Comprehensive overview of each immune factor

Log2-fold difference between luteal and follicular phase

For each immune mediator, there are two pages. The first page shows the individual participant data (concentrations of immune mediators) for each sample in each study. The second page shows a forest plot, showing the difference between luteal and follicular phase for each study separately.

Notes:

- The Shust-2010 study, which appears in some forest plots, does not appear in the concentration plots. This is because individual participant data was unavailable for this study.
- New wet lab data indicates the exploratory and validation measurements performed for this meta-analysis, as described in the results section.

Concentration plots

Each symbol shows the concentration of the indicated immune mediator in a single sample. Each study is plotted separately. Lines connect samples from the same participant; in some cases participants provided multiple samples in the same phase, in which case multiple symbols within the same phase may be connected. Pale grey symbols are below the lower limit of detection and are assigned the value of half the lower limit of detection.

Forest plots

This section shows the meta-analyses for each immune factor where the concentrations of at least half of the samples fell above the limit of detection.

Each row represents a different study, with the vertical line at the middle of each square indicating the mean and the horizontal line indicating the 95% confidence interval. Positive numbers indicate higher concentrations during the luteal phase (compared to the follicular phase), while negative numbers indicate lower concentrations during the luteal phase (compared to the follicular phase). The size of the squares is proportional to how heavily the study is weighted in the meta-analysis.

The center of the diamond and the vertical dotted line indicates the meta-effect as determined by the random effects model. The width of the diamond indicates the 95% confidence interval of the meta-effect. A narrow diamond indicates small confidence intervals, a wide diamond indicates large confidence intervals.

TE, treatment effect (log2-pg/mL of the luteal phase minus log2-pg/mL of the follicular phase); seTE, standard error of the treatment effect; 95%-CI, 95% confidence interval around the treatment effect; Weight, the percentage of the meta-estimate contributed by each study.







CCL2 | MCP-1





CCL20 | MIP-3alpha



Makinde-2018 -2.31 0.5070 -2.31 [-3.31; -1.32] 10.9% Boily-Larouche-2019 -1.33 0.7760 -1.33 [-2.86; 0.19] 6.8% Hughes-2021 [-2.62; 0.03] -1.30 0.6762 -1.30 8.1% Thurman-2015 -1.03 0.9703 -1.03 [-2.93; 0.87] 5.0% Thurman-unpublished -0.50 0.4942 -0.50 [-1.47; 0.47] 11.2% Jais-2016 -0.49 14.5% [-1.16; 0.17] -0.49 0.3409 Joag-unpublished -0.42 0.7038 -0.42 [-1.79; 0.96] 7.7% Hughes-unpublished -0.34 [-1.00; 0.31] 14.7% -0.34 0.3341 Patel-2014 -0.05 1.1593 -0.05 [-2.32; 2.23] 3.8% Bradley-2018 0.31 0.6675 0.31 [-1.00; 1.62] 8.2% Arnold-2016 0.59 [-1.13; 2.31] 5.8% 0.59 0.8780 Ghosh-2010a 1.16 1.4397 1.16 [-1.66; 3.98] 2.6% Yegorov-2019 1.60 3.0064 1.60 [-4.29; 7.49] 0.7% Random effects model -0.61 [-1.10; -0.12] 100.0% \diamond Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 41\%$ -6 -4 -2 0 2 4 6 Lower luteal Higher luteal

