- 1 Title: Estimating the potential impact and diagnostic requirements for SARS-CoV-2
- 2 test-and-treat programs
- 3
- 4 Authors: Alvin X. Han¹, Emma Hannay², Sergio Carmona², Bill Rodriguez², Brooke E.
- 5 Nichols^{1,2,3,†}, Colin A. Russell^{1,3,†}
- 6

7 Affiliations:

- 8 ¹Department of Medical Microbiology & Infection Prevention, Amsterdam University
- 9 Medical Center, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- 10 ²Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics (FIND), Geneva, Switzerland
- ³Department of Global Health, School of Public Health, Boston University, Boston, MA,
- 12 USA
- 13 *†*Contributed equally
- 14
- 15 **Correspondence:** Alvin X. Han (<u>x.han@amsterdamumc.nl</u>) and Colin A. Russell
- 16 (c.a.russell@amsterdamumc.nl)
- 17

18 Abstract (201/200 words):

19 Oral antivirals have the potential to reduce the public health burden of COVID-19. However, 20 now that we have exited the emergency phase of the COVID-19 pandemic, declining SARS-21 CoV-2 clinical testing rates (average testing rates = $\ll 10$ tests/100,000 people/day in low-22 and-middle income countries; <100 tests/100,000 people/day in high-income countries; 23 September 2023) make the development of effective test-and-treat programs challenging. We 24 used an agent-based model to investigate how testing rates and strategies affect the use and 25 effectiveness of oral antiviral test-to-treat programs in four country archetypes of different 26 income levels and demographies. We find that in the post-emergency phase of the pandemic, 27 in countries where low testing rates are driven by limited testing capacity, significant 28 population-level impact of test-and-treat programs can only be achieved by both increasing 29 testing rates and prioritizing individuals with greater risk of severe disease. However, for all 30 countries, significant reductions in severe cases with antivirals are only possible if testing 31 rates were substantially increased with high willingness of people to seek testing. Comparing 32 the potential population-level reductions in severe disease outcomes of test-to-treat programs 33 and vaccination shows that test-and-treat strategies are likely substantially more resource 34 intensive requiring very high levels of testing (>>100 tests/100,000 people/day) and antiviral 35 use suggesting that vaccination should be a higher priority.

37 Main Text

38 Introduction

39 Antiviral therapies such as anti-SARS-CoV-2 monoclonal antibodies, replication inhibitors, protease inhibitors, and host-directed therapies can be used to treat COVID-19, reducing the 40 probability of severe disease to varying degrees.¹ Direct-acting antiviral drugs, such as 41 molnupiravir² and nirmatrelvir-ritonavir (Paxlovid),³ have the potential to substantially lower 42 43 disease burden given their efficacy and convenience of oral dosing. Nirmatrelvir-ritonavir, in 44 particular, can reduce incidence of adverse events in high-risk individuals (i.e. ≥ 60 years of 45 age (over-60y) or an adult \geq 18 years with a relevant comorbidity) by 46-89%.^{3,4} Given their ability to lower viral load,³ these drugs could also potentially be used to control SARS-CoV-2 46 47 transmission.⁵ To achieve maximum impact, these drugs must typically be administered 48 within a few days of symptom onset. Given limited resources and the relatively high cost of these drugs,⁶ along with the need to administer drugs quickly after symptom onset,^{2,3} 49 diagnostic testing remains an essential first step for identifying suitable drug recipients. 50

51

52 Oral antivirals (the term "antivirals" refers only to oral direct antivirals for the rest of this article) have the potential to reduce the disease burden of COVID-19 outbreaks. Various 53 studies have estimated $\sim 10\% - 40\%$ reduction in severe disease outcomes if antivirals were 54 distributed to 20% - 50% of all symptomatic infected individuals.^{5,7,8} However, none of these 55 56 studies have accounted for the diagnostic capacity required to identify and treat these cases 57 with antivirals. There have been substantial gaps in COVID-19 testing equity across country 58 income groups throughout the pandemic. Between January 2020 and March 2022, LMICs 59 were only testing at an average of 27 tests/100,000 people/day (tests/100K/day) as compared 60 to >800 tests/100K/day in high-income countries (HICs).⁹ In the post-public health 61 emergency phase of the pandemic, testing rates have dwindled down to less than 10

tests/100K/day and 100 tests/100K/day on average for LMICs and HICs respectively (as of
September 2023).⁹ Low testing rates severely underestimate COVID-19 cases,¹⁰ which not
only complicate antiviral demand forecasts but also create additional barriers to the effective
distribution and use of antivirals.

