Use of antiviral treatment and prophylaxis is unlikely to have a major impact on the prevalence of herpes simplex virus type 2
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Background: Genital infection with herpes simplex virus (HSV) is common and can cause severe morbidity, over many years in some cases. Aciclovir provides suppressive therapy but there is debate over the effects of its use on the spread of infection.

Objectives: To explore the influence of the natural history of genital HSV and the impact of antiviral therapy.

Methods: A simple mathematical model of HSV-2 transmission dynamics was developed, and parameter values estimated from published data.

Results: The relative durations of the risk of transmitting HSV-2 and the duration of therapy generate a non-linear relation between the duration of antiviral therapy and the reduction in prevalence of infection. If there is a wide distribution of risk of HSV-2 transmission over the course of an infection then practicable aciclovir use is unlikely to have any great impact on disease transmission dynamics.

Conclusions: There are still many uncertainties in the transmission dynamics of HSV-2. In particular, infectiousness over the course of an infection requires more detailed exploration. To have a significant impact on the prevalence of HSV-2 aciclovir use would have to be widespread and for a long duration.

(Sex Transm Inf 1999;75:49–54)
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Introduction
Herpes simplex virus type 2 (HSV-2) can cause painful recurring ulcers, which could be important in enhancing the transmission of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV).1–4 The current treatment options of aciclovir (and the prodrug, valaciclovir) and penciclovir (generated by famciclovir), while not curing infection, successfully suppress symptoms.5–10 This raises issues about the ability of treatment and disease prophyaxis to reduce the incidence and prevalence of infection.11–13 As well as reducing the severity of symptoms, frequent oral doses of aciclovir, valaciclovir, or famiciclovir over a period of months or years reduce both the frequency and duration of viral shedding during treatment.14–15 This provides a potential means of controlling the spread of infection within a population, and there is debate over whether the use of suppressive therapy and easier access to treatment (for example, “over the counter” without prescription) should be encouraged.12–15 16–18 In order to explore the potential impact of such aciclovir use, we developed a very simple mathematical model of the transmission dynamics of HSV-2 which included the impact of treatment altering transmission probabilities, and reviewed the parameter values available in published literature.

Methods
A compartmental model of the type discussed by Anderson and Brunham and Plummer27 (that is, a model where the population divided according to infection status), was developed to describe the heterosexual spread of genital HSV infection throughout the most sexually active age group of a typical Western population—those aged 16–35 years. This group has the highest rates of sexual partner change both for males and females,21 and the peak incidence for HSV-2 infection.22–25 Three compartments were used describe infection in the population: susceptible, $S_i$, recently infected, $T_i$, and long term infected, $I_i$. As in the models of Hethcote and Yorke26 for gonorrhoea, the model population was divided in two groups ($i=1$ and $i=2$), with different rates of sexual partner change, $c_i$ and frequency of sexual intercourse within the partnership. The different frequency of sexual acts is reflected in different transmission probabilities per sexual partner change between a susceptible from group $i$ and an infected from group $j$, $\beta_{ij}$. The activity classes corresponded to Williams et al’s27 activity classes 1–3 and 4–6, respectively. The proportion of sexual partners chosen from each activity group was described by mixing coefficients, $\rho_{ij}$ controlled by a coefficient $\varepsilon$.28 The rates of flow between the compartments are described by a set of ordinary differential equations:

$$\frac{dS_i}{dt} = \mu N - S_i \sum_j \left[ \frac{\beta_{ij} (1 - \varepsilon) (I_j / \gamma_j)}{N_i} \right] - \mu S_i$$

$$\frac{dT_i}{dt} = S_i \sum_j \left[ \frac{\beta_{ij} (1 - \varepsilon) (I_j / \gamma_j)}{N_i} \right] - \left( \frac{1}{T_D} \right) T_i - \mu T_i$$

