**Comments suppl table ETI (estimated time of infection)**

**Patient 1**

ETI was based on a combination Fiebig staging and BED test results, because he patient was in Fiebig stage VI (i.e. >100 days since ETI), whereas BED testing on a sample obtained 22 days later indicated a shorter time (85 days) since ETI. Based on these data ETI was placed 100 days before date for HIV serology for Fiebig staging. The first sequenced sample was obtained 122 days after ETI.

The first VL was <500 and was obtained 122 days after ETI. This VL may be false low because the first generation Roche HIV monitor test, which was used until fall of 1997, is known to sometimes underquantify non-B-subtypes including CRF01\_AE (Alaeus, AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses 1999;15:889).

**Patient 2**

ETI was based on Fiebig stage V. BED also indicates early infection (61 days).The first sequenced sample was obtained 74 days after ETI.

**Patient 3**

Fiebig stage VI indicated >100 days since ETI. Therefore ETI was based on the BED test result that indicated that the first sample used for sequencing (and BED testing) was obtained 146 days after ETI.

**Patient 5**

ETI was based on a combination Fiebig staging and BED test results, because he patient was in Fiebig stage VI (i.e. >100 days since ETI), whereas BED testing on the same sample indicated a shorter time (60 days) since ETI. Based on these data ETI was placed 100 days before date for HIV serology for Fiebig staging. The first sequenced sample was obtained 134 days after ETI and had a VL of <50.

**Patient 6**

ETI was based on a laboratory-confirmed primary HIV infection (PHI). Fiebig staging and BED agrees relatively well with this ETI. Note that Fiebing staging was based on RIBA testing instead of Western blot (WB) because no sample remained for retrospective WB testing. The first sample for sequencing was obtained 62 days after ETI and had a VL of 6800.

**Patient 8**

ETI was based on Fiebig V. Based on this ETI the first sequenced sample was obtained 87 days after ETI. BED agrees quite well with this ETI.

**Patient 9**

ETI was based on a combination of Fiebig staging and BED test results. Fiebig stage VI indicated >100 days since ETI, whereas BED testing on a sample obtained 6 days later indicated a shorter time (71 days) since ETI. Based on these data ETI was placed 100 days before the date of sampling for Fiebig staging, which meant that the first sample used for sequencing was obtained 106 days after ETI.

**Patient 10**

ETI was based on laboratory confirmed primary HIV infection. ETI based on Fiebig staging and BED agrees quite well with this ETI. The first sample for sequencing was obtained 33 days after ETI.

**Patient 11**

ETI was based on a combination of Fiebig staging and BED test results. Fiebig stage VI indicated >100 days since ETI, whereas BED testing on a sample obtained 16 days later indicated 208 days since ETI. Based on these data ETI was placed 208 days before the date of sampling for BED testing. This was also the first sample used for sequencing.