

Covid-19 vaccination and menstrual cycle length in the Apple Women's Health Study

Elizabeth A. Gibson, PhD;^{a*} Huichu Li, PhD;^{b*} Victoria Fruh, PhD^b Malaika Gabra, BA;^b Gowtham Asokan, MS;^a Anne Marie Z. Jukic, PhD, MSPH;^c Donna D. Baird, PhD;^c Christine L Curry, MD, PhD;^d Tyler Fischer-Colbrie, MBA;^d Jukka-Pekka Onnela, DSc;^a Michelle A. Williams, ScD;^e Russ Hauser, MD, ScD, MPH^{b,e} Brent A. Coull, PhD;^{a,b} Shruthi Mahalingaiah, MD, MS^{b,f}

* Co-first authors

a Department of Biostatistics, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA

b Department of Environmental Health, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA

c Epidemiology Branch, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina

d Health, Apple Inc., Cupertino, CA

e Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA

f Corresponding author: shruthi@hsph.harvard.edu

Abstract

Background:

COVID-19 vaccination may be associated with change in menstrual cycle length following vaccination.

Methods:

We conducted a longitudinal analysis within a subgroup of 14,915 participants in the Apple Women's Health Study (AWHS) who enrolled between November 2019 and December 2021 and met the following eligibility criteria: were living in the U.S., met minimum age requirements for consent, were English speaking, actively tracked their menstrual cycles, and responded to the COVID-19 Vaccine Update survey. In the main analysis, we included tracked cycles recorded when premenopausal participants were not pregnant, lactating, or using hormonal contraceptives. We used conditional linear regression and multivariable linear mixed-effects models with random intercepts to estimate the covariate-adjusted difference in mean cycle length, measured in days, between pre-vaccination cycles, cycles in which a vaccine was administered, and post-vaccination cycles within vaccinated participants, and between vaccinated and unvaccinated participants. We further compared associations between vaccination and menstrual cycle length by the timing of vaccine dose within a menstrual cycle (i.e., in follicular or luteal phase). We present Bonferroni-adjusted 95% confidence intervals to account for multiple comparisons.

Results:

A total of 128,094 cycles (median = 10 cycles per participant; interquartile range: 4-22) from 9,652 participants (8,486 vaccinated; 1,166 unvaccinated) were included. The average within-individual standard deviation in cycle length was 4.2 days. Fifty-five percent of vaccinated participants received Pfizer-BioNTech's mRNA vaccine, 37% received Moderna's mRNA vaccine, and 7% received the Johnson & Johnson/Janssen vaccine (J&J). We found no evidence of a difference between mean menstrual cycle length in the unvaccinated and vaccinated participants prior to vaccination (0.24 days, 95% CI: -0.34, 0.82).

Among vaccinated participants, COVID-19 vaccination was associated with a small increase in mean cycle length (MCL) for cycles in which participants received the first dose (0.50 days, 95% CI: 0.22, 0.78) and cycles in which participants received the second dose (0.39 days, 95% CI: 0.11, 0.67) of mRNA vaccines compared with pre-vaccination cycles. Cycles in which the single dose of J&J was administered were, on average, 1.26 days longer (95% CI: 0.45, 2.07) than pre-vaccination cycles. Post-vaccination cycles returned to average pre-vaccination length. Estimates for pre vs post cycle lengths were 0.14 days (95% CI: -0.13, 0.40) in the first cycle following vaccination, 0.13 days (95% CI: -0.14, 0.40) in the second, -0.17 days (95% CI: -0.43, 0.10) in the third, and -0.25 days (95% CI: -0.52, 0.01) in the fourth cycle post-vaccination.

Follicular phase vaccination was associated with an increase in MCL in cycles in which participants received the first dose (0.97 days, 95% CI: 0.53, 1.42) or the second dose (1.43 days, 95% CI: 1.06, 1.80) of mRNA vaccines or the J&J dose (2.27 days, 95% CI: 1.04, 3.50), compared with pre-vaccination cycles.

Conclusions:

COVID-19 vaccination was associated with an immediate short-term increase in menstrual cycle length overall, which appeared to be driven by doses received in the follicular phase. However, the magnitude of this increase was small and diminished in each cycle following vaccination. No association with cycle length persisted over time. The magnitude of change associated with vaccination was well within the natural variability in the study population. Menstrual cycle change following COVID-19 vaccination appears small and temporary and should not discourage individuals from becoming vaccinated.

Introduction

Though the United States Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) does not actively collect information regarding menstrual cycles, over 11,000 people self-reported a menstrual-related issue to the system following COVID-19 vaccination by April 2022.¹ Events included heavy bleeding, irregular or delayed menstruation, oligomenorrhea, and amenorrhea. Likewise, the United Kingdom's Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) yellow card surveillance scheme received over 50,000 reports of menstrual disorders, including heavier than usual periods, delayed periods, and unexpected bleeding, after the COVID-19 vaccine.² This anecdotal evidence suggested the possibility of temporary changes in menstrual cycles following COVID-19 vaccination.^{3,4} Women reported these menstrual changes to their doctors and posted about them on social media.^{5,6} Various news outlets publicized the anecdotal reports.⁷⁻⁹

COVID-19 vaccination is widely regarded as safe,^{10,11} and there is no evidence that it affects fertility in laboratory models,^{12,13} clinical trials,^{14,15} or observational studies.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ Still, the immune response or the associated stress may link the vaccine with certain temporary menstrual changes.³ Improved understanding of these associations, such as whether one exists and the magnitude and persistence of potential changes, will assist clinicians in counselling women concerning vaccination.¹⁹

While research on the COVID-19 vaccine and menstrual characteristics is limited, existing studies have reported temporarily increased menstrual cycle length,²⁰ increased menstrual bleeding,²¹ longer duration of menses,²² and menstrual irregularities,^{23,24} as well as breakthrough bleeding in individuals who previously menstruated.²⁵ Generally, these changes were considered short term, but detailed follow-up data beyond the first cycle after vaccination were not presented. These reports suggest the possibility of temporary changes in menstrual cycles following COVID-19 vaccination.^{3,4}

Here, we evaluate the relationship between COVID-19 vaccination and menstrual cycle length over time in the Apple Women's Health Study (AWHS), a longitudinal digital cohort of people in the U.S. with manually

tracked menstrual cycles.²⁶ We compare pre-vaccination cycle lengths with those in which a vaccine dose was administered and cycles following vaccination.

Methods

Study design and population

The AWHs is a prospective digital cohort of participants in the U.S.. Recruitment began in November 2019 and is currently on-going.²⁶ Enrollment eligibility specifies that participants must be assigned female at birth, have menstruated at least once, live in the U.S., be at least 18 years old (at least 19 years old in Alabama and Nebraska and at least 21 years old in Puerto Rico), be able to communicate through written and spoken English, have an iPhone with a compatible version of iOS, download the Apple Research app, be the sole user of an iPhone and an iCloud account, and provide informed consent for participation. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Advarra (CIRB #PRO00037562) and registered on Clinicaltrials.gov (NCT04196595).

Detailed information on study design, participant recruitment, and data collection has been described previously.²⁶ Briefly, participants completed surveys on demographic characteristics and baseline menstrual status at enrollment, on reproductive history within the first year, and on health behaviors and gynecological history once a year during follow-up. After enrollment, participants were surveyed monthly regarding their menstrual health. A COVID-19 Vaccine Update survey prompted participants to record their vaccination status and, if applicable, answer questions regarding their vaccine. For this analysis, we included eligible AWHs participants who completed the COVID-19 Vaccine Update survey and tracked at least one menstrual cycle.