95%-CI Weight

TE seTE

CCL20



CCL3 | MIP-1alpha



CCL4 | MIP-1beta



-2.12 [-3.69; -0.55] Hughes-2021 -2.12 0.7996 4.0% Thurman-2015 1.2% -1.93 [-5.25; 1.40] -1.93 1.6942 Joag-unpublished -1.92 0.5227 -1.92 [-2.95; -0.90] 6.8% Makinde-2018 -1.82 0.8644 -1.82 [-3.51; -0.13] 3.6% Jespers-2017 -0.99 0.1994 -0.99 [-1.38; -0.60] 12.2% Boily-Larouche-2019 -0.89 0.6283 -0.89 [-2.12; 0.35] 5.6% Hughes-unpublished -0.88 0.2366 -0.88 [-1.35; -0.42] 11.6% Thurman-2017 -0.75 [-1.71; 0.21] 7.3% -0.75 0.4889 Kyongo-2012 -0.45 0.2233 -0.45 [-0.89; -0.01] 11.8% -0.26 [-1.13; 0.61] Byrne-2016 -0.26 0.4430 8.0% Francis-2016 -0.14 0.2355 -0.14 [-0.60; 0.32] 11.6% Arnold-2016 -0.12 1.1380 -0.12 [-2.35; 2.11] 2.3% Cortez-2014 0.13 [-0.14; 0.40] 13.2% 0.13 0.1366 Yegorov-2019 1.19 2.2781 1.19 [-3.27; 5.66] 0.7% Random effects model -0.70 [-1.07; -0.33] 100.0% \diamond Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 73\%$ -2 2 4 -4 0 Lower luteal **Higher luteal**

95%-CI Weight

TE seTE

CCL4

CCL5 | RANTES



Joag-unpublished -2.60 0.7588 -2.60 [-4.09; -1.12] 4.8% Makinde-2018 -1.84 [-2.92; -0.76] 8.0% -1.84 0.5517 Patel-2014 -1.41 [-3.45; 0.62] -1.41 1.0384 2.8% Thurman-unpublished -1.23 0.5442 -1.23 [-2.29; -0.16] 8.2% Bradley-2018 -0.77 0.5178 -0.77 [-1.79; 0.24] 8.8% -0.62 0.3008 -0.62 [-1.21; -0.03] 16.6% Francis-2016 Hughes-unpublished -0.56 [-1.10; -0.03] -0.56 0.2712 18.1% Byrne-2016 -0.45 [-1.58; 0.67] 7.5% -0.45 0.5749 Hwang-2011 [-3.84; 2.94] 1.1% -0.45 1.7300 -0.45 Yegorov-2019 -0.40 [-3.25; 2.46] 1.5% -0.40 1.4582 Shust-2010 0.06 0.6663 0.06 [-1.24; 1.37] 6.0% Arnold-2016 0.07 [-1.35; 1.50] 5.2% 0.07 0.7271 Novak-2007 0.13 1.2980 0.13 [-2.42; 2.67] 1.9% Hughes-2021 0.13 0.5174 0.13 [-0.88; 1.14] 8.8% Barousse-2007 0.18 2.2837 0.18 [-4.29; 4.66] 0.6% **Random effects model** \diamond -0.71 [-1.07; -0.35] 100.0% Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 23\%$ -2 0 2 -4 4 Lower luteal Higher luteal

14

95%-CI Weight

TE seTE

CCL5



CCL8 | MCP-2





CD40L



CSF2 | GM-CSF





CSF3 | G-CSF







CTSD









CXCL10 | IP-10



CXCL10	TE	seTE					95	5%–CI	Weight
Joag-unpublished	-1.67	0.5374		-		-1.67	[-2.72; -	-0.61]	7.5%
Makinde-2018	-1.32	0.3699	+	i		-1.32	[-2.05; -	-0.60]	9.6%
Jespers–2017	-0.52	0.2645		-+		-0.52	[-1.03;	0.00]	11.0%
Kyongo–2012	-0.37	0.2036		+		-0.37	[-0.77;	0.03	11.7%
Francis-2016	-0.08	0.2137		-		-0.08	[-0.50;	0.33]	11.6%
Byrne-2016	-0.02	0.9566	-	-		-0.02	[-1.89;	1.86]	3.9%
Cortez-2014	0.03	0.1726		+		0.03	[-0.31;	0.37]	12.0%
Hughes–2021	0.17	0.6612			-	0.17	[-1.13;	1.46]	6.1%
Hughes-unpublished	0.17	0.3234		-		0.17	[-0.46;	0.80]	10.2%
Arnold-2016	0.38	1.0432	-			0.38	[-1.67;	2.42]	3.5%
Thurman–2017	1.18	0.5334			-	1.18	[0.13;	2.23]	7.5%
Boily-Larouche-2019	1.45	0.7981		H	•	1.45	[-0.11;	3.01]	5.0%
Yegorov-2019	1.80	3.2284			+	1.80	[-4.52;	8.13]	0.5%
Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 65\%$			Γ	•]	-0.15	[–0.59;	0.30]	100.0%
. ,			-5	0	5				
			Lower luteal		Higher lutea	I			

