Modelling the impact of initiation delay, duration and prior PrEP usage on the prophylactic efficacy of FTC/TDF-containing post-exposure prophylaxis	1 2 3
Lanxin Zhang ¹ , Simon Collins ² Julie Fox ³ , Max von Kleist ^{1, 4,§}	4
 Project group 5 "Systems Medicine of Infectious Disease", Robert Koch Institute, Berlin, Germany HIV i-Base, United Kingdom Department of Infectious Disease, King's College London, United Kingdom Mathematics for Data Science, Dep. of Mathematics and Computer Science, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany 	5 6 7 8 9 10
\S Corresponding author: Max von Kleist	11
Nordufer 20, Berlin, 13353, Germany	12
E-mail addresses of authors:	13
LZ: lzhang@zedat.fu-berlin.de	14
SC: simon.collins@i-base.org.uk	15
JF: julie.fox@kcl.ac.uk	16
MvK: max.kleist@fu-berlin.de	17

Abstract

Introduction

Pre- and post-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP and PEP) are important pillars of the HIV prevention portfolio to reduce the risk of infection just before or after HIV exposure. While PrEP efficacy has been elucidated in many randomized clinical trials, corresponding data for PEP is extremely difficult to obtain in a controlled setting. Consequently, it is almost impossible to study the impact of PEP initiation delay and duration on HIV risk reduction clinically, which would inform recommendations on PEP use. 25

18

19

26

Methods

We employ pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, and viral dynamics models, along with ²⁷ individual factors, such as drug adherence to investigate the impact of initiation delay and ²⁸ PEP duration on HIV risk reduction. We evaluated PEP using two- and three-drug regimens ²⁹ with a FTC/TDF backbone. Moreover, we study PEP efficacy in the context of PrEP-to-PEP ³⁰ transitions. ³¹

Results

In our simulations, early initiation of PEP emerged as a pivotal factor for HIV risk reduction. 33 We found that 2-drug (FTC/TDF) PEP may insufficiently protect when initiated > 1 hour post-34 exposure. When adding a third drug, early initiation was still a critical factor, however, over 90%35 efficacy could be achieved when PEP was initiated 48hours post-exposure and taken for at least 36 14-28 days, depending on the efficacy of the third-drug component. When investigating PrEP-37 PEP transitions, we observed that preceding PrEP can (i) contribute directly to prophylactic 38 efficacy, and (ii) boost subsequent PEP efficacy by delaying initial viral dynamics and building-up 39 drug concentrations, overall facilitating self-managed transitioning between PrEP and PEP. 40

Conclusions

Our study confirms the critical role of early (< 48hours) PEP initiation, preferably with three drugs taken for 28days. Self-start with TDF/FTC and later addition of a third drug is better than not self-starting. Furthermore, our study highlights the synergy between recent PrEP 44 intake and PEP and may help to inform recommendations on PEP use. 45

Introduction

The human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) remains a public health challenge with an estimated 47 1.3 million new infections in 2022 [1]. To date, with a handful of exceptions, HIV infection cannot 48 be cured [2]. However, major successes in antiviral drug development allow to not only to prevent 49 AIDS, but to suppress the virus to an extent where the treated individual is non-infectious [3, 4]. 50 However, an HIV diagnosis needs to made and subsequent treatment currently needs to be 51 taken life-long, which, in addition to individual burden, relies on HIV testing and treatment 52 availability, medical care infrastructure and funding. HIV prevention through vaccination would 53 constitute an ideal means to fight the pandemic. However, developing an effective HIV vaccine 54 turned out to be extremely challenging, with all recent vaccine trials prematurely terminated due 55 to failure in demonstrating clinical efficacy [5]. In the absence of effective vaccines, pre-exposure 56 prophylaxis (PrEP) has partly taken its place. Four effective regimen are currently available: 57 once daily emtricitabine (FTC) with either tenofovir disoproxil fumerate (TDF) or tenofovir 58 alfenamide (TAF) can be administered orally, long-acting cabotegravir (CAB) can be injected 59 every two month. Monthly dapivirine (DPV) vaginal rings to prevent infection through receptive 60 vaginal intercourse recently received positive review by the European Medicines Agency (EMA). 61 Twice-yearly injectable lenecapavir demonstrated potential in clinical phase III. Of the available 62 PrEP options, oral TDF/FTC is widely available as a generic and rolled out in both low- and 63 high-income countries. 64

Post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) taken after suspected sexual-, or occupational exposure to 65 HIV [6] denotes another important preventive measure to reduce infection risk. Current guidelines 66 recommend to initiate oral PEP within 72hours after suspected virus exposure and to continue 67 the regimen for 28 days [6-8]. National [6,8] and international guidelines [9] differ with regards 68 to recommending two- or three-drug regimens for PEP: For example, TDF/FTC + raltegravir 69 or dolutegravir are recommended in the US, whereas the WHO 2014 guidelines also discuss 70 scenarios where two-drug regimens with generics may be recommended. To date, TDF/FTC 71 denotes the preferred backbone in PEP, whereas different choices of third-component drugs may 72 be used [10]. However, because of operational and ethical challenges no randomized controlled 73

41

46

trial has been conducted to test PEP efficacy directly. Current evidence for non-occupational 74 PEP efficacy has been synthesized from animal transmission models, observational studies of 75 health care workers receiving prophylaxis after occupational exposures, and observational- and 76 case studies of PEP use [6, 8]. However, results from observational studies may be impacted by 77 many factors such as individual adherence- and risk behavior [11] and differences in regards 78 to the utilized PEP drugs [8]. Although the developed guidelines are based on impressive 79 trans-disciplinary synthesis of evidence across heterogeneous data sources, it has not been 80 possible to date to elucidate the sensitivity of particular PEP regimen to delays in initiation, 81 PEP duration, as well as the impact of PrEP on PEP efficacy. 82

In the absence of randomized controlled trial data on PEP efficacy, mathematical modelling may support the synthesis of evidence, by integrating available knowledge on drug pharmacokinetics, as well as early viral dynamics. However, to our knowledge, no such modelling exists to date. By considering population pharmacokinetics, we extended a recently developed mathematical model [12] to analyse PEP efficacy for two- and three-drug regimens, and to test the impact of delays in 'time to PEP', as well as PEP duration. Finally, we investigate the transition from PrEP to PEP, providing a comprehensive understanding of the continuum preventive portfolio. 89

Methods

90

We combined population pharmacokinetic models of oral FTC, TDF, EFV and DTG [13–16] with 91 viral dynamics models [17, 18] and a novel numerical scheme [19] to estimate the prophylactic 92 efficacy of PEP with a TDF/FTC backbone for any dosing pattern of interest, as well as various 93 PrEP-to-PEP transitions. The overarching goal was to understand sensitivity of PEP efficacy 94 towards timing, delay and duration of PEP with- and without prior PrEP administration. 95 **Prophylactic efficacy.** In clinical trials, *average* HIV risk reduction is quantified in terms 96 of incidence reduction in an intervention vs. a control arm [20–23]. In a mathematical model 97 of within-host viral replication, the same quantity may be derived directly by computing the 98 reduction of infection probability per viral exposure due to a prophylactic regimen \mathcal{S} : 99

$$\varphi = 1 - \frac{P_I(Y_t, \mathcal{S})}{P_I(Y_t, \emptyset)} \tag{1}$$

where $P_I(Y_t, S)$ and $P_I(Y_t, \emptyset)$ denote the infection probability in the presence- and absence of a prophylactic regimen S upon exposure with Y_t viral particles at time t. Notably, the infection probability is the complement of the probability that the virus may eventually be eliminated in the exposed host, i.e. $P_I(Y_t, S) = 1 - P_E(Y_t, S)$.

