1	Triaging clients at risk of disengagement from HIV care: Application of a predictive model to
2	clinical trial data in South Africa
3	
4	
5	Mhairi Maskew ¹ *, Shantelle Smith ² , Lucien De Voux ² , Kieran Sharpey-Schafer ² , Thomas Crompton ³ ,
6	Ashley Govender ³ , Pedro Pisa ^{3,4} , Sydney Rosen ^{1,5}
7	
8	INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATIONS:
9	¹ Health Economics and Epidemiology Research Office, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the
10	Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.
11	² Palindrome Data, Cape Town, South Africa.
12	³ Right to Care, Johannesburg, South Africa.
13	⁴ Department of Human Nutrition and Dietetics, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pretoria,
14	Pretoria, South Africa.
15	⁵ Department of Global Health, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston University, Boston,
16	MA, USA.
17	
18	*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:
19	Email: mmaskew@heroza.org (MM)
20	
21	SHORT TITLE: Triaging for risk of disengagement from HIV care
22	

23 ABSTRACT

24

Background: To reach South Africa's targets for HIV treatment and viral suppression, retention on
antiretroviral therapy (ART) must increase. Much effort and resources have been invested in tracing
those already disengaged and returning them to care programs with mixed success. Here we aim to
successfully identify ART clients at risk of loss from care prior to disengagement.

29

30 **Methods and Findings**: We applied a previously developed machine learning and predictive modelling 31 algorithm (PREDICT) to routinely collected ART client data from the SLATE I and SLATE II trials, which 32 evaluated same-day ART initiation in 2017-18. Using a primary outcome of an interruption in treatment 33 (IIT), defined as missing the next scheduled clinic visit by >28 days, we investigated the reproducibility of 34 PREDICT in SLATE datasets. We also tested two risk triaging approaches: 1) threshold approach 35 classifying individuals into low, moderate, or high risk of IIT; and 2) archetype approach identifying 36 subgroups with characteristics associated with risk of ITT. We report associations between risk category 37 groups and subsequent IIT at the next scheduled visit using crude risk differences and relative risks with 38 95% confidence intervals. SLATE datasets included 7,199 client visits for 1,193 clients over ≤14 months of follow-up. The algorithm achieved 63% accuracy, 89% negative predictive value, and an area under 39 40 the curve of 0.61 for attendance at next scheduled visit, similar to previous results using only medical 41 record data. The threshold approach consistently and accurately assigned levels of IIT risk for multiple stages of the care cascade. The archetype approach identified several subgroups at increased risk of IIT, 42 43 including those late to previous appointments, those returning after a period of disengagement, those 44 living alone or without a treatment supporter. Behavioural elements of the archetypes tended to drive 45 risk of treatment interruption more consistently than demographics; e.g. adolescent boys/young men 46 who attended visits on time experienced lowest rates of treatment interruption (10%, PREDICT datasets

47	and 7% SLATE datasets), while adolescent boys/young men returning after previously disengaging from
48	care had highest rates of subsequent treatment interruption (31%, PREDICT datasets and 40% SLATE
49	datasets).
50	
51	Conclusion: Routinely collected medical record data can be combined with basic demographic and
52	socioeconomic data to assess individual risk of future treatment disengagement using machine learning
53	and predictive modelling. This approach offers an opportunity to intervene prior to and potentially
54	prevent disengagement from HIV care, rather than responding only after it has occurred.
55	
56	Word count = 389 words
57	Key words: HIV service delivery, retention, risk triaging, machine learning, predictive modelling
58	

59 INTRODUCTION

60

80

61	With the successful expansion of universal access to HIV treatment around the world, retaining persons
62	living with HIV in lifelong antiretroviral therapy (ART) has emerged as one of the most important
63	challenges to HIV epidemic control [1]. For those who disengage from care (i.e. are not retained), the
64	most common intervention continues to be after-the-fact tracking and tracing efforts, in which
65	healthcare workers attempt to contact disengaged ART clients and encourage and/or assist them to
66	return to care. These efforts have had mixed results, in terms of achieving re-engagement in care [2–8].
67	
68	A major drawback to all tracking and tracing programs is that they can only intervene after a person
69	disengages from care. Little is done to distinguish those at higher risk of dropping out of care in advance,
70	before disengagement occurs. Instead, the same advance support is offered to all, regardless of risk
71	level. A strategy for identifying individuals at high risk of disengagement before they interrupt care
72	would allow interventions to be targeted to those in need up front, before any damage is done, while
73	conserving the resources that might otherwise be expended on low risk clients who require little or no
74	intervention to remain in care [9]. To put such a strategy into practice, both accurate pre-interruption
75	risk triaging and a practical, low-cost tool that frontline healthcare workers can use to identify ART
76	clients for differing levels of retention support and interventions are needed.
77	
78	A number of previous efforts have been made to predict risks of poor outcomes among people living
79	with HIV [10–16]. While several models include basic demographic characteristics such as age and sex

81 demographic subgroups at higher risk of disengagement than their age/sex peers remain unclear. Other

and clinical history such as baseline CD4 count to predict risk, the mechanisms driving risk within

82 characteristics that predict risk may be important to identify because within virtually any "risky" age/sex

83	stratum, such as young men [17,18], a majority of individuals remain low risk and achieve good
84	outcomes without intervention. In at 2018 population survey in KwaZulu Natal South Africa, for
85	example, young men aged 15-29 were the highest risk age/sex group identified, but more than half of
86	them (51.5%) were virally suppressed[19].
87	
88	We previously applied machine learning and predictive algorithms [20] to routinely collected
89	longitudinal HIV phenotypic and clinical outcome data from the South African HIV treatment
90	programme, one of the largest globally [21]. The PREDICT model aimed to identify those at risk of a
91	near-term interruption in treatment (IIT), defined as missing their next scheduled clinic visit by more
92	than 28 days. To move beyond the age/sex and visit history characteristics that are currently routinely
93	collected in electronic medical records, we reproduced this model in a smaller South African HIV clinical
94	trial dataset from the SLATE trials [15,22] containing socioeconomic indicators. We then utilized the
95	output for two risk score triaging approaches to identify those at risk for disengagement from care: 1) a
96	threshold approach to segment populations into risk groups; and 2) a series of archetypes characterizing
97	social and behavioral client profiles. Here, we describe the development of these approaches and
98	estimate associations with risk of disengagement from care, providing the basis for future development
99	of a practical, point-of-care risk triaging tool.
100	
101	METHODS
102	
103	Population and data sources
104	The two approaches to risk triaging were developed using output derived from two machine learning

105 models. The first, PREDICT (Prioritizing Retention Efforts using Data Intelligence and Cohort Targeting)

106 [23], was initially trained and tested on routinely collected, anonymized, longitudinal medical record