COVID-19 Vaccine Update survey and cycle tracking

The COVID-19 Vaccine Update survey was first delivered to participants in September 2021. This survey was redistributed quarterly or until participants completed it. It asked if participants received a COVID-19 vaccine, and they could respond “Yes,” “No,” or “Prefer not to answer.” Participants who answered “Yes”

received follow-up questions to ascertain the date of the first and second (if applicable) vaccines, the type of first and second (if applicable) vaccines (Pfizer-BioNTech, Moderna, Johnson & Johnson/Janssen, or other), and any symptoms in the 48 hours following a dose. Participants who completed the COVID-19 Vaccine Update survey with missing or incorrect dates [e.g., vaccination dates recorded before December 2021 (when vaccinations first became available) or after February 2022 (when this analysis was conducted) or second dose recorded before first dose] were excluded from this analysis. Dissemination of the COVID-19 Vaccine Update survey occurred prior to the authorization and roll out of additional doses and boosters in the U.S..²⁷ Therefore, questions concerning the number of vaccines received was aligned with CDC classification of vaccination primary series.²⁸

Characteristics of tracked menstrual cycles in the AWHs and methods for menstrual cycle identification have been described.²⁹ Participants logged menses, with associated dates, via Cycle Tracking in the Apple Health app or any third-party cycle tracking app that the participant permitted to write to HealthKit. These merged data could include logging collected prospectively after enrollment and entries from up to two years prior to enrollment. Menstrual cycle length was derived from cycles identified after removing artifacts due to skipped tracking.²⁹ The primary analysis included cycles tracked retrospectively as early as January 2018, and prospectively between enrollment and November 2021 when participants had not reported a hysterectomy and were not pregnant, lactating, menopausal, or using hormones.

For the current work, participants were categorized as vaccinated or unvaccinated as self-reported in the COVID-19 Vaccine Update survey. Of the participants who responded “Prefer not to answer” concerning their vaccination status (N = 216) and participants who indicated that they had received one dose of a two-dose series (N = 257), none tracked menstrual cycles. Individual cycles for vaccinated participants were labeled as: 1) “pre-vaccination”, if the entire cycle occurred prior to the first vaccination, 2) “first dose,” cycle in which the participant received the first vaccine dose of the Pfizer-BioNTech or Moderna series (i.e., mRNA vaccines), 3) “second dose,” the cycle in which the participant received the second dose of an mRNA

series, 4) “J&J dose,” the cycle in which the participant received the single Johnson & Johnson/Janssen dose, or 5) “post-vaccination,” with the number of cycles since vaccination (since the second dose of an mRNA series or since the single J&J dose, accordingly) recorded. Post-vaccine cycles 1-4 were assessed for potentially persistent associations over time; we limited analysis to four cycles post-vaccination because booster vaccines likely became available as early as cycle five. We further categorized vaccination as having occurred during the follicular phase or luteal phase of a cycle to assess the impact of timing of the dose within a menstrual cycle. For a given cycle beginning with the first bleed day, we defined the luteal phase as the 14 days prior to the start of the subsequent cycle, and we defined the follicular phase as the remaining days beginning with the first bleed day and ending on the day prior to the luteal phase.^{30,31} Participants with a single cycle in which they received both doses were excluded from the current analysis due to the fact that these cycles could not be short, by definition, and their length was not necessarily a result of treatment.

Covariates

Extensive data were collected from survey questionnaires through the Apple Research app.²⁶ Final regression models included covariates that were a priori defined as potential confounders based on previous literature and a directed acyclic graph [(DAG) Supplemental Figure S1].^{32,33} These include age, race/ethnicity, body mass index (BMI), parity, and season. We calculated participants’ age as the year of a given menstrual cycle minus their birth year. Because previous studies have suggested a non-linear relationship between age and menstrual cycle length,^{30,34} we categorized age as < 20, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, and > 50. For this analysis, we divided race/ethnicity into three categories based on self-report at enrollment, White, non-Hispanic, Hispanic (Latina or Spanish), or other [including Black, non-Hispanic (African American or African), Asian, American Indian or Alaska Native, Middle Eastern or North African, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, more than one race/ethnicity, or participants who reported that none of the available categories fully described them], due to the small number of participants in some

groups. BMI was calculated from self-reported height and weight at enrollment; participants are prompted to update these fields yearly. Participants were categorized as underweight (BMI < 18.5 kg/m²), normal (18.5 ≤ BMI < 25 kg/m²), overweight (25 ≤ BMI < 30 kg/m²), or obese (BMI ≥ 30 kg/m²). Parity was recorded as nulliparous or parous as reported in the reproductive history survey. We included an indicator variable for month and year of cycle to control for seasonality as well as shared pandemic experiences and stressors among all participants in the study (vaccinated and unvaccinated). Missingness was included as a category for all covariates.

Statistical analysis

We examined distributional plots, contingency tables, and descriptive statistics for all variables of interest. We used conditional linear regression models with subject-level fixed effects to estimate the covariate-adjusted within-woman difference and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) in mean cycle length, measured in days, between pre-vaccination cycles and cycles in which a vaccine dose was administered and between pre-vaccination cycles and post-vaccination cycles. We included participant ID as a fixed effect in the conditional model to account for longitudinal clustering of repeated measures within each participant. The fixed effect controls for all potential confounders that vary between participants, and so in this approach, subject-specific covariates that do not vary with time are not included in the model. This strategy is similar to a case-control study that includes matching of cases and controls on certain covariates. In the present analysis, the “matching” is within a participant and compares vaccinated and post-vaccine cycles (case cycles) to their own pre-vaccine cycles (control cycles).

We defined long (>38 days) cycles using recommendations from the International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics and estimated the probability of experiencing a long menstrual cycle in cycles in which a vaccine was received and post-vaccine cycles compared with pre-vaccine cycles.³⁵ To consider the chance of a long cycle in relation to vaccination, we fit a covariate-adjusted conditional logistic regression and present odds ratios (ORs) and 95% CIs.

We further compared associations between vaccination and menstrual cycle length by the timing of vaccine dose within a menstrual cycle (i.e., in the follicular phase or the luteal phase). Heterogeneity by menstrual cycle phase was considered by calculating the difference in effect estimates (e.g., first dose in the follicular phase versus first dose in the luteal phase) with the associated 95% CI; a 95% CI that did not contain zero was interpreted as a significant difference between the two coefficients.

Because conditional regression does not provide estimates for independent variables that do not vary within participant (e.g., race/ethnicity and parity), we used multivariable linear mixed-effects models with random participant-specific intercepts to estimate the covariate-adjusted difference and 95% CI in mean cycle length between vaccinated and unvaccinated participants. Additionally, we used generalized estimating equations (GEE) to fit a logistic regression model that estimated ORs and 95% CI for the association between COVID-19 vaccination and the probability of having a long cycle in vaccinated participants compared with unvaccinated participants.

