medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.11.22270855; this version posted February 13, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Comparing Sexual Network Mean Active Degree Measurement Metrics among Men who have Sex with Men

Authors

Christina Chandra[1], Martina Morris[2], Connor Van Meter[1], Steven M. Goodreau[3], Travis Sanchez[1], Patrick Janulis[4], Michelle Birkett[4], Samuel M. Jenness[1]

[1] Department of Epidemiology, Rollin School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA

[2] Department of Sociology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

[3] Department of Anthropology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

[4] Department of Medical Social Sciences, Feinberg School of Medicine, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL

Correspondence

Christina Chandra, Emory University, 1520 Clifton Road, Atlanta, GA 30323. Email: christina.lynne.chandra@emory.edu.

Funding

This work was supported by National Institutes of Health grants R21 MH112449 and R01 AI138783, and a grant from the MAC AIDS Fund.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Word Counts

Abstract: 200 words

Text: 3393 words

Keywords

Sexual networks, HIV, sexually transmitted infection, men who have sex with men, partnerships

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.11.22270855; this version posted February 13, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Background Mean active degree is an important proxy measure of network connectivity in HIV/STI epidemiology. The performance of different degree estimands are not known for men who have sex with men (MSM) in the United States, especially within the context of fixed choice designs in behavioral surveys.

Methods We compared estimates of mean active degree based on reported ongoing main and casual partnerships (*current method*) against dates of first and last sex (*retrospective method*) in ARTnet, a cross-sectional survey of U.S. MSM with partnership reporting limited to the 5 most recent partners. We used linear regression to understand the impact of this data truncation on differences between the current and retrospective methods.

Results Retrospective estimates declined as the offset was shifted backwards in time. Among participants with more than 5 total past-year partners compared to those with 5 or fewer partners, the average change in main degree between 12- and 0-month offsets was -0.05 (95% CI: -0.08, -0.03) after adjusting for demographics. The adjusted average change in casual degree was -0.40 (95% CI: -0.45, -0.35).

Conclusions The retrospective method underestimates mean degree in surveys that limit partner reporting, especially for offsets further from the survey date and for casual partnerships.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.11.22270855; this version posted February 13, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

In the United States, men who have sex with men (MSM) experience a disproportionate burden of HIV and bacterial sexually transmitted infections (STIs). In 2018, MSM accounted for 66% of all new HIV diagnoses, 54% of primary and secondary syphilis cases, and 43% of gonorrhea cases [1,2]. Young, non-white MSM are particularly affected by HIV/STIs despite evidence that individual risk behaviors are not different between Black and white MSM [3]. Differences in sexual network connectivity, the mechanistic pathway for HIV/STI transmission, may explain these disparities among MSM in the U.S. [4,5]. Networks are also essential for deploying prevention tools, such as HIV PrEP or STI partner services [6, 7].

The potential effectiveness of a network-informed HIV/STI public health response depends on good empirical metrics: accurate and unbiased estimates of observable behaviors that determine the unobservable network connectivity. One common metric is active degree: the count of current, ongoing partners at a point in time, which may be summarized as the mean active degree across nodes (persons) at the population level. It is mathematically established and intuitive that network connectivity rises as mean degree increases, though the relation is non-linear [7]. Active degree also forms the definitional basis of partnership concurrency (active degree of two or more). Modeling has demonstrated that higher mean active degree and higher prevalence of concurrency create network conditions that lead to more rapid and pervasive HIV/STI spread within networks [5,8]. Even small changes in mean active degree can have a substantial impact on network connectivity, and subsequently epidemic persistence or elimination, due to the non-linear threshold effects [9]. For this reason, accurate measurement of mean active degree is needed to assess epidemic potential.

