Prospects of HIV elimination among men who have sex with men: a systematic review of modeling studies

Jacob Aiden Roberts, MSc*[1], Alexandra Teslya, PhD[1], Prof Mirjam E. Kretzschmar, PhD[1,2,3], Prof Janneke H.H.M. van de Wijgert, MD PhD MPH[1], and Ganna Rozhnova, PhD†[1,2,4,5]

[1]Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

[2]Center for Complex Systems Studies (CCSS), Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

[3]Institute of Epidemiology and Social Medicine, University of Münster, Münster, Germany

[4]BioISI—Biosystems & Integrative Sciences Institute, Faculty of Sciences, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal

[5]Faculty of Sciences, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal

September 22, 2024

*Corresponding author:

Jacob Aiden Roberts

Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care

University Medical Center Utrecht

P.O. Box 85500 Utrecht

The Netherlands

Email: j.a.roberts@umcutrecht.nl

Phone: +31 631119057

†Corresponding author:

Dr. Ganna Rozhnova

Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care

University Medical Center Utrecht

P.O. Box 85500 Utrecht

The Netherlands

Email: g.rozhnova@umcutrecht.nl

Phone: +31 683890206

Abstract

Background Despite advances in HIV treatment and prevention, men who have sex with men (MSM) remain disproportionately affected by HIV worldwide. This systematic review summarizes the results of mathematical modeling studies that evaluated whether interventions might eliminate HIV in MSM populations by geographical setting, type of intervention(s), elimination definition, and model characteristics.

Methods We searched Embase and PubMed for modeling studies published between July 1, 2016 and August 7, 2023. Studies were included if they used a dynamic model to assess the impact of interventions on HIV transmission among MSM. Data were extracted on article information, study population, interventions, elimination definitions, model type, model structure, and calibration. The studies were critically appraised by evaluating the comprehensiveness of their models in addressing elimination.

Findings Of the 2,732 identified records, 80 studies were included. MSM populations in only five of the eight Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) regions were modeled, with over half of the models considering MSM in the USA. Complex agent-based models were the most common overall, while simpler compartmental models predominated outside Western and Central Europe and North America. Thirty-five of the 80 studies defined elimination as reductions or thresholds in HIV incidence or prevalence, a reproduction number below one, or the elimination of racial disparities. Elimination was achieved in 32 out of 44 modeled scenarios, but the authors of only six of these 32 scenarios thought the interventions required to achieve elimination were feasible. The six feasible elimination scenarios were reported in compartmental models for few countries in Western Europe and Asia. Models in which elimination was achieved most commonly used a combination of interventions that included pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) and/or test-and-treat, except in Africa, where PrEP was not included.

Interpretation Modeling efforts to understand HIV elimination prospects among MSM outside Western and Central Europe and North America should be intensified. Various definitions of elimination reflect perspectives from both modeling and public health. To enhance study comparability and for models to contribute effectively to public health policy, the use of an elimination definition based on an incidence threshold would be the most valuable. Furthermore, by identifying gaps in current studies, we recommend novel research directions for modeling to inform a coordinated global response for HIV elimination among MSM.

Funding Aidsfonds, EU.

Introduction

The HIV epidemic remains a major public health problem, particularly among key populations [1]. The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) considers men who have sex with men (MSM) as one of the main key populations vulnerable to HIV acquisition and transmission. Despite considerable progress in HIV prevention and treatment overall, MSM continue to have a disproportionately high HIV incidence and prevalence worldwide [1]. In 2022, global HIV prevalence among MSM was eleven times higher than among adults in the general population [2]. Alarmingly, the annual number of new HIV infections among MSM increased by 11% globally and by 19% outside

sub-Saharan Africa from 2010 to 2022 [3]. Contrasting trends in reaching elimination among MSM are currently observed in different UNAIDS regions. Some countries in Western and Central Europe and North America are characterized by a rapidly slowing epidemic (e.g., [4–6]), while emerging and ongoing HIV epidemics are reported in the Middle East and North Africa [7, 8], the Caribbean [9], and no evidence of slowing epidemics is found in Africa [10].

To address a disproportionate burden of HIV among MSM, interventions such as classical partner reduction and condom use approaches, pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) [11], and test-and-treat [12] are used either separately or in combination to reach this key population [13]. Predicting the impact of interventions on HIV dynamics at the population level empirically is challenging. Mathematical modeling can guide the design of interventions and plays an increasingly important role in supporting evidence-based policymaking in public health [14]. Models describe transmission dynamics using equations and/or computer simulations. Modeling studies are often the only way to investigate large-scale complex HIV dynamics, particularly in cases where experiments are not ethical or logistically impossible. A well-designed model can assist policymakers in making decisions on HIV control and elimination.

Despite a large body of modeling studies that investigate the impact of interventions on HIV transmission dynamics [15], including the assessment of HIV elimination strategies [4, 16], the literature concerning the prospects of HIV elimination among MSM worldwide is inconsistent. The success of HIV elimination in a specific context depends on a combination of factors, such as the target population, the state of the HIV epidemic, HIV care and prevention practices, and details of sexual behavior that shape HIV transmission among MSM. Evaluation of HIV elimination prospects is complicated by the fact that different authors use different definitions of elimination, posing a barrier to a unified response. HIV elimination is usually considered accomplished upon reaching a certain quantifiable threshold, often based on guidelines issued by (inter)national public health authorities. Definitions of elimination include achieving zero new HIV infections, reducing HIV incidence to a low level, or reaching a point where the HIV epidemic is no longer a public health threat [17]. A 90% reduction in HIV incidence by 2030 is an example of the latter definition used in ending the HIV epidemic goals in the USA [18]. The elimination definition of fewer than one HIV infection per 1,000 persons per year was adopted from the seminal modeling study by Granich et al. [12], which received attention from the public health community by demonstrating the possibility of HIV elimination.

This systematic review aims to improve our understanding of the prospects of HIV elimination among MSM globally. We summarized mathematical modeling studies by (i) geographical setting where elimination may or may not be achieved, (ii) elimination definitions used, and (iii) interventions required to achieve elimination. We discuss the knowledge gaps in these areas and identify further modeling research needed to better inform policy about effective intervention strategies for ultimately achieving the ambitious goal of HIV elimination among MSM.

Methods

This systematic review adhered to PRISMA guidelines [19]. The full PRISMA checklist is available in Appendix 1. No protocol was registered for this review.

Search strategy and selection criteria

Embase and PubMed were searched for studies published between July 1, 2016 and August 7, 2023, when the search was conducted. The starting date was chosen to coincide with the publication of the World Health Organization (WHO) consolidated guidelines on the use of antiretroviral drugs for treating and preventing HIV infection [20]. The search string was ("HIV" OR "human immunodeficiency virus") AND ("homosexual*" OR "transgender*" OR "gay" OR "MSM" OR "men who have sex with men" OR "men having sex with men" OR "bisexual*") AND ("model*" OR "framework" OR "simulat*") AND ("treat*" OR "prevent*") AND ("mathematic*" OR "transm*" OR "comput*").

Studies were included if they (i) involved a dynamic model for HIV transmission, where the force of infection depends on the state of the population at a given time, and (ii) assessed the impact of interventions on HIV transmission among MSM. Studies for HIV transmission in a broader population involving MSM were included if they reported a direct or indirect impact of interventions on HIV outcomes among MSM specifically. Studies that involved a dynamic co-transmission model of HIV and another sexually transmitted infection (STI) were included if the primary outcome was HIV. As we were interested in the epidemiological impact of interventions assessed using dynamic transmission models, statistical, back-calculation, decision-analytic, and health economic models primarily focused on cost-effectiveness evaluations were excluded. Studies focused on methodology rather than the impact of interventions on HIV transmission were excluded. Conference abstracts, reviews, preprints, articles not published in English, or without full text were also excluded.

Data extraction and analysis

Two authors independently screened the titles and abstracts for inclusion and identified eligible studies using Rayyan software. Three authors independently conducted full-text screening and extracted data using a predefined data extraction form. Study inclusion was by consensus. Rare disagreements were resolved through detailed discussions of the studies in question. The authors regularly compared extracted data to ensure consistency in the review process. Data were extracted on article information, study population, interventions, elimination definition, model type, model structure, and calibration (43 data fields in total; Appendix 2). Data fields were summarized descriptively unless quantitative data were available.

Studies were categorized geographically by country and by UNAIDS region (Asia and the Pacific, Caribbean, Eastern and Southern Africa, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, Latin America, Middle East and North Africa, Western

and Central Africa, Western and Central Europe and North America) [2]. Additionally, studies were categorized by characteristics of the modeled population, such as demographics (age and ethnicity), subgroups (MSM only or MSM and other subgroups such as the heterosexual population, female sex workers and their clients, injecting drug users, and transgender women), and geographical scale (national, regional, or urban). National scale models consider populations in the entire country. Regional scale models consider a large administrative division within a country (e.g., a state in the USA or a province in China). Urban scale models consider a city or a group of cities and their immediate metropolitan areas. Populations were regarded as stratified by these characteristics if model analyses used different model parameters to describe distinct subgroups.

Models were categorized into deterministic compartmental (DCM), stochastic compartmental (SCM), and agent-based models (ABM). Compartmental models stratify the population into compartments based on certain characteristics, such as disease stage, and track the population in each compartment over time. In contrast, agent-based models include individual heterogeneities and track the status of each individual over time. Unlike deterministic models, stochastic models account for random events. Agent-based models are inherently stochastic.

We reported primary interventions, defined as interventions for which model parameters describing different aspects of intervention engagement (e.g., uptake, retention, coverage, and adherence) and/or intervention efficacy were varied. For example, in a study investigating the increase in PrEP uptake combined with regular HIV testing, PrEP is considered the primary intervention because its uptake was varied. The definition of HIV elimination was a measurable target used in the model analyses to determine when interventions could stop HIV transmission. Elimination definitions and interventions required to achieve elimination were extracted and narratively reported.

Descriptive statistics, i.e., frequencies and percentages, were used to summarize the study locations, characteristics of modeled populations, elimination definitions used, and interventions evaluated. Summary statistics were presented in tables and bar charts. The locations of the studied populations and HIV prevalence were visualized using world maps. Subgroup analyses of the summary statistics were performed to examine differences in elimination prospects, stratified by UNAIDS region, model type, elimination definition, and interventions. All results were pooled quantitatively whenever feasible.

Critical appraisal

Studies that included an elimination definition were critically appraised by evaluating the comprehensiveness of the models in addressing elimination. Given that different studies pursued different goals, ranging from conceptual analytical investigations to operational modeling, the critical appraisal was not used to exclude studies but rather to evaluate the appropriateness of model structures and methodologies for assessing elimination. In the absence of standardized tools for the critical appraisal of modeling studies focused on elimination, we developed our own scoring system. The model comprehensiveness score was calculated based on five criteria, such as whether a model accounted for adherence to interventions, sexual risk compensation, the openness of the modeled MSM population

(indicating that new HIV infections could be imported or result from sexual contacts with the external population), whether uncertainty in the model outcomes was investigated and reported, and whether a model was validated. Table S4 outlines the questions we used to assess each criterion and provides clear guidance on scoring. Studies received a score between 0 and 2 for the inclusion of adherence to interventions, reporting of uncertainty in model outcomes, and model validation. A score of 0 or 1 was assigned for the inclusion of sexual risk compensation and the openness of the MSM population. The individual scores were then summed to obtain the final score for each study, ranging from 0 to 8, with a higher score indicating that more criteria were satisfied. Critical appraisal was performed independently by two authors. The scoring of studies was by consensus.

Role of the funding source

The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Results

Study selection

The initial search resulted in 2,732 records, of which 80 studies (2.93%) met the eligibility criteria and were included for data extraction (Figure 1). After the title and abstract screening, a total of 1,721 records (62.99%) were excluded. The majority of records were excluded because they did not involve a dynamic transmission model ($n = 1,427$, 52.23%). Following the full-text assessment, a further 78 records (2.86%) were excluded due to being conference abstracts ($n = 28$, 1.02%), lack of a dynamic transmission model ($n = 17$, 0.62%), or for other reasons ($n = 33$, 1.21%). The list of 80 included studies and their characteristics is given in Table 1.

Study locations and HIV prevalence

Figure 2 shows the worldwide location of the modeled populations, juxtaposed with HIV prevalence among MSM by country. Of the 80 included studies, 61 (76.25%) focused on MSM in Western and Central Europe and North America, nine (11.25%) on Asia and the Pacific, six (7.50%) on Western and Central Africa, three (3.75%) on Latin America, one (1.25%) on Eastern and Southern Africa, one (1.25%) on two UNAIDS regions [28], and one (1.25%) was not associated with a specified geographical location [27] (Figure 2 **A**). No studies focused on MSM in the Caribbean, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, or the Middle East and North Africa. More than half of the studies focused on MSM in the USA ($n = 47$, 58.75%), with the second most frequently considered location being China and Canada ($n = 5$, 6.25%, each) (Figure 2 **C**). We observed a striking discordance between the geography of the modeled populations and HIV prevalence among MSM in those populations (Figure 2 **B** and **C**). For example,



Figure 1. Study selection. MSM = men who have sex with men.

Table 1. Characteristics of the included studies. MSM = men who have sex with men. TW = transgender women. PWID = people who inject drugs. FSW = female sex workers. SCM = stochastic compartmental model. DCM = deterministic compartmental model. ABM = agent-based model. IQR = interquartile range.