66

Here, we used an agent-based model (PATAT)^{11,12} to demonstrate how testing rates and 67 strategies affect the use and impact of antivirals. In the model, we focused on antigen rapid 68 diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) which can easily be performed at point-of-care or be used as self-69 tests with short turnaround time needed to quickly identify high-risk infected individuals.¹³ 70 71 We computed the potential impact of test-and-treat programs on infections, severe cases, and 72 deaths averted in three LMIC archetypes with distinct demographic structures – Brazil, 73 Georgia, and Zambia – and the Netherlands as an HIC example, all under varying levels of 74 vaccination coverage. The LMIC archetypes were selected as the age demography of their 75 populations were largely representative of the 132 other LMICs as classified by the World Bank (Figure 1).^{14,15} Our findings highlight the limits and expected outcomes of COVID-19 76 77 oral antiviral treatment programs under realistic testing and vaccination landscapes.

78

79 **Results**

80 Dynamic epidemic simulations with PATAT

81 We first provide key details of the PATAT model and assumptions to contextualize our

82 results. See Methods and Supplementary Information for full description of the model and

- 83 parameters. We simulated SARS-CoV-2 epidemics in each country under a range of average
- 84 effective reproduction number (i.e. $R_e = 0.9$, 1.2 (doubling time = 6-9 days), 1.5 (doubling
- 1-3 days time = 3-5 days), and 2.0 (doubling time = 1-3 days)) during the first week of each
- 86 simulation. These doubling times coincide the range reported for prominent Omicron

subvariants as well, including BA.2 (~3 days)¹⁶, BA.5 (5-6 days)¹⁷ and XBB.1.5 (9-10 87 days)¹⁸ (Figure S1). All simulations were initialized with 1% of the population infected at the 88 89 start of the epidemic. We did not model varying levels of population immunity due to the 90 lack of comprehensive country-specific infection data and complexities in parameterizing the 91 proportion and protection conferred to individuals with infections by different variant 92 infection histories in the past. Instead, the different R_e values should be viewed as the 93 collective outcome of population immunity from previous infections, intrinsic 94 transmissibility of the variant virus as well as effects of any existing any public health interventions other than vaccination and oral antivirals. For each R_e value and country, we 95 performed two sets of simulations - one with and the other without the distribution of 96 97 antivirals. For each set of simulations, we assumed three vaccination coverage: 10%, 50% and 90%. We randomly assigned vaccination status across the simulated population but 98 99 assumed that vaccination was age-tiered such that the older individuals were vaccinated first. 100 For comparability between countries and as a simplification, we assumed that protection rates 101 against infection and severe disease were 29% and 70% respectively, which were based on 102 the more conservative, lower average estimates of vaccine effectiveness against BA.1 across different vaccines (i.e. mRNA and ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine) and doses (i.e. 1-3 doses).¹⁹⁻ 103 21 104

105

106 The relative susceptibility of individuals to infection,^{22,23} probability of becoming

107 symptomatic, ^{24,25} probability of developing severe disease, ^{24,25} and the probability of death

108 ^{26,27} depend on the age of the individual (Table S1). We assumed that only high-risk

109 individuals (i.e. ≥ 60 years of age (over-60y) or an adult ≥ 18 years with a relevant

110 comorbidity) who tested positive at clinics (e.g. a self-reported self-test would be insufficient

111 to access antivirals) would receive a course of antivirals. We also randomly assigned 20% of

112 the population to have a 40% increase in relative risk to developing severe disease because of pre-existing comorbidities (e.g. obesity, diabetes, people living with HIV, etc.).^{28,29} As a 113 114 simplification, we assumed that the prevalence of comorbidities was independent of age. 115 Although the phase 2/3 trial of nirmatrelvir–ritonavir reported 89% relative risk reduction among unvaccinated high-risk patients infected by the Delta variant-of-concern,³ we assumed 116 117 that an antiviral course conferred a 46% risk reduction for infected high-risk individuals to 118 severe disease outcomes based on a separate cohort study on the effectiveness of 119 nirmatrelvir-ritonavir among high-risk patients infected by Omicron BA.1 independent of their vaccination status.⁴ 120