Active degree can be operationalized in multiple ways in behavioral surveys (**Figure 1**). UNAIDS focused on this problem in a reference group meeting in 2009, leading to published recommendations for measuring active degree and calculating point prevalence of concurrency as an indicator for monitoring national HIV epidemics [10]. Two of the approaches they considered were: 1) active degree as measured on the day of survey (the “current method”); 2) using the reported dates of first and last sex with each partner during the last year (the “retrospective method”). UNAIDS recommended the latter.

With the current method, the goal is to measure the person’s ongoing (i.e., current) sexual partnerships on the day of the survey. This can be done on a partner-by-partner basis after enumerating relevant partners (e.g., “Do you expect to have sex with this person again?”), or with a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.11.22270855; this version posted February 13, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

single summary question (e.g., “With how many people do you currently have an active sexual relationship?”). Active degree is measured as the number of ongoing partnerships reported. This approach does not depend on recall of events in the past, or on reporting of dates. It can also be asked in a single question if time and respondent burden are concerns. The drawback is that it requires respondents to accurately predict whether a partnership will continue. While that may be reasonable for populations characterized by having a few long-term stable partnerships, it may fail in populations with more frequent short-term casual partnerships [11].

With the retrospective method, partners are enumerated for some period (e.g., all in the last year), and data are collected on each partnership’s date of first and last sex. The partnership intervals are then evaluated at the time of data analysis for periods of active overlap, and a time-series of active degree can be derived for each respondent. The UNAIDS reference group recommended using a 6-month offset from the survey date to get a point estimate of the active degree. This method does not require the respondent to predict whether current partnerships will continue, but it does require accurate recollection of the dates of first and last sex. For surveys that truncate partner data collection using a fixed choice design that only ask about a limited number of partnerships in a specified period, more active study participants may reach this limit before the specified month offset. When partner reporting is truncated, the higher the cumulative number of partners over time, the more potential there is for downward bias in the active mean degree as you go back in time.

While both methods have been used in surveys of MSM in the U.S. [12–15], there have been no comparative studies of these methods for this population. Active degree is often higher among MSM, and more heterogenous, reflecting different partnership types of varying durations and typologies. Furthermore, the biases from missing partnership data due to fixed choice design (also known as right-censoring of degree) has been well-documented in the field of network science [16–18]. It would be useful to understand how these measurement approaches perform for this population with these survey designs.

In this study, we compared estimates using the current method and the retrospective method among U.S. MSM in a survey that supports estimates using both methods and employs a fixed choice design for sexual network data. Our primary research question was to understand if partnership data truncation was the main source of bias for the differences seen between the current

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.11.22270855; this version posted February 13, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

and retrospective method, even after controlling for demographic variables that may be correlated with both truncation of partnership data and other mechanisms for bias in mean degree estimates.

METHODS

Study Design. We used data from ARTnet, a cross-sectional web-based study of MSM in the U.S. conducted between 2017 and 2019 [19]. ARTnet recruited participants through the American Men's Internet Survey (AMIS), an ongoing study about MSM sexual health [20]. ARTnet eligibility criteria included age between 15 and 65 years, cisgender male identity, male sex at birth, and having ever had sex with a male partner. ARTnet recruited AMIS participants and collected data in two waves: July 2017 to February 2018 and September 2018 to January 2019. Participants were deduplicated within and across waves, and we retained the most recent survey record for participants in both waves. The Emory University Institutional Review Board approved this study.

Measures. ARTnet collected information on egocentric sexual network data, recent sexual behavior, and utilization of HIV and STI prevention services. For sexual networks, participants were asked to provide information on up to five of their most recent male sexual partners within the last 12 months. Participants reported on characteristics of these partnerships such as type of partnership (main, casual, or one-time), start and end dates of these partnerships by month and year, and sexual activity within these partnerships (e.g., condomless anal sex). For each partnership, participants also answered the question, "Is this relationship with this partner active and ongoing?"