Authors (Year)	Population	Age (Years)	Location	Model Population Size (Individuals)	Model Type
Balasubramanian et al (2022) [21]	African American/Hispanic/Other MSM	≥ 13	32 urban areas of highest HIV burden and Washington DC, USA	Varies by area	SCM
Booton et al (2021)	General MSM	Not specified	Guangzhou, China Shenzhen, China Jinan, China Qingdao, China	12,249-57,856 45,801-180,000 9,687-19,373 28,000-51,000	DCM
Borquez et al (2020) [22]	MSM + TW + heterosexual population	15-49	Peru	4,767,148 total, 286,028 MSM + TW	DCM
Buchanan et al (2022) [23]	White/African American MSM	18-39	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell metropolitan area, Georgia, USA	17,440	ABM
Buchanan et al (2021) [24]	White/African American MSM	18-65	Atlanta, Georgia, USA	11,245	ABM
Chan et al (2019) [25]	General MSM	15-65	Rhode Island, USA	23,815	ABM
Chen et al (2022) [26]	African American/Hispanic/Other MSM + PWID + heterosexual population	13-64	USA	215,534,336 total, 4,187,426 MSM	DCM
David et al (2020) [27]	Gay, bisexual and other MSM	Not specified	Not specified	5,000	DCM
Dimitrov et al (2019a) [28]	MSM + TW + female partners at Harlem site	Not specified	Bangkok, Thailand and Harlem, New York, USA	3,600 men for each site	ABM
Dimitrov et al (2019b) [29]	MSM + TW	15-49	Lima, Peru	400,000	DCM
Drabo et al (2022) [30]	White/African American/Hispanic MSM	≥15	Los Angeles County, USA	251,521	ABM
Elion et al (2019) [31]	African American/Hispanic/White/Other MSM	≥18	USA	4,503,080	ABM
Fojo et al (2021) [32]	African American/Hispanic/Other MSM + heterosexual population + PWID	≥13	32 urban areas of highest HIV burden and Washington DC, USA	Varies by area	DCM
Fraser et al (2021) [33]	MSM + PWID + FSW + clients + heterosexual population	Not specified	Tijuana, Mexico	25,663 total, 5,726 MSM	DCM
Gantenberg et al (2018) [34]	General MSM	15-74	Rhode Island, USA	25,000	ABM
Gilmour et al (2020) [35]	General MSM	18-59	Japan	1,111,426	DCM
Goedel et al (2020) [36]	African American/White MSM	18-39	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell metropolitan area, Georgia, USA	17,440	ABM
Goedel et al (2018) [37]	African American/White MSM	18-74	Atlanta, Georgia, USA	10,000	ABM
Goodreau et al (2018) [38]	Adolescent sexual minority MSM	13-18	USA	10,000	ABM
Le Guillou et al (2021) [39]	African American/Hispanic/White MSM	15-65	San Francisco, USA	10,000	ABM
Gurski et al (2023) [40]	General MSM	All ages	USA	Unclear (2005 CDC data)	DCM
Gutowska et al (2022) [41]	General MSM	18-65	USA	7,100,000	DCM
Hamilton et al (2023) [18]	African American/Hispanic/Other MSM + heterosexual population	15-65	16 states and District of Columbia in the South census region, USA	500,000 total, 3.6% MSM	ABM
Hamilton et al (2021a) [42]	General MSM	13-39	Chicago, Illinois, USA	54,000	ABM
Hamilton et al (2021b) [43]	General MSM	Not specified	Seattle, Washington and Atlanta, Georgia, USA	10,000	ABM
Hamilton et al (2019) [44]	Adolescent sexual minority MSM + older MSM	13-39	Atlanta, Georgia, USA	13,500	ABM
Hamilton et al (2018) [45]	African American/White adolescent sexual minority MSM	13-18	Atlanta, Georgia, USA	10,000	ABM
Hansson et al (2020) [46]	General MSM	16-76	Sweden	Unclear	DCM
Hansson et al (2019) [47]	General MSM	16-76	Stockholm, Sweden	5,000	SCM
Irvine et al (2020) [48]	Gay and bisexual MSM	Not specified	Greater Vancouver, Canada	20,000	DCM
Irvine et al (2018) [49]	Gay and bisexual MSM	Not specified	Vancouver, Canada	20,000	SCM
Jenness et al (2021) [50]	African American/Hispanic/White/Other MSM	15-65	Atlanta metropolitan area, Georgia, USA	10,000	ABM
Jenness et al (2020) [51]	African American/Hispanic/White MSM	15-65	Atlanta, Georgia, USA	10,000	ABM
Jenness et al (2019) [52]	Young African American/White MSM	18-40	Atlanta, Georgia, USA	10,000	ABM
Jenness et al (2017) [53]	General MSM	Not specified	USA	Unclear	ABM
Jenness et al (2016) [54]	General MSM	18-40	USA	10,000	ABM

Continued on next page

Table 1. *(Continued)*

Authors (Year)	Population	Age (Years)	Location	Model Population Size (Individuals)	Model Type
Jijon et al (2021) [55]	General MSM	Not specified	Paris region, France	111,000	SCM
Jones et al (2022) [56]	African American/Hispanic/White MSM	15-64	Atlanta, Georgia, USA	25,000	ABM
Kasaie et al (2019) [57]	White/African American MSM	15-75	Baltimore, Maryland, USA	15,000	ABM
Kasaie et al (2018) [58]	White/African American MSM	15-75	Baltimore, Maryland, USA	15,000	ABM
Kasaie et al (2017) [59]	White/African American MSM	15-75	Baltimore, Maryland, USA	15,000	ABM
Khanna et al (2021) [60]	Young African American MSM	18-34	State of Illinois, USA	10,000	ABM
Khanna et al (2019) [61]	Young African American MSM	18-34	State of Illinois, USA	10,000	ABM
Khurana et al (2018) [62]	African American/Hispanic/Other MSM + PWID + heterosexual population	13-64	USA	USA population 2010, 4,187,426 MSM	DCM
Kusejiko et al (2018) [63]	General MSM	IQR 27-42	Switzerland	5,710	DCM
Labs et al (2022) [64]	African American MSM	18-64	Jackson, Mississippi, USA	6,825	ABM
Lee et al (2023) [65]	Young African American MSM	18-34	Houston, Texas, USA	10,000	ABM
Lee et al (2022) [66]	Young African American MSM	18-34	State of Illinois, USA	10,000	ABM
Lima et al (2021) [67]	General MSM	15-79	British Columbia, Canada	52,755	DCM
LeVasseur et al (2018) [68]	High-risk MSM	Not specified	USA	10,000	ABM
Lou et al (2018) [69]	General MSM	18-60	Beijing, China	About 11,350	SCM
Lou et al (2017) [70]	General MSM	15-64	Beijing, China	311,527	DCM
Lyons et al (2022) [71]	General MSM	Not specified	Yaoundé and Douala, Cameroon	Unclear	DCM
Lu et al (2020) [72]	General MSM	15-64	Zhejiang province, China	25,010	DCM
Maheu-Giroux et al (2017a) [73]	MSM + FSW + clients + general population	15-59	Côte d'Ivoire	2,711,050, 0.8-1.6% MSM	SCM
Maheu-Giroux et al (2017b) [74]	MSM + FSW + clients + general population	15-59	Côte d'Ivoire	2,711,050, 0.8-1.6% MSM	DCM
Marshall et al (2018) [75]	African American/White MSM	<65	Atlanta, Georgia, USA	11,245	ABM
Martin et al (2020) [76]	MSM + general population	Not specified	New York State, USA	Unclear	DCM
Milwid et al (2022) [77]	Gay and bisexual MSM	≥15	Montreal, Canada	10,000	ABM
Mitchell et al (2023) [78]	African American/White MSM	≥18	Atlanta, Georgia, USA	65,180	DCM
Mitchell et al (2021) [79]	African American/White MSM	≥18	Baltimore, Maryland, USA	65,180	DCM
Mitchell et al (2019) [80]	African American/White MSM	≥18	Baltimore, Maryland, USA	6,518	DCM
Mitchell et al (2016) [81]	MSM + FSW + clients + general population	Not specified	Bangalore, India	18,367 MSM	DCM
Mukandavire et al (2018) [82]	MSM + FSW + clients + general population	15-49	Dakar, Senegal	895,266 females, 885,570 males with 1.2% MSM	DCM
Palk et al (2018) [4]	General MSM	Not specified	Denmark	54,700	SCM
Robineau et al (2017) [83]	High-risk MSM	≥18	Paris, France	10,000	ABM
Rozhnova et al (2019) [84]	General MSM	Not specified	The Netherlands	Initial size 330,000	DCM
Rozhnova et al (2018) [16]	General MSM	15-70 years	The Netherlands	Final size 190,000	DCM
Rozhnova et al (2016) [85]	General MSM	15-70 years	The Netherlands	Initial size 330,000	DCM
Silhol et al (2021a) [86]	MSM + FSW + clients + general population	15-49	Yaoundé, Cameroon	1,217,440, 1.05% MSM	DCM
Silhol et al (2021b) [87]	MSM + FSW + clients + general population	15-49	Yaoundé, Cameroon	1,217,440, 1.05% MSM	DCM
Silhol et al (2020) [88]	African American/White MSM	≥18	Baltimore, Maryland, USA	6,518	DCM
Singleton et al (2020) [89]	African American/White MSM	18-39	Atlanta, Georgia, USA	17,440	ABM
Shen et al (2017) [90]	General MSM	18-65	San Francisco, USA	69,122	DCM
Stansfield et al (2021) [91]	General MSM	18-55	USA	10,000	ABM
Stone et al (2021) [92]	MSM + FSW + clients + general population	15-49	South Africa	MSM are 0.65-7.3% of males	ABM
Vermeer et al (2022) [93]	African American/Hispanic/White MSM	13-70	Chicago, Illinois, USA	6,500	ABM
Wang et al (2022) [94]	General MSM	18-59	Japan	1,251,730	DCM
Wang et al (2021) [95]	General MSM	Not specified	Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver, Canada	Varies by city	DCM
Zhang et al (2020) [96]	General MSM	18-65	Beijing, China	Unclear	DCM



Figure 2. Worldwide location of studies and HIV prevalence among MSM. (**A**) Locations of the modeled populations by UNAIDS region [2]. (**B**) HIV prevalence among MSM by country reported by UNAIDS [1]. In (**A**) and (**B**), countries with no data are shown in white. (**C**) The number of studies that did or did not define elimination and HIV prevalence among MSM by country. The study [28] that considered two countries was counted twice. The study [27] that did not apply to any specific location was not counted. MSM = men who have sex with men.

South Africa, which has the highest HIV prevalence among MSM (29.7%), is represented by a single study (1.25%). Additionally, we found only one study for Senegal (1.25%) and three studies for Cameroon (4.25%), which have the next highest HIV prevalence among MSM (27.6% and 20.6%, respectively). The HIV prevalence in MSM in Western countries, such as Switzerland, France, and the USA, is similar (about 14-15%), however, most studies focus on the USA, with only a few studies considering MSM in other Western countries. Across all UNAIDS regions, 29 countries with HIV prevalence among MSM above 15% [1] were not represented in the recent studies that involve dynamic transmission models.

Table 2. Number of studies by characteristics of the modeled population and model types. MSM = men who have sex with men. SCM = stochastic compartmental model. DCM = deterministic compartmental model. ABM = agent-based model. UNAIDS = The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS.

Population characteristics		**UNAIDS regions***					
		Western and Central Europe and North America	Latin America	Western and Central Africa	Eastern and Southern Africa	Asia and The Pacific	**Total**
		n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	**n** (%)
Ethnicity	Yes	27 (44.26)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	**27** (33.33)
	No	34 (55.74)	3 (100.00)	6 (100.00)	1 (100.00)	9 (100.00)	**54*** (66.67)
Age	Yes	29 (47.54)	1 (33.33)	5 (83.33)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	**35** (43.21)
	No	32 (52.46)	2 (66.67)	1 (16.67)	1 (100.00)	9 (100.00)	**46*** (56.79)
MSM only (vs MSM + other subgroups)	Yes	53 (86.89)	0 (0.00)	1 (16.67)	0 (0.00)	7 (77.78)	**64*** (79.01)
	No	8 (13.11)	3 (100.00)	5 (83.33)	1 (100.00)	2 (22.22)	**17** (20.99)
Geographical scale	National	15 (24.59)	1 (33.33)	2 (33.33)	1 (100.00)	2 (22.22)	**21** (25.93)
	Regional	9 (14.75)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (11.11)	**10** (12.35)
	Urban	37 (60.66)	2 (66.67)	4 (66.67)	0 (0.00)	6 (66.67)	**49** (60.49)
Model type	DCM	20 (32.79)	3 (100.00)	5 (83.33)	0 (0.00)	7 (77.78)	**36*** (44.44)
	SCM	4 (6.56)	0 (0.00)	1 (16.67)	0 (0.00)	1 (11.11)	**6** (7.41)
	ABM	37 (60.66)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (100.00)	1 (11.11)	**39** (48.15)
Total		**61**	**3**	**6**	**1**	**9**	**81***

* The study [27] considered only MSM using a DCM and did not reference any specific location, geographical scale, age, or ethnicity. The study [28] that included both the USA and Thailand was counted for two UNAIDS regions.

