Supplementary Material for: Influence of sexual risk behaviour and STI co-infection dynamics on the evolution of HIV set point viral load in MSM.

Diana M Hendrickx<sup>1,\*</sup>, Wim Delva<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup>, Niel Hens<sup>1,7</sup>,

1 I-BioStat, Data Science Institute, Hasselt University, Hasselt, Belgium

2 The South African Department of Science and Technology-National Research Foundation (DST-NRF) Centre of Excellence in Epidemiological Modelling and Analysis (SACEMA), Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa

3 Department of Global Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa

4 International Centre for Reproductive Health, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

5 Rega Institute for Medical Research, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

6 School for Data Science and Computational Thinking, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa

7 Centre for Health Economics Research and Modelling Infectious Diseases, Vaccine & Infectious Disease Institute, University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium

\* diana.hendrickx@uhasselt.be

# Simpact Cyan 1.0

The models in this study were developed with Simpact Cyan 1.0, an open-source framework for individual-based modeling of transmission, diagnosis and treatment of HIV [10]. Simpact Cyan 1.0 models each individual in a population, as well as the sexual relationships between individuals. Birth, mortality, the formation and break-up of relationships as well as HIV transmission, diagnosis and treatment are represented by events. The risk that an event takes place at a certain moment is represented by its hazard function. Simpact Cyan 1.0 implements models in continuous time, i.e. each time an event happens the models are updated. Also a generic STI co-factor effect on HIV is implemented. Furthermore, parameters can be changed during the simulation to simulate interventions. More details on Simpact Cyan 1.0 are available in [11] and from http://www.simpact.org/.

# Weibull distribution

In Simpact Cyan 1.0, birth events happen as a result of a conception event. As a consequence, no birth events can happen in an MSM population. This means that no new individuals can enter the population after initialization of the simulation. Therefore, the following alternative implementation is used (see Figure S1):

- People are assumed to be born when they have a simulation age of 30 years. In this way, all people with simulation age < 30 at initialization enter the population during the simulation.
- People become sexually active at a simulation age of 45 years, corresponding to a real age of 15 years.
- The average simulation age for natural mortality is 110 years, corresponding with a real age of 80 years.

In this way, we avoid that the population decreases during the simulation due to natural (non-AIDS) mortality.

The population pyramid for males from Belgium in 1980

(https://www.populationpyramid.net/belgium/1980/) was used to fit the Weibull survival distribution. Figure S2 shows the survival distribution for real age and simulation age.



Figure S1. Real age versus simulation age in this study. The figure shows birth (30 = simulation age, 0 = real age), the age at with a person becomes sexually active (45 = simulation age, 15 = real age) and the average age for natural mortality, used for fitting the Weibull distribution in Figure S2 (110 = simulation age, 80=real age).



Figure S2. Weibull survival distribution for real age (left) and simulation age (right).

In the parameter configuration file, this is implemented as

- mortality.normal.weibull.scale = 106
- mortality.normal.weibull.shape = 5

### Other parameter settings

Table S1. Parameter settings used for all scenarios in this study. The number of parameters is the same in all models. Adding or removing parameters from the model is done by setting parameters to a value so that effects in the model are disabled or not. The parameter names in the first column are directly related to Simpact Cyan 1.0.

parameter	value	explanation
mortality.normal.weibull.genderdiff	0	no females in the popula-
		tion
population.msm	yes	homosexual population

debut.debutage	45	45 = simulation age, 15 =
		real age (default)
population.simtime	45	stabilization period of 10
		y = y = 1980 - 2015
population.nummen	10,000	population of 10,000 men
population.numwomen	0	no women in the popula-
		tion
population.maxevents	population.simtime	The average number of
	× popula-	events per year that can
	tion.nummen	happen to the same per-
	$\times 15$	son is 15. The simulation
		is stopped when a num-
		ber of events equal to pop-
		ulation.maxevents is exe-
		cuted.
population.eyecap.fraction	0.2	Each men can have sex-
		ual contacts with 20% of
		all other men. Because of
		age-mixing etc, this will be
		only max. a few 100 in
	0.70 : 6	practice.
hsv2transmission.hazard.d	0.76 in case of an	effect of HIV on STI trans-
	STI-cofactor; not	mission, for HSV2 risk
	used in case of no	ratio = 2.14 [9]; $a = 1.12(2.14) = 0.76$
1. 1.	S11 co-factor	ln(2.14) = 0.76
hivseed.time	10	vears
hivseed.type	amount	a fixed number of seeders
		is chosen to start the HIV
		infection
hivseed.age.min	45	45 = simulation age, 15 =
		real age (equal to the de-
		fault debut age)
hivseed.age.max	80	80 = simulation age, 50 =
		real age
hivseed.gender	male	HIV seeders are MSM
hivseed.amount	30	seed of $1\%$ in 1980; start
		of HIV in MSM end 70's -
		begin 80's [13]. In 1980,
		about 3000 of of 10,000
		men in the simulation have
		reached the sexual debut
		age of 15 (simulation age
		45 years). $1\%$ of $3000 = 30$
		HIV seeds.
hsv2seed.time	10 in case of an	stabilization period of 10
	STI co-factor; -1	years
	in case of no STI	
	co-tactor to disable	
	HSV2 seeding	