We conducted additional sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of our results. First, we restricted to participants who contributed at least three menstrual cycles; for vaccinated participants, we required at least two cycles before their first dose and at least one cycle in which a dose was administered or post-vaccination. Within participants who contributed three or more cycles, we calculated the average menstrual cycle length across all tracked cycles for unvaccinated participants and across pre-vaccination cycles for vaccinated participants and then restricted to those with an average cycle length of 24-38 days. Additionally, we retained participants who received two doses in a single cycle (N = 830), and we conducted a complete case analysis by removing cycles with missing values for covariates. Finally, considering some participants may have reported being unvaccinated in the COVID-19 Vaccine Update survey but later received a vaccine, we restricted to cycles recorded prior to COVID-19 Vaccine Update survey completion. Data management, processing, and statistical analyses were conducted in Python 3.6.³⁶ All statistical tests were two-sided. We present Bonferroni-adjusted 95% confidence intervals for all results, with $\alpha = 0.05/7$

(i.e., 99.99% confidence intervals) for the main analysis to account for multiple comparisons among the seven main associations of interest (i.e., first dose, second dose, J&J dose, and post-vaccination cycles 1-4, all compared with pre-vaccination cycles).

Results

A total of 257,838 menstrual cycles from 15,001 participants who completed the COVID-19 Vaccine Update survey and tracked at least one cycle were initially identified. After applying the remaining exclusion criteria, 128,094 menstrual cycles from 9,652 participants were included in the current analysis (Supplemental Figure S2). Participants recorded 13 cycles on average [median = 10; inter-quartile range (IQR): 4-22 (Supplemental Figure S3)]. The average within-individual standard deviation in cycle length was 4.2 days. Eighty-eight percent of participants were vaccinated; 12% were not. Fifty-five percent of vaccinated participants received the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine, 37% received Moderna, and 7% received Johnson & Johnson/Janssen. A total of 7,490 long cycles were identified, 6% of all cycles included. Vaccinated participants tended to be in the older age groups, to have a college or graduate degree, to be married, and to be nulliparous (Table 1). The distribution of BMI and race/ethnicity were similar between vaccinated and unvaccinated participants.

Using covariate-adjusted conditional linear regression, we found menstrual cycles when participants received the vaccine to be, on average, longer than their pre-vaccination cycles (Table 2). Among vaccinated participants, COVID-19 vaccination was associated with a small increase in length for cycles when participants received the first dose (0.50 days, 95% CI: 0.22, 0.78) and cycles when participants received the second dose (0.39 days, 95% CI: 0.11, 0.67) of mRNA vaccines compared with pre-vaccination cycles. Cycles in which the single dose of J&J was administered were, on average, 1.26 days longer (95% CI: 0.45, 2.07) than pre-vaccination cycles. Post-vaccination cycles returned to average pre-vaccination length, with 0.14 days (95% CI: -0.13, 0.40) in the first cycle following vaccination, 0.13 days (95% CI: -0.14, 0.40) in the

second cycle, -0.17 days (95% CI: -0.43, 0.10) in the third cycle, and -0.25 days (95% CI: -0.52, 0.01) in the fourth.

The conditional logistic regression model of the probability of a long cycle suggested that, compared with pre-vaccination cycles, participants were more likely to experience a long cycle during the cycle in which they received the J&J vaccine [OR = 2.17, 95% CI: 1.16, 4.04 (Table 2)]. There was no evidence of increased probability of a long cycle for cycles in which participants received the first dose (OR = 1.13, 95% CI: 0.86, 1.48) or the second dose (OR = 1.08, 95% CI: 0.82, 1.42) of mRNA vaccines. There was, likewise, no evidence of increased odds of long cycles in the first cycle (OR = 0.94, 95% CI: 0.73, 1.21) or the second cycle (OR = 0.94, 95% CI: 0.73, 1.21) post-vaccination, regardless of the vaccine type. In the third and fourth post-vaccination cycles, the odds of a long cycle decreased, with OR = 0.76 (95% CI: 0.59, 0.98) in the third cycle and OR = 0.71 (95% CI: 0.55, 0.93) in the fourth cycle following the single J&J dose or the second dose of an mRNA vaccine.

The association between vaccine dose and mean cycle length depended on the phase in which the dose was received (Table 3). Compared with pre-vaccination cycles, follicular phase vaccination with an mRNA vaccine was associated with an increase in mean cycle length in first dose cycles (0.97 days, 95% CI: 0.53, 1.42) or second dose cycles (1.43 days, 95% CI: 1.06, 1.80). For the J&J dose, follicular phase vaccination was associated with a 2.27 (95% CI: 1.04, 3.50) day increase in cycle length. There was no evidence of increased mean cycle length in cycles in which the first vaccine dose (0.21 days, 95% CI: -0.14, 0.57) or the J&J vaccine dose (0.39 days, 95% CI: -0.75, 1.53) were administered in the luteal phase. However, luteal phase vaccination was associated with a decrease in average length for cycles in which the second dose was administered (-0.97 days, 95% CI: -1.39, -0.55), compared with pre-vaccination cycles. Regression coefficients for post-vaccination cycles did not meaningfully change with the inclusion of cycle phase.

In the covariate-adjusted mixed-effects model, we found no evidence of a difference between mean menstrual cycle length in vaccinated and unvaccinated participants (0.24 days, 95% CI: -0.34, 0.82).

Likewise, in the GEE, the probability of a long cycle was similar in unvaccinated and vaccinated participants (OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 1.00, 1.44). Regression coefficients for vaccine doses were similar to but larger in magnitude than those from conditional regression models (Tables S1 and S2).

Fifty-eight percent of participants were included in the sensitivity analysis restricted to those with three or more tracked cycles. While 82% of participants had three or more tracked cycles, only 53% of vaccinated participants had two or more tracked cycles before vaccination and at least one tracked cycle in which a vaccine was administered or after vaccination. Three percent of cycles had missing values and were dropped in the complete case analysis. Ninety-seven percent of cycles were tracked before completion of the COVID-19 Vaccine Update survey, and 83% of participants had an average cycle length of 24-38 days. Results from sensitivity analyses were consistent with those from the main analyses (Table S1-S4). When participants who received two doses in a single menstrual cycle were included, these cycles were, on average, 4.96 days (95% CI: 4.42, 5.50) longer than pre-vaccination cycles (Table S5).

Discussion

In this large prospective cohort of participants in the U.S., we examined differences in menstrual cycle length in relation to the type of COVID-19 vaccine administered and the timing of administration. Our results suggest a small, non-persistent increase in average length of menstrual cycles in which a vaccine was administered. Moreover, the J&J vaccine was associated with a significant increase in the probability of a clinically long (> 38 days) cycle; however, this increase did not persist over time. We found little evidence of increased length for cycles following vaccination. We saw that doses received in the follicular phase explained the increase in mean cycle length observed in the primary results. We also observed that when a second dose was received in the luteal phase, that cycle was, on average, shorter. Together, these results indicate that the association between vaccination and cycle length differs by the phase in which a dose was administered.

Previous studies have shown increased cycle length,²⁰ as well as menstrual cycle irregularities in relation to COVID-19 vaccination.^{21–24} The current work is consistent with results from Edelman et al. that showed a less than one day increase in length during cycles when vaccination occurred.²⁰ We extended this work to evaluate vaccine timing and menstrual cycle length and found follicular dosing of all vaccines associated with longer cycles, while a second dose of an mRNA vaccine in the luteal phase was associated with slightly shorter cycles.