Our main exposure was the truncation of partnership data due to the fixed choice design. This was operationalized by a binary variable the split participants by whether they had five or fewer partners, including main, casual, or one-time, or more than five partners in the past 12 months. Those with more than five male partners in the past year are considered to have provided truncated information about their partnerships. Our outcome of interest was a summary measure of active degree (henceforth, degree): the mean degree across all participants at a specified time point. Because we were interested in degree, this measure did not include one-time partnerships, as they are not ongoing. We calculated mean degree using the current method and compared it to mean degree calculated using the retrospective method at monthly offsets, ranging from 0 months (current study month) to 12 months prior to the day of survey. Since participants reported only month and year for dates of first and last sex in ARTnet, we randomly imputed days within these months.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.11.22270855; this version posted February 13, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Statistical Analysis. For descriptive analyses, we plotted mean degree by both current and retrospective methods by the truncation variable. For analytic comparisons of the degree measurement methods, we estimated the effect of month offsets on degree measures by calculating the difference in degree between 12-month and 0-month offsets. This difference provides a measure of stability of the retrospective method across potential measurement time points. Bivariable and multivariable linear regression were then used to estimate the temporal slope (i.e., that 12-month difference) and variations in that slope by the truncation variable and selected demographic variables (e.g., race/ethnicity, age, geography, education, income) that may also be correlated with bias in mean degree estimates. In multiple linear regression, we investigated whether variations in the offset slopes were caused by the truncation of partnership data, after controlling for race, age, and education, which we hypothesized as associated with the primary exposure and the outcome. All analyses were conducted in R 4.1.2 [21]. Analysis scripts are provided in a GitHub repository (https://github.com/EpiModel/Mean-Degree-Analysis).

RESULTS

Of the 4,904 MSM who completed the ARTnet study, most were non-Hispanic white, less than 35 years old, completed college or above, and had an annual household income of at least $40,000 (**Table 1**). A total of 16,198 partnerships were reported by the participants. Of these, 7,602 (46.9%) were one-time partnerships, 5,978 (36.9%) were casual partnerships, and 2,618 (16.2%) were main partnerships. On the day of survey, 5,875 (68.3%) of main and casual partnerships were reported as ongoing. Overall, 1,962 (40.0%) of participants had more than 5 partners (main, casual, and one-time) in the past 12 months.

Mean degree estimates varied by partnership type for both measurement approaches. Using the current method, total mean degree was 1.19 across partnership types: 0.45 for main partnerships, and 0.74 for casual partnerships (**Figure 2**). Mean degree estimates ranged from 1.01 at the 12-month offset to 1.23 at the 1-month offset across all partnerships. Mean degree ranged from 0.38 (12-month offset) to 0.45 (0-month offset) for main partnerships and from 0.64 (12-month offset) to 0.78 (1-month offset) for casual partnerships.

The mean degrees estimated by the retrospective method followed a decreasing trend as the number of months offset increased from 1 to 12 months, yielding estimates like the current method

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.11.22270855; this version posted February 13, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

only at some offset months (**Figure 2**). Mean degree estimated at the 0-month offset was the same as the mean degree estimated from the current method across all partnership types, which is expected given that the 0-month offset date is the same as the date the survey is taken for each participant. Mean degree of main partnerships from the current method (0.45) was most similar to estimates between 1- and 2-month offsets (0.45–0.44), while for casual partnerships, the current estimate (0.75) was most similar to mean degree estimated at 5- and 6-month offsets (0.76, 0.73). Overall mean degree estimated with the current method (1.19) was most similar to mean degree at the 4-month offset (1.19) across all partnerships.