hsv2seed.type	amount in case of an	a fixed number of seeders
	STI co-factor; not	is chosen to start the STI
	used in case of no	infection
	STI co-factor	
hsv2seed.age.min	45 in case of an STI	45 = simulation age, 15 =
	co-factor; not used	real age (equal to the de-
	in case of no STI co-	fault debut age)
	factor	
hsv2seed.age.max	80 in case of an STI	80 = simulation age, 50 =
	co-factor; not used	real age
	in case of no STI co-	
	factor	
hsv2seed.gender	male in case of an	STI seeders are MSM
	STI co-factor; not	
	used in case of no	
	STI co-factor	
hsv2seed.amount	330 in case of an	11% men with HSV2 in
	STI co-factor; not	1976 [6]. In 1980, about
	used in case of no	3000 of of $10,000$ men
	STI co-factor	in the simulation have
		reached the sexual debut
		age of 15 (simulation age
		45 years). $11\%$ of $3000 =$
		- ,
		330 HSV2 seeds.
hivtransmission.param.e1	0.4700036	$\begin{array}{rcl} 330 \text{ HSV2 seeds.} \\ \hline \text{risk} & \text{ratio} &= 1.6; \end{array}$
hivtransmission.param.e1	0.4700036	$\begin{array}{l} 330 \text{ HSV2 seeds.} \\ \hline \text{risk}  \text{ratio} &= 1.6; \\ \ln(1.6) = 0.4700036 \ [16] \end{array}$
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2	0.4700036	$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2	0.4700036	$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2 person.hsv2.a.dist.type	0.4700036 0.4700036 fixed in case of an	$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2 person.hsv2.a.dist.type	0.4700036 0.4700036 fixed in case of an STI co-factor; not	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis-
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2 person.hsv2.a.dist.type	0.4700036 0.4700036 fixed in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2 person.hsv2.a.dist.type	0.4700036 0.4700036 fixed in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2 person.hsv2.a.dist.type person.hsv2.a.dist.fixed.value	0.4700036 0.4700036 fixed in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor -2.25 in case of an	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value transmission rate (cumu-
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2 person.hsv2.a.dist.type person.hsv2.a.dist.fixed.value	0.4700036 0.4700036 fixed in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor -2.25 in case of an STI co-factor; not	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value transmission rate (cumu- lative incidence) = 10%
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2 person.hsv2.a.dist.type person.hsv2.a.dist.fixed.value	0.4700036 0.4700036 fixed in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor -2.25 in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value transmission rate (cumu- lative incidence) = 10% [4]; risk ratio = $-\log(1 - 1)$
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2 person.hsv2.a.dist.type person.hsv2.a.dist.fixed.value	0.4700036 0.4700036 fixed in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor -2.25 in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value transmission rate (cumu- lative incidence) = 10% [4]; risk ratio = $-\log(1 - cumulative incidence)$ =
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2 person.hsv2.a.dist.type person.hsv2.a.dist.fixed.value	0.4700036 0.4700036 fixed in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor -2.25 in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor	$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2 person.hsv2.a.dist.type person.hsv2.a.dist.fixed.value	0.4700036 0.4700036 fixed in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor -2.25 in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value transmission rate (cumu- lative incidence) = 10% [4]; risk ratio = $-\log(1 - cumu-\log(0.9)) = 0.1053605;$ $\ln(0.1053605) = -2.25$
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2 person.hsv2.a.dist.type person.hsv2.a.dist.fixed.value mortality.aids.survtime.C	0.4700036 0.4700036 fixed in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor -2.25 in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor 65	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value transmission rate (cumu- lative incidence) = 10% [4]; risk ratio = $-\log(1 - cumu-\log(1 - cumu))$ (0.9) = 0.1053605; $\ln(0.1053605) = -2.25$ parameter C in the for-
hivtransmission.param.e1      hivtransmission.param.e2      person.hsv2.a.dist.type      person.hsv2.a.dist.fixed.value      mortality.aids.survtime.C	0.47000360.4700036fixed in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor-2.25 in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor65	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value transmission rate (cumu- lative incidence) = 10% [4]; risk ratio = $-\log(1 - cumulative incidence) =$ $-\log (0.9) = 0.1053605;$ $\ln(0.1053605) = -2.25$ parameter C in the for- mula for survival time [2]
hivtransmission.param.e1      hivtransmission.param.e2      person.hsv2.a.dist.type      person.hsv2.a.dist.fixed.value      mortality.aids.survtime.C	0.47000360.4700036fixed in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor-2.25 in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor65	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value transmission rate (cumu- lative incidence) = 10% [4]; risk ratio = -log(1 – cumulative incidence) = -log (0.9) = 0.1053605; $\ln(0.1053605) = -2.25$ parameter C in the for- mula for survival time [2] $t_{survival} = (C/V_{sp}^k) \times 10^x$
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2 person.hsv2.a.dist.type person.hsv2.a.dist.fixed.value mortality.aids.survtime.C	0.47000360.4700036fixed in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor-2.25 in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor65	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value transmission rate (cumu- lative incidence) = 10% [4]; risk ratio = $-\log(1 - cumulative incidence) =$ $-\log (0.9) = 0.1053605;$ $\ln(0.1053605) = -2.25$ parameter C in the for- mula for survival time [2] $t_{survival} = (C/V_{sp}^k) \times 10^x$ where $V_{sp}$ is the set-point
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2 person.hsv2.a.dist.type person.hsv2.a.dist.fixed.value mortality.aids.survtime.C	0.47000360.4700036fixed in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor-2.25 in case of an STI co-factor; not used in case of no STI co-factor65	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value transmission rate (cumu- lative incidence) = 10% [4]; risk ratio = $-\log(1 - \cos(1 - \cos(0.9)) = 0.1053605;$ $\ln(0.1053605) = -2.25$ parameter C in the for- mula for survival time [2] $t_{survival} = (C/V_{sp}^k) \times 10^x$ where $V_{sp}$ is the set-point viral load and x is the
hivtransmission.param.e1      hivtransmission.param.e2      person.hsv2.a.dist.type      person.hsv2.a.dist.fixed.value      mortality.aids.survtime.C	0.4700036      0.4700036      fixed in case of an      STI co-factor; not      used in case of no      STI co-factor      -2.25 in case of an      STI co-factor; not      used in case of no      STI co-factor; not      used in case of no      STI co-factor      65	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value transmission rate (cumu- lative incidence) = 10% [4]; risk ratio = -log(1 - cumulative incidence) = -log (0.9) = 0.1053605; $\ln(0.1053605) = -2.25$ parameter C in the for- mula for survival time [2] $t_{survival} = (C/V_{sp}^k) \times 10^x$ where $V_{sp}$ is the set-point viral load and x is the parameter determined per
hivtransmission.param.e1      hivtransmission.param.e2      person.hsv2.a.dist.type      person.hsv2.a.dist.fixed.value      mortality.aids.survtime.C	0.4700036      0.4700036      fixed in case of an      STI co-factor; not      used in case of no      STI co-factor      -2.25 in case of an      STI co-factor; not      used in case of no      STI co-factor; not      used in case of no      STI co-factor;      65	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value transmission rate (cumu- lative incidence) = 10% [4]; risk ratio = $-\log(1 - cumulative incidence) =$ $-\log (0.9) = 0.1053605;$ $\ln(0.1053605) = -2.25$ parameter C in the for- mula for survival time [2] $t_{survival} = (C/V_{sp}^k) \times 10^x$ where $V_{sp}$ is the set-point viral load and x is the parameter determined per person allowing some ran-
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2 person.hsv2.a.dist.type person.hsv2.a.dist.fixed.value mortality.aids.survtime.C	0.4700036      0.4700036      fixed in case of an      STI co-factor; not      used in case of no      STI co-factor      -2.25 in case of an      STI co-factor; not      used in case of no      STI co-factor      65	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value transmission rate (cumu- lative incidence) = 10% [4]; risk ratio = $-\log(1 - cumulative incidence) =$ $-\log (0.9) = 0.1053605;$ $\ln(0.1053605) = -2.25$ parameter C in the for- mula for survival time [2] $t_{survival} = (C/V_{sp}^k) \times 10^x$ where $V_{sp}$ is the set-point viral load and x is the parameter determined per person allowing some ran- domness in the formula; re-
hivtransmission.param.e1 hivtransmission.param.e2 person.hsv2.a.dist.type person.hsv2.a.dist.fixed.value mortality.aids.survtime.C	0.4700036      0.4700036      fixed in case of an      STI co-factor; not      used in case of no      STI co-factor      -2.25 in case of an      STI co-factor; not      used in case of no      STI co-factor; not      used in case of no      STI co-factor      65	330 HSV2 seeds. risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] risk ratio = 1.6; $\ln(1.6)=0.4700036$ [16] person dependent baseline value for the STI transmis- sion hazard is a fixed value transmission rate (cumu- lative incidence) = 10% [4]; risk ratio = $-\log(1 - \cos(1 - \cos(0.9)) = 0.1053605;$ $\ln(0.1053605) = -2.25$ parameter C in the for- mula for survival time [2] $t_{survival} = (C/V_{sp}^k) \times 10^x$ where $V_{sp}$ is the set-point viral load and x is the parameter determined per person allowing some ran- domness in the formula; re- sults in survival time of 10-