Virus exposure model. We used previously developed exposure models for sex without 104 condoms [24]. In these models, the number of infectious viruses (inoculum size Y_t) that are 105 transmitted to- and reaching an anatomical site where they may spark an infection, are estimated 106 from a binomial distribution, $Y_t \sim \mathcal{B}(VL, r)$, where VL denotes the donor virus load, and the 107 'success rate' r depended on the type of exposure. Throughout this study, unless stated otherwise, 108 we utilize the exposure model designed for receptive vaginal intercourse. 109

HIV viral dynamics model. To compute the viral elimination probability in the exposed 110 host for prophylactic regimen S, we employ a within-host viral dynamics model [17,18], depicted 111 in Fig S1. The model considers replication of free infectious viruses, early- and productively 112 infected T-cells, as well as long-lived cells such as macrophages and latently infected T-cells, 113 which are believed to be an obstacle for the within-host clearance of HIV [25]. The model was 114

derived from first principles [17] and allows to model pharmacodynamic effects of all antiviral 115 classes [26]. Moreover, it allows to incorporate state-of-the-art population pharmacokinetic 116 models. 117

Pharmacokinetics. We used the previously developed pharmacokinetic models of emtricitabine 118 (FTC) [13] and tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF) [14], which allow to predict prodrug phar-119 macokinetics in blood plasma, as well as the pharmacokinetics of the active tri-phosphorylated 120 molecties in peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC). In line our recent findings [12], we as-121 sume that the concentration of tenofovir-diphosphate (TFV-DP) and emtricitabine-triphosphate 122 (FTC-TP) in PBMCs predicts the prophylactic effect. We adopted recently developed PK models 123 for dolutegravir (DTG) [15] and efavirenz (EFV) [27]. To capture the impact of individual 124 pharmacokinetic variability, we sampled PK parameters for 1000 virtual patients per drug, 125 utilizing distributions described in the aforementioned original sources. We considered once 126 daily oral doses of 300/200mg, 50mg and 400mg for TDF/FTC, DTG and EFV. 127 **PK-PD** link. The active intracellular components of TDF/FTC, i.e. TFV-DP and FTC-TP 128 are nucleotides reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTI). To evaluate their combinatorial effect, we 129

adopted a model for the molecular mechanism of action (MMOA) and drug-drug interaction [28]. ¹³⁰ For DTG and EFV, their direct effect can be modelled using the Emax equation [29], corrected ¹³¹ by plasma protein binding, and was assumed to be additive with the TDF/FTC backbone. ¹³² **Numerics.** We adopted the numerical scheme (PGS) from [19] to formulate a set of ordinary ¹³³ differential equations that allows computing extinction probabilities $P_E(Y_t)$, S of each compartment of the viral dynamics model, subject to pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of the ¹³⁵ considered drugs, eq. (S16). ¹³⁶

Results

'Time to PEP' is the most critical parameter.

Currently, the WHO recommends to initiate PEP up to 3 days after potential viral exposure 139 and to continue PEP for 28 days [9]. Using our modelling framework, we evaluated how 140 PEP initiation delay may alter prophylactic efficacy. As a first test case, we explored the 141 efficacy of 2-drug (oral TDF/FTC) PEP, as these drugs may be available in many settings 142 where PrEP is implemented. We created 1000 virtual individuals and simulated individual 143 pharmacokinetics based on the dosing profiles in Fig 1A. Using the model, we then computed 144 the prophylactic efficacy for each virtual individual, if a 2-drug PEP with daily TDF/FTC was 145 initiated at different time points post viral exposure and taken for 28 days. Fig 1C (red line, grey 146 areas) depicts summary statistics of derived PEP efficacy estimates across the cohort of virtual 147 individuals (median, interquartile ranges and 95% confidence intervals). From the simulations, it 148 is evident that $\geq 90\%$ 2-drug PEP efficacy in only achieved if TDF/FTC is initiated within one 149 hour after virus exposure. Efficacy steeply drops to < 50% when TDF/FTC-PEP was initiated 150 20hours after virus exposure. We also found that longer duration of 2-drug TDF/TFC PEP 151 could not compensate for delayed initiation (Fig 1B, Fig 1D red line) with efficacy remaining 152 low (median efficacy < 20%), when PEP was initiated 48hours after virus exposure and taken 153 for up to 7 weeks. We tested whether a third drug component (DTG or EFV) may impact on 154 prophylactic efficacy and change sensitivity to 'time to PEP' and 'PEP duration', Fig 1A–D. 155 Compared to 2-drug PEP, 3-drug PEP provided > 88% protection against sexual transmission, 156 when initiated 2days post-exposure and continued for 28days (Fig 1E). When initiated 2days 157 post-exposure, we predicted that TDF/FTC + EFV provided > 90% HIV risk reduction when 158

137

taken at least for 2 weeks, whereas TDF/FTC + DTG provided 85 - -90% HIV risk reduction ¹⁵⁹ when taken for at least 4 weeks, Fig 1E. In contrast to 2-drug PEP, we predicted that PEP ¹⁶⁰ efficacy with TDF/FTC + EFV or DTG increased with extended duration of PEP. ¹⁶¹

162

Third drug may be added later, if TDF/FTC is initiated quickly.

In many settings, all three drugs may not be available within reasonable time. However, 163 TDF/FTC may be readily available to individuals who already used, or have access to PrEP. 164 We investigated whether prompt PEP initiation with TDF/FTC and later addition of a third 165 drug may effectively prevent infection (schematic in Fig 2A). Reading Fig 2B-E bottom-to-top, 166 indicates that adding DTG or EFV to a TDF/FTC backbone increases PEP efficacy (lowest 167 row: TDF/FTC only) and that earlier addition of the third drug results in greater efficacy 168 (top row). Reading Fig 2B-E horizontally (left-to-right), indicates that the earlier TDF/FTC is 169 initiated, the better. For the three drug combinations, a 'window of opportunity' arises, where 170 the PEP efficacy exceeds 95%. For TDF/FTC + DTG the duration of PEP strongly impacts on 171 its prophylactic efficacy (compare panels B and D in Fig 2), whereas the impact is less strong 172 for PEP with TDF/FTC + EFV, which is already efficient for 2 weeks PEP. The simulations 173 highlight that if TDF/FTC is available within 12-24 hours, the third drug should be added in 174 less than a weeks time and PEP should preferably be taken for 28days from the first TDF/TFC 175 dose. 176

Previous PrEP can boost subsequent PEP efficacy and widen the 'window of 177 opportunity' 178

The pharmacologically active components of TDF and FTC (TFV-DP and FTC-TP respectively) 179 are built-up slowly within HIV target cells [13,14,24,30], which limits the 'window of opportunity' 180 for 2-drug (TDF/FTC) PEP (Fig 1C) and necessitates almost instantaneous PEP initiation to 181 achieve sufficient efficacy. However, TFV-DP and FTC-TP may persist for many hours even 182 after a single, or a few dosing events. To assess the combined impact of earlier TDF/FTC 183 PrEP intake with PEP, we investigated the efficacy of PEP following an 'on-demand' (2-1-1) 184 PrEP regimen [31] (schematic in Fig 3A). In our simulations, viral exposure occurs 2 (panels B, 185 F), 3 (panels C, G) or 7 (panels D, H) days after the last PrEP 'on demand' dose. A two- or 186 three drug PEP regimen is then initiated within 0-72 hours post virus exposure (x-axis) and 187 continued for either for 7 (panels B-E) or 28 days (panels F-I). 188

