FPsim: An agent-based model of family planning

3

4 Authors

5 Michelle L. O'Brien¹, Annie Valente¹, Cliff C. Kerr¹, Joshua L. Proctor¹, Navideh Noori¹, Elisabeth D. Root¹,

Helen Olsen¹, Samuel Buxton¹, Guillaume Chabot-Couture¹, Daniel J. Klein¹, Marita Zimmermann¹

8 Affiliations

9 ¹ Institute for Disease Modeling, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

10

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.

29

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

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

Yet, much of the existing FP modeling landscape has focused on macro- or population-50 51 level dynamics of family planning, with far less attention paid to individual needs and preferences (Brunson 2020; Speizer, Bremner, and Farid 2022) or individual-level consequences (Barham et 52 al. 2021; Brunson and Suh 2020; Finlay and Lee 2018; Okenwa, Lawoko, and Jansson 2011; 53 54 Schwarz et al. 2019). Due to the individual nature of the biological and behavioral underpinnings of family planning and its consequences, deeper understanding of how family planning is 55 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.

To that end, this article introduces the Family Planning Simulator (FPsim), a data-driven agent-based model of family planning, which explicitly models individual heterogeneity in biology and behaviors over the life course to better understand the conditions under which we might expect contraceptive decision-making to change, and, in turn, to inform programmatic and policy decision-making to expand contraceptive choice and access. To our knowledge, FPsim is the first open-source, individual-level, woman-centered model of family planning. Despite the individual nature of family planning, few FP models center individual biology and behavior. As an agentbased model, FPsim allows researchers to better understand and interrogate the individual behavioral and biological dynamics that aggregate to macro-level fertility outcomes. Integrating individual-level dynamics into the model allows for explicitly modeling interventions and programming targeted to specific groups (i.e. adolescents, postpartum women) in a heterogeneous population.

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

73

74 1.1 Agent-Based Modeling

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

87 1.2 Family Planning Modeling

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

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

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

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

- 117 2. Materials & Methods
- 118 2.1 Model Description

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

126

127 2.2 Initialization and Parameterization

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

The model is initialized with a historical population pyramid from the context. Men and women 131 132 enter the model without children and non-pregnant. Initialization of agents without history of pregnancy or childbirth creates a fictional initial cohort that will tend to have skewed outcomes. 133 Both men and women are initialized, but men are subject to aging and mortality alone, while 134 135 women can go on to experience the range of events listed in Table A1 in the appendix. In FPsim, agents experience events and move from one state to another based on data-136 derived and assumption-based probabilities. Fig. 1 maps the major states and events that FPsim 137 138 agents can experience. Agents are assessed for their eligibility (i.e., only pregnant women deliver; only women who are sexually active that month are eligible to conceive), and experience new 139

140 events based on assigned probabilities.





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

143

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

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



158 2.3 Data sources & methods for parameter estimates

159

154 155

156

157

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

events that are possible for agents to experience in FPsim, as well as their respective data sources 163 164 for the Senegal calibration. Note that these example data sources are meant to be informative for future calibrations, but because FPsim is data-driven and context-specific, different data 165 166 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 and Health Survey (DHS) contraceptive calendars; but we use the Performance Monitoring in 168 169 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 setting). 172

173

2.3.1 Fecundability

174 Although it is commonly cited that 85% of women using no method will conceive within a year (Trussell 2011), the biological underpinnings of fertility vary over the life course, following an 175 176 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 fecundability, as women age and do not conceive, they exhibit a further decreased likelihood of 181 182 conceiving (Steiner and Jukic 2016). Thus, we use additional estimates from the PRESTO study to inform a separate parameter which adjusts individual women's fecundability downward as they 183 184 age and have yet to conceive.

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

192



193

194 195

196

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

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

fit for the overall population. This means that some women consistently have much lower 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 fecundability in lower- and middle-income countries, despite estimates that nearly 186 million 205 206 women in LMICs experience primary or secondary infertility (Mascarenhas et al. 2012). To our knowledge, there have been no prospective cohort studies on fecundability in sub-Saharan 207 208 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

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

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

limitations in the field, but which does not necessarily reflect women's concurrent usage. Thechoice matrices are stratified by age group, as well as postpartum status.

