following the filtering for lowly expressed genes,

10496 protein coding genes in PWBC and 290 miRNAs in plasma samples were used for

differential gene expression, coexpression and prediction analyses (Fig. 1a). Notably, three of the

five not-pregnant samples clustered separately from other subjects based on the expression

levels of protein-coding genes. Contrariwise, there was no separation of samples based on the

miRNA expression levels (Fig. 1c).

Differential mRNA:mRNA coexpression associated with pregnancy outcome

First, we asked whether there was a general coexpression profile of the protein-coding

genes expressed in PWBCs amongst all 17 samples. We identified that 1633 genes that formed

2017 pairs with highly significant correlated expression levels ($|r|>0.98$, FDR<0.02, Fig. 2a,

Supplementary Table 1). Notably, ~99% of those significant correlations were positive (Fig. 2a).

Several genes showing coexpression were associated with 'translation', 'positive regulation of

gene expression', 'B cell differentiation', and 'negative regulation of extrinsic apoptotic signaling

pathway' amongst other biological processes (FDR<0.1, Supplementary Table 2). This result

indicates the occurrence of gene regulatory networks in PWBCs that are biologically meaningful

for the immune system.

Next, we investigated if the pair-wise gene coexpression differs between animals that

became pregnant relative to those that did not become pregnant. We identified 1860 genes with

significant differential correlation based on the pregnancy outcome (eFDR<0.002, Fig. 2b,c,

Supplementary Table 3, Supplementary Fig. 1). Of these 1860 genes, 963 genes formed 716

negative, 1053 genes formed 708 positive, four genes lost two positive, and 40 genes formed 23

inverted coexpression connections in not-preg heifers relative to both AI-preg and NB-preg

heifers. Among the 963 genes that formed new negative coexpression connections in not-preg

heifers, there was enrichment of the biological processes "proteolysis" (n=38 genes) and

"translation" (n=52 genes, FDR<0.1, see Fig. 2d for selected genes and Supplementary Table 4

for list of genes). Five of the 40 genes that formed inverted coexpression connection in not-preg

heifers relative to the pregnant counterparts were associated with "negative regulation of

transcription by RNA polymerase II" (FDR<0.1, see Fig. 2d for selected genes and Supplementary

Table 5 for a list of genes). These results indicate that physiological factors associated with fertility

or infertility act on the transcription protein-coding genes in PWBCs.

Differential miRNA:mRNA coexpression associated with pregnancy outcome

The generation of data from small RNA (from plasma) and mRNA (from PWBCs) from the

same subjects (n=17) permitted us to ask whether circulating miRNAs have correlated expression

with protein-coding genes expressed in the PWBCs. We identified 141 pairs of miRNA:mRNA

with |r|>0.85 (eFDR<0.0001, Supplementary Fig. 2) that were formed by 106 protein-coding genes

and 33 miRNAs (Supplementary table 6). Among the 106 protein-coding genes existing in high

correlation with miRNA, we identified three significantly enriched biological processes, namely:

"peptidyl-threonine phosphorylation", "cilium assembly" and "regulation of gene expression" (Fig.

3a, Supplementary table 7). Of notice, 30 of the 141 miRNA:mRNA pairs that presented negative

correlation between the expression levels have been previously identified as interacting pairs in

the miRWalk database (Fig. 3b). Additionally, bta-mir-744 and bta-mir-320a emerged as the two

most connected miRNAs (13 and 6 connections, respectively). It is evident that circulating

miRNAs have regulatory roles over transcripts of protein-coding genes expressed in the PWBCs.

We also interrogated miRNA:mRNA pairs for differential coexpression associated with

pregnancy outcome. We identified 2330 and 2738 miRNA:mRNA pairs with gain of negative and

positive correlated expression, respectively, (|r|>0.9, eFDR≤0.01, Supplementary Fig. 3) in not-

pregnant heifers that were not identified compared to in pregnant heifers (both AI-preg and NB-

preg, Fig. 3c). In addition, there were 51, two and three connections showing inverted, loss of

negative and loss of positive correlations in not-pregnant heifers relative to the pregnant (both AI-

preg and NB-preg) counterparts (Fig. 3c, see Supplementary table 8 for genes). Among the 1220

protein-coding genes associated with gain of negative correlation with miRNAs, there were

biological processes significantly enriched, namely: "immunoglobulin mediated immune

response", "negative regulation of DNA-binding transcription factor activity", "lymphocyte chemotaxis" and "mitochondrial respiratory chain complex I assembly" (FDR<0.1, Supplementary table 9). Among the 1288 genes associated with gain of positive correlation with miRNAs, the following biological processes were significantly enriched: "regulation of DNA replication" and "cellular response to BMP stimulus" (FDR<0.1, Supplementary table 10). These results indicate that several miRNA and mRNA pairs have their connections altered in relation to the heifer's fertility potential.

Differential gene expression associated with pregnancy outcome

Differential gene expression analysis revealed 67 (55 up- and 12 down-regulated) and 81 (63 up- and 18 down-regulated) protein-coding genes with altered expression profiles between PWBC of AI-preg versus not-pregnant, and NB-preg versus not-pregnant heifers, respectively (eFDR≤0.05, Fig. 4a, Supplementary tables 11 and 12, Supplementary Fig. 4). Notably, 26 genes were common between both pregnant groups versus the not-pregnant group (Fig. 4b). Gene ontology and pathway analyses of differentially expressed genes between AI-preg and Not-pregnant heifers revealed significant enrichment for the terms "signal transduction" (*ARAP3*, *LSP1*, *NFAM1*, *OR12D2*, *RARA*; FDR<0.05). When differentially expressed genes between NB-preg and not-pregnant heifers were analyzed, significant enrichment was determined for the terms "signal transduction" (*ARAP3*, *HRH2*, *LSP1*, *TIAM2*, *TNFRSF17*, *TNFRSF1A*; FDR=0.062) and the KEGG Pathway "cytokine-cytokine receptor interaction" (*IFNGR2*, *IL5RA*, *LTB*, *TNFRSF17*, *TNFRSF1A*; FDR=0.0045). Plasma miRNA profiles were very similar among samples from all pregnancy outcomes with the exception of miR-11995 that was more abundant in AI-preg versus not-pregnant heifers. These results indicate that quantitative differences exist in transcript abundance of protein-coding genes expressed in PWBC relative to the pregnancy outcome.