$$\frac{dI_i}{dt} = \frac{1}{T_D} T_i - \mu I_i$$
After infection individuals enter the “recently infected” compartment $T_i$ where a fraction $f$ are treated and have a modified value for the transmission probability $\beta_T$. In the absence of treatment the fraction treated, $f$, is set to zero. Those not being treated are as infectious as those in the “long term infected” compartment, $I_i$, which those in the “recently infected” compartment enter at a rate $1/TD$ and remain in until they leave the model population. The pattern of mixing ranges from fully assortative to random determined by the value $\varepsilon$ where

$$\rho_s = (1-\varepsilon)I_s + \varepsilon \left( \frac{cN_s}{\Sigma N_s} \right).$$

Here $\delta_s$ is the identity matrix and $s$ a dummy variable describing each of the sexual activity groups. Each activity group consists of $N_s$ people ($N = S_i + T_i + I_i$). The rate of entry into the sexually active population is the same as the rate of leaving, $\mu$, so that the population remains constant. This means that all individual have a negative exponential distributed sexually active lifespan with a mean duration of 19 years.

The values given to the parameters are described in table 1. Numerical solutions (4th order Runge-Kutta method) were obtained using the Model Maker v2.0 software package.

The pattern of transmission of an infectious disease depends upon the biological properties of the host-pathogen interaction (for example, the frequency of symptomatic and asymptomatic shedding of virus at infectious doses) and the behaviour of the host (for example, the frequency of sexual intercourse and whether it occurs while the infected partner is symptomatically, as well as asymptptomatically, shedding virus).\footnote{19} The transmission probability, $\beta_s$, used in the model is defined per sexual partnership. Assuming there is a fixed chance of transmission for each sex act ($\beta_s$) then the transmission probability for each sexual partnership ($\beta_T$) is a function of the number of sex acts within the partnership (Na):

$$\beta_T = 1 - (1 - \beta_s)^{Na}.$$

This relation was observed empirically for gonorrhoea,\footnote{20} where the duration of infectiousness is short enough for a simple model in which transmission occurs on partner change. Data on the likelihood of HSV-2 transmission were taken from a prospective study in which one partner had a recurrent symptomatic infection and the other was initially seronegative for HSV-2.\footnote{21} Infection risk was assessed typically over 1 year in this sample, which was biased to stable partnerships and to those who had symptomatic infection. For transmission from men to women, prior exposure of the female partner to HSV-1 appears to offer protection against HSV-2 infection, reducing the rate of transmission from 31.8% per year of partnership to 9.1%. Assuming that around 65% of the population exposed to HSV-2 has already experienced infection with HSV-1\footnote{22} gives a weighted mean value of 17% for the transmission probability. The estimated transmission probability per year from women to men was 4.5%. The number of men in the study who were infected was too small to analyse the effect of their HSV-1 serological status, although they are expected to have similar protection.\footnote{23} The average transmission probability from men to women and from women to men is the geometric mean of the separate values (8.76%) and is the appropriate value for our model where we do not distinguish between the sexes.\footnote{19} We do though make allowance for the different duration of high and low activity partnerships and the frequency of sex that occurs per unit time within the partnership. If the average duration of partnerships is the inverse of the rate of partner change, then high activity partnerships last on average for 0.28 years and low activity partnerships for 2.08 years.\footnote{24} If we assume, based on reported behaviours,\footnote{25} that those with high numbers of partners have twice as many sex acts per partner, per unit of time, as others, then we can recalculate from the transmission probability estimated for stable partnerships over 1 year (8.76%), the transmission probability per partnership lasting for 2.08 years (17.4%) and that for partnerships of 0.28 years with twice as many sex acts per unit time (5.1%). In the results we varied which partnerships these values applied to and, because these estimates are subject to many biases, we used a range of values by reducing the initial estimates by 50% and 25% and increasing them by 25%.