CXCL8 | IL-8



CXCL8	TE se	TE			95%–Cl	Weight
Hughes-2021	-1.60 0.62	272 —	- :	-1.60 [-2.8	33; –0.37]	2.1%
Barousse-2007	-1.30 0.99	933 — +		-1.30 [-3.	24; 0.65]	0.9%
Joag-unpublished	-1.01 0.50	010 —		-1.01 [-1.9	99; -0.02]	3.1%
Jais-2016	-0.69 0.43	399 —	∎ i	-0.69 [-1.	55; 0.17]	3.9%
Hwang–2011	-0.47 2.28	311 ———	*	-0.47 [-4.	94; 4.00]	0.2%
Jespers-2017	-0.38 0.17	759		-0.38 [-0.7	73; -0.04]	13.7%
Thurman-unpublished	-0.34 0.47	798 —	-	-0.34 [-1.	28; 0.60]	3.4%
Makinde–2018	-0.28 0.51	118 —		-0.28 [-1.	28; 0.73]	3.0%
Hughes-unpublished	-0.26 0.30	- 88		-0.26 [-0.	87; 0.34]	6.9%
Shust–2010	-0.20 0.58	370 —		-0.20 [-1.	35; 0.95]	2.4%
Cortez-2014	-0.15 0.20	036	÷	-0.15 [-0.	55; 0.25]	11.8%
Boily-Larouche-2019	-0.11 0.59	989 —		-0.11 [-1.	28; 1.06]	2.3%
Moscicki–2020	-0.05 0.49	962 -		-0.05 [-1.	02; 0.92]	3.2%
Yegorov–2019	-0.05 1.81	178 ———		-0.05 [-3.	61; 3.51]	0.3%
Kyongo–2012	0.06 0.15	535		0.06 [–0.	24; 0.37]	15.5%
Francis–2016	0.19 0.16	605		0.19 [–0.	13; 0.50]	14.9%
Sriprasert–2020	0.20 0.88	302 —		0.20 [–1.	53; 1.92]	1.1%
Lieberman–2008	0.26 1.95	510 ———		0.26 [-3.	57; 4.08]	0.2%
Arnold–2016	0.29 1.28	324 —	+	0.29 [–2.	22; 2.81]	0.5%
Bradley–2018	0.41 0.50	055		0.41 [–0.	58; 1.40]	3.1%
Lahey–2012	0.51 1.05	502 —		0.51 [–1.	55; 2.57]	0.8%
Patel-2014	0.57 0.42	246	+	0.57 [–0.	27; 1.40]	4.2%
Byrne-2016	0.60 0.67	747		0.60 [–0.	72; 1.92]	1.8%
Thurman–2015	0.88 1.26	626 —		0.88 [–1.	59; 3.36]	0.6%
Random effects mode Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 10\%$	I	r		-0.12 [-0.	31; 0.06]	100.0%
0,		-4 -2	0 2 4			
		Lower luteal	Higher luteal	I		

95%–CI Weight

CXCL9 | MIG







DEFA1-3 | HNP-1-3





DEFB103B | HBD-3



###
DEFB4A | HBD-2







New wet lab data

Hughes-2021







ICAM1 | CD54



IFN-alpha











IFN-gamma

Lieberman-2008 -2.28 1.7985 -2.28 [-5.81; 1.24] 0.9% Joag-unpublished -1.03 [-2.21; 0.15] 5.3% -1.03 0.6013 -0.66 0.3567 -0.66 [-1.36; 0.04] 8.8% Moscicki-2020 Yegorov-2019 -0.33 2.1901 -0.33 [-4.62; 3.97] 0.6% Hughes-unpublished -0.24 0.2160 -0.24 [-0.67; 0.18] 11.4% Barousse-2007 -0.11 1.3515 -0.11 [-2.75; 2.54] 1.5% Boily-Larouche-2019 -0.07 0.6254 -0.07 [-1.29; 1.16] 5.1% Francis-2016 -0.04 0.2685 -0.04 [-0.57; 0.48] 10.4% 0.02 0.2446 0.02 [-0.46; 0.50] 10.9% Makinde-2018 Hughes-2021 0.07 0.4202 0.07 [-0.75; 0.90] 7.7% Shust-2010 0.15 0.6178 0.15 [-1.06; 1.36] 5.2% Cortez-2014 0.18 0.1740 0.18 [-0.16; 0.52] 12.1% Hwang-2011 0.24 1.1349 0.24 [-1.99; 2.46] 2.1% Bradley-2018 0.31 0.3742 0.31 [-0.42; 1.04] 8.5% Byrne-2016 0.45 0.7127 0.45 [-0.94; 1.85] 4.3% Fidel-2003 2.69 0.6136 2.69 [1.49; 3.90] 5.2% Random effects model 0.05 [-0.29; 0.40] 100.0% Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 51\%$ -2 0 2 -4 4 **Higher** luteal Lower luteal