107	data from clients accessing HIV care and treatment at public sector treatment sites in Mpumalanga and
108	the Free State between January 2016 and December 2018. These records contain information on clients'
109	clinical and antiretroviral treatment histories, including scheduled and attended clinical visits and
110	laboratory test results, and basic demographic characteristics (age and sex). On average, PREDICT
111	correctly identified two out of three clients who missed their next scheduled clinic visit. The model was
112	recently validated in a different population and geographic setting in South Africa and demonstrated
113	almost identical performance metrics [24].
114	
115	For the second model, the SLATE model, we used client survey and medical record data collected for the
116	SLATE I and SLATE II trials, which were randomized evaluations of a clinical algorithm to determine
117	eligibility for same-day initiation of ART at three primary healthcare facilities in Gauteng Province
118	[15,22,25]. SLATE enrolled non-pregnant adults who presented at the study clinics for any kind of HIV
119	care, including diagnosis, and were not yet on ART. Participants completed a baseline survey that
120	included demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, HIV testing and treatment history, and social
121	indicators including disclosure status. Participants were then passively followed up for 14 months after
122	study enrolment through clinic medical records observing scheduled and attended clinic visits at the
123	study sites.
124	

125 Study outcomes

The primary outcome of interest was retention in HIV care. We considered a client to be retained in care if a clinic visit was observed before or within 28 days of the next scheduled appointment date in that client's medical record[26]. Conversely, we defined a client to have experienced an interruption in treatment (IIT) when a client did not attend a clinic visit within 28 days of their scheduled appointment. We restricted the analysis to visits scheduled a minimum of three months prior to the database censor

131	date to allow for one month to meet the outcome definition and a further two months to allow for
132	capturing visit data into the EMR. All raw data available in the source datasets were considered as
133	potential predictors of IIT. These included data characterizing client demographics, HIV testing and ART
134	treatment history, socio-economic indicators (employment, income), disclosure, drug regimen data, visit
135	history and patterns, and ART monitoring laboratory test results.
136	
137	Model building and performance
138	Both the PREDICT and SLATE models used the AdaBoost (adaptive boosting binary classification)
139	algorithm from scikit-learn [27]. The model building and validation process is detailed in Supplementary
140	File 1 and also described elsewhere [20,24]. In short, each of the source datasets is split into training and
141	test sets. Training sets are datasets with known exposure and outcome variables used in machine
142	learning approaches to allow the algorithm to "learn" the predictive importance of exposure variables in
143	terms of correctly classifying each specified outcome. For test sets, the exposure variables are separated
144	from the outcome variables (unseen) and given to the final classifier algorithm. The model is tested on
145	this unseen data set by generating predicted outcomes for each observed visit using the predictor
146	variables from the unseen test set. In this way, the model produces an overall predicted risk score for
147	each visit that indicates the likelihood that the next scheduled visit will not be attended on time and will
148	be classified as an interruption in treatment. These predicted outcomes are then compared to the
149	known outcomes in the test set and the model is scored according to standard test performance metrics
150	(sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive value and area under the curve). To determine
151	the value of the additional variables added to the medical record data using the SLATE baseline survey
152	questionnaires, we estimated model performance metrics when restricting the SLATE model to the set
153	of variables that were available to the PREDICT model (i.e. data from routinely collected medical records
154	only).

155

156 Risk score triaging

- 157 We next adopted two approaches to create a risk score triaging system to identify groups at risk of IIT.
- 158 Output from both the SLATE and PREDICT models were used in each of the two risk-score triaging
- 159 systems and are presented stratified by source model for comparison throughout, with the exception of
- situations where the model did not contain variables required to classify risk groups or profiles. The two
- approaches are described below and compared in Panel 1.
- 162

163 Panel 1: Comparison of threshold and archetype approaches to risk triaging

PROPERTY	THRESHOLD APPROACH	ARCHETYPE APPROACH
General	Classifies clients into groups at low (green),	Identifies sub-clusters of client populations with
approach	moderate (yellow) or high (red) risk of	characteristics associated with risk of outcome
	outcome based on predictive model scores	
Automation	Can be automated into predictive model	Currently involves manual application of clustering
	output; integrated into EMR	characteristics identified by machine learning
		model. Automation through EMR integration may
		be possible in future versions
Applicability	Applicable to any dataset and population	Specific to population context and characteristics
Intuitiveness or	Requires score to be calculated beforehand	Intuitive, easy to apply with clients at point of care
understandability	and may not always be consistent with	
	clinician assessment of risk	
Identification of	Mechanism behind risk not readily apparent	Some underlying driver of risk can be ascertained
drivers of risk		through group characteristics
Intervention	Less directly useful for intervention mapping	May offer opportunities for direct intervention
mapping		mapping

164

165 The *threshold approach* grouped the final predicted risk scores assigned to each visit by the PREDICT or

166 SLATE model into three pre-set categories: visits with the lowest 50% of scores were assigned a "green"

167 or low risk category; visits with the middle 40% of scores were assigned a "yellow" or moderate risk

168	category; and visits scoring in the highest 10% of risk scores were assigned a "red" or high-risk category.
169	We then considered the visit observed immediately after a "scored" visit (hereafter called "next visit")
170	and classified this as IIT or not, based on whether the next visit occurred within 28 days of its scheduled
171	date. The proportion of next visits classified as IIT was then estimated for each risk triage category.
172	
173	The archetype approach used characteristics identified by each model as important predictors of missed
174	visits. The PREDICT model considered demographic and visit history characteristics available in the
175	routine EMR datasets while the SLATE model used social, economic, and HIV treatment experience
176	features collected as part of the clinical trial enrolment survey, in addition to demographic and visit
177	history characteristics from the EMR. ART clients were then grouped together into subgroups with a
178	shared set of characteristics, creating distinct sub-population profiles or archetypes.
179	
180	Using feature importance tables from the predictive modeling, features were next paired into different
181	configurations. (For example, combining responses to the questions 'Has the client disclosed their
182	status?' and 'Does the client have enough information to start ART?' yields four configurations: not
183	disclosed and not enough information; have disclosed and not enough information; not disclosed and
184	have enough information; have disclosed and have enough information.) These archetypes were then
185	used to isolate the subgroups of the population where those two or three features were key in
186	determining their risk of an interruption in treatment. Any logically invalid or very small subgroups were
187	removed. Finally, the rate of IIT was calculated within each sub-group (or configuration) and all
188	subgroups' IIT rates were then compared to the whole population's baseline IIT rate. The groupings that
189	had the largest positive or negative differences from baseline were identified as potential archetypes of
190	interest.