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





231

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

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

200

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

240 2.3.3 Conception

One of the key life events that women experience in FPsim is conception. In any given timestep 241 (representing one month), women who are sexually active that month are eligible to conceive. 242 243 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 methods are assigned an efficacy value based on failure rates in 43 DHS countries (Polis et al. 245 2016). Women who are within six months of delivery and exclusively breastfeeding have a 246 probability of remaining amenorrheic and thus meeting criteria for the lactational amenorrhea 247 248 method (LAM), which provides excellent protection against pregnancy (Van der Wijden and Manion 2015). We consider LAM separately from the method-specific contraceptive matrix due 249 to these qualifying criteria. 250

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

and a nulliparous (life stage) adjustment of 0.96. She has also been assigned a random variation 254 255 multiplier between 0.7 and 1.1 – let us assume 0.8 for this hypothetical FPsim agent. Her total fecundability is the sum of 0.793 * 0.96 * 0.8 = 0.609. In the binomial trial to check conception, if 256 257 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 – (1efficacy) – to her conception probability. In this case, her initial fecundability would be further 259 260 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 in that timestep. 263

264 2.3.4 Pregnancy loss and mortality

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

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

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

288

289 2.4 Data gaps and assumption-based parameters

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

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

303 Birth spacing patterns present a unique challenge to simulating synthetic cohorts. In part, this is due to mismatching data timelines for most demographic surveys (including the DHS). 304 Contraceptive calendar data typically captures 1-5 years retrospectively, but shouldn't be 305 considered reliable much more than 12-24 months due to recall bias (Callahan and Becker 2012). 306 307 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. This creates a gap in knowledge where researchers can identify birth spacing between births for 309 310 which we do not know that woman's contraceptive use or non-use. Because of this gap, we developed a birth spacing preference parameter, which increases or decreases an agent's 311 312 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

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

shifting probabilities of pregnancy-related events (e.g., abortion) on specified metrics over time.
How we use FPsim depends on what kind of information we have, and generally fall under one
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 changes for some women. For instance, some research questions might investigate the 323 compounding effects over time of increased uptake of a specific method. With FPsim, we could 324 325 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 method. For example, a researcher may want to compare scenarios in which we roll out a new 327 328 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.

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

339 3.2 Scenarios

To examine any research question using FPsim, the model needs to be calibrated to a setting, 340 341 either a pre-programmed setting like Kenya or Senegal, or a custom calibration that users create for their own research questions. Once the model is calibrated, custom intervention scenarios 342 can be built to investigate a wide range of research questions. Users can adjust nearly any 343 344 parameter with the built-in scenarios script, including abortion, the probabilities of adverse outcomes (e.g. stillbirth), and the dimensions of any existing method (such as efficacy, initiation, 345 switching to another method, and discontinuation). Users can also add a new contraceptive 346 347 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 subpopulations, which may be defined by characteristics including age, parity, or postpartum status. 349 350 FPsim allows for straightforward, user-friendly scenario-building. The following example scenarios are intended to illustrate the mechanics of building scenarios in FPsim, rather than to 351 352 answer any one specific research question. In the first example, we build hypothetical scenarios for FPsim-Senegal, in which we 1) increase the efficacy of existing injectable methods to 99%; 2) 353 354 double the probability of all women initiating injectables; 3) double the probability of women over 35 initiation injectables; and 4) combine scenarios 1 and 3, increasing the efficacy of 355 injectables for all, and doubling the initiation for women over the age 35. Figure 6 displays the 356 357 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]
              = 2020 #intervention year for all scenarios unless otherwise specified
   year
   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: <u>https://github.com/fpsim/fpsim_technical</u>.

