

1 Increased risk of fungal infection detection in women using
2 menstrual cups vs. tampons: a cross-sectional study

3 Nicolas Tessandier^{1,2,*}, Ilkay Başak Uysal^{2,#}, Baptiste Elie^{2,#}, Christian
4 Selinger², Claire Bernat², Vanina Boué², Sophie Grasset², Soraya Groc²,
5 Tsukushi Kamiya^{1,3}, Massilva Rahmoun², Bastien Reyné², Noemi Bender⁴,
6 Marine Bonneau⁵, Christelle Graf⁵, Vincent Tribout⁶, Vincent Foulongne⁷,
7 Jacques Ravel⁸, Tim Waterboer⁴, Christophe Hirtz⁹, Ignacio G Bravo², Jacques
8 Reynes¹⁰, Michel Segondy¹¹, Carmen Lia Murall^{2,12}, Nathalie Boulle¹³, Samuel
9 Alizon^{1,2,*}

10 ¹ Center for Interdisciplinary Research in Biology (CIRB), College de France, CNRS, INSERM,
11 Université PSL, Paris, France

12 ² Laboratoire MIVEGEC (UMR CNRS 5290, IRD 224, UM), Montpellier, France

13 ³ HRB Clinical Research Facility, National University of Ireland Galway, Ireland

14 ⁴ Molecular Diagnostics of Oncogenic Infections, Infection, Inflammation and Cancer Program,
15 German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), Im Neuenheimer Feld, Heidelberg, Germany.

16 ⁵ Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Montpellier,
17 Montpellier, France

18 ⁶ Center for Free Information, Screening and Diagnosis (CeGIDD), Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de
19 Montpellier, Montpellier, France

20 ⁷ Pathogenesis and Control of Chronic Infections, Montpellier University, INSERM, EFS, Montpellier,
21 France.

22 ⁸ Institute for Genome Sciences, Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Maryland
23 School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA

24 ⁹ LBPC/PPC- IRMB, CHU de Montpellier and Université de Montpellier, Montpellier, France

25 ¹⁰ Infectious Diseases Departement, University Hospital Montpellier; INSERM U1175/Institut de
26 Recherche et de Developement, Unité Mixte International, Montpellier, France.

27 ¹¹ Pathogenesis and Control of Chronic Infections, University of Montpellier, INSERM, EFS, CHU
28 Montpellier, Montpellier, France.

29 ¹² Current address: Department of Biological Sciences, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada

30 ¹³ Pathogenesis and Control of Chronic Infections, University of Montpellier, INSERM, EFS;
31 Departement of Pathology and Oncobiology, Laboratory of Solid Tumors, CHU Montpellier,
32 Montpellier, France.

33 # Equal contribution

34 * Corresponding authors: nicolas.tessandier@college-de-france.fr, samuel.alizon@cns.fr, Collège de
35 France, 11 place Marcelin Berthelot, 75005 Paris, France, phone: +33 144271667

36 **Running title:** Menstrual cup use increases fungal infection risk

Abstract

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

Objective: To determine if the use of menstrual cups rather than tampons is associated with more or less health risk.

Design: Analysing biological, demographic, and behavioural data in a cohort of women who reported using mostly tampons ($n = 81$) or menstrual cups ($n = 22$).

Setting: A cross-sectional analysis using the inclusion data of a single centre longitudinal study.

Population: 149 women from 18 to 25 years old living in the area of Montpellier (France) who reported having at least one new sexual partner over the last year.

Methods: Statistical modelling (mainly binomial regression models and factor analyses of mixed data).

Main Outcome Measures: Self-reported data from questionnaires (fungal infection, urinary tract infection, stress level) and biological data (HPV screening, vaginal microbiota profiling, circulating antibodies titration, and local cytokine concentrations).

