Type: Original Research Article

Title: Assessing Direct and Spillover Effects of Intervention Packages in Network-Randomized Studies

Short Title: Spillover Package Effects in Randomized Studies

Ashley L. Buchanan[1], Raul Ulises Hernández-Ramírez[2], Judith J. Lok[3], Sten H. Vermund[2], Samuel R. Friedman[4], Laura Forastiere[5], and Donna Spiegelman[2]

[1]*Department of Pharmacy Practice, College of Pharmacy, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881*

[2]*Center for Methods in Implementation and Prevention Science, Departments of Biostatistics and Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, and Center for Interdisciplinary Research on AIDS, Yale School of Public Health and Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT 06520*

[3]*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Boston University, Boston MA 02215*

[4]*Department of Population Health, New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York, NY 10016*

[5]*Departments of Biostatistics, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT 06520*

Contact for corresponding author: 7 Greenhouse Road, Kingston, RI 02881; ph: 401-874-4739; email: buchanan@uri.edu

Text (abstract) word count: 3,999/4,000 (223/250)

Title: 93 characters

Short title: 47 characters

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

FUNDING: ALB and SRF were supported by an Avenir Award DP2DA046856 from National Institute on Drug Abuse of the National Institutes of Health. RUH-R, ALB, and DS were supported by National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant R01AI112339. RUH-R, and DS were also supported by NIH grant P30MH062294-18. ALB and DS were also supported by NIH grant DP1ES025459 (DP1), while SHV was supported by NIH grant P30MH062294. JL was supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) grant DMS 1854934. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health or the National Science Foundation.

DATA AND COMPUTING CODE AVAILABILITY: Example SAS code used to fit the models presented in this paper can be found in the Supplement Appendix E. The HPTN 037 study data sets are publicly available and can be requested from the Statistical Center for HIV/AIDS Research and Prevention through the ATLAS Science Portal through `https://atlas.scharp.org/cpas/project/HPTN/`.

PUBLICATION HISTORY: This manuscript was previously published in MedRxiv doi: `https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.24.22272909`.

ABSTRACT

Intervention packages may result in a greater public health impact than single interventions. Understanding the separate impact of each component in the overall package effectiveness can improve intervention delivery. We propose an approach to evaluate the effects of a time-varying intervention package in a single study. In some network-randomized studies, only a subset of participants in exposed networks receives the intervention themselves. The spillover effect contrasts average potential outcomes if a person was not exposed themselves under intervention in the network versus no intervention in a control network. We estimated effects of components of the intervention package in HIV Prevention Trials Network 037, a Phase III network-randomized HIV prevention trial among people who inject drugs and their risk networks using Marginal Structural Models to adjust for time-varying confounding. The index participant in an intervention network received a peer education intervention initially at baseline, then boosters at 6 and 12 months. All participants were followed to ascertain HIV risk behaviors. There were 560 participants with at least one follow-up visit, 48% of whom were randomized to the intervention, and 1,598 participant-visits were observed. The spillover effect of the boosters in the presence of initial peer education training was a 39% rate reduction (95% confidence interval (CI) = -57%, -13%). These methods will be useful for evaluation of intervention packages in studies with network features.

ABBREVIATIONS: Confidence interval (CI), Generalized estimating equations (GEEs), HIV Prevention Trials Network (HPTN), Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), People who inject drugs (PWID), Risk/Rate ratio (RR)

KEY WORDS: Causal inference; Cluster-randomized trials; Spillover/Indirect effects; HIV/AIDS; Implementation Science; Interference; Package Interventions; Substance use

Introduction

Design and scale-up of intervention packages offer a means for control of the HIV/AIDS epidemic by meeting the needs of a target population [1–3]. Intervention packages are defined herein as a set of individual components to simultaneously prevent or treat a disease or condition through multiple pathways. Many interventions confer partial protection against HIV transmission [1, 4]. Offering these interventions in combination (e.g., HIV testing, treatment as prevention (TasP)) is an important strategy. Several cluster-randomized trials of packages of HIV prevention and treatment interventions were conducted in Sub-Saharan Africa and demonstrated a range of effectiveness for TasP in combination with other HIV interventions [5–12]. Intervention packages are not exclusive to community-level HIV epidemic control. Intervention packages are often tailored to specific subpopulations, such as people who inject drugs (PWID), in an effort to achieve a larger and more sustainable intervention impact [13–15].

In studies of intervention packages, treatment may be randomly assigned to individuals and/or networks (i.e., social groupings, communities), or treatments can be self-selected by individuals. Previous work on intervention packages illustrated causal inference approaches to account for implementation factors that were not randomized [16, 17], but did not consider possible spillover of the package components. Howe et al. [18] and Hernán et al. [19] developed and applied methodology to evaluate the joint causal effects of two non-randomized exposures; that is, their *interaction* in the presence of time-varying confounding in an observational study, employing joint Marginal Structural Models, but did not consider spillover effects. He et al. [20] developed Marginal Structural Models for studies of a single intervention with spillover and fit the models using cluster-level propensity scores. Marginal Structural Models are a class of causal models that typically model the marginal mean of the counterfactual outcome, and the parameters in the model correspond to average causal effects [21].