To explore the impact of suppressive therapy we need to estimate how it alters the transmission probability. Although the duration of infectiousness is very long, infected individuals are not continuously infectious. Rather, there are episodic outbreaks of viral shedding from the site of infection.\footnote{26} Some of these are accompanied by recognised symptoms, but most are asymptomatic.\footnote{27} It is likely that the level of infectiousness during an outbreak depends upon the viral titre at the site of shedding,\footnote{28} and that symptoms appear during the highest titre outbreaks. If this is true then the viral titre required to cause symptoms is greater than that required for transmission (between 50% and 70% of transmission events occur during an asymptomatic episode).\footnote{29} Aciclovir is known to reduce the frequency both of recurrent symptoms\footnote{30} and of viral shedding events detectable by cell culture and DNA polymerase chain reaction (PCR) assays.\footnote{31} Some asymptomatic shedding can be below the detection limit for cell culture methods, but be detectable by PCR assays.\footnote{32} It is possible that aciclovir may suppress symptoms without eliminating the potential for transmission. The presence of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate of entry into, and exit from the sexually active age group</td>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>1/19 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of the population in high activity group</td>
<td>$\beta_a$</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSV-2 transmission probability per high activity partnership</td>
<td>$\beta_T$</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSV-2 transmission probability per low activity partnership</td>
<td>$\beta_L$</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of partner change: low and high activity groups</td>
<td>$c_{ij}$</td>
<td>0.48, 3.5 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of interaction between low- and high-activity groups</td>
<td>$\varepsilon$</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission probability, during treatment: low- and high-activity groups</td>
<td>$\beta_{a,T}, \beta_{l,T}$</td>
<td>0%, 0% or 31.7%, 0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion treated</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>0.3, 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean treatment duration</td>
<td>$TD$</td>
<td>1-50 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Results**

The endemic prevalence of HSV-2 depends upon the transmission probability of the virus (fig 1). Realistic prevalences of infection below 40% of the sexually active population occur either when the transmission probability used is lower than that estimated, or when partnerships which involve those with many partners have a lower than average transmission probability. However, our model is too simple to use observed prevalences of HSV-2 to estimate patterns of sexual behaviour or parameter values with any confidence. We therefore used a range of prevalences in the absence of suppressive therapy as a baseline to explore the impact of its introduction. Most STDs, such as gonorrhoea, syphilis, and chancroid, have a relatively short duration of infectiousness and depend upon a “core group” of individuals with high rates of sexual partner change in order to persist.19 35 36 There is usually a high transmission probability, which facilitates rapid transmission within and from this core group, who tend to have many short partnerships. Such STDs do not usually infect many individuals outside of the core group because infection chains rapidly break down among less sexually active individuals. In contrast, genital HSV-2 has a relatively low transmission probability, but a very long duration of infectiousness—perhaps lifelong. Thus, HSV-2 infection will be more widespread in the sexually active population.

To determine the impact of suppressive therapy on this widespread infection a fraction of the population is assumed to receive treatment throughout the “recently infected” stage the duration of which was varied (fig 2). Once therapy is withdrawn, individuals are assumed to be as infectious as those who had not received aciclovir.37 To predict the maximum effect of aciclovir usage, it was assumed that all
infected individuals regardless of symptoms received treatment upon becoming infected. As the duration of treatment is increased, the prevalence of HSV-2 declines in the “best case” and increases in the “worst” (fig 2). The change in prevalence is related to the treatment duration in a non-linear fashion, with changes becoming smaller as the duration increases. This is because as people age they reduce their rates of sexual partner change (in our model leaving the sexually active model population) and their risk of transmitting the infection decreases. Thus, as the duration of treatment increases fewer individuals are still influential in viral transmission. The impact of treatment is modest in either direction. Even in the best case, elimination still requires that individuals be treated for many years, whereas suppressive therapy is normally used for just 2 years. Many of those infected are asymptomatic, or have unrecognised symptoms, and would not receive such treatment. Only about 30% have recognised symptoms, which is the maximum proportion likely to receive aciclovir without screening for infection. We explored the situations where everyone and where 30% of those infected are treated and looked at the time it takes for the intervention to have an effect (fig 3). The effects of such an intervention would be slow to be seen, taking decades for any substantial change to occur. The results of treating all infected individuals were modest, and the effects of treating the much more realistic 30% were correspondingly even less dramatic.