Results: We identify an increased risk of reporting fungal infections for women using menstrual cups over tampons. We do not detect significant differences in terms of vaginal microbiota composition or local cytokines expression profile but find that women fall into two different clusters in a factor analysis of mixed data depending on the type of menstrual product they use more (cups or tampons).

Conclusions: These results point to potential health risks in the use of menstrual cups and differences in local vaginal environments. In-depth studies are needed to better understand potential associations between menstrual product use and women's health.

Funding: European Research Council (EVOLPROOF, grant 648963)

Ethics The PAPCLEAR study ClinicalTrials.gov identifier is NCT02946346.

Keywords: menstrual hygiene; women's health; vaginal microbiota; fungal infections; immunity

65

66

Tweetable abstract: A cross-sectional study finds a significant association between menstrual cup use and fungal infection risk.

67 Introduction

68 Menstruation is associated with reproductive health, but it also has implications beyond
69 physical health, as recognised by the emergent concept of menstrual health [1]. Further-
70 more, the risks associated with menstrual poverty [2] are increasingly recognised and
71 include for instance bacterial vaginosis [3] or reproductive tract infections [4].

72 The vaginal microbiota is a crucial component of women's health throughout their
73 lives [5]. It could play a key role in preventing diseases such as yeast infections, urinary
74 tract infections (UTI), and STIs, especially HIV [6]. Contrarily to the gut microbiota,
75 the vaginal microbiota is associated with relatively few, clearly-defined, community state
76 types (CST), most of which are dominated by one or two species of *Lactobacillus* bacteria
77 [7]. The CST IV stands out because of its high diversity and prevalence of anaerobic
78 bacteria with, therefore, an association with dysbioses. For these reasons, it could be
79 associated with menstrual health.

80 The immune system (both innate and adaptive) elements of the vaginal environ-
81 ment have evolved to meet the special challenges that are associated with the female
82 reproductive tract [8]. This equilibrium is tightly maintained by both sex hormones
83 throughout the menstrual cycle and microbiota to respond to the challenges of bacteria,
84 yeast, and viruses without interfering with events that surround conception[9]. Pertur-
85 bations in either may impede the efficiency of the immune system to control pathogens
86 and significantly compromise women's health.

87 Among the variety of products used during the menses, menstrual cups are perceived
88 as a safe, practical, economical, and ecologically-friendly alternative to tampons and
89 sanitary pads [10]. The majority of women using them report wanting to continue to
90 use them both in high and low-income settings, showing a good level of acceptability
91 [11, 10]. Nevertheless, there have been some reported cases of toxic shock syndrome,
92 renal colic, and allergies associated with menstrual cup usage [10]. Moreover, higher
93 levels of *Staphylococcus aureus* growth have been reported in menstrual cups compared
94 to tampons [12]. However, the number of case studies is limited and we know little about
95 potential health risks associated with cup usage compared to other menstrual hygiene
96 products [10].

97 Our objective is to test whether the type of menstrual hygiene products can shape
98 the vaginal immunological and microbiological environment in a way that could affect
99 women's health. To this end, analysed biological, demographic, and behavioural longitu-
100 dinal data from 149 women, in the context of the PAPCLEAR clinical study on human
101 papillomavirus (HPV) infections [13]. We focused in particular on the local impact of
102 the different product use and, using statistical modelling, identified profile differences
103 depending on the type of menstrual product used.

104 **Materials and methods**

105 **Cohort description and data curation**

106 The participants of this analysis were 149 young women from the PAPCLEAR longitu-
107 dinal clinical study which started in 2016 and was finalised in 2020. The women were
108 aged between 18-25 years, mainly students, from the area of Montpellier (France) and
109 their human papillomavirus status, other genital infections, immunological responses
110 (antibodies and cytokines), behaviours were followed up for two years [13].

111 We selected participants who reported using tampons or cups for menstrual products,
112 and for whom detailed cytokine profiles (see below), microbiota metabarcoding data, and
113 antibody data at the inclusion visit were available. This amounts to $n = 103$ women.