When stratifying by the total number of partners a participant had in the past 12 months, the decreasing trend of mean degree across all partnerships was largely explained by participants who had 6 or more partners (**Figure 3**). Participants with 6 or more partners in the past year did not have the opportunity to share information on more than 5 of their partners, and therefore, the partnerships reported may be biased to the most recent partnerships. For main partnerships, there continued to be a slight decreasing trend of mean degree observed between the 1- and 12-month offsets (0.48 to 0.42) for participants with 5 or fewer partnerships in the past year; however, this did not impact the stability of the overall mean degree when restricted to participants with 5 or fewer partnerships. Mean degree remained stable from 0.83 at 1-month offset to 0.80 at 12-month offset for participants with 5 or fewer partners in the past year, but mean degree decreased from 1.83 at 1-month offset to 1.34 at 12-month offset for those with 6 or more partners. A similar pattern was found for casual mean degree. Among participants with 5 or fewer partners, casual mean degree was relatively stable from 0.35 at 1-month offset to 0.37 at 12-month offset. For participants with 6 or more partners, casual mean degree decreased from 1.44 at 1-month offset to 1.04 at 12-month offset. **Supplemental Table 1** describes mean degree estimates using both methods by participant and partnership characteristics for 0-, 3-, 6-, and 12-month offsets.

Bivariable and multivariable linear regression further confirmed that the number of male partners was the principal cause of the decreasing trend of mean degree estimated with the retrospective method, particularly for casual partnerships. Race/ethnicity, age, and education were found to be potential confounders of the relationship between truncation of partnerships reported and the downward bias of mean degree in the retrospective method (**Table 2; Supplemental Table 2; Supplemental Figures 1–5**). The negative association between average change in degree and number of male partners in the past year remained after adjusting for demographics. The average

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.11.22270855; this version posted February 13, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

change in main degree between 12- and 0-month offsets among participants with more than 5 partners in the past year compared to those with 5 or fewer partners was -0.04 (95% CI: -0.07, -0.02) in unadjusted analysis and -0.05 (95% CI: -0.08, -0.03) in adjusted analysis (Table 2). For casual partnerships among participants with more than 5 partners compared to 5 or fewer partners, the unadjusted average change in degree was -0.41 (95% CI: -0.46, -0.36) and adjusted average change in degree was -0.40 (95% CI: -0.45, -0.35).

In **Supplemental Tables 3–4**, we further explored the impact of truncation by partnership type. Truncation impacted mean degree estimates for casual more than main partnerships because respondents typically had a greater cumulative number of casual partnerships, so the truncation limit was reached faster.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we compared the current and the retrospective methods of measuring active degree on the estimates of mean degree in a sample of U.S. MSM. The two methods produced similar estimates of mean degree for participants with fewer past-year partners. With the retrospective method, mean degree estimates systematically declined as the month offset increased (i.e., as the retrospective measure of degree was moved back in time). This was due to the truncation effect imposed by the fixed choice design: data were collected on at most five of the most recent partners. For partnership types characterized by high rates of turnover and accumulation this truncation limited the observation of partnerships to shorter retrospective offsets, and the downward bias over time was most pronounced. Overall, our results suggest this potential downward bias would lead to underestimation of degree using the retrospective methods when surveys employ a fixed choice design with truncation of partnership reporting. Underestimation of active degree may impact projected transmission of HIV in simulated networks **[22,23]**. The current method of measurement is less prone to truncation from the fixed choice design.

With 40.0% of the ARTnet participants reporting more than 5 main, casual, and one-time in the past year, the truncation of partnership data had a major impact on mean degree estimation with the retrospective method (**Table 1**). This was particularly true for casual partnerships, which were more prevalent (36.9%) compared to main partnerships (16.2%) in our sample. An exploration of a few cases with large slope differences between 12- and 0-month offsets shows that reporting more

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.11.22270855; this version posted February 13, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

partnerships may also mean that participants are reporting concurrent partnerships that are closer to the survey date or further away from the survey date, leading to these large slopes (**Supplemental Figures 6–7)**. Since participants were asked to report on their most recent partnerships, participants with truncated partner data were likely to only report on partnerships closer to the survey date before exhausting their responses, leading to underestimation of degree as month offsets increased. Furthermore, reporting on more one-time partnerships, which don't contribute to mean degree, may censor main and casual partnerships in the past year and underestimate mean degree.

