

# 1 FPsim: An agent-based model of family 2 planning 3

## 4 **Authors**

5 Michelle L. O'Brien<sup>1</sup>, Annie Valente<sup>1</sup>, Cliff C. Kerr<sup>1</sup>, Joshua L. Proctor<sup>1</sup>, Navideh Noori<sup>1</sup>, Elisabeth D. Root<sup>1</sup>,  
6 Helen Olsen<sup>1</sup>, Samuel Buxton<sup>1</sup>, Guillaume Chabot-Couture<sup>1</sup>, Daniel J. Klein<sup>1</sup>, Marita Zimmermann<sup>1</sup>

## 8 **Affiliations**

9 <sup>1</sup> Institute for Disease Modeling, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

## 11 **Abstract**

12 The biological and behavioral underpinnings of family planning (FP) unfold on an individual level, across a  
13 full reproductive life course, and within a complex system of social and structural constraints. Yet, much  
14 of the existing FP modeling landscape has focused solely on macro- or population-level dynamics of family  
15 planning. There is a need for an individual-based approach to provide a deeper understanding of how  
16 family planning is intertwined with individuals' lives and health at the micro-level, which can contribute  
17 to more effective, person-centered design of both contraceptive technologies and programmatic  
18 interventions. This article introduces the Family Planning Simulator (FPsim), a data-driven, agent-based  
19 model of family planning, which explicitly models individual heterogeneity in biology and behavior over  
20 the life course. Agents in FPsim can experience a wide range of life-course events, such as increases in  
21 fecundability (and primary infertility), sexual debut, contraceptive choice, postpartum family planning,  
22 abortion, miscarriage, stillbirth, infant mortality, and maternal mortality. The core components of the  
23 model – fecundability and contraceptive choice, are represented individually and probabilistically,  
24 following age-specific patterns observed in demographic data and prospective cohort studies. Once  
25 calibrated to a setting leveraging multiple sources of data, FPsim can be used to build hypothetical  
26 scenarios and interrogate counterfactual research questions about the use, non-use, and/or efficacy of  
27 family planning programs and contraceptive methods. To our knowledge, FPsim is the first open-source,  
28 individual-level, woman-centered model of family planning.

## 30 **Author Summary**

31 Although the causes and consequences of family planning unfold on an individual level, few models of  
32 family planning consider individual heterogeneity over the life course. To that end, we introduce the  
33 methodology, parameters, and use-case(s) of the family planning simulator (FPsim). FPsim is a data-driven  
34 agent-based model of family planning, which explicitly models individual heterogeneity in biology and  
35 behaviors over a woman's full life course to better understand the micro-level dynamics leading to more  
36 or less successful family planning programs and policies. FPsim is a data-driven model that leverages  
37 multiple sources of data to simulate realistic populations in settings that reflect real-life contexts. It is  
38 designed to be flexible and user-friendly, allowing for custom calibrations and providing integrated  
39 functions for straightforward use. This manuscript describes the model design, including its parameters,  
40 potential data sources, and limitations. We illustrate the functionality of FPsim using hypothetical  
41 scenarios that improve upon existing injectable contraceptives and introduce new injectable  
42 contraceptives into a Senegal-like setting.

## 43 1. Introduction

44 Family planning (FP) behavior and biology unfold on an individual level, across a full reproductive  
45 life course, and within a complex system of social and structural constraints. Consequences of  
46 family planning, or lack thereof, likewise unfold individually – with greater contraceptive access  
47 and use repeatedly linked to better health for women and children (Chola et al. 2015; Cleland et  
48 al. 2012; Rana and Goli 2018, 2021; Singh, Darroch, and Ashford 2014), and more empowered  
49 women (Dhak, Saggurti, and Ram 2020; Prata et al. 2017).

50 Yet, much of the existing FP modeling landscape has focused on macro- or population-  
51 level dynamics of family planning, with far less attention paid to individual needs and preferences  
52 (Brunson 2020; Speizer, Bremner, and Farid 2022) or individual-level consequences (Barham et  
53 al. 2021; Brunson and Suh 2020; Finlay and Lee 2018; Okenwa, Lawoko, and Jansson 2011;  
54 Schwarz et al. 2019). Due to the individual nature of the biological and behavioral underpinnings  
55 of family planning and its consequences, deeper understanding of how family planning is  
56 intertwined with individuals' lives and health at the *micro*-level can contribute to more effective,  
57 person-centered design of both contraceptive technologies and programmatic interventions.

58 To that end, this article introduces the Family Planning Simulator (FPsim), a data-driven  
59 agent-based model of family planning, which explicitly models individual heterogeneity in biology  
60 and behaviors over the life course to better understand the conditions under which we might  
61 expect contraceptive decision-making to change, and, in turn, to inform programmatic and policy  
62 decision-making to expand contraceptive choice and access. To our knowledge, FPsim is the first  
63 open-source, individual-level, woman-centered model of family planning. Despite the individual  
64 nature of family planning, few FP models center individual biology and behavior. As an agent-

65 based model, FPsim allows researchers to better understand and interrogate the individual  
66 behavioral and biological dynamics that aggregate to macro-level fertility outcomes. Integrating  
67 individual-level dynamics into the model allows for explicitly modeling interventions and  
68 programming targeted to specific groups (i.e. adolescents, postpartum women) in a  
69 heterogeneous population.

70 In the following sections, we outline the need for an agent-based model in the family planning  
71 field, describe the model design, data and methods used to parameterize the model, and provide  
72 illustrative examples of using FPsim for research.

73

## 74 [1.1 Agent-Based Modeling](#)

75 Agent-based models (ABMs; also called individual-based models) simulate realistic or theoretical  
76 populations, allowing for adaptive behavior, in which agents interact with themselves, other  
77 agents, and their environments (Railsback and Grimm 2012). ABMs link individual-level dynamics  
78 to emergent population processes, and thus have been used in social sciences and population  
79 health to address a wide range of complex issues (Billari et al. 2007; Bonabeau 2002; Grow and  
80 Van Bavel 2017; Silverman et al. 2020). An incomplete list includes such a range of demographic  
81 topics as dynamic marriage markets (Bijak et al. 2013; Billari et al. 2007); the effects of family  
82 planning efforts on conserving panda habitat in China (An and Liu 2010); sex ratio at birth  
83 (Kashyap and Villavicencio 2017); population change after armed conflict in Nepal (Williams,  
84 O'Brien, and Yao 2017, 2021); migration and mobility (Hinsch and Bijak 2022); and fertility decline  
85 and economic growth (Karra, Canning, and Wilde 2017).

86

## 87 1.2 Family Planning Modeling

88 Family planning biology and behavior unfold on the micro level. Fecundability, the biological  
89 capacity to conceive, is age-specific and subject to a great deal of individual variation (Smarr et  
90 al. 2017; Steiner et al. 2011; Steiner and Jukic 2016; Wesselink et al. 2017). Within households,  
91 women and couples make risk-benefit calculations at the micro-level, aligned with their  
92 preferences, desires, and intentions (Ajzen and Klobas 2013; Bongaarts and Casterline 2018;  
93 Cottingham 1997). These intentions are dynamic as families grow (Preis et al. 2020) and as  
94 women move through the life course: experiencing various states of health, reproductive  
95 outcomes, and social stability (Bledsoe, Banja, and Hill 1998; Schwarz et al. 2019).