Reading Fig 3B–D and Fig 3F–H left-to-right shows that if the last PrEP-on-demand dosing 189 event was 7 days ago, the added benefit of earlier PrEP-on-demand on subsequent PEP efficacy 190 had almost vanished, compare to Fig 3E and Fig 3I (no preceding PrEP). However, if PrEP-191 on-demand was taken less than 7 days prior to virus exposure, it increases subsequent PEP 192 efficacy, as residual FTC-TP and TFV-DP concentrations may be present that either prevent 193 infection in some individuals, delay sero-conversion [32, 33], or result in a 'pre-loading' of drug 194 concentrations for subsequent PEP. For example, if on-demand-PrEP was stopped 2days prior 195 to virus exposure, subsequent PEP with TDF/FTC may be >90% efficient, even when initiated 196 within three days, Fig 3B,F. For the three-drug PEP regimen we observed a >90% efficacy when 197 initiated within three days after viral exposure and taken for >7 days, Fig 3C,G. Overall, we 198 observe that earlier PrEP combined with subsequent PEP can increase efficacy. 199

Next, we investigated the concomitant impact of preceding daily PrEP with 1–7 average doses 200 per week, stopped 2days before viral exposure, in conjunction with subsequent 2-drug or 3-drug 201

PEP, initiated 2-, 3-, or 7 days after virus exposure and taken for 28 days (schematic in Fig 4A). 202 As controls, we performed simulations without earlier PrEP (grey-shaded areas), as well as 203 PrEP-only simulations (empty box plots) in Fig. 4B-D. Our simulations confirm the combined 204 action of PrEP and PEP: Earlier PrEP boosts the efficacy of PEP, if PEP is initiated 2-, or 3days 205 post-exposure, Fig. 4B–C: Compared both to 'no-PrEP' (grey-shaded areas), as well as 'no-PEP' 206 (empty boxplots), prophylactic efficacy is increased for the PrEP+PEP combination. However, 207 PEP does not offer any additional protection when initiated 7 days post-exposure (compare 208 empty- vs. coloured box-plots in Fig 4D). Interestingly, our model predicts that PrEP-only with 209 100% adherence offers > 90\% protection, when stopped 2 days before virus exposure (empty bars 210 in Fig. 4D). Also, for the PrEP+PEP combination we observe > 95% protection, if 4/7 doses of 211 earlier PrEP were taken and 3-drug PEP was initiated 3days post exposure. For comparison, 212 PEP-only offers only 50% (TDF/FTC/DTG) and 65% (TDF/FTC/EFV) protection if initiated 213 3 days post exposure (Fig. 1C and Fig. 4C). If PEP is initiated 2 days post-exposure, preceding 214 PrEP may lift prophylactic efficacy from 90% (TDF/FTC/DTG) and 95% (TDF/FTC/EFV) 215 to almost complete protection, if adherence during preceding PrEP was 2/7 doses (EFV) vs. 216 3/7 (DTG). 217

Lastly, we tested scenarios in which the probability of PEP adherence declined substantially 218 over time. We modelled PrEP with incomplete adherence 48 hours prior to virus exposure 219 (schematic: Fig 5A). We further assumed a substantial decrease in PEP-adherence after 7days, 220 Fig 5B. Overall, compared to a full 28 days PEP regimen simulated in Fig 4B, we can see a 221 drug-specific decline in efficacy that is clearly seen in simulations without preceding PrEP (grey 222 shaded area in Fig 4C): Two-drug TDF/FTC is already quite inefficient (< 20%) when initiated 223 2.3 or 7 days post exposure and hence poor PEP-adherence marginally impacts (grev-shaded 224 areas in Fig 4B–D vs Fig 5C–E). In contrast, for the three-drug combinations, we see that poor 225 PEP-adherence negatively impacts on prophylactic efficacy (compare shaded areas in Fig. 4B–C 226 with Fig. 5C–D). However, if $\geq 4/7$ doses of earlier PrEP were taken and subsequent 3-drug PEP 227 was initiated \leq 3 days post-exposure, we predicted that prophylactic efficacy may exceed 95%. 228 In summary, we observe that preceding PrEP can substantially boost subsequent PEP efficacy 229 for all drug regimen, and 'buy time' with regards to PEP initiation, particularly if preceding 230 PrEP adherence was good (> 3 doses/week). 231

Discussion

We evaluated the impact of delays in 'time to PEP', PEP duration and PrEP-to-PEP transition, 233 based on a combined model of drug-specific pharmacokinetics and viral dynamics. Our modelling 234 by-and-large confirms recent UK, US and WHO guidelines on PEP [6–8], which recommend to 235 combine a TDF/FTC backbone with a third drug, initiate PEP as early as possible and to take 236 it for 28days. Moreover, our simulations indicate that early PEP initiation after suspected virus 237 exposure denotes the most critical parameter. For TDF/FTC two-drug PEP, instantaneous 238 initiation would be required, which may be infeasible. Adding a third drug to the TDF/FTC-239 backbone 'buys time'. However, protection may still be incomplete (Fig 1C), if a three drug PEP 240 was initiated 72 hours post virus exposure and taken for 28 days. The duration of PEP was a less 241 sensitive parameter for EFV, compared to DTG. The latter is contributed to the half-life $(t_{1/2})$ 242 of the drugs, with DTG having a relatively short half-life $(t_{1/2} = 13.5 - 15.9 \text{ h} [15] \text{ compared to}$ 243 EFV $(t_{1/2} = 40 - 55h)$ [27]. The long half-life may increase the likelihood that virus is cleared 244 before the drug is washed out of the body. While early PEP initiation may be particularly 245

difficult in settings with less established health infrastructure, we simulated scenarios, in which 246 PEP may be initiated with available TDF/FTC and later intensified with a third drug. Overall, 247 if TDF/FTC can be initiated within less than 24 hours, the third drug may be added, as soon as 248 it becomes available (Fig 2), on condition that PEP is taken 28 days. We found that preceding 249 TDF/FTC-based PrEP can substantially boost PEP efficacy, if stopped no more than 3 days 250 before suspected virus exposure (Fig. 3), or taken at 4/7 days on average (Fig 4–5). Thus, 251 individuals taking PrEP up to the time of exposure (-3days) could re-initiate the regimen and 252 may add a third drug when it becomes available. The combined effects of PrEP+PEP in this 253 scenario indicate synergy, which could arise from the fact that previous PrEP delays initial viral 254 replication [33], or pre-loads drug levels for subsequent PEP. Our simulations further highlighted 255 that daily PrEP-only with 100% adherence may provide > 90% protection, if stopped no more 256 than 48 hours before exposure (Fig. 4D and Fig. 5E). Essentially, this observation is backed by 257 the long pharmacokinetic halflifes of TFV-DP and FTC-TP in PBMCs, in the range of 4–7 and 258 1-2.2 days respectively [34–38]. 259

Our work has a number of limitations: Foremost, there is a lack of data that could be inputted into the model, due to a lack of clinical research into PEP. To strengthen the model further clinical trials with clinically relevant endpoints may be required. 260