A direct comparison of the current method to the UNAIDS-recommended retrospective method at 6 months using ARTnet data shows that the percent of participants reporting more than 1 partner at both time points was similar and total, main, and casual mean degree was slightly smaller when estimated at the 6-month offset (**Supplemental Table 6**). The distribution of degree for both time points were also similar (**Supplemental Figure 8**). The retrospective method may still be a suitable alternative to the current method if there was no truncation of partnership data in the behavioral survey or if information on the active status of current partnerships was not collected and if mean degree is estimated within 6 months of the survey date.

The current or retrospective measurement methods have been applied to the estimation of partnership concurrency (degree of two or more), aligning generally with our current study. One study of young adults in the U.S. directly comparing reported partnership concurrency within the last 6 years through direct questioning and overlapping partnership dates found both methods reported a similar prevalence of concurrency [24]. However, the agreement about concurrent partnerships between the two methods was only modest, with the authors suggesting that measuring concurrency using overlapping partnership dates was more likely to be complicated by missing or uninterpretable data. Another study of heterosexual partnerships in Malawi found that measuring concurrency using partnership dates underestimated self-reported concurrency due to difficulty of recalling partnership start and end dates and general underreporting of partnerships [25]. Additionally, the current method may be statistically preferable because both mean active degree and partnership age can be jointly estimated with typical distributional assumptions [19,26]. On the other hand, study participants may not be able to accurately predict whether current partnerships will continue, leading to overestimation of mean active degree using the current method [11]. The current method is not perfect, and bias adjustment or improvement of the measurement method is needed.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.11.22270855; this version posted February 13, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Limitations. There are some limitations to this study. First, only month and year of dates of first and last sex were reported for each partnership. Partnerships with start or end months that were the same as the month of the retrospective date from the date of survey could either be considered ongoing or not ongoing depending on the exact day of first/last sex. To address this, we randomly imputed the day for the start and end dates to identify partnerships overlapping with the retrospective date. In a sensitivity analysis where partnerships were imputed to be ongoing for the entire month of the start or end date or not ongoing for the entire month, we found that the average percent change of mean degree for these extreme assumptions was minimal at 2–3% (**Supplemental Table 4**). Second, this study was limited to cross-sectional data, which may be useful because many studies estimate mean degree from cross-sectional data, but longitudinal studies may be able to describe unique biases from cross-sectional data such as the prediction of ongoing partnerships [11]. Third, ARTnet coding decisions around one-time partnerships and "Do not know" responses for the question of whether a partnership is active and ongoing may lead to underestimation of mean degree using the current method or 0-month offset of the retrospective method. Partnerships were coded as one-time if the participant has only had sex with that partner once, regardless of whether the partnership was marked as active and ongoing. As a result, 20% of one-time partnerships were marked as active and ongoing but not included in the calculation of mean degree. Additionally, all "Do not know" responses for the question about whether a partnership was active and ongoing were coded as not ongoing. We conducted a sensitivity analysis that found there is potential underestimation of mean degree estimates when all 20% of one-time partnerships marked as ongoing were recoded as ongoing casual partnerships and when "Do not know responses" were imputed as ongoing (**Supplemental Table 6**). Given prior research that suggested MSM may be overconfident in predicting the ongoingness of sexual partnerships [11], we used the original method as a more conservative measure.

Conclusions. Sexual mean active degree is an important measure in HIV and STI epidemiology. It should therefore be measured rigorously and estimated consistently across studies. Future network-based studies should justify their preferred estimand for mean active degree measures with special consideration of how data used to estimate active degree is collected. Our analysis suggests that cross-sectional data with truncated partnership data may underestimate mean degree using the retrospective method, favoring the current method. However, improvements can further be made to the current method to address bias in predicting ongoingness of partnerships [11]. The accuracy of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.11.22270855; this version posted February 13, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

the active degree estimates will have important impacts on the delivery of HIV/STI prevention interventions that target networks.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.11.22270855; this version posted February 13, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. HIV Surveillance Report, 2018 [Internet]. 2018 Nov. Report No.: 29. Available from: http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/library/reports/hiv-surveillance.html.