96 Most agent-based models for family planning have been built to answer specific  
97 questions, e.g. helping couples with decision-making regarding delaying fertility if they have an  
98 ideal family size in mind (Habbema et al. 2015), the impact of assistive reproductive technology  
99 on fertility outcomes (Leridon 2004), the influence of son preference on sex ratio at birth  
100 (Kashyap and Villavicencio 2016), and the macro-level impact of family planning on  
101 environmental outcomes, such as panda habitat (An & Liu 2010).

102 Compartmental models have more commonly been used for policy and programmatic  
103 decision-making, such as Avenir Health's Spectrum (Stover, McKinnon, and Winfrey 2010) and  
104 Impact 2 (Weinberger et al. 2012). These models have been developed as tools to understand a  
105 predefined set of *impacts* of family planning, but not necessarily to understand the dynamics  
106 driving family planning use in and of itself. A major statistical model used in FP, the Family  
107 Planning Estimation Tool or FPET (Cahill et al. 2018) projects future modern contraceptive  
108 prevalence and unmet need using historical patterns from health surveys and service statistics at

109 the national level, but this model relies on S-curves -- which have been critiqued (Adetunji and  
110 Feyisetan 2017) -- and cannot explore deeper individual-level connections between  
111 contraception and reproductive health. To better understand *subnational* dynamics of common  
112 FP indicators, Mercer, Lu, and Proctor (2019) built a Bayesian hierarchical model that leverages  
113 spatiotemporal smoothing to integrate multiple surveys and their designs. While each of these  
114 models presents a different tool for analyzing FP questions, none provide an individual-level  
115 model that integrates the complexities of family planning dynamics – biological and behavioral –  
116 over a woman’s full reproductive life course.

## 117 2. Materials & Methods

### 118 2.1 Model Description

119 FPsim is an agent-based, woman-centered, data-driven model that is designed to be flexible  
120 enough to address a wide range of questions and settings. FPsim was developed in Python using  
121 the SciPy ([scipy.org](https://www.scipy.org)) ecosystem. It uses NumPy ([numpy.org](https://numpy.org)), Pandas ([pandas.pydata.org](https://pandas.pydata.org)), and  
122 Numba ([numba.pydata.org](https://numba.pydata.org)) for fast numerical computing; Matplotlib ([matplotlib.org](https://matplotlib.org)) for  
123 plotting; and Sciris ([sciris.org](https://sciris.org)) for data structures, parallelization, and other utilities. Source code  
124 for FPsim is available via both the Python Package Index (via `pip install fpsim`) and GitHub  
125 (via [fpsim.org](https://fpsim.org)).


126

### 127 2.2 Initialization and Parameterization

128 FPsim users choose a calibrated location when running the model. FPsim is currently available  
129 for Senegal, and calibrated Kenya and Ethiopia options are in development – these pre-made  
130 calibrations can be used as examples, or users can calibrate the model to their setting of choice.

131 The model is initialized with a historical population pyramid from the context. Men and women  
 132 enter the model without children and non-pregnant. Initialization of agents without history of  
 133 pregnancy or childbirth creates a fictional initial cohort that will tend to have skewed outcomes.  
 134 Both men and women are initialized, but men are subject to aging and mortality alone, while  
 135 women can go on to experience the range of events listed in Table A1 in the appendix.

136 In FPsim, agents experience events and move from one state to another based on data-  
 137 derived and assumption-based probabilities. Fig. 1 maps the major states and events that FPsim  
 138 agents can experience. Agents are assessed for their eligibility (i.e., only pregnant women deliver;  
 139 only women who are sexually active that month are eligible to conceive), and experience new  
 140 events based on assigned probabilities.



141


142

Figure 1. Partial map of major decisions and events encountered by FPsim agents

143

144 When the move to a new state or event is probabilistic, agents are assessed using a  
145 binomial trial – a random number between 0 and 1 is generated, and agents with an assigned  
146 probability higher than the random number will move or take that action. This allows for  
147 individual heterogeneity and, importantly for agent-based models, unpredictable behavior of  
148 some agents.

149 Thus, a single agent in FPsim experiences a simulated life course with probabilistic events  
150 related to her reproductive life and health. Figure 2, below, visualizes an example life course of a  
151 single FPsim-Senegal agent. How typical or atypical this agent is depends on the calibrated  
152 setting. For example, this agent may have average fertility for Senegal but higher than average  
153 for a lower fertility setting like Kenya.



154  
155  
156  
157

Figure 2. Example life course of a single FPsim-Senegal agent  
Note: LAM – lactational amenorrhea

### 158 2.3 Data sources & methods for parameter estimates

159

160 Depending on the parameter, agents are assigned probabilities based on a combination of any of  
161 the following: a) context-specific probabilities applied uniformly; b) age-specific probabilities;  
162 and/or c) life-stage-specific probabilities. Table A1 in the appendix lists the parameters and


163 events that are possible for agents to experience in FPsim, as well as their respective data sources  
164 for the Senegal calibration. Note that these example data sources are meant to be informative  
165 for future calibrations, but because FPsim is data-driven and context-specific, different data  
166 sources are likely to be used for different scenarios. For instance, we parameterize matrices for  
167 initiating, discontinue, or switching contraceptive methods for Senegal using the Demographic  
168 and Health Survey (DHS) contraceptive calendars; but we use the Performance Monitoring in  
169 Action (PMA) calendars for Kenya (ICRHK 2022). Details on these matrices are in section 3.2.2.  
170 Because no one data source captures all of the intricacies and nuances within a specific country  
171 or region, FPsim calibrations are best interpreted as country- or region-like (i.e., a Senegal-like  
172 setting).

### 173 2.3.1 Fecundability

174 Although it is commonly cited that 85% of women using no method will conceive within a year  
175 (Trussell 2011), the biological underpinnings of fertility vary over the life course, following an  
176 inverted u-shaped curve as women age. Because we simulate an entire life course, age specific  
177 fecundability estimates are critical inputs to FPsim. We parameterize fecundability as a linear  
178 interpolation of the percentage of women at each age who achieved pregnancy in the PRESTO  
179 study (Wesselink et al. 2017; Wise et al. 2015). The PRESTO study is a prospective cohort study  
180 of couples seeking pregnancies in the United States and Canada. In addition to age-specific  
181 fecundability, as women age and do not conceive, they exhibit a further decreased likelihood of  
182 conceiving (Steiner and Jukic 2016). Thus, we use additional estimates from the PRESTO study to  
183 inform a separate parameter which adjusts individual women's fecundability downward as they  
184 age and have yet to conceive.