Next, we asked if differential gene expression could be associated with differential miRNA:mRNA coexpression. An intersection of the results identified 12 differentially expressed genes (10 annotated genes) in not-pregnant heifers relative to the AI-preg and NB-preg groups that also gained coexpression with 27 miRNAs (Fig. 4c). Notably, all genes that had higher expression in not-pregnant heifers (*CEACAM4*, *FCGR2*, *ISG20*, *JAML*, *LSP1*, *NCF1*, *NFE2*, *PLEKHO1*) showed a gain in negative coexpression with specific miRNAs. By contrast *MGAT4D* was lower expressed in not-pregnant heifers and gained a positive coexpression with a miRNA in not-pregnant heifers.

Assessment of transcript levels as predictors of pregnancy outcome

Motivated by the observations that several genes have their abundance altered in
relationship to the fertility potential pregnancy (Fig. 4a), we asked whether transcript abundances
could serve as predictor features across datasets. We generated gene expression values for a
similar dataset we produced previously (GSE103628[34]), which also consisted of transcriptome
data from PWBCs collected from heifers at the time of AI and were classified according to their
pregnancy outcome as AI-preg (n=6) or not-pregnant (n=6). This dataset was particularly fitting
for this interrogation because the sampling occurred one year earlier on the same site. We
combined the expression values of the previously produced dataset (year one) with those of the
current dataset (year two) and contrasted the transcript abundance between heifers that were
categorized as AI-preg versus not pregnant accounting for the different years as a fixed effect in
the model. This analysis identified 198 genes whose abundance were significantly different
between the two experimental groups (AI-preg, not pregnant, FDR<0.03, Fig. 5a, Supplementary
table 13).

We used the transcript abundance values for these 198 genes obtained from samples
collected in year one as input (training set) for machine learning algorithms to derive models of
prediction to discriminate pregnancy outcome (AI-preg or not-pregnant, Fig. 5b). Next, we used
the transcript abundance values for these 198 genes obtained from samples collected in year two
as input to the algorithms for a blind classification of pregnancy outcome (AI-preg or not-pregnant,
Fig. 5c). The accuracy of classifications was assessed based on the known pregnancy outcome,
and parallelized random forest was the algorithm that produced the greatest proportion of correct
classification of all 11 heifers tested (46.3% out of 2000 randomizations), followed by 53.1%
correct classification for 10 out of 11 heifers (Fig. 5d). Notably, the top five genes that showed the
largest degree of importance for the classification were *RPL39*, *SMIM26*, *LONRF3*, *GATA3*,
N6AMT1 (Fig. 5e), of which, *RPL39*, *SMIM26*, *N6AMT1* were up-regulated and *LONRF3* and
GATA3 were down-regulated in AI-preg heifers relative to the not- pregnant group (Fig. 5f).

DISCUSSION

Here, we report a multilayered transcriptome analysis of bloodborne transcripts sampled
on the day of AI. The main objective of our study was to understand gene regulatory networks[35]
occurring in PWBCs, and rewiring that can occur based on the heifer's fertility potential. We
focused on the day of artificial insemination because it is the last day prior to the fertilization, when
the heifer has the first opportunity to become pregnant. We interrogated mRNA and miRNA

abundance levels obtained from the same individuals using the coexpression framework, which

is a valuable systems biology approach to gain insights into the biology of complex traits[35].

Furthermore, using machine learning[36], we detected consistent altered gene transcript abundance

associated with infertility across independent datasets. Collectively, our results provide important

aspects of regulatory networks in PWBCs that shed light on the physiological status of an animal

and its preparedness for becoming pregnant.

Similar to work reported in humans[37], our gene network analysis focusing on mRNAs

detected several protein-coding genes with strong coexpression in PWBCs. Interestingly, nearly

all of the correlated expression inferred as statistically significant across all heifers ($|r|>0.98$,

FDR<0.02) were positive. As expected[38], in silico functional gene co-expression analysis

indicated groups of genes that are linked to specific biological processes. A contrast of

coexpressing pairs of genes between samples collected from not-pregnant heifers and the two

groups of heifers that became pregnant displayed a large number of connections present in not-

pregnant heifers that were not identified in both AI-preg and NB-preg heifers. Our strict criteria

($|r|>0.99$, eFDR<0.002) utilized to identify these altered connections indicate functional regulatory

relationships between selected genes.

Surprisingly, a great majority of the altered connections between gene pairs were present

gained in not-pregnant heifers, while there was minor loss of significant connections in not-

pregnant heifers relative to the AI-preg and NB-preg groups. The enrichment for specific biological

processes of genes that formed new negative connections was a clear evidence of the biological

relevance of these new connections. Notably, among genes annotated with proteolytic activity,

ADAM19[39], *ASRGL1*[40], *ATG4B*[41], *DPEP2*[42], *IMMP2L*[43], *PSMB9*[44], *SERPINE2*[45], *UCHL3*[46],

USP42[47] have been implicated in female infertility. A more drastic change in patterns of

coexpression was observed with the inversion of gene connections (significant pairwise

coexpression in one group with significant coexpression with opposite direction in another group).

These gene circuits changing from activation to repression are explained by current models of

incoherent feed-forward loops[48]. Cumulatively, the large occurrence of new connections and the

inverted connections created in PWBCs exclusively in not pregnant heifers indicate that gene

regulation is altered as an adaptative response to a stimulus.

Our profiling of small RNAs from plasma identified 263 annotated miRNAs, out of which

131 and 122 were previously identified in sera and circulating exosomes, respectively, among

other cattle organs[49]. Only 38 annotated miRNAs were profiled in peripheral blood mononucleated

cells in humans[50], which demonstrates that our plasma samples were depleted of intact cells.

Immuno-related cells composing the PWBC population can uptake circulating small
RNAs[51]. Although our data did not allow us to trace the origin of the tissue that produced the
miRNAs, we detected 33 circulating miRNAs whose abundance are associated with the
abundance of 106 protein-coding genes. As reported in humans[52], we quantified positive and
negative correlated abundance between miRNA and protein-coding genes. Negative correlations
mostly occur due to the targeting of mRNA by a specific miRNA. Indeed, we found several pairs
of miRNA:mRNA negatively correlated that had been identified as interacting pairs that fit this
model. By comparison, the positive coexpression between miRNA:mRNA pairs can be explained
by a miRNA targeting an intermediate gene, which in turn is negatively associated with a third
gene, thereby creating a positive correlation between a miRNA:mRNA pair (see Fig. 3 in
reference[53]). In our results, we only identify examples of miRNA:mRNA pairs that follow the
intermediate action of miRNAs when relaxing the stringent criteria for inference of significant
coexpression. Regardless of the model of interaction, it was notable that many protein-coding
genes that were coexpressed with miRNAs were enriched for specific biological processes,
including "regulation of gene expression". These results add further evidence to the growing body
of literature suggesting that circulating miRNAs act as mediators of cellular function[54,55].