Our simulations refer to exposure with 'wild type' viruses, whereas NNRTI drug resistance, 263 which may amount to 10 - 20% of transmitted viruses in Africa and the Americas [39, 40] 264 may severely diminish EFV-based PEP efficacy [27] and thus the suitability of EFV as a PEP 265 component. Notably, while we include EFV in our analysis to explore the impact of a 3rd drug 266 components with very high molecular potency [41], we are not advocating EFV for PEP as it is 267 contraindicated both for psychological side effects and low risk of serious liver toxicity. However, 268 while some clinical trials suggest superiority of integrase inhibitors (DTG over EFV) [42-45]269 with regards to 'time to viral load suppression', we would like to emphasize that viral load 270 kinetics decay more strongly for integrase inhibitors, merely because they inhibit a later stage of 271 the viral replication cycle and not because of superior efficacy (or potency) [46–48]. Hence, the 272 current preference for integrase inhibitors in PEP regimen should be motivated by tolerability 273 and low prevalence of drug resistance rather than alleged efficacy. We did not investigate 274 ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitors lopinavir (LPV/r) or atazanavir (ATV/r) as third drug 275 components in our model [7]. While these compounds have high molecular potency [41] we expect 276 PEP efficacy to be similar to EFV. However, previous work suggests very steep dose-response 277 curves for LPV/r and ATV/r, implying that prophylactic effect may rapidly drop in case of 278 incomplete PEP-adherence, or discontinuation [49]. In our model, we assume that the effect of 279 the considered drugs is associated with systemic drug levels. Both EFV and DTG are lipophilic 280 drugs that can rapidly cross cellular membranes by passive diffusion, such that their unbound 281 drug concentration in plasma strongly correlates with effect-site concentrations ('free drug 282 hypothesis' [50,51]). With regards to TDF/FTC, their phosphate moieties (TFV-DP/FTC-TP) 283 in peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) were used as an effect marker, since our recent 284 work [12] indicated strong correlation with effect, whereas concentrations in tissue homogenates 285 were not predictive regarding prophylactic efficacy. 286

With regards to pharmacodynamics, we simulated synergistic effects between TFV-DP and FTC-TP, based on recent results [28] and assumed that the direct antiviral effects of DTG and EFV are additive to the TDF/FTC-backbone. 289

In our simulations, we modelled viral challenges after sexual exposure (receptive vaginal intercourse). Notably, the majority of non-occupational PEP is administered after potential sexual exposure (PEPSE) [52] and women denote the major HIV risk group [53]. Occupational

virus exposures, through e.g. needle-stick injuries during healthcare procedures may lead to the translocation of larger amounts of viruses which may negatively impact on prophylactic efficacy [30]. Thus, our predictions may be optimistic regarding occupational exposures with patient blood.

Conclusions

297

Our modelling suggests that 'time to PEP' denotes the most critical parameter. Three-drug ²⁹⁸ PEP, preferably initiated no later than 48hours after virus exposure, and taken for 28days ²⁹⁹ remains the optimal regimen. Three-drug PEP for 14days is less efficient than 28days and 2-drug ³⁰⁰ (TDF/FTC) PEP only has high efficacy, if started within one hour after exposure. Self-start ³⁰¹ 2-drug (TDF/FTC) PEP with a subsequent addition of a 3rd drug in the clinic works better ³⁰² than not self-starting. Lastly, previous PrEP intake < 7days prior to virus exposure boosts ³⁰³ subsequent PEP efficacy and may widen the window period for 'time to PEP' past 72hours. ³⁰⁴



Sensitivity to 'time to PEP' and 'PEP duration'

Time from	TDF/FTC			TDF/FTC + DTG			TDF/FTC+EFV		
exposure to first	PEP duration			PEP duration			PEP duration		
dose of PEP	14 days	28 days	7 weeks	14 days	28 days	7 weeks	14 days	28 days	7 weeks
0 – 2 hr	> 83%	> 84%	>84%	>99%	>99%	>99%	>99%	>99%	>99%
	(68%, 98%)	(69%, 99%)	(69%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)
2-8hr	>60%	>61%	>61%	>99%	>99%	>99%	>99%	>99%	>99%
	(38%, 94%)	(38%, 99%)	(38%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)
8 – 12 hr	>51%	> 52%	> 52%	>99%	>99%	>99%	> 99%	>99%	>99%
	(28%, 90%)	(28%, 98%)	(28%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)
12 – 24 hr	>34%	>35%	>35%	> 96%	>99%	>99%	>99%	>99%	>99%
	(15%, 72%)	(15%, 93%)	(15%, 99%)	(93%, 98%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)	(99%, 99%)
24 – 48 hr	>16%	>17%	>17%	>63%	>88%	>90%	>93%	>96%	>98%
	(6%, 37%)	(6%, 57%)	(6%, 87%)	(57%, 70%)	(85%, 90%)	(88%, 92%)	(91%, 96%)	(95%, 98%)	(98%, 99%)
72 hr	8%	8%	8%	32%	50%	52%	56%	64%	74%
	(3%, 18%)	(3%, 28%)	(3%, 49%)	(28%, 36%)	(47%, 52%)	(50%, 54%)	(53%, 63%)	(61%, 71%)	(72%, 79%)

Fig 1. Sensitivity of TDF/FTC-based PEP on initiation delay and PEP duration. A & B: Schematic of the dosing regimen in panel C and D, respectively. C: PEP efficacy of TDF/FTC (red line), TDF/FTC + EFV (blue line), or TDF/FTC + DTG (green line) when initiated at different delays post virus exposure and taken for 28 days once-daily. D: Efficacy of TDF/FTC (red line), TDF/FTC + EFV (blue line) and TDF/FTC + DTG (green line) when initiated 48 hours post virus exposure and taken for different durations. E: Numerical results for different 'times to PEP', 'PEP durations' and regimen. Values denote the median efficacy and 95% confidence interval evaluated at the maximum 'time to PEP' of the indicated interval (e.g. 8hr for the 2-8hr interval). All computations were conducted on 1000 virtual patients. The daily oral dose for each drug corresponds to 300/200 mg TDF/FTC, 50mg DTG and 400mg EFV. The colored lines depict the median predicted PEP efficacy, whereas the dark- and light grey areas present the inter-quartile range and the 95% confidence range, respectively. Dashed horizontal lines indicate 90% prophylactic efficacy.



Self-start PEP with TDF/FTC, then get third PEP drug at clinic

Fig 2. Efficacy of TDF/FTC-based PEP with delayed initiation of TDF/FTC and further delay of the third drug. A:Schematic of the dosing regimen. For the drug combinations TDF/FTC + DTG and TDF/FTC + EFV, PEP efficacy was computed for virus exposures occurring within 1 to 48 hours before the first dose of TDF/FTC. The third drug was then added to the PEP regimen 1 to 7 days after the the first dose of TDF/FTC. B: PEP efficacy for the drug combination TDF/FTC + DTG, PEP duration was 14 days from the first dose of TDF/FTC. C: Corresponding PEP efficacy for TDF/FTC + EFV. D: PEP efficacy for TDF/FTC + DTG when taken for 28 days after the first TDF/FTC dose. E: Corresponding PEP efficacy for TDF/FTC + EFV. In panel B-E, the top row outlined in black denotes the scenario where the third drug is immediately added to the TDF/FTC backbone; the bottom row represents the scenario where no third drug was added to the TFC/TDF backbone.