mortality.aids.survtime.k	-0.2	parameter k in the for-
		(see parameter C); results
		in survival time of 10-11
	-	years for AIDS [18]
person.survtime.logoffset.dist.type	normal	the parameter x in the for-
		drawn from a normal dis
		tribution
person.survtime.logoffset.dist.normal.mu	0	the normal distribution for
	-	parameter x in the formula
		for survival time has mean
		0
person.survtime.logoffset.dist.normal.sigma	0.1	the normal distribution for
		parameter x in the for-
		mula for survival time has
		obtain a survival distri
		bution which is approxi-
		mately Weibull distributed
person.vsp.model.logdist2d.dist2d.binormalsymm.mean	4.3	the distribution used to
		pick set-point viral load
		values on a base 10 log-
		arithmic scale is a bi-
		normal distribution using
		the same mean and stan-
		direction as for the v-
		direction (default): the pa-
		rameters are fitted to the
		histogram for MSM in [7];
		the mean is 4.3
person.vsp.model.logdist 2d.dist 2d.binormal symm.rho	0.31	parameter rho for the cor-
		relation between x and
		y in the distribution of
		parameter represents set-
		point viral load heritability
		and is taken from [3]
person.vsp.model.logdist2d.dist2d.binormalsymm.sigma	1.3	standard deviation for the
		distribution of set-point vi-
		ral load; the parameters
		are fitted to the histogram
parson van model leadiet 2d van 1 temptivez addiet		IOF MSM in [7]
person.vsp.moder.iogdisi2d.useaiternativeseeddist	yes	than the default to initial-
		ize set-point viral load val-
		ues when HIV seeding is
		triggered