We also tested whether circulating miRNA and PWBC mRNA pairs have differential
coexpression relative to the pregnancy outcome. Following the same trend observed for
miRNA:mRNA coexpression in PWBCs, there were 1000-fold more miRNA:mRNA connections
that were present in heifers that did not become pregnant compared to the loss in coexpression.
Results from gene enrichment analysis support the notion that genes forming new miRNA:mRNA
coexpression connections in not-pregnant heifers function in the immune system, although our
data do not permit inferences on whether particular immune processes were more or less
functional in not-pregnant heifers.

Critical aspects of female fertility are tied to an appropriate regulation of the immune
system. Maternal immune tolerance to pregnancy starts with the exposure to proteins in the
semen[56], and is carried throughout placentation and pregnancy establishment[57]. Notably, 24 out
of 26 differentially expressed genes between pregnant (AI-preg and NB-preg) and not-pregnant
heifers showed greater abundance in not-pregnant heifers relative to the other two groups. (AI-
preg and NB-preg). While we did not detect differential abundance of miRNAs relative to
pregnancy outcome, the gain of coexpression between miRNAs and mRNAs from differentially
expressed genes functionally linked with immunology is in line with regulatory roles that certain
miRNAs exert on immune cells[58]. This result lead us to hypothesize that the heifers in the not-

pregnant group have a heightened activity of specific cells or functions in the immune system
relative to the heifers that became pregnant. It remains unclear, however, if this possible higher
activity was stimulated by extrinsic factors or is within the naturally-occurring variation[59].

The results of differential gene expression and differential coexpression fostered a
hypothesis that transcript abundance in the PWBCs can be used as predictors of pregnancy
outcome. We tested this hypothesis by applying machine learning algorithms on two groups of
heifers that were bred in 2015 (year one) and 2016 (year two). Parallel random forest emerged
as the algorithm with over 90% efficiency of classification nearly all trials executed, which confirms
the potential of accurate classification of samples using RNA-seq data under the case-control
framework[60,61]. The results show that while not one single gene emerges as a potential biomarker,
the accumulated information of transcript abundance from multiple genes can be powerful for the
identification of fertility potential in cattle.

Although we detected altered coexpression with high confidence, and in some instances,
with significant enrichment of genes in specific gene ontology terms, the consequence of the
differential coexpression on those biological functions remains undetermined. In addition, it
remains unclear whether the altered patterns of gene expression profiles are connected to
immune functions that are related to infertility[62]. The data analyzed here does not allow us to infer
causality[63], however our results converge to a strong indication that differences in gene
expression profiles are associated[63] with fertility in cattle.

In summary, analyses of mRNA from PWBCs and circulating extracellular miRNA by
multiple approaches (differential gene expression, differential gene coexpression and machine
learning classification) provided complementary evidence that gene expression profiles in the
PWBCs are associated with the fertility potential in beef heifers. The overall difference detected
in transcript abundance for specific genes is reproducible across samples and show promise for
the development of predictors of fertility potential in beef cattle.

METHODS

Heifer classification according to pregnancy outcome

All procedures with animals were performed in accordance with protocols approved by
Institutional Animal and Care and Use Committee at Auburn University.

Crossbred female calves (n=32, Angus-Simmental, *Bos taurus*) were developed as
replacement heifers[64,65] at the Black Belt Research and Extension Center (Auburn University).
Thirty-four days prior to AI, heifers were evaluated for reproductive tract score (scale of 1-5[66]) and
body condition score (BCS; scale of 1-9[67]) for the assertion that morphological and physiological
conditions were suitable for breeding. One animal was eliminated from the breeding herd at this
time.

Thirty one animals, 14 months of age on average, underwent estrous synchronization for
fixed-time artificial insemination utilizing the 7-Day Co-Synch + CIDR protocol[68]. An experienced
veterinarian inseminated all heifers with semen from sires of proven fertility. Fourteen days after
insemination, heifers were exposed to two fertile bulls for natural breeding for 60 days. An
experienced veterinarian performed pregnancy evaluation by transrectal palpation on days 69
and 120 post artificial insemination. Presence or absence of a conceptus, alongside
morphological features indicating fetal age were used to classify heifers as pregnant to AI (AI-
pregnant), pregnant to natural breeding (NB-pregnant), or not-pregnant.

Collection, processing and preservation of biological material

Immediately after AI, 10ml of blood was drawn from the jugular vein into vacutainers
containing 18mg K2 EDTA (Becton, Dickinson and Company, Franklin, NJ). The tubes were
inverted to prevent blood coagulation and immersed in ice for approximately 4 hours. Plasma and
buffy coat were separated by centrifugation for 10 minutes at 2000×g at 4°C. Plasma was
removed (~1.5ml) and centrifuged 10 minutes at 500×g at 4°C for further removal of cells. The
plasma devoid of cells was then transferred to a new microcentrifuge tube and preserved at -
80°C. The buffy coat was removed and deposited into 14ml of red blood cell lysis solution (0.15
M ammonium chloride, 10mM potassium bicarbonate, 0.1mM EDTA, Cold Spring Harbor
Protocols) for 10 minutes at room temperature (24-25°C). After a centrifugation, 800xg for 10
minutes, the solution was discarded and the pellet containing PWBCs was re-suspended in 200
μl of RNAlater® (Lifetechnologies™, Carlsbad, CA). PWBC samples were stored at -80°C.

RNA extraction, library preparation, and RNA sequencing

Total RNA was isolated from PWBCs of 18 heifers (AI-pregnant (n=6), NB-pregnant (n=6),
and not-pregnant (n=6)) using TRIzol™ reagent (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA)[69,70] following the
manufacturer's protocol. RNA yield was quantified using the Qubit™ RNA Broad Range Assay
Kit (Eurogene, OR) on a Qubit® Fluorometer, and integrity was assessed on an Agilent 2100
Bioanalyzer (Agilent, Santa Clara, CA) using an Agilent RNA 6000 Nano kit (Agilent, Santa Clara,

CA). Aproximatly 500 μg of total RNA was used as input for the TruSeq Stranded mRNA Library
Prep kit (Illumina, Inc., San Diego, CA); and library preparation was carried out following
manufacturer's instructions. Libraries were quantified with the Qubit™ dsDNA High Sensitivity
Assay Kit (Eurogene, OR); and quality was evaluated using the High Sensitivity DNA chip (Agilent,
Santa Clara, CA) on an Agilent 2100 Bioanalyzer. Libraries were sequenced in a HiSeq2500
system at the Genomic Services Laboratory at HudsonAlpha, Huntsville, AL to generate 125nt
long, pair-end reads.