2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Sexually Transmitted Disease Surveillance 2018 [Internet]. 2019. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/std/stats

3. Millett GA, Flores SA, Peterson JL, Bakeman R. Explaining disparities in HIV infection among black and white men who have sex with men: a meta-analysis of HIV risk behaviors. AIDS. 2007;21:2083–91.

4. Mustanski B, Morgan E, D'Aquila R, Birkett M, Janulis P, Newcomb ME. Individual and Network Factors Associated With Racial Disparities in HIV Among Young Men Who Have Sex With Men. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2019;80:24–30.

5. Morris M, Kurth AE, Hamilton DT, Moody J, Wakefield S. Concurrent partnerships and HIV prevalence disparities by race: linking science and public health practice. Am J Public Health. 2009;99:1023–31.

6. Teixeira da Silva D, Bouris A, Ramachandran A, Blocker O, Davis B, Harris J, et al. Embedding a Linkage to Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) Care Intervention in Social Network Strategy and Partner Notification Services: Results from a Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2021;86:191–9.

7. Erdos P, Rényi A. On the evolution of random graphs. Publ Math Inst Hung Acad Sci. Citeseer; 1960;5:17–60.

8. Eaton JW, Hallett TB, Garnett GP. Concurrent sexual partnerships and primary HIV infection: a critical interaction. AIDS Behav. 2011;15:687–92.

9. Carnegie NB, Morris M. Size matters: concurrency and the epidemic potential of HIV in small networks. PLoS ONE. 2012;7:e43048.

10. Eaton J, Case, Kelsey, secretariat of the UNAIDS Reference Group on Estimates, Modelling, and Projections. Consultation on Concurrent Sexual Partnerships [Internet]. UNAIDS; 2009 Jun p. 19. Available from: http://www.epidem.org/sites/default/files/content/resources/attachments/Concurrency%20meeting%20recommendations_Final.pdf

11. Uong S, Rosenberg ES, Goodreau SM, Luisi N, Sullivan P, Jenness SM. Assessment of Bias in Estimates of Sexual Network Degree using Prospective Cohort Data. Epidemiology. 2020;31:229–37.

12. Jenness SM, Johnson JA, Hoover KW, Smith DK, Delaney KP. Modeling an integrated HIV prevention and care continuum to achieve the ending the HIV epidemic goals. AIDS. 2020;34:2103–13.

13. Maloney KM, Driggers RA, Sarkar S, Anderson E, Malik A, Jenness SM. Projected Impact of Concurrently Available Long-Acting Injectable and Daily-Oral HIV Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis. Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2021;223:72–82.

14. Jenness SM, Le Guillou A, Chandra C, Mann LM, Sanchez T, Westreich D, et al. Projected HIV and Bacterial Sexually Transmitted Infection Incidence Following COVID-19-Related Sexual Distancing and Clinical Service Interruption. J Infect Dis. 2021;223:1019–28.

15. Janulis P, Phillips G, Birkett M, Mustanski B. Sexual Networks of Racially Diverse Young MSM Differ in Racial Homophily But Not Concurrency. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2018;77:459–66.

16. Holland PW, Leinhardt S. The structural implications of measurement error in sociometry. The Journal of Mathematical Sociology. Routledge; 1973;3:85–111.

17. Kossinets G. Effects of missing data in social networks. Social Networks. 2006;28:247–68.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.11.22270855; this version posted February 13, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

18. Gommans R, Cillessen AHN. Nominating under constraints: A systematic comparison of unlimited and limited peer nomination methodologies in elementary school. International Journal of Behavioral Development. SAGE Publications Ltd; 2015;39:77–86.

19. Weiss KM, Goodreau SM, Morris M, Prasad P, Ramaraju R, Sanchez T, et al. Egocentric sexual networks of men who have sex with men in the United States: Results from the ARTnet study. Epidemics. 2020;30:100386.