191

192 Statistical analysis

193	For the threshold approach, we first used simple frequencies and proportions to describe the overall
194	number and distribution of visits triaged into each risk category (green, yellow and red groups). We
195	stratified these descriptive statistics by age, gender, and time on ART. Next, we estimated the crude
196	relative risk (RR) and corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI) for IIT at next visit stratified by current
197	visit risk triage category, with the green "low risk" group as reference. The analytic approach to the
198	client archetypes was similar. We first described the overall frequency and distribution of visits by
199	clients characterized into each archetype, stratified into age and gender clusters and by time on ART.
200	We then estimated the crude relative risk and corresponding 95% confidence interval of missing a
201	scheduled visit for comparing each archetype to the archetype with the lowest perceived risk of IIT.
202	
203	Ethics statement
204	All analyses of de-identified data from human subjects were approved by and carried out in accordance
205	with relevant guidelines and regulations as set out by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the
206	University of the Witwatersrand (Medical). This study involved secondary analysis of two data sources:
207	1) deidentified data collected as part of routine care, for which the requirement for individual patient
208	consent was waived by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of the Witwatersrand
209	for protocols M140201 and M210472 during the study approval; and 2) de-identified clinical trial
210	collected as part of the SLATE I and SLATE II trials (Clinicaltrials.gov registration NCT02891135). Both
211	studies were approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of the Witwatersrand
212	(Medical) and the institutional review board of Boston University Medical Campus. All SLATE study
213	participants provided written informed consent.
214	

215 RESULTS

216

217 Characteristics of study participants and model performance metrics

218 The two source data sets are described in Table 1. The original PREDICT model data set utilized routinely 219 collected, anonymized, longitudinal data from >460,000 clients accessing HIV care and treatment during 220 >4.6M visits at public sector treatment sites in Mpumalanga and the Free State between January 2016 221 and December 2018. The SLATE trials provided a total of 1,193 patient records containing 7,199 clinic 222 visits in Gauteng. Participant characteristics are summarized in Table 1. We note that the SLATE study 223 population differed substantially from the original PREDICT model dataset by the distribution of stage of 224 HIV care journey. The original PREDICT data set included visits across all stages of care with a median 225 duration on ART of approximately 5 years. SLATE study participants, in contrast, were all enrolled at ART 226 initiation and followed up for a maximum duration of 14 months. Pregnant women were also excluded 227 from the SLATE studies but included in the PREDICT datasets.

228

229 The SLATE data set was divided into a training set of 5,759 visits by 872 clients and a test set of 1,440 230 visits by 668 clients. In total, 13.5% of visits in the training set and 14.0% visits in the test set were 231 observed to occur >28 days after the scheduled visit date. The algorithm investigated 239 exposure 232 variables in total, including the additional demographic and socioeconomic variables from the SLATE 233 baseline questionnaires. The full set of exposure variables was then reduced to a parsimonious model 234 containing the top 11 exposure features with the most predictive power: time on ART, appointment 235 month, time since last viral load (VL) test, VL test result, proportion of visits attended >3 days late, CD4 236 count at screening, age, travel time to clinic, total number of TB symptoms, year first tested positive, and number of others living with client in their house. 237

239 Table 1: Characteristics of the study population

Characteristic	PREDICT model	SLATE model		
Data source	Routinely collected EMR data	Clinical trial data supplemented with		
		EMR data		
Setting	Ehlanzeni District (Mpumalanga)	City of Johannesburg and Ekurhuleni		
	and Thabo Mofutsanyana District	Districts (Gauteng)		
	(Free State)			
Facility profile (%)				
Urban	52%	67%		
Peri-urban	9%	33%		
Rural	37%	0%		
Missing	2%	0%		
Client sample size	463,418 clients	1,156 clients		
Visit sample size	4,663,816 visits	7,199 visits		
Current age	39 years (27-49)	SLATE: 35 years (29-41)		
(median, IQR)				
% Female	68%	64%		
Prevalent pregnancy	2%	0% (pregnant women were excluded)		
Time on ART at	62 months (30-93 months)	0 months (all newly initiating or re-		
entry to cohort		initiating clients)		
(median, IQR)				
Maximum follow up	36 months	14 months		
duration				
Variables with most	% Visits attended >3 days late	Time on ART		
predictive power in	# Times >28 days late	Appointment month		
the final model	# Visits at this facility	Time since last viral load test		
	# VL tests done	Viral load value (copies/mm ³)		
	Months since first visit	% Visits attended >3 days late		
	Months since last visit	CD4 count at screening		
	Current age	Current age		
	Day of month of next appointment	Travel time to clinic		
	Viral load value (copies/mm ³)	Total # TB symptoms		
	Day of week of next appointment	Year first tested positive		
	Visits on regimen	# Other people living with the client		
	Sex (M/F)			
	# Missed months			

- The SLATE model achieved an accuracy of 63%, specificity of 64%, and negative predictive value of 89%
- 242 (Table 2), comparable to the original (and much larger) PREDICT dataset which achieved an accuracy of
- 243 66%, specificity of 67%, and negative predictive value of 94%.
- 244

Table 2: Comparison of SLATE model performance metrics to original PREDICT model

Variable	PREDICT model	SLATE model with all	SLATE model limited to	
		variables	variables available in PREDICT	
Total sample size	3,264,671 client visits	7,199 client visits	7,199 client visits	
Test set sample size	1,399,145 client visits	1,440 client visits	1,440 client visits	
Accuracy	66% (n = 1,399,145)	63% (n = 1,440)	61% (n = 1,440)	
Sensitivity	61% (n = 146,881)	52% (n = 200)	55% (n = 200)	
Specificity	67% (n = 1,252,264)	64% (n = 1,240)	61% (n = 1,240)	
Positive predictive value	18% (n = 503,730 total	19% (n = 544 total	19% (n = 589 total positive	
	positive predictions)	positive predictions)	predictions)	
Negative predictive value	94% (n = 895,415 total	89% (n = 896 total	89% (n = 851 total negative	
	negative predictions)	negative predictions)	predictions)	
AUC	0.688	0.614	0.603	

AUC, area under the curve

247

248 When restricting the SLATE model to the set of variables that were available to the PREDICT model (i.e.

249 data from routinely collected medical records only), the performance of SLATE model demonstrated

little change from results obtained using all variables available in the SLATE datasets: 61% accuracy, 61%

- 251 specificity, and 89% negative predictive value. Results using an alternate model building approach
- 252 (gradient boosting) to the SLATE data are provided in Supplementary Table 1 for comparison. Hereafter,

253 all results from the SLATE datasets refer to the full model using all variables available in the SLATE

254 datasets unless otherwise stated.

255

256 Results for threshold approach to risk triaging

As explained above, for the threshold approach, results from the predictive models were used to assign a final predictive risk score to every observed visit in the PREDICT and SLATE datasets. These scores were then grouped into centile brackets: the visits with the lowest 50% of scores were assigned a "green" or low risk category; the middle 40% were assigned a "yellow" or moderate risk category; and visits with the highest 10% of scores were assigned a "red" or high-risk category. We then considered the visit

observed immediately after a "scored" visit (hereafter called "next visit") and classified these as IIT or

263 not based on whether the next visit occurred within 28 days of its scheduled date.

264

In total, 11% of all visits observed in the PREDICT datasets were classified as IIT (n=146,881 visits). The 265 266 IIT rate observed for visits in the SLATE datasets was slightly higher, at 14% (n=200 visits; Table 3). Rates 267 of IIT at next visit increased in a linear fashion with the increasing predicted risk threshold categories for 268 current visit. Compared to green "low risk" visits in the PREDICT datasets, visits classified in a yellow 269 "moderate risk" group were twice as likely to be followed by a treatment interruption (13% IIT at next 270 visit in yellow group versus 6% IIT at next visit for green group; RR=2.17; 95% CI 2.14-2.19), while the red 271 "high risk" triage visits were more than 4 times as likely to be followed by a treatment interruption at 272 next visit compared to visits classified as green (26% IIT at next visit in red group versus 6% IIT at next 273 visit in green group; RR = 4.33; 95% CI 4.28-4.39). Results were similar using the SLATE datasets.