IFNG

TE seTE

95%-CI Weight



lgA

49





























IL-10

1210	12 0012	•			/0 0.	morgine
Byrne-2016	-0.66 0.6778	3	-0.66	[–1.99;	0.67]	2.4%
Castle-2002	-0.62 1.2919)	-0.62	[-3.15;	1.92]	0.7%
Barousse-2007	-0.38 1.7765	j	-0.38	[-3.86;	3.10]	0.4%
Hughes–unpublished	-0.37 0.1655	; .	-0.37	[-0.70; -	0.05]	15.9%
Moscicki–2020	-0.34 0.2827	·	-0.34	[-0.89;	0.22]	9.4%
Joag-unpublished	-0.17 0.2753	; <u> </u>	-0.17	[-0.71;	0.37]	9.7%
Arnold–2016	-0.15 0.4831	-	-0.15	[–1.09;	0.80]	4.3%
Lieberman–2008	-0.10 1.9358	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-0.10	[-3.90;	3.69]	0.3%
Francis–2016	0.07 0.1409		0.07	[-0.20;	0.35]	17.6%
Thurman-unpublished	0.17 0.6070)	0.17	[–1.02;	1.36]	2.9%
Cortez–2014	0.21 0.1528	s [+	0.21	[-0.09;	0.51]	16.8%
Makinde-2018	0.28 0.8402	2	0.28	[–1.37;	1.93]	1.6%
Hwang–2011	0.40 0.9376	;	0.40	[–1.44;	2.23]	1.3%
Thurman–2015	0.51 0.9650)*	0.51	[–1.38;	2.40]	1.2%
Bradley–2018	0.55 0.4270)	0.55	[–0.29;	1.39]	5.2%
Boily-Larouche-2019	0.57 0.3577	' <u>+</u>	0.57	[–0.13;	1.27]	6.8%
Fidel-2003	1.19 0.5796	;	1.19	[0.05;	2.32]	3.1%
Yegorov–2019	1.22 1.4055	5	1.22	[–1.53;	3.98]	0.6%
Random effects model		<u> </u>	0.05	[–0.17;	0.26]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 15\%$						
		-2 0 2				
		Lower luteal Higher luteal				

IL10

TE seTE

95%-CI Weight







IL12p70

TE seTE

95%–CI Weight


















IL-18



IL-1alpha



	12 0012			noight
Lahey-2012	-0.84 2.4102		-0.84 [-5.57; 3.88]	0.3%
Arnold-2016	-0.78 1.2891		-0.78 [-3.31; 1.74]	0.9%
Yegorov–2019	-0.58 1.4336		-0.58 [-3.39; 2.23]	0.7%
Makinde-2018	-0.56 0.4201		-0.56 [-1.38; 0.27]	5.0%
Hughes–2021	-0.14 0.5118	<u> </u>	-0.14 [-1.15; 0.86]	3.9%
Shust-2010	0.07 0.2350		0.07 [-0.39; 0.53]	8.4%
Jespers–2017	0.15 0.2146		0.15 [-0.27; 0.57]	8.8%
Joag-unpublished	0.31 0.3478		0.31 [-0.37; 0.99]	6.2%
Hughes-unpublished	0.48 0.2325	- • - ·	0.48 [0.02; 0.93]	8.4%
Byrne–2016	0.48 0.7289		0.48 [-0.95; 1.91]	2.3%
Boily-Larouche-2019	0.55 0.7444		0.55 [-0.91; 2.01]	2.2%
Francis–2016	0.60 0.1643	-	0.60 [0.28; 0.92]	9.9%
New wet lab data	0.73 0.2097		0.73 [0.32; 1.14]	8.9%
Kyongo–2012	0.73 0.1791		0.73 [0.38; 1.09]	9.6%
Bradley-2018	0.82 0.3957		0.82 [0.05; 1.60]	5.4%
Cortez-2014	0.83 0.1832		0.83 [0.47; 1.19]	9.5%
Moscicki–2020	1.03 0.6014		1.03 [-0.15; 2.21]	3.1%
Hwang-2011	1.48 1.4535		<u> </u>	0.7%
Barousse-2007	1.56 0.7995		- 1.56 [-0.01; 3.13]	2.0%
Fidel-2003	2.40 0.5276		- 2.40 [1.36; 3.43]	3.8%
Random effects mode	el 🛛		0.54 [0.29; 0.78]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 51\%$			I	
		-4 -2 0 2	4	
		Lower luteal Highe	er luteal	