185 Women under the age of 20 are not included in the PRESTO study. Fecundability is  
186 understudied in adolescents, with rare exceptions (see, for example, Hur et al. [2020] on the  
187 relationship between undernutrition and married adolescent fecundability in Bangladesh). For  
188 the parameter in FPsim, we imputed fecundability at age 15 by applying the ratio of fertility rates for  
189 15–19-year-olds compared to 25-year-olds. We then assume that fecundability is approximately  
190 linear from age 10 to 15 years old, as well as from age 15 to 20. The resulting distribution of age-  
191 specific fecundability estimates is shown in Fig. 2.  
192



193  
194 Figure 3. Age-specific fecundability estimates in FPsim-Senegal  
195 Shaded area represents the upper and lower bounds of individual fecundability variation.  
196

197 In addition, individuals vary widely in their fecundability. To account for this individual-level  
198 heterogeneity, we introduce a multiplier for each agent – regardless of their age-specific base  
199 fecundability or their nulliparous adjustment, we multiply their final fecundability by the  
200 individual multiplier. For the Senegal context, we use the range 0.7-1.1, as this provided the best

201 fit for the overall population. This means that some women consistently have much lower  
202 fecundability than the PRESTO estimate for their age, and some have slightly higher.

203 Infertility and fecundability may vary from context to context, particularly under  
204 conditions of extreme stress (Wesselink et al. 2018). However, very few studies examine  
205 fecundability in lower- and middle-income countries, despite estimates that nearly 186 million  
206 women in LMICs experience primary or secondary infertility (Mascarenhas et al. 2012). To our  
207 knowledge, there have been no prospective cohort studies on fecundability in sub-Saharan  
208 Africa to date. Because age-specific fecundability (the biologic capacity to conceive, *not* fertility)  
209 is rarely studied in countries with DHS surveys, we use these baseline fecundability values despite  
210 their limitations.

211


### 212 2.3.2 Contraceptive choice

213 Contraceptive choice in FPsim is parameterized through multiple age- and life-stage-specific  
214 choice matrices. The matrices represent the probability of switching *from* a given method,  
215 including no method, (the columns of the matrix), *to* another method, including no method (the  
216 rows of the matrix). The matrices are derived from contraceptive calendar data – in the case of  
217 Senegal, we use the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) data from the most recent survey,  
218 and in the case of Kenya we use the longitudinal Performance Monitoring in Action (PMA) data,  
219 as the most recent DHS for Kenya is now nearly a decade old.

220 Agents access the annual matrices once per year, on the timestep that represents their  
221 individual birth month. Agents can only choose one method at a time, which aligns with data

222 limitations in the field, but which does not necessarily reflect women’s concurrent usage. The  
223 choice matrices are stratified by age group, as well as postpartum status.

224 Nine specific methods are included: withdrawal, condoms, the pill, injectables, implants,  
225 IUDs, female sterilization, ‘other modern’ which includes emergency contraceptive and standard  
226 days method, and ‘other traditional’, which, in the DHS, encompasses any other method a  
227 respondent mentions. During their birth month, women in FPsim access the contraceptive  
228 matrices and choose a method for the year. A visual representation of one of the age-specific  
229 matrices from Senegal is shown in Figure 4.



230

231 Figure 4. Visual representation of a switching matrix for 18–20-year-olds in FPsim-Senegal.

232 Figure does not show ~80% of young women in Senegal who continue non-use (None-to-None).  
233

234 After delivery, separate postpartum matrices are accessed, which were derived using data  
235 from postpartum women. A one-month postpartum matrix is used to assess probability of  
236 initiating a method one month after birth, and a separate postpartum matrix is used at six months  
237 postpartum to assess the probability of starting a method or switching or discontinuing for  
238 women who initiated a method at one month postpartum. Subsequently, each woman re-enters  
239 the annual (non-postpartum) matrix at her next birth month timestep.

### 240 2.3.3 Conception

241 One of the key life events that women experience in FPsim is conception. In any given timestep  
242 (representing one month), women who are sexually active that month are eligible to conceive.  
243 Their initial probability of conception is constituted by their individual fecundability. This  
244 probability is adjusted by their contraceptive choice – if none, there is no adjustment. All other  
245 methods are assigned an efficacy value based on failure rates in 43 DHS countries (Polis et al.  
246 2016). Women who are within six months of delivery and exclusively breastfeeding have a  
247 probability of remaining amenorrheic and thus meeting criteria for the lactational amenorrhea  
248 method (LAM), which provides excellent protection against pregnancy (Van der Wijden and  
249 Manion 2015). We consider LAM separately from the method-specific contraceptive matrix due  
250 to these qualifying criteria.

251 Conception, as with all events in FPsim that are affected by multiple parameters,  
252 combines several probabilities. For instance, a 25-year-old nulliparous agent in a Senegal-like  
253 setting who was sexually active this month will have an age-specific base fecundability of 0.793

254 and a nulliparous (life stage) adjustment of 0.96. She has also been assigned a random variation  
255 multiplier between 0.7 and 1.1 – let us assume 0.8 for this hypothetical FPsim agent. Her total  
256 fecundability is the sum of  $0.793 * 0.96 * 0.8 = 0.609$ . In the binomial trial to check conception, if  
257 the random number generated is lower than 0.609, this agent would conceive. However, if she  
258 also uses a modern contraceptive method, like the pill, then we apply another multiplier – (1-  
259 efficacy) – to her conception probability. In this case, her initial fecundability would be further  
260 reduced to  $0.609 * (1-0.945) = 0.0335$ . Now this agent has greatly reduced chance (3.35%) of  
261 conception over the course of her year on the pill, which is converted to per-month probability.  
262 She will only conceive if the random number generated is lower than her individual probability  
263 in that timestep.

#### 264 2.3.4 Pregnancy loss and mortality

265 During the same timestep that agents conceive, they have a probability of terminating the  
266 pregnancy, parameterized based on Guttmacher’s context-specific abortion incidence estimates  
267 (Sedgh et al. 2015). If the pregnancy is not terminated, women may experience a miscarriage at  
268 the end of the first trimester (after three months gestation). Miscarriage probabilities are based  
269 on women’s age, where the youngest (<15) and the oldest (>35) have the highest risk. Pregnant  
270 women who are 25 years old have the lowest miscarriage probability, at 9.7 percent (Magnus et  
271 al. 2019). Once the gestation counter reaches the ninth month, women experience delivery. At  
272 the point of delivery, probabilities of stillbirth, infant mortality, and maternal mortality are  
273 assessed, in that order. Both stillbirths and infant mortality estimates follow a time-trend based  
274 on annual country-level incidence (UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation 2020;

275 World Bank 2019). Adolescents under 20 years old have a higher probability of experiencing both  
276 stillbirth and infant mortality, reflected in odds ratios calculated by Noori et al. (2022).

277 Maternal mortality ratio (MMR) is a notoriously difficult measure to estimate with any  
278 certainty, and indeed the World Bank reports a wide 80% confidence interval in addition to their  
279 point estimates. For the Senegal calibration, we opted for published estimates of the risk of  
280 maternal death in Mali and Senegal (Huchon et al. 2013). Because those estimates are based on  
281 institutional deliveries, we provide the confidence interval to allow users to select high, medium,  
282 and low estimates of maternal mortality. The baseline estimates from Huchon et al. (2013) are  
283 then extrapolated to create a time trend based on the annual change in the World Bank indicator  
284 for MMR (WHO et al. 2019). No equivalent study of maternal death was available for Kenya, to  
285 our knowledge, and thus we use World Bank modeled estimates for Kenya's maternal death  
286 probabilities. Because of the wide uncertainty range and the well-known issues with collecting  
287 maternal mortality data, this indicator should be interpreted with caution.