Table 3: Proportion visits with IIT at next scheduled visit stratified by current visit risk triaging classification and time on ART (threshold

approach)

Risk triaging	ALL VISITS		FIRST VISIT AFTER INITIATION (n=41,751)		0-6 MONTHS ON ART (n=194,469)		7-12 MONTHS ON ART (n=129,764)		
at current visit	IIT at next visit	Relative risk (95% Cl)	IIT at next visit	Relative risk (95% Cl)	IIT at next visit	Relative risk (95% CI)	IIT at next visit	Relative risk (95% Cl)	
PREDICT model	PREDICT model datasets								
ALL	11%		19%		11%		10%		
(n=1,399,145)	(n=146,881)		(7,979/41,751)		(19,583/194,469)		(12,970/129,764)		
GREEN (n=699,573)	6% (n=41,974)	Ref	13% (2,714/20,878)	Ref	6% (5,835/97,245)	Ref	5% (3,244/64,889)	Ref	
YELLOW	13%	RR=2.17	21%	RR=1.62	12%	RR=2.00	11%	RR=2.20	
(n= 559,658)	(n=72,756)	(2.14-2.19)	(3,068/14,609)	(1.54-1.69)	(8,165/68,044)	(1.94-2.07)	(4,994/45,404)	(2.11-2.30)	
RED	26%	RR=4.33	33%	RR=2.54	21%	RR=3.50	23%	RR=4.60	
(n = 139,915)	(n=36,378)	(4.28-4.39)	(2,067/6,264)	(2.42-2.67)	(6,128/29,180)	(3.38-3.62)	(4,478/19,471)	(4.41-4.80)	
SLATE model da	tasets						·		
ALL	14%		19%		15%		N/A		
(n=1,440)	(n=200)		(34/155)		(114/791)				
GREEN	10%	Ref	18%	Ref	10%	Ref			
(n=720)	(n=75)	Net 1	(14/78)	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	(41/396)	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i			
YELLOW	14%	RR=1.41	24%	RR=1.35	18%	RR=1.79			
(n= 576)	(n=81)	(1.04-1.89)	(15/62)	(0.71-2.58)	(56/316)	(1.23-2.60)			
RED	31%	RR=3.13	33%	RR=1.86	22%	RR=2.13			
(n = 144)	(n=44)	(2.25-4.33)	(5/15)	(0.79-4.38)	(17/79)	(1.27-3.56)			

Ref, Reference population

The rate of IIT at next scheduled visit also differed by time on ART for both the PREDICT and SLATE datasets (Figure 1 and Table 3). Risk of IIT at the next scheduled visit after ART initiation was nearly double that of the periods 0-6 months or 7-12 months on ART (19% versus 10%, respectively). Visits that occurred during month 7-12 after ART initiation and were classified as green had the lowest rates of IIT at next scheduled visit (5%) while first visits after initiation that were classified as red were followed by the highest rates of treatment interruption at next scheduled visit (33%). Within the first 6 months on treatment, visits classified as green (RR 3.50; 95% CI 3.38-3.62); during months 7-12 red visits were more than four times as likely to be followed by an IIT at next scheduled visit as were green visits in the same period (5% vs. 23%; RR=4.60; 95% CI 4.41-4.80). Models generally performed somewhat better in terms of accuracy, sensitivity, specificity and AUC for the full period 0-6 months on ART compared to predictions made only for the first visit (Supplementary Table 2).



Figure 1: Proportion of visits classified as IIT stratified by risk threshold approach and time on ART (PREDICT model data)

Results for the archetype approach to triaging

Using characteristics identified by the SLATE model as important predictors of missed visits, we defined archetype profiles across three categories: 1) demographic archetypes based on age and gender; 2) behavioral archetypes based on visit attendance; and 3) social-behavioral archetypes based on client characteristics. In Panel 2, we define archetypes within each category, giving each archetype a descriptive label. As the PREDICT datasets did not contain several of the variables needed to define the socio-behavioural archetypes, these are reported for the SLATE datasets only. The SLATE datasets did not observe movement across facilities and so the behavioural archetype "Shopper" is reported for PREDICT only. All other archetypes are reported for both datasets.

Category and archetype	Description	Dataset	Data collection period
		source	
Demographic archetypes			
Adult female	Female client aged >25 years at date of visit	SLATE and	At ART initiation and
		PREDICT	each follow up visit
Adult male	Male client aged >25 years at date of visit	SLATE and	At ART initiation and
		PREDICT	each follow up visit
Adolescent girls and young	Female client aged between 15 and 25 years	SLATE and	At ART initiation and
women	at date of visit	PREDICT	each follow up visit
Adolescent boys and young	Male client aged between 15 and 25 years at	SLATE and	At ART initiation and
men	date of visit	PREDICT	each follow up visit
Behavioral archetypes			
Prompt and loyal	Visit attended on time and only attended care	SLATE and	At each follow up visit
	at this facility	PREDICT	
Late twice	The previous two visits were attended after	SLATE and	At each follow up visit
	the scheduled appointment date	PREDICT	
Shopper, no number	Has attended at other facilities and no phone	PREDICT	At each follow up visit
	number on file		

Panel 2: Archetype approach definitions

Category and archetype	Description	Dataset	Data collection period
		source	
Returning after	At least one prior visit was attended >28 days	SLATE and	At re-initiation visit
disengagement	late	PREDICT	
Socio-behavioral archetypes			
Super green	Punctual visit attendance, doesn't live alone	SLATE	At ART initiation and
			each follow up visit
Employed youth at payday	Age 18-29, identify as employed AND next visit	SLATE	At ART initiation and
	scheduled <7 days from payday		each follow up visit
Prior test and prompt	Has a history of HIV testing (before testing	SLATE	At ART initiation and
	positive) AND regularly prompt for visits		each follow up visit
Lone ranger	Lives alone or with 1 other person AND lives	SLATE	At ART initiation
	more than 20 mins away		
Unexpected and	Was not planning to test for HIV today AND	SLATE	At ART initiation
unsupported	lives alone/with 1 other person		
Disillusioned disclosers	Identifies as having HIV info, has disclosed,	SLATE	At ART initiation
	lives alone or with 1 other person		
Live close, always late	Lives <20 mins from clinic but is also regularly	SLATE	At ART initiation and
	late for appointments		each follow up visit
Prepared and late	Prepared to start ART today, has tested before	SLATE	At ART initiation and
	but is late to appointments		each follow up visit

Adult females comprised the largest demographic group in both the SLATE and PREDICT datasets (57%) and between 10% and 13% of visits made by adult females were classified as IIT (Table 4). Adult males made up nearly a third of clients in both datasets, with 12-14% of visits made by adult males classified as IIT. Few adolescent or young men and women (8%) were observed in the SLATE datasets, as the trials enrolled participants >18 years of age only. Despite being one of the smallest population groups, adolescent girls and young women (AGYW) demonstrated the highest rates of IIT across the demographic archetypes (15% in SLATE and 16% in PREDICT) and were more likely to have a treatment interruption compared to adult women in both the PREDICT (RR=1.52; 95% CI 1.49-1.55) and SLATE datasets (1.15; 95% CI 0.91-1.46).