121

122 Impact of test-and-treat

123 We simulated the implementation of test-and-treat programs during SARS-CoV-2 epidemic 124 waves in three different LMICs (Brazil, Georgia, and Zambia) with distinct population 125 demography (Figure 1) and the Netherlands under different levels of vaccine coverage (10%, 126 50% or 90%) and average test availability (10, 100 or 500 tests/100K/day). We assumed that tests were only available at health clinics and that 65% of individuals with mild symptoms 127 128 would likely seek testing at clinics based on surveys of testing behaviour during the pandemic.^{30,31} Test-seeking individuals would, however, only be tested if tests were 129 130 available. From our simulations, we found that the likelihood of detecting an infection ranged 131 between 0.06% and 64.6%, depending on the country simulated, epidemic intensity, 132 vaccination coverage and test availability (Figure S2). Generally, detection is more likely 133 with a larger proportion of over-60y individuals (i.e. the more likely cases will be 134 symptomatic and seek testing), lower reproduction rate R_e , higher vaccination coverage and 135 greater test availability (i.e. any of the aforementioned factors directly or indirectly increases 136 the surplus of tests available for symptomatic individuals).

137

138 At 10 tests/100K/day, test-and-treat programs are unlikely to have any population-level 139 impact on disease transmission in all countries (Figure S3). At higher testing rates (≥ 100 140 tests/100K/day) and lower R_e (≤ 1.5), there were modest differences between simulated 141 countries. We found that antivirals largely only have a limited impact on total infections 142 averted (Figure S3), in large part because 58-67% of all transmission events were attributed 143 to asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic individuals (Figure S4A). However, in Georgia and 144 the Netherlands where >30% of the population are over-60y and high-risk individuals 145 transmitted almost half of all infections (Figure S4B), increasing testing rates to 100 (500) 146 tests/100K/day, accompanied by uncapped distribution of antivirals, could reduce total 147 infections by $\sim 12\%$ ($\sim 22-24\%$). On the other hand, regardless of testing rates, infections 148 averted were <12% and <4% in Brazil and Zambia respectively, both of which have smaller 149 over-60y populations (i.e. Brazil: 15%; Zambia: 6% of population; Figure S3A) and where 150 most infections are transmitted by low-risk individuals (Figure S4B). Across all settings and 151 testing rates, increasing vaccination coverage did not change the proportion of infections 152 averted by antivirals substantially.

153

154 If testing rates increased to 500 tests/100K/day, the proportion of severe cases averted due to 155 antivirals would depend on the proportion of over-60y in the population, with Zambia, Brazil, Georgia and the Netherlands, maximally reducing up to an average of 46%, 55%, 67% and 156 157 68% of severe cases respectively through test-and-treat strategies (Figure 2). Linking 158 antiviral treatment to testing programs at a rate of 10 tests/100K/day did not generate any 159 impact under any scenario, including when 90% of the population were vaccinated. Raising 160 testing rates to 100 tests/100K/day – a widely publicized global target during the pandemic – 161 and treating all high-risk, test-positive patients with antivirals substantially increased the

proportion of severe cases averted at lower R_e (i.e. proportion of severe cases averted at R_e = 162 0.9 (1.2) with 10-90% vaccination coverage: Zambia, 17-20% (3-4%); Brazil, 24-55% (6-163 164 14%); Georgia, 50-65% (13-30%) and the Netherlands, 48-67 (12-31%); Figure 2). The 165 impact was greatest in Georgia and the Netherlands given their substantial >60y population. 166 As R_e increases (≥ 1.5), the likely population demand for tests also increased, and 167 correspondingly >100 tests/100K/day was needed to ensure that high-risk individuals could 168 be identified to initiate treatment (i.e. proportion of severe cases averted at $R_e = 1.5$ (2.0) 169 with 10-90% vaccination coverage at 100 tests/100K/day: Zambia, 2-4% (0-3%); Brazil, 1-4% (0-1%); Georgia, 3-9% (1-2%); Netherlands, 3-10% (0-2%). At 500 tests/100K/day: 170 171 Zambia, 9-16% (7-9%); Brazil, 11-36% (6-9%); Georgia, 24-66% (8-14%); Netherlands, 28-172 65% (6-18%); Figure 2). Although we did not model the impact of antivirals in reducing the 173 likelihood of death, developing severe disease precedes dying from COVID-19 in our model 174 (see Methods), the number of deaths averted thus follow similar trends as severe cases 175 averted (Figure S5).