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),
        1
    )
#anticipate switching from existing injectables, all ages
s5b = fp.make_scen(
   year=year,
   probs=[
       dict(source='Injectables', value=0.20, **d_kw)
       1
    )
#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
```

Figure 7. Complex scenario building with FPsim

```
367
368
```

366

369 In part a, we first introduce the new injectable method by copying over characteristics injectable 370 from the existing (dict(copy from='Injectables', method=method, ages=limiters). We then identify the characteristics we want to change for the named age 371 372 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
- 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

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



385

386

Figure 8. Default output after running scenarios in FPsim

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

392

393 394





396 4. Discussion

Although there currently exist FP models that provide cross-country comparisons, we see a need 397 398 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 fail. With a focus on macro-level inputs and outputs alone, we risk missing the individual 400 401 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 individual behavior and biology impact fertility and health outcomes, including contraceptive 404 prevalence, pregnancy loss and mortality, and method mix. With individual-level modeling and a 405 life course perspective, we can better capture how probabilistic behaviors interact with biology, 406 and how events and activities impact women differently throughout their life. FPsim provides an 407 408 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 setting through examining behavioral change – i.e. changing demand – rather than relying on 410 supply-side factors alone. FPsim's flexible and modular simulation scenarios provide an 411 412 opportunity to explore the impact of policies and investments in family planning using a modeling tool designed around a woman's unique reproductive life course. 413

As with any computational modeling methodology, FPsim has its limitations. No simulation model can replace rigorous data collection and analysis. The insights that FPsim produces are only as good as the inputs and expertise that inform the model. FPsim is best used 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

- Adetunji, J., and B. Feyisetan. 2017. "Stages in the Adoption of Modern Contraceptive Methods: Do the
 Growth Patterns in Developing Countries Follow the S-Curve Model?" *PAA 2017 Annual Meeting*.
- Ajzen, Icek, and Jane Klobas. 2013. "Fertility Intentions: An Approach Based on the Theory of Planned
 Behavior." *Demographic Research* 29:203–32. doi: 10.4054/DemRes.2013.29.8.
- An, Li, and Jianguo Liu. 2010. "Long-Term Effects of Family Planning and Other Determinants of Fertility
 on Population and Environment: Agent-Based Modeling Evidence from Wolong Nature Reserve,
 China." *Population and Environment* 31(6):427–59. doi: 10.1007/s1111-010-0111-3.
- Barham, Tania, Brachel Champion, Andrew D. Foster, Jena D. Hamadani, Warren C. Jochem, Gisella Kagy,
 Randall Kuhn, Jane Menken, Abdur Razzaque, Elisabeth Dowling Root, and Patrick S. Turner.
 2021. "Thirty-Five Years Later: Long-Term Effects of the Matlab Maternal and Child
 Health/Family Planning Program on Older Women's Well-Being." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118(28). doi: 10.1073/pnas.2101160118.
- Bijak, Jakub, Jason Hilton, Eric Silverman, and Viet Dung Cao. 2013. "Reforging the Wedding Ring:
 Exploring a Semi-Artificial Model of Population for the United Kingdom with Gaussian Process."
 Demographic Research 29:729–66. doi: 10.4054/DemRes.2013.29.27.
- Billari, Francesco, Thomas Fent, Alexia Prskawetz, and Belinda Aparicio Diaz. 2007. "The 'Wedding-Ring':
 An Agent-Based Marriage Model Based on Social Interaction." *Demographic Research* 17:59–82.
 doi: 10.4054/DemRes.2007.17.3.
- Bledsoe, Caroline, Fatoumatta Banja, and Allan G. Hill. 1998. "Reproductive Mishaps and Western