Table 4:	Proportion	of visits	classified	as IIT	stratified by	archetype	triaging	approach
----------	------------	-----------	------------	--------	---------------	-----------	----------	----------

ARCHETYPES	SLATE DATA (N=7,199 VISITS)			PREDICT DATA (N=925,639 VISITS)**				
	Visits	IIT (n <i>,</i> %)	RR (95% CI)*	Visits	IIT (n, %)	RR (95% CI)*		
Demographic archetypes (variables available in both SLATE and PREDICT models)								
Adult females	4,141 (57%)	555 (13%)	Ref	572,154 (57%)	58,271 (10%)	Ref		
AGYW***	434 (6%)	67 (15%)	1.15 (0.91-1.46)	70,045 (7%)	10,864 (16%)	1.52 (1.49-1.55)		
ABYM***	146 (2%)	19 (13%)	0.97 (0.63-1.49)	10,444 (10%)	1,304 (13%)	1.23 (1.17-1.29)		
Adult males	2,478 (34%)	893 (14%)	1.02 (0.9 -1.14)	272,996 (27%)	31,279 (12%)	1.20 (1.1921)		
Behavioral archetypes (varia	bles available	in both SLAT	TE and PREDICT m	odels)				
Prompt and loyal	1,552 (22%)	227 (15%)	Ref	652,595 (65%)	59,099 (9%)	Ref		
Late twice	854 (12%)	155 (18%)	1.24 (1.03-1.50)	97,986 (10%)	15,932 (16%)	1.80 (1.76-1.83)		
Shopper no-number		N/A		68,087 (7%)	11,360 (17%)	1.91 (1.87 -1.94)		
Returning after disengagement	861 (12%)	169 (20%)	1.34 (1.12-1.61)	37,404 (4%)	9,280 (25%)	2.74 (2.69 -2.80)		
Socio-behavioral archetypes	(variables ava	ilable in SLA	TE model only)					
Super green	2,313 (32%)	239 (10%)	Ref					
Employed youth at payday	301 (4%)	35 (12%)	1.13 (0.81-1.57)					
Prior test and prompt	1,789 (25%)	228 (13%)	1.23 (1.04-1.46)					
Lone ranger	1,478 (21%)	221 (15%)	1.45 (1.22-1.72)					
Unexpected and unsupported	817 (11%)	120 (15%)	1.42 (1.16-1.74)					
Disillusioned disclosers	1,194 (17%)	184 (15%)	1.49 (1.25-1.78)					
Live close but always late	986 (14%)	167 (17%)	1.64 (1.36-1.97)					
Prepared and late	501 (7%)	93 (19%)	1.80 (1.44-2.24)					

* RR = Relative risk, reported with 95% confidence interval

** Data restricted to visits within the first 6 months on ART

*** AGYW = adolescent girls and young women, ABYM = adolescent boys and young men

Several of the identified behavioral archetypes were also at increased risk of IIT at next visit compared to their reference groups. Clients who had been late for at least two prior visits were more likely to have an IIT at next visit compared to all adult women (Table 4) in both datasets. Those who were returning after previously disengaging from care were at the highest risk of IIT compared to adult females (RR = 2.44; 95% Cl 2.40-2.48 in PREDICT and RR=1.46; 95% Cl 1.25-1.71 in SLATE). When combining social and behavioural characteristics (SLATE data only), the client archetypes least likely to have an IIT at next visit were those who attended prior visits on time, were young and employed, and had a history of previous

HIV testing. Those who lived alone, did not have a treatment supporter, or were not expecting to start HIV treatment at initiation were at increased risk of having a treatment interruption. Compared to those who attend visits on time and don't live alone, youth who reported being employed and had a visit scheduled within 7 days of payday were at a somewhat increased risk of a subsequent treatment interruption (12% IIT; RR = 1.13; 95% CI 0.81-1.57)

We also stratified the behavioural and socio-behavioural archetypes by age and gender and noted varying risk for different substrata of the population (Table 5). In particular, we noted that the behavioural elements (visit attendance) of the archetypes tended to drive the risk of treatment interruption more consistently than the basic demographic elements. For example, adolescent boys and young men who attended visits on time experienced one of the lowest rates of treatment interruption (10%, PREDICT datasets and 7% SLATE datasets), while adolescent boys and young men who had returned after previously disengaging in care were the group with highest rates of subsequent treatment interruption (31%, PREDICT datasets and 40% SLATE datasets). Similarly, adolescent girls and young women returning after a period of disengagement were 3.5 times more likely to have a treatment interruption when compared to adult females (RR=3.50; 95% CI 3.32-3.68; PREDICT datasets). In fact, even a visit history of attending late twice among adolescent girls and young women was associated with a subsequent treatment interruption (21% IIT, RR=2.50 (95% CI 2.39-2.61) in PREDICT data and 26% IIT, RR =1.93 (95% CI 1.23-3.05) in SLATE datasets) compared to all adult females. Other sociobehavioural archetypes associated with increases in risk for subsequent treatment interruption regardless of demographic profile included archetypes characterized by limited or no social support at home and living alone and/or at a far distance from the clinic.

Table 5: Proportion of visits classified as IIT stratified by archetype triaging approach and

demographics (PREDICT and SLATE data)

MODEL	Visits (n, %)	IIT%	RR	95% CI
PREDICT DATA ARCHETYPES (N=925,639 VISITS)*				
All adult females (reference group)	572,154 (57%)	10%	Reference	
Adult females prompt and loyal	384 316 (39%)	8%	0.83	0.82-0.84
Adult males prompt and loyal	173 750 (17%)	9%	0.91	0.89-0.92
ABYM prompt and loyal	6 511 (1%)	10%	0.96	0.89-1.03
AGYW prompt and loyal	43 938 (4%)	13%	1.29	1.26-1.32
Adult females late twice	51 244 (5%)	15%	1.47	1.44 - 1.51
Adult females shopper no-number	40 627 (4%)	16%	1.56	1.53 - 1.60
Adult males late twice	30 554 (3%)	17%	1.65	1.60 - 1.69
Adult males shopper no-number	18 945 (2%)	17%	1.70	1.65 - 1.76
ABYM shopper no-number	667 (0%)	18%	1.78	1.52 - 2.09
ABYM late twice	1 190 (0%)	18%	1.79	1.59 - 2.02
AGYW late twice	7 371 (1%)	21%	2.07	1.98 - 2.16
AGYW shopper no-number	4 194 (0%)	22%	2.11	1.99 - 2.24
Adult females returning after disengagement	19 784 (2%)	23%	2.29	2.23 - 2.35
Adult males returning after disengagement	9 874 (1%)	26%	2.56	2.47 - 2.65
AGYW returning after disengagement	3 639 (0%)	30%	2.90	2.75 - 3.05
ABYM returning after disengagement	426 (0%)	31%	3.07	2.66 - 3.53
SLATE DATA ARCHETYPES (N=7,199 VISITS)				
All adult females (reference group)	4,141 (57%)	1 3 %	Reference	
AGYW prior test and prompt	52 (1%)	6%	0.43	0.14 - 1.30
AGYW super green	49 (1%)	6%	0.46	0.15 - 1.37
ABYM prompt and loyal	30 (0,5%)	7%	0.50	0.13 - 1.90
Adult females super green	1 418 (20%)	10%	0.67	0.56 - 0.80
Adult males super green	698 (10%)	11%	0.79	0.63 - 0.99
AGYW lone ranger	82 (1%)	11%	0.82	0.44 - 1.52
ABYM super green	148 (2%)	12%	0.91	0.59 - 1.41
Adult males unexpected and unsupported	370 (5%)	12%	0.91	0.68 - 1.21
Adult males prior test and prompt	636 (9%)	12%	0.92	0.73 - 1.14
Adult females prior test and prompt	1 012 (14%)	13%	0.97	0.81 - 1.17