IL1A

TE seTE

95%-CI Weight

IL-1beta



ILID	IE Sei	C						90	0%-CI	weight
Lieberman-2008	-1.82 1.331	4					-1.82	[-4.43;	0.79]	1.7%
Makinde–2018	-1.79 0.794	2		<u> </u>			-1.79	[-3.35; ·	-0.23]	4.0%
Hughes–2021	-1.42 0.788	8	+				-1.42	[-2.97;	0.13]	4.1%
Moscicki–2020	-1.08 0.746	9		•			-1.08	[-2.54;	0.38]	4.4%
Joag–unpublished	-0.93 0.571	5	-	•			-0.93	[-2.05;	0.19]	6.2%
Arnold–2016	-0.78 1.647	1		*			-0.78	[-4.01;	2.45]	1.2%
Shust–2010	-0.68 0.678	6					-0.68	[–2.01;	0.65]	5.0%
Jespers-2017	-0.58 0.301	5					-0.58	i [–1.17;	0.01]	10.9%
Boily–Larouche–2019	-0.46 1.234	6		-			-0.46	[-2.88;	1.96]	2.0%
Thurman–2017	-0.29 0.936	9		-	_		-0.29	[-2.12;	1.55]	3.1%
Thurman-unpublished	-0.19 0.631	0	-		-		-0.19	[-1.42;	1.05]	5.5%
Hughes-unpublished	0.17 0.405	6					0.17	′ [–0.63;	0.96]	8.8%
Byrne-2016	0.29 1.069	1					0.29	[–1.81;	2.38]	2.5%
Francis-2016	0.38 0.261	8					0.38	[-0.14;	0.89]	11.7%
Kyongo–2012	0.42 0.281	9			•		0.42	2 [-0.13;	0.98]	11.3%
Cortez-2014	0.51 0.260	9			-		0.51	[–0.01;	1.02]	11.7%
Thurman–2015	0.83 1.192	5	_			-	0.83	[–1.50;	3.17]	2.1%
Hwang-2011	1.18 2.089	6			*		1.18	[-2.92;	5.27]	0.7%
Sriprasert-2020	1.34 1.132	3			1	_	1.34	· [-0.88;	3.56]	2.3%
Yegorov–2019	2.19 2.036	0	_				- 2.19	[–1.80;	6.19]	0.8%
Random effects model	l	_		\diamond			0.15	[-0.52;	0.21]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 40\%$		I		I	1	I	I			
		-6	-4 -2	0	2	4	6			
		L٥١	wer luteal		High	er lute	eal			

II 1R

TE SOTE

95%_CI Weight











IL2	TE seTE		95%-Cl	Weight
Boily-Larouche-2019	-0.81 0.5271		-0.81 [-1.84; 0.22]	2.9%
Yegorov–2019	-0.76 0.7569		-0.76 [-2.25; 0.72]	1.4%
Hughes-unpublished	-0.25 0.2621		-0.25 [-0.76; 0.26]	11.6%
Byrne-2016	-0.23 0.5666		-0.23 [-1.34; 0.88]	2.5%
Francis-2016	-0.17 0.1770		-0.17 [-0.51; 0.18]	25.4%
Cortez-2014	-0.12 0.1464		-0.12 [-0.40; 0.17]	37.2%
Makinde-2018	-0.07 0.2509		-0.07 [-0.56; 0.42]	12.7%
Hughes–2021	-0.02 0.4531		-0.02 [-0.91; 0.87]	3.9%
Lieberman–2008	0.06 1.0236		0.06 [-1.95; 2.06]	0.8%
Fidel-2003	0.39 0.7921		0.39 [-1.16; 1.94]	1.3%
Barousse-2007	0.48 1.2725		0.48 [-2.01; 2.98]	0.5%
Random effects model			-0.16 [-0.33; 0.02]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$				
		-2 -1 0 1 2		
		Lower luteal Higher luteal		