 Contraception: An African Challenge to Fertility Theory." *Population and Development Review*24(1):15–57. doi: 10.2307/2808121.
- Bonabeau, E. 2002. "Agent-Based Modeling: Methods and Techniques for Simulating Human Systems." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99(Supplement 3):7280–87. doi:
 10.1073/pnas.082080899.
- Bongaarts, John, and John B. Casterline. 2018. "From Fertility Preferences to Reproductive Outcomes in
 the Developing World." *Population and Development Review* 44(4):703–809.
- Brunson, Jan. 2020. "Tool of Economic Development, Metric of Global Health: Promoting Planned
 Families and Economized Life in Nepal." *Social Science & Medicine (1982)* 254:112298. doi:
 10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.05.003.
- Brunson, Jan, and Siri Suh. 2020. "Behind the Measures of Maternal and Reproductive Health:
 Ethnographic Accounts of Inventory and Intervention." *Social Science & Medicine (1982)*254:112730. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112730.
- Cahill, Niamh, Emily Sonneveldt, John Stover, Michelle Weinberger, Jessica Williamson, Chuchu Wei,
 Win Brown, and Leontine Alkema. 2018. "Modern Contraceptive Use, Unmet Need, and
 Demand Satisfied among Women of Reproductive Age Who Are Married or in a Union in the

459 460 461	Focus Countries of the Family Planning 2020 Initiative: A Systematic Analysis Using the Family Planning Estimation Tool." <i>The Lancet</i> 391(10123):870–82. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)33104-5.
462	Callahan, Rebecca L., and Stan Becker. 2012. "The Reliability of Calendar Data for Reporting
463	Contraceptive Use: Evidence from Rural Bangladesh." <i>Studies in Family Planning</i> 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." <i>PLoS ONE</i> 10(6):e0130077. doi:
468	10.1371/journal.pone.0130077.
469 470	Cleland, John, Agustin Conde-Agudelo, Herbert Peterson, John Ross, and Amy Tsui. 2012. "Contraception and Health." <i>The Lancet</i> 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	<i>Beyond acceptability : users' perspectives on contraception,</i> edited by T. K. S. Ravindran, M.
473	Berer, and J. Cottingham. Reproductive Health Matters for the World Health Organization.
474	Dhak, Biplab, Niranjan Saggurti, and Faujdar Ram. 2020. "Contraceptive Use and Its Effect on Indian
475	Women's Empowerment: Evidence from the National Family Health Survey-4." <i>Journal of</i>
476	<i>Biosocial Science</i> 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." <i>The Milbank Quarterly</i> 96(2):300–322. doi: 10.1111/1468-0009.12326.
480 481 482	Grow, André, and Jan Van Bavel, eds. 2017. <i>Agent-Based Modelling in Population Studies: Concepts, Methods, and Applications</i> . 1st ed. 2017. Cham: Springer International Publishing : Imprint: 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?" <i>Human Reproduction</i> 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 <i>Towards Bayesian Model-Based Demography: Agency, Complexity and</i>
488	<i>Uncertainty in Migration Studies</i> , 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." <i>Obstetrics & Gynecology</i> 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	Hasmot 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	<i>Maternal & Child Nutrition</i> 16(3). doi: 10.1111/mcn.12985.

International Centre for Reproductive Health Kenya (ICRHK); the Bill & Melinda Gates Institute for
Population and Reproductive Health at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health;
and Jhpiego. Performance Monitoring for Action (PMA) Kenya Phase 1-3: Household and Female
Survey, PMA2019/KE-P1-HQFQ. 2022. Kenya and Baltimore, Maryland, USA.
https://doi.org/10.34976/4swk-g935

- Karra, Mahesh, David Canning, and Joshua Wilde. 2017. "The Effect of Fertility Decline on Economic
 Growth in Africa: A Macrosimulation Model." *Population and Development Review* 43:237–63.
- Kashyap, Ridhi, and Francisco Villavicencio. 2017. "An Agent-Based Model of Sex Ratio at Birth
 Distortions." Pp. 343–67 in Agent-Based Modelling in Population Studies: Concepts, Methods,