The widespread use of suppressive therapy depends on being able to identify asymptomatic infections. This would be more manageable if screening were restricted to groups, such as STD clinic patients, who have a high risk of acquiring and transmitting infection. We explore the impact of therapy restricted to the high activity group (fig 4). It is only when suppressive therapy is used beyond the core group that there are substantial declines in the steady state prevalence.

Discussion

Our results highlight two important concerns about the use of aciclovir as a population level intervention to control HSV-2 transmission. Currently we need to know more about the relation between disease symptoms, viral shedding, and the likelihood of HSV-2 transmission. Because we are uncertain of how the suppression of symptoms will influence the probability of sexual contact and how much virus has to be shed for transmission to be possible, we are uncertain of the decrease in the transmission probability of HSV-2 with aciclovir. In the case of gonorrhoea, patients often deny having sex while symptomatic. If this is also true of HSV-2 then suppressing symptoms without preventing transmissible levels of viral shedding could increase the transmission of infection. Evidence that the reduced shedding of detectable virus will reduce the transmission probability would be reassuring. However, it is made less important by the second result that all but the most extensive use of antivirals has little impact on a system that is dominated by the long duration of infectiousness.

The epidemiology of most other sexually transmitted infections is dominated by a number of individuals who for generally short durations have a very high risk of acquiring and transmitting infection. Under such circumstances the targeted prevention of transmission can have wide ranging impact. In contrast HSV-2 has a low transmissibility for a long duration and hence a more “core group” (see Garnett and Anderson). It is much less sensitive to a short term reduction in the transmission probability. Aciclovir is likely to have little impact on HSV epidemiology, whether it increases or decreases transmission probabilities, because of the relatively short duration of treatment.

Only about one third of those infected have recognised symptoms and many of these will not report those symptoms or receive treatment. This means that unless there is screening for, infection mass prophylaxis would be restricted to a small fraction of those infectious individuals. Such mass long term screening
and treatment would be expensive,logistically complex,and possibly unwelcome,because those asymptomatically infected may not wish to know of their infection. The degree of patient compliance required and the cost of treatment are high,whether funded publicly or by individuals privately purchasing aciclovir.The widespread use of aciclovir to prevent transmission would only be worth considering if it were to have a major impact.This would require therapy for a long period.Acinovir is safe and efficacious for a long period and the introduction of drugs with better bioavailability such as valaciclovir and famciclovir could make treatment schedules more acceptable.16 None the less, it would be a major undertaking.

At present,genital HSV-2 epidemiology is too poorly understood for reliable quantitative projections.The model presented here is deliberately simple in order to generate qualitative insight.Despite this simplicity, the findings with respect to the impact of aciclovir are reasonably robust to model assumptions,owing to the exaggeration of both the numbers of people treated, and reductions in transmission probability possible. However, our assumptions about changes in the transmission probability with time from infection (that is, that it does not change), the relative transmissibility of symptomatic and asymptomatic infection, and the duration of sexual activity within the at risk population, influence the success of aciclovir use as a population level intervention. For example, the severity and frequency of symptoms declines with time since infection.1–3 33 If most infectious viral shedding occurs early in infection, then the use of suppressive therapy over this period would be more beneficial than if virus is shed equally throughout an infection.

In light of the likely ineffectiveness of aciclovir in reducing HSV-2 prevalence, we believe that it is necessary for other strategies to be pursued,such as education.Unfortunately, that it is necessary for other strategies to be pursued, such as education. Despite this simplicity, the findings of this model are robust to some of the assumptions used.
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