We adapted methods with the goal of disentangling the effects of time-varying components of intervention packages in studies where spillover may be present using a Marginal Structural Model. We consider the setting of an HIV prevention network-randomized trial in which only one member of each network was exposed to the intervention package by the study investigators and each participant belongs to only one network. The exposed members are hereafter denoted as "index participants". First, these individuals came forward to be an index member, then centered around each index, investigators ascertained their immediate HIV risk contacts, defined as all individuals reporting injection

or sexual risk behavior with the index, known as an *egocentric network*. Then, the networks were randomized to intervention (i.e., index is peer educator) or control condition. After the initial training (and prior to the first outcome ascertainment), the index participants in intervention networks then educate their network members about HIV risk reduction behavior, further disseminating to their network members (i.e., all participants in the network besides the index). This study design is frequently utilized in HIV prevention research among people who use drugs [22–25].

Causal inference methods for observational studies can be employed to analyze data arising from a network-randomized trial setting lacking randomization at the individual level [26]. Each component of the intervention package is considered a time-varying non-randomized exposure possibly subject to time-varying confounding. Effects can be estimated using inverse probability weights to fit Marginal Structural Models [26, 27]. This model can also be used to estimate spillover effects when an intervention package is implemented in HIV risk networks in which only one network member is exposed [28]. For example, immediate ART initiation may benefit the health outcomes of the index person in a household who is treated, for example, by improving that person's immune system and preventing tuberculosis, and it may also benefit the health outcomes of their untreated family members by preventing HIV acquisition and tuberculosis, via contact with the exposed index person, known as a *spillover* (indirect or disseminated) effect [29, 30]. We propose estimators of direct and spillover package component effects. The *direct* effect compares the risk of the outcome if a participant is an index versus a network member under network exposure to a package component. Illustrating with data from a network-randomized trial in the HIV Prevention Trials Network (HPTN), we employ inverse probability weighted (IPW) generalized linear mixed models to estimate these effects, adjusting for time-varying confounding.

Methods

Notation

Let uppercase letters denote random variables and lowercase letters denote realizations of those random variables. Let K be the total number of networks ($k = 1, \ldots, K$) and $i = 1, \ldots, n_k$ denote participants in network k. Let $\sum_k n_k = N$ be the total number of participants in the study, $j = 0, \ldots, m_{ki}$ denote the study visit for participant i in network k, where visit 0 corresponds to the baseline visit, $J_k = \sum_i m_{ki}$ denote the total number of visits across all participants in each network k, $M_k = \max_i m_{ki}$. Define Y_{kij} as the observed binary outcome for participant i in network k at

visit j. Let X_k be the randomized intervention package assignment for network k and let R_{ki} denote index (versus network member) status for participant i in network k. Let A_{hkj} denote exposure to the hth intervention component for network k at visit j, with $h = 1, \ldots, H$. We consider the exposure vectors to include the history of all package components in the study up to and including visit j. Let $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{hkj} = (A_{hk0}, A_{hk1}, \ldots, A_{hkj})^T$ be a vector of size $j \times 1$ denoting the exposure histories for component h up to and including visit j for network k. Let $\mathbf{A}_{kj} = (A_{1kj}, \ldots, A_{Hkj})^T$ denote the vector of size $H \times 1$ denoting all package component exposures in network k at visit j and let the history of the intervention package component exposures be denoted by the matrix

$$\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{kj} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{1k0} & A_{1k1} & \cdots & A_{1kj} \\ A_{2k0} & A_{2k1} & \cdots & A_{2kj} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{Hk0} & A_{Hk1} & \cdots & A_{Hkj} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{k0} & \mathbf{A}_{k1} & \ldots & \mathbf{A}_{kj} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{A}}_{1kj}^T & \bar{\mathbf{A}}_{2kj}^T & \ldots & \bar{\mathbf{A}}_{Hkj}^T \end{pmatrix}^T.$$

Let $\mathbf{Z}_{ki}$ denote a $p \times 1$ vector of baseline covariates for participant i in network k and $\mathbf{Z}_{kij}$ denote a $q \times 1$ vector of time-varying covariates for participant i in network k at visit j. Let $\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{kij}$ denote an individual's covariate history up to and including visit j. We assume that there is only one index per network in this study design and let i_k denote the unique index member in each network k. Let $\mathbf{Z}_k = (\mathbf{Z}_{k0}^T, \mathbf{Z}_{k1}^T, \ldots, \mathbf{Z}_{kn_k}^T)^T$ be a vector of size $pn_k \times 1$ baseline covariates in network k and $\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{kj} = (\mathbf{Z}_{k10}^T, \mathbf{Z}_{k11}^T, \ldots, \mathbf{Z}_{k1j}^T \ldots, \mathbf{Z}_{kn_k1}^T, \ldots, \mathbf{Z}_{kn_kj}^T)^T$ be a vector of size $qn_kj \times 1$ denoting covariate histories of all participants in network k up to and including visit j. For ease of notation, let $\mathbf{Y}_k = (Y_{k10}, Y_{k11}, \ldots, Y_{k1m_{11}}, \ldots, Y_{kn_k0}, \ldots, Y_{kn_km_{kn_k}})^T$ be the vector of size $J_k \times 1$ denoting outcomes across all participant-visits within network k. Assume $\mathbf{Y}_k \perp \mathbf{Y}_{k'}$ are independent for $k \neq k'$. Let $\mathbf{R}_k = (R_{k1}, \ldots, R_{kn_k})^T$ be a vector of size $n_k \times 1$ denoting the index membership in network k. Let $\mathbf{U}_{ki}$ be a vector of size $s \times 1$ of unmeasured baseline covariates for participant i in network k. Let $\mathbf{U}_k$ denote a vector of the unmeasured baseline covariates of all participants in network k. Furthermore, at the network level, let $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{kj}$ be a network-level aggregate function of the covariates, such as the mean of the history for a given covariate, in network k up to and including visit j. Let $\mathbf{Z}_{ki_k0}$ denote the index member covariates at baseline and $\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{ki_kj}$ denote the index member covariates in network k up to and including visit j.