Population characteristics and model types

The distribution of studies by the characteristics of the modeled population and model types across UNAIDS regions is shown in Table 2. All 27 studies (44.26%) in the Western and Central Europe and North America region that stratified MSM by ethnicity concerned MSM populations at different geographical scales in the USA. Commonly considered subgroups were non-Hispanic Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, non-Hispanic White or other (e.g., [18, 21, 36]). Most studies that included stratification by ethnicity explored the effectiveness of interventions in achieving the dual goals of reducing the overall HIV burden and narrowing racial disparities (e.g., [36,37,45]). None of the studies in other regions used stratification by ethnicity. Twenty-nine studies (47.54%) in Western and Central Europe and North America, one study (33.33%) in Latin America [29], and five studies (83.33%) in Western and Central Africa [73, 74, 82, 86, 87] stratified MSM by age. None of the studies for Asia and the Pacific or Eastern and Southern Africa used age stratification. The age ranges mostly covered sexually

active MSM, spanning from 13–18 years to 60–80 years. Two studies, both in USA populations, included adolescent sexual minority men (13 to 18 years old) to investigate the impact of interventions on HIV burden in this group specifically [38, 45]. The majority of studies (n = 64, 80.00%) considered populations consisting solely of MSM (e.g., [16, 92, 96, 97]). The remaining studies (n = 16, 20%) included other subgroups, such as the heterosexual population [18], transgender women [29], injecting drug users, female sex workers and their clients [81]. Most studies for settings in Western and Central Africa (n = 5, 83.33%) [71, 73, 74, 82, 86], and Eastern and Southern Africa (n = 1, 100%) [92] considered sexual mixing of MSM and the consequent cross-transmission of HIV with other subgroups. Studies for Western countries mostly consider MSM as a separate key population with just a few studies considering MSM mixing with other subgroups (n = 6, 9.68%) [16, 18, 26, 28, 62, 76]. Most studies developed models for an urban environment (n = 48, 60.00%), while the remaining studies developed national (n = 21, 26.25%) and regional (n = 10, 12.50%) models, or did not mention any particular geographical scale (n = 1, 1.25%) [27]. ABMs were the most frequently used model type overall (n = 38, 47.5%) but were rarely used outside Western countries (n = 2, 5.13%). DCMs were the second most used model type (n = 36, 45.00%), being the main model type in Latin America (n = 3, 100.00%), Western and Central Africa (n = 5, 83.33%), and Asia and the Pacific (n = 7, 77.78%). SCMs were rarely used (n = 6, 7.50%).



Figure 3. Distribution of modeled interventions by UNAIDS region. The labels on each bar represent the number of times the intervention was included in models. A single study might have included multiple interventions. The study [27] that did not apply to any specific location was not counted. The study [28] that included both the USA and Thailand was counted for two UNAIDS regions. Pre-exposure prophylaxis = PrEP. STI = sexually transmitted infection. PEP = post-exposure prophylaxis. VMMC = voluntary medical male circumcision. The distribution of interventions by UNAIDS region for studies that defined elimination is shown in Figure S2.

Interventions

Studies investigated classical behavioral interventions (partner reduction and condom use), biomedical interventions (PrEP, post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP), test-and-treat, voluntary medical male circumcision (VMMC), and STI treatment), and structural interventions. Classical behavioral interventions facilitated changes in the behavior of MSM pertinent to HIV transmission, such as a reduction in the number of sexual partners (e.g., [70, 72, 94]), and increased use or effectiveness of condoms (e.g., [33, 40, 73]). The term test-and-treat was used to describe interventions that accelerated HIV testing and/or ART initiation (e.g., [27,80,85]). Structural interventions involved changes in healthcare systems or support for MSM at risk, such as providing housing for homeless MSM [76]. Figure 3 shows the distribution of interventions by type and UNAIDS region. Globally, the most frequently studied interventions were biomedical, namely PrEP and test-and-treat, followed by classical HIV prevention approaches. In contrast, STI treatment, PEP, VMMC, and structural interventions were rarely included in modeling studies. PrEP was considered more often ($n = 51$, 51.00%) in Western and Central Europe and North America (e.g., [38, 54, 57]) than in other regions ($n = 1$, 33.33% in Latin America [22]; $n = 4$, 21.05% in Asia and the Pacific [28, 35, 81, 94]; $n = 2$, 15.38% in Western and Central Africa [71, 82]). The next most studied intervention was test-and-treat which was considered frequently across all included regions ($n = 1$, 100.00% in Eastern and Southern Africa [92]; $n = 5$, 38.46% in Western and Central Africa [73, 74, 82, 86, 87]; $n = 1$, 33.33% in Latin America [33]; $n = 6$, 31.58% in Asia and the Pacific [28, 69, 70, 72, 94, 97]; $n = 31$, 31.00% in Western and Central Europe and North America, e.g., [40, 62, 76]). Classical behavioral interventions were studied frequently outside Western and Central Europe and North America. Combinations of different interventions were more frequently investigated in Western and Central Africa ($n = 5$, 83.3%) [74, 82, 86, 87], Asia and the Pacific ($n = 7$, 77.78%) [28, 35, 69, 70, 72, 94, 97], and Latin America ($n = 2$, 66.67%) [22, 33] than in other regions (Figure S1).

Critical appraisal

Out of the 80 studies investigating the impact of interventions, only 35 studies (43.75%) defined criteria for HIV elimination. The critical appraisal results of these 35 studies are summarized in Tables S5 and S6. The model comprehensiveness scores ranged from 0 to 8, although no study received either of these extreme scores. Studies using ABMs and SCMs all scored at least 4, while three studies (14.29%) using DCMs scored 3 or lower [27, 41, 94]. The average score for ABMs (5.00) was higher than the average scores for DCMs (4.84) and SCMs (4.50). However, three studies (15.79%) using DCMs achieved a score of 7, whereas none of the ABMs did.

Two of the five criteria were well satisfied across all studies. All studies presented results with some level of uncertainty, whether due to sensitivity analyses, stochastic effects, or multiple parameter sets. Only one study [27] did not account for adherence to the primary interventions. In contrast, the other three criteria were often either not included or only partially included. Fourteen studies (40.00%) (e.g., [26, 67, 80]) attempted to validate their model outputs, although six of these validations were informal or not clearly described [51, 52, 65, 66, 76, 86]. Twelve

Table 3. The overview of included studies that defined HIV elimination. In total, 35 out of the 80 studies were included. Elimination achievable indicates whether elimination is technically possible in the modeled scenarios. Elimination feasibility indicates the authors' judgment on whether it is realistic to implement the modeled elimination scenarios in practice. ND indicates that the feasibility of elimination scenarios was not discussed by the authors. A dash in the elimination feasibility column indicates that a discussion about feasibility is not applicable. It is used for studies where elimination is not possible in the model. The elimination scenario with elimination achievable is the minimum required level of studied interventions. If elimination is not achievable, the elimination scenario describes the level of interventions that came closest to meeting the elimination criteria. MSM = men who have sex with men. TW = transgender women. PWID = people who inject drugs. FSW = female sex workers. SCM = stochastic compartmental model. DCM = deterministic compartmental model. ABM = agent-based model. ART = antiretroviral treatment. PrEP = pre-exposure prophylaxis. ND = not discussed. - = not applicable.

Authors (Year)	Setting	Model type	Definition of elimination	Elimination achievable	Elimination feasibility	Interventions	Starting year and duration	Elimination scenario
Unspecified setting								
David et al (2020) [27]	Gay, bisexual and other MSM; unspecified setting	DCM	Reproduction number < 1	Yes	Unlikely	Test-and-treat	Steady state	Decrease in ART initiation time to less than 1 week
Asia and the Pacific								
China								
Lou et al (2017) [70]	General MSM; Beijing, China	DCM	Reproduction number < 1	Yes	ND	Test-and-treat + condom use + other behavioral	Steady state	Increase of ART coverage + increase of condom use and/or substantial reduction in the number of sexual partners[a]
Lu et al (2020) [72]	General MSM; Zhejiang province, China	DCM	Reproduction number < 1	No	-	Test-and-treat	Steady state	Increase of test-and-treat parameters to reach 90-90-90 targets
India								
Mitchell et al (2016) [81]	MSM + FSW + clients + general population; Bangalore, India	DCM	< 1 new infection per 1,000 person-years	Yes	Likely	PrEP	2017 20 years	Introduction of PrEP among MSM & FSW progressively increasing to 60% coverage within five years, subsequently maintaining this level for the remainder of simulated time, combined with 50% adherence
Japan								
Gilmour et al (2020) [35]	General MSM; Japan	DCM	< 1 new infection per 1,000 person-years	Yes	Likely	PrEP + test-and-treat	2020 30 years	Introduction of PrEP at 25% coverage among high-risk MSM achieved instantaneously at the time of intervention start + test-and-treat reaching 95-95-95 targets immediately
Wang et al (2022) [94]	General MSM; Japan	DCM	< 1 new infection per 1,000 person-years	Yes	Likely	PrEP + test-and-treat + condom use + other behavioral	2010 40 years	Introduction of PrEP at 10% coverage and 90% effectiveness or increasing annual testing rate and ART coverage to above 80% among all MSM/diagnosed MSM, respectively or condom use increasing from 35% to 65% or high-risk MSM reducing annual partner numbers to less than 9
Western and Central Africa								
Cameroon								
Silhol et al (2021a) [86]	MSM + FSW + clients + general population; Yaoundé, Cameroon	DCM	< 1 new infection per 1,000 person-years by 2030	No	-	Test-and-treat + condom use	2018 12 years	Increase in viral suppression rate from 85% to 90% by 2030 with a 10% ART drop-out rate + condom use increasing from 33% in 2011 to 85% for MSM and their male partners[b]
Côte d'Ivoire								
Maheu-Giroux et al (2017a) [73]	MSM + FSW + clients + general population; Côte d'Ivoire	DCM	< 1 new infection per 1,000 person-years by 2030	Yes	ND	Test-and-treat + condom use	2015 15 years	The threshold will be reached without additional interventions. The threshold can be reached most quickly by achieving 90-90-90 targets by 2020 + 95-95-95 targets by 2030 + 95% condom use among MSM and FSW by 2020

Continued on next page

Table 3. *(Continued)*

Authors (Year)	Setting	Model type	Definition of elimination	Elimination achievable	Elimination feasibility	Interventions	Starting year and duration	Elimination scenario
Western and Central Europe and North America								
Canada								
Lima et al (2021) [67]	General MSM; British Columbia, Canada	DCM	i) Reproduction number < 1 ii) < 1 new infection per 1,000 person-years[c]	i) Yes ii) Yes	i) ND ii) ND	PrEP + test-and-treat	2019 10 years	Increasing PrEP coverage, adherence, and retention among high-risk/young MSM by 20% + increasing test-and-treat parameters (diagnosis rate, treatment initiation rate, time suppressed and re-initiation rate) by 20% or only increasing test-and-treat parameters by 40%
Milwid et al (2022) [77]	Gay and bisexual MSM; Montreal, Canada	ABM	Zero new infections by 2030	-[d]	-	PrEP + test-and-treat + condom use + PEP	2000 20 years	2013 onwards: annual PrEP uptake of 6%-32% among eligible MSM + 68.8% - 78.9% proportion of MSM tested annually + 30.0% - 42.3% condom use probability + 2001 onwards: PEP among 0.03%-0.11% of eligible MSM
Denmark								
Palk et al (2018) [4]	General MSM; Denmark	SCM	< 1 new infection per 1,000 person-years	Yes	Likely	PrEP + test-and-treat	2018 12 years	In the baseline without a PrEP program + 80% ART coverage in people with HIV, elimination is reached by 2030. The introduction of PrEP with coverage in the interval of 0-50% & 60% effectiveness + 3-fold increase in the diagnosis rate will decrease the time to elimination
France								
Jijon et al (2021) [55]	General MSM; Paris region, France	DCM	Reproduction number < 1	Yes	ND	PrEP + test-and-treat	Steady state	Increase of PrEP coverage from 47% to 55% among high-risk MSM + HIV testing increasing from every 3 years to 4 times a year for those on PrEP
Netherlands								
Rozhnova et al (2018) [16]	General MSM; The Netherlands	DCM	Reproduction number < 1	Yes	Likely	PrEP + test-and-treat	Steady state	82% PrEP coverage (86% effectiveness) among high-risk MSM or 70% PrEP coverage among high-risk MSM + ART coverage in people with HIV increase from 80% to 89%
Rozhnova et al (2016) [85]	General MSM; The Netherlands	DCM	Reproduction number < 1	Yes	Unlikely	Test-and-treat	Steady state	No interventions required for fully proportionate mixing between risk groups. For slightly heterogeneous mixing, 30% annual ART uptake (80% coverage of MSM with HIV). For highly heterogeneous mixing elimination is not possible
Sweden								
Hansson et al (2020) [46]	General MSM; Sweden	DCM	Zero endemic prevalence	Yes	Unlikely	PrEP	Steady state	3.5% PrEP coverage among all MSM targeted at high-risk MSM (33.7% of all MSM) or 34.4% PrEP coverage among all MSM targeted at low-risk MSM (66.3% of all MSM)
Hansson et al (2019) [47]	General MSM; Stockholm, Sweden	SCM	Reproduction number < 1	Yes	Likely	Test-and-treat + condom use	Steady state	Reduction of the time to diagnosis and treatment from 2.86 to < 2.5 years for all partnerships or increase in condom use from 52% to 69% in steady partnerships or from 63% to 72% in casual partnerships