176

177 At testing rates of ≤ 10 tests/100,000 people/day, use of antivirals made negligible 178 contributions to reducing severe disease at all levels of vaccine coverage. At testing rates 179 \geq 100 tests/100,000/people/day, higher vaccination coverage was associated with a smaller 180 absolute number of severe cases averted by antivirals. However, at higher testing rates, the 181 proportion of severe cases averted by antivirals relative to no distribution of antivirals is 182 larger at higher vaccination coverage. This is because as infections decrease with higher 183 vaccination coverage, a greater percentage of severe cases could also be detected and treated 184 by antivirals assuming that the quantity of test availability is a constraining factor and that 185 demand in low vaccination scenarios would exceed supply.

187 Distribution of test and antivirals to high-risk household contacts of test-positive individuals 188 As antivirals must be administered quickly after symptom onset, one way to promptly 189 identify and treat infected high-risk individuals is to secondarily distribute self-tests to high-190 risk household contacts who were exposed to the test-positive individuals. This would, 191 however, also result in a faster depletion of available test stocks under limited test 192 availability. We repeated our simulations with high-risk household contacts receiving Ag-193 RDTs from clinics to perform self-test over the ensuing three days, initiating antiviral 194 treatment upon a positive diagnosis. In this scenario, however, there was little reduction in 195 total infections due to antivirals (Figure S6). In fact, when R_e was low (≤ 1.2) and at 100 196 tests/100K/day, distributing tests to high-risk household contacts for self-tests diverted away 197 test stocks that would otherwise be used to diagnose test-seeking symptomatic individuals 198 (which would, in turn, change their behavior to reduce transmission if tested positive). At 100 199 tests/100K/day across all R_e values, or at 500 tests/100K/day and higher R_e , the proportion of 200 severe cases and in turn, deaths averted diminished substantially by a factor of two- to ten-201 fold (Figure S7-8) relative to no secondary distribution of Ag-RDTs to high-risk household 202 contacts (Figure 2 and Figure S5). Unless testing rates were increased to \geq 500 tests/100K/day, 100 tests/100K/day remains inadequate to meet the testing demand of both 203 204 symptomatic individuals and high-risk household contacts to derive greater impact from test-205 and-treat.

206

207 *Restricting symptomatic testing to high-risk individuals*

Given the modest impact of antivirals in reducing transmissions, testing could be targeted to high-risk individuals only in order to distribute antivirals to as many infected high-risk individuals as possible. This strategy can be effective in reducing severe cases and deaths by test-and-treat when Ag-RDT availability is inadequate to test all symptomatic individuals who seek testing, which was a common scenario in LMICs during the pandemic. Otherwise, if most individuals only isolate themselves after a positive test, the testing restriction would lead to excess tests available that are not effectively used to alter the behaviour of low-risk infected individuals that curb onward transmissions.

216

217 In our model, restricting testing to high-risk groups when there are ample amount of tests to 218 diagnose non-high-risk symptomatic individuals as well resulted in more transmissions 219 (Figure S9) and severe cases (Figure 3). We estimated that there can be up to 56% more 220 infections at $R_e \leq 1.5$ if test availability was 500 tests/100K/day but were restricted to high-221 risk individuals only. In Georgia, for example, restricting testing to high-risk groups would 222 reduce 52% of severe cases by antivirals at $R_e = 1.5$, 500 tests/100K/day and 90% 223 vaccination coverage as opposed to 66% under the same scenario but without testing restrictions. On the other hand, when operating under limited test availability relative to R_e , 224 225 restricting symptomatic testing to high-risk individuals could be an effective strategy to 226 further reduce severe cases (i.e. Fold increase in proportion of severe cases averted relative to 227 no symptomatic testing restrictions when $R_e \ge 1.5$, across all vaccination coverages and 228 countries simulated: 100 tests/100K/day, median 4.9-fold (IQR = 3.3-6.4); 500 229 tests/100K/day, median 3.2-fold (IQR = 2.4-5.1)) and in turn, deaths as well (Figure S10). Of 230 the test distribution strategies simulated in this study, restricting testing to high-risk-groupsonly also substantially reduced the number of tests performed per antiviral distributed to 231 232 median 6 tests (IQR = 5-8 tests; Figure S11). In contrast, a median 20 tests (IQR = 15-33 233 tests) would be required per antiviral distributed if symptomatic testing was performed 234 without restrictions about risk status.