114 We assigned tampon or menstrual cup categories when a participant reported using
115 either type of menstrual product over 75% of the time over the whole duration of the
116 study. There was no difference in follow-up duration between women using mostly cups
117 or mostly tampons (Table 1).

118 The demographic, behavioural, and biological analyses were performed on the first
119 two visits of the participant (V1 and V2), which were spread 4 weeks apart.

120 **Patient involvement**

121 Women participating in the study benefited from free gynaecological consults and from
122 a compensation fee, as detailed in the study protocol [13]. Furthermore, two information
123 leaflets on HPV infections in young women and on the vaginal microbiota were written
124 in collaboration with the University Hospital of Montpellier and handed out to study

125 participants upon inclusion. Finally, participants who have finished the follow-up and
126 who accept to be informed by the scientific results of the study receive information by
127 email.

128 **Biological analyses**

129 Antibodies were analysed according to methods from Waterboer et al. [14] and already
130 partly analysed in Murall et al. [15] in the context of HPV infection.

131 The cytokine data were obtained using MesoScale discovery (MSD) technology from
132 vaginal secretions collected using ophthalmic sponges as described in Murall et al. [13]
133 and was already analysed in the context of HPV infections by Selinger et al. [16]. We
134 used the same protocol to obtain normalised values (per total protein concentration).

135 The microbiota profiling was performed via metabarcoding using the V3-V4 region of
136 the 16S gene, as discussed in the study protocol [13]. The assignment of the community
137 state type was done using the VALENCIA software package [17].

138 **Statistical analysis**

139 We used binomial regression models for models in Table 1, Figure 1A, and in Extended
140 data Tables S4 and S5. For each model, we computed the odds ratios associated with
141 each predictor along with a 95% confidence interval. All analyses were performed in R
142 (4.1.2) [18]. We used the `glmulti` function to conduct binomial regressions and selected
143 the best model using the Akaike Information Criterion corrected for small sample sizes
144 (AICc). We used a lowest AICc +5 interval for the most probable best models (Table
145 S3 and S4) [19]. For clustering analysis, factor analysis of mixed data (FAMD) was used
146 when combining both factor and numeric data (Figure 1F), and multiple correspondence
147 analysis (MCA) was used when analysing binary data (Figure S2) [20].

148 **Core outcome set**

149 No core outcome set (COS) was used in the study. According to the CROWN database,
150 the only potential relevant COS could have been "Heavy menstrual bleeding" but we
151 found no general COS about menstrual health.

152 **Data availability**

153 The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding
154 author upon request, and from the Zenodo public repository (XXXXXX) upon publication.

155 **Funding**

156 The PAPCLEAR clinical study was funded by the European Research Council (ERC)
157 under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme [grant
158 agreement No 648963]. The funders played no role in conducting research and writing
159 the manuscript.

160 **Results**

161 The 103 women who could be included in the analysis were aged from 18 to 25 years old
162 and primarily university students. Their main demographic characteristics are shown in
163 Table S1. We stratified the population according to the most frequent type of menstrual
164 product used, *i.e.* either tampons, $n = 81$ women, or menstrual cups, $n = 22$ (see the
165 Supplementary Methods). The self-reported stress level was the only variable for which
166 the two groups differed slightly ($p - value = 0.08$), with menstrual cup users reporting
167 more frequently a moderate level of stress than tampon users (Supplementary Table S1).

168 We used generalised linear models to detect potential differences in key covariates
169 (listed in Supplementary Table 2) between the two groups. The best model, according
170 to our selection approach (see Supplementary Methods), shows that a significantly lower
171 fraction of menstrual cup users identifies themselves as smokers compared to tampon
172 users ($OR = 0.18$) and that the fraction of women who report using menstrual cups
173 presenting a genital infection by human papillomaviruses (HPVs) is also lower ($OR =$
174 0.36). Conversely, reporting using menstrual cups was more associated with reporting
175 a recent fungal genital infection ($OR = 6.55$). There was also a marginally significant
176 trend of increased risk of urinary tract infection (Table 1). Importantly, **Smoking** and
177 **Fungal infection** were the only two covariates to be present and significant in the best
178 model and in the models comparable to it based on an Akaike Information Criterion (see
179 Supplementary Methods and Table 2).