person.vsp.model.log dist 2d.alternative seed. dist.type	fixed	person dependent initial set-point viral load value
		is a fixed value
person.vsp.model.logdist2d.alternativeseed.dist.fixed.value	4	value is a bit lower than the value for 1984 in [8]
formationmem hazard type	simplo	amount of data available is
iormationmisminazard.type	simple	limited: we take the most
		innited, we take the most
		simple form of the forma-
		tion hazard to limit the
		amount of parameters to
		fit
person.art.accept.threshold.dist.fixed.value	1	ART acceptance thresh-
		old is 1 (the maximum
		value for this parameter)
		for each person: willing
		nor each person, while-
		hess to accept treatment
		when offered. RIVM re-
		ports that in $2017, 95\%$ of
		MSM diagnosed and linked
		to care were on ART $[15]$
diagnosis.baseline	-1000000	no ART before $1994$ [12];
		we set this parameter to a
		very small number so that
		nobody will be treated
person.cd4.start.dist.type	lognormal	lognormal distribution for
	1001101100	the CD4 value a person has
		at the time of infection
person.cd4.start.dist.lognormal.zeta	$ln\left(\frac{mu.cd4}{\sqrt{1+var.cd4}}\right)$	value for location param-
	$\sqrt{\frac{1}{mu.cd4^2}}$	eter zeta of the distribu-
		tion for the CD4 value
		a person has at the time
		of infection; mu.cd4=800;
		var.cd4=40000
person cd4 start dist lognormal sigma	$\sqrt{l_{n}\left(1+var.cd4\right)}$	value for scale parame
person.cd4.start.dist.lognormai.sigma	$\sqrt{mu.cd4^2}$	ton simple of the distribut
		ter signa of the distribu-
		tion for the CD4 value
		a person has at the time
		of infection; mu.cd4=800;
		var.cd4=40000
person.cd4.end.dist.type	lognormal	lognormal distribution for
		the CD4 value a person
		will have when he dies from
		AIDS related causes
person odd and dist lognormal zeta	log mu.cd4.end	value for location param
person.ou4.enu.uist.iognormat.zeta	$\left(\frac{1+var.cd4.end}{\sqrt{\frac{1+var.cd4.end}{2}}}\right)$	oton zoto of the distant
	v mu.cd4.end <sup>2</sup>	eter zeta of the distribu-
		tion for the CD4 value
		a person will have when
		he dies from AIDS related
		causes; $mu.cd4.end=20;$
		var.cd4.end=5