235

236 Oral antiviral need

237 Assuming that only symptomatic high-risk individuals who sought testing received an 238 antiviral course upon a positive test, and that there were two 90-day epidemic waves in a 239 year, we estimated that one antiviral course is needed for every 73-251 (14-154) persons per 240 year on average if testing rate was 100 (500) tests/100K/day across all simulated countries 241 and vaccination coverage (Figure 4). We assumed that vaccine protection against infection 242 was low (29%) and that antivirals were distributed regardless of vaccination status. As such, 243 increasing vaccination coverage did not lower antiviral need substantially (median 0.93-fold 244 change (IQR = 0.70-1.00) when vaccination coverage increased from 10% to 90%). Conversely, the amount of antivirals distributed depends on R_e (median 2.60-fold change 245 246 (IQR = 0.97-4.35) when R_e increases from 0.9 to 2.0), country demographics (median 1.72-247 fold change (IOR=1.02-2.04) when distributing antivirals in Georgia relative to Zambia). 248 testing rates (median 4.31-fold change (IQR = 1.49-5.77) when increasing from 100 to 500 249 tests/100K/day), and how tests were targeted (median 2.57-fold change (IQR = 1.52-4.55) 250 when testing only high-risk as opposed to all symptomatic individuals).

251

252 Impact of oral antivirals with over-the-counter self-tests

253 Unlike LMICs, over-the-counter Ag-RDTs were readily available in high-income countries 254 during and after the emergency phase of the pandemic. In a separate analysis for the Netherlands, we assumed that over-the-counter Ag-RDTs for self-testing were widely 255 256 available (i.e. with no-cap on availability) such that only 10% of symptomatic individuals 257 seek clinic-provided testing directly. We also assumed that 80% of symptomatic individuals who did not seek clinic-provided testing may perform a self-test using over-the-counter Ag-258 259 RDTs instead. This effectively means that up to 82% of all symptomatic individuals would 260 perform either a clinic-provided or over-the-counter self-test. All high-risk individuals who 261 tested positive using self-tests would then seek reflexive testing at clinics on the same day to be administered antivirals. Clinic-provided testing would only be performed if they were still
available under the average test availability of either 100 or 500 tests/100K/day.

264

265 Under these assumptions, we found that in combination with clinic-provided testing rate of 266 500 tests/100K/day, distribution of antivirals could avert 56-59% of severe cases and 67-70% of deaths on average, regardless of the epidemic intensity (Figure 5). Reduction in infections 267 268 due to antivirals was similarly modest and did not amount to more than an average of 13%. 269 However, if mean clinic-provided testing rates fell to 100 tests/100K/day, the mean 270 proportion of severe cases and deaths averted would also drop precipitously to as low as 14% 271 and 19% respectively when $R_e \ge 1.5$. Across both testing rates and R_e , we found that one 272 antiviral course was distributed for every 4-69 individuals for two 90-day epidemic waves in 273 a year.

274

Since antivirals must be administered promptly upon a positive diagnosis, we also computed the proportion of high-risk, symptomatic individuals that would miss the treatment window if they had sought reflexive testing late. Regardless of clinical testing rate and R_e , for $\geq 90\%$ of high-risk symptomatic individuals who were able to avert severe disease outcomes by antivirals to be treated with the drug, they must not seek reflexive testing at clinics (if reflexive testing is required) later than two days after being tested positive with over-thecounter self-tests (Figure S12).

282

283 Effectiveness of test-and-treat strategies

To further compare the effectiveness of the test-and-treat strategies we investigated, we plotted efficiency curves of the number of severe cases averted by antivirals against the number of antivirals administered across all R_e values and countries (Figure S13). As we 287 assumed that there was no cap on antiviral availability, the limited test availability thus 288 determines the number of antivirals distributed and in turn, the maximum number of severe 289 cases averted by antivirals. We found that testing and treating test-positive, high-risk 290 household contacts alongside the test-positive index individual ("Symptomatic + HR 291 household" in Figure S13) was the least efficient test-and-treat strategy in our analyses. This 292 is because allocating tests to screen high-risk household contacts, who may or may not be 293 infected, under limited test availability reduced the number of tests that would otherwise have 294 been used to identify symptomatic infected high-risk individuals for antiviral administration. 295 Restricting tests to high-risk individuals only ("HR symptomatic only") was similarly 296 effective to no restriction in access to tests for all symptomatic individuals ("Symptomatic") 297 as it is an essentially a workaround of the latter strategy to increase the number of high-risk 298 infected individuals who are tested and treated under limited test-availability. In short, the 299 greater the access high-risk individuals have to testing, the more likely they could be 300 identified for timely treatment by antivirals. This could also be achieved when we test all 301 symptomatic individuals but ensuring the wide availability of over-the-counter self-tests 302 alongside large clinic-based test availability ("OTC self-test").