180 To better understand the association between the type of menstrual products used
181 and the occurrence of fungal infections, we performed another set of generalised linear
182 models, this time evaluating the covariates associated with reporting a fungal infection.
183 The selection procedure yielded a (best) model according to which smoking ($p = 0.02$)
184 and the use of menstrual cups ($p = 0.002$) were associated with a higher reporting of
185 recent fungal infection (Figure 1A). There was also a significant association between
186 being vaccinated against HPV and reporting a recent fungal infection ($p = 0.02$). Of
187 note, among women aged 18 to 25 years, reporting of fungal infections was less common
188 in older cohorts. ($p = 0.03$). The type of menstrual product used the most (cups or
189 tampons) was the only covariate present and significant in all of the 124 next best models
190 selected (Supplementary Table S3), further confirming its association with reporting
191 fungal infections in our cohort.

192 To study a potential association between the type of menstrual protection used and
193 the vaginal microbiota, we performed a 16S metabarcoding analysis (Figure 1B). We
194 found no significant difference in community state types (CST) composition (Figure 1C),
195 although there were some qualitative differences. For instance, none of the menstrual
196 cup users displayed a CST II or V [21]. We also did not find any significant differences
197 in microbiota diversity, assessed using Shannon diversity index, between women using
198 menstrual cups or tampons (Figure 1D).

199 To assess the potential effect of menstrual cups on the local immune response,
200 we analysed cytokines and chemokine relative concentrations in cervical samples [16].
201 Among the 20 analytes measured, only IFN- β appeared to be significantly increased in
202 women using cups ($p = 0.044$), although this association did not withstand correction
203 for multiple testing comparisons ($p = 0.89$) (Figure 1E).

204 Finally, we performed a profile analysis using a factor analysis of mixed data (FAMD)
205 approach with CSTs distribution, Shannon diversity index, cytokines, and chemokines
206 relative concentrations. The results show that women who use tampons and women
207 using menstrual cups fall into different clusters (Figure 1F and Supplementary Figure
208 S1), suggesting that the type of menstrual product used could be shaping the local im-
209 munological and microbial environment. Conversely, a similar multiple correspondence
210 analysis (MCA) approach using blood seropositivity status for IgG and IgM of several

211 sexually transmitted infections (STIs), including HPVs (see Supplementary Methods)
212 detected no clustering effect (Supplementary Figure S2), hinting that the women in
213 these two groups originate from similar populations in terms of the risk of exposition to
214 STIs.

215 Discussion

216 Menstrual cups are gaining in popularity as an environmentally sustainable and afford-
217 able type of menstrual protection [10]. However, there currently is a lack of epidemi-
218 ological and biological data to assess their safety. Using the PAPCLEAR study [13],
219 we compared microbiological, immunological, and epidemiological profiles of women de-
220 pending on whether they report using mainly cups or tampons.

221 Main findings

222 We did not identify strong demographic or behavioural biases between our two popula-
223 tions, except for reported stress levels. On the epidemiological side, we detected a strong
224 association between reporting using menstrual cups and recent fungal genital infections.
225 We also found a marginally significant positive association with urinary tract infections.
226 Finally, we identified a negative significant association with HPV infection. Note that
227 women using menstrual cups reported a greater number of partners and less smoking
228 than women using tampons, which suggests the decreased HPV prevalence is not due to
229 differences in sexual contact. To further understand the occurrence of fungal infections,
230 we performed another model which confirmed their strong association with menstrual
231 cup use, as well as smoking, number of partners, and vaccination against HPV.