person.cd4.end.dist.lognormal.sigma $\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1+var.cd4.end}{mu.cd4.end^2}\right)}$ value for scale parameter sigma of the distribution
for the CD4 value a per- son will have when he dies from AIDS related causes; mu.cd4.end=20; var.cd4.end=5

## Intervention events

Table S2 summarizes the intervention events for simulating the increased ART coverage since 1994, and the increase in sexual risk behaviour with ART coverage.

Table S2. Intervention events for simulating the increased ART coverage since 1994, and the increase in sexual risk behaviour with ART coverage. CD4 treshold: the parameter monitoring.cd4.threshold, if a person's CD4 count is below this threshold, he will be offered ART; diagnosis.baseline: baseline value in the hazard for a diagnosis event; formation alpha\_12: the parameter formationmsm.hazard.simple.alpha\_12 in the hazard for a relationship formation event, corresponding to a weight for the number of relationships men in the relationship have. This parameter only changes for the scenarios with increased risk behaviour. The behavioural parameter formation alpha\_12 is equal to an initial value in the period 1980-1993. From 1994 onwards until 2014, this value is increased with 0.05 every two years to simulate increased risk behaviour over time in the decade after the introduction of ART. The actual value of the initial value of formation alpha\_12 is determined during the model calibration procedure.

year	$\operatorname{time}$	CD4 threshold	diagnosis.baseline	formation $alpha_12$
1994	24	200	-1.5	initial value $+$ 0.05
1996	26	230	-1.25	initial value $+$ 0.1
1998	28	260	-1	initial value $+$ 0.15
2000	30	290	-0.75	initial value $+$ 0.2
2002	32	320	-0.5	initial value $+$ 0.25
2004	34	350	-0.25	initial value $+$ 0.3
2006	36	380	0	initial value $+$ 0.35
2008	38	410	0.25	initial value $+$ 0.4
2010	40	440	0.5	initial value $+$ 0.45
2012	42	470	0.75	initial value $+$ 0.5
2014	44	500	1	initial value $+$ 0.55

# Statistical analysis of the parameter space

### Methods

For exploring the parameter space, we consider the 10,000 parameter combinations generated by Latin Hypercube Sampling (LHS) and focus on the top 1% of the lowest values of the GOF statistic (sum of squared relative errors) and follow the approach described by Castro Sanchez et al. [5]. First, for each parameter, smoothed density plots of the initial uniform distribution (range as in Table 2) are compared with smoothed density plots for the distribution of the top 1% solutions. The more peaked the density for the top 1% solutions, the more the parameter is influenced by the data. Second, a classification tree method, called activity region finder (ARF) [1] is applied to identify regions in the parameter space that have significantly more top 1% solutions than other solutions. The 10,000 parameter combinations from the LHS are used as input variables, and a binary output, which is 1 for a top 1% solution and 0 otherwise is used. Third, the

input-output from the ARF is used to fit generalized additive models (GAM) [17]. For each parameter, the predicted probability of low sum of relative squared errors is plotted against the value of the parameter. In this way, we further explore which regions in the parameter space contain a large amount of top 1% solutions. Finally, the associations between the parameters in the top 1% solution space are calculated using the Maximal Information Coefficient (MIC) [14].