303

304 Sensitivity analyses

We performed several sensitivity analyses in Georgia, owing to the relatively greater impact of antivirals among the simulated LMICs, and investigated the extent to which our results may deviate under different key assumptions. First, unvaccinated individuals could have shared socio-demographic traits³² and consequently vaccinated individuals would not necessarily be randomly distributed across the population. As an approximation, we assumed that vaccinated individuals, while still tiered by age, cluster among members from the same household. Although reduction in infections remained similarly modest even when

312 vaccinated individuals tended to be clustered (Figure S14), a larger proportion of severe cases 313 were averted by antivirals (50% vaccinated: 8% (random) vs. 30% (clustered); 90% 314 vaccinated: 14% (random) vs. 44% (clustered)) at the highest epidemic intensity simulated $(R_{e}=2)$ but only if testing rates were large enough to support the distribution of antivirals 315 316 (500 tests/100,000 people/day; Figure S15). However, the greater impact of antivirals on 317 severe cases here is attributed to the increased number of severe cases stemming from 318 vaccinated individuals being clustered (Figure S15B). We found that severe cases increased 319 by 15-170% across all simulated scenarios if vaccinated individuals were clustered by 320 households as opposed to being randomly assigned. This correspondingly led to greater oral 321 antiviral demand as well with one antiviral course distributed for every 53-128 (5-104) 322 persons per year if testing rate was 100 (500) tests/100K/day. In short, while oral antivirals 323 could alleviate the greater disease burden associated with clustering among vaccinated 324 individuals, it is only facilitated by large enough testing rates and the need for greater 325 antiviral supply. The more critical factor towards lowering severe cases is to minimize spatial 326 bias among vaccinated individuals.

327

328 Second, we had assumed low average estimates of vaccine effectiveness (i.e. 29% and 70% 329 protection against infection and severe disease respectively). However, vaccine effectiveness 330 can be improved by updating the vaccine strains to match circulating viruses or through 331 booster shots. We repeated our simulations with vaccines conferring greater effectiveness, 332 including known average protection against Delta-like (i.e. 52% and 96% protection against 333 infection and severe disease respectively) and wild-type SARS-CoV-2 viruses (i.e. 75% and 334 97% protection against infection and severe disease).^{19–21} Similar to our original results for 335 low vaccine effectiveness, use of antivirals could reduce transmissions in Georgia by up to 336 ~20% but only if testing rates were high (500 tests/100K/day; Figure S16). In contrast, the

proportion of severe cases averted due to antivirals became increasingly uncertain (i.e. wider
error bars in Figure S17). This was because improved vaccine effectiveness, on top of wider
vaccination coverage, substantially reduced the number of severe cases. Nonetheless,
regardless of vaccine effectiveness and coverage, meaningful reductions in severe cases by
antivirals could only be achieved with higher testing rates (≥ 100 tests/100K/day) to support
the administration of antivirals for infected high-risk individuals.

343

344 Third, we lowered the epidemic seeding condition from 1% to 0.1% such that antivirals were 345 distributed and used by the population earlier akin to the situation where Paxlovid is readily 346 available in certain countries. Although reduction in infections by antivirals continues to be 347 achieved only at higher testing rates, if antivirals were distributed earlier (i.e. starting from a 348 lower seeding condition), infections could be lowered by up to 30% even when test 349 availability was 100 tests/100K/day (e.g. At 100 tests/100K/day and 50% vaccination coverage, only an average of 1% of infections were averted due to antivirals when $R_e = 1.5$ 350 if the seeding condition was set to 1% but increased to 21% if seeding proportion was 351 352 lowered to 0.1%; Figure S18). The reduction in infections compounded the impact of 353 antivirals on severe case reduction: the proportion of severe disease averted due to antivirals 354 increased with improved outcomes at higher vaccination coverage (e.g. At 100 355 tests/100K/day and 50% vaccination coverage, only an average of 4% of severe cases were 356 averted due to antivirals when $R_e = 1.5$ if seeding condition was at 1% but increased to 47% 357 if seeding proportion was lowered to 0.1%; Figure S19). The lower seeding condition also led to a fair proportion of severe cases averted at 10 tests/100K/day but with large uncertainty 358 359 (i.e. wider error bars in Figure S19A) and mostly only when $R_e < 1$ or at high vaccination 360 coverage (90%). This suggests that the benefit of antivirals can be further augmented by early 361 widespread adoption of test-and-treat programs.