MODEL	Visits (n, %)	IIT%	RR	95% CI
AGYW unexpected and unsupported	60 (1%)	13%	1.00	0.52 - 1.91
Adult males disillusioned disclosers	453 (6%)	14%	1.05	0.83 - 1.34
Adult males lone ranger	533 (7%)	15%	1.09	0.88 - 1.36
Adult males prompt and loyal	529 (7%)	15%	1.11	0.90 - 1.39
Adult females prompt and loyal	875 (12%)	15%	1.11	0.92 - 1.33
Adult females live close but always late	521 (7%)	15%	1.15	0.93 - 1.44
ABYM prior test and prompt	89 (1%)	16%	1.17	0.72 - 1.91
Adult females lone ranger	856 (12%)	15%	1.19	0.99 - 1.42
Adult females disillusioned disclosers	720 (10%)	15%	1.19	0.98 - 1.43
AGYW prompt and loyal	118 (2%)	16%	1.20	0.79 - 1.82
Adult males live close but always late	378 (5%)	17%	1.28	1.01 - 1.62
Adult females late twice	489 (7%)	17%	1.30	1.04 - 1.61
Adult females unexpected and unsupported	378 (5%)	17%	1.32	1.04 - 1.67
Adult females prepared and late	338 (5%)	18%	1.36	1.07 - 1.74
Adult male late twice	292 (4%)	19%	1.38	1.07 - 1.78
Adult males returning after disengagement	291 (4%)	19%	1.44	1.12 - 1.84
Adult females returning after disengagement	509 (7%)	19%	1.49	1.22 - 1.82
Adult males prepared and late	131 (2%)	21%	1.54	1.09 - 2.17
AGYW returning after disengagement	41 (1%)	22%	1.64	0.92 - 2.93
ABYM unexpected and unsupported	9 (0%)	22%	1.66	0.49 - 5.64
AGYW live close but always late	59 (1%)	24%	1.77	1.11 - 2.82
AGYW late twice	54 (1%)	26%	1.93	1.23 - 3.05
ABYM late twice	19 (0%)	26%	1.96	0.92 - 4.18
ABYM live close but always late	28 (0%)	32%	2.40	1.39 - 4.13
ABYM returning after disengagement	20 (0%)	40%	2.99	1.73 - 5.14
ABYM lone ranger	7 (0%)	43%	3.20	1.36 - 7.55

*Data restricted to visits within the first 6 months on ART

RR = Relative risk; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval; AGYW = adolescent girls and young women; ABYM = adolescent boys and

young men

The development of the behavioural archetypes provided a more granular characterization of risk within each demographic stratum compared to a single risk estimate for any one demographic group. Figure 2 offers a visual depiction of how the point estimates for risk of treatment interruption vary when stratifying risk using demographic characteristics only compared to stratifying risk by combined demographic and behavioural characteristics. For both PREDICT and SLATE datasets, when risk of IIT is stratified by demographic characteristics only (gender and age), we find estimates of risk tend to cluster close together. In the SLATE datasets, for example, risk of IIT ranged from a relative risk of 0.97 (95% CI 0.63-1.49) for adolescent boys and young men to a relative risk of 1.15 (95% CI 0.91-1.46) among adolescent girls and young women; suggesting adolescent boys to be at similar risk for IIT compared to adult women. However, when the behavoural archetypes are considered within a singular demographic stratum (in this case, restricting to adolescent boys and young men), the point estimates for relative risk of treatment interruption at next scheduled visit spans a much wider range and subgroups with varying risk of IIT are revealed; characterized largely by prior visit attendance. The behavioural archetypes indicate that adolescent boys and young men who have attended clinic visits on time are at low risk of IIT at next visit compared to adult females, while those who have attended visits late at least twice in the past are twice as likely to experience treatment interruption (RR= 2.16; 95% CI 1.91-2.44; PREDICT datasets) and those who have previously disengaged from care are three times as likely to interrupt treatment at next scheduled visit (RR = 3.07; 95% CI 2.66 - 3.53; PREDICT datasets).



*Note: ABYM = adolescent boys and young men; AGYW = adolescent girls and young women

Figure 2: Relative risk of interruption in treatment (IIT) at next scheduled visit stratified by risk

archetype and demographic strata

DISCUSSION

As HIV service delivery models expand and evolve, ensuring sustained client retention after treatment initiation remains a key priority. Many interventions to address disengagement from care are either applied universally to all clients engaged in treatment programs or reactively after clients have disengaged from care [28,29]; both scenarios utilize resources that do little to improve program outcomes. In this paper we present a novel application of machine learning and predictive algorithms to develop approaches that identify clients who are at heightened risk of disengagement before they experience interruptions in care or disengage entirely. Both of our models, if used in the course of a routine clinic visit, would allow healthcare providers to target interventions substantially more accurately than is currently possible, potentially improving retention among those at risk for disengagement if suitable interventions to address underlying drivers of risk are available as part of routine care.

Both of the approaches we report were successful, though in different ways. We note first that the original PREDICT model reproduced well in the SLATE datasets. Despite the differences in population, geography, and sample size, the results were very similar in terms of model performance metrics between the PREDICT and SLATE models. Across varying approaches and classification algorithms, the models were able to consistently predict approximately two in three visits classified as treatment interruptions.

The threshold approach is also useful for categorizing client groups at functional risk levels and offers an opportunity to triage clients for different intensity interventions. For example, our results confirm that rates of IIT are high for some clients during the first 6 months but are not universally so for all clients.

The threshold approach to triaging was able to identify sub-groups of early ART clients most at risk for a treatment interruption (red group) and others at low risk (green group), an approach that can be readily interpreted and easily adapted into a simple scoring system for use at point-of-care. This could allow for triaging of clients at the facility level into high or low intensity models of service delivery before clients are eligible for existing differentiated service delivery models. Given that low risk visits comprised half of all visits and were associated with very low rates of IIT (6%), shifting clinician time and facility resources to higher risk clients could translate into important gains in efficiency without compromising quality of care for low risk groups.