232 Biological analyses revealed an absence of significant difference between vaginal mi-
233 crobiota compositions depending on the type of menstrual product used. For local cy-
234 tokine and chemokine relative concentrations, only one potential difference was identified
235 in IFN- β . However, the joint analysis of microbiota and immunological data showed that
236 women segregate into two clusters based on the type of menstrual product they use most.
237 Similar analyses using circulating antibodies found no such clustering patterns, which
238 reinforces our conclusion that the two populations of women studied do not differ from
239 an epidemiological standpoint (their past exposition to STIs being comparable) but,

240 potentially, from their local vaginal environment.

241 **Strengths and limitations**

242 Our study has several limitations, the strongest being the relatively small sample size of
243 the cohort used ($n = 103$), which was originally designed to study HPV infections. This
244 may hinder our ability to detect moderate or subtle changes induced by the menstrual
245 cups in the vaginal environment. Another limitation of the study lies in its cross-sectional
246 nature. Further longitudinal analyses would be helpful to establish long-term potential
247 impacts of the use of menstrual cups on the local environment, for example, on the
248 vaginal microbiota composition. Finally, we cannot provide more details regarding the
249 fungal species or their abundance. From a statistical standpoint, a potential issue has to
250 do with pseudo-replication since we analyse two visits for each participant. To address it,
251 we analysed each of the two visits independently. In both cases, the associations between
252 menstrual cup use, smoking, and fungal infection were at least significant (Table S4 and
253 S5). Interestingly, for the second visit, the time frame for reporting a fungal infection
254 (since the last visit, i.e. one month) was smaller than for the inclusion visit (three months)
255 and the effect is stronger in the former case.

256 Finally, other factors have been shown to shape the vaginal environment [21]. Here,
257 we included for instance the use of lubricants in the analysis but more detailed studies
258 could also include contraception methods or probiotic use.

259 **Interpretation**

260 Earlier work on menstrual cup use and women's health is limited and summarised in
261 a recent meta-analysis [10]. Our results are consistent with earlier studies, which do
262 not show adverse effects on the vaginal microbiota. Unfortunately, this earlier meta-
263 analysis studied infections in general and it would require a new meta-analysis to focus
264 on fungal infections in particular. However, the meta-analysis reported nine cases of
265 urinary tract complaints and we do find that menstrual cups users reported more urinary
266 tract infections than tampons users, although to a lesser extent than fungal infections.

267 **Conclusion**

268 Menstrual cups are one of the most popular alternatives to disposable menstrual prod-
269 ucts. As the demand for ‘eco-friendly’ and less expensive menstrual products arises, it is
270 crucial to better understand the effect of these products on women’s health. Our findings
271 can help shape public health policies regarding the use of menstrual cups and underline
272 the need for additional studies to be conducted that incorporate epidemiological, clinical,
273 and biological outcomes.

274 **Acknowledgements**

275 The authors thank all participants of the PAPCLEAR study and clinical staff and nurses
276 for their help.

277 **Disclosure of Interests**

278 The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may
279 be considered as potential competing interests: TW serves on advisory boards for MSD
280 (Merck) Sharp & Dohme.

281 **Contributions**

282 NT, CLM, NBo, and SA designed the study. NT, CLM, BE, BE, TK, IGB, and SA
283 designed the experiments. CB, VB, SGro, MR, and NBe performed experiments. CH,
284 JRa, and TW contributed reagents, materials, and analysis tools. CB, VB, SGra, SGro,
285 MR, MB, CG, VT, VF, CLM, JRe, IGB, MSe, NBo, and SA contributed to study design,
286 patient recruitment, and clinical data acquisition. NT, IBU, BE, BR, CS, TK, CLM,
287 and SA performed data analyses. NT, IBU, IGB, CLM, and SA wrote the initial version
288 of the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