Continued on next page

Table 3. *(Continued)*

Authors (Year)	Setting	Model type	Definition of elimination	Elimination achievable	Elimination feasibility	Interventions	Starting year and duration	Elimination scenario
USA								
Chen et al (2022) [26]	African American/ Hispanic/ Other MSM + PWID + heterosexual population; USA	DCM	Reproduction number substantially $< 1^{e}$	Yes	Unlikely	Test-and-treat	2017 3 years	50% reduction of viral suppression loss rate
Fojo et al (2021) [32]	African American/ Hispanic/ Other MSM + heterosexual population + PWID; 32 urban areas of highest HIV burden and Washington DC, USA	DCM	90% incidence reduction by 2030^{f}	Yes	Unlikely	PrEP + test-and-treat	2020 10 years	25% PrEP coverage among those eligible + 90% viral suppression among diagnosed + twice-yearly testing
Goedel et al (2020) [36]	African American/ White MSM; Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell metropolitan area, Georgia, USA	ABM	Eliminating racial disparities[g]	No	-	PrEP + test-and-treat	2015 10 years	Increase in PrEP coverage from 7%/2% to 68%/17% for African American/White MSM + increase in rates of diagnosis, treatment, and viral suppression reaching 90-90-90 targets
Goedel et al (2018) [37]	African American/White MSM; Atlanta, Georgia, USA	ABM	Eliminating racial disparities[g]	No	-	PrEP	2015 10 years	Increasing PrEP coverage from 2.5% in African American MSM and 5% in White MSM, even when done equally, up to 30% in both, increases the incidence disparity between African American MSM and White MSM
Le Guillou et al (2021) [39]	African American/ Hispanic/ White MSM; San Francisco, USA	ABM	i) 75% incidence reduction by 2025 + ii) 90% reduction by 2030^{f}	i) Yes ii) No	i) Unlikely ii) -	PrEP + test-and-treat	2019 10 years	Increase in PrEP coverage from 25% to 75% + 60% viral suppression among all MSM with HIV or from 25% to 62.5% + 68% viral suppression among all MSM with HIV
Gutowska et al (2022) [41]	General MSM; USA	DCM	Reproduction number < 1	Yes[h]	Unlikely	PrEP	Steady state	Model with only short-term partnerships: no PrEP needed; model with only long-term partnerships: 40% PrEP coverage and 95% adherence; model with both types of partnerships: PrEP does not lead to elimination
Hamilton et al (2023) [18]	African American/ Hispanic/ Other MSM + heterosexual population; 16 states and District of Columbia in the South census region, USA	ABM	i) 75% incidence reduction by 2025 + ii) 90% reduction by 2030^{f}	i) Yes ii) Yes	i) ND ii) ND	PrEP + test-and-treat	2022 8 years	PrEP coverage among eligible + ART coverage among all people with HIV of i) 40% and 90% or ii) 50% and 100%
Hamilton et al (2018) [45]	African American/White adolescent sexual minority MSM; Atlanta, Georgia, USA	ABM	Eliminating racial disparities[g]	No	-	PrEP	Unclear 20 years	Increasing PrEP coverage from 0% up to 60% of all MSM results in unequal coverage between African American and White MSM, increasing the prevalence disparity between African American MSM and White MSM
Jenness et al (2020) [51]	African American/ Hispanic/ White MSM; Atlanta, Georgia, USA	ABM	i) 75% incidence reduction by 2025 + ii) 90% reduction by 2030^{f}	i) Yes ii) Yes[i]	i) ND ii) ND	PrEP + test-and-treat	2020 10 years	PrEP linkage for eligible MSM via screening resulting in a PrEP coverage increase from 15% to 67% + 10-fold increase in HIV screening and care retention resulting in quarterly screening for white MSM & twice-yearly for African American/Hispanic MSM
Jenness et al (2019) [52]	Young African American/White MSM; Atlanta, Georgia, USA	ABM	Eliminating racial disparities [g]	No	-	PrEP	Unclear 10 years	Increasing of up to 2x of PrEP awareness, access to healthcare, PrEP uptake, adherence and retention in African American MSM
Khanna et al (2021) [60]	Young African American MSM; State of Illinois, USA	ABM	< 200 new infections per year by 2030^{j}	No	-	PrEP + test-and-treat	2016 15 years	Increase in PrEP coverage from 10% to 40% + increase in ART coverage among all MSM with HIV from 50% to 80%

Continued on next page

Table 3. *(Continued)*

Authors (Year)	Setting	Model type	Definition of elimination	Elimination achievable	Elimination feasibility	Interventions	Starting year and duration	Elimination scenario
Khanna et al (2019) [61]	Young African American MSM; State of Illinois, USA	ABM	< 200 new infections per year by 2030[j]	Yes	Unlikely	PrEP	2020 10 years	Increased PrEP coverage from 13% to 50% prioritizing individuals in serodiscordant partnerships
Lee et al (2023) [65]	Young African American MSM; Houston, Texas, USA	ABM	< 200 new infections per year by 2030[j]	No	-	PrEP + test-and-treat	2020 10 years	Increase in PrEP coverage from 19.6% to 49.6% + increase in ART coverage from 63% to 78% + 30% reduction in the proportion of individuals who tested 1-2 times in the last two years from 42.7% to 12.7% + increase in the proportion of individuals who initiate treatment within 1 week of diagnosis from 3.8% to 63.8%
Lee et al (2022) [66]	Young African American MSM; State of Illinois, USA	ABM	< 200 new infections per year by 2030[j]	Yes	ND	PrEP + test-and-treat + other behavioral	2020 10 years	30% increase in PrEP coverage from 13.7% + 30% increase of ART coverage + 25% coverage of behavioral interventions aiming to reduce stimulant use coverage among stimulant users
Martin et al (2020) [76]	MSM + general population; New York State, USA	DCM	By the end of 2020: i) < 750 new infections per year ii) achieve a decrease in annual HIV prevalence iii) reduce AIDS progression	i) Yes[i] ii) Yes iii) Yes	i) Unlikely ii) Unlikely iii) Unlikely	PrEP + test-and-treat + structural	2014 12 years	Introduction of PrEP coverage at 25-75% with 50-100% adherence among MSM + increased test-and-treat (25-75% increase in ART uptake & 85-135% decrease in time between ART initiation and viral suppression) + housing assistance (0-10% reduction in HIV infectivity & 15-55% increase in ART initiation rate and 15-55% decrease in time between ART initiation and viral suppression)
Mitchell et al (2023) [78]	African American/ White MSM; Atlanta, Georgia, USA	DCM	i) 75% incidence reduction by 2025 + ii) 90% reduction by 2030[f]	i) Yes ii) Yes	i) Unlikely ii) Unlikely	PrEP	2022 8 years	i) 97% coverage of oral PrEP or 73% coverage of injectable PrEP ii) 100% coverage of oral PrEP is insufficient but 93% coverage of injectable PrEP (including ≥90% of PrEP-indicated MSM) is sufficient
Mitchell et al (2019) [80]	African American/White MSM; Baltimore, Maryland, USA	DCM	< 1 new infection per 1,000 person-years	Yes	Unlikely	Test-and-treat	2016 20 years	Increase in ART coverage among those diagnosed to 86% from 66% after five years resulting in a 50% relative reduction in HIV incidence rate leads to the highest probability (5.9%) of achieving elimination by 2036
Singleton et al (2020) [89]	African American/ White MSM; Atlanta, Georgia, USA	ABM	i) 90% incidence reduction by 2030[f] + ii) < 1 new infection per 1,000 person-years + iii) Eliminating racial disparities[g]	i) No ii) No iii) No	i) - ii) - iii) -	PrEP + test-and-treat	2015 10 years	i) & ii) 90% PrEP coverage among all eligible MSM + expanding test-and-treat to achieve 95-95-95 targets iii) Eliminating PrEP adherence disparities by increasing the proportion of African American MSM on PrEP who take four or more doses per week from 56.8% to 91.1%, the same as White MSM
Vermeer et al (2022) [93]	African American/ Hispanic/ White MSM; Chicago, Illinois, USA	ABM	i) 75% incidence reduction by 2025 + ii) 90% reduction by 2030[f]	i) Yes ii) Yes	i) Unlikely ii) Unlikely	PrEP + test-and-treat	2015 15 years	i) PrEP linkage (proportion of MSM who initate PrEP after a negative test) increase from 7% to 47% + 75% annual PrEP retention + 100% PrEP adherence, succeeding in 77% of simulations ii) PrEP linkage increase from 7% to 67% + 75% annual PrEP retention + 100% PrEP adherence + increase in ART retention to 99%, succeeding in 58% of simulations

[a] Model parameters and the effect of ART coverage are not clearly described in the model.
[b] Model uses different values for partnerships between all population subgroups. Male-male partnerships are given as an example.
[c] WHO incidence threshold of < 1 new infection per 1,000 person-years.
[d] The study did not assess elimination prospects but reconstructed the past pandemic to guide future elimination efforts.
[e] Reproduction number substantially < 1 is not clearly defined, the baseline reproduction number is already < 1.
[f] Ending the HIV epidemic goals in the USA/Getting to zero goals in the state of Illinois, USA.
[g] Various definitions were used for the elimination of racial disparities across different models.
[h] Elimination prospects depend on the assumptions about sexual behavior.
[i] Elimination is achieved, but not by the target time.
[j] Functional zero target, i.e., a level of new annual infections at which the epidemic in the USA cannot be sustained.



Figure 4. HIV elimination definitions. Distribution of definitions by (**A**) model type and (**B**) UNAIDS region. The labels on each bar represent the number of times the definition was included in studies. A single study might include multiple definitions. In (**B**), the study [27] that did not reference any specific location was not counted. SCM = stochastic compartmental model. DCM = deterministic compartmental model. ABM = agent-based model.

studies (34.29%) (e.g., [4, 45, 86]) modeled open MSM populations, with six studies using compartmental models and six using ABMs. Seven studies (20.00%) (e.g., [35, 39, 70]) accounted for sexual risk compensation, more often in compartmental models than in ABMs.

Elimination definitions

Table 3 provides an overview of the 35 studies that defined HIV elimination. There was no consensus on a single definition of elimination. Eight of the 35 (22.86%) studies used multiple definitions [18, 39, 51, 67, 76, 78, 86, 89, 93].

For these studies, each definition was assessed individually for achievability and feasibility.

HIV elimination criteria were defined as a threshold for incidence (n = 14, 31.11%; e.g., < 1 new infection per 1,000 person-years [4, 80, 94]), a percentage reduction in incidence (n = 12, 26.67%; e.g., 90% reduction by 2030 from 2020 [32, 39, 78]), reproduction number less than one (n = 10, 22.22%; e,g., [27, 41, 72]), elimination of racial disparities in incidence or prevalence (n = 5, 11.11% [36, 37, 45, 52, 89]), zero incidence (n = 1, 2.22% [77]), zero steady-state prevalence (n = 1, 2.22% [46]), and other (n = 2, 4.44% [89]).

Elimination definitions varied across model types and UNAIDS regions (Figure 4). A reproduction number less than one was the most frequently used definition in DCMs (n = 9, 39.13%) (e.g., [26, 27, 41] and SCMs (n = 1, 50.00%) [47], but was absent in ABMs. Conversely, incidence reduction was the most frequent definition in ABMs (n = 9, 45.00%) (e.g., [18, 39, 51]) but was seldom used in DCMs (n = 3, 13.04%) [32, 78] and absent in SCMs. Incidence threshold criteria were used across all model types (n = 14, 31.11%) (e.g., [4, 65, 80]), whereas the elimination of racial disparities was exclusively studied in ABMs (n = 5, 25.00% [36, 37, 45, 52, 89]).

The preferential use of elimination definitions by UNAIDS region (Figure 4 **B**) resulted mainly from (i) ABMs not being used for settings outside Western and Central Europe and North America, specifically the USA, and (ii) studies often aligning their elimination definitions with the national goals of the country where elimination was assessed. For example, incidence reduction accounted for almost half of the definitions used in the USA (n = 12, 42.86%) (e.g., [32, 51, 89]), driven by the goals to end the HIV epidemic in the USA, which aim for 75% and 90% reductions in incidence by 2025 and 2030, respectively. In contrast, studies outside of the USA focused on reaching incidence thresholds (e.g., [35, 67, 86]) and reducing the reproduction number below one (e.g., [70, 72, 85]), and did not use incidence reduction as the elimination definition.

Elimination prospects

In the following, we distinguished between elimination being (i) achievable, if it was technically possible within modeled scenarios, and (ii) feasible, if, based on the authors' judgment and discussion, the modeled scenarios where elimination was achievable were practical in a real-world context (Table 4). Feasibility was considered (un)likely if the authors judged that the intervention scenario required to achieve elimination in the model was (im)plausible. In 32 out of 44 modeled scenarios (72.73%), elimination was achievable. Using UNAIDS regional stratification, 26 scenarios in Western and Central Europe and North America (e.g., [16, 61, 80]), one scenario in Western and Central Africa [74], and four scenarios in Asia and the Pacific [35, 70, 81, 94]) could achieve elimination in the model. However, only six (18.75%) of these 32 modeled scenarios were deemed likely to be feasible in practice, half of which were in Western and Central Europe and North America [4, 16, 47] and half in Asia and the Pacific [35, 81, 94]. Sixteen (50.00%) elimination scenarios were deemed unlikely to be feasible in practice, all for settings in Western and Central Europe and North America (e.g., [46, 76, 85]) or without a specific location [27]. The feasibility of ten (31.25%) scenarios was not discussed by the authors (e.g., [18, 66, 74]).