288

#### 289 [2.4 Data gaps and assumption-based parameters](#)

290 One of the most informative aspects of a data-driven agent-based model is that researchers are  
291 forced to precisely indicate and quantify relationships between agents, agent history, and the  
292 agent's environments. In doing so, the model development itself can highlight critical data gaps  
293 in the field. Insights into those critical data gaps can inform investments in data collection and  
294 programs. Although we leverage multiple data sources in FPsim, we do identify data gaps, for  
295 which we have used assumption-based parameters.

296 One of the most impactful of these assumptions, *exposure*, is a multiplier applied directly  
297 to conception probabilities, based on women’s age and/or parity, to proxy residual exposure to  
298 pregnancy not captured by data. For the Senegal calibration, we found that using age-based  
299 exposure was not necessary. However, we did find it necessary to use parity-based exposure to  
300 reduce the likelihood of conception once women reach parity 7 and above. In contexts with  
301 scarce data, researchers may find that exposure corrections, especially at the margins, are  
302 necessary to achieve realistic pregnancy outcomes.

303 Birth spacing patterns present a unique challenge to simulating synthetic cohorts. In part,  
304 this is due to mismatching data timelines for most demographic surveys (including the DHS).  
305 Contraceptive calendar data typically captures 1-5 years retrospectively, but shouldn’t be  
306 considered reliable much more than 12-24 months due to recall bias (Callahan and Becker 2012).  
307 On the other hand, fertility data, in which respondents typically report birth month and year of  
308 each living child, spans a woman’s entire reproductive life course up to the time of interview.  
309 This creates a gap in knowledge where researchers can identify birth spacing between births for  
310 which we do not know that woman’s contraceptive use or non-use. Because of this gap, we  
311 developed a birth spacing preference parameter, which increases or decreases an agent’s  
312 likelihood of being sexually active while she is postpartum. This parameter indirectly impacts her  
313 likelihood of conception, via her eligibility each timestep.

## 314 3. Results

### 315 3.1 Using FPsim for Research

316 Given a set of basic biological constraints (fecundability, conception, pregnancy), we can use  
317 FPsim to model the impact of dynamic individual-level decisions about contraceptive use and/or

318 shifting probabilities of pregnancy-related events (e.g., abortion) on specified metrics over time.  
319 How we use FPsim depends on what kind of information we have, and generally fall under one  
320 of two categories: data-driven research questions, and assumption-based research-questions.

321 Data-driven research questions leverage additional data sources, including historical  
322 datasets, user insights and market research, and so on, to inform how we anticipate behavioral  
323 changes for some women. For instance, some research questions might investigate the  
324 compounding effects over time of increased uptake of a specific method. With FPsim, we could  
325 also examine those effects if the changes are limited to specific age groups, or postpartum  
326 women. We can investigate how switching behaviors impact the roll-out of a new contraceptive  
327 method. For example, a researcher may want to compare scenarios in which we roll out a new  
328 injectable and a new implant in a Senegal-like setting where contraceptive prevalence is low; but  
329 amongst method users, injectables and implants are already popular. We could examine how  
330 investing in an improved injectable or implant might impact the method mix and other family  
331 planning outcomes. Identifying and quantifying data gaps would also fall under data-driven  
332 research questions.

333 Assumption based research, on the other hand, implements user-defined assumptions  
334 into the model to reach particular outcomes. The researcher may ask, for example, what  
335 magnitude of behavioral change (uptake) would have needed to occur to meet FP2020 mCPR  
336 goals in a certain country? Another example of an assumption-based question would be what  
337 kind of gains in adolescent postpartum family planning would need to occur to reduce rapid  
338 repeat pregnancies, and in turn, adolescent maternal mortality.

### 339 [3.2 Scenarios](#)



340 To examine any research question using FPsim, the model needs to be calibrated to a setting,  
341 either a pre-programmed setting like Kenya or Senegal, or a custom calibration that users create  
342 for their own research questions. Once the model is calibrated, custom intervention scenarios  
343 can be built to investigate a wide range of research questions. Users can adjust nearly any  
344 parameter with the built-in scenarios script, including abortion, the probabilities of adverse  
345 outcomes (e.g. stillbirth), and the dimensions of any existing method (such as efficacy, initiation,  
346 switching to another method, and discontinuation). Users can also add a new contraceptive  
347 technology by adding in a row and method to the existing contraceptive matrices. These  
348 scenarios can be built to affect an entire population, or they can be written to affect specific sub-  
349 populations, which may be defined by characteristics including age, parity, or postpartum status.

350 FPsim allows for straightforward, user-friendly scenario-building. The following example  
351 scenarios are intended to illustrate the mechanics of building scenarios in FPsim, rather than to  
352 answer any one specific research question. In the first example, we build hypothetical scenarios  
353 for FPsim-Senegal, in which we 1) increase the efficacy of existing injectable methods to 99%; 2)  
354 double the probability of all women initiating injectables; 3) double the probability of women  
355 over 35 initiation injectables; and 4) combine scenarios 1 and 3, increasing the efficacy of  
356 injectables for all, and doubling the initiation for women over the age 35. Figure 6 displays the  
357 code snippet used to build the scenarios.

```
import fpsim as fp

n_agents = [5_000, 100][debug]
start_year = [1980, 2010][debug]
end_year = 2030
repeats = [3, 1][debug]
year = 2020 #intervention year for all scenarios unless otherwise specified
limiters = ['>35']
youth = ['<18', '18-20']
location = 'senegal'

pars = fp.pars(n_agents=n_agents, start_year=start_year, end_year=end_year, location=location)
pars.add_method(name='new injectables', eff=0.983)

## Prepare basic set of scenarios ##

# Increase injectable efficacy

s1 = fp.make_scen(eff={'Injectables':0.99}, year=year)

# Double rate of injectables initiation

s2 = fp.make_scen(method='Injectables', init_factor=2, year=year)

# Target 35+ with double injectable uptake

s3 = fp.make_scen(method='Injectables', init_factor=2, year=year, ages=limiters)

# Combine scenarios 1 and 3

s4 = s1 + s3
```

358  
359

Figure 6. Basic scenario building in FPSim

360

361 Full python scripts to replicate the scenarios and outputs of these sample scenarios are publicly  
362 available at: [https://github.com/fpsim/fpsim\\_technical](https://github.com/fpsim/fpsim_technical).