95%-Cl Weight











								0
Makinde-2018	-2.01 0.6312		- :		-2.01	[-3.25; -	0.78]	3.9%
Joag-unpublished	-1.69 0.6450		<u> </u>		-1.69	[-2.95; -	0.42	3.8%
Hughes-2021	-1.58 0.4312		- :		-1.58	[-2.43; -	0.74	5.7%
Fidel-2003	-1.24 0.3760	+			-1.24	[-1.98; -	0.51	6.3%
Jespers-2017	-1.12 0.2404				-1.12	[-1.59; -	0.65	8.0%
Hwang–2011	-1.04 1.6326				-1.04	[-4.24;	2.16	0.9%
Moscicki–2020	-0.68 0.5239		•+		-0.68	[-1.71;	0.34]	4.7%
Jais–2016	-0.66 0.3596	-	<u>.</u>		-0.66	[–1.36;	0.05]	6.5%
Thurman-unpublished	-0.43 0.3879	-			-0.43	[-1.19;	0.33]	6.2%
Lieberman-2008	-0.42 1.0137		- <u>.</u>		-0.42	[-2.40;	1.57]	2.0%
Hughes-unpublished	-0.39 0.3869	-	- ! -		-0.39	[–1.15;	0.37]	6.2%
Thurman-2015	-0.20 0.7510				-0.20	[–1.67;	1.27]	3.1%
Francis-2016	-0.16 0.2313		-		-0.16	[-0.62;	0.29]	8.1%
Cortez-2014	-0.08 0.1623		-		-0.08	[-0.39;	0.24]	8.9%
Shust-2010	-0.05 0.3962				-0.05	[-0.82;	0.73]	6.1%
Kyongo–2012	-0.04 0.2774		÷		-0.04	[-0.59;	0.50]	7.5%
Arnold–2016	-0.03 1.0072		<u> </u>		-0.03	[–2.01;	1.94]	2.0%
Byrne–2016	0.55 0.7274				0.55	[-0.87;	1.98]	3.2%
Barousse-2007	0.78 0.8532				0.78	[-0.89;	2.45]	2.6%
Bradley–2018	0.91 0.6292		+ • •		0.91	[-0.32;	2.14]	3.9%
Yegorov–2019	1.72 1.9377				1.72	[-2.08;	5.52]	0.6%
Random effects mode	l		\diamond		-0.49	[-0.80; -	0.18]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 60\%$			1 1	I				
		-4 -2	0 2	4				
		Lower luteal	Highe	er luteal				

IL6

TE seTE

95%-CI Weight









LTF





















PI3 | Elafin



TE seTE

95%–CI Weight

SLPI



SLPI

TE seTE

95%-CI Weight

				• 1						
Thurman-2015	-0.65 0.8204						-0.65	[–2.26;	0.96]	1.7%
Francis–2016	-0.51 0.1621			•			-0.51	[-0.83; -	-0.19]	20.9%
Thurman-unpublished	-0.46 0.5798	_					-0.46	[-1.59;	0.68]	3.2%
Jais-2016	-0.30 0.7978						-0.30	[-1.87;	1.26]	1.8%
Makinde-2018	-0.18 0.2216		-	-			-0.18	[-0.61;	0.26]	14.9%
Ghosh–2010a	-0.10 0.5953			-			-0.10	[-1.27;	1.07]	3.0%
Jespers–2017	-0.10 0.2515		-		_		-0.10	[-0.59;	0.40]	12.6%
Novak–2007	0.06 0.1475				-		0.06	[-0.23;	0.35]	22.8%
Shust-2010	0.07 0.2156				_		0.07	[-0.36;	0.49]	15.4%
Thurman-2017	0.50 0.5314						0.50	[-0.54;	1.54]	3.8%
Random effects model				\overleftrightarrow			-0.14	[-0.35;	0.08]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 11\%$				1				•	-	
- /		-2	-1	0	1	2				
		Lowe	r luteal		Higher I	luteal				