There are n_k possible configurations of index status in an egocentric network. In this setting, each participant has potential outcomes $\mathbf{Y}_{ki,j+1}(\boldsymbol{r}, \bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j)$, which correspond to the $2^{H \times j} \times n_k$ vector of potential outcomes for participant i in network k at visit j under the index status indicator vector $\mathbf{R}_k = \boldsymbol{r}$ and package component history $\bar{\boldsymbol{A}}_{kj} = \bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j$.

Estimands

Let $\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j$ denote a possible history of all package components from baseline up to and including visit j. Assuming only one index per network and that the effects depend on the network package intervention and index status, but not specifically who is the index (i.e., stratified interference assumption [31]), the potential outcomes of interest are $Y_{ki,j+1}(r, \bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j)$. The *direct* package effect is a contrast in average potential outcomes under index versus network member status if the network is exposed component history $\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j$; that is, on the ratio scale, $RR^D(\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j) = E[Y_{ki,j+1}(r = 1, \bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j)]/E[Y_{ki,j+1}(r = 0, \bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j)]$. The *spillover* package effect compares the average potential outcomes if a participant is a network member under network component history $\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j$ versus no component history exposure $\bar{\mathbf{0}}$; that is, $RR^S(\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j) = E[Y_{ki,j+1}(r = 0, \bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j)]/E[Y_{ki,j+1}(r = 0, \bar{\mathbf{0}})]$. The *composite* package effect is $RR^{Comp}(\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j) = E[Y_{ki,j+1}(r = 1, \bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j)]/E[Y_{ki,j+1}(r = 0, \bar{\mathbf{0}})]$; that is, a comparison of the average potential outcomes if an index under network component history exposure $\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j$ versus if a network member under no component history exposure $\bar{\mathbf{0}}$. Marginalizing over the index status, the *overall* package effect compares average potential outcomes under component history exposure $\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j$ versus no exposure, denoted as $RR^{Overall}(\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j) = E[Y_{ki,j+1}(\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j)]/E[Y_{ki,j+1}(\bar{\mathbf{0}})]$[28]. Analogous effects can be defined on the difference scale and other definitions of these effects are possible.

Assumptions

We assume partial interference, which allows for spillover between any members of an egocentric network, but not between networks [32]. We assume there is correlation between outcomes in a network and no contamination across study intervention arms [29]. For the time-varying package components $\mathbf{A}_{kj}$, exchangeability may not hold because the network-level exposure is determined by both the randomization scheme and index visit attendance. However, we assume that exchangeability holds conditional on network-level time-varying covariates. At the individual level conditional on $\mathbf{Z}_{ki}$ and $\mathbf{U}_{ki}$, we assume conditional *index member exchangeability* because the index status is self-selected; that is, $Y_{ki,j+1}(\boldsymbol{r}, \bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j) \perp \mathbf{R}_{ki}|\mathbf{Z}_{ki}, \mathbf{U}_{ki}$ [28, 33]. For the time-varying package components in network k, we assume $Y_{ki,j+1}(\boldsymbol{r}, \bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j) \perp \mathbf{A}_{kj}|\{\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{k,j-1} = \bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_{k,j-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{kj}, \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_{ki_kj}\}$ for $j = 0, \ldots, m_{ki}$. That is, we assume that exchangeability of potential outcomes corresponding to the package component exposures holds conditional on each network's package component history and a network-level aggregate of covariate history, as well as its index member's covariate history up to and including the prior visit j. The covariates required for exchangeability are ascertained from previous visits because the component

exposure is defined by index visit attendance, which can only be modeled across all indexes using information from previous visits. The positivity assumption ensures we have networks exposed (and not exposed) to each of the components at each level of the index and network-level covariates. This assumption also requires we have participants who are indexes (and network members) at each level of the individual-level covariates. In fact, if two components were always delivered simultaneously and there was perfect compliance, we would not be able to disentangle the package component effects. For causal consistency, we also assume treatment variation irrelevance for the package components, which ensures we have only one version of exposed to each component and one version of not exposed, which clarifies how the potential outcomes relate to each package intervention exposure. We also assume that data from missed visits and drop out due to loss to follow-up are missing completely at random [34].

Estimation and Inference

We estimate the effect of each package component in a single model, while considering the presence of the remaining package components [28]. This outcome model is adjusted for individual-level confounding at baseline and inverse probability weighted to adjust for network level time-varying confounding. In Appendix A, we describe the models for the weights used to control for time-varying confounding in the Marginal Structural Model. Assuming that the package components and index status are not modified by the covariates (e.g., there are no $\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j$ by $\mathbf{Z}_{ki}$ interactions) and the log-binomial generalized linear mixed model fits the data, the Marginal Structural Model is

$$\log\{E[Y_{ki,j+1}(r, \bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j)|\mathbf{Z}_{ki}]\} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 r_{ki} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_2 \bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_{kj} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_3 r_{ki} \bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_{kj} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_4 \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \ . \tag{1}$$