363 More complex scenarios, to add in a new contraceptive technology, for instance, take a  
364 slightly different shape. In the example below, we are building a single scenario in three distinct  
365 parts. Figure 7, below, contains the code snippet to build this three-part scenario.

```
## Three-part scenario to add in new contraceptive method

method = 'new injectables'
kw = dict(method=method)
d_kw = dict(dest=method)

#initial introduction of new method, same probability of uptake across ages, reduced discontinuation for 35+
s5a = fp.make_scen(
    year=year,
    probs=[
        dict(copy_from='Injectables', method=method, ages=limiters),
        dict(discont_factor=0.5, **kw),
    ]
)

#anticipate switching from existing injectables, all ages
s5b = fp.make_scen(
    year=year,
    probs=[
        dict(source='Injectables', value=0.20, **d_kw)
    ]
)

#Staggered introduction to youth sub-population with 1.15% initiation probability

s5c = fp.make_scen(
    year = 2023,
    probs = [
        dict(copy_from='Injectables', method=method, ages=youth),
        dict(init_value=0.015, **kw),
    ]
)

s5 = s5a + s5b + s5c
```

366  
367  
368

Figure 7. Complex scenario building with FPsim


369 In part a, we first introduce the new injectable method by copying over characteristics  
370 from the existing injectable (`dict(copy_from='Injectables', method=method,`  
371 `ages=limiters)`). We then identify the characteristics we want to change for the named age  
372 group, limiters, who are over 35. In this case, we want to halve the discontinuation probability  
373 for the newly introduced injectables (`discont_factor=0.5`), perhaps assuming the new  
374 injectables will address issues like side effects and be more appealing to women than the existing

375 method. In part b, we anticipate 20% probability of switching from existing injectables to the new  
376 injectables. In part c, we add in a staggered introduction that focuses on the youth (under 20)  
377 population. As before, we simply add up the three scenario parts to incorporate all aspects of our  
378 new contraceptive technology into a single scenario.

379

### 380 3.3 Output

381 FPsim has integrated plot options that can be utilized after a single sim or after a multiple  
382 simulation run with user-defined scenarios. The default plotting option (`plot()`) includes mCPR,  
383 a cumulative count of live births, stillbirths, maternal deaths, and infant deaths, and the infant  
384 mortality rate. Fig. 8, below, shows the default output for our basic set of sample scenarios.



385 Figure 8. Default output after running scenarios in FPsim

386


387 Other integrated plotting options include adverse pregnancy outcomes, multiple definitions of  
388 contraceptive prevalence, and method mix over time. Fig. 9 shows the method mix plotting of  
389 our more complex scenario, in which we may want to track the how the switching patterns we  
390 identified impact the existing injectables (light blue) when we introduce the new injectables  
391 (salmon).

392

393

394

Figure 9. Method mix plotting to track the introduction of a new method in FPsim



395

## 396 4. Discussion

397 Although there currently exist FP models that provide cross-country comparisons, we see a need  
398 for an FP model designed to explicitly consider individual trajectories, to complement and  
399 augment our understanding of the conditions under which family planning programs succeed or  
400 fail. With a focus on macro-level inputs and outputs alone, we risk missing the individual  
401 heterogeneity in biology and behavior, that underlie and can deeply impact family planning  
402 dynamics at both the micro- and macro-levels. We designed Family Planning Simulator (FPsim),  
403 which centers a woman’s individual life course. This allows FPsim to generate insights into how  
404 individual behavior and biology impact fertility and health outcomes, including contraceptive  
405 prevalence, pregnancy loss and mortality, and method mix. With individual-level modeling and a  
406 life course perspective, we can better capture how probabilistic behaviors interact with biology,  
407 and how events and activities impact women differently throughout their life. FPsim provides an  
408 agent-based environment in which researchers can leverage multiple sources of data and  
409 interrogate assumptions. Researchers and policymakers alike can use the tool to improve goal  
410 setting through examining behavioral change – i.e. changing demand – rather than relying on  
411 supply-side factors alone. FPsim’s flexible and modular simulation scenarios provide an  
412 opportunity to explore the impact of policies and investments in family planning using a modeling  
413 tool designed around a woman’s unique reproductive life course.

414 As with any computational modeling methodology, FPsim has its limitations. No  
415 simulation model can replace rigorous data collection and analysis. The insights that FPsim  
416 produces are only as good as the inputs and expertise that inform the model. FPsim is best used  
417 as a tool to ask questions about what could be, or what could have been, using counterfactual

418 scenarios informed by robust data and expert opinion. With these caveats, we aim for FPsim to  
419 be a user-friendly and informative tool that can supplement the family planning research and  
420 evaluation landscape to help decision-makers better target the most impactful investments,  
421 programming, and implementation strategies.

## 422 References

- 423 Adetunji, J., and B. Feyisetan. 2017. "Stages in the Adoption of Modern Contraceptive Methods: Do the  
424 Growth Patterns in Developing Countries Follow the S-Curve Model?" *PAA 2017 Annual*  
425 *Meeting*.
- 426 Ajzen, Icek, and Jane Klobas. 2013. "Fertility Intentions: An Approach Based on the Theory of Planned  
427 Behavior." *Demographic Research* 29:203–32. doi: 10.4054/DemRes.2013.29.8.
- 428 An, Li, and Jianguo Liu. 2010. "Long-Term Effects of Family Planning and Other Determinants of Fertility  
429 on Population and Environment: Agent-Based Modeling Evidence from Wolong Nature Reserve,  
430 China." *Population and Environment* 31(6):427–59. doi: 10.1007/s11111-010-0111-3.
- 431 Barham, Tania, Brachel Champion, Andrew D. Foster, Jena D. Hamadani, Warren C. Jochem, Gisella Kagy,  
432 Randall Kuhn, Jane Menken, Abdur Razzaque, Elisabeth Dowling Root, and Patrick S. Turner.  
433 2021. "Thirty-Five Years Later: Long-Term Effects of the Matlab Maternal and Child  
434 Health/Family Planning Program on Older Women's Well-Being." *Proceedings of the National*  
435 *Academy of Sciences* 118(28). doi: 10.1073/pnas.2101160118.
- 436 Bijak, Jakub, Jason Hilton, Eric Silverman, and Viet Dung Cao. 2013. "Reforging the Wedding Ring:  
437 Exploring a Semi-Artificial Model of Population for the United Kingdom with Gaussian Process."  
438 *Demographic Research* 29:729–66. doi: 10.4054/DemRes.2013.29.27.
- 439 Billari, Francesco, Thomas Fent, Alexia Prskawetz, and Belinda Aparicio Diaz. 2007. "The 'Wedding-Ring':  
440 An Agent-Based Marriage Model Based on Social Interaction." *Demographic Research* 17:59–82.  
441 doi: 10.4054/DemRes.2007.17.3.
- 442 Bledsoe, Caroline, Fatoumatta Banja, and Allan G. Hill. 1998. "Reproductive Mishaps and Western  
443 Contraception: An African Challenge to Fertility Theory." *Population and Development Review*  
444 24(1):15–57. doi: 10.2307/2808121.
- 445 Bonabeau, E. 2002. "Agent-Based Modeling: Methods and Techniques for Simulating Human Systems."  
446 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99(Supplement 3):7280–87. doi:  
447 10.1073/pnas.082080899.
- 448 Bongaarts, John, and John B. Casterline. 2018. "From Fertility Preferences to Reproductive Outcomes in  
449 the Developing World." *Population and Development Review* 44(4):703–809.
- 450 Brunson, Jan. 2020. "Tool of Economic Development, Metric of Global Health: Promoting Planned  
451 Families and Economized Life in Nepal." *Social Science & Medicine (1982)* 254:112298. doi:  
452 10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.05.003.
- 453 Brunson, Jan, and Siri Suh. 2020. "Behind the Measures of Maternal and Reproductive Health:  
454 Ethnographic Accounts of Inventory and Intervention." *Social Science & Medicine (1982)*  
455 254:112730. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112730.
- 456 Cahill, Niamh, Emily Sonneveldt, John Stover, Michelle Weinberger, Jessica Williamson, Chuchu Wei,  
457 Win Brown, and Leontine Alkema. 2018. "Modern Contraceptive Use, Unmet Need, and  
458 Demand Satisfied among Women of Reproductive Age Who Are Married or in a Union in the