Impact of previous on-demand PrEP on subsequent PEP efficacy

Fig 3. PEP Efficacy Following On-Demand PrEP. A: Schematic of the dosing regimen. Truvada was initially administered as "on-demand" PrEP (2-1-1), followed by viral exposure after a certain period. Subsequently, the PEP regimen was initiated after various time intervals, potentially incorporating a third drug. B-D: the efficacy profiles for PEP with overall duration of 7 days, and the exposure occurred 2 days, 3 days and 7 days after the on-demand PrEP, respectively. F-H: the efficacy profiles for PEP with overall duration of 28 days. E&I: PEP efficacy of baseline scenario without preceeding PrEP. All computations were performed on 1000 virtual patients. The daily dose for each drug corresponds to 200 mg FTC, 300 mg TDF, 50 mg DTG, and 400 mg EFV. The colored lines represent the median efficacy value in cases where PEP was initiated at the respective time point along the x-axis. The shaded areas depict the quantile range of prophylactic efficacy.



Impact of previous daily PrEP on subsequent PEP efficacy

Fig 4. Predicted efficacy of once-daily PEP, in cases where PrEP was recently taken. A: Schematic of dosing regimen: PrEP with incomplete, variable levels of adherence was taken and stopped 24hours before virus exposure. PEP with either TDF/FTC, or TDF/FTC + DTG or EFV was then initiated after a variable delay and taken for 28 days. PEP efficacy is calculated with regards to preceding PrEP adherence, as well as delay in PEP initiation. B-D: Computed prophylactic efficacy for the distinct PrEP+PEP regimen, if PEP was initiated 2, 3, or 7 days post-exposure and taken daily for 28days. The grey-shaded area indicates PEP efficacy, with no prior PrEP, while empty boxplots highlight the prophylactic effect of preceding PrEP, without subsequent PEP. Boxplots show the median, interquartile ranges and whiskers encompass the 95% confidence interval.



Impact of previous daily PrEP on subsequent PEP efficacy with incomplete adherence

Fig 5. Predicted efficacy of PEP with strongly declining adherence, in cases where PrEP was recently taken. A: Schematic of dosing regimen: PrEP with incomplete, variable levels of adherence was taken and stopped 24 hours before virus exposure. PEP with either TDF/FTC, or TDF/FTC + DTG or EFV was then initiated after a variable delay and adherence strongly decreases over time. PEP efficacy is calculated with regards to preceding PrEP adherence, as well as delay in PEP initiation. B: Simulated PEP adherence probability with a half maximum at 7 days post PEP initiation. C-E: Computed prophylactic efficacy for the distinct PrEP+PEP regimen, if PEP was initiated 2, 3, or 7 days post-exposure and adherence declined substantially after 7 days. The grey-shaded area indicates PEP efficacy without prior PrEP, while empty boxplots highlight the prophylactic effect of preceding PrEP, without subsequent PEP. Boxplots show the median, interquartile ranges and whiskers encompass the 95% confidence interval.

Competing interests	305
The authors declare that no competing interests exist.	306
Authors' contributions	307
L.Z. and M.v.K. wrote the manuscript with help from J.F. and S.C. L.Z. and M.v.K. designed the research. L.Z. performed the research and L.Z., M.v.K., J.F. and S.C. analyzed the data.	308 309
Acknowledgements	310
Funding	311
M.v.K. acknowledges funding from the German ministry for science and education (BMBF), grant number 01KI2016, from the DFG research center MATH+, as well as "Sonderforschungsmittel" (SoFo) provided through the Robert-Koch Institute. The funders had no role in the design of the study or the decision to publish.	312 313 314 315
Data Availability Statement	316
All data and computational codes are available at https://github.com/KleistLab/PEP	317

Supporting Information

318

319

Supplementary Text S1: Viral dynamics of HIV

We employ a viral dynamic model of HIV [17, 18], which contains six viral compartments: free ³²⁰ infectious viruses V, early infected cells, i.e. T-cells T₁ and macrophages M₁, productively ³²¹ infected cells T₂ and M₂, and the latently infected T-cells T_L. As depicted in Fig S1, the ³²² dynamics can be defined by 15 reactions whose reaction propensities are denoted as a_1 through ³²³ a_{15} . The drug classes that are investigated in this work are also integrated in this viral dynamics. ³²⁴ Equations (S1)–(S15) define the concrete propensity of reaction.



Figure S1. Illustration of the viral dynamic model and the interference mechanisms of different drug classes. Free infectious viruses V can infect target cells and create early infected T-cells T_1 and macrophages M_1 after successful infection. In early infected cells, the viral DNA can become integrated into the host genome, creating late infected cells T_2 and M_2 , which are able to release new viruses. Early infected T-cells T_1 can become latently infected, i.e. the cells will transition into a resting state, denoted as T_L . The latent infected T-cells can replicate itself or be reactivated and turn into T_2 cells. Viral compartments can also be eliminated. $a_{j\in 1...15}$ denotes the propensity of each reaction (see equations (S1)-(S15)). RTI: reverse transcriptase inhibitor; InI: integrase inhibitor.

R_1 : Clearance of free virus	$\mathbf{V} \to \ast$	$a_1(t) = (CL + (1 + \eta(t)) \cdot (\beta_{\mathrm{T}} \cdot T_u + \beta_{\mathrm{M}} \cdot M_u)) \cdot V$ (S1)
R_2 : Clearance of T_1 -cell	$T_1 \rightarrow \ast$	$a_2 = (\delta_{\text{PIC},\text{T}} + \delta_{\text{T}_1}) \cdot T_1 \tag{S2}$
R_3 : Clearance of T_2 -cell	$T_2 \rightarrow \ast$	$a_3 = \delta_{\mathrm{T}_2} \cdot T_2 \tag{S3}$
R ₄ : Infection of susceptible T-cell	$\mathrm{V} \to \mathrm{T}_1$	$a_4(t) = (1 - \eta(t)) \cdot \beta_{\mathrm{T}} \cdot T_u \cdot V $ (S4)
\mathbf{R}_5 : Integration of viral DNA into \mathbf{T}_1	$T_1 \rightarrow T_2$	$a_{5}(t) = (1 - \eta(t)) \cdot (1 - p) \cdot k_{\mathrm{T}} \cdot T_{1}$ (S5)
R_6 : Production of new virus	$T_2 \rightarrow V\!+\!T_2$	$a_6 = N_{\rm T} \cdot T_2 \tag{S6}$
R_7 : Transition of T_1 into latent infection	$T_1 \rightarrow T_L$	$a_7(t) = (1 - \eta(t)) \cdot p \cdot k_{\mathrm{T}} \cdot \mathrm{T}_1$ (S7)
${\rm R}_8$: Infection of susceptible macrophage	$\mathrm{V} \to \mathrm{M}_1$	$a_8(t) = (1 - \eta(t)) \cdot \beta_M \cdot M_u \cdot V $ (S8)
R_9 : Clearance of M_1 -cell	$M_1 \to \ast$	$a_9 = (\delta_{\text{PIC,M}} + \delta_{\text{M}_1}) \cdot M_1 \tag{S9}$
R_{10} : Clearance of M ₂ -cell	$M_2 \to \ast$	$a_{10} = \delta_{M_2} \cdot M_2 \tag{S10}$
\mathbf{R}_{11} : Integration of viral DNA into \mathbf{M}_1	$M_1 \to M_2$	$a_{11}(t) = (1 - \eta(t)) \cdot k_{\rm M} \cdot M_1$ (S11)
R_{12} : Production of new virus	$M_2 \rightarrow V\!+\!M_2$	$a_{12} = N_{\rm M} \cdot M_2 \tag{S12}$
R_{13} : Clearance of T_L -cell	$T_L \to \ast$	$a_{13} = \delta_L \cdot T_L \tag{S13}$
R_{14} : Reactivation of T_L -cell	$T_L \to T_2$	$a_{14} = \alpha \cdot T_L \tag{S14}$
R_{15} : Replication of T_L -cell	$T_L \rightarrow T_L \!+\! T_L$	$a_{15} = \zeta \cdot T_L \tag{S15}$