In this model, two random intercepts are included for correlation within participants and within networks as a working correlation structure. Recall that $\mathbf{U}_{ki}$ is a vector of unmeasured baseline covariates that may affect R_{ki} within levels of the baseline covariates $\mathbf{Z}_{ki}$. Thus, even after conditioning on $\mathbf{Z}_{ki}$, our estimators that involve R_{ki} may require further adjustment for unmeasured confounding $\mathbf{U}_{ki}$. To adjust for baseline differences between index and non-index members by accounting for unmeasured covariates $\mathbf{U}_{ki}$, we consider the term $\beta_1 = \log\{E[Y_{ki,j+1}(r = 1, \bar{\mathbf{0}})|\mathbf{Z}_{ki}]\} - \log\{E[Y_{ki,j+1}(r = 0, \bar{\mathbf{0}})|\mathbf{Z}_{ki}]\}$ for the definition of these estimators, assuming (1) holds. If conditional exchangeability does not hold, $\hat{\beta}_1$ may be different from the null, and using this term could strengthen the plausibility of exchangeability for index status. The β_1 term could be written as a different expression for alternative outcome models. Extending results in Buchanan et al. [28], suppressing the notation for the

covariates for ease of notation, estimators for each of the parameters are

$$\widehat{RR}^{D}(\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}) = \left(\widehat{E}[Y_{ki,j+1}(r=1,\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j)]/\widehat{E}[Y_{ki,j+1}(r=0,\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j)]\right)\exp(\hat{\beta}_1)^{-1} = \exp(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_3\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j)$$
$$\widehat{RR}^{S}(\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}) = \widehat{E}[Y_{ki,j+1}(r=0,\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j)]/\widehat{E}[Y_{ki,j+1}(r=0,\bar{\mathbf{0}})] = \exp(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_2\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j)$$
$$\widehat{RR}^{Comp}(\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}) = \left(\widehat{E}[Y_{ki,j+1}(r=1,\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j)]/\widehat{E}[Y_{ki,j+1}(r=0,\bar{\mathbf{0}})]\right)\exp(\hat{\beta}_1)^{-1} = \exp\left((\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_2+\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_3)\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j\right) .$$

On the relative rate scale, $\exp(\beta_2\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j)$ can be interpreted as the causal spillover effect of exposure to intervention package component history exposure $\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_j$ versus no intervention package component exposure from baseline up to and including visit j. For log links as employed in this paper, the conditional and marginal model parameters of interest are equivalent because the conditional mean is additive in the fixed and random effects; thus, the estimated effects can be interpreted as either participant-level and/or population-level estimates [35, 36]. We consider a model for quantifying the effects of multiple package components that includes pairwise interactions between components in a single model (Appendix B). We used an empirical sandwich estimator of the variance from the generalized linear mixed model with a working correlation structure specified by within-participant and within-network random intercepts to construct 95% Wald-type confidence intervals (CIs) [34, 37].

Illustrative Example

HIV Prevention Trials Network Protocol 037

The HPTN Protocol 037 was a Phase III, network-randomized controlled HIV prevention trial with 696 participants who were PWID and their HIV risk networks in Philadelphia, PA, US [13]. This study evaluated the efficacy of a network-oriented peer education intervention package to promote HIV risk reduction among PWID and their HIV risk network. Participants were followed for up to 30 months with visits every six months. Index participants whose network was randomized to the intervention received an intervention package that consisted of an educational intervention at baseline with six 2-hour peer educator sessions during the first four weeks and educational boosters at six and 12 months. The initial training educated indexes in the intervention networks through role-playing actives and developing communication skills: 1) promote safer sex and drug injection skills among network members, and 2) communication strategies to reach peers and promote norms about HIV risk reduction. At the booster sessions, indexes had the opportunity to troubleshoot, share their experiences, improve communication, and bolster motivation as peer educators. An

intervention network was exposed if its index member attended a visit when a package component was administered. Participants in both the intervention and control conditions received HIV counseling, and testing at each study visit [13]. Table 1 presents the intervention package evaluated in HPTN 037.

We are interested in the effect of the additional boosters among those who received the initial intervention and the direct and spillover effects of the intervention package components. Exposure to the booster was defined as a time-updated variable lagged by one visit accounting for the most recent exposure only. In this illustrative example, we estimated one effect of the initial intervention and one effect of the boosters across all study visits that describe the patterns of change in the probability of response over time in the study population. Direct and spillover effects of the package components were evaluated through comparisons of the report of any injection-related risk behavior and included the following: sharing injection equipment (needles, cookers, cotton, and rinse water), front and back loading (i.e., injecting drugs from one syringe to another), and injecting with people not well known or in shooting gallery in the past month. Following the original analysis of this study [13], these outcomes were assessed among participants who reported injection drug use in the six months prior to baseline. The longitudinal data were used to assess the effects of the intervention on the inter-visit rates of any injection-related risk behavior using a multilevel generalized linear mixed model with a working correlation specified through random effects (independent correlation structure) to obtain marginal estimates with robust standard errors.