Total RNA (circulating extracellular RNA) was isolated from 1ml of plasma by adding 9 ml
of TRIzol™ reagent and following manufacturer's protocols through organic phase separation. The
aqueous phase containing the RNA was then collected and purified with the RNA Clean &
Concentrator-5 kit (ZymoResearch, Irvine, CA), according to manufacturer's instructions. Total
RNA yield was quantified in test samples using the Qubit™ RNA Broad Range Assay Kit
averaging 21.4ng, whereas samples prepared for sequencing were not quantified and all of the
eluted RNA was directly used for library preparation.

Total RNA obtained from plasma was desiccated to a volume of 2.5μl for library
preparation with the TruSeq Small RNA Library Prep kit (Illumina, Inc., San Diego, CA) following
manufacturer's instructions, with the minor alteration that reagent volumes were halved in all
reactions until reverse transcription was performed, as described elsewhere[71]. After PCR
amplification, libraries were loaded onto a 10% polyacrylamide gel[72] and electrophoresis was
carried out for three hours at 100 volts alongside a 25/100 bp mixed DNA ladder (Bioneer,
Alameda, CA); and the custom DNA ladder included in the TruSeq Small RNA Library Prep kit.
The gel was soaked in GelRed® Nucleic Acid Gel Stain (Biotium, Inc., Fremont, CA) for DNA
staining. DNA bands in the range of 145 -160 base pairs were isolated from the gel by the crush-
and-soak method[73] with the following modifications. Gel fragments were placed into a 0.5 ml tube
containing small holes at the bottom, mounted into a 2ml tube. The tubes were centrifuged at
14,000xg for two minutes at room temperature. The crushed gel was soaked in 200μl of water at
4°C overnight, followed by removal of the solution containing the library to a new tube.

Concentration of each library was determined by Qubit™ dsDNA High Sensitivity Assay
Kit, and the volume corresponding to 1.5ng of each library was pooled for further purification with
the DNA Clean & Concentrator™-5 (ZymoResearch, Irvine, CA) following the manufacturer's
instructions. The pool was quantified with Qubit™ dsDNA High Sensitivity Assay Kit, and the DNA
profile was evaluated using the High Sensitivity DNA chip on an Agilent 2100 Bioanalyzer.

Libraries were sequenced in a NextSeq system at the Genomic Services Laboratory at
HudsonAlpha, Huntsville, AL to generate 75nt long, single end reads.

Raw sequences and metadata are deposited in the Gene Expression Omnibus database
(GSE146041)

RNA sequencing data processing

Sequences were submitted to a custom build bioinformatics pipeline[74,75,76]. Reads were
aligned to the bovine genome (ARS-UCD1.2 obtained from Ensembl[77]) using HISAT2[78].
Sequences aligning to multiple places on the genome, or with 5 or more mismatches, were filtered
out. The sequences were then marked for duplicates, and non-duplicated pairs of reads (mRNA)
or single reads (miRNA) were used for transcript quantification at the gene level. The fragments
were counted against the Ensembl gene annotation[79] (version 1.87) using featureCounts[80].
RNAseq data from one animal (not-pregnant) were removed from analysis due to low sequencing
yield (613,765 reads).

Filtering of lowly expressed genes

All analytical procedures were carried out in R software[81]. Supplementary Code contain
all scripts used for analytical procedures described below and the creation of the plots, which can
also be obtained on figshare[82].

Counts per million (CPM), and fragments per kilobase per million reads (FPKM) were
calculated using "edgeR"[83]. In order to remove quantification uncertainty associated to lowly
expressed genes and erroneous identification of differentially expressed genes[84,85], we retained
genes with at least 2 CPM for PWBC mRNA or at least 1 CPM for plasma miRNA in five or more
samples for downstream analyses. Further analytical procedures were carried out with genes
annotated as "protein-coding" and "miRNA" for the PWBC RNA-sequencing and plasma small
RNA-sequencing, respectively.

Pair-wise gene coexpression and differential coexpression for protein-coding genes

First, we calculated pair-wise Pearson's correlation coefficient (r)[86,87] for all 17 animals
sampled. Significance of the correlations was assessed using the "TestCor" package based on
the empirical statistical test and the large-scale correlation test with normal approximation[88] for
the calculation of the false discovery rate (FDR). Further biological interpretation of results was

performed on pairs of genes if abs(r)>0.98, which corresponded to a nominal P≤1.2x10^{-16} and
FDR<0.02.

Next, we calculated within group pair-wise Pearson's correlation coefficient (*r*) for each
group: AI-pregnant, NB-pregnant, and not-pregnant. We interpreted a differential correlation as
biologically meaningful based on the following scenarios, assuming that groups 1 and 2 can be
assigned arbitrarily: inverted correlation, if $|r_{group\ 1} - r_{group\ 2}| > 1.95$; gained correlation in group
1 and lost correlation in group 2, if $|r_{group\ 1}| > 0.99$ and $-0.1 < r_{group\ 2} < 0.1$.

Significance was estimated by the eFDR approach[75,89,90]. We resampled (5000
randomizations) the labels of pregnancy outcome and calculated *r* for each pair of genes in the
scrambled data set (*r*$_{scramble}$). eFDR was obtained based on the proportion of the *r*$_{scramble}$ greater
than a specified *r* (i.e.: for r=0.99, eFDR<0.002, Supplementary Fig. 1), relative to the total number
of correlations calculated using the formulas described elsewhere[75,89,90].

mRNA-miRNA coexpression and differential coexpression

We calculated Pearson's correlation (*r*)[86,87] values between miRNA and mRNA genes for
all 17 samples. Significance was estimated by the eFDR approach[75,89,90] by shuffling (5000
randomizations) the animal identification on mRNA dataset, thus breaking the common source of
both RNA types (Supplementary Fig. 2).

Pearson's correlation (r) values were calculated for mRNA-miRNA transcript pairs within
groups: AI-pregnant, NB-pregnant, and not-pregnant heifers. We interpreted a differential
correlation as biologically meaningful based on the following scenarios $|r_{group\ 1}| > 0.99$ and
$-0.1 < r_{group\ 2} < 0.1$. Significance was assessed by the eFDR approach (Supplementary Fig. 3).
We further interrogated the data for experimentally validated miRNA-mRNA interactions obtained
from miRWalk database (version 3)[91,92].