Here we assume a continuous virus production model, where T_2 and M_2 cells will produce ³²⁶ viruses continuously until they are eliminated. The used parameters except for the replication ³²⁷ rate of T_L are listed in [18], Table 1 therein. The T_L replication rate ζ is adopted from [54]. ³²⁸

Supplementary Text S2: numerical approach for PEP efficacy

In the *Methods* section we defined the prophylactic efficacy of a given prophylactic regimen, as the reduction in infection probability *per exposure*. Since extinction probability is the complement of infection probability, we can compute the extinction probability by adopting a recently developed numerical approach [19]. Based on the viral dynamics model in Fig S1, the extinction probability P_E of each single viral compartment can be derived as follows: 334

329

$$\frac{dP_E(\hat{V})}{dt} = (a_1(t) + a_4(t) + a_8(t)) \cdot P_E(\hat{V}) - a_4(t) \cdot P_E(\hat{T}_1) - a_8(t) \cdot P_E(\hat{M}_1) - a_1(t)$$

$$\frac{dP_E(\hat{T}_1)}{dt} = (a_2 + a_5(t) + a_7(t)) \cdot P_E(\hat{T}_1) - a_5(t) \cdot P_E(\hat{T}_2) - a_7(t) \cdot P_E(\hat{T}_L) - a_2$$

$$\frac{dP_E(\hat{T}_2)}{dt} = (a_3 + a_6)P_E(\hat{T}_2) - a_6 \cdot P_E(\hat{V}) \cdot P_E(\hat{T}_2) - a_3$$

$$\frac{dP_E(\hat{T}_L)}{dt} = (a_{13} + a_{14} + a_{15}) \cdot P_E(\hat{T}_L) - a_{14} \cdot P_E(\hat{T}_2) - a_{15} \cdot P_E(\hat{T}_L)^2 - a_{13}$$

$$\frac{dP_E(\hat{M}_1)}{dt} = (a_9 + a_{11}(t))P_E(\hat{M}_1) - a_{11}(t) \cdot P_E(\hat{M}_2) - a_9$$

$$\frac{dP_E(\hat{M}_2)}{dt} = (a_{10} + a_{12})P_E(\hat{M}_2) - a_{12} \cdot P_E(\hat{V}) \cdot P_E(\hat{M}_2) - a_{10}$$
(S16)

The time-dependent reaction rates are given in eqs (S1)–(S15). The system of ordinary differential equations (S16) is solved backwards using standard ODE solvers, as outlined in [19].

References

- UNAIDS. Global HIV and AIDS statistics 2023 fact sheet. https://www.unaids. 338 org/en/resources/fact-sheet, 2023.
 339
- Thumbi Ndung'u, Joseph M McCune, and Steven G Deeks. Why and where an HIV cure is needed and how it might be achieved. *Nature*, 576(7787):397–405, 2019.
- Robert W Eisinger, Carl W Dieffenbach, and Anthony S Fauci. HIV viral load and transmissibility of HIV infection: undetectable equals untransmittable. Jama, 321(5):451– 452, 2019.
- Myron S Cohen, Ying Q Chen, Marybeth McCauley, Theresa Gamble, Mina C Hosseinipour, Nagalingeswaran Kumarasamy, James G Hakim, Johnstone Kumwenda, Beatriz Grinsztejn, Jose HS Pilotto, et al. Prevention of HIV-1 infection with early antiretroviral therapy. New England journal of medicine, 365(6):493–505, 2011.
- Raphael J Landovitz, Hyman Scott, and Steven G Deeks. Prevention, treatment and cure of HIV infection. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 21(10):657–670, 2023.
- Fiona Cresswell, Kaveh Asanati, Sanjay Bhagani, Marta Boffito, Valerie Delpech, Jayne
 Ellis, Julie Fox, Linda Furness, Margaret Kingston, Massoud Mansouri, et al. UK guideline
 for the use of HIV post-exposure prophylaxis 2021. *HIV medicine*, 23(5):494–545, 2022.
- World Health Organization. Guidelines on post-exposure prophylaxis for HIV and the use of co-trimoxazole prophylaxis for HIV-related infections among adults, adolescents and children: recommendations for a public health approach. https://www.who.int/ southeastasia/publications/i/item/9789241506830, 2014.
- Kenneth L Dominguez, Dawn K Smith, Vasavi Thomas, Nicole Crepaz, Karen Lang, ³⁵⁸ Walid Heneine, Janet M McNicholl, Laurie Reid, Brandi Freelon, Steven R Nesheim, et al. ³⁵⁹ Updated guidelines for antiretroviral postexposure prophylaxis after sexual, injection ³⁶⁰ drug use, or other nonoccupational exposure to HIV—United States, 2016. https: ³⁶¹ //stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/38856, 2016. ³⁶²
- World Health Organization et al. Post-exposure prophylaxis to prevent HIV infection: 363 joint WHO/ILO guidelines on post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) to prevent hiv infection. 364 https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241596374, 2007. 365
- P Gantner, C Allavena, C Duvivier, A Cabie, J Reynes, A Makinson, I Ravaux, S Bregigeon, ³⁶⁶ L Cotte, D Rey, et al. Post-exposure prophylaxis completion and condom use in the ³⁶⁷ context of potential sexual exposure to HIV. *HIV medicine*, 21(7):463–469, 2020. ³⁶⁸
- Mauro Schechter, Regina F Do Lago, Aaron B Mendelsohn, Ronaldo I Moreira, Lawrence H
 Moulton, Lee H Harrison, Praca Onze Study Team, et al. Behavioral impact, acceptability,
 and HIV incidence among homosexual men with access to postexposure chemoprophylaxis
 for HIV. JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes, 35(5):519–525, 2004.