289 **Ethics**

290 The PAPCLEAR trial is promoted by the Centre Hospitalier Universitaire (CHU) de
291 Montpellier and has been approved by the Comité de Protection des Personnes (CPP)

292 Sud Méditerranée I on 11 May 2016 (CPP number 16 42, reference number ID RCB 2016-
293 A00712-49); by the Comité Consultatif sur le Traitement de l'Information en matière de
294 Recherche dans le domaine de la Santé on 12 July 2016 (reference number 16.504); and
295 by the Commission Nationale Informatique et Libertés on 16 December 2016 (reference
296 number MMS/ABD/AR1612278, decision number DR-2016-488). This trial was autho-
297 rised by the Agence Nationale de Sécurité du Médicament et des Produits de Santé on 20
298 July 2016 (reference 20160072000007). The ClinicalTrials.gov identifier is NCT02946346.
299 All participants provided written informed consent.

300 **Funding**

301 This work was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European
302 Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme [grant agreement No 648963
303 to SA]. NT is an ANRS-MIE fellow. IBU is funded by the FHU INCH. TK is funded
304 by the Fondation pour la Recherche Médicale. The sponsors had no role in the study
305 design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report;
306 and in the decision to submit the article for publication.

307 Bibliography

- 308 1. Hennegan J, Winkler IT, Bobel C, Keiser D, Hampton J, Larsson G, Chandra-Mouli
309 V, Plesons M, and Mahon T. Menstrual health: a definition for policy, practice, and
310 research. *Sex. Reprod. Health Matters* 2021; 29. DOI: [10.1080/26410397.2021.
311 1911618](https://doi.org/10.1080/26410397.2021.1911618)
- 312 2. Carneiro MM. Menstrual poverty: enough is enough. *Women Health* 2021; 61:721–
313 2. DOI: [10.1080/03630242.2021.1970502](https://doi.org/10.1080/03630242.2021.1970502)
- 314 3. Phillips-Howard PA, Nyothach E, Kuile FO ter, Omoto J, Wang D, Zeh C, Onyango
315 C, Mason L, Alexander KT, Odhiambo FO, Eleveld A, Mohammed A, Eijk AM van,
316 Edwards RT, Vulule J, Faragher B, and Laserson KF. Menstrual cups and sanitary
317 pads to reduce school attrition, and sexually transmitted and reproductive tract
318 infections: a cluster randomised controlled feasibility study in rural Western Kenya.
319 *BMJ Open* 2016; 6. DOI: [10.1136/bmjopen-2016-013229](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-013229)
- 320 4. Torondel B, Sinha S, Mohanty JR, Swain T, Sahoo P, Panda B, Nayak A, Bara
321 M, Bilung B, Cumming O, Panigrahi P, and Das P. Association between unhy-
322gienic menstrual management practices and prevalence of lower reproductive tract
323 infections: a hospital-based cross-sectional study in Odisha, India. *BMC Infect Dis*
324 2018; 18:473
- 325 5. Smith SB and Ravel J. The vaginal microbiota, host defence and reproductive
326 physiology. *J Physiol* 2017; 595:451–63. DOI: [10.1113/JP271694](https://doi.org/10.1113/JP271694)
- 327 6. McKinnon LR, Achilles SL, Bradshaw CS, Burgener A, Crucitti T, Fredricks DN,
328 Jaspan HB, Kaul R, Kaushic C, Klatt N, Kwon DS, Marrazzo JM, Masson L,
329 McClelland RS, Ravel J, Wiggert JHHM van de, Vodstrcil LA, and Tachedjian G.
330 The Evolving Facets of Bacterial Vaginosis: Implications for HIV Transmission.
331 *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses* 2019; 35:219–28. DOI: [10.1089/aid.2018.0304](https://doi.org/10.1089/aid.2018.0304)
- 332 7. Ma B, France MT, Crabtree J, Holm JB, Humphrys MS, Brotman RM, and Ravel J.
333 A comprehensive non-redundant gene catalog reveals extensive within-community
334 intraspecies diversity in the human vagina. *Nat Commun* 2020; 11:940
- 335 8. Zhou JZ, Way SS, and Chen K. Immunology of the Uterine and Vaginal Mucosae.
336 *Trends Immunol* 2018 Apr; 39:302–14
- 337 9. Wira CR, Rodriguez-Garcia M, and Patel MV. The role of sex hormones in immune
338 protection of the female reproductive tract. *Nat Rev Immunol* 2015 Apr; 15:217–
339 30