Ideally, we would include all covariates that were known or suspected risk factors; however, this resulted in overparameterization of the model given the size of the study. We employed a variable selection procedure (Appendix C). To summarize, for covariates with P value < 0.20 in the univariate models, we performed backward selection (P value < 0.20) for individual-, index-, and network-level covariates (in that order), then replaced the selected covariates with their time-varying versions (if applicable). Lastly, we generated all pairwise interaction terms and performed backward selection (P value < 0.20). The outcome models were adjusted for baseline individual-level covariates that were known or suspected risk factors for the outcome, including race (nonwhite vs. white), ethnicity (Hispanic vs. non-Hispanic), report of any injection risk behavior (yes vs. no), injected daily in the last month (yes vs. no), alcohol use (got drunk vs. no), and injected heroin or heroin and cocaine (yes vs. no) and network-level average age and prevalence of nonwhite race, report of any injection risk behavior, cocaine use, and injected heroin or heroin and cocaine. Models with time-varying covariates were adjusted for the same set of individual-, index-, and network-level covariates included

in the baseline model (except report of injected heroin or heroin/cocaine was excluded because most indexes in the intervention reported this).

Time-varying confounding was adjusted for using stabilized inverse probability weights (IPW) (Appendix A). The IPW generalized linear mixed model with a log link and binomial distribution was fit by weighting individual participants according to their estimated stabilized weights. In intervention networks only, the weight models were estimated in the network-level data with one record per network per visit, pooling across the visits where the network-level exposure status could change (e.g., 12- to 18-month visits). The denominator weight models included selected time-varying network-level aggregate covariates, index member covariates that were known or suspected risk factors for the outcome, and selected pairwise interactions, which allowed for more flexibility in the model specification, and the package component exposure at the previous visit. The numerator weight model included the package component exposure at the previous visit and selected baseline network-level covariates and index member covariates that were known or suspected risk factors for the outcome, which were also included in the outcome model. Both the models for the numerator and denominator of the weights included a variable for time specified as study visit month. For some of the models, the log Binomial models did not converge and log Poisson models, which provide consistent but not fully efficient estimates of the relative risk, were used [35, 38]. In examination of the distribution of the weights, there was no evidence of model misspecification or positivity violations because the mean of the stabilized weights distribution was approximately one (standard deviation (SD) = 0.08; minimum = 0.10; maximum = 2.13; Table A1). For comparison to traditional methods, we also presented models that adjusted for baseline covariates only or included the time-varying covariates in the outcome model, and both of these methods may result in estimates that do not confer a causal interpretation due to bias (Appendix A). Additional results, including sensitivity analysis for effect modification by study visit month, are included in Appendix D (Table A2). The data analysis for this paper was generated using SAS software (Version 9.4), and we provide example SAS code in Appendix E.

Results

There were 696 participants, 651 reported injection drug use at baseline, and 560 participants had at least one follow-up visit with a total of 1,598 person visits. The size of the networks ranged from two to seven participants and network size was not associated with the outcome (P value = 0.40). Among the 560 participants, 270 (48%) were in intervention networks. Of the 232 indexes

who reported injection drug behavior at baseline, 112 (48%) index participants received the initial peer education intervention. Table 2 displays the number of participants who received initial peer education and each booster session; 70 (44%) index participants received the 6-month booster, and 59 (47%) index participants received the 12-month booster.

Regardless of the adjustment approach, the estimated spillover effect for the initial peer education intervention was comparable (Table 3). In the IPW models, there was an estimated 13% reduction in the spillover rate of report of any injection risk behavior (95% CI = -31%, 10%). Adjusting with the IP weights, the estimated spillover rate reduction for the boosters was a 39% reduction (95% CI = -57%, -13%). We expect a rate of reporting any injection risk behavior 39% lower in network members within the intervention networks with recent exposure to the 6- or 12- month booster in addition to the initial training compared to within the control networks. The estimated direct effect of the initial peer education intervention was protective but not significantly different from the null, regardless of the covariate adjustment approach; however, the estimated direct effect of the booster in addition to the initial intervention was null. In the IPW models, the estimated initial and booster composite effects were protective with a 24% (95% CI = -44%, 2%) and 37% rate reduction (95% CI = -57%, -8%), respectively. The estimated overall effects of the initial and booster were protective with a 17% (95% CI = -31%, 0%) and 38% (95% CI = -54%, -18%) rate reduction, respectively. We expect a 17% reduction in the overall rate of reporting injection risk behavior if the networks are exposed to the initial intervention and not recently exposed to the 6- or 12-month booster compared to control networks. Furthermore, we expect a 38% decrease in the overall rate of reporting injection risk behavior if the intervention networks are recently exposed to the 6- or 12-month booster in addition to the initial training compared to under the control condition. Based on the parameterization of the Marginal Structural Model, the rate ratios could be interpreted as the estimates from a trial in which participants are randomized to the booster at six months, 12 months, or no booster at either visit [39]. For the spillover effect of the boosters by study visit, the magnitude of the estimated effect was larger at 12 months (46% reduction in the spillover rate; 95% CI = (0.36, 0.81)), compared to 18 months (31% reduction in spillover rate; 95% CI = 0.44, 1.10). The magnitude of the estimated spillover effect of the initial intervention was comparable across study visits (Table A2).

Discussion

We proposed an approach to quantify the direct and spillover effects of intervention packages for network-randomized trials. This setting could also arise in a network-randomized study with non-compliance or treatment ineligibility for some network members. We adapted existing causal inference methods to evaluate time-varying components of intervention packages in studies where spillover may be present. Estimating these effects provides information about the impact of individual package components and their spillover to network members from an exposed index participant. These methods provide a more in-depth understanding of package components' effects for exposed index participants and those sharing networks with exposed participants.