362

363 Finally, the results above were predicated on crisis-period willingness-to-test behavior. 364 However, in many countries, the willingness of people to test has waned substantially in the 365 post-emergency phase of the pandemic. To investigate the consequences of this decline, we 366 repeated our simulations for all countries assuming that the likelihood a symptomatic 367 individual seek testing was 10% instead of the 65% assumed in the prior results (Figure S20). 368 Low willingness to test would substantial reduce the impact of potential test-and-treat 369 programs under all test availabilities, averting no more than ~10% of severe cases on average 370 in any country for all simulated R_e values and vaccination coverage.

371

372 Discussion

Individual-level data on the effectiveness of antivirals for reducing severe disease^{3,4} and the 373 374 modelling work presented here highlight that substantial reductions in COVID-19 disease 375 burden could arise from population-level test-and-treat programs. However, the low testing 376 rates in the post-emergency phase of the pandemic represent a profound impediment for 377 realizing the benefits of such programs. Most of the analyses described here focused on test 378 availability as the functional constraint on the development of test-and-treat programs and 379 this remains an issue in many LMICs. However, in many countries, regardless of socio-380 economic status, the willingness of people to pursue testing for respiratory virus disease is 381 either low or declining and this presents challenges even when tests are available.

382

383 Given that antivirals are unlikely to have substantial impact on population-level

transmission,⁵ if the main objective of testing is to maximize the distribution of antivirals to

385 infected high-risk individuals, restricting clinic-based testing to only high-risk symptomatic

individuals at testing rates of 100 tests/100K/day could lead to 3.3-6.4-fold increase in

proportions of severe cases averted relative to the default scenario where no restrictions to
clinic-provided testing was imposed, provided that people are proactively seek testing.

390 It is also possible to require asymptomatic, high-risk household contacts of test-positive 391 symptomatic individuals to perform self-tests in order to initiate as many high-risk infected 392 individuals to early antiviral treatment as possible. However, setting aside tests to screen 393 high-risk household contacts under test availability constraints diminish the utility of tests 394 that would have otherwise been used to test symptomatic individuals who sought testing. In 395 turn, the proportion of severe cases and deaths averted due to antiviral distribution decrease 396 by a relative factor of two to ten-fold under this strategy. A potential workaround could be to 397 distribute antivirals to high-risk household contacts of test-positive individuals without the 398 need to confirm if the high-risk contacts were infected themselves by testing. However, this 399 would also increase the number of antiviral courses needed as well as result in wastage 400 among individuals who were not infected. A cost effectiveness analysis could be performed 401 to identify the most resource effective strategy but is beyond the scope of this work.

402

403 Assuming high willingness to test, ensuring the wide-availability of over-the-counter self-404 tests could also lead to substantial reductions in severe cases (56-59%) and deaths (67-70%) 405 at $R_e \ge 1.5$ (e.g. BA.1 or BA.5 variant-like events). However, if reflexive testing is needed 406 for administration of antivirals, these reductions would only be possible if clinic-provided 407 testing is maintained at the mean HIC rate of 500 tests/100K/day. If clinical testing volumes 408 drop to 100 tests/100K/day, the expected reduction in severe cases and deaths attributable to 409 antivirals would fall to only 14% and 19% respectively in an epidemic wave initializing at 410 $R_e = 2.0$ (e.g. BA.1 variant-like event).

412 Our results suggest that regardless of the (test and antiviral) distribution strategy, an effective 413 test-and-treat program in any country requires large testing rates (>100 tests/100K/day) that are far beyond testing rates reported globally since 2023.⁹ In turn, increasing vaccination is 414 415 likely a more viable approach to lower severe cases than implementing large-scale test-and-416 treat programs. To compare the vaccination coverage and the resource requirements needed 417 for test-and-treat to achieve the same reduction in disease burden, we computed the 418 additional vaccination coverage needed to halve the number of severe cases at different R_e 419 under 10% starting vaccination coverage. We also estimated the equivalent number of tests 420 and antivirals distributed to half the number of severe cases (Table 2). Across all countries and R_e , we estimated that an additional 24%-67% of the population must be vaccinated to 421 422 reduce the number of severe cases by half without antivirals. Conversely, $\sim 9.000 - 400.000$ 423 courses of antivirals per 1,000,000 people would be needed to avert the same number of 424 severe cases by antivirals for one epidemic wave. Furthermore, we estimated that $\sim 200 -$ 425 7,000 tests must be performed per 100,000 people per day to support the distribution of those 426 antivirals. While these testing rates were achieved by some high-income countries during the 427 COVID-19 pandemic, no countries are testing at anywhere near these rates in the post-428 emergency phase, suggesting that vaccination would likely be the more efficient option for 429 reducing severe disease burden.