Potential mechanisms underlying the change in menstrual cycle length may involve inflammation from the immune response to vaccination. This immune response may impact a) signaling between the hypothalamus, pituitary, and ovaries (HPO), resulting in i) prolongation of follicular recruitment and, as a result, elongation of menstrual cycle length,³⁷ or ii) suppression of the growth of the endometrial lining,³⁸ and b) endometrial stability in the luteal phase, causing a reduction in cycle length.^{39,40}

The onset of menstruation is characterized by endometrial breakdown and apoptosis. Immune cells derived from menstrual blood demonstrate production of inflammatory markers (e.g., interferon (IFN)-gamma, granzyme B, and perforin),⁴¹ and genes related to inflammatory processes (e.g., lipopolysaccharide binding protein, SERPINB3, SERPINB4, IL17C, and SPINK1) are up-regulated.⁴² mRNA vaccines may potentially trigger an innate immune response by activating pro-inflammatory cytokines, type I IFNs, and pro-inflammatory genes.⁴³ In this way, the Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna vaccines may disturb the menstrual cycle by promoting local and systemic inflammation.

Individual cycle length varies naturally,^{44,45} and the International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics classifies a difference of less than 8 days between an individual's shortest and longest cycles as normal.³⁵ The magnitude of the change we see in our data following vaccination is well within this natural variability. In contrast, infection by the COVID-19 virus may cause potentially long-term disruption of menstrual function.^{46–51} Research has found no evidence that COVID-19 vaccination adversely impacts fertility

outcomes.^{12–18} COVID-19 vaccination is widely regarded as safe for people who menstruate,^{52,53} and this work supports that conclusion.

This study has several strengths. First, a large sample size (120,815 menstrual cycles from 9,295 participants) allowed for sufficient statistical power to detect minor differences measured in fractions of days. Further, the AWHs includes a diverse population across a wide range of demographic characteristics (e.g., age, race/ethnicity, education, BMI category). Moreover, the AWHs is not limited to users of a specific cycle tracking app which may target certain demographic groups; instead, cycle tracking can occur directly through the Health app or through a variety of third-party apps. Additionally, menstrual cycle characteristics were reported prospectively. We used multivariable models to adjust for potential confounding in all analyses. In our main analyses, we used conditional, fixed effect models which control for individual-level features. This removed any avenue for confounding by sociodemographic factors or differential tracking behavior across participants. Finally, we controlled for seasonality by including an indicator variable for month and year of cycle; this further accounted for pandemic era experiences and shared social stressors in both vaccinated and unvaccinated participants.

Our findings should be interpreted in light of several limitations. First, because our analysis considered mean cycle length in the population, it cannot distinguish subpopulations, such as participants with preexisting conditions, who may have experienced more extreme changes in cycle length. Second, we relied on self-report for menstrual characteristics, COVID-19 vaccination details, and reported covariates. Consequently, the accuracy of the estimated menstrual cycle length may be affected by user tracking behavior, on which we have limited information. However, use of conditional models for our primary analyses controlled for differences in tracking behavior between participants, and the precise indicator variable for month and year controlled for potential changes in tracking behavior over time, leaving the only path for temporal confounding through differential changes in tracking behavior over time by treatment (i.e., in vaccinated and unvaccinated participants). We also had limited data on menses and were

thus unable to address potential associations between the COVID-19 vaccine and bleed length or flow characteristics. We lacked measurements for participants' hormone levels to determine the follicular and luteal phases of a given cycle; instead, we calculated this using a standard approach which could affect the phase-specific estimates and the comparisons between them.^{30,31} Because our study population only included iPhone users in the U.S., our results may not be generalizable to all U.S. individuals who menstruate or to other populations. Additionally, given available data, we did not include participants with two vaccine doses in a single cycle in our main analyses. In a sensitivity analysis, these cycles appeared close to five days longer than pre-vaccination cycles, on average. However, cycles in which two vaccines were administered could not be shorter than the number of days between doses (usually 21 or 28 days), truncating the distribution of menstrual cycle length and making these cycles longer, by definition, and not necessarily a result of vaccination. Because receiving two doses in a single cycle was dependent on menstrual cycle length, we did not present these findings as main results, and further research is required to investigate this association. Finally, we cannot exclude the possibility of residual confounding from an unidentified time-varying factor, such as COVID-19 infection, which we did not query. Nonetheless, we adjusted for multiple factors that varied within participant (and between participants in mixed-effects models) to account for confounding from multiple directions. We do not expect, therefore, that residual confounding can fully explain our results.

Conclusions

In the present study, we estimated the association between COVID-19 vaccination and menstrual cycle length in the cycles in which vaccination occurred and in succeeding cycles. Vaccination was associated with a very small increase in cycle length that was well within the natural variability in the study population. This change appeared driven by doses received in the follicular phase of the cycle. The magnitude of the increase diminished in each cycle following vaccination, and no association with cycle length persisted over

time. This change appears minor and temporary and should not discourage individuals from becoming vaccinated.

Acknowledgements

The AWHS team would like to thank the participants for signing up for the study and contributing to the advancement of women's health research. We would like to acknowledge Alexis de Figueiredo Veiga, MS, Nicola Gallagher, MS, and Ariel L Scalise, MPH for their work in supporting the study as part of the Harvard Study staff.

References

1. United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Public Health Service (PHS), Food and Drug Administration (FDA) / Centers for Disease Control (CDC). Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) 1990 - last Friday, CDC WONDER Online Database. Search terms: Symptoms: HEAVY MENSTRUAL BLEEDING, MENSTRUATION IRREGULAR, MENSTRUAL DISORDER, INTERMENSTRUAL BLEEDING, MENSTRUATION DELAYED, AMENORRHOEA, POLYMENORRHOEA, OLIGOMENORRHOEA, MENOMETRORRHAGIA, MENORRHAGIA, METRORRHAGIA, MENSTRUAL CYCLE MANAGEMENT. Vaccine: COVID-19. Accessed April 15, 2022. <https://wonder.cdc.gov/controller/datarequest/D8>
2. Coronavirus vaccine - weekly summary of Yellow Card reporting. GOV.UK. Accessed April 15, 2022. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-vaccine-adverse-reactions/coronavirus-vaccine-summary-of-yellow-card-reporting>
3. Male V. Menstrual changes after covid-19 vaccination. *BMJ*. 2021;374:n2211. doi:10.1136/bmj.n2211
4. Sharp GC, Fraser A, Sawyer G, et al. The COVID-19 pandemic and the menstrual cycle: research gaps and opportunities. *Int J Epidemiol*. Published online December 2, 2021:dyab239. doi:10.1093/ije/dyab239
5. Forrester C. Period problems after Covid vaccine: Tenfold increase in reports to drugs watchdog. The Courier. Accessed April 15, 2022. <https://www.thecourier.co.uk/fp/lifestyle/health-wellbeing/3149276/period-problems-after-covid-vaccine-tenfold-increase-in-reports/>
6. Landman K. Why were scientists so slow to study Covid-19 vaccines and menstruation? Vox. Published February 17, 2022. Accessed April 15, 2022. <https://www.vox.com/22935125/covid-vaccine-trials-menstrual-cycle-period-changes-fertility-myths>
7. Subbaraman N. Covid-19 Vaccines Linked to Menstrual Cycle Changes. WSJ. Accessed April 15, 2022. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/covid-19-vaccines-linked-to-menstrual-cycle-changes-11643902386>
8. Covid Vaccines Can Delay Women's Periods, Study Finds. *Bloomberg.com*. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-01-07/covid-vaccines-can-delay-women-s-periods-study-finds>. Published January 7, 2022. Accessed April 15, 2022.
9. Brumfiel G. COVID vaccines may briefly change your menstrual cycle, but you should still get one. *NPR*. <https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2022/01/06/1070796638/covid-vaccine-periods>. Published January 6, 2022. Accessed April 15, 2022.
10. CDC. COVID-19 Vaccination. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published February 11, 2020. Accessed April 15, 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/safety/safety-of-vaccines.html>
11. CDC. Benefits of Getting a COVID-19 Vaccine. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published February 25, 2022. Accessed April 15, 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/vaccine-benefits.html>