Differential expression of mRNA and miRNA

Differences of transcript levels between groups based on the pregnancy outcome were
determined from fragment counts using "edgeR"[83] and "DESeq2"[93]. For each comparison, a gene
was initially inferred as differentially expressed if the nominal P value was ≤0.03 in both "edgeR"
and "DESeq2" analyses. This nominal P value corresponded to eFDR≤0.05 (Supplementary Fig.
4), as calculated according to the procedure and formulas outlined elsewhere[75,89,90] using 10000
randomizations of sample reshuffling. Genes inferred as differentially expressed based on P
values were further selected through "leave-one-out" cross validation[94,95]. Only genes whose

significance were maintained after all rounds of sampling were further considered for biological
interpretation.

Testing for enrichment of gene ontology terms and KEGG pathways

Differentially expressed genes and genes that displayed differential coexpression among
heifers of AI-pregnant, NB-pregnant, and not-pregnant classifications were analyzed for
enrichment of Gene Ontology[96] categories and KEGG Pathways[97]. In all tests, the background
gene list consisted of all genes detected as expressed in our dataset[98]. GO annotations and
transcript lengths were obtained from BioMart[99] and KEGG annotation was obtained from the
"org.Bt.eg.db" package. We used "GoSeq" package[100] to estimate significance of category
enrichment using the sampling method[100]. We utilized FDR for multiple testing under
dependency[101], and inferred statistical significance of GO terms and KEGG pathways if FDR <
0.10.

Assessment of predictive potential of gene expression levels by machine learning algorithms.

We focused the mRNA sequencing data from AI-pregnant and not-pregnant heifers from
this report and data we collected from the same site on the previous year and published
elsewhere[34,76]. The raw sequences from the previous dataset were realigned, and data were
treated as described above.

To remove the genes not informative to the machine learning algorithm, we identified
differentially expressed genes between the two groups (AI-pregnant and not-pregnant). We used
the same procedures and standards aforementioned with the exception that we added year as a
fixed effect into the model. There were 198 genes differentially expressed between these two
groups (AI-preg and not-pregnant). We performed a variance stabilizing transformation on the
counts for these 198 genes, and the transformed data were used as input.

For the machine learning approach, we used the expression data for the 198 DEGs from
year one (2015) as a training set and the data for the same group of genes from year two (2016)
as a test set. Initially we processed the training set for the development of models and assessed
the prediction accuracy for 86 classification algorithms (Supplementary Fig. 5). Accuracy was
determined by the number of samples correctly classified divided by the number of samples tested
(n=11). The models that showed prediction accuracy ≥ 0.9 (classified correctly at least 10
samples, accuracy P value ≤ 0.01), were further subjected to 2000 random predictions with
different initial 'seed' numbers.

 FIGURE LEGEND

Fig. 1: Overview of the experimental design and data. a Schematics of the experimental design,

classification scheme based on fertility, data produced and overview of the analyses. b

Dimensionality reduction of the transcriptome data obtained from the mRNA abundance of

protein-coding genes in PWBCs and plasma extracellular miRNA.

Fig. 2: mRNA:mRNA coexpression in PWBCs. a Network of genes with highly correlated mRNA

abundance. b Coexpression of 1860 protein-coding genes in pregnant heifers (AI-preg and NB-

preg). c Profile of the differential coexpression in heifers classified as not-pregnant relative to the

counterparts that became pregnant. d Scatterplot of selected genes associated with "proteolysis"

that were coexpressed in heifers classified as not-pregnant relative to the counterparts that

became pregnant. e Scatterplot of selected genes associated with "negative regulation of

transcription by RNA polymerase II" that showed inverted coexpression in heifers classified as

not-pregnant relative to the counterparts that became pregnant.

Fig. 3: miRNA from plasma coexpressed with mRNA in PWBCs. a miRNA:mRNA pairs

significantly coexpressed whose genes are significantly enriched in specific biological processes.

b miRNA:mRNA pairs significantly coexpressed with evidence of interaction from miRBase. c

Scatterplots of selected pairs representing differential coexpression between miRNA:mRNA in

heifers classified as not-pregnant relative to the counterparts that became pregnant

Fig. 4: Differential coexpression among heifers of different reproductive outcome. a Heatmap

depicting the expression levels of genes differentially expressed according to specific contrasts.

b Transcript abundance of the genes differentially expressed on both contrasts: AI-preg vs not-

pregnant and NB-preg vs not-pregnat. c miRNA:mRNA pairs significantly coexpressed whose

protein-coding genes are differentially expressed in PWBCs based on pregnancy outcome.

Fig. 5: Prediction of pregnancy outcome based on mRNA levels and machine learning algorithms.

a Representation of the contrasting of gene expression levels of heifers classified as AI-preg and

not-pregnant from two years and the number of differentially expressed genes (DEGs). b

Depiction of the training set used as input for the modeling of the transcriptome dataset by multiple

machine learning algorithms. c Depiction of the data used as the test set for prediction of
pregnancy outcome and the representation of the calculation of accuracy. d Accuracy of blind
pregnancy prediction based on the algorithm "parallel random forest" in 2000 trials. e Variable
importance for the top five genes. f Transcript levels for the top five genes most informative for
the machine learning algorithm to classify pregnancy outcome.

DATA AVAIABILITY

All raw sequencing files and raw read counts are deposited in the National Center for
Biotechnology Information under the Gene Expression Omnibus database, accession:
GSE146041 and GSE103628. All the intermediate data and results produced from raw files can
be reproduced based on the codes available on Supplementary Code.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

F.B. conceived designed and supervised the experiments. S.E.M. performed sample collection,
library preparations, contributed to the data analysis, prepared the first draft and edited the final
draft. B.N.W. contributed to sample collection, assisted on the laboratory assays and editing of
the final draft. M.F.E. is responsible for the acquisition and curation of the animal database. J.B.E
and S.P.R. were responsible for the health and reproductive management of the animals. F.B.
conceived designed, supervised the experiments, contributed to data analysis and wrote the final
draft.
498

REFERENCES

1. Zegers-Hochschild F*, et al.* The International Glossary on Infertility and Fertility Care, 2017. *Fertil Steril* **108**, 393-406 (2017).

2. Boivin J, Bunting L, Collins JA, Nygren KG. International estimates of infertility prevalence and treatment-seeking: potential need and demand for infertility medical care. *Human reproduction (Oxford, England)* **22**, 1506-1512 (2007).

3. Dickinson SE*, et al.* Evaluation of age, weaning weight, body condition score, and reproductive tract score in pre-selected beef heifers relative to reproductive potential. *J Anim Sci Biotechnol* **10**, 18 (2019).