- 459 Focus Countries of the Family Planning 2020 Initiative: A Systematic Analysis Using the Family  
460 Planning Estimation Tool." *The Lancet* 391(10123):870–82. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)33104-  
461 5.
- 462 Callahan, Rebecca L., and Stan Becker. 2012. "The Reliability of Calendar Data for Reporting  
463 Contraceptive Use: Evidence from Rural Bangladesh." *Studies in Family Planning* 43(3):213–22.  
464 doi: 10.1111/j.1728-4465.2012.00319.x.
- 465 Chola, Lumbwe, Shelley McGee, Aviva Tugendhaft, Eckhart Buchmann, and Karen Hofman. 2015.  
466 "Scaling Up Family Planning to Reduce Maternal and Child Mortality: The Potential Costs and  
467 Benefits of Modern Contraceptive Use in South Africa." *PLoS ONE* 10(6):e0130077. doi:  
468 10.1371/journal.pone.0130077.
- 469 Cleland, John, Agustin Conde-Agudelo, Herbert Peterson, John Ross, and Amy Tsui. 2012. "Contraception  
470 and Health." *The Lancet* 380(9837):149–56. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60609-6.
- 471 Cottingham, Jane. 1997. "Beyond Acceptability: Users' Perspectives on Contraception." Pp. 1–5 in  
472 *Beyond acceptability : users' perspectives on contraception*, edited by T. K. S. Ravindran, M.  
473 Berer, and J. Cottingham. Reproductive Health Matters for the World Health Organization.
- 474 Dhak, Biplab, Niranjana Saggurti, and Faujdar Ram. 2020. "Contraceptive Use and Its Effect on Indian  
475 Women's Empowerment: Evidence from the National Family Health Survey-4." *Journal of*  
476 *Biosocial Science* 52(4):523–33. doi: 10.1017/S0021932019000609.
- 477 Finlay, Jocelyn E., and Marlene A. Lee. 2018. "Identifying Causal Effects of Reproductive Health  
478 Improvements on Women's Economic Empowerment Through the Population Poverty Research  
479 Initiative." *The Milbank Quarterly* 96(2):300–322. doi: 10.1111/1468-0009.12326.
- 480 Grow, André, and Jan Van Bavel, eds. 2017. *Agent-Based Modelling in Population Studies: Concepts,*  
481 *Methods, and Applications*. 1st ed. 2017. Cham: Springer International Publishing : Imprint:  
482 Springer.
- 483 Habbema, J. Dik F., Marinus J. C. Eijkemans, Henri Leridon, and Egbert R. te Velde. 2015. "Realizing a  
484 Desired Family Size: When Should Couples Start?" *Human Reproduction* 30(9):2215–21. doi:  
485 10.1093/humrep/dev148.
- 486 Hinsch, Martin, and Jakub Bijak. 2022. "Principles and State of the Art of Agent-Based Migration  
487 Modelling." Pp. 33–49 in *Towards Bayesian Model-Based Demography: Agency, Complexity and*  
488 *Uncertainty in Migration Studies*, edited by J. Bijak. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- 489 Huchon, Cyrille, Alexandre Dumont, Mamadou Traoré, Michal Abrahamowicz, Arnaud Fauconnier,  
490 William Fraser, and Pierre Fournier. 2013. "A Prediction Score for Maternal Mortality in Senegal  
491 and Mali." *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 121(5):1049–56. doi: 10.1097/AOG.0b013e31828b33a4.
- 492 Hur, Jinhee, Keith P. West, Abu Ahmed Shamim, Mahbubur Rashid, Alain B. Labrique, Lee S. F. Wu,  
493 Hasmat Ali, Barkat Ullah, Kerry J. Schulze, Rolf D. W. Klemm, and Parul Christian. 2020.  
494 "Thinness and Fecundability: Time to Pregnancy after Adolescent Marriage in Rural Bangladesh."  
495 *Maternal & Child Nutrition* 16(3). doi: 10.1111/mcn.12985.

- 496 International Centre for Reproductive Health Kenya (ICRHK); the Bill & Melinda Gates Institute for  
497 Population and Reproductive Health at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health;  
498 and Jhpiego. Performance Monitoring for Action (PMA) Kenya Phase 1-3: Household and Female  
499 Survey, PMA2019/KE-P1-HQFQ. 2022. Kenya and Baltimore, Maryland, USA.  
500 <https://doi.org/10.34976/4swk-g935>
- 501 Karra, Mahesh, David Canning, and Joshua Wilde. 2017. "The Effect of Fertility Decline on Economic  
502 Growth in Africa: A Macrosimulation Model." *Population and Development Review* 43:237–63.
- 503 Kashyap, Ridhi, and Francisco Villavicencio. 2017. "An Agent-Based Model of Sex Ratio at Birth  
504 Distortions." Pp. 343–67 in *Agent-Based Modelling in Population Studies: Concepts, Methods,  
505 and Applications*, edited by A. Grow and J. Van Bavel. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- 506 Leridon, H. 2004. "Can Assisted Reproduction Technology Compensate for the Natural Decline in Fertility  
507 with Age? A Model Assessment." *Human Reproduction* 19(7):1548–53. doi:  
508 10.1093/humrep/deh304.
- 509 Magnus, Maria C., Allen J. Wilcox, Nils Halvdan Morken, Clarice R. Weinberg, and Siri E. Håberg. 2019.  
510 "Role of Maternal Age and Pregnancy History in Risk of Miscarriage: Prospective Register Based  
511 Study." *BMJ (Online)*. doi: 10.1136/bmj.l869.
- 512 Mascarenhas, Maya N., Seth R. Flaxman, Ties Boerma, Sheryl Vanderpoel, and Gretchen A. Stevens.  
513 2012. "National, Regional, and Global Trends in Infertility Prevalence Since 1990: A Systematic  
514 Analysis of 277 Health Surveys" edited by N. Low. *PLoS Medicine* 9(12):e1001356. doi:  
515 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001356.
- 516 Mercer, Laina D., Fred Lu, and Joshua L. Proctor. 2019. "Sub-National Levels and Trends in Contraceptive  
517 Prevalence, Unmet Need, and Demand for Family Planning in Nigeria with Survey Uncertainty."  
518 *BMC Public Health* 19(1):1752. doi: 10.1186/s12889-019-8043-z.
- 519 Mohamed, Shukri F., Chimaraoke Izugbara, Ann M. Moore, Michael Mutua, Elizabeth W. Kimani-  
520 Murage, Abdhala K. Ziraba, Akinrinola Bankole, Susheela D. Singh, and Caroline Egesa. 2015.  
521 "The Estimated Incidence of Induced Abortion in Kenya: A Cross-Sectional Study." *BMC  
522 Pregnancy and Childbirth* 15(1):185. doi: 10.1186/s12884-015-0621-1.
- 523 Noori, Navideh, Joshua L. Proctor, Yvette Efevbera, and Assaf P. Oron. 2021. *The Effect of Adolescent  
524 Pregnancy on Child Mortality in 46 Low- and Middle-Income Countries*. preprint. Public and  
525 Global Health. doi: 10.1101/2021.06.10.21258227.
- 526 Okenwa, Leah, Stephen Lawoko, and Bjarne Jansson. 2011. "Contraception, Reproductive Health and  
527 Pregnancy Outcomes among Women Exposed to Intimate Partner Violence in Nigeria." *The  
528 European Journal of Contraception & Reproductive Health Care: The Official Journal of the  
529 European Society of Contraception* 16(1):18–25. doi: 10.3109/13625187.2010.534515.
- 530 Polis, Chelsea B., Sarah E. K. Bradley, Akinrinola Bankole, Tsuyoshi Onda, Trevor Croft, and Susheela  
531 Singh. 2016. *Contraceptive Failure Rates in the Developing World*. doi:  
532 10.1016/j.contraception.2016.03.011.