Table 4. Elimination prospects. MSM = men who have sex with men. SCM = stochastic compartmental model. DCM = deterministic compartmental model. ABM = agent-based model. UNAIDS = The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. ND = not discussed.

		UNAIDS regions*			
		Western and Central Europe and North America	Western and Central Africa	Asia and The Pacific	**Total**
		n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	**n** (%)
Elimination definition	Incidence threshold	9 (25.00)	2 (100.00)	3 (60.00)	**14** (31.82)
	Incidence reduction	12 (33.33)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	**12** (27.27)
	Reproduction number < 1	7 (10.44)	0 (0.00)	2 (40.00)	**10*** (22.73)
	Elimination of disparities	5 (13.89)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	**5** (11.36)
	Other†	2 (5.56)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	**2** (4.55)
	Zero prevalence	1 (2.78)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	**1** (2.27)
Interventions	Individual	12 (33.33)	0 (0.00)	2 (40.00)	**15*** (34.09)
	Combination	24 (66.67)	2 (100.00)	3 (60.00)	**29** (65.91)
Elimination achievable in modeled scenarios	Yes	26 (72.22)	1 (50.00)	4 (80.00)	**32*** (72.73)
	No	10 (27.78)	1 (50.00)	1 (20.00)	**12** (27.27)
Total		**36**	**2**	**5**	**44*,‡**
		UNAIDS regions*			
Elimination feasibility if elimination is achievable in modeled scenarios	Likely	3 (11.54)	0 (0.00)	3 (75.00)	**6** (18.75)
	Unlikely	15 (57.69)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	**16*** (50.00)
	ND	8 (30.77)	1 (100.00)	1 (25.00)	**10** (31.25)
Total		**26**	**1**	**4**	**32***

* The study [27] did not reference a specific location and, therefore, was added directly to the totals. In this study, elimination was achieved in the model using test-and-treat and a reproduction number definition, but considered unlikely.
† The study [76] used elimination definitions that did not fit into other categories, such as (i) achieving a reduction in annual HIV prevalence by 2020 and (ii) reducing AIDS progression by 2020.
‡ The study [77] defined elimination as zero HIV incidence among MSM but did not directly assess it; therefore, it was not counted in this table.

Achievability of elimination differed with respect to interventions by UNAIDS region and country (Tables S2 and S3). The majority of scenarios in Western and Central Europe and North America that included PrEP and test-and-treat achieved elimination (n = 22, 68.75%, e.g., [4, 41, 55] and n = 21, 75.00%, e.g., [18, 39, 67], respectively), while classical behavioral and structural interventions were included less frequently. However, only three elimination scenarios were discussed to be feasible, all for models that consider populations consisting solely of MSM in Europe [4, 16, 47]. Feasible elimination scenarios included an increase of ART coverage and introduction of oral PrEP in the Netherlands [16] and Denmark [4], and a further reduction in time to diagnosis with an increase in condom use in Sweden [47]. In the USA, elimination using a similar composition of interventions was considered unlikely despite the majority of modeled scenarios predicting elimination (e.g., [26, 32, 41]). In Western and Central Africa, test-and-treat and condom use could achieve elimination in half of the modeled scenarios [74], but their feasibility was not discussed. In Asia and the Pacific, modeled elimination scenarios included test-and-treat (n = 4, 36.36%), PrEP (n = 3, 27.27%), condom use (n = 2, 18.18%), and other behavioral (n = 2, 18.18%) interventions. Except one scenario that involved test-and-treat only [72], all of them were successful, and their feasibility was also reported as high for India [81] and Japan [35, 94]. The feasible elimination scenarios involved

the introduction of oral PrEP and an increase in test-and-treat rates, which could be complemented with condom use and other behavioral interventions. Notably, of the six feasible elimination scenarios, five used a combination of interventions [4, 16, 35, 47, 94], while only one used PrEP as an individual intervention [81]. Elimination prospects stratified by the use of combination and individual interventions are shown in Table S1.

Discussion

Underrepresented populations

HIV among MSM is a global problem that transcends geographical borders [1]. To our knowledge, this study is the first to systematically review mathematical modeling studies that assess HIV elimination prospects in this key population worldwide. Our findings show that across all UNAIDS regions, many countries with high HIV burden among MSM were not represented in the recent studies that involve dynamic transmission models. In particular, we did not identify any studies that assess the epidemiological impacts of interventions on MSM in the Caribbean, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, and the Middle East and North Africa. Several factors could contribute to this gap in knowledge, including the lack of high quality sexual behavior and epidemiological data needed for model parameterization, the shortage of local expertise in HIV modeling [98], criminalization of HIV and sodomy, insufficient interest from public health systems in countries where the HIV epidemic in non-MSM populations is more severe than among MSM, poor surveillance, underfunding, discrimination, and stigma.

Notably, a relatively small number of studies targeted MSM in the UNAIDS regions of Western and Central Africa, and Eastern and Southern Africa, collectively known as sub-Saharan Africa [71, 73, 74, 82, 86, 87, 92], where modeling HIV transmission in the general population has traditionally received a lot of attention [99, 100]. This region is known for generalized heterosexual epidemics and a high HIV burden in the general population, but there is also strong evidence of epidemics among MSM [10, 101, 102]. Finally, within Western and Central Europe and North America UNAIDS region, a relatively small number of studies concerned MSM in Europe [4, 16, 46, 47, 55, 63, 83–85] compared to the USA. The likely explanation for this is that modeling methods outside the scope of our review are used to investigate HIV elimination in Europe. For example, back-calculation models have been developed for the Netherlands [6], the UK [5, 103], and Denmark [104] but are not included in our review focused on dynamic transmission models.

Elimination scenarios

Elimination was achieved in models far more often than authors deemed feasible for real-world implementation (six out of 32 scenarios). Several reasons could contribute to this discrepancy. Firstly, intervention parameters in models (e.g., PrEP, ART, condom use coverage and adherence, testing rates) can be selected from the maximum possible range, potentially resulting in values that are not achievable in practice (e.g., [39, 76, 78]). Secondly,

the feasibility of about one-third of modeled elimination scenarios was not discussed by the authors (e.g., [70]), possibly due to the lack of authors with relevant real-world implementation expertise. Thirdly, the six feasible scenarios [4, 16, 35, 47, 81, 94] were obtained in either DCMs or SCMs that were mostly among the least complex models, as described by their comprehensiveness scores. This implies that the results reported by these six models may be overly optimistic.

Our findings show that significant gains in HIV control among MSM have been made in some settings. Elimination is likely in certain Western European countries due to the scale-up of test-and-treat programs, and PrEP emerges as one of the key interventions that can help to reach elimination faster [4]. This aligns with evidence that HIV incidence in countries like the Netherlands and the UK had started to decline with the expansion of test-and-treat programs [5, 6] but declined much further after the introduction of national PrEP programs [105]. Notably, none of the studies in the USA settings considered elimination feasible. This outcome could be partly explained by the use of ABMs and the complexity of the subepidemics in the USA, characterized by strong heterogeneity in transmission among different ethnic and geographical subgroups that require culturally and regionally tailored interventions.

Our findings also highlight inequitable responses in HIV control worldwide. Unlike many studies in Western countries [4, 16, 32, 46, 55, 66, 67, 77, 78] and some studies in Asia [35, 81, 94] that consider PrEP as an essential intervention for faster approach to elimination, studies in Africa still focus on the expansion of treatment and condom use [74, 86]. However, the real-world effectiveness of condoms is undermined by adherence issues. No studies considered elimination scenarios with PrEP introduction among MSM in Africa, potentially due to delays and structural barriers in implementing this intervention [106].

Lastly, our review underscores the importance of combination interventions in increasing the feasibility of elimination. Although the sample of feasible elimination scenarios was small and their conclusions may be overly optimistic, 5 out of 6 considered a combination of interventions [4, 16, 35, 47, 94]. This is consistent with other studies suggesting that a combination of intervention strategies is necessary to control and eliminate HIV [13, 107, 108], and that transmission models should incorporate multiple, simultaneously acting interventions [15].

Relatedness of elimination definitions

Various definitions of elimination used by different studies reflect their perspectives in terms of modeling and public health. While each elimination definition focuses on a specific aspect of the epidemic dynamics of HIV, these aspects are epidemiologically related. In theory, when the effective reproduction number is below one, the incidence will decrease and eventually elimination will be reached. The smaller the effective reproduction number, the faster the decline in incidence, and the sooner a given incidence threshold will be reached. From a modeling perspective, using the effective reproduction number is attractive (e.g., [47, 55, 94]), because it summarizes the qualitative behavior of the epidemic, and elimination is a consequence of reducing the reproduction number below the threshold of one. From an estimate of the reproduction number, one could, in principle, compute the incidence and the time it takes

for the incidence to fall below a threshold. The converse does not hold, i.e., knowing that the incidence is below a certain threshold does not necessarily mean that elimination will be reached in the long term. The incidence could still stabilize at a new lower endemic prevalence if the reproduction number is above one. Therefore, from a modeling perspective, calculating the effective reproduction number has clear advantages over simply calculating incidence. However, an explicit calculation of the reproduction number is only possible for DCMs which explains the frequent use of this definition for these models in our review (e.g., [16,41,67]). For SCMs and ABMs, approximations for a reproduction number can be computed numerically by calculating the average number of secondary cases per infected individual. The involved numerical computations probably explain why none of the ABMs in our review used this definition.

From a public health perspective, it is essential to consider how the path to elimination can be achieved and monitored [109]. This implies that we need elimination definitions based on measurable quantities [110]. Although incidence is not directly observable, it can be estimated from the number of diagnosed cases. More concretely, definitions based on an epidemiological goal such as a threshold (e.g., [4, 60, 80]) or a reduction in incidence (e.g., [18, 32, 78]) can be used in practice to validate model predictions. Both can be measured and monitored over time, and serve as a basis for defining standardized indicators for public health policy evaluation [110]. Therefore, for modeling to contribute effectively to public health policy, it is necessary and valuable to report intervention coverage and incidence, preferably in a format that can easily be compared to standard indicators [109,110]. A clear advantage of using the elimination definition based on an incidence threshold is that incidence can be computed in all model types. Besides offering meaningful guidance to policymakers, this definition would also enhance study comparability within and across different MSM settings.

The elimination of disparities, often discussed in the context of HIV, is a different concept and does not necessarily lead to the elimination of HIV from a population. The goal is to eliminate large differences in HIV incidence between population groups, such as ethnic groups (e.g., [36,37,45]), rather than to eliminate HIV entirely. However, in many epidemiological contexts, it is an important milestone to overall HIV elimination once we consider that groups with high incidence are often characterized by a high risk of HIV acquisition, resulting in effective reproduction numbers in these groups remaining above one the longest. In the final stages before elimination, the groups with the highest reproduction numbers will be the remaining drivers of transmission. Therefore, targeting these groups will be crucial to achieving the final goal of HIV elimination.

Future elimination modeling

Based on our findings, we identify several areas where HIV elimination modeling in MSM needs to advance. In countries where HIV incidence has dropped considerably in recent years [4–6] and elimination may be possible, modeling should focus not only on interventions that achieve elimination but also on those that sustain it. This conclusion was also supported by [111]. Elimination of transmission among MSM in specific settings may be

interpreted as HIV no longer being a public health problem, which could lead to cutbacks in national prevention programs in these communities. For example, scenarios of future changes in the capacity of the national program for oral PrEP are being investigated in the Netherlands [112]. A decrease in PrEP uptake and condom use, combined with a potential increase in sexual risk behavior among MSM [113–115], may lead to a rebound in HIV incidence. A new priority for countries nearing elimination and aiming to sustain it could be interventions targeting HIV infections acquired abroad, either through immigration or travel. Examples of such interventions include offering voluntary HIV testing to incoming migrants or providing PrEP to MSM who travel abroad [4]. Additionally, transmission modeling will need to be complemented with health economic evaluations to guide future interventions that balance the cost of maintaining them and keeping HIV transmission at bay.

Our review highlighted a lack of modeling studies in some regions that have a high HIV prevalence among MSM. Within locations that warrant such attention, a special place is held by so-called island countries. To wit, the Caribbean region, which has the second highest HIV prevalence among MSM across UNAIDS regions [116] and a high volume of migration both within the region and internationally, will require the development of meta-population models. These models including population mobility were absent in our review. Understanding HIV transmission networks and the impact of migration [117] including from Latin America will be crucial for achieving HIV elimination in this region. Meta-population models could also be relevant for MSM populations in island countries in Asia and the Pacific, which have so far received little attention. Movement and migration [117] will generally become increasingly important as they could aid in importing HIV infections from high-prevalence regions to regions nearing elimination, including in the context of Western countries [4].