### Model with no STI co-factor and no behavioural change (nSTI-nBC)

The distribution of the top 1% solutions showed the most pronounced peaks for the weight for the age of the parameters (formation  $\alpha_4$ ) and the parameter c in the HIV transmission hazard (HIV transmission c), followed by the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ) and its assortativity (formation  $\alpha_3$ )(see Figure S3).



Figure S3. Analysis of the parameter space for the nSTI-nBC model. Smoothed density plots for the initial uniform distribution (dashed line) and the distribution of the top 1% solutions (solid line) for the nine estimated parameters.

When applying ARF, only the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ), the assortativity for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_3$ ), the baseline dissolution parmeter (dissolution  $\alpha_0$ ) and the assortativity for age (formation  $\alpha_5$ ) take part in the classification process. The first split of the classification tree uses the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ). The next splits use the assortativity for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_3$ ) and the baseline dissolution parameter (dissolution  $\alpha_0$ ). Only one region with significantly more top 1% solutions could be detected, where the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ) is between 0.3917 and 0.4485.

The results of the GAM (Figure S4) show a high probability of low relative sum of squared errors (SSE) for positive values of the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ). Lower values of the baseline formation parameter (formation  $\alpha_0$ ), the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ), the assortativity for age (formation  $\alpha_5$ ) and the baseline parameter for HIV transmission (HIV transmission a) increase the

probability of low relative SSE. Higher values of the HIV transmission parameters related to viral load (HIV transmission b and c) increase the probability for low relative SSE.



Figure S4. Analysis of the parameter space for the nSTI-nBC model. Results of the GAM: predicted probabilities of low relative sum of squared errors (SSE) for the nine estimated parameters.

The three highest values for the MIC were obtained for

- 1. the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ) and the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ )(MIC = 0.71, negative correlation);
- 2. the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ) and the baseline dissolution parameter (dissolution  $\alpha_0$ )(MIC = 0.53, positive correlation);
- 3. the weight for assortativity for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_3$ ) and the baseline dissolution parameter (dissolution  $\alpha_0$ )(MIC = 0.52, positive correlation).

#### Model with an STI co-factor and no behavioural change (STI-nBC)

The distribution of the top 1% solutions showed the most pronounced peaks for the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ) and the parameter c in the HIV transmission hazard (HIV transmission c), followed by the baseline parameter a in the HIV transmission hazard (HIV transmission a)(see Figure S5).

When applying ARF, only the parameter c in the HIV transmission hazard (HIV transmission c), the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ), the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ) and the weight for the assortativity related to the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_3$ ) take part in the classification process. The first split of the classification tree uses the parameter c in the HIV transmission hazard (HIV transmission c). The next splits use the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ) and the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ). Only one region with significantly more top 1% solutions could be detected, where the HIV transmission parameter c (HIV transmission c) is between 0.3447 and 0.3481.



Figure S5. Analysis of the parameter space for the STI-nBC model. Smoothed density plots for the initial uniform distribution (dashed line) and the distribution of the top 1% solutions (solid line) for the nine estimated parameters.

The GAM predicted a low relative SSE for positive values of the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ) and values between 0.2 and 0.5 for the HIV transmission parameter c (HIV transmission c)(see Figure S6). Lower values of the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ), the assortativity related to the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_3$ ) and the assortativity related to the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_5$ ) increase the probability for a low relative SSE. Higher values of the baseline dissolution parameters (dissolution  $\alpha_0$  increase the probability for a low relative SSE.

The three highest MIC values were obtained for

- 1. the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ) and the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ )(MIC = 0.58, negative correlation);
- 2. the weight for assortativity related to the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_3$ ) and the weight for assortativity related to the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_5$ )(MIC = 0.45, positive correlation);
- 3. the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ) and the HIV transmission parameter c (HIV transmission c)(MIC = 0.42, negative correlation).



Figure S6. Analysis of the parameter space for the STI-nBC model. Results of the GAM: predicted probabilities of low relative sum of squared errors (SSE) for the nine estimated parameters.

### Model with no STI co-factor and a behavioural change (nSTI-BC)

The distribution of the top 1% solutions showed the most pronounced peak for the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ), followed by the HIV transmission parameters b and c related to viral load (HIV transmission b and c)(see Figure S7).

When applying ARF, only the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ) and the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ) take part in the classification process. The first split of the tree uses the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ). The next splits use the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ). No regions with significantly more top 1% solutions could be detected.

