**Supplemental appendix: Additional Detail on Propensity Score Methods**

As an alternate modelling strategy for the primary outcome, viral suppression, and the primary exposure, the pre/post-COVID-19 time-interval, we first constructed a propensity score model for the probability of having a viral load checked during and prior to shelter-in-place due to COVID-19. Covariates were selected using directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) examining potential confounders of obtaining viral load monitoring pre/post-COVID-19. Covariates in the mixed-effects logistic regression model included: sex (binary, woman vs. man), race/ethnicity (categorical, hierarchy of Black>Latinx>Asian>White>Other), primary language (binary, English vs. non-English), and homeless housing status (binary, homeless vs. housed); while age and CD4+ count were included using restricted cubic splines with 3 knots. After fitting the model, we checked for balance of key confounders (CD4 count, homeless status, etc.) in box plots and 2x2 tables comparing means of the covariates across the 5 strata. To assess probability score overlap, we examined graphs of the pre/post COVID-19 probability score histograms (**Supplemental Figure)**. We divided the propensity scores into quintiles, and examined the odds ratios across each quintile, and tested for an interaction of the propensity scores with the pre/post-COVID-19 exposure indicator using a likelihood ratio test (p=0.54, **Supplemental Table**). Finally, to test the robustness of these findings we performed two sensitivity analyses: (1) we conducted a trimmed analysis that was restricted to the region of common support; and (2) we used restricted cubic splines with five knots instead of quintiles to model the relationship between the propensity scores and odds of unsuppressed viral load. Limiting the analysis to propensity scores within the region of overlap had minimal impact on results (AOR 1.31; 95% CI=1.14-1.51). The cubic spline propensity score analysis of the relationship between viral non-suppression and the pre/post-COVID-19 time-interval was nearly identical to the analysis using quintiles (AOR 1.33; 95% CI=1.15-1.53 using cubic splines vs. AOR 1.32; 95% CI=1.14-1.51 using quintiles).

**Supplemental Figure**: Overlap of propensity scores for the pre/post-COVID-19 time intervals
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**Supplemental Table:** Stratum-specific odds ratios

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Quintile of Propensity Score | Odds ratio for outcome of viral non-suppression | 95% Confidence Interval | Mantel-Haenszel Weight |
| 1 | 1.29 | 0.89-1.87 | 25.82 |
| 2 | 1.32 | 0.84-2.05 | 17.71 |
| 3 | 1.10 | 0.77-1.55 | 32.48 |
| 4 | 1.24 | 0.89-1.72 | 33.67 |
| 5 | 1.58 | 1.21-2.07 | 44.05 |
| Combined | 1.32 | 1.14-1.51 | - |

Test of interaction (likelihood ratio test): p=0.54