 and Applications, edited by A. Grow and J. Van Bavel. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Leridon, H. 2004. "Can Assisted Reproduction Technology Compensate for the Natural Decline in Fertility
 with Age? A Model Assessment." *Human Reproduction* 19(7):1548–53. doi:
 10.1093/humrep/deh304.
- Magnus, Maria C., Allen J. Wilcox, Nils Halvdan Morken, Clarice R. Weinberg, and Siri E. Håberg. 2019.
 "Role of Maternal Age and Pregnancy History in Risk of Miscarriage: Prospective Register Based
 Study." *BMJ (Online)*. doi: 10.1136/bmj.l869.
- Mascarenhas, Maya N., Seth R. Flaxman, Ties Boerma, Sheryl Vanderpoel, and Gretchen A. Stevens.
 2012. "National, Regional, and Global Trends in Infertility Prevalence Since 1990: A Systematic
 Analysis of 277 Health Surveys" edited by N. Low. *PLoS Medicine* 9(12):e1001356. doi:
 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001356.
- Mercer, Laina D., Fred Lu, and Joshua L. Proctor. 2019. "Sub-National Levels and Trends in Contraceptive
 Prevalence, Unmet Need, and Demand for Family Planning in Nigeria with Survey Uncertainty."
 BMC Public Health 19(1):1752. doi: 10.1186/s12889-019-8043-z.
- Mohamed, Shukri F., Chimaraoke Izugbara, Ann M. Moore, Michael Mutua, Elizabeth W. KimaniMurage, Abdhalah K. Ziraba, Akinrinola Bankole, Susheela D. Singh, and Caroline Egesa. 2015.
 "The Estimated Incidence of Induced Abortion in Kenya: A Cross-Sectional Study." *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth* 15(1):185. doi: 10.1186/s12884-015-0621-1.
- Noori, Navideh, Joshua L. Proctor, Yvette Efevbera, and Assaf P. Oron. 2021. *The Effect of Adolescent Pregnancy on Child Mortality in 46 Low- and Middle-Income Countries. preprint*. Public and
 Global Health. doi: 10.1101/2021.06.10.21258227.
- Okenwa, Leah, Stephen Lawoko, and Bjarne Jansson. 2011. "Contraception, Reproductive Health and
 Pregnancy Outcomes among Women Exposed to Intimate Partner Violence in Nigeria." *The European Journal of Contraception & Reproductive Health Care: The Official Journal of the European Society of Contraception* 16(1):18–25. doi: 10.3109/13625187.2010.534515.
- Polis, Chelsea B., Sarah E. K. Bradley, Akinrinola Bankole, Tsuyoshi Onda, Trevor Croft, and Susheela
 Singh. 2016. *Contraceptive Failure Rates in the Developing World*. doi:
 10.1016/j.contraception.2016.03.011.

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

Steiner, Anne Z., Amy H. Herring, James S. Kesner, Juliana W. Meadows, Frank Z. Stanczyk, Steven
Hoberman, and Donna D. Baird. 2011. "Antimüllerian Hormone as a Predictor of Natural
Fecundability in Women Aged 30–42 Years." *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 117(4):798–804. doi:
10.1097/AOG.0b013e3182116bc8.

- Steiner, Anne Z., and Anne Marie Z. Jukic. 2016. "Impact of Female Age and Nulligravidity on Fecundity
 in an Older Reproductive Age Cohort." *Fertility and Sterility*. doi:
 10.1016/i.fertnstert.2016.02.028.
- Stover, John, Robert McKinnon, and Bill Winfrey. 2010. "Spectrum: A Model Platform for Linking
 Maternal and Child Survival Interventions with AIDS, Family Planning and Demographic
 Projections." International Journal of Epidemiology 39(suppl_1):i7–10. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyq016.
- Trussell, James. 2011. "Contraceptive Failure in the United States." *Contraception* 83(5):397–404. doi:
 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.
- Van der Wijden, Carla, and Carol Manion. 2015. "Lactational Amenorrhoea Method for Family Planning"
 edited by Cochrane Fertility Regulation Group. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2015(10). doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD001329.pub2.
- Weinberger, M., F. Pozo-Martin, T. Boler, K. Fry, and K. Hopkins. 2012. *Impact 2 v5: An Innovative Tool* for Estimating the Impact of Reproductive Health Programmes: Methodology Paper.
 Methodology Paper. London, U.K.: Marie Stopes International.
- Wesselink, Amelia K., Elizabeth E. Hatch, Kenneth J. Rothman, Jennifer L. Weuve, Ann Aschengrau,
 Rebecca J. Song, and Lauren A. Wise. 2018. "Perceived Stress and Fecundability: A