In our review, almost all studies considered MSM in Africa as part of a wider population consisting of the heterosexual population and key populations other than MSM [73,74,82,86,87,92]. In contrast to concentrated epidemics among MSM in Western and Central Europe and North America (e,g. [49,63,91]), HIV epidemics among MSM and the heterosexual population in Africa are substantially mixed due to men having sex with men and women [118,119]. However, while the numbers of new infections in the overall adult population, sex workers, and their clients in Africa have been falling at the same rate, no such progress has been observed for MSM [3, 10]. If MSM are left behind in the HIV response in Africa, they may continue to be a source of infection for women in the general population in the future, potentially undermining the progress made in eliminating HIV within this population. The inclusion of MSM in transmission models for African countries is needed to inform tailored interventions that ensure equal rates of progress towards HIV elimination for different key populations and the general population [120]. Given the proven benefits of PrEP in Western countries and Asia, exploring its impact on HIV elimination among MSM in Africa is desirable. Additionally, while public health literature highlights the benefits of PEP, the population-level impact of this intervention remains largely unexplored in Africa and globally [121], as does the impact of long-acting injectable PrEP compared to oral PrEP. One study in our review [78] demonstrated that long-acting injectable PrEP programs can achieve HIV elimination at much lower coverage compared to oral PrEP.

Another modeling direction involves understanding the elimination of disparities in HIV burden among diverse subgroups of MSM. As overall incidence decreases, disparities may be exacerbated [120]. Therefore, eliminating disparities is a parallel goal to achieving the overall target for HIV elimination. In our review, this topic has received much attention in the context of epidemics in the USA [36, 37, 45, 52], where pronounced disparities in HIV burden have been observed due to assortative mixing of racial and ethnic subgroups and differences in their interaction with the healthcare system (e.g., testing rates, ART, and PrEP coverage). However, the issue of disparities is not limited to the USA and is relevant to characteristics other than ethnicity in many countries. For example, substantial age differences in HIV prevalence are observed among MSM in Africa [122] and the Caribbean [9]. On the road to elimination, disparities may increase between native and migrant populations [117], as well as between rural and urban communities. In our review, simpler models with fewer stratifications such as DCMs and SCMs predominated outside Western and Central Europe and North America. More complex ABMs will be required to simulate elimination interventions that are sufficiently nuanced to address the vulnerabilities of diverse subgroups of MSM. The need for improved incorporation of characteristics such as ethnicity in future models was also discussed in other literature [15, 99].

Finally, modeling could be useful for understanding how new HIV technologies and biomedical prevention tools might affect transmission dynamics and either strengthen or undermine the feasibility of elimination in different regions. Research efforts are increasingly dedicated to improving the quality of life for people already living with HIV. Biomedical advancements may lead to a potential HIV cure in the future, with a target product profile already formulated [123]. Notably, the target product profile considers the possibility of re-infection and viral rebound after ART-free suppression acceptable. These characteristics imply that introducing an HIV cure may result in new infections among MSM. Investigating future scenarios involving such potential interventions will be necessary to guide their implementation in the context of current HIV elimination efforts.

Limitations

In the absence of prior systematic reviews on the possibility of global elimination among MSM, we focused our study on mathematical transmission models. These models have the advantage of providing a mechanistic understanding of the transmission process and are frequently used to inform policymakers. The synthesis of elimination definitions and interventions that may lead to elimination in a broader class of models available in the literature (e.g., statistical, back-calculation, decision-analytic, health economic) should be a subject of future research. Additionally, we compared the worldwide location of the studied populations with the HIV prevalence among MSM as reported by the UNAIDS key population Atlas [1]. These UNAIDS data are compiled from public sources and reviewed for quality, though the quality may vary. Other recent estimates of HIV prevalence among MSM cover only specific UNAIDS regions (e.g., [9, 101, 102]) and their use would not alter our overall conclusions about the underrepresentation of MSM populations. However, it is important to note that our decision to exclude studies not published in

English may have contributed to the finding that some UNAIDS regions are underrepresented in modeling studies. Furthermore, the presence of various elimination definitions and model types complicated the comparison of efficient intervention scenarios across settings. Different studies modeled similar interventions using a range of modeling paradigms, making cross-comparison challenging. Although we extracted some details on model structures and methodologies, our review primarily focused on elimination definitions and the potential for elimination through various interventions rather than on the structural composition of the models. Therefore, we did not comment on the suitability of the model structure for projecting elimination prospects beyond the criteria included in the comprehensiveness score and used for critical appraisal of studies. In the future, more research should focus on systematic comparative analyses of different models using consistent elimination definitions, epidemiological outcomes. Although it does not specifically define elimination, the study by Eaton et al. [100] serves as an example of such an analysis.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this systematic review compiled evidence on the possibilities of HIV elimination among MSM worldwide by summarizing findings from mathematical modeling studies. There is a need to intensify modeling efforts to assess elimination prospects among MSM outside Western and Central Europe and North America. Additionally, we analyzed the elimination definitions used in current studies and recommended new research directions for modeling to support a coordinated global response to HIV elimination among MSM.

Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the Aidsfonds Netherlands (grant number P-53902) and by the VERDI project (101045989), funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Health and Digital Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. We thank Kevin Jenniskens (University Medical Center Utrecht and Cochrane Netherlands), Marleen Werkman (University Medical Center Utrecht), Noor Godijk van Merkestein (GGD Limburg-Noord), Maria Xiridou (The National Institute for Public Health and The Environment), and members of the Infectious Disease Modeling Group (University Medical Center Utrecht) for useful discussions.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Author contributions

G.R. supervised the study. G.R. and J.A.R. wrote the manuscript. J.A.R., A.T., and G.R. extracted data. J.A.R. analyzed data. J.A.R. and A.T. performed a critical appraisal of studies. M.E.K., J.H.H.M.v.d.W., and A.T. made substantial contributions to the discussions and commented on the manuscript.

Reporting summary

Further information on research design is available in the Nature Research Reporting Summary linked to this article.

Additional information

The full PRISMA checklist is available in Appendix 1. Additional results are shown in Figures S1-S2 and Tables S1-S6.

Data availability

The extracted data are available in Appendix 2.

Correspondence

Correspondence and material requests should be addressed to Dr. Ganna Rozhnova, Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, P.O. Box 85500 Utrecht, The Netherlands; email: g.rozhnova@umcutrecht.nl.

References

[1] The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). UNAIDS Key Population Atlas; 2024. Available from: https://kpatlas.unaids.org/dashboard.

[2] The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). Global HIV & AIDS statistics — Fact sheet; 2024. Available from: https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/UNAIDS_FactSheet_en.pdf.

[3] Korenromp EL, Sabin K, Stover J, Brown T, Johnson LF, Martin-Hughes R, et al. New HIV infections among key populations and their partners in 2010 and 2022, by world region: a multisources estimation. Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes. 2024;95(1):S34–S45. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000003340.

[4] Palk L, Gerstoft J, Obel N, Blower S. A modeling study of the Danish HIV epidemic in men who have sex with men: travel, pre-exposure prophylaxis and elimination. Scientific Reports. 2018;8(1):16003. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-33570-0.

[5] Brizzi F, Birrell PJ, Kirwan P, Ogaz D, Brown AE, Delpech VC, et al. Tracking elimination of HIV transmission in men who have sex with men in England: a modelling study. The Lancet HIV. 2021;8(7):e440–e448. doi:10.1016/S2352-3018(21)00044-8.

[6] van Sighem A, Wit F, Boyd A, Smit C, Jongen V, Koole J. Monitoring Report 2023. Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Infection in the Netherlands. Amsterdam: Stichting hiv monitoring; 2023. Available from: https://www.hiv-monitoring.nl.

[7] Mumtaz GR, Chemaitelly H, Abu-Raddad LJ. In: Laher I, editor. The HIV Epidemic in the Middle East and North Africa: Key Lessons. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2021. p. 3053–3079. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-36811-1_139.

[8] Mumtaz GR, Chemaitelly H, AlMukdad S, Osman A, Fahme S, Rizk NA, et al. Status of the HIV epidemic in key populations in the Middle East and north Africa: knowns and unknowns. The Lancet HIV. 2022;9(7):e506–e516. doi:10.1016/S2352-3018(22)00093-5.

[9] Coelho LE, Torres TS, Veloso VG, Grinsztejn B, Jalil EM, Wilson EC, et al. The prevalence of HIV among men who have sex with men (MSM) and young MSM in Latin America and the Caribbean: a systematic review. AIDS and Behavior. 2021;25(10):3223–3237. doi:10.1007/s10461-021-03180-5.

[10] Stannah J, Soni N, Lam JKS, Giguère K, Mitchell KM, Kronfli N, et al. Trends in HIV testing, the treatment cascade, and HIV incidence among men who have sex with men in Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis. The Lancet HIV. 2023;10(8):e528–e542. doi:10.1016/S2352-3018(23)00111-X.

[11] McCormack S, Dunn DT, Desai M, Dolling DI, Gafos M, Gilson R, et al. Pre-exposure prophylaxis to prevent the acquisition of HIV-1 infection (PROUD): effectiveness results from the pilot phase of a pragmatic open-label randomised trial. The Lancet. 2016;387(10013):53–60. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00056-2.

[12] Granich RM, Gilks CF, Dye C, De Cock KM, Williams BG. Universal voluntary HIV testing with immediate antiretroviral therapy as a strategy for elimination of HIV transmission: a mathematical model. Lancet. 2008;373(9657):48–57. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61697-9.

[13] van Sighem A, van der Valk M. Moving towards zero new HIV infections: The importance of combination prevention. The Lancet Regional Health – Western Pacific. 2022;25. doi:10.1016/j.lanwpc.2022.100558.

[14] Garnett GP. An introduction to mathematical models in sexually transmitted disease epidemiology. Sex Transm Infect. 2002;78(1):7–12. doi:10.1136/sti.78.1.7.

[15] Giddings R, Indravudh P, Medley GF, Bozzani F, Gafos M, Malhotra S, et al. Infectious disease modelling of HIV prevention interventions: a systematic review and narrative synthesis of compartmental models. PharmacoEconomics. 2023;41(6):693–707. doi:10.1007/s40273-023-01260-z.

[16] Rozhnova G, Heijne J, Bezemer D, van Sighem A, Presanis A, De Angelis D, et al. Elimination prospects of the Dutch HIV epidemic among men who have sex with men in the era of preexposure prophylaxis. AIDS. 2018;32(17):2615–2623. doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000002050.

[17] The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). Understanding fast-track accelerating action to end the AIDS epidemic by 2030; 2015. Available from: https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/201506_JC2743_Understanding_FastTrack_en.pdf.

[18] Hamilton DT, Hoover KW, Smith DK, Delaney KP, Wang LY, Li J, et al. Achieving the "Ending the HIV Epidemic in the U.S." incidence reduction goals among at-risk populations in the South. BMC Public Health. 2023;23(1):716. doi:10.1186/s12889-023-15563-5.

[19] Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;372:n71. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71.

[20] World Health Organization. Consolidated guidelines on the use of antiretroviral drugs for treating and preventing HIV infection: recommendations for a public health approach, 2nd ed; 2016. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241549684.

[21] Balasubramanian R, Kasaie P, Schnure M, Dowdy DW, Shah M, Fojo AT. Projected impact of expanded long-acting injectable PrEP use among men who have sex with men on local HIV epidemics. JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes. 2022;91(2):144–150. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000003029.

[22] Bórquez A, Rich K, Farrell M, Degenhardt L, McKetin R, Tran LT, et al. Integrating HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis and harm reduction among men who have sex with men and transgender women to address intersecting harms associated with stimulant use: a modelling study. J Int AIDS Soc. 2020;23 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):e25495. doi:10.1002/jia2.25495.

[23] Buchanan AL, Park CJ, Bessey S, Goedel WC, Murray EJ, Friedman SR, et al. Spillover benefit of pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention: evaluating the importance of effect modification using an agent-based model. Epidemiol Infect. 2022;150:e192. doi:10.1017/S0950268822001650.

[24] Buchanan AL, Bessey S, Goedel WC, King M, Murray EJ, Friedman SR, et al. Disseminated effects in agent-based models: A potential outcomes framework and application to inform preexposure prophylaxis coverage levels for HIV prevention. Am J Epidemiol. 2021;190(5):939–948. doi:10.1093/aje/kwaa239.

[25] Chan PA, Goedel WC, Nunn AS, Sowemimo-Coker G, Galárraga O, Prosperi M, et al. Potential impact of interventions to enhance retention in care during real-world HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis implementation. AIDS Patient Care STDS. 2019;33(10):434–439. doi:10.1089/apc.2019.0064.

[26] Chen YH, Farnham PG, Hicks KA, Sansom SL. Estimating the HIV effective reproduction number in the United States and evaluating HIV elimination strategies. J Public Health Manag Pract. 2022;28(2):152–161. doi:10.1097/PHH.0000000000001397.

[27] David JF, Lima VD, Zhu J, Brauer F. A co-interaction model of HIV and syphilis infection among gay, bisexual and other men who have sex with men. Infect Dis Model. 2020;5:855–870. doi:10.1016/j.idm.2020.10.008.

[28] Dimitrov D, Moore JR, Wood D, Mitchell KM, Li M, Hughes JP, et al. Predicted effectiveness of daily and nondaily preexposure prophylaxis for men who have sex with men based on sex and pill-taking patterns from the human immuno virus prevention trials network 067/ADAPT study. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2019;71(2):249–255. doi:10.1093/cid/ciz799.