The results of the GAM (Figure S8) show that positive values of the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ) are associated with a low relative SSE. Higher values of the HIV transmission parameters related to viral load (HIV transmission b and c) increase the probability for a low relative SSE.

The three highest MIC values were obtained for

- 1. the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ) and HIV transmission parameter c (negative correlation; MIC = 0.72);
- 2. HIV transmission parameters a and c (negative correlation; MIC = 0.62);
- 3. the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ) and the weight for the age of the partners (negative correlation; MIC = 0.61).



Figure S7. Analysis of the parameter space for the nSTI-BC model. Smoothed density plots for the initial uniform distribution (dashed line) and the distribution of the top 1% solutions (solid line) for the nine estimated parameters.



Figure S8. Analysis of the parameter space for the nSTI-BC model. Results of the GAM: predicted probabilities of low relative sum of squared errors (SSE) for the nine estimated parameters.

#### Model with an STI co-factor and a behavioural change (STI-BC)

The distribution of the top 1% solutions showed the most pronounced peaks for the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ) and the HIV transmission parameter c (HIV transmission c), followed by the baseline parameter for relationship formation (formation  $\alpha_0$ )(see Figure S9.



Figure S9. Analysis of the parameter space for the STI-BC model. Smoothed density plots for the initial uniform distribution (dashed line) and the distribution of the top 1% solutions (solid line) for the nine estimated parameters.

When applying ARF, only the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ), the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ) and HIV transmission parameter a take part in the classification process. The first split of the tree uses the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ). The next splits use the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ) and HIV transmission parameter a. Two regions with significantly more top 1% solutions could be detected. In the first region the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ) is between 0.22686 and 0.23041. In the second region the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ) is between -0.4999 and 0.2268 and the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ) is between -3.497 and -3.465.

The results of the GAM (Figure S10) show that positive values of the weight for the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_4$ ) are associated with a low relative SSE. Furthermore, higher values of the baseline formation parameter (formation  $\alpha_0$ ) and the HIV transmission parameters related to viral load (HIV transmission b and c) increase the probability for a low relative SSE. Lower values for the weight for assortativity related to the age of the partners (formation  $\alpha_5$ ) and the baseline dissolution parameter (dissolution  $\alpha_0$ ) increase the probability for a low relative SSE. For the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ), two regions with higher probability of low relative SSE were observed: a first region where  $\alpha_{12}$  has values between -10 and -8.75, and a second region where  $\alpha_{12}$  has values between -6.25 and -2.5.

The three highest MIC values were obtained for

1. the HIV transmission parameters b and c related to viral load (MIC = 0.65, negative correlation);



Figure S10. Analysis of the parameter space for the STI-BC model. Results of the GAM: predicted probabilities of low relative sum of squared errors (SSE) for the nine estimated parameters.

- 2. the weight for the number of partners (formation  $\alpha_{12}$ ) and the baseline dissolution parameters (dissolution  $\alpha_0$ ) (MIC = 0.58, negative correlation);
- 3. the baseline dissolution parameter (dissolution  $\alpha_0$ ) and the HIV transmission parameter c (MIC = 0.57, positive correlation).

### Generation of Figure 2

For each of the four scenarios (nSTI-nBC, STI-nBC, nSTI-BC, STI-BC) 100 simulations with the fitted parameters were run. For each simulation, and for each person with date of seroconvertion between 1980-2015, we determined the first HIV RNA at 9-27 months after seroconvertion (red dots in Figure S11, each dot represents a person). A curve of the mean log10 SPVL (black line in Figure S11 over time was generated by fitting a cubic spline through the red dots, in analogy to Figure 1A in Gras et al [8]. This was repeated for all 100 simulations. Figure 2 in the main text represents the median and interquartile range of the 100 splines.



Figure S11. First HIV RNA at 9-27 months after seroconversion for each person with date of seroconversion between 1980 and 2015 (red dots) for a single simulation. Black line: cubic spline fitted through the red dots, representing the mean log10 SPVL over time.

### References

- 1. D. Amaratunga and J. Cabrera. Mining data to find subsets of high activity. *Journal of statistical planning and inference*, 122(1-2):23–41, 2004.
- R. A. Arnaout, A. L. Lloyd, T. R. O'Brien, J. J. Goedert, J. M. Leonard, and M. A. Nowak. A simple relationship between viral load and survival time in HIV-1 infection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 96(20):11549–11553, 1999.
- F. Blanquart, C. Wymant, M. Cornelissen, A. Gall, M. Bakker, D. Bezemer, M. Hall, M. Hillebregt, S. H. Ong, J. Albert, et al. Viral genetic variation accounts for a third of variability in HIV-1 set-point viral load in europe. *PLoS biology*, 15(6):e2001855, 2017.