12. Morris RS. SARS-CoV-2 spike protein seropositivity from vaccination or infection does not cause sterility. *FS Rep*. 2021;2(3):253-255. doi:10.1016/j.xfre.2021.05.010
13. Bowman CJ, Bouressam M, Champion SN, et al. Lack of effects on female fertility and prenatal and postnatal offspring development in rats with BNT162b2, a mRNA-based COVID-19 vaccine. *Reprod Toxicol Elmsford N*. 2021;103:28-35. doi:10.1016/j.reprotox.2021.05.007
14. Hillson K, Clemens SC, Madhi SA, et al. Fertility rates and birth outcomes after ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (AZD1222) vaccination. *Lancet Lond Engl*. 2021;398(10312):1683-1684. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)02282-0
15. Male V. Are COVID-19 vaccines safe in pregnancy? *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2021;21(4):200-201. doi:10.1038/s41577-021-00525-y
16. Orvieto R, Noach-Hirsh M, Segev-Zahav A, Haas J, Nahum R, Aizer A. Does mRNA SARS-CoV-2 vaccine influence patients' performance during IVF-ET cycle? *Reprod Biol Endocrinol RBE*. 2021;19(1):69. doi:10.1186/s12958-021-00757-6
17. Bentov Y, Beharier O, Moav-Zafir A, et al. Ovarian follicular function is not altered by SARS-CoV-2 infection or BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccination. *Hum Reprod Oxf Engl*. 2021;36(9):2506-2513. doi:10.1093/humrep/deab182
18. Safrai M, Rottenstreich A, Herzberg S, Imbar T, Reubinoff B, Ben-Meir A. Stopping the misinformation: BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine has no negative effect on women's fertility. Published online June 1, 2021:2021.05.30.21258079. doi:10.1101/2021.05.30.21258079
19. Male V. Menstruation and covid-19 vaccination. *BMJ*. 2022;376:o142. doi:10.1136/bmj.o142
20. Edelman A, Boniface ER, Benhar E, et al. Association Between Menstrual Cycle Length and Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Vaccination: A U.S. Cohort. *Obstet Gynecol*. Published online January 5, 2022. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000004695
21. Alghamdi AN, Alotaibi MI, Alqahtani AS, Al Aboud D, Abdel-Moneim AS. BNT162b2 and ChAdOx1 SARS-CoV-2 Post-vaccination Side-Effects Among Saudi Vaccinees. *Front Med*. 2021;8:760047. doi:10.3389/fmed.2021.760047
22. Trogstad L. *Increased Occurrence of Menstrual Disturbances in 18- to 30-Year-Old Women after COVID-19 Vaccination*. Social Science Research Network; 2022. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3998180
23. Laganà AS, Veronesi G, Ghezzi F, et al. Evaluation of menstrual irregularities after COVID-19 vaccination: Results of the MECOVAC survey. *Open Med Wars Pol*. 2022;17(1):475-484. doi:10.1515/med-2022-0452
24. Muhaidat N, Alshrouf MA, Azzam MI, Karam AM, Al-Nazer MW, Al-Ani A. Menstrual Symptoms After COVID-19 Vaccine: A Cross-Sectional Investigation in the MENA Region. *Int J Womens Health*. 2022;14:395-404. doi:10.2147/IJWH.S352167

25. Lee KM, Junkins EJ, Luo C, Fatima UA, Cox ML, Clancy KB. Investigating trends in those who experience menstrual bleeding changes after SARS-CoV-2 vaccination. Published online February 11, 2022:2021.10.11.21264863. doi:10.1101/2021.10.11.21264863
26. Mahalingaiah S, Fruh V, Rodriguez E, et al. Design and methods of the Apple Women's Health Study: a digital longitudinal cohort study. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2022;226(4):545.e1-545.e29. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2021.09.041
27. Commissioner O of the. FDA Authorizes Booster Dose of Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine for Certain Populations. FDA. Published September 22, 2021. Accessed April 26, 2022. <https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-authorizes-booster-dose-pfizer-biontech-covid-19-vaccine-certain-populations>
28. CDC. COVID-19 Vaccination. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published April 21, 2022. Accessed April 26, 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/stay-up-to-date.html>
29. Li H, Gibson EA, Jukic AMZ, et al. Variation in menstrual cycle length by age, race/ethnicity, and body mass index in a large digital cohort of women in the US. Manuscript in preparation.
30. Treloar AE, Boynton RE, Behn BG, Brown BW. Variation of the human menstrual cycle through reproductive life. *Int J Fertil*. 1967;12(1 Pt 2):77-126.
31. Sherman BM, Korenman SG. Hormonal characteristics of the human menstrual cycle throughout reproductive life. *J Clin Invest*. 1975;55(4):699-706. doi:10.1172/JCI107979
32. Pearl J. *Causality: Models, Reasoning, and Inference*. Cambridge University Press; 2000.
33. Hernán MA, Robins JM. *Causal Inference: What If (the Book)*. Chapman & Hall/CRC; 2020. <https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/miguel-hernan/causal-inference-book/>
34. Fraser I, Critchley H, Broder M, Munro M. The FIGO Recommendations on Terminologies and Definitions for Normal and Abnormal Uterine Bleeding. *Semin Reprod Med*. 2011;29(05):383-390. doi:10.1055/s-0031-1287662
35. Munro MG, Critchley HOD, Fraser IS, FIGO Menstrual Disorders Committee. The two FIGO systems for normal and abnormal uterine bleeding symptoms and classification of causes of abnormal uterine bleeding in the reproductive years: 2018 revisions. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet Off Organ Int Fed Gynaecol Obstet*. 2018;143(3):393-408. doi:10.1002/ijgo.12666
36. Python Software Foundation. Python 3.6 Documentation. Published 2022. Accessed April 15, 2022. <https://docs.python.org/3.6/>
37. Chrousos GP, Torpy DJ, Gold PW. Interactions between the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis and the female reproductive system: clinical implications. *Ann Intern Med*. 1998;129(3):229-240. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-129-3-199808010-00012
38. Ciechanowska M, Lapot M, Malewski T, Misztal T, Mateusiak K, Przekop F. Effect of stress on the expression of GnRH and GnRH receptor (GnRH-R) genes in the preoptic area-hypothalamus and

