

Supplementary Figure 1. Expression patterns of MMPs in EC patients and healthy individuals. Heatmap of differentially expressed genes between EC and control groups; the MMPs in each module were annotated; the line graph showed the trend in the gene module expression, the text on the right showed the enriched pathways for each module gene. MMPs, matrix metalloproteinases;.



Supplementary Figure 2. (A) CNV for MMPs genes using GO enrichment analysis. (B) CNV for MMPs genes using KEGG enrichment analysis. (C) Heatmap depicting the correlation between the ssGSEA score of 22 immune cells and survival. The colour depth of the squares represents the strength of the correlation. (D) The immune function scores were significantly different between the high and low MMP score groups. (E) Correlation between the MMP score and B cells native in endometrial cancer. R = 0.15, P = 0.023. (F) Correlation between the MMP score and dendritic activated in endometrial cancer. R = 0.15, P = 0.023. (F) Correlation between the MMP score and dendritic activated in endometrial cancer. R = 0.15, P = 0.023. (F) Correlation between the MMP score and dendritic activated in endometrial cancer. R = 0.15, P = 0.018. GO, gene ontology. KEGG, Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes; ssGSEA, single-sample gene set enrichment analysis.



Supplementary Figure 3. (A) MMP score and CTLA4; (B) MMP score and CD276; (C) MMP score and CD80; (D) MMP score and CD70; (E) MMP score and CD44; (F) MMP score and CD40; (G) MMP score and CD28; (H) MMP score and ADORA2A; (I) MMP score and LAG3; (J) MMP score and LR3DL1; (K) MMP score and ICOSLG; (L) MMP score and HAVCR2.



Supplementary Figure 4. Correlation between the MMP score and immune checkpoints. (A) MMP score and PDCD1LG2; (B) MMP score and TIGIT; (C) MMP score and PDCD1; (D) MMP score and NRP1; (E) MMP score and TNFSF18; (F) MMP score and TNFSF9; (G) MMP score and TNFSF4; (H) MMP score and TNFRSF25; (I) MMP score and TNFRSF18; (J) MMP score and TNFRSF9; (F) MMP score and TNFRSF4; (G) MMP score and TNFRSF8.





Supplementary Figure 5. (A) Survival analyses of patients with a high-tumour mutational burden and low-tumour mutational burden using Kaplan–Meier curves (P = 0.023, Log-rank test). (B) Mutational landscape of genes in the TCGA UCEC cohort stratified by high versus low MMP score subgroups. Each column represents individual patients. The upper bar plot shows TMB, the right bar plot shows the mutation frequency of each gene in separate MMP score groups. (C) Survival analysis of the patients with a high dysfunction score and the patients with a low dysfunction score using Kaplan–Meier curves (P = 0.005, Log-rank test). Red, high dysfunction group; blue, low dysfunction group. (D) Analysis of the stromal, immune, and ESTIMATE scores between the low and high MMP score groups based on the ESTIMATE algorithm. Blue, low MMP score group; red, high MMP score group. TMB, tumour mutational burden











TG101348 senstivity (IC50)













Supplementary Figure 6. Association between the MMP score and response to pharmacotherapy. (A–F) There was a significance difference in drug sensitivity between the two MMP score groups. (G–L) The correlation between the high and low expression of MMP score and the semi-inhibited concentration sensitivity of various drugs. Drugs: TG101348 sensitivity, WH-4-023 sensitivity, BMS-754807 sensitivity, Foretinib sensitivity, AUY922 sensitivity, and BX-795 sensitivity.



Supplementary Figure 7. (A) The t-SNE plot demonstrating main cell clusters in normal and EC samples. (B) The cell ratio in normal and EC samples for each cell type. (C) Average expression level of MMP related genes in each cell type. (D) Correlation between the *MMP*-7 and abnormality of complement system (r = 0.36, *P* < 0.001, Spearman correlation analysis).













K



Ι

L

















Supplementary Figure 8. Immunohistochemical analysis of MMP expression in EC. (A-C) The expression of *MMP-9* in EC; (D-F) The expression of *MMP-11* in EC. (G-I) The expression of *MMP-15* in EC; (J-L) The expression of *MMP-24* in EC.

Patient		Са			N		
		Cal	Ca2	Ca3	N1	N2	N3
Characteristic	age	58	56	67	46	54	61
	Time of pregnancy	4	3	1	0	5	3
	parity	3	1	1	0	3	2
	tumor size	2.5*2*1.3	1.5*1.0*0.5	3*2* 1.6	-	-	-
	FIGO staging	II	IA	IIIC1	-	-	-
	histological	Adenocarcinoma	Adenocarcinoma	Adenocarcinoma	-	-	-
	histological grading	High	High	Middle	-	-	-
	lymph node	Negative	Negative	Positive	-	-	-
	metastasis						
	treatment	surgery+radiotherapy	surgery	surgery+chemotherapy	-	-	-

Supplementary Table 1. Comparison of basic data from eligible selected endometrial cancer patients and controls.

Ca: cancer; N: normal; II: Invasion of cervical stroma with extrauterine extension OR with substantial LVSI OR aggressive histological types with myometrial invasion; IA: Disease limited to the endometrium OR non-aggressive histological type, i.e., low-grade endometroid, with invasion of less than half of myometrium with no or focal lymphovascular space involvement (LVSI) OR good prognosis disease; IIIC1: Metastasis to the pelvic lymph node.

- 1 Supplementary Table 1. Comparison of basic data from eligible selected endometrial cancer patients and
- 2 controls. Including age, times of pregnancy, parity, tumor size, FIGO staging, histological, histological
- 3 grading, lymph node metastasis and treatment. Ca: cancer; N: normal.