20. Sanchez TH, Sineath RC, Kahle EM, Tregear SJ, Sullivan PS. The Annual American Men's Internet Survey of Behaviors of Men Who Have Sex With Men in the United States: Protocol and Key Indicators Report 2013. JMIR Public Health Surveill. 2015;1:e3.

21. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing [Internet]. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2019. Available from: https://www.R-project.org/

22. Harling G, Onnela J-P. Impact of degree truncation on the spread of a contagious process on networks. Netw Sci (Camb Univ Press). 2018;6:34–53.

23. Anderson EJ, Weiss KM, Morris MM, Sanchez TH, Prasad P, Jenness SM. HIV and Sexually Transmitted Infection Epidemic Potential of Networks of Men Who Have Sex With Men in Two Cities. Epidemiology. 2021;32:681–9.

24. Nelson SJ, Manhart LE, Gorbach PM, Martin DH, Stoner BP, Aral SO, et al. Measuring sex partner concurrency: it's what's missing that counts. Sex Transm Dis. 2007;34:801–7.

25. Glynn JR, Dube A, Kayuni N, Floyd S, Molesworth A, Parrott F, et al. Measuring concurrency: an empirical study of different methods in a large population-based survey and evaluation of the UNAIDS guidelines. AIDS. 2012;26:977–85.

26. Krivitsky P, Morris M. Inference for Social Network Models from Egocentrically-Sampled Data, with Application to Understanding Persistent Racial Disparities in HIV Prevalence in the US. Ann Appl Stat. 2017;11:427–55.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.11.22270855; this version posted February 13, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

TABLES

Table 1. Individual- and Partnership-level Characteristics of Participants in ARTnet Study of MSM in the U.S.

Individual	N	%
Total Sample	4904	100.0
Age (Mean and SD)	36.5	14.2
Age Category		
15–24	1324	27.0
25–34	1268	25.9
35–44	694	14.2
45–54	833	17.0
55–65	785	16.0
Race/Ethnicity		
Black (Non-Hispanic)	266	5.4
Hispanic	676	13.8
Other (Non-Hispanic)	439	9.0
White (Non-Hispanic)	3523	71.8
Residence in Census Region		
Northeast	882	18.0
Midwest	994	20.3
South	1782	36.3
West	1246	25.4
Residence in Census Division		
New England	250	5.1
Middle Atlantic	632	12.9
East North Central	698	14.2
West North Central	296	6.0
South Atlantic	1062	21.7
East South Central	222	4.5
West South Central	498	10.2
Mountain	404	8.2
Pacific	842	17.2
Education		
High school or below	616	12.6
Some college	1519	31.1
College and above	2742	56.2
Annual Household Income		
$0 to $19,999	605	13.7
$20,000 to $39,999	867	19.6
$40,000 to $74,999	1258	28.5
$75,000 or more	1686	38.2
Number of Male Partners		
≤ 5 Partners	2939	59.9
> 5	1962	40.0

Partnership[a]	N	%
Total Sample	16198	100.0
Partnership Type		
Main	2618	16.2
Casual	5978	36.9
One-time	7602	46.9
Self-Reported Ongoing		
Yes	7289	45.0
No	8909	55.0

[a] The ARTnet survey allows participants to report on up to five of the most recent sexual male partners within the past 12 months of taking the survey.

Table 2. Bivariable Linear Regression Results of Average Change in Degree of Main and Casual Partnerships at 12-Month and 0-Month Offsets