4. Gajbhiye R, Fung JN, Montgomery GW. Complex genetics of female fertility. *NPJ Genom Med* **3**, 29 (2018).

5. Peters SO*, et al.* Heritability and Bayesian genome-wide association study of first service conception and pregnancy in Brangus heifers. *Journal of Animal Science* **2013**, 605-612 (2013).

6. Neupane M*, et al.* Loci and pathways associated with uterine capacity for pregnancy and fertility in beef cattle. *PLoS One* **12**, e0188997 (2017).

7. McDaneld TG*, et al.* Genomewide association study of reproductive efficiency in female cattle. *Journal of Animal Science* **2014**, 1945-1957 (2014).

8. McDaneld TG*, et al.* Y are you not pregnant: Identification of Y chromosome segments in female cattle with decreased reproductive efficiency. *Journal of Animal Science* **90**, 2142-2151 (2012).

9. de Camargo GM, Costa RB, de Albuquerque LG, Regitano LC, Baldi F, Tonhati H. Association between JY-1 gene polymorphisms and reproductive traits in beef cattle. *Gene* **533**, 477-480 (2014).

10. Dias MM*, et al.* Study of lipid metabolism-related genes as candidate genes of sexual precocity in Nellore cattle. *Genet Mol Res* **14**, 234-243 (2015).

11. Irano N*, et al.* Genome-wide association study for indicator traits of sexual precocity in Nellore cattle. *PLoS One* **11**, e0159502 (2016).

12. Junior GAO*, et al.* Genomic study and medical subject headings enrichment analysis of early pregnancy rate and antral follicle numbers in Nelore heifers. *Journal of Animal Science* **95**, 4796-4812 (2017).

13. Kosova G, Abney M, Ober C. Colloquium papers: Heritability of reproductive fitness traits in a human population. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **107 Suppl 1**, 1772-1778 (2010).

545
546 14. Fortes MRS*, et al.* Gene network analyses of first service conception in Brangus heifers:
547   Use of genome and trait associations, hypothalamic-transcriptome information, and
548   transcription factors. *Journal of Animal Science* **2012**, 2894-2906 (2012).
549
550 15. Doyle SP, Golden BL, Green RD, Brinks JS. Additive genetic parameter estimates for
551   heifer pregnancy and subsequent reproduction in Angus females. *Journal of Animal*
552   *Science* **78**, 2091-2098 (2000).
553
554 16. Toghiani S, Hay E, Sumreddee P, Geary TW, Rekaya R, Roberts AJ. Genomic prediction
555   of continuous and binary fertility traits of females in a composite beef cattle breed.
556   *Journal of Animal Science* **95**, 4787-4795 (2017).
557
558 17. Bormann JM, Totir LR, Kachman SD, Fernando RL, Wilson DE. Pregnancy rate and
559   first-service conception rate in Angus heifers. *Journal of Animal Science* **84**, 2022-2025
560   (2006).
561
562 18. McAllister CM, Speidel SE, Crews DH, Jr., Enns RM. Genetic parameters for
563   intramuscular fat percentage, marbling score, scrotal circumference, and heifer pregnancy
564   in Red Angus cattle. *Journal of Animal Science* **89**, 2068-2072 (2011).
565
566 19. Boddhireddy P, Kelly MJ, Northcutt S, Prayaga KC, Rumph J, DeNise S. Genomic
567   predictions in Angus cattle: Comparisons of sample size, response variables, and
568   clustering methods for cross-validation. *Journal of Animal Science* **92**, 485-497 (2014).
569
570 20. Adams GP, Pierson RA. Bovine Model for Study of Ovarian Follicular Dynamics in
571   Humans. *Theriogenology* **43**, 113-120 (1995).
572
573 21. Abedal-Majed MA, Cupp AS. Livestock animals to study infertility in women. *Anim*
574   *Front* **9**, 28-33 (2019).
575
576 22. Henchion M, Hayes M, Mullen AM, Fenelon M, Tiwari B. Future Protein Supply and
577   Demand: Strategies and Factors Influencing a Sustainable Equilibrium. *Foods* **6**, (2017).
578
579 23. Cushman RA, Kill LK, Funston RN, Mousel EM, Perry GA. Heifer calving date
580   positively influences calf weaning weights through six parturitions. *Journal of Animal*
581   *Science* **2013**, 4486-4491 (2013).
582
583 24. Marshall DM, Minqiang W, Freking BA. Relative calving date of first-calf heifers as
584   related to production efficiency and subsequent reproductive performance. *Journal of*
585   *Animal Science* **68**, 1812-1817 (1990).
586
587 25. Lesmeister JL, Burfening PJ, Blackwell RL. Date of first calving in beef cows and
588   subsequent calf production. *Journal of Animal Science* **36**, 1-6 (1973).
589

590 26. Damiran D, Larson KA, Pearce LT, Erickson NE, Lardner BHA. Effect of calving period
591 on beef cow longevity and lifetime productivity in western Canada. *Translational Animal*
592 *Science* **2**, S61-S65 (2018).
593
594 27. Morris CA, Cullen NG. A note on genetic correlations between pubertal traits of males or
595 females and lifetime pregnancy rate in beef cattle. *Livestock Production Science* **39**, 291-
596 297 (1994).
597
598 28. Mwansa PB, Kemp RA, Jr DHC, Kastelic JP, Bailey DRC, Coulter GH. Selection for
599 cow lifetime pregnancy rate using bull and heifer growth and reproductive traits in
600 composite cattle. *Canadian Journal of Animal Science* **80**, 507-510 (2000).
601
602 29. Li-Pook-Than J, Snyder M. iPOP goes the world: integrated personalized Omics profiling
603 and the road toward improved health care. *Chem Biol* **20**, 660-666 (2013).
604
605 30. Mancuso N, Shi H, Goddard P, Kichaev G, Gusev A, Pasaniuc B. Integrating Gene
606 Expression with Summary Association Statistics to Identify Genes Associated with 30
607 Complex Traits. *Am J Hum Genet* **100**, 473-487 (2017).
608
609 31. Gusev A*, et al.* Integrative approaches for large-scale transcriptome-wide association
610 studies. *Nat Genet* **48**, 245-252 (2016).
611
612 32. Ioannidis J, Donadeu FX. Circulating microRNA profiles during the bovine oestrous
613 cycle. *PLoS One* **11**, e0158160 (2016).
614
615 33. Dickinson SE*, et al.* Transcriptome profiles in peripheral white blood cells at the time of
616 artificial insemination discriminate beef heifers with different fertility potential. *BMC*
617 *Genomics* **19**, 129 (2018).
618
619 34. Dickinson SE*, et al.* Transcriptome profiles in peripheral white blood cells at the time of
620 artificial insemination discriminate beef heifers with different fertility potential. *BMC*
621 *Genomics* **19**, (2018).
622
623 35. Emmert-Streib F, Dehmer M, Haibe-Kains B. Gene regulatory networks and their
624 applications: understanding biological and medical problems in terms of networks. *Front*
625 *Cell Dev Biol* **2**, 38 (2014).
626
627 36. Xu C, Jackson SA. Machine learning and complex biological data. *Genome Biol* **20**, 76
628 (2019).
629
630 37. Monaco G*, et al.* RNA-Seq Signatures Normalized by mRNA Abundance Allow
631 Absolute Deconvolution of Human Immune Cell Types. *Cell Rep* **26**, 1627-1640 e1627
632 (2019).
633