- 340 10. Eijk AM van, Zulaika G, Lenchner M, Mason L, Sivakami M, Nyothach E, Unger
341 H, Laserson K, and Phillips-Howard PA. Menstrual cup use, leakage, acceptabil-
342 ity, safety, and availability: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Public*
343 *Health* 2019; 4:e376–e393. DOI: [10.1016/S2468-2667\(19\)30111-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(19)30111-2)
- 344 11. North BB and Oldham MJ. Preclinical, clinical, and over-the-counter postmarket-
345 ing experience with a new vaginal cup: menstrual collection. *J Womens Health*
346 2011; 20:303–11. DOI: [10.1089/jwh.2009.1929](https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2009.1929)
- 347 12. Nonfoux L, Chiaruzzi M, Badiou C, Baude J, Tristan A, Thioulouse J, Muller
348 D, Prigent-Combaret C, and Lina G. Impact of Currently Marketed Tampons and
349 Menstrual Cups on *Staphylococcus aureus* Growth and Toxic Shock Syndrome Toxin
350 1 Production *In Vitro*. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 2018; 84. DOI: [10.1128/AEM.](https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00351-18)
351 [00351-18](https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00351-18)
- 352 13. Murall CL, Rahmoun M, Selinger C, Baldellou M, Bernat C, Bonneau M, Boué
353 V, Buisson M, Christophe G, D’Auria G, Taroni FD, Foulongne V, Froissart R,
354 Graf C, Grasset S, Groc S, Hirtz C, Jaussent A, Lajoie J, Lorcy F, Picot E, Picot
355 MC, Ravel J, Reynes J, Rousset T, Seddiki A, Teirlinck M, Tribout V, Tuailon É,
356 Waterboer T, Jacobs N, Bravo IG, Segondy M, Boulle N, and Alizon S. Natural
357 history, dynamics, and ecology of human papillomaviruses in genital infections of
358 young women: Protocol of the PAPCLEAR cohort study. *BMJ Open* 2019; 9:25129.
359 DOI: [10.1136/bmjopen-2018-025129](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-025129)
- 360 14. Waterboer T, Sehr P, Michael KM, Franceschi S, Nieland JD, Joos TO, Templin
361 MF, and Pawlita M. Multiplex human papillomavirus serology based on in situ-
362 purified glutathione s-transferase fusion proteins. *Clin Chem* 2005; 51:1845–53
- 363 15. Murall CL, Reyné B, Selinger C, Bernat C, Boué V, Grasset S, Groc S, Rahmoun
364 M, Bender N, Bonneau M, Foulongne V, Graf C, Picot E, Picot MC, Tribout
365 V, Waterboer T, Bravo IG, Reynes J, Segondy M, Boulle N, and Alizon S. HPV
366 cervical infections and serological status in vaccinated and unvaccinated women.
367 *Vaccine* 2020; 38:8167–74. DOI: [10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.10.078](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.10.078)
- 368 16. Selinger C, Rahmoun M, Murall CL, Bernat C, Boué V, Bonneau M, Graf C,
369 Grasset S, Groc S, Reynes J, Hirtz C, Jacobs N, and Alizon S. Cytokine response
370 following perturbation of the cervicovaginal milieu during HPV genital infection.
371 *Immunol. Res.* 2021; 69:255–63. DOI: [10.1007/S12026-021-09196-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/S12026-021-09196-2)
- 372 17. France MT, Ma B, Gajer P, Brown S, Humphrys MS, Holm JB, Waetjen LE,
373 Brotman RM, and Ravel J. VALENCIA: a nearest centroid classification method