- 533 Prata, Ndola, Ashley Fraser, Megan J. Huchko, Jessica D. Gipson, Mellissa Withers, Shayna Lewis, Erica J.  
534 Ciaraldi, and Ushma D. Upadhyay. 2017. "Women's Empowerment and Family Planning: A  
535 Review of the Literature." *Journal of Biosocial Science* 49(6):713–43. doi:  
536 10.1017/S0021932016000663.
- 537 Preis, Heidi, Selen Tovim, Pnina Mor, Sorina Grisar-Granovsky, Arnon Samueloff, and Yael Benyamini.  
538 2020. "Fertility Intentions and the Way They Change Following Birth- a Prospective Longitudinal  
539 Study." *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth* 20(1):228. doi: 10.1186/s12884-020-02922-y.
- 540 Railsback, Steven F., and Volker Grimm. 2012. *Agent-Based and Individual-Based Modeling: A Practical*  
541 *Introduction*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- 542 Rana, Md Juel, and Srinivas Goli. 2018. "Does Planning of Births Affect Childhood Undernutrition?  
543 Evidence from Demographic and Health Surveys of Selected South Asian Countries." *Nutrition*  
544 47:90–96. doi: 10.1016/j.nut.2017.10.006.
- 545 Rana, Md Juel, and Srinivas Goli. 2021. "The Road from ICPD to SDGs: Health Returns of Reducing the  
546 Unmet Need for Family Planning in India." *Midwifery* 103:103107. doi:  
547 10.1016/j.midw.2021.103107.
- 548 Schwarz, Joëlle, Mari Dumbaugh, Wyvine Bapolisi, Marie Souavis Ndorere, Marie-Chantale Mwamini,  
549 Ghislain Bisimwa, and Sonja Merten. 2019. "'So That's Why I'm Scared of These Methods':  
550 Locating Contraceptive Side Effects in Embodied Life Circumstances in Burundi and Eastern  
551 Democratic Republic of the Congo." *Social Science & Medicine (1982)* 220:264–72. doi:  
552 10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.09.030.
- 553 Sedgh, Gilda, Amadou Hassane Sylla, Jesse Philbin, Sarah Keogh, and Salif Ndiaye. 2015. "Estimates of  
554 the Incidence of Induced Abortion and Consequences of Unsafe Abortion in Senegal."  
555 *International Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*. doi: 10.1363/4101115.
- 556 Silverman, Eric, Umberto Gostoli, Stefano Picascia, Jonatan Almagor, Mark McCann, Richard Shaw, and  
557 Claudio Angione. 2020. "Situating Agent-Based Modelling in Population Health Research." 1–22.
- 558 Singh, Susheela, Jacqueline E. Darroch, and Lori S. Ashford. 2014. "Adding It Up: The Costs and Benefits  
559 of Investing in Sexual and Reproductive Health 2014." *United Nations Population Fund*.
- 560 Smarr, Melissa M., Katherine J. Sapra, Alison Gemmill, Linda G. Kahn, Lauren A. Wise, Courtney D. Lynch,  
561 Pam Factor-Litvak, Sunni L. Mumford, Niels E. Skakkebaek, Rémy Slama, Danelle T. Lobdell,  
562 Joseph B. Stanford, Tina Kold Jensen, Elizabeth Heger Boyle, Michael L. Eisenberg, Paul J. Turek,  
563 Rajeshwari Sundaram, Marie E. Thoma, and Germaine M. Buck Louis. 2017. "Is Human Fecundity  
564 Changing? A Discussion of Research and Data Gaps Precluding Us from Having an Answer."  
565 *Human Reproduction*. doi: 10.1093/humrep/dew361.
- 566 Smits, Jeroen, and Christiaan Monden. 2011. "Twinning across the Developing World" edited by M.-L.  
567 Newell. *PLoS ONE* 6(9):e25239. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0025239.
- 568 Speizer, Ilene S., Jason Bremner, and Shiza Farid. 2022. "Language and Measurement of Contraceptive  
569 Need and Making These Indicators More Meaningful for Measuring Fertility Intentions of  
570 Women and Girls." *Global Health: Science and Practice* 10(1). doi: 10.9745/GHSP-D-21-00450.

- 571 Steiner, Anne Z., Amy H. Herring, James S. Kesner, Juliana W. Meadows, Frank Z. Stanczyk, Steven  
572 Hoberman, and Donna D. Baird. 2011. "Antimüllerian Hormone as a Predictor of Natural  
573 Fecundability in Women Aged 30–42 Years." *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 117(4):798–804. doi:  
574 10.1097/AOG.0b013e3182116bc8.
- 575 Steiner, Anne Z., and Anne Marie Z. Jukic. 2016. "Impact of Female Age and Nulligravidity on Fecundity  
576 in an Older Reproductive Age Cohort." *Fertility and Sterility*. doi:  
577 10.1016/j.fertnstert.2016.02.028.
- 578 Stover, John, Robert McKinnon, and Bill Winfrey. 2010. "Spectrum: A Model Platform for Linking  
579 Maternal and Child Survival Interventions with AIDS, Family Planning and Demographic  
580 Projections." *International Journal of Epidemiology* 39(suppl\_1):i7–10. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyq016.
- 581 Trussell, James. 2011. "Contraceptive Failure in the United States." *Contraception* 83(5):397–404. doi:  
582 10.1016/j.contraception.2011.01.021.
- 583 UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation. 2020. *A Neglected Tragedy: The Global Burden of*  
584 *Stillbirths*. New York; Washington, DC; Geneva: United Nations Children's Fund; World Bank  
585 Group; World Health Organization; United Nations Population Division.
- 586 Van der Wijden, Carla, and Carol Manion. 2015. "Lactational Amenorrhoea Method for Family Planning"  
587 edited by Cochrane Fertility Regulation Group. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*  
588 2015(10). doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD001329.pub2.
- 589 Weinberger, M., F. Pozo-Martin, T. Boler, K. Fry, and K. Hopkins. 2012. *Impact 2 v5: An Innovative Tool*  
590 *for Estimating the Impact of Reproductive Health Programmes: Methodology Paper.*  
591 *Methodology Paper*. London, U.K.: Marie Stopes International.
- 592 Wesselink, Amelia K., Elizabeth E. Hatch, Kenneth J. Rothman, Jennifer L. Weuve, Ann Aschengrau,  
593 Rebecca J. Song, and Lauren A. Wise. 2018. "Perceived Stress and Fecundability: A  
594 Preconception Cohort Study of North American Couples." *American Journal of Epidemiology*.  
595 doi: 10.1093/aje/kwy186.
- 596 Wesselink, Amelia K., Kenneth J. Rothman, Elizabeth E. Hatch, Ellen M. Mikkelsen, Henrik T. Sørensen,  
597 and Lauren A. Wise. 2017. "Age and Fecundability in a North American Preconception Cohort  
598 Study." *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2017.09.002.
- 599 WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, World Bank Group, and United Nations Population Division. 2019. *Trends in*  
600 *Maternal Mortality: 2000 to 2017*. Geneva, World Health Organization, 2019. Geneva: World  
601 Health Organization.
- 602 Williams, Nathalie E., Michelle L. O'Brien, and Xiaozheng Yao. 2017. "Using Survey Data for Agent-Based  
603 Modeling: Design and Challenges in a Model of Armed Conflict and Population Change." Pp.  
604 159–84 in *Agent-Based Modelling in Population Studies: Concepts, Methods, and Applications*,  
605 edited by A. Grow and J. Van Bavel. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- 606 Williams, Nathalie E., Michelle L. O'Brien, and Xiaozheng Yao. 2021. "How Armed Conflict Influences  
607 Migration." *Population and Development Review* padr.12408. doi: 10.1111/padr.12408.