- GnRH-R gene in the stalk/median eminence and anterior pituitary gland in ewes during follicular phase of the estrous cycle. *Acta Neurobiol Exp (Warsz)*. 2007;67(1):1-12.
39. Wu MH, Hsiao KY, Tsai SJ. Endometriosis and possible inflammation markers. *Gynecol Minim Invasive Ther*. 2015;4(3):61-67. doi:10.1016/j.gmit.2015.05.001
 40. Jarrell J. The significance and evolution of menstruation. *Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol*. 2018;50:18-26. doi:10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2018.01.007
 41. van der Molen RG, Schutten JHF, van Cranenbroek B, et al. Menstrual blood closely resembles the uterine immune micro-environment and is clearly distinct from peripheral blood. *Hum Reprod Oxf Engl*. 2014;29(2):303-314. doi:10.1093/humrep/det398
 42. Paiva P, Lockhart MG, Girling JE, et al. Identification of genes differentially expressed in menstrual breakdown and repair. *Mol Hum Reprod*. 2016;22(12):898-912. doi:10.1093/molehr/gaw060
 43. Park JW, Lagniton PNP, Liu Y, Xu RH. mRNA vaccines for COVID-19: what, why and how. *Int J Biol Sci*. 2021;17(6):1446-1460. doi:10.7150/ijbs.59233
 44. Harlow SD, Ephross SA. Epidemiology of menstruation and its relevance to women's health. *Epidemiol Rev*. 1995;17(2):265-286. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.epirev.a036193
 45. Bull JR, Rowland SP, Scherwitzl EB, Scherwitzl R, Danielsson KG, Harper J. Real-world menstrual cycle characteristics of more than 600,000 menstrual cycles. *NPJ Digit Med*. 2019;2:83. doi:10.1038/s41746-019-0152-7
 46. Allotey J, Stallings E, Bonet M, et al. Clinical manifestations, risk factors, and maternal and perinatal outcomes of coronavirus disease 2019 in pregnancy: living systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2020;370:m3320. doi:10.1136/bmj.m3320
 47. Ding T, Wang T, Zhang J, et al. Analysis of Ovarian Injury Associated With COVID-19 Disease in Reproductive-Aged Women in Wuhan, China: An Observational Study. *Front Med*. 2021;8:635255. doi:10.3389/fmed.2021.635255
 48. Khan SM, Shilen A, Heslin KM, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection and subsequent changes in the menstrual cycle among participants in the Arizona CoVHORT study. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2022;226(2):270-273. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2021.09.016
 49. Li F, Lu H, Zhang Q, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on female fertility: a systematic review and meta-analysis protocol. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(2):e045524. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-045524
 50. Jing Y, Run-Qian L, Hao-Ran W, et al. Potential influence of COVID-19/ACE2 on the female reproductive system. *Mol Hum Reprod*. 2020;26(6):367-373. doi:10.1093/molehr/gaaa030
 51. Morelli F, Meirelles LE de F, de Souza MVF, et al. COVID-19 Infection in the Human Reproductive Tract of Men and Nonpregnant Women. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2021;104(3):814-825. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.20-1098

52. Iacobucci G. Covid-19: No evidence that vaccines can affect fertility, says new guidance. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n509. doi:10.1136/bmj.n509
53. Girardi G, Bremer AA. Scientific Evidence Supporting Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Vaccine Efficacy and Safety in People Planning to Conceive or Who Are Pregnant or Lactating. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2022;139(1):3-8. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000004636

Tables:

Table 1: Demographic characteristics among 9,652 participants in the Apple Women’s Health Study at enrollment and number of cycles included among 128,094 total cycles

	Vaccinated ^a		Unvaccinated ^a		Overall ^a	
	Participants	Cycles	Participants	Cycles	Participants	Cycles
	(N _p = 8,486) ^b	(N _c = 113,890) ^b	(N _p = 1,166) ^b	(N _c = 14,204) ^b	(N _p = 9,652) ^b	(N _c = 128,094) ^b
Age						
< 20	240 (2.8)	11843 (10.4)	58 (5.0)	1724 (12.1)	298 (3.1)	13567 (10.6)
20-24	1038 (12.2)	16907 (14.8)	168 (14.4)	2294 (16.2)	1206 (12.5)	19201 (15.0)
25-29	1475 (17.4)	19345 (17.0)	220 (18.9)	2974 (20.9)	1695 (17.6)	22319 (17.4)
30-34	1601 (18.9)	22454 (19.7)	259 (22.2)	2904 (20.4)	1860 (19.3)	25358 (19.8)
35-39	1606 (18.9)	21619 (19.0)	219 (18.8)	2172 (15.3)	1825 (18.9)	23791 (18.6)
40-44	1361 (16.0)	14175 (12.4)	144 (12.3)	1137 (8.0)	1505 (15.6)	15312 (12.0)
45-49	848 (10.0)	3210 (2.8)	75 (6.4)	672 (4.7)	923 (9.6)	3882 (3.0)
>= 50	317 (3.7)	4337 (3.8)	23 (2.0)	327 (2.3)	340 (3.5)	4664 (3.6)
Race/Ethnicity ^c						
White, non-Hispanic	6276 (74.0)	84242 (74.0)	848 (72.7)	10334 (72.8)	7124 (73.8)	94576 (73.8)
Hispanic/Latina	910 (10.7)	11651 (10.2)	137 (11.7)	1559 (11.0)	1047 (10.8)	13210 (10.3)

Other	1300 (15.3)	17997 (15.8)	181 (15.5)	2311 (16.3)	1481 (15.3)	20308 (15.9)
Educational Attainment						
No College Degree	2854 (33.6)	36086 (31.7)	875 (75.0)	10329 (72.7)	3729 (38.6)	46415 (36.2)
College Degree	3081 (36.3)	42715 (37.5)	200 (17.2)	2643 (18.6)	3281 (34.0)	45358 (35.4)
Graduate Degree	2533 (29.8)	34935 (30.7)	84 (7.2)	1204 (8.5)	2617 (27.1)	36139 (28.2)
Missing	18 (0.2)	154 (0.1)	7 (0.6)	28 (0.2)	25 (0.3)	182 (0.1)
Marital Status						
Married	3999 (47.1)	54718 (48.0)	433 (37.1)	5435 (38.3)	4432 (45.9)	60153 (47.0)
Never married	2602 (30.7)	35478 (31.2)	372 (31.9)	4271 (30.1)	2974 (30.8)	39749 (31.0)
Widowed, divorced, or separated	755 (8.9)	10128 (8.9)	180 (15.4)	2392 (16.8)	935 (9.7)	12520 (9.8)
Part of an unmarried couple	1098 (12.9)	13120 (11.5)	174 (14.9)	2020 (14.2)	1272 (13.2)	15140 (11.8)
Missing	32 (0.4)	446 (0.4)	7 (0.6)	86 (0.6)	39 (0.4)	532 (0.4)
BMI ^d						
Underweight	139 (1.6)	1880 (1.7)	43 (3.7)	587 (4.1)	182 (1.9)	2467 (1.9)
Normal weight	2899 (34.2)	39840 (35.0)	355 (30.4)	4474 (31.5)	3254 (33.7)	44314 (34.6)
Overweight	2192 (25.8)	28828 (25.3)	300 (25.7)	3659 (25.8)	2492 (25.8)	32487 (25.4)

