SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Prolactin as immune cell regulator in *Toxocara canis* somatic larvae chronic infection.
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**Supplementary Figure 1. Cell population analysis.** Immune cell populations were defined according to the following analysis: Cells were first gated by size and complexity, then we selected them as T cells (CD3+); B cells (CD45RA+); NK (CD161+) or Tγδ cells (TCRγδ+). T cells were then gated as T helper (CD4+) or T cytotoxic (CD8+). In all cases, the percentage of PRLR+ cells was defined in histograms according to the unspecific staining in each mice of the secondary antibody used to detect the anti-PRLR.

**Supplementary Figure 2. Immune cell subpopulations comparison among experimental groups in the spleen.** Representative dot plots showing the analysis of the percentage of T helper (CD4+) vs. T cytotoxic (CD8+) cells (upper row); T cells (CD3+) vs. B cells (CD45RA+) (middle row); and NK (CD161+) vs Tγδ cells (TCRγδ+) (lower row) in the spleen of the experimental groups (from left to right): Intact Non-infected (Intact Control); Intact Infected (Intact Infx); Sham-HPRL Non-infected (Sh-HPRL Ctrl); Sham-HPRL Infected (Sh-HPRL Infx); HPRL Non-infected (HPRL Ctrl); and HPRL Infected (Sh-HPRL Infx).

**Supplementary Figure 3. Immune cell subpopulations comparison among experimental groups in peripheral lymph nodes (PLN).** Representative dot plots showing the analysis of the percentage of T helper (CD4+) vs. T cytotoxic (CD8+) cells (upper row); T cells (CD3+) vs. B cells (CD45RA+) (middle row); and NK (CD161+) vs Tγδ cells (TCRγδ+) (lower row) in PLN's of the experimental groups (from left to right): Intact Non-infected (Intact Control); Intact Infected (Intact Infx); Sham-HPRL Non-infected (Sh-HPRL Ctrl); Sham-HPRL Infected (Sh-HPRL Infx); HPRL Non-infected (HPRL Ctrl); and HPRL Infected (Sh-HPRL Infx).

**Supplementary Figure 4. Immune cell subpopulations comparison among experimental groups in mesenteric lymph nodes (MLN).** Representative dot plots showing the analysis of the percentage of T helper (CD4+) vs. T cytotoxic (CD8+) cells (upper row); T cells (CD3+) vs. B cells (CD45RA+) (middle row); and NK (CD161+) vs Tγδ cells (TCRγδ+) (lower row) in
MLN’s of the experimental groups (from left to right): Intact Non-infected (Intact Control); Intact Infected (Intact Infx); Sham-HPRL Non-infected (Sh-HPRL Ctrl); Sham-HPRL Infected (Sh-HPRL Infx); HPRL Non-infected 1 (HPRL Ctrl); and HPRL Infected (Sh-HPRL Infx).