634   38.   van Dam S, Vosa U, van der Graaf A, Franke L, de Magalhaes JP. Gene co-expression
635   analysis for functional classification and gene-disease predictions. *Brief Bioinform* **19**,
636   575-592 (2018).
637

638   39.   Sheridan MA*, et al.* Early onset preeclampsia in a model for human placental trophoblast.
639   *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **116**, 4336-4345 (2019).
640

641   40.   Fitzgerald HC*, et al.* Idiopathic infertility in women is associated with distinct changes in
642   proliferative phase uterine fluid proteins. *Biol Reprod* **98**, 752-764 (2018).
643

644   41.   Yang HL, Mei J, Chang KK, Zhou WJ, Huang LQ, Li MQ. Autophagy in endometriosis.
645   *Am J Transl Res* **9**, 4707-4725 (2017).
646

647   42.   Pelch KE, Schroder AL, Kimball PA, Sharpe-Timms KL, Davis JW, Nagel SC. Aberrant
648   gene expression profile in a mouse model of endometriosis mirrors that observed in
649   women. *Fertil Steril* **93**, 1615-1627 e1618 (2010).
650

651   43.   Demain LA, Conway GS, Newman WG. Genetics of mitochondrial dysfunction and
652   infertility. *Clin Genet* **91**, 199-207 (2017).
653

654   44.   Koks S*, et al.* The differential transcriptome and ontology profiles of floating and
655   cumulus granulosa cells in stimulated human antral follicles. *Mol Hum Reprod* **16**, 229-
656   240 (2010).
657

658   45.   Li SH*, et al.* Correlation of cumulus gene expression of GJA1, PRSS35, PTX3, and
659   SERPINE2 with oocyte maturation, fertilization, and embryo development. *Reprod Biol
660   Endocrinol* **13**, 93 (2015).
661

662   46.   Mtango NR, Sutovsky M, Susor A, Zhong Z, Latham KE, Sutovsky P. Essential role of
663   maternal UCHL1 and UCHL3 in fertilization and preimplantation embryo development.
664   *J Cell Physiol* **227**, 1592-1603 (2012).
665

666   47.   Ingham NJ*, et al.* Mouse screen reveals multiple new genes underlying mouse and human
667   hearing loss. *PLoS Biol* **17**, e3000194 (2019).
668

669   48.   Reeves GT. The engineering principles of combining a transcriptional incoherent
670   feedforward loop with negative feedback. *J Biol Eng* **13**, 62 (2019).
671

672   49.   Sun HZ, Chen Y, Guan LL. MicroRNA expression profiles across blood and different
673   tissues in cattle. *Sci Data* **6**, 190013 (2019).
674

675   50.   Vaz C*, et al.* Analysis of microRNA transcriptome by deep sequencing of small RNA
676   libraries of peripheral blood. *BMC Genomics* **11**, 288 (2010).
677

678   51.   Fritz JV*, et al.* Sources and Functions of Extracellular Small RNAs in Human
679   Circulation. *Annu Rev Nutr* **36**, 301-336 (2016).

681   52.   Diaz G, Zamboni F, Tice A, Farci P. Integrated ordination of miRNA and mRNA
682   expression profiles. *BMC Genomics* **16**, 767 (2015).

684   53.   Ritchie W, Rajasekhar M, Flamant S, Rasko JE. Conserved expression patterns predict
685   microRNA targets. *PLoS Comput Biol* **5**, e1000513 (2009).

687   54.   Bayraktar R, Van Roosbroeck K, Calin GA. Cell-to-cell communication: microRNAs as
688   hormones. *Mol Oncol* **11**, 1673-1686 (2017).

690   55.   Rayner KJ, Hennessy EJ. Extracellular communication via microRNA: lipid particles
691   have a new message. *J Lipid Res* **54**, 1174-1181 (2013).

693   56.   Robertson SA, Sharkey DJ. The role of semen in induction of maternal immune tolerance
694   to pregnancy. *Semin Immunol* **13**, 243-254 (2001).

696   57.   Moffett A, Loke C. Immunology of placentation in eutherian mammals. *Nat Rev*
697   *Immunol* **6**, 584-594 (2006).

699   58.   Momen-Heravi F, Bala S. miRNA regulation of innate immunity. *J Leukoc Biol*, (2018).

701   59.   Hughes HD, Carroll JA, Burdick Sanchez NC, Richeson JT. Natural variations in the
702   stress and acute phase responses of cattle. *Innate Immun* **20**, 888-896 (2014).

704   60.   Wenric S, Shemirani R. Using Supervised Learning Methods for Gene Selection in RNA-
705   Seq Case-Control Studies. *Front Genet* **9**, 297 (2018).

707   61.   Zararsiz G*, et al.* A comprehensive simulation study on classification of RNA-Seq data.
708   *PLoS One* **12**, e0182507 (2017).

710   62.   Brazdova A, Senechal H, Peltre G, Poncet P. Immune Aspects of Female Infertility. *Int J*
711   *Fertil Steril* **10**, 1-10 (2016).

713   63.   Altman N, Krzywinski M. Association, correlation and causation. *Nat Methods* **12**, 899-
714   900 (2015).

716   64.   Patterson DJ, Smith MF. Management considerations in beef heifer development and
717   puberty. *Vet Clin North Am Food Anim Pract* **29**, xiii-xiv (2013).

719   65.   Larson RL, White BJ, Laflin S. Beef Heifer Development. *Vet Clin North Am Food Anim*
720   *Pract* **32**, 285-302 (2016).

722   66.   Holm DE, Thompson PN, Irons PC. The value of reproductive tract scoring as a predictor
723   of fertility and production outcomes in beef heifers. *J Anim Sci* **87**, 1934-1940 (2009).