- Lanxin Zhang, Sara Iannuzzi, Ayyappa Chaturvedula, Elizabeth Irungu, Jessica E Haberer, Craig W Hendrix, and Max von Kleist. Model-based predictions of protective HIV preexposure prophylaxis adherence levels in cisgender women. *Nature medicine*, pages 1–10, 2023.
- Katy L Garrett, Jingxian Chen, Brian M Maas, Mackenzie L Cottrell, Heather A Prince, Craig Sykes, Amanda P Schauer, Nicole White, and Julie B Dumond. A pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic model to predict effective HIV prophylaxis dosing strategies for people who inject drugs. Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, 367(2):245–251, 2018.
- Rebecca N Burns, Craig W Hendrix, and Ayyappa Chaturvedula. Population pharmacokinetics of tenofovir and tenofovir-diphosphate in healthy women. *The Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, 55(6):629–638, 2015.
- Sulav Duwal, Laura Dickinson, Saye Khoo, and Max von Kleist. Hybrid stochastic 385 framework predicts efficacy of prophylaxis against HIV: An example with different 386 dolutegravir prophylaxis schemes. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 14(6):e1006155, 2018. 387
- Laura Dickinson, Janaki Amin, Laura Else, Marta Boffito, Deirdre Egan, Andrew Owen, 388
 Saye Khoo, David Back, Catherine Orrell, Amanda Clarke, et al. Pharmacokinetic and 389
 pharmacodynamic comparison of once-daily efavirenz (400 mg vs. 600 mg) in treatment- 390
 naive HIV-infected patients: results of the encore1 study. Clinical Pharmacology & 391
 Therapeutics, 98(4):406-416, 2015. 392
- Max Von Kleist, Stephan Menz, and Wilhelm Huisinga. Drug-class specific impact of antivirals on the reproductive capacity of HIV. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 6(3):e1000720, 2010.
- Max von Kleist, Stephan Menz, Hartmut Stocker, Keikawus Arasteh, Christof Schütte, and Wilhelm Huisinga. HIV quasispecies dynamics during pro-active treatment switching: impact on multi-drug resistance and resistance archiving in latent reservoirs. *PlOS ONE*, 6(3):e18204, 2011.
- Lanxin Zhang, Junyu Wang, and Max von Kleist. Numerical approaches for the rapid analysis of prophylactic efficacy against HIV with arbitrary drug-dosing schemes. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 17(12):e1009295, 2021.
- 20. Jared M. Baeten, Deborah Donnell, Patrick Ndase, Nelly R. Mugo, James D. Campbell, 403 Jonathan Wangisi, Jordan W. Tappero, Elizabeth A. Bukusi, Craig R. Cohen, Elly 404 Katabira, Allan Ronald, Elioda Tumwesigye, Edwin Were, Kenneth H. Fife, James Kiarie, 405 Carey Farquhar, Grace John-Stewart, Aloysious Kakia, Josephine Odoyo, Akasiima 406 Mucunguzi, Edith Nakku-Joloba, Rogers Twesigye, Kenneth Ngure, Cosmas Apaka, 407 Harrison Tamooh, Fridah Gabona, Andrew Mujugira, Dana Panteleeff, Katherine K. 408 Thomas, Lara Kidoguchi, Meighan Krows, Jennifer Revall, Susan Morrison, Harald 409 Haugen, Mira Emmanuel-Ogier, Lisa Ondrejcek, Robert W. Coombs, Lisa Frenkel, Craig 410 Hendrix, Namandjé N. Bumpus, David Bangsberg, Jessica E. Haberer, Wendy S. Stevens, 411 Jairam R. Lingappa, and Connie Celum. Antiretroviral prophylaxis for HIV prevention in 412

heterosexual men and women. New England Journal of Medicine, 367(5):399–410, August 413 2012. 414

- 21. Jeanne M. Marrazzo, Gita Ramjee, Barbra A. Richardson, Kailazarid Gomez, Nyaradzo 415 Mgodi, Gonasagrie Nair, Thesla Palanee, Clemensia Nakabiito, Ariane van der Straten, 416 Lisa Noguchi, Craig W. Hendrix, James Y. Dai, Shavhana Ganesh, Baningi Mkhize, 417 Marthinette Taljaard, Urvi M. Parikh, Jeanna Piper, Benoît Mâsse, Cynthia Grossman, 418 James Rooney, Jill L. Schwartz, Heather Watts, Mark A. Marzinke, Sharon L. Hillier, 419 Ian M. McGowan, and Z. Mike Chirenje. Tenofovir-based preexposure prophylaxis for 420 HIV infection among african women. New England Journal of Medicine, 372(6):509–518, 421 February 2015. 422
- 22. Sinead Delany-Moretlwe, James P Hughes, Peter Bock, Samuel Gurrion Ouma, Portia Hunidzarira, Dishiki Kalonji, Noel Kayange, Joseph Makhema, Patricia Mandima, Carrie Mathew, et al. Cabotegravir for the prevention of HIV-1 in women: results from hptn 425 084, a phase 3, randomised clinical trial. The Lancet, 399(10337):1779–1789, 2022.
- Michael C. Thigpen, Poloko M. Kebaabetswe, Lynn A. Paxton, Dawn K. Smith, Charles E. 427 Rose, Tebogo M. Segolodi, Faith L. Henderson, Sonal R. Pathak, Fatma A. Soud, Kata L. 428 Chillag, Rodreck Mutanhaurwa, Lovemore Ian Chirwa, Michael Kasonde, Daniel Abebe, 429 Evans Buliva, Roman J. Gvetadze, Sandra Johnson, Thom Sukalac, Vasavi T. Thomas, 430 Clyde Hart, Jeffrey A. Johnson, C. Kevin Malotte, Craig W. Hendrix, and John T. Brooks. 431 Antiretroviral preexposure prophylaxis for heterosexual HIV transmission in botswana. 432 New England Journal of Medicine, 367(5):423–434, August 2012. 433
- 24. S Duwal, V Sunkara, and M von Kleist. Multiscale systems-pharmacology pipeline to assess the prophylactic efficacy of nrtis against HIV-1. CPT Pharmacometrics Syst Pharmacol, 5(7):377–87, 07 2016.
- 25. Tae-Wook Chun, Susan Moir, and Anthony S Fauci. HIV reservoirs as obstacles and opportunities for an HIV cure. *Nature Immunology*, 16(6):584–589, may 2015.
- 26. Sulav Duwal and Max von Kleist. Top-down and bottom-up modeling in system pharmacology to understand clinical efficacy: An example with nrtis of HIV-1. *European Journal* of *Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 94:72–83, 2016. 441
- 27. Sulav Duwal, Daniel Seeler, Laura Dickinson, Saye Khoo, and Max von Kleist. The utility
 of efavirenz-based prophylaxis against HIV infection. a systems pharmacological analysis.
 Front Pharmacol, 10:199, 2019.
- 28. Sara Iannuzzi and Max von Kleist. Mathematical modelling of the molecular mechanisms 445 of interaction of tenofovir with emtricitabine against HIV. *Viruses*, 13(7):1354, jul 2021. 446
- 29. Ting-Chao Chou. Theoretical basis, experimental design, and computerized simulation of synergism and antagonism in drug combination studies. *Pharmacological Reviews*, 448 58(3):621–681, 2006. 449