608 Wise, Lauren A., Kenneth J. Rothman, Ellen M. Mikkelsen, Joseph B. Stanford, Amelia K. Wesselink, Craig  
609 McKinnon, Siobhan M. Gruschow, Casie E. Horgan, Aleta S. Wiley, Kristen A. Hahn, Henrik Toft  
610 Sørensen, and Elizabeth E. Hatch. 2015. "Design and Conduct of an Internet-Based  
611 Preconception Cohort Study in North America: Pregnancy Study Online: Pregnancy Study Online  
612 (PRESTO)." *Paediatric and Perinatal Epidemiology* 29(4):360–71. doi: 10.1111/ppe.12201.

613 World Bank. 2019. "Infant Mortality Rate."

614

615

616 Appendix

617

618

Table A1. List of parameters, events, and respective data sources in FPSim

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Senegal data source</i>	<i>Kenya data source</i>	<i>Operationalized in FPSim</i>	<i>Affects:</i>	<i>Affected by:</i>
<i>Fecundability (base)</i>	PRESTO	PRESTO	Rates used as probabilities (conceptions per 100 per woman over 12 cycles)	Conception	Age
<i>Fecundability age limit</i>	PRESTO	PRESTO	Max age for fecund women	Fecundability, method choice	Age
<i>Nulliparous adjustment</i>	PRESTO	PRESTO	Array of decreasing (negative) multipliers to fecundability for women with no pregnancies	Fecundability	Age, parity
<i>Fecundability variation (noise)</i>	N/A	N/A	Random multiplier on fecundability	Fecundability	None
<i>Sexual activity</i>	DHS	DHS	DHS rates (% women had sex last four weeks) transformed to per woman probability of being sexually active (0/1)	Conception eligibility each timestep	Age, parity, postpartum status (abstinence), spacing preferences (postpartum women only)
<i>Contraceptive method</i>	DHS	PMA	Switching matrix based on contraceptive calendar; MCPR rates based on annual trends	Conception (efficacy rates)	Age, parity, lactation, postpartum status, previous method used, MCPR rates from DHS
<i>Contraceptive efficacy</i>	Guttmacher	Guttmacher	Used pooled failure rates for 25+ and under 25 age groups	Conception	Age (over/under 25)
<i>Minimum age for method choice</i>	N/A	N/A	Set min age to begin using any method	Method choice	None
<i>Lactational amenorrhea</i>	DHS	DHS	Array of percentage of breastfeeding women in the DHS who are exclusively breastfeeding <i>and</i> amenorrheic. Affects women 0-11 months postpartum.	Probability of conception	Lactation, postpartum status, DHS rates of women likely on LAM
<i>Breastfeeding</i>	DHS	DHS	Randomly selected duration (months) from a right-skewed gumbel distribution based on data from the DHS	LAM	None

<i>Postpartum duration</i>	N/A	N/A	Months counted after delivery	Method choice, LAM, lactation, sexual activity	None
<i>Birth spacing preferences</i>	N/A	N/A	Array of likelihoods based on postpartum month that is applied to prob of sexual activity (formerly pregnancy probability)	Sexually active or not	Postpartum status
<i>Family size preferences</i>	N/A	N/A	Increased likelihood to use contraception at a certain number of living children	Method choice	Parity
<i>Sexual debut</i>	DHS	DHS	Fated sexual debut pinned at an age drawn from distribution of age at first sex in DHS	Sexual activity	Age
<i>Conception</i>	Calculated probability	Calculated probability	Individual probability of conception in eligible month	Gestation counter; pregnancy status	sexually active status, contraceptive efficacy, LAM, fecundability, nulliparous fecundability adjustment, exposure (if using), family size preference (if using)
<i>Abortion</i>	Sedgh et al. 2015	Mohamed et al. 2015	Probability applied uniformly; checked at conception	Pregnancy (termination)	None
<i>Miscarriage</i>	Magnus et al. 2019	Magnus et al. 2019	Linear interpolation of the likelihood of miscarriage, checked at end of first trimester	Pregnancy (termination)	Age
<i>Delivery</i>	N/A	N/A	Automatic event triggered by gestational counter	Agent assessed for mortality and twin probabilities	Gestational counter
<i>Twin birth</i>	Smits and Monden 2011	Smits and Monden 2011	Probability applied uniformly; checked at delivery	Parity	None
<i>Maternal Death</i>	Huchon et al. 2013; World Bank indicators (WHO, UNFPA, UN Population Division)	World Bank indicators for maternal mortality ratio (modeled estimate)	Senegal: Risk of maternal death, extrapolated by year according to World Bank modeled estimates of Maternal Mortality Ratio  Kenya: Risk of maternal death directly from World Bank modeled estimates	Crude death rate. Agent removed from model population.	Year

		per 100,000 live births			
<i>Stillbirth</i>	UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation; calculated estimates for age-specific odds ratios from DHS data	UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation; calculated estimates for age-specific odds ratios from DHS data	Array of annual prevalence for 2000, 2010, 2019; odds ratios to increase risk for adolescent mothers	Infant agent (does not enter model population)	Year of sim (historical rates), age
<i>Infant death</i>	World Bank indicators (UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation); Noori et al. 2021 for age-specific odds ratios	World Bank indicators (UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation); Noori et al. 2021 for age-specific odds ratios	Probability of infant death at delivery; odds ratios to increase risk for adolescent mothers	Parity, infant agent (removed from model population)	Infant mortality rate, age
<i>Death</i>	World Bank indicators for crude death rate (United Nations Population Division. World Population Prospects)	World Bank indicators for crude death rate (United Nations Population Division. World Population Prospects)	Age-sex splines for probability of death	Agent's lifespan. Death removes agent from model population.	Sex, age
<i>Initial population distribution</i>	World Population Prospects	World Population Prospects	Age-sex population pyramids used to initialize model with historical population. Preserves distribution of population across age and sex regardless of initial population size.	Age and sex distribution of initial population	Location-specific

619  
620  
621