	Main Partnerships			Casual Partnerships		
	Estimate	**95% CI**	**F-Test P-value**	**Estimate**	**95% CI**	**F-Test P-value**
Number of Male Partners[a]			<0.01			<0.01
Intercept (≤ 5 Partners)	-0.06	-0.07, -0.04		0.06	0.03, 0.09	
> 5	-0.04	-0.07, -0.02		-0.41	-0.46, -0.36	
Race/Ethnicity			0.05			0.16
Intercept (Black)	-0.02	-0.07, 0.02		-0.01	-0.11, 0.10	
Hispanic	-0.08	-0.13, -0.02		-0.07	-0.20, 0.04	
Other	-0.04	-0.10, 0.01		-0.09	-0.22, 0.04	
White	-0.05	-0.10, -0.01		-0.11	-0.23, 0.01	
Age (continuous)	0.003	0.002, 0.004	<0.01	-0.003	-0.005, -0.001	<0.01
Age Category			<0.01			<0.01
Intercept (15-24 years)	-0.15	-0.17, -0.13		-0.03	-0.08, 0.01	
25-34 years	0.09	0.06, 0.12		-0.07	-0.14, -0.01	
35-44 years	0.09	0.05, 0.12		-0.10	-0.18, -0.02	
45-54 years	0.11	0.08, 0.15		-0.15	-0.23, -0.07	
55-65 years	0.13	0.09, 0.16		-0.11	-0.19, -0.03	
Census Region			0.28			0.15
Intercept (Northeast)	-0.06	-0.08, -0.03		-0.14	-0.20, -0.08	
Midwest	-0.03	-0.07, 0.00		0.07	-0.01, 0.15	
South	-0.02	-0.05, 0.01		0.05	-0.02, 0.12	
West	-0.02	-0.05, 0.02		0.00	-0.08, 0.07	
Highest Level of Education			<0.01			<0.01
Intercept (High school or below)	-0.12	-0.15, -0.09		-0.06	-0.13, 0.01	
Some college	0.05	0.01, 0.08		0.03	-0.05, 0.11	
College and above	0.06	0.03, 0.09		-0.11	-0.18, -0.03	
Annual Household Income			0.44			<0.01
Intercept ($0 to $19,999)	-0.08	-0.11, -0.05		-0.01	-0.08, 0.05	
$20,000 to $39,999	0.00	-0.04, 0.04		-0.08	-0.17, 0.01	
$40,000 to $74,999	0.00	-0.04, 0.04		-0.07	-0.15, 0.02	
$75,000 or more	0.02	-0.02, 0.05		-0.16	-0.24, -0.08	

[a] The ARTnet survey allows participants to report on up to five of the most recent sexual male partners within the past 12 months of taking the survey. Participants are also asked about the total number of male sexual partners they have had within the past 12 months.

Figure 1. Calculation of Degree by Current Method and Retrospective Method at Three Month Offset.



AMIS ID	Partner ID	Partner Type	Three-Month Offset Method: Partnership Ongoing?	Three-Month Offset Method: Degree	Three-Month Offset Method: Mean Degree	Day-of-Survey Method: Partnership Ongoing?	Day-of-Survey Method: Degree	Day-of-Survey Method: Mean Degree
1	1	Casual	No	1		No	1	
1	2	Main	Yes			Yes		
2	1	Casual	No	2	1	No	1	1
2	2	One-Time	No			No		
2	3	Main	Yes			No		
2	4	Casual	Yes			Yes		
3	1	Casual	No	0		Yes	1	

	Mean Degree: Main	Mean Degree: Casual	Mean Degree: Total
Three-Month Offset Method	2/3	1/3	1
Day-of-Survey Method	1/3	2/3	1

Figure 2. Mean Degree Comparison by Number of Offset Months and Current Method among All, Main, and Casual Male Sexual Partnerships of 4,904 ARTnet Participants. Current mean degree estimates are represented by dotted lines and dashed lines for the 95% confidence intervals. Points and corresponding vertical lines represent mean degree estimates and 95% confidence intervals estimated by the retrospective method.



Figure 3. Mean Degree Comparison by Retrospective and Current Method among All, Main, and Casual Partnerships of ARTnet Participants Stratified by Total Number of Partners. Current method mean degree estimates are represented by dashed lines. Points and corresponding vertical lines represent mean degree estimates with 95% confidence intervals by the month offset of the retrospective method and are connected by solid lines.