Obese	3108 (36.6)	39800 (34.9)	450 (38.6)	5263 (37.1)	3558 (36.9)	45063 (35.2)
Missing	148 (1.7)	3542 (3.1)	18 (1.5)	221 (1.6)	166 (1.7)	3763 (2.9)
Parity						
Parous	3335 (39.3)	45251 (39.7)	643 (55.1)	7951 (56.0)	3978 (41.2)	53202 (41.5)
Nulliparous	5101 (60.1)	67986 (59.7)	512 (43.9)	6200 (43.6)	5613 (58.2)	74186 (57.9)
Missing	50 (0.6)	653 (0.6)	11 (0.9)	53 (0.4)	61 (0.6)	706 (0.6)

^a Values are presented as N (%) of total participants included in this analysis

^b N_p = number of participants. N_c = number of cycles

^c Including Black, non-Hispanic (African American or African), Asian, American Indian or Alaska Native, Middle Eastern or North African, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, more than one race/ethnicity, or participants who reported that none of the available categories fully described them

^d BMI, body mass index. Underweight: BMI < 18.5 kg/m²; normal: 18.5 ≤ BMI < 25 kg/m², overweight: 25 ≤ BMI < 30 kg/m², Obese: BMI ≥ 30kg/m²

Table 2. Adjusted within-participant change in mean menstrual cycle length and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) and adjusted odds ratios (ORs) and 95% CIs of experiencing a long menstrual cycle (> 38 days) comparing cycles in which a vaccine was administered and post-vaccination cycles with pre-vaccination cycles

	Difference in mean cycle length (95% CI) ^{a, b}	Odds Ratio of having a long cycle (95% CI) ^{a, c}
Pre-vaccination cycles	Reference	Reference
First dose ^d	0.50 (0.22, 0.78)	1.13 (0.86, 1.48)
Second dose ^d	0.39 (0.11, 0.67)	1.08 (0.82, 1.42)
J&J dose ^e	1.26 (0.45, 2.07)	2.17 (1.16, 4.04)
Post-vaccination cycles		
First cycle	0.14 (-0.13, 0.40)	0.94 (0.73, 1.21)
Second cycle	0.13 (-0.14, 0.40)	0.94 (0.73, 1.21)
Third cycle	-0.17 (-0.43, 0.10)	0.76 (0.59, 0.98)
Fourth cycle	-0.25 (-0.52, 0.01)	0.71 (0.55, 0.93)

^a Conditional models control for all participant-level characteristics; models additionally adjusted for age, BMI, and seasonality

^b Differences are from conditional linear regression

^c Odds ratios are from conditional logistic regression

^d Doses 1 and 2 were Pfizer-BioNTech or Moderna

^e J&J = Johnson & Johnson/Janssen

Table 3. Adjusted within-participant change in mean menstrual cycle length and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) comparing cycles in which a vaccine was administered and post-vaccination cycles with pre-vaccination cycles by menstrual cycle phase of vaccine dose

	Difference in mean cycle length (95% CI) ^{a, b}	Difference from coefficient for dose in luteal phase (95% CI) ^{a, c}
Pre-vaccination cycles	Reference	---
Dose in follicular phase		
First dose ^d	0.97 (0.53, 1.42)	0.76 (0.16, 1.35)
Second dose ^d	1.43 (1.06, 1.80)	2.40 (1.81, 2.99)
J&J dose ^e	2.27 (1.04, 3.50)	1.89 (0.20, 3.27)
Dose in luteal phase		
First dose ^d	0.21 (-0.14, 0.57)	Reference
Second dose ^d	-0.97 (-1.39, -0.55)	Reference
J&J dose ^e	0.39 (-0.75, 1.53)	Reference
Post-vaccination cycles		
First cycle	0.16 (-0.11, 0.44)	---
Second cycle	0.15 (-0.12, 0.43)	---
Third cycle	-0.14 (-0.42, 0.13)	---
Fourth cycle	-0.24 (-0.51, 0.04)	---

^a Conditional model controls for all participant-level characteristics; model additionally adjusted for age, BMI, and seasonality

^b Differences are from conditional linear regression

^c Difference between regression coefficients for a given dose in the follicular vs luteal phase

^d Doses 1 and 2 were Pfizer-BioNTech or Moderna

^e J&J = Johnson & Johnson/Janssen

Supplemental Materials.

Table S1. Adjusted change in mean menstrual cycle length and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) and adjusted odds ratios (ORs) and 95% CIs of experiencing a long menstrual cycle (> 38 days) comparing vaccinated and unvaccinated participants and cycles in which a vaccine was administered and post-vaccination cycles with pre-vaccination cycles

	Difference in mean cycle length (95% CI) ^{a, b}	Odds Ratio of having a long cycle (95% CI) ^{a, c}
Cycles in unvaccinated participants	0.24 (-0.34, 0.82)	1.20 (1.00, 1.44)
Pre-vaccination cycles	Reference	Reference
First dose ^d	0.61 (0.33, 0.90)	1.30 (1.11, 1.51)
Second dose ^d	0.54 (0.26, 0.83)	1.36 (1.16, 1.58)
J&J dose ^e	1.39 (0.57, 2.22)	2.17 (1.47, 3.19)
Post-vaccination cycles		
First cycle	0.43 (0.16, 0.70)	1.48 (1.28, 1.72)
Second cycle	0.35 (0.08, 0.62)	1.40 (1.20, 1.63)
Third cycle	0.00 (-0.26, 0.27)	1.14 (0.98, 1.33)
Fourth cycle	-0.17 (-0.44, 0.10)	0.95 (0.81, 1.11)

^a Models adjusted for race/ethnicity, parity, age, BMI, and seasonality

^b Differences are from linear mixed-effect regression with participant-specific random intercepts

^c Odds ratios are from logistic generalized estimating equations

^d Doses 1 and 2 were Pfizer-BioNTech or Moderna

^e J&J = Johnson & Johnson/Janssen

Table S2. Adjusted change in mean menstrual cycle length and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) comparing vaccinated and unvaccinated participants and cycles in which a vaccine was administered and post-vaccination cycles with pre-vaccination cycles

	Difference in mean cycle length (95% CI) ^{a, b}	Difference from coefficient for dose in luteal phase (95% CI) ^{a, b, c}
Cycles in unvaccinated participants	0.25 (-0.35, 0.85)	---
Pre-vaccination cycles	Reference	---
Dose in follicular phase		
First dose ^d	1.09 (0.64, 1.54)	0.77 (0.16, 1.37)
Second dose ^d	1.66 (1.28, 2.03)	2.57 (1.97, 3.18)
J&J dose ^e	2.42 (1.17, 3.66)	1.92 (0.21, 3.64)
Dose in luteal phase		
First dose ^d	0.32 (-0.03, 0.68)	Reference
Second dose ^d	-0.92 (-1.34, -0.49)	Reference
J&J dose ^e	0.50 (-0.66, 1.65)	Reference
Post-vaccination cycles		
First cycle	0.46 (0.18, 0.74)	---
Second cycle	0.37 (0.09, 0.65)	---
Third cycle	0.03 (-0.25, 0.30)	---
Fourth cycle	-0.15 (-0.43, 0.13)	---

^a Mixed-effect models adjusted for race/ethnicity, education, marital status, parity, age, BMI, and seasonality.