Arnold-2016	-1.52 1.3111		+				-1.52	[-4.09;	1.05]	0.5%
Joag-unpublished	-1.43 0.5814	ŀ					-1.43	[-2.57; -	-0.29]	2.2%
Thurman-2015	-1.22 1.0863	s —			_		-1.22	[-3.35;	0.90]	0.7%
Byrne-2016	-1.18 0.9578	; -					-1.18	[-3.06;	0.70]	0.8%
Barousse-2007	-0.86 0.6416	6		+			-0.86	[-2.12;	0.40]	1.8%
Makinde-2018	-0.74 0.7423	3		•	-		-0.74	[-2.20;	0.71]	1.4%
Moscicki–2020	-0.50 0.2283	3	-				-0.50	[-0.94; -	-0.05]	11.3%
Hughes-unpublished	-0.40 0.2901		-	•			-0.40	[-0.96;	0.17]	7.7%
Lieberman–2008	-0.35 1.9795	5 ——		-+			-0.35	[-4.23;	3.53]	0.2%
Thurman–2017	-0.10 0.1918	3					-0.10	[-0.47;	0.28]	14.4%
Boily-Larouche-2019	-0.07 0.7513	3					-0.07	[–1.54;	1.41]	1.4%
Cortez-2014	-0.05 0.1872	2		<u> </u>			-0.05	[-0.42;	0.31]	14.9%
Francis–2016	0.05 0.1951						0.05	[-0.33;	0.43]	14.1%
Thurman-unpublished	0.13 0.2223	3		-			0.13	[-0.31;	0.56]	11.7%
Hughes–2021	0.13 0.4279)			_		0.13	[-0.70;	0.97]	3.9%
Bradley–2018	0.38 0.3444	ŀ		+	_		0.38	[-0.29;	1.06]	5.8%
Jais–2016	0.53 0.3746	5		+ •	<u> </u>		0.53	[-0.20;	1.27]	5.0%
Fidel–2003	0.55 0.6111						0.55	[-0.65;	1.75]	2.0%
Yegorov–2019	0.99 1.7115	5			+		0.99	[-2.36;	4.35]	0.3%
Random effects model	l			\diamond			-0.10	[-0.28;	0.07]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 23\%$				I						
		-4	-2	0	2	4				
		Lowe	er luteal		Higher	luteal				

TNF

TE seTE

95%-CI Weight

Log-odds difference in detectability between follicular and luteal phase

This section shows the meta-analyses for each immune factor where more than half of the samples were undetectable. For each immune mediator, there are two pages. The first page shows the individual participant data (concentrations of immune mediators) for each sample in each study. The second page shows a forest plot, showing the difference between luteal and follicular phase for each study separately.

Notes:

• New wet lab data indicates the exploratory and validation measurements performed for this meta-analysis, as described in the results section.

Concentration plots

Each symbol shows the concentration of the indicated immune mediator in a single sample. Each study is plotted separately. Lines connect samples from the same participant; in some cases participants provided multiple samples in the same phase, in which case multiple symbols within the same phase may be connected. Pale grey symbols are below the lower limit of detection and are assigned the value of half the lower limit of detection.

Forest plots

Each row represents a different study, with the vertical line in the middle of each square indicating the mean and the horizontal line indicating the 95% confidence interval. Positive numbers indicate greater detectability during the luteal phase (compared to the follicular phase), while negative numbers indicate lower detectability during the luteal phase (compared to the follicular phase). The size of the squares is proportional to how heavily the study is weighted in the meta-analysis.

The center of the diamond and the vertical dotted line indicates the meta-effect as determined by the random effects model. The width of the diamond indicates the 95% confidence interval of the meta-effect.

TE, treatment effect (log-odds of proportion detectable in luteal vs follicular phase); seTE, standard error of the treatment effect; 95%-CI, 95% confidence interval around the treatment effect; Weight, the percentage of the meta-estimate contributed by each study.









##