- Y. Bryson, M. Dillon, D. I. Bernstein, J. Radolf, P. Zakowski, and E. Garratty. Risk of acquisition of genital herpes simplex virus type 2 in sex partners of persons with genital herpes: a prospective couple study. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 167(4):942–946, 1993.
- A. Y. Castro Sanchez, M. Aerts, Z. Shkedy, P. Vickerman, F. Faggiano, G. Salamina, and N. Hens. A mathematical model for HIV and hepatitis C co-infection and its assessment from a statistical perspective. *Epidemics*, 5(1):56–66, 2013.
- D. T. Fleming, G. M. McQuillan, R. E. Johnson, A. J. Nahmias, S. O. Aral, F. K. Lee, and M. E. St. Louis. Herpes simplex virus type 2 in the United States, 1976 to 1994. New England Journal of Medicine, 337(16):1105–1111, 1997.
- C. Fraser, T. D. Hollingsworth, R. Chapman, F. de Wolf, and W. P. Hanage. Variation in HIV-1 set-point viral load: epidemiological analysis and an evolutionary hypothesis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(44):17441–17446, 2007.
- L. Gras, S. Jurriaans, M. Bakker, A. van Sighem, D. Bezemer, C. Fraser, J. Lange, J. M. Prins,
  B. Berkhout, F. de Wolf, et al. Viral load levels measured at set-point have risen over the last decade of the HIV epidemic in the Netherlands. *PLoS One*, 4(10):e7365, 2009.
- C. Hill, E. McKinney, C. Lowndes, H. Munro, G. Murphy, J. Parry, O. Gill, et al. Epidemiology of herpes simplex virus types 2 and 1 amongst men who have sex with men attending sexual health clinics in England and Wales: implications for HIV prevention and management. *Eurosurveillance*, 14(47):19418, 2009.
- J. Liesenborgs, D. M. Hendrickx, E. Kuylen, D. Niyukuri, N. Hens, and W. Delva. SimpactCyan 1.0: An open-source simulator for individual-based models in HIV epidemiology with R and Python interfaces. *bioRxiv*, page 440834, 2018.
- J. Liesenborgs, D. M. Hendrickx, E. Kuylen, D. Niyukuri, N. Hens, and W. Delva. SimpactCyan 1.0: An open-source simulator for individual-based models in HIV epidemiology with R and Python interfaces. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1):1–13, 2019.
- F. J. Palella Jr, K. M. Delaney, A. C. Moorman, M. O. Loveless, J. Fuhrer, G. A. Satten, D. J. Aschman, S. D. Holmberg, and H. O. S. Investigators. Declining morbidity and mortality among patients with advanced human immunodeficiency virus infection. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 338(13):853–860, 1998.
- A. N. Phillips, V. Cambiano, F. Nakagawa, A. E. Brown, F. Lampe, A. Rodger, A. Miners, J. Elford, G. Hart, A. M. Johnson, et al. Increased HIV incidence in men who have sex with men despite high levels of ART-induced viral suppression: analysis of an extensively documented epidemic. *PloS one*, 8(2):e55312, 2013.
- D. N. Reshef, Y. A. Reshef, H. K. Finucane, S. R. Grossman, G. McVean, P. J. Turnbaugh, E. S. Lander, M. Mitzenmacher, and P. C. Sabeti. Detecting novel associations in large data sets. *science*, 334(6062):1518–1524, 2011.
- 15. I. Slurink, F. van Aar, E. Op de Coul, J. Heijne, D. van Wees, B. Hoenderboom, M. Visser, C. den Daas, P. Woestenberg, H. Gotz, et al. Sexually transmitted infections in the netherlands in 2018. 2019.
- 16. R. V Barnabas and C. Celum. Infectious co-factors in HIV-1 transmission herpes simplex virus type-2 and HIV-1: new insights and interventions. *Current HIV research*, 10(3):228–237, 2012.
- 17. S. N. Wood. Generalized additive models: an introduction with R. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2017.
- World Health Organization. AIDS epidemic update: December 2007. WHO Regional Office Europe, 2008.