67. Rae DO, Kunkle WE, Chenoweth PJ, Sand RS, Tran T. Relationship of parity and body condition score to pregnancy rate in Florida beef-cattle. *Theriogenology* **1993**, 1143-1152 (1993).

68. Larson JE*, et al.* Synchronization of estrus in suckled beef cows for detected estrus and artificial insemination and timed artificial insemination using gonadotropin-releasing hormone, prostaglandin F2α, and progesterone. *Journal of Animal Science* **2006**, 332–342 (2006).

69. Rio DC, Ares M, Jr., Hannon GJ, Nilsen TW. Purification of RNA using TRIzol (TRI reagent). *Cold Spring Harb Protoc* **2010**, pdb prot5439 (2010).

70. Chomczynski P, Sacchi N. The single-step method of RNA isolation by acid guanidinium thiocyanate-phenol-chloroform extraction: twenty-something years on. *Nat Protoc* **1**, 581-585 (2006).

71. Yeri A*, et al.* Total Extracellular Small RNA Profiles from Plasma, Saliva, and Urine of Healthy Subjects. *Scientific Reports* **7**, 44061 (2017).

72. Chory J, Pollard JD, Jr. Separation of small DNA fragments by conventional gel electrophoresis. *Curr Protoc Mol Biol* **Chapter 2**, Unit2 7 (2001).

73. Green MR, Sambrook J. Isolation of DNA Fragments from Polyacrylamide Gels by the Crush and Soak Method. *Cold Spring Harb Protoc* **2019**, pdb prot100479 (2019).

74. Biase FH*, et al.* Massive dysregulation of genes involved in cell signaling and placental development in cloned cattle conceptus and maternal endometrium. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **113**, 14492-14501 (2016).

75. Biase FH, Kimble KM. Functional signaling and gene regulatory networks between the oocyte and the surrounding cumulus cells. *BMC Genomics* **19**, 351 (2018).

76. Dickinson SE, Biase FH. Transcriptome data of peripheral white blood cells from beef heifers collected at the time of artificial insemination. *Data Brief* **18**, 706-709 (2018).

77. Kinsella RJ*, et al.* Ensembl BioMarts: a hub for data retrieval across taxonomic space. *Database* **2011**, bar030 (2011).

78. Kim D, Langmead B, Salzberg SL. HISAT: a fast spliced aligner with low memory requirements. *Nat Methods* **12**, 357-360 (2015).

79. Flicek P*, et al.* Ensembl 2014. *Nucleic Acids Res* **42**, D749-755 (2014).

80. Liao Y, Smyth GK, Shi W. featureCounts: an efficient general purpose program for assigning sequence reads to genomic features. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 923-930 (2014).

771   81.   Ihaka R, Gentleman. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. *Journal*
772   *of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **5**, 299-214 (2012).
773

774   82.   Biase FH.Supplementary code and files to Rewiring of gene expression in PWBC at
775   artificial insemination is predictive of pregnancy outcome in cattle (Bos taurus).
776   https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.11985666.v2.
777

778   83.   Robinson MD, McCarthy DJ, Smyth GK. edgeR: a Bioconductor package for differential
779   expression analysis of digital gene expression data. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 139-140 (2010).
780

781   84.   Bullard JH, Purdom E, Hansen KD, Dudoit S. Evaluation of statistical methods for
782   normalization and differential expression in mRNA-Seq experiments. *BMC*
783   *Bioinformatics* **11**, 94 (2010).
784

785   85.   Robinson MD, Oshlack A. A scaling normalization method for differential expression
786   analysis of RNA-seq data. *Genome Biol* **11**, R25 (2010).
787

788   86.   Bansal M, Belcastro V, Ambesi-Impiombato A, di Bernardo D. How to infer gene
789   networks from expression profiles. *Mol Syst Biol* **3**, (2007).
790

791   87.   Serin EA, Nijveen H, Hilhorst HW, Ligterink W. Learning from Co-expression
792   Networks: Possibilities and Challenges. *Front Plant Sci* **7**, 444 (2016).
793

794   88.   Cai TT, Liu W. Large-Scale Multiple Testing of Correlations. *J Am Stat Assoc* **111**, 229-
795   240 (2016).
796

797   89.   Storey JD, Tibshirani R. Statistical significance for genomewide studies. *P Natl Acad Sci*
798   *USA* **100**, 9440-9445 (2003).
799

800   90.   Sham PC, Purcell SM. Statistical power and significance testing in large-scale genetic
801   studies. *Nat Rev Genet* **15**, 335-346 (2014).
802

803   91.   Dweep H, Sticht C, Pandey P, Gretz N. miRWalk--database: prediction of possible
804   miRNA binding sites by "walking" the genes of three genomes. *J Biomed Inform* **44**, 839-
805   847 (2011).
806

807   92.   Dweep H, Gretz N. miRWalk2.0: a comprehensive atlas of microRNA-target
808   interactions. *Nat Methods* **12**, 697 (2015).
809

810   93.   Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for
811   RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol* **15**, 550 (2014).
812

813   94.   Picard RR, Cook RD. Cross-Validation of Regression-Models. *J Am Stat Assoc* **79**, 575-
814   583 (1984).
815

95.   Breiman L, Spector P. Submodel Selection and Evaluation in Regression - the X-Random
Case. *Int Stat Rev* **60**, 291-319 (1992).

96.   Ashburner M*, et al.* Gene ontology: tool for the unification of biology. The Gene
Ontology Consortium. *Nat Genet* **25**, 25-29 (2000).

97.   Du J, Yuan Z, Ma Z, Song J, Xie X, Chen Y. KEGG-PATH: Kyoto encyclopedia of
genes and genomes-based pathway analysis using a path analysis model. *Molecular*
BioSystems **10**, 2441-2447 (2014).

98.   Timmons JA, Szkop KJ, Gallagher IJ. Multiple sources of bias confound functional
enrichment analysis of global -omics data. *Genome Biol* **16**, 186 (2015).

99.   Durinck S*, et al.* BioMart and Bioconductor: a powerful link between biological
databases and microarray data analysis. *Bioinformatics* **21**, 3439-3440 (2005).

100.   Young MD, Wakefield MJ, Smyth GK, Oshlack A. Gene ontology analysis for RNA-seq:
accounting for selection bias. *Genome Biology* **11**, R14 (2010).

101.   Benjamini Y, Yekutieli D. The control of the false discovery rate in multiple testing
under dependency. *Ann Statist* **29**, 1165-1188 (2001).

Figure 1

Figure 2

844
845

846   Figure 3

847
848

849   Figure 4

852   Figure 5