- 374 for vaginal microbial communities based on composition. *Microbiome* 2020; 8:166.
375 DOI: [10.1186/s40168-020-00934-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-020-00934-6)
- 376 18. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foun-
377 dation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria, 2021. Available from: [https:](https://www.R-project.org/)
378 [//www.R-project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/)
- 379 19. Burnham K and Anderson D. Model Selection and Inference: A Practical Information-
380 Theoretic Approach. 2. 2002 :75
- 381 20. Lê S, Josse J, and Husson F. FactoMineR: An R Package for Multivariate Analysis.
382 *Journal of Statistical Software* 2008; 25:1–18. DOI: [10.18637/jss.v025.i01](https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v025.i01)
- 383 21. Ravel J, Gajer P, Abdo Z, Schneider GM, Koenig SS, McCulle SL, Karlebach S,
384 Gorle R, Russell J, Tacket CO, Brotman RM, Davis CC, Ault K, Peralta L, and
385 Forney LJ. Vaginal microbiome of reproductive-age women. *Proc Nat Acad Sci*
386 USA 2011; 108:4680–7. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.1002611107](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1002611107)

Table 1: **Association between menstrual cups usage in comparison with tampons.** Results show the odds ratio (OR) of the factors selected in the best generalised linear model against menstrual cup as the response variable and using an Akaike Information Criterion corrected for small sample size (AICc). SE stands for standard error and CI for confidence interval.

Model [1]: Menstrual cup	OR	OR SE	CI 2.5%	CI 95%	p.value	
Urinary tract infection	3.45	2.37	0.86	13.37	0.07	•
Smoking	0.18	0.10	0.06	0.49	0.001	**
HPV positive (focal)	0.36	0.18	0.13	0.92	0.04	*
Number of partners over the last 12 months	1.04	0.02	1.00	1.08	0.04	*
Fungal infection	6.55	4.22	1.86	24.10	0.004	**

** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$; • $p < 0.1$

Model [1]: Menstrual cup	Presence in best models (#)	Presence in best models (%)	p.value < 0.1(%)	p.value < 0.05(%)
Smoking	93	100	100	100
Fungal infection	93	100	100	100
HPV positive (focal)	72	77.42	73.12	45.16
Number of partners over the last 12 months	71	76.34	46.24	21.51
Urinary tract infection	53	56.99	37.63	0
Age	40	43.01	19.35	0
Menses	19	20.43	0	0
HPV positive (multiple)	20	21.51	0	0
Lubricant	19	20.43	0	0
Intercourse with an occasional partner (last week)	14	15.05	0	0
Intercourse with a regular partner (last week)	13	13.98	0	0
Vaccinated against HPV	16	17.2	0	0
Stress level (1)	2	2.15	0	0
Stress level (2)	2	2.15	0	0
Stress level (3 (Max))	2	2.15	0	0

Table 2: Proportion of covariables presence among the 93 best models (Model 1) selected by AICc ($AICc + 5$)




Figure 1: **Epidemiological, microbiological, and immunological differences between women using mainly menstrual cups or tampons.** A) Odds ratio of covariates associated with the risk of fungal infection detection, B) Abundance and diversity of the main bacterial species found in participants, C) Community State Types (CST) distribution, D) Shannon diversity index, E) Cytokines local concentrations (log), and F) Outcome of a multi-parametric clustering analysis using factor analysis of mixed data (FAMD). In A, red indicates significance ($p < 0.05$) and blue indicates non-significance. In D, E, and F, colours show the type of menstrual product used (tampons in blue and cups in yellow). In F, the CSTs are shown in red.