[29] Dimitrov D, Wood D, Ulrich A, Swan DA, Adamson B, Lama JR, et al. Projected effectiveness of HIV detection during early infection and rapid ART initiation among MSM and transgender women in Peru: a modeling study. Infectious Disease Modelling. 2019;4:73–82. doi:10.1016/j.idm.2019.04.001.

[30] Drabo EF, Moucheraud C, Nguyen A, Garland WH, Holloway IW, Leibowitz A, et al. Using microsimulation modeling to inform EHE implementation strategies in Los Angeles County. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2022;90(S1):S167–S176. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000002977.

[31] Elion RA, Kabiri M, Mayer KH, Wohl DA, Cohen J, Beaubrun AC, et al. Estimated impact of targeted pre-exposure prophylaxis: strategies for men who have sex with men in the United States. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2019;16(9). doi:10.3390/ijerph16091592.

[32] Fojo AT, Schnure M, Kasaie P, Dowdy DW, Shah M. What will it take to end HIV in the United States? : A comprehensive, local-level modeling study. Ann Intern Med. 2021;174(11):1542–1553. doi:10.7326/M21-1501.

[33] Fraser H, Borquez A, Stone J, Abramovitz D, Brouwer KC, Goodman-Meza D, et al. Overlapping key populations and HIV transmission in Tijuana, Mexico: a modelling analysis of epidemic drivers. AIDS and Behavior. 2021;25(11):3814–3827. doi:10.1007/s10461-021-03361-2.

[34] Gantenberg JR, King M, Montgomery MC, Galárraga O, Prosperi M, Chan PA, et al. Improving the impact of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis implementation in small urban centers among men who have sex with men: an agent-based modelling study. PLoS One. 2018;13(7):e0199915. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0199915.

[35] Gilmour S, Peng L, Li J, Oka S, Tanuma J. New strategies for prevention of HIV among Japanese men who have sex with men: a mathematical model. Scientific Reports. 2020;10(1):18187. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-75182-7.

[36] Goedel WC, Bessey S, Lurie MN, Biello KB, Sullivan PS, Nunn AS, et al. Projecting the impact of equity-based preexposure prophylaxis implementation on racial disparities in HIV incidence among MSM. AIDS. 2020;34(10):1509–1517. doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000002577.

[37] Goedel WC, King MRF, Lurie MN, Nunn AS, Chan PA, Marshall BDL. Effect of racial inequities in pre-exposure prophylaxis use on racial disparities in HIV incidence among men who have sex with men: a modeling study. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2018;79(3):323–329. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000001817.

[38] Goodreau SM, Hamilton DT, Jenness SM, Sullivan PS, Valencia RK, Wang LY, et al. Targeting human immunodeficiency virus pre-exposure prophylaxis to adolescent sexual minority males in higher prevalence areas of the United States: a modeling study. Journal of Adolescent Health. 2018;62(3):311–319. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2017.09.023.

[39] Le Guillou A, Buchbinder S, Scott H, Liu A, Havlir D, Scheer S, et al. Population impact and efficiency of improvements to HIV PrEP under conditions of high ART coverage among San Francisco men who have sex with men. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2021;88(4):340–347. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000002781.

[40] Gurski K, Hoffman K. Staged HIV transmission and treatment in a dynamic model with long-term partnerships. Journal of Mathematical Biology. 2023;86(5):74. doi:10.1007/s00285-023-01885-w.

[41] Gutowska SJ, Hoffman KA, Gurski KF. The effect of PrEP uptake and adherence on the spread of HIV in the presence of casual and long-term partnerships. Math Biosci Eng. 2022;19(12):11903–11934. doi:10.3934/mbe.2022555.

[42] Hamilton DT, Rosenberg ES, Sullivan PS, Wang LY, Dunville RL, Barrios LC, et al. Modeling the impact of PrEP programs for adolescent sexual minority males based on empirical estimates for the PrEP continuum of care. J Adolesc Health. 2020;68(3):488–496. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.06.041.

[43] Hamilton DT, Katz DA, Luo W, Stekler JD, Rosenberg ES, Sullivan PS, et al. Effective strategies to promote HIV self-testing for men who have sex with men: evidence from a mathematical model. Epidemics. 2021;37:100518. doi:10.1016/j.epidem.2021.100518.

[44] Hamilton DT, Rosenberg ES, Jenness SM, Sullivan PS, Wang LY, Dunville RL, et al. Modeling the joint effects of adolescent and adult PrEP for sexual minority males in the United States. PLoS One. 2019;14(5):e0217315. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0217315.

[45] Hamilton DT, Goodreau SM, Jenness SM, Sullivan PS, Wang LY, Dunville RL, et al. Potential impact of HIV preexposure prophylaxis among black and white adolescent sexual minority males. American Journal of Public Health. 2018;108(S4):S284–S291. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2018.304471.

[46] Hansson D, Strömdahl S, Leung KY, Britton T. Introducing pre-exposure prophylaxis to prevent HIV acquisition among men who have sex with men in Sweden: insights from a mathematical pair formation model. BMJ Open. 2020;10(2):e033852. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033852.

[47] Hansson D, Leung KY, Britton T, Strömdahl S. A dynamic network model to disentangle the roles of steady and casual partners for HIV transmission among MSM. Epidemics. 2019;27:66–76. doi:10.1016/j.epidem.2019.02.001.

[48] Irvine MA, Salway T, Grennan T, Wong J, Gilbert M, Coombs D. Predicting the impact of clustered risk and testing behaviour patterns on the population-level effectiveness of pre-exposure prophylaxis against HIV among gay, bisexual and other men who have sex with men in Greater Vancouver, Canada. Epidemics. 2019;30:100360. doi:10.1016/j.epidem.2019.100360.

[49] Irvine MA, Konrad BP, Michelow W, Balshaw R, Gilbert M, Coombs D. A novel Bayesian approach to predicting reductions in HIV incidence following increased testing interventions among gay, bisexual and other men who have sex with men in Vancouver, Canada. J R Soc Interface. 2018;15(140). doi:10.1098/rsif.2017.0849.

[50] 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(6):1019–1028. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiab051.

[51] 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(14):2103–2113. doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000002681.

[52] Jenness SM, Maloney KM, Smith DK, Hoover KW, Goodreau SM, Rosenberg ES, et al. Addressing gaps in HIV preexposure prophylaxis care to reduce racial disparities in HIV incidence in the United States. Am J Epidemiol. 2019;188(4):743–752. doi:10.1093/aje/kwy230.

[53] Jenness SM, Sharma A, Goodreau SM, Rosenberg ES, Weiss KM, Hoover KW, et al. Individual HIV risk versus population impact of risk compensation after HIV preexposure prophylaxis initiation among men Who have sex with men. PLoS One. 2017;12(1):e0169484. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0169484.

[54] Jenness SM, Goodreau SM, Rosenberg E, Beylerian EN, Hoover KW, Smith DK, et al. Impact of the Centers for Disease Control's HIV preexposure prophylaxis guidelines for men who have sex with men in the United States. J Infect Dis. 2016;214(12):1800–1807. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiw223.

[55] Jijón S, Molina JM, Costagliola D, Supervie V, Breban R. Can HIV epidemics among MSM be eliminated through participation in preexposure prophylaxis rollouts? AIDS. 2021;35(14):2347–2354. doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000003012.

[56] Jones J, Le Guillou A, Gift TL, Chesson H, Bernstein KT, Delaney KP, et al. Effect of screening and treatment for gonorrhea and chlamydia on HIV incidence among men who have sex with men in the United States: a modeling analysis. Sexually Transmitted Diseases. 2022;49(10). doi:10.1097/OLQ.0000000000001685.

[57] Kasaie P, Schumacher CM, Jennings JM, Berry SA, Tuddenham SA, Shah MS, et al. Gonorrhoea and chlamydia diagnosis as an entry point for HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis: a modelling study. BMJ Open. 2019;9(3). doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-023453.

[58] Kasaie P, Berry SA, Shah MS, Rosenberg ES, Hoover KW, Gift TL, et al. Impact of providing preexposure prophylaxis for human immunodeficiency virus at clinics for sexually transmitted infections in Baltimore City: an agent-based model. Sex Transm Dis. 2018;45(12):791–797. doi:10.1097/OLQ.0000000000000882.

[59] Kasaie P, Pennington J, Shah MS, Berry SA, German D, Flynn CP, et al. The impact of preexposure prophylaxis among men who have sex with men: an individual-based model. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2017;75(2):175–183. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000001354.

[60] Khanna AS, Edali M, Ozik J, Collier N, Hotton A, Skwara A, et al. Projecting the number of new HIV infections to formulate the "Getting to Zero" strategy in Illinois, USA. Math Biosci Eng. 2021;18(4):3922–3938. doi:10.3934/mbe.2021196.

[61] Khanna AS, Schneider JA, Collier N, Ozik J, Issema R, di Paola A, et al. A modeling framework to inform preexposure prophylaxis initiation and retention scale-up in the context of 'Getting to Zero' initiatives. AIDS. 2019;33(12):1911–1922. doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000002290.

[62] Khurana N, Yaylali E, Farnham PG, Hicks KA, Allaire BT, Jacobson E, et al. Impact of improved HIV care and treatment on PrEP effectiveness in the United States, 2016–2020. JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes. 2018;78(4):399–405. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000001707.

[63] Kusejko K, Marzel A, Hampel B, Bachmann N, Nguyen H, Fehr J, et al. Quantifying the drivers of HIV transmission and prevention in men who have sex with men: a population model-based analysis in Switzerland. HIV Med. 2018;19(10):688–697. doi:10.1111/hiv.12660.

[64] Labs J, Nunn AS, Chan PA, Bessey S, Park CJ, Marshall BDL, et al. Projected effects of disruptions to human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) prevention services during the Coronavirus Disease 2019 pandemic among Black/African American men who have sex with men in an ending the HIV epidemic priority jurisdiction. Open Forum Infect Dis. 2022;9(7):ofac274. doi:10.1093/ofid/ofac274.

[65] Lee F, Khanna AS, Hallmark CJ, Lavingia R, McNeese M, Zhao J, et al. Expanding medicaid to reduce human immunodeficiency virus transmission in Houston, Texas: insights from a modeling study. Med Care. 2023;61(1):12–19. doi:10.1097/MLR.0000000000001772.

[66] Lee F, Sheeler D, Hotton A, Vecchio ND, Flores R, Fujimoto K, et al. Stimulant use interventions may strengthen 'Getting to Zero' HIV elimination initiatives in Illinois: insights from a modeling study. International Journal of Drug Policy. 2022;103:103628. doi:10.1016/j.drugpo.2022.103628.

[67] Lima VD, Zhu J, Card KG, Lachowsky NJ, Chowell-Puente G, Wu Z, et al. Can the combination of TasP and PrEP eliminate HIV among MSM in British Columbia, Canada? Epidemics. 2021;35:100461. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epidem.2021.100461.

[68] LeVasseur MT, Goldstein ND, Tabb LP, Olivieri-Mui BL, Welles SL. The effect of PrEP on HIV incidence among men who have sex with men in the context of condom use, treatment as prevention, and seroadaptive practices. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2018;77(1):31–40. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000001555.

[69] Lou J, Cheng J, Li Y, Zhang C, Xing H, Ruan Y, et al. Comparison of different strategies for controlling HIV/AIDS spreading in MSM. Infect Dis Model. 2018;3:293–300. doi:10.1016/j.idm.2018.10.002.

[70] Lou J, Hu P, Qian HZ, Ruan Y, Jin Z, Xing H, et al. Expanded antiretroviral treatment, sexual networks, and condom use: treatment as prevention unlikely to succeed without partner reduction among men who have sex with men in China. PLOS ONE. 2017;12(4):1–18. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0171295.

[71] Lyons CE, Stokes-Cawley OJ, Simkin A, Bowring AL, Mfochive Njindam I, Njoya O, et al. Modeling the potential impact of pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV among men who have sex with men in Cameroon. BMC Infectious Diseases. 2022;22(1):751. doi:10.1186/s12879-022-07738-z.

[72] Lu Z, Wang L, Wang P, Xing H, Fu G, Yan H, et al. A mathematical model for HIV prevention and control among men who have sex with men in China. Epidemiology and Infection. 2020;148(224):1–9. doi:10.1017/S0950268820000850.

[73] Maheu-Giroux M, Vesga JF, Diabaté S, Alary M, Baral S, Diouf D, et al. Changing dynamics of HIV transmission in Côte d'Ivoire: modeling who acquired and transmitted infections and estimating the impact of past HIV interventions (1976–2015). JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes. 2017;75(5):517–527. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000001434.

[74] Maheu-Giroux M, Vesga JF, Diabaté S, Alary M, Baral S, Diouf D, et al. Population-level impact of an accelerated HIV response plan to reach the UNAIDS 90-90-90 target in Côte d'Ivoire: insights from mathematical modeling. PLOS Medicine. 2017;14(6):1–18. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002321.

[75] Marshall BDL, Goedel WC, King MRF, Singleton A, Durham DP, Chan PA, et al. Potential effectiveness of long-acting injectable pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention in men who have sex with men: a modelling study. Lancet HIV. 2018;5(9):e498–e505. doi:10.1016/S2352-3018(18)30097-3.