The second approach, the archetype approach to risk triaging confirmed several important points. First, patterns of visit attendance are key in identifying risk of IIT in both directions, regardless of demographic sub-group. Of the three socio-behavioural risk groups with the lowest rates of IIT, two were characterized by on-time visit attendance ("super green" and "prior test and prompt"). In contrast, the three archetypes at highest risk of IIT ("returning after disengagement", "live close but always late" and "prepared and late") were all characterized by a history of late appointments or prior disengagement in care. This suggests that client behavior, as revealed by visit attendance, tends to be consistent and may present opportunities to intervene prior to disengagement among those who are at higher risk. It also allows providers to identify low risk groups who not only represent an important share of clients attending facility visits (32% of visits were among clients characterized as "super green") but could potentially be safely managed with lower intensity models of care immediately after ART initiation, allowing for reallocation of time and resources to groups identified as priority risk groups. The use of behavioural archetypes allows for a more granular and detailed characterization of risk within a particular demographic profile (Figure 2). When risk of IIT is estimated for each of the behavoural archetypes within a singular demographic stratum, key sub-groups at increased risk of IIT are revealed;

again, characterized largely by prior visit attendance. In this way, adolescent boys and young men simultaneously represent both the group at lowest risk of IIT at next visit (ABYM who have attended visits at the originating facility on time) as well as the group at nearly the highest risk of IIT (ABYM returning after previously disengaging from care). The behavioural archetype approach allows for identification of subgroups that have similar demographic characteristics but likely require quite different intervention strategies to support continuous engagement in care. As the information required to profile a client into a behavioural archetype is readily available at point-of-care, this approach may offer the potential to tailor interventions to specific groups in a more targeted way than has been available previously.

Where social and behavioural data are available, utilizing the archetype approach can also contribute to understanding not only particular client subgroups that are at risk of treatment interruption but also insight into the mechanisms underlying the increased risk. For example, when the socio-behavioural archetypes are stratified by demographic profiles (Table 5) we see a higher risk of IIT for AGYW who are classified as disillusioned disclosers and ABYM meeting the lone ranger archetype. Both of these archetypes are characterized by living alone, which suggests that young persons living with HIV may be vulnerable to a lack of social support as they navigate their HIV care journey. This knowledge could inform service delivery models providing differentiated care to this age group. In addition, we noted that while youth are generally at higher risk of treatment interruption, the subgroup of youth who reported being employed and had a visit scheduled within 7 days of payday were an archetype with one of the lowest risk of a subsequent treatment interruption (RR=1.13, 95% Cl 0.81-1.57; Table 4), suggesting that scheduling of clinic visits may important for successful attendance among those with work commitments or where access to money for transport is key.

Finally, where the archetype approach to risk triaging provides insight into underlying drivers of risk of treatment interruption, it also creates the opportunity to map appropriate interventions to groups of ART clients most likely to benefit from them (Figure 3). For example, archetypes characterized by a lack of social support might be offered a treatment buddy or coach to assist them in establishing care during the early treatment period. Alternatively, a health worker might consider offering the choice of appointment scheduling to the employed youth – those who struggle to attend near payday because of work commitments might prefer a visit date earlier in the month, while another youth who needs their wages for transport money may prefer a visit scheduled shortly after payday. Used in this way, risk triaging offers an opportunity to optimize the impact of retention interventions by offering them to those among whom such interventions are most likely to have a positive impact on visit attendance while also reducing unnecessary resource expenditure by not offering the same interventions to clients who may neither want nor need them.



Figure 3: Schematic of intervention mapping guided by behavioural archetype

Our results should be interpreted in light of the limitations in both the data sources used in this analysis and our approaches. Importantly, both data sources only observed clinic visits at the originating site. Clients may have attended HIV care at another facility but not been observed in the analytic datasets presented here; such visits may be misclassified as "not attended". This is a common drawback to studies that rely on unlinked clinic records, as we did in both our analytic approaches (threshold and archetype) [26]. To the extent that this happened, our results will overestimate proportions of clinic visits not attended. The archetype results reflect several other limitations as well. Development of the client archetype approach is limited to the variables that were collected in the SLATE trials; other important archetypes may exist that we are unable to describe due to this limitation. The archetyping approach itself may be limited by the need for variables that are not currently routinely collected, though information such as whether a client lives alone or not could easily be added to routine data collection forms if it proved of sufficient value. Finally, generalizability of the archetype approach in particular may be limited to South Africa, as it relies on social and behavioral variables that vary by geographic location or culture.

CONCLUSIONS

Despite the limitations mentioned above, our results have several important implications for HIV service delivery. First, the threshold risk triaging approach allows for identifying clients at risk of treatment interruptions while the archetype approach could potentially inform underlying obstacles to visit adherence and possible intervention mapping efforts. Of note is that these processes are intended to happen at point of care among clients still engaged in HIV health services, avoiding resource-intense tracing activities. We also present results and risk profiling relevant to the first six months after ART initiation; a key period for disengagement in care where the optimal model of service delivery remains unclear. Future work should address changes in risk states identified through these triaging approaches

and the implications for long-term retention on ART. Finally, beyond improving the accuracy of risk prediction, our results represent an important step in introducing the results of machine learning and predictive analytic risk profiling into a routine practice setting. A simple tool for healthcare providers to utilize at point of care, before clients experiences negative outcomes, may be feasible using the characteristics found to be most predictive of future ITT in this study.

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES AND FIGURES

Supplementary Table 1: Model building and validation process Supplementary Table 2: Proportion visits with IIT at next scheduled visit stratified by current visit risk triaging classification and time on ART (varying threshold classification and model approaches)

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS:

Conceptualization: MM, KSS, LDV Methodology: MM, KSS, LDV, SP Validation: KSS, LDV, SP Software: SP, KSS, LDV Formal analysis: MM, KSS, LDV, SP Investigation: MM, KSS, LDV, SP Data curation: PP, TC, AG, SR Supervision: MM and SR Original draft preparation: MM and SP Review and editing: All authors

REFERENCES

- Keene CM, Ragunathan A, Euvrard J, English M, McKnight J, Orrell C. Measuring patient engagement with HIV care in sub-Saharan Africa: a scoping study. Journal of the International AIDS Society. 2022;25: 1–15. doi:10.1002/jia2.26025
- 2. Ford N, Geng E, Ellman T, Orrell C, Ehrenkranz P, Sikazwe I, et al. Emerging priorities for HIV service delivery. PLoS Medicine. 2020;17: 1–13. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PMED.1003028
- NCT04429061. Reaching 90 90 90 in Adolescents in Zambia: using All Our SKILLZ. https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT04429061. 2020.
- Beres LK, Denison JA, Schwartz S, Simbeza S, Mwamba C, Sikombe K, et al. Patterns and Predictors of Incident Return to HIV Care Among Traced, Disengaged Patients in Zambia: Analysis of a Prospective Cohort. Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndromes (1999). 2021;86: 313– 322. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/QAI.00000000002554
- 5. Tweya H, Gareta D, Chagwera F, Ben-Smith A, Mwenyemasi J, Chiputula F, et al. Early active follow-up of patients on antiretroviral therapy (ART) who are lost to follow-up: the "Back-to-Care" project in Lilongwe, Malawi. Tropical medicine & international health : TM & IH. 2010;15 Suppl 1: 82–89. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3156.2010.02509.x
- Satti H, McLaughlin MM, Omotayo DB, Keshavjee S, Becerra MC, Mukherjee JS, et al. Outcomes of Comprehensive Care for Children Empirically Treated for Multidrug-Resistant Tuberculosis in a Setting of High HIV Prevalence. Madhi SA, editor. PLoS ONE. 2012;7: e37114. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0037114
- 7. Bershetyn A, Odeny TA, Lyamuya R, Nakiwogga-Muwanga A, Diero L, Bwana M, et al. The causal effect of tracing by peer health workers on return to clinic among patients who were lost to

follow-up from antiretroviral therapy in Eastern Africa: A "natural experiment" arising from surveillance of lost patients. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2017;64: 1547–1554. doi:10.1093/cid/cix191