- 30. Sulav Duwal, Christof Schütte, and Max von Kleist. Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of the reverse transcriptase inhibitor tenofovir and prophylactic efficacy against
 HIV-1 infection. *PLOS ONE*, 7(7):e40382, 2012.
- 31. Guillemette Antoni, Cécile Tremblay, Constance Delaugerre, Isabelle Charreau, Eric Cua, 453 Daniela Rojas Castro, François Raffi, Julie Chas, Thomas Huleux, Bruno Spire, et al. Ondemand pre-exposure prophylaxis with tenofovir disoproxil fumarate plus emtricitabine 455 among men who have sex with men with less frequent sexual intercourse: a post-hoc 456 analysis of the anrs ipergay trial. The lancet HIV, 7(2):e113–e120, 2020. 457
- Deborah Donnell, Eric Ramos, Connie Celum, Jared Baeten, Joan Dragavon, Jordan 458 Tappero, Jairam R Lingappa, Allan Ronald, Kenneth Fife, Robert W Coombs, et al. The 459 effect of oral preexposure prophylaxis on the progression of HIV-1 seroconversion. AIDS, 460 31(14):2007–2016, 2017. 461
- 33. Juan Ambrosioni, Elisa Petit, Geoffroy Liegeon, Montserrat Laguno, and José M Miró.
 Primary HIV-1 infection in users of pre-exposure prophylaxis. The Lancet HIV, 8(3):e166–
 e174, 2021.
- 34. Jose R Castillo-Mancilla, Jia-Hua Zheng, Joseph E Rower, Amie Meditz, Edward M 465 Gardner, Julie Predhomme, Caitlin Fernandez, Jacob Langness, Jennifer J Kiser, Lane R 466 Bushman, et al. Tenofovir, emtricitabine, and tenofovir diphosphate in dried blood 467 spots for determining recent and cumulative drug exposure. AIDS research and human 468 retroviruses, 29(2):384–390, 2013. 469
- 35. Jenna L Yager, Kristina M Brooks, Jose R Castillo-Mancilla, Cricket Nemkov, Mary 470 Morrow, Skyler Peterson, Mustafa Ibrahim, Lane Bushman, Jennifer J Kiser, Samantha MaWhinney, et al. Tenofovir-diphosphate in peripheral blood mononuclear cells 472 during low, medium and high adherence to emtricitabine/tenofovir alafenamide vs. emtricitabine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate. *AIDS*, 35(15):2481–2487, 2021. 474
- 36. Xinhui Chen, Sharon M Seifert, Jose R Castillo-Mancilla, Lane R Bushman, Jia-Hua ⁴⁷⁵ Zheng, Jennifer J Kiser, Samantha MaWhinney, and Peter L Anderson. Model linking ⁴⁷⁶ plasma and intracellular tenofovir/emtricitabine with deoxynucleoside triphosphates. ⁴⁷⁷ *PLOS ONE*, 11(11):e0165505, 2016. ⁴⁷⁸
- 37. Peter L Anderson, Albert Y Liu, Jose R Castillo-Mancilla, Edward M Gardner, Sharon M 479 Seifert, Cricket McHugh, Theresa Wagner, Kayla Campbell, Mary Morrow, Mustafa 480 Ibrahim, et al. Intracellular tenofovir-diphosphate and emtricitabine-triphosphate in dried 481 blood spots following directly observed therapy. Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy, 482 62(1):10–1128, 2018. 483
- 38. Nicolette A Louissaint, Ying-Jun Cao, Paul L Skipper, Rosa G Liberman, Steven R
 Tannenbaum, Sridhar Nimmagadda, Jean R Anderson, Stephanie Everts, Rahul Bakshi,
 Edward J Fuchs, et al. Single dose pharmacokinetics of oral tenofovir in plasma, peripheral
 blood mononuclear cells, colonic tissue, and vaginal tissue. *AIDS research and human retroviruses*, 29(11):1443–1450, 2013.

- Sizulu Moyo, Gillian Hunt, Khangelani Zuma, Mpumi Zungu, Edmore Marinda, Musawenkosi Mabaso, Vibha Kana, Monalisa Kalimashe, Johanna Ledwaba, Inbarani Naidoo, et al. HIV drug resistance profile in south africa: findings and implications from the 2017 national HIV household survey. *PLOS ONE*, 15(11):e0241071, 2020.
- 40. World Health Organization. HIV drug resistance brief report 2024. https://www.who. 493 int/publications/i/item/9789240086319, 2024. 494
- Lin Shen, Susan Peterson, Ahmad R Sedaghat, Moira A McMahon, Marc Callender, Haili
 Zhang, Yan Zhou, Eleanor Pitt, Karen S Anderson, Edward P Acosta, and Robert F
 Siliciano. Dose-response curve slope sets class-specific limits on inhibitory potential of
 anti-HIV drugs. Nature medicine, 14(7):762–6, Jul 2008.
- 42. George W Rutherford and Hacsi Horvath. Dolutegravir plus two nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors versus efavirenz plus two nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors son as initial antiretroviral therapy for people with HIV: a systematic review. *PLOS ONE*, 11(10):e0162775, 2016. 501
- 43. Steve Kanters, Marco Vitoria, Michael Zoratti, Meg Doherty, Martina Penazzato, Ajay Rangaraj, Nathan Ford, Kristian Thorlund, Aslam H Anis, Mohammad Ehsanul Karim, et al. Comparative efficacy, tolerability and safety of dolutegravir and efavirenz 400mg among antiretroviral therapies for first-line HIV treatment: a systematic literature review and network meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine*, 28, 2020.
- 44. Avania Bangalee, S Hanley, and V Bangalee. Dolutegravir as first-line antiretroviral therapy in south africa: Beware the one-size-fits-all approach. South African Medical Journal, 112(10):787–790, 2022.
- 45. Karen Jacobson and Onyema Ogbuagu. Integrase inhibitor-based regimens result in 511 more rapid virologic suppression rates among treatment-naïve human immunodeficiency 512 virus-infected patients compared to non-nucleoside and protease inhibitor-based regimens 513 in a real-world clinical setting: a retrospective cohort study. *Medicine*, 97(43):e13016, 514 2018. 515
- 46. Adriana Andrade, Jeremie Guedj, Susan L Rosenkranz, Darlene Lu, John Mellors, ⁵¹⁶ Daniel R Kuritzkes, Alan S Perelson, Ruy M Ribeiro, et al. Early HIV RNA decay ⁵¹⁷ during raltegravir-containing regimens exhibits two distinct subphases (1a and 1b). *AIDS*, ⁵¹⁸ 29(18):2419–2426, 2015. ⁵¹⁹
- 47. Daniel A Donahue, Richard D Sloan, Bjorn D Kuhl, Tamara Bar-Magen, Susan M Schader, 520 and Mark A Wainberg. Stage-dependent inhibition of HIV-1 replication by antiretroviral 521 drugs in cell culture. Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy, 54(3):1047–1054, 2010. 522
- 48. Ahmad R Sedaghat, Jason B Dinoso, Lin Shen, Claus O Wilke, and Robert F Siliciano.
 523 Decay dynamics of HIV-1 depend on the inhibited stages of the viral life cycle. Proceedings
 67 the National Academy of Sciences, 105(12):4832–4837, 2008.

- 49. Sulav Duwal, Laura Dickinson, Saye Khoo, and Max von Kleist. Mechanistic framework predicts drug-class specific utility of antiretrovirals for HIV prophylaxis. *PLOS computational biology*, 15(1):e1006740, 01 2019.
- 50. Dennis A Smith, Li Di, and Edward H Kerns. The effect of plasma protein binding 529 on in vivo efficacy: misconceptions in drug discovery. *Nature reviews Drug discovery*, 530 9(12):929–939, 2010. 531
- LB Avery, RP Bakshi, YJ Cao, and CW Hendrix. The male genital tract is not a pharmacological sanctuary from efavirenz. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, 90(1):151–156, 533 2011.
- 52. Binta Sultan, Paul Benn, and Laura Waters. Current perspectives in HIV post-exposure prophylaxis. *HIV/AIDS-Research and Palliative Care*, pages 147–158, 2014. 536
- 53. Grant Murewanhema, Godfrey Musuka, Perseverance Moyo, Enos Moyo, and Tafadzwa
 537 Dzinamarira. HIV and adolescent girls and young women in sub-saharan africa: A call
 538 for expedited action to reduce new infections. *IJID regions*, 5:30–32, 2022.
- 54. Daniel B Reeves, Elizabeth R Duke, Thor A Wagner, Sarah E Palmer, Adam M Spivak, 540 and Joshua T Schiffer. A majority of HIV persistence during antiretroviral therapy is due 541 to infected cell proliferation. *Nature communications*, 9(1):1–16, 2018. 542