In HPTN 037, the estimated overall effect was larger in magnitude for the booster with initial intervention, as compared to the initial intervention alone, highlighting the importance of continued training for peer educators in this context. Interestingly, a protective spillover effect was observed for network members for the initial and booster interventions, without a corresponding direct benefit for those trained to be peer educators. We found evidence that booster sessions strengthen the spillover of the intervention, which can be utilized when developing peer-led interventions [40].

This work is particularly timely as there are several HIV combination prevention cluster-randomized trials that warrant evaluation of the intervention packages effects, as well as the spillover effects within communities, to better understand the effects of TasP [3, 41]. Understanding the components that may be driving the observed effects of the intervention package could inform modifications to the existing public health strategies in these settings by strengthening highly effective components and redeveloping those found to be partially effective or ineffective [5–7, 9, 11, 12]. Evaluation of the universal "test and treat" interventions could include assessment of the intervention's impact on the health outcomes among those in the communities assigned to immediate ART scale-up but who did not receive immediate ART themselves. As in vaccine campaign design, this could inform the level of ART coverage needed to benefit the community and consistently achieve such targets as the UNAIDS 2025 [42].

The assumption of no unmeasured covariates associated with the network-level exposure and outcome or with the index status and outcome is untestable. Future work could develop methods to assess the sensitivity of these methods to unmeasured confounders [43]. The weight and outcome models were assumed to be correct (e.g., correct functional forms of covariates). This is not guaranteed in practice, and sensitivity analyses could be performed to evaluate the robustness of results to

model specification. In addition, we do not expect any structural violations of positivity, as both the index status and each of the package components can occur at each level of the measured covariates; however, given the number of covariates included, we used a parametric model for the weights [44]. We also assumed that any data from missing visits were ignorable with respect to valid estimation of intervention effects. These models could be extended to include censoring weights to adjust for possibly differential loss to follow-up due to dropout [45]. In HPTN 037, the ascertainment of personal networks of index participants is likely only a partial ascertainment of each person's network, which limits the evaluation of spillover within the networks of recruited individuals. Our methods will be a valuable tool to evaluate randomized and non-randomized intervention packages in a single study with network features.

Table 1: Interventions in HPTN 037 by study arm and network membership

Study Arm	**Behavioral Intervention**	
	Index Participant	**Network Members**
Experimental Arm	Enhanced HIV counseling and testing *plus* Six 2-hour network-orientated peer-educator sessions during weeks 1 to 4 (initial intervention) *and* Booster session at months 6 and 12	Enhanced HIV Counseling and Testing
Control Arm	Enhanced HIV Counseling and Testing	Enhanced HIV Counseling and Testing

Table 2: Package components received by index and network members during follow-up among HPTN 037 participants who reported injecting drugs at baseline and had at least one follow-up visit after baseline (n = 560)

	Network Member Role	
	Index	**Network Member**[1]
Initial Peer Education ($n = 560$)[2]	97/201 (48%)	173/359 (48%)
6-Month Booster ($n = 447$)	70/159 (44%)	128/288 (44%)
12-Month Booster ($n = 344$)	59/125 (47%)	106/219 (48%)

[1]Network member exposure determined by randomized package and their index's visit attendance.

[2] Reported n is the total number of participants who had at least some follow-up after baseline.

Table 3: Estimated rate ratios (RR) for the direct, spillover, composite and overall effects of the HPTN 037 peer education package components on reducing report of any injection risk behavior (per person-visit) during follow-up with 95% confidence intervals (CI) among participants with at least one follow-up visit[1]

	Direct		**Spillover**	
	Initial	Booster	Initial	Booster
Unadjusted	0.94 (0.65, 1.36)	1.03 (0.64, 1.66)	0.86 (0.66, 1.11)	0.59 (0.39, 0.87)
Adjusted for baseline covariates[2]	0.87 (0.59, 1.26)	1.05 (0.65, 1.68)	0.87 (0.69, 1.10)	0.62 (0.43, 0.88)
Adjusted for baseline and TV covariates[2,3]	0.83 (0.57, 1.21)	1.00 (0.62, 1.64)	0.88 (0.69, 1.11)	0.72 (0.49, 1.06)
IP-weighted	0.87 (0.60, 1.27)	1.03 (0.64, 1.65)	0.87 (0.69, 1.10)	0.61 (0.43, 0.87)
	Overall		**Composite**	
	Initial	Booster	Initial	Booster
Unadjusted	0.84 (0.68, 1.04)	0.59 (0.43, 0.82)	0.80 (0.59, 1.10)	0.60 (0.41, 0.89)
Adjusted for baseline covariates[2]	0.82 (0.68, 0.99)	0.63 (0.47, 0.83)	0.75 (0.56, 1.01)	0.64 (0.44, 0.94)
Adjusted for baseline and TV covariates[2,3]	0.82 (0.68, 0.98)	0.72 (0.54, 0.96)	0.73 (0.55, 0.96)	0.72 (0.51, 1.02)
IP-weighted	0.83 (0.69, 0.99)	0.62 (0.46, 0.82)	0.76 (0.56, 1.02)	0.63 (0.43, 0.92)

[1] Analysis included a total of 560 participants and 1,598 person-visits with 509 events total.

