Journal of Assisted Reproduction and Genetics (2024) 41:359–362
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10815-023-03005-5

CORRECTION

Correction to: Does cleavage stage morphology increase the discriminatory power of prediction in blastocyst transfer outcome?

Zhenfang Liu[1] · Jiali Cai[1,2] · Lanlan Liu[1,2] · Ling Ouyang[3] · Jinghua Chen[1] · Chao Yang[1] · Kaijie Chen[1] · Xiaolian Yang[1] · Jianzhi Ren[1] · Xiaoming Jiang[1,2]

Published online: 18 December 2023

Correction to: Journal of Assisted Reproduction and Genetics
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10815-023-02997-4

In this article the Figs. 1, 2, and 3 captions had been interchanged; the figure captions should have appeared as shown below.

The original article has been corrected.

The original article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1007/s10815-023-02997-4.

✉ Xiaoming Jiang
keaishmily@126.com

[1] Reproductive Medicine Center, Xiamen University Affiliated Chenggong Hospital, Xiamen 361003, Fujian, China

[2] School of Medicine, Xiamen University, Xiamen 361005, Fujian, China

[3] Medical Quality Management Department, Xiamen University Affiliated Chenggong Hospital, Xiamen 361003, Fujian, China



Fig. 1 The AUCs of ROC curves of the models. a The AUCs of ROC curves of XGboost, b the AUCs of ROC curves of LASSO, and c the AUCs of ROC curves of GLM. Model 1, all-in model with D3 morphology. Model 2, all-in model without D3 morphology. Model 3, embryo quality only model with D3 morphology. Model 4, embryo quality only model without D3 morphology



Fig. 2 Calibration curves for predicting models



Fig. 3 The importance of each variable in different models. A: XGboost; B: LASSO; C: GLM