- Etoori D, Wringe A, Renju J, Kabudula CW, Gomez-Olive FX, Reniers G. Challenges with tracing patients on antiretroviral therapy who are late for clinic appointments in rural South Africa and recommendations for future practice. Global Health Action. 2020;13. doi:10.1080/16549716.2020.1755115
- USAID. Data and Advanced Analytics in HIV Service Delivery: Use Cases to Help Reach 95-95-95.
 2020.
- Kerschberger B, Aung A, Mpala Q, Ntshalintshali N, Mamba C, Schomaker M, et al. Predicting,
 Diagnosing, and Treating Acute and Early HIV Infection in a Public Sector Facility in Eswatini. J
 Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2021;88: 506–517.
- Giovenco D, Pettifor A, MacPhail C, Kahn K, Wagner R, Piwowar-Manning E, et al. Assessing risk for HIV infection among adolescent girls in South Africa: an evaluation of the VOICE risk score (HPTN 068). J Int AIDS Soc. 2019;22: e25359.
- Brown LB, Miller WC, Kamanga G, Kaufman JS, Pettifor A, Dominik RC, et al. Predicting partner HIV testing and counseling following a partner notification intervention. AIDS Behav. 2012;16: 1148–55. doi:10.1007/s10461-011-0094-9
- Stevens WS, Gous NM, Macleod WB, Long LC, Variava E, Martinson NA, et al. Multidisciplinary point-of-care testing in south african primary health care clinics accelerates HIV ART initiation but does not alter retention in care. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr (1988). 2017;76: 65–73. doi:10.1097/QAI.00000000001456

- 14. Auld AF, Fielding K, Agizew T, Maida A, Mathoma A, Boyd R, et al. Risk scores for predicting early antiretroviral therapy mortality in sub-Saharan Africa to inform who needs intensification of care: a derivation and external validation cohort study. BMC Med. 2020;18: 1–19.
- Maskew M, Brennan AT, Fox MP, Vezi L, Venter WDF, Ehrenkranz P, et al. A clinical algorithm for same-day HIV treatment initiation in settings with high TB symptom prevalence in South Africa: The SLATE II individually randomized clinical trial. PLoS Med. 2020;17. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PMED.1003226
- 16. Mamo DN, Yilma TM, Fekadie M, Sebastian Y, Bizuayehu T, Melaku MS, et al. Machine learning to predict virological failure among HIV patients on antiretroviral therapy in the University of Gondar Comprehensive and Specialized Hospital, in Amhara Region, Ethiopia, 2022. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak. 2023;23. doi:10.1186/s12911-023-02167-7
- 17. Frijters EM, Hermans LE, Wensing AMJ, Devillé WLJM, Tempelman HA, De Wit JBF. Risk factors for loss to follow-up from antiretroviral therapy programmes in low-income and middle-income countries. AIDS. 2020;34: 1261–1288. doi:10.1097/QAD.00000000002523
- 18. Makurumidze R, Decroo T, Jacobs BKM, Rusakaniko S, Van Damme W, Lynen L, et al. Attrition one year after starting antiretroviral therapy before and after the programmatic implementation of HIV "Treat All" in Sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Infectious Diseases. 2023;23: 1–13. doi:10.1186/s12879-023-08551-y
- Conan N, Simons E, Chihana ML, Ohler L, FordKamara E, Mbatha M, et al. Increase in HIV viral suppression in KwaZulu- Natal, South Africa: Community-based cross sectional surveys 2018 and 2013. What remains to be done? PLoS One. 2022;17. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0265488

- 20. Maskew M, Sharpey-Schafer K, De Voux L, Crompton T, Bor J, Rennick M, et al. Applying machine learning and predictive modeling to retention and viral suppression in South African HIV treatment cohorts. Scientific Reports. 2022;12: 12715. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-16062-0
- 21. UNAIDS Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. Global AIDS Update 2021: Confronting Inequalities. Geneva, Switzerland; 2021.
- 22. Rosen S, Maskew M, Larson BA, Brennan AT, Tsikhutsu I, Fox MP, et al. Simplified clinical algorithm for identifying patients eligible for same-day HIV treatment initiation (SLATE): Results from an individually randomized trial in South Africa and Kenya. Newell M-L, editor. PLOS Medicine. 2019;16: e1002912. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002912
- 23. Maskew M, Sharpey-Schafer K, De Voux L, Crompton T, Bor J, Rennick M, et al. Applying machine learning and predictive modeling to retention and viral suppression in South African HIV treatment cohorts. Scientific Reports. 2022;12: 12715. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-16062-0
- Esra R, Carstens J, Le Roux S, Mabuto T, Eisenstein M, Keiser O, et al. Validation and improvement of a machine learning model to predict interruptions in antiretroviral treatment in South Africa. Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndromes (1999). 2022.
 doi:10.1097/QAI.00000000003108
- 25. Maskew M, Brennan AT, Venter WDF, Fox MP, Vezi L, Rosen S. Retention in care and viral suppression after same-day ART initiation: One-year outcomes of the SLATE I and II individually randomized clinical trials in South Africa. Journal of the International AIDS Society. 2021;24: e25825. doi:10.1002/jia2.25825
- 26. Maskew M, Benade M, Huber A, Pascoe S, Sande L, Malala L, et al. Patterns of engagement in care during clients' first 12 months after HIV treatment initiation in South Africa: A retrospective

cohort analysis using routinely collected data. PLOS Global Public Health. 2024;4: e0002956. doi:10.1371/journal.pgph.0002956

- Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, Michel V, Prettenhofer P, Weiss R, et al. Scikit-learn:
 Machine Learning in Python. Journal of Machine Learning Research. 2011;12: 2825–2830.
- 28. Long L, Kuchukhidze S, Pascoe S, Nichols BE, Fox MP, Cele R, et al. Retention in care and viral suppression in differentiated service delivery models for HIV treatment delivery in sub-Saharan Africa: a rapid systematic review. Journal of the International AIDS Society. John Wiley and Sons Inc; 2020. doi:10.1002/jia2.25640
- Rosen S, Grimsrud A, Ehrenkranz P, Katz I. Models of service delivery for optimizing a patient's first six months on antiretroviral therapy for HIV: An applied research agenda. Gates Open Research. 2020;4: 1–15. doi:10.12688/gatesopenres.13159.1