[2] Baseline covariates included individual-level race (nonwhite vs. white), Hispanic (yes vs. no), report of any injection risk behavior (yes vs. no), injected daily in the last month (yes vs. no), and alcohol use (got drunk vs. no), index member race (nonwhite vs. white), index report of any injection risk behavior (yes vs. no), index injected daily in the last month (yes vs. no), and index injected heroin or heroin and cocaine (yes vs. no) and network-level average age and network-level prevalence of nonwhite race, report of any injection risk behavior, cocaine use, and injected heroin or heroin and cocaine.

[3] Adjusted for the same individual-level covariates included in the baseline model and also the time-varying version of the index member and network-level covariates included in the baseline model, except for time-varying index member report of injected heroin or heroin and cocaine, which was excluded because most index participants in the intervention group reported this behavior.

Acknowledgements

We thank Drs. Deborah Donnell and Carl Latkin for access to the HIV Prevention Trials Network (HPTN) 037 data and their valuable suggestions. Data from the HPTN were obtained with support from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), National Institute of Allergies and Infectious Disease (NIAID), and National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) under National Institutes of Health (NIH) grants UM1AI068x619 (HPTN Leadership and Operations Center), UM1AI068617 (HPTN Statistical and Data Management Center), and UM1AI068613 (HPTN Laboratory Center).

References

1. Padian NS, McCoy SI, Manian S, Wilson D, Schwartländer B, Bertozzi SM. Evaluation of large-scale combination HIV prevention programs: essential issues. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*. 2011; 58(2):e23–e28.

2. DeGruttola V, Smith DM, Little SJ, Miller V. Developing and evaluating comprehensive HIV infection control strategies: Issues and challenges. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2010; 50(3):S102–S107.

3. Kurth AE, Celum C, Baeten JM, Vermund SH, Wasserheit JN. Combination HIV prevention: Significance, challenges, and opportunities. *Current HIV/AIDS Reports*. 2011; 8(1):62–72.

4. Padian NS, Holmes CB, McCoy SI, Lyerla R, Bouey PD, Goosby EP. Implementation science for the US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR). *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*. 2011; 56(3):199–203.

5. Tanser F, Bärnighausen T, Grapsa E, Zaidi J, Newell ML. High coverage of ART associated with decline in risk of HIV acquisition in rural KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Science*. 2013; 339(6122):966–971.

6. Hayes R, Moulton L. *Cluster Randomised Trials*. London: Taylor & Francis, 2009.

7. Hayes R, Ayles H, Beyers N, Sabapathy K, Floyd S, Shanaube K, et al. HPTN 071 (PopART): Rationale and design of a cluster-randomised trial of the population impact of an HIV combination prevention intervention including universal testing and treatment–a study protocol for a cluster randomised trial. *Trials*. 2014; 15(1):57.

8. Hayes RJ, Donnell D, Floyd S, Mandla N, Bwalya J, Sabapathy K, et al. Effect of universal testing and treatment on HIV incidence – HPTN 071 (PopART). *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2019; 381(3):207–218.

9. Iwuji CC, Orne-Gliemann J, Tanser F, Boyer S, Lessells RJ, Lert F, et al. Evaluation of the impact of immediate versus WHO recommendations-guided antiretroviral therapy initiation on HIV incidence: The ANRS 12249 TasP (Treatment as Prevention) trial in Hlabisa sub-district, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa: Study protocol for a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Trials*. 2013; 14(1):230.

10. Iwuji CC, Orne-Gliemann J, Larmarange J, Balestre E, Thiebaut R, Tanser F, et al. Universal test and treat and the HIV epidemic in rural South Africa: A phase 4, open-label, community cluster randomised trial. *The Lancet HIV*. 2018; 5(3):e116–e125.

11. Chamie G, Kwarisiima D, Clark TD, Kabami J, Jain V, Geng E, et al. Leveraging rapid community-based HIV testing campaigns for non-communicable diseases in rural Uganda. *PloS one*. 2012; 7 (8):e43400.

12. Chamie G, Kwarisiima D, Clark TD, Kabami J, Jain V, Geng E, et al. Uptake of community-based HIV testing during a multi-disease health campaign in rural Uganda. *PloS one*. 2014; 9(1):e84317.

13. Latkin CA, Donnell D, Metzger D, Sherman S, Aramrattna A, Davis-Vogel A, et al. The efficacy of a network intervention to reduce HIV risk behaviors among drug users and risk partners in Chiang Mai, Thailand and Philadelphia, USA. *Social Science and Medicine*. 2009; 68(4):740–748.

14. Nikolopoulos GK, Pavlitina E, Muth SQ, Schneider J, Psichogiou M, Williams LD, et al. A network intervention that locates and intervenes with recently HIV-infected persons: The Transmission Reduction Intervention Project (TRIP). *Scientific Reports*. 2016; 6.

15. Spoth R, Guyll M, Lillehoj CJ, Redmond C, Greenberg M. Prosper study of evidence-based intervention implementation quality by community–university partnerships. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 2007; 35(8):981–999.

16. Crowley DM, Coffman DL, Feinberg ME, Greenberg MT, Spoth RL. Evaluating the impact of implementation factors on family-based prevention programming: Methods for strengthening causal inference. *Prevention Science*. 2014; 15(2):246–255.

17. Lippman SA, Shade SB, Hubbard AE. Inverse probability weighting in STI/HIV prevention research: methods for evaluating social and community interventions. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases*. 2010; 37(8):512–518.

18. Howe CJ, Cole SR, Mehta SH, Kirk GD. Estimating the effects of multiple time-varying exposures using joint marginal structural models: alcohol consumption, injection drug use, and HIV acquisition. *Epidemiology*. 2012; 23(4):574–582.