[76] Martin EG, MacDonald RH, Gordon DE, Swain CA, O'Donnell T, Helmeset J, et al. Simulating the end of AIDS in New York: using participatory dynamic modeling to improve implementation of the ending the epidemic initiative. Public Health Reports. 2020;135(1_suppl):158S–171S. doi:10.1177/0033354920935069.

[77] Milwid RM, Xia Y, Doyle CM, Cox J, Lambert G, Thomas R, et al. Past dynamics of HIV transmission among men who have sex with men in Montréal, Canada: a mathematical modeling study. BMC Infect Dis. 2022;22(1):233. doi:10.1186/s12879-022-07207-7.

[78] Mitchell KM, Boily MC, Hanscom B, Moore M, Todd J, Paz-Bailey G, et al. Estimating the impact of HIV PrEP regimens containing long-acting injectable cabotegravir or daily oral tenofovir disoproxil fumarate/emtricitabine among men who have sex with men in the United States: a mathematical modelling study for HPTN 083. Lancet Reg Health Am. 2023;18:100416. doi:10.1016/j.lana.2022.100416.

[79] Mitchell KM, Dimitrov D, Silhol R, Geidelberg L, Moore M, Liu A. The potential effect of COVID-19-related disruptions on HIV incidence and HIV-related mortality among men who have sex with men in the USA: a modelling study. Lancet HIV. 2021;8(4):e206–e215. doi:10.1016/S2352-3018(21)00022-9.

[80] Mitchell KM, Hoots B, Dimitrov D, German D, Flynn C, Farley JE, et al. Improvements in the HIV care continuum needed to meaningfully reduce HIV incidence among men who have sex with men in Baltimore, US: a modelling study for HPTN 078. Journal of the International AIDS Society. 2019;22(3):e25246. doi:10.1002/jia2.25246.

[81] Mitchell KM, Prudden HJ, Washington R, Isac S, Rajaram SP, Foss AM, et al. Potential impact of pre-exposure prophylaxis for female sex workers and men who have sex with men in Bangalore, India: a mathematical modelling study. Journal of the International AIDS Society. 2016;19(1):20942. doi:10.7448/IAS.19.1.20942.

[82] Mukandavire C, Walker J, Schwartz S, Boily MC, Danon L, Lyons C, et al. Estimating the contribution of key populations towards the spread of HIV in Dakar, Senegal. Journal of the International AIDS Society. 2018;21(S5):e25126. doi:10.1002/jia2.25126.

[83] Robineau O, Velter A, Barin F, Boelle PY. HIV transmission and pre-exposure prophylaxis in a high risk MSM population: a simulation study of location-based selection of sexual partners. PLoS One. 2017;12(11):e0189002. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0189002.

[84] Rozhnova G, Heijne JCM, Basten M, den Daas C, Matser A, Kretzschmar M. Impact of sexual trajectories of men who have sex with men on the reduction in HIV transmission by pre-exposure prophylaxis. Epidemics. 2019;28:100337. doi:10.1016/j.epidem.2019.03.003.

[85] Rozhnova G, van der Loeff MFS, Heijne JCM, Kretzschmar ME. Impact of heterogeneity in sexual behavior on effectiveness in reducing HIV transmission with test-and-treat strategy. PLOS Computational Biology. 2016;12(8):1–20. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005012.

[86] Silhol R, Baral S, Bowring AL, Mukandavire C, Njindam IM, Rao A, et al. Quantifying the evolving contribution of HIV interventions and key populations to the HIV epidemic in Yaoundé, Cameroon. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2021;86(4):396–405. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000002580.

[87] Silhol R, Geidelberg L, Mitchell KM, Mishra S, Dimitrov D, Bowring A, et al. Assessing the potential impact of disruptions due to COVID-19 on HIV among key and lower-risk populations in the largest cities of Cameroon and Benin. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2021;87(3):899–911. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000002663.

[88] Silhol R, Boily MC, Dimitrov D, German D, Flynn C, Farley JE, et al. Understanding the HIV epidemic among MSM in Baltimore: a modeling study estimating the impact of past HIV interventions and who acquired and contributed to infections. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2020;84(3):253–262. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000002340.

[89] Singleton AL, Marshall BDL, Zang X, Nunn AS, Goedel WC. Added benefits of pre-exposure prophylaxis use on HIV incidence with minimal changes in efficiency in the context of high treatment engagement among men who have sex with men. AIDS Patient Care STDS. 2020;34(12):506–515. doi:10.1089/apc.2020.0151.

[90] Shen M, Xiao Y, Rong L, Meyers LA, Bellan SE. Early antiretroviral therapy and potent second-line drugs could decrease HIV incidence of drug resistance. Proc Biol Sci. 2017;284(1857). doi:10.1098/rspb.2017.0525.

[91] Stansfield SE, Herbeck JT, Gottlieb GS, Abernethy NF, Murphy JT, Mittler JE, et al. Test-and-treat coverage and HIV virulence evolution among men who have sex with men. Virus Evol. 2021;7(1):veab011. doi:10.1093/ve/veab011.

[92] Stone J, Mukandavire C, Boily MC, Fraser H, Mishra S, Schwartz S, et al. Estimating the contribution of key populations towards HIV transmission in South Africa. Journal of the International AIDS Society. 2021;24(1):e25650. doi:10.1002/jia2.25650.

[93] Vermeer W, Gurkan C, Hjorth A, Benbow N, Mustanski BM, Kern D, et al. Agent-based model projections for reducing HIV infection among MSM: Prevention and care pathways to end the HIV epidemic in Chicago, Illinois. PLoS One. 2022;17(10):e0274288. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0274288.

[94] Wang Y, Tanuma J, Li J, Iwahashi K, Peng L, Chen C, et al. Elimination of HIV transmission in Japanese MSM with combination interventions. The Lancet Regional Health – Western Pacific. 2022;23. doi:10.1016/j.lanwpc.2022.100467.

[95] Wang L, Moqueet N, Simkin A, Knight J, Ma H, Lachowsky NJ, et al. Mathematical modelling of the influence of serosorting on the population-level HIV transmission impact of pre-exposure prophylaxis. AIDS. 2021;35(7):1113–1125. doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000002826.

[96] Zhang C, Webb GF, Lou J, Shepherd BE, Qian HZ, Liu Y, et al. Predicting the long-term impact of voluntary medical male circumcision on HIV incidence among men who have sex with men in Beijing, China. AIDS Care. 2020;32(3):343–353. doi:10.1080/09540121.2019.1679704.

[97] Booton RD, Ong JJ, Lee A, Liu A, Huang W, Wei C, et al. Modelling the impact of an HIV testing intervention on HIV transmission among men who have sex with men in China. HIV Med. 2021;22(6):467–477. doi:10.1111/hiv.13063.

[98] Sweileh WM. Global research activity on mathematical modeling of transmission and control of 23 selected infectious disease outbreak. Globalization and Health. 2022;18(1):4. doi:10.1186/s12992-022-00803-x.

[99] Anderle RV, de Oliveira RB, Rubio FA, Macinko J, Dourado I, Rasella D. Modelling HIV/AIDS epidemiological complexity: a scoping review of agent-based models and their application. PLoS One. 2024;19(2):e0297247. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0297247.

[100] Eaton JW, Johnson LF, Salomon JA, Bärnighausen T, Bendavid E, Bershteyn A, et al. HIV treatment as prevention: systematic comparison of mathematical models of the potential impact of antiretroviral therapy on HIV incidence in South Africa. PLOS Medicine. 2012;9(7):1–20. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001245.

[101] Kloek M, Bulstra CA, van Noord L, Al-Hassany L, Cowan FM, Hontelez JAC. HIV prevalence among men who have sex with men, transgender women and cisgender male sex workers in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of the International AIDS Society. 2022;25(11):e26022. doi:10.1002/jia2.26022.

[102] Stevens O, Sabin K, Anderson R, Garcia SA, Willis K, Rao A, et al. Population size, HIV prevalence, and antiretroviral therapy coverage among key populations in sub-Saharan Africa: collation and synthesis of survey data 2010-2023. medRxiv. 2024;doi:10.1101/2022.07.27.22278071.

[103] Massey K, Vardanega V, Chaponda M, Eddowes LA, Hearmon N. Investigating zero transmission of HIV in the MSM population: a UK modelling case study. Archives of Public Health. 2023;81(1):201. doi:10.1186/s13690-023-01178-0.

[104] Okano JT, Robbins D, Palk L, Gerstoft J, Obel N, Blower S. Testing the hypothesis that treatment can eliminate HIV: a nationwide, population-based study of the Danish HIV epidemic in men who have sex with men. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2016;16(7):789–796. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(16)30022-6.

[105] Bavinton B, Grulich A. HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis: scaling up for impact now and in the future. The Lancet Public Health. 2021;6. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00112-2.

[106] Moyo PL, Nunu WN. Exploring barriers and facilitators that influence uptake of oral pre-exposure prophylaxis among men who have sex with men in Bulawayo, Zimbabwe: key stakeholder's perspectives. American Journal of Men's Health. 2024;18(1):15579883231223377. doi:10.1177/15579883231223377.

[107] 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. doi:10.1007/s11904-010-0063-3.

[108] Iwuji CC, McGrath N, de Oliveira T, Porter K, Pillay D, Fisher M, et al. The art of HIV elimination: past and present science. J AIDS Clin Res. 2015;6. doi:10.4172/2155-6113.1000525.

[109] Galvani AP, Pandey A, Fitzpatrick MC, Medlock J, Gray GE. Defining control of HIV epidemics. The Lancet HIV. 2018;5(11):e667–e670. doi:10.1016/S2352-3018(18)30178-4.

[110] Ghys PD, Williams BG, Over M, Hallett TB, Godfrey-Faussett P. Epidemiological metrics and benchmarks for a transition in the HIV epidemic. PLoS Med. 2018;15(10):e1002678. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002678.

[111] Kapadia F, Landers S. Ending the HIV epidemic: getting to zero and staying at zero. American Journal of Public Health. 2020;110(1):15–16. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2019.305462.

[112] Reitsema M, van Hoek AJ, van der Loeff MS, Hoornenborg E, van Sighem A, Wallinga J, et al. Preexposure prophylaxis for men who have sex with men in the Netherlands: impact on HIV and Neisseria gonorrhoeae transmission and cost-effectiveness. AIDS. 2020;34(4):621–630. doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000002469.

[113] Jansen IA, Geskus RB, Davidovich U, Jurriaans S, Coutinho RA, Prins M, et al. Ongoing HIV-1 transmission among men who have sex with men in Amsterdam: a 25-year prospective cohort study. AIDS. 2011;25(4).

[114] Brooks RA, Landovitz RJ, Kaplan RL, Lieber E, Lee SJ, Barkley TW. Sexual risk behaviors and acceptability of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis among HIV-negative gay and bisexual men in serodiscordant relationships: a mixed methods study. AIDS Patient Care STDS. 2011;26(2):87–94. doi:10.1089/apc.2011.0283.

[115] Schaefer R, Gregson S, Benedikt C. Widespread changes in sexual behaviour in eastern and southern Africa: Challenges to achieving global HIV targets? Longitudinal analyses of nationally representative surveys. Journal of the International AIDS Society. 2019;22(6):e25329. doi:10.1002/jia2.25329.

[116] The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). UNAIDS data 2023; 2023. Available from: https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/data-book-2023_en.pdf.

[117] Santoso D, Asfia SKBM, Mello MB, Baggaley RC, Johnson CC, Chow EPF, et al. HIV prevalence ratio of international migrants compared to their native-born counterparts: A systematic review and meta-analysis. eClinicalMedicine. 2022;53. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2022.101661.

[118] Fiorentino M, Coulibaly B, Couderc C, Keita BD, Anoma C, Dah E, et al. Men who have sex with both men and women in West Africa: factors associated with a high behavioral risk of acquiring HIV from male partners and transmission to women (CohMSM ANRS 12324—Expertise France). Archives of Sexual Behavior. 2024;53(2):757–769. doi:10.1007/s10508-023-02715-2.

[119] Fiorentino M, Yanwou N, Gravier-Dumonceau Mazelier R, Eubanks A, Roux P, Laurent C, et al. Sexual behaviours and risk with women in MSM in sub-Saharan Africa. AIDS. 2024;38(3). doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000003787.

[120] The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). Global AIDS strategy 2021–2026: end inequalities, end AIDS; 2021. Available from: https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/global-AIDS-strategy-2021-2026_en.pdf.

[121] Ayieko J, Petersen ML, Kamya MR, Havlir DV. PEP for HIV prevention: are we missing opportunities to reduce new infections? J Int AIDS Soc. 2022;25(5):e25942. doi:10.1002/jia2.25942.

[122] Ribeiro Banze Á, Muleia R, Nuvunga S, Boothe M, Semá Baltazar C. Trends in HIV prevalence and risk factors among men who have sex with men in Mozambique: implications for targeted interventions and public health strategies. BMC Public Health. 2024;24(1):1185. doi:10.1186/s12889-024-18661-0.

[123] Lewin SR, Attoye T, Bansbach C, Doehle B, Dubé K, Dybul M, et al. Multi-stakeholder consensus on a target product profile for an HIV cure. The Lancet HIV. 2021;8(1):e42–e50. doi:10.1016/S2352-3018(20)30234-4.