^b Differences are from linear mixed-effect regression with participant-specific random intercepts

^c Difference between regression coefficients for a given dose in the follicular vs luteal phase

^d Doses 1 and 2 were Pfizer-BioNTech or Moderna

^e J&J = Johnson & Johnson/Janssen

Table S3. Adjusted within-participant change in mean menstrual cycle length and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) comparing cycles in which a vaccine was administered and post-vaccination cycles with pre-vaccination cycles after restricting to participants who tracked at least 3 cycles, restricting to participants with average cycles between 24-38 days, restricting to cycles completed before COVID-19 Vaccine Update survey completion, and restricting to cycles with complete cases

	Participants with 3 or more cycles	Participants with normal average cycles	Cycles before COVID-19 survey completion	Cycles with complete cases
	Difference in mean cycle length (95% CI) ^{a, b}	Difference in mean cycle length (95% CI) ^{a, b}	Difference in mean cycle length (95% CI) ^{a, b}	Difference in mean cycle length (95% CI) ^{a, b}
Pre-vaccination cycles	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
First dose ^c	0.52 (0.25, 0.79)	0.48 (0.23, 0.73)	0.51 (0.23, 0.79)	0.49 (0.21, 0.78)
Second dose ^c	0.43 (0.15, 0.71)	0.41 (0.15, 0.67)	0.39 (0.10, 0.67)	0.38 (0.09, 0.67)
J&J dose ^d	1.29 (0.51, 2.08)	1.22 (0.48, 1.96)	1.33 (0.52, 2.14)	1.34 (0.52, 2.17)
Post-vaccination cycles				
First cycle	0.14 (-0.12, 0.41)	0.12 (-0.13, 0.37)	0.14 (-0.12, 0.41)	0.15 (-0.12, 0.43)
Second cycle	0.30 (0.02, 0.57)	0.32 (0.06, 0.58)	0.13 (-0.13, 0.40)	0.15 (-0.12, 0.42)
Third cycle	0.00 (-0.28, 0.28)	0.01 (-0.25, 0.27)	-0.13 (-0.39, 0.14)	-0.13 (-0.40, 0.15)
Fourth cycle	-0.16 (-0.44, 0.13)	-0.06 (-0.32, 0.21)	-0.23 (-0.49, 0.04)	-0.25 (-0.52, 0.02)

^a Differences are from conditional linear regression

^b Conditional model controls for all participant-level characteristics; model additionally adjusted for age, BMI, and seasonality

^c Doses 1 and 2 were Pfizer-BioNTech or Moderna

^d J&J = Johnson & Johnson/Janssen

Table S4. Adjusted change in mean menstrual cycle length and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) comparing vaccinated and unvaccinated participants and cycles in which a vaccine was administered and post-vaccination cycles with pre-vaccination cycles after restricting to participants who tracked at least 3 cycles, restricting to participants with average cycles between 24-38 days, restricting to cycles completed before COVID-19 Vaccine Update survey completion, and restricting to cycles with complete cases

	Participants with 3 or more cycles	Participants with normal average cycles	Cycles before COVID-19 survey completion	Cycles with complete cases
	Difference in mean cycle length (95% CI) ^{a, b}	Difference in mean cycle length (95% CI) ^{a, b}	Difference in mean cycle length (95% CI) ^{a, b}	Difference in mean cycle length (95% CI) ^{a, b}
Cycles in unvaccinated participants	1.03 (0.59, 1.48)	0.21 (-0.09, 0.51)	0.17 (-0.41, 0.75)	0.27 (-0.34, 0.88)
Pre-vaccination cycles	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
First dose ^c	0.58 (0.31, 0.86)	0.55 (0.30, 0.81)	0.62 (0.33, 0.90)	0.61 (0.30, 0.91)
Second dose ^c	0.49 (0.21, 0.78)	0.48 (0.22, 0.75)	0.54 (0.25, 0.83)	0.54 (0.23, 0.85)
J&J dose ^d	1.42 (0.62, 2.22)	1.34 (0.59, 2.09)	1.42 (0.59, 2.25)	1.49 (0.61, 2.36)
Post-vaccination cycles				
First cycle	0.24 (-0.03, 0.52)	0.23 (-0.03, 0.48)	0.42 (0.15, 0.69)	0.45 (0.17, 0.74)
Second cycle	0.38 (0.10, 0.66)	0.43 (0.17, 0.69)	0.33 (0.06, 0.60)	0.37 (0.09, 0.66)
Third cycle	0.06 (-0.23, 0.34)	0.11 (-0.16, 0.37)	0.00 (-0.27, 0.27)	0.04 (-0.24, 0.33)
Fourth cycle	-0.12 (-0.41, 0.17)	0.03 (-0.24, 0.29)	-0.17 (-0.44, 0.10)	-0.16 (-0.45, 0.12)

^a Differences are from linear mixed-effect regression with participant-specific random intercepts

^b Mixed-effects models adjusted for race/ethnicity, education, marital status, parity, age, BMI, and seasonality

^c Doses 1 and 2 were Pfizer-BioNTech or Moderna, ^d J&J = Johnson & Johnson/Janssen

Table S5. Adjusted within-participant change in mean menstrual cycle length and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) comparing cycles in which a vaccine was administered and post-vaccination cycles with pre-vaccination cycles, retaining participants who received two doses in a single cycle.

	Difference in mean cycle length (95% CI) ^a
Pre-vaccination cycles	Reference
First dose ^b	0.51 (0.23, 0.79)
Second dose ^b	0.42 (0.13, 0.70)
J&J dose ^c	1.28 (0.46, 2.10)
First and second dose ^b	4.96 (4.42, 5.50)
Post-vaccination cycles	
First cycle	0.18 (-0.07, 0.43)
Second cycle	0.15 (-0.10, 0.41)
Third cycle	-0.11 (-0.36, 0.14)
Fourth cycle	-0.19 (-0.44, 0.06)

^a Conditional models control for all participant-level characteristics; models additionally adjusted for age, BMI, and seasonality

^b Doses 1 and 2 were Pfizer-BioNTech or Moderna

^c J&J = Johnson & Johnson/Janssen

Figures:

Figure S1. Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) used to identify confounding variables as covariates for inclusion in regression models; Note: Figure generated using DAGitty v3.0.5. Acronyms: SES = socioeconomic status; BMI = body mass index; MCL = menstrual cycle length. The green variable with a triangle, COVID-19 vaccine, is the treatment, and the blue variable, MCL, is the outcome of interest. The green arrow is the association of interest. Variables in red (race/ethnicity, SES, education, age, marital status, BMI, parity, and season) are identified as confounders, and red arrows are confounding paths. The variable in green, region, affects only the exposure, and the black arrow is a non-confounding path. This DAG identifies five variables—age, race/ethnicity, parity, BMI, and season—as the minimally sufficient adjustment set for estimating the total effect of the COVID-19 vaccine on MCL.




Figure S2. Flow chart of study identification, inclusion, and exclusion criteria for current analysis. N_p = number of participants. N_c = number of cycles.





Figure S3. Histogram of number of cycles reported by participants in the Apple Women's Health Study.



STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	4-5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	4-5
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	4-5
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	NA
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	5-6
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	5-6
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6-7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	5-7, Fig S1
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	5-7
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7-8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	NA
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	8-9
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	9, Fig S1
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	9, Fig S1
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	Fig S1
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	9, Table 1
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	9, Table 1
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	9, Fig S3
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	9

Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	9-11, Tables 2-3 6 NA
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	11, Tables S1-S4
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	11-12
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	13-14
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	14
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	13
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	15

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at <http://www.strobe-statement.org>.