19. Hernán MA, Brumback B, Robins JM. Marginal structural models to estimate the joint causal effect of nonrandomized treatments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 2001; 96(454):440–448.

20. He J, Stephens-Shields A, Joffe M. Marginal structural models to estimate the effects of time-varying treatments on clustered outcomes in the presence of interference. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*. 2019; 28(2):613–625.

21. Hernán MA, Robins JM. *Causal Inference: What If*. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2020.

22. Friedman SR, Bolyard M, Khan M, Maslow C, Sandoval M, Mateu-Gelabert P, et al. Group sex events and HIV/STI risk in an urban network. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*. 2008; 49(4):440–446.

23. Khan MR, Epperson MW, Mateu-Gelabert P, Bolyard M, Sandoval M, Friedman SR. Incarceration, sex with an STI-or HIV-infected partner, and infection with an STI or HIV in Bushwick, Brooklyn, NY: A social network perspective. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2011; 101(6):1110–1117.

24. Friedman S, Bolyard M, Sandoval M, Mateu-Gelabert P, Maslow C, Zenilman J. Relative prevalence of different sexually transmitted infections in HIV-discordant sexual partnerships: Data from a risk network study in a high-risk New York neighbourhood. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*. 2008; 84(1):17–18.

25. Tobin KE, Kuramoto SJ, Davey-Rothwell MA, Latkin CA. The STEP into Action study: A peer-based, personal risk network-focused HIV prevention intervention with injection drug users in Baltimore, Maryland. *Addiction*. 2011; 106(2):366–375.

26. Robins JM, Hernan MA, Brumback B. Marginal structural models and causal inference in epidemiology. *Epidemiology*. 2000; 11(5):550–560.

27. Hernán MÁ, Brumback B, Robins JM. Marginal structural models to estimate the causal effect of zidovudine on the survival of HIV-positive men. *Epidemiology*. 2000; 11(5):561–571.

28. Buchanan A, Vermund S, Friedman S, Spiegelman D. Assessing Individual and Disseminated Effects in Network-Randomized Studies. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2018; 187(11):2449–2459.

29. Benjamin-Chung J, Arnold BF, Berger D, Luby SP, Miguel E, Colford Jr JM, et al. Spillover effects in epidemiology: parameters, study designs and methodological considerations. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2018; 47(1):332–347.

30. Halloran ME, Hudgens MG. Dependent happenings: A recent methodological review. *Current Epidemiology Reports*. 2016; 3(4):297–305.

31. Sobel ME. What do randomized studies of housing mobility demonstrate? Causal inference in the face of interference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 2006; 101(476):1398–1407.

32. Hudgens MG, Halloran ME. Toward causal inference with interference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 2008; 103(482):832–842.

33. Ogburn EL, VanderWeele TJ. Causal diagrams for interference. *Statistical Science*. 2014; 29(4):559–578.

34. Fitzmaurice GM, Laird NM, Ware JH. *Applied Longitudinal Analysis*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2012.

35. Spiegelman D, Hertzmark E. Easy SAS calculations for risk or prevalence ratios and differences. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2005; 162(3):199–200.

36. Ritz J, Spiegelman D. Equivalence of conditional and marginal regression models for clustered and longitudinal data. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*. 2004; 13:309–323.

37. Stefanski LA, Boos DD. The calculus of M-estimation. *The American Statistician*. 2002; 56:29–38.

38. Zou G. A modified poisson regression approach to prospective studies with binary data. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2004; 159(7):702–706.

39. Breskin A, Cole SR, Westreich D. Exploring the subtleties of inverse probability weighting and marginal structural models. *Epidemiology*. 2018; 29(3):352–355.

40. Lancaster KE, Miller WC, Kiriazova T, Sarasvita R, Bui Q, Ha TV, et al. Designing an individually tailored multilevel intervention to increase engagement in HIV and substance use treatment among people who inject drugs with HIV: HPTN 074. *AIDS Education and Prevention*. 2019; 31(2):95–110.

41. Perriat D, Balzer L, Hayes R, Lockman S, Walsh F, Ayles H, et al. Comparative assessment of five trials of universal HIV testing and treatment in sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*. 2018; 21(1):e25048.

42. De Lay PR, Benzaken A, Karim QA, Aliyu S, Amole C, Ayala G, et al. Ending AIDS as a public health threat by 2030: Time to reset targets for 2025. *PLoS Medicine*. 2021; 18(6):e1003649.

43. VanderWeele TJ, Tchetgen Tchetgen EJ, Halloran ME. Interference and sensitivity analysis. *Statistical Science*. 2014; 29(4):687–706.

44. Cole SR, Hernán MA. Constructing inverse probability weights for marginal structural models. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2008; 168(6):656–664.

45. Robins JM, Finkelstein DM. Correcting for noncompliance and dependent censoring in an AIDS clinical trial with inverse probability of censoring weighted log-rank tests. *Biometrics*. 2000; 56(3):779–788.

46. Hernán MA, Robins JM. Using big data to emulate a target trial when a randomized trial is not available. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2016; 183(8):758–764.

47. Cole SR, Platt RW, Schisterman EF, Chu H, Westreich D, Richardson D, et al. Illustrating bias due to conditioning on a collider. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2010; 39(2):417–420.

48. Bang H, Robins JM. Doubly robust estimation in missing data and causal inference models. *Biometrics*. 2005; 61(4):962–973.