 Preconception Cohort Study of North American Couples." *American Journal of Epidemiology*.
 doi: 10.1093/aje/kwy186.
- Wesselink, Amelia K., Kenneth J. Rothman, Elizabeth E. Hatch, Ellen M. Mikkelsen, Henrik T. Sørensen,
 and Lauren A. Wise. 2017. "Age and Fecundability in a North American Preconception Cohort
 Study." American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2017.09.002.
- WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, World Bank Group, and United Nations Population Division. 2019. Trends in
 Maternal Mortality: 2000 to 2017. Geneva, World Health Organization, 2019. Geneva: World
 Health Organization.
- Williams, Nathalie E., Michelle L. O'Brien, and Xiaozheng Yao. 2017. "Using Survey Data for Agent-Based
 Modeling: Design and Challenges in a Model of Armed Conflict and Population Change." Pp.
 159–84 in Agent-Based Modelling in Population Studies: Concepts, Methods, and Applications,
 edited by A. Grow and J. Van Bavel. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Williams, Nathalie E., Michelle L. O'Brien, and Xiaozheng Yao. 2021. "How Armed Conflict Influences
 Migration." *Population and Development Review* padr.12408. doi: 10.1111/padr.12408.

Wise, Lauren A., Kenneth J. Rothman, Ellen M. Mikkelsen, Joseph B. Stanford, Amelia K. Wesselink, Craig
 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

Appendix 616

617 618

Table A1. List of parameters, events, and respective data sources in FPsim eter Senegal Kenya data Operationalized in FPsim Affects: Aff Affects: Affected b

Parameter	Senegal data source	Kenya data source	Operationalized in FPsim	Affects:	Affected by:
Fecundability (base)	PRESTO	PRESTO	Rates used as probabilities (conceptions per 100 per woman over 12 cycles)	Conception	Age
Fecundability age limit	PRESTO	PRESTO	Max age for fecund women	Fecundability, method choice	Age
Nulliparous adjustment	PRESTO	PRESTO	Array of decreasing (negative) multipliers to fecundability for women with no pregnancies	Fecundability	Age, parity
Fecundability variation (noise)	N/A	N/A	Random multiplier on fecundability	Fecundability	None
Sexual activity	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)
Contraceptive method	DHS	ΡΜΑ	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
Contraceptive efficacy	Guttmacher	Guttmacher	Used pooled failure rates for 25+ and under 25 age groups	Conception	Age (over/under 25)
Minimum age for method choice	N/A	N/A	Set min age to begin using any method	Method choice	None
Lactational amenorrhea	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
Breastfeeding	DHS	DHS	Randomly selected duration (months) from a right-skewed gumbel distribution based on data from the DHS	LAM	None

Postpartum duration	N/A	N/A	Months counted after delivery	Method choice, LAM, lactation, sexual activity	None
Birth spacing preferences	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
Family size preferences	N/A	N/A	Increased likelihood to use contraception at a certain number of living children	Method choice	Parity
Sexual debut	DHS	DHS	Fated sexual debut pinned at an age drawn from distribution of age at first sex in DHS	Sexual activity	Age
Conception	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)
Abortion	Sedgh et al. 2015	Mohamed et al. 2015	Probability applied uniformly; checked at conception	Pregnancy (termination)	None
Miscarriage	Magnus et al. 2019	Magnus et al. 2019	Linear interpolation of the likelihood of miscarriage, checked at end of first trimester	Pregnancy (termination)	Age
Delivery	N/A	N/A	Automatic event triggered by gestational counter	Agent assessed for mortality and twin probabilities	Gestational counter
Twin birth	Smits and Monden 2011	Smits and Monden 2011	Probability applied uniformly; checked at delivery	Parity	None
Maternal Death	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			
Stillbirth	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
Infant death	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
Death	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
Initial population distribution	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