430

431 There have been other modelling efforts that estimated substantial reductions in disease

432 burden by distributing antivirals to 20% - 50% of symptomatic infected individuals.

433 However, from our analyses, doing so would also require testing rates that are far greater than

434 500 tests/100,000 people/day. First, Leung et al.⁷ estimated that distributing antivirals to 50%

435 of all symptomatic infected individuals regardless of risk status would only reduce

436 hospitalizations by 10-13% in a population with high vaccination coverage (70-90%). For the

Netherlands, we simulated a population with 80% vaccination coverage and large test
availability, that included both clinic-based and over-the-counter self-tests, such that at least
50% of all symptomatic individuals were diagnosed. We estimated that 56-59% of severe
cases could be averted if only high-risk symptomatic individuals were administered
antivirals. When we reconfigured our simulations to now distribute antivirals to 50% of all
symptomatic infected individuals, the proportion of severe cases averted lower to only 18%
which is more in line with Leung et al.

444

445 Second, Matrajt et al. found that initiating 20% of infected individuals that were >65 years of age on antivirals daily could avert 32-43% of deaths in an Omicron-like wave ($R_e \ge 2$) for an 446 unvaccinated population in LMICs such as Kenya and Mexico.⁵ We had estimated that 31-447 62% of deaths could be averted at $R_e = 2$ at low (10%) vaccination coverage in LMICs but 448 449 only if test availability was 500 tests/100K/day and clinic-provided symptomatic testing were 450 restricted to high-risk individuals, which would mean a daily average of 19-20% of high-risk 451 infected individuals being initiated on treatment each day. If there are no restrictions on 452 access to clinic-provided tests, testing rate must be at least 750 tests/100K/day to initiate 20% 453 of infected >65-years on antivirals daily with >95% probability, indicating that the previous 454 from Martrajt et al. predicated on very high testing rates.

455

Finally, Brault et al. estimated that 11% of hospitalizations could be averted if antivirals with 50% effectiveness were administered to half of all high-risk cases in Wallis and Futuna, where ~70% of individuals have at least two doses of vaccines, during an epidemic wave with a doubling time of 2-3 days.⁸ In the closest scenario we had simulated (i.e $R_e = 2$, 46% effectiveness of antivirals, 50% vaccination coverage and 500 tests/100K/day), we estimated

461 that severe cases could be reduced by 7% in Brazil (Figure 2B), which has a similar

demography to Wallis and Futuna (i.e. median age = 33 and 35 years in Brazil and Wallis and
Futuna respectively; proportion of individuals ≥65 years = 10% and 13% respectively).
However, like the two preceding examples, this is only possible at testing rates that are manyfold higher than those performed in most LMICs both during and after the emergency-phase
of the pandemic.

467

There are limitations to our work: First, our simulations were based on the estimated
effectiveness of nirmatrelvir–ritonavir. We did not consider the clinical benefits of other oral
antivirals as nirmatrelvir–ritonavir was the most efficacious antiviral available during the
development of this work.

472

473 Second, as a simplification, we assumed that individuals with pre-existing comorbidities that 474 augment the risk of severe COVID-19 disease outcomes were randomly distributed across the population. The prevalence of certain comorbidities is known to correlate with socio-475 economic and demographic factors,^{33,34} resulting in the clustering of severe cases with similar 476 socio-economic backgrounds. However, there is limited country-specific data on the 477 prevalence and distribution of comorbidities across the population, especially for LMICs. We 478 479 would also need to stratify the simulation population socio-economically which is beyond the 480 scope of this study.

481

Third, we had assumed that clinical testing for disease and administration of treatment occur on the same day in our simulations. However, any practical barriers that limit timely access to antivirals (e.g. inadequate supply and distribution, limited access to healthcare providers, acceptance of antiviral therapy) can substantially reduce the estimated impact of test-andtreat programs.³⁵ As shown in Figure S12, even under a large test availability scenario (with

487 self-tests), if administration of antivirals was delayed by >2 days, <20% of high-risk treated 488 individuals received their antiviral courses within the 5 days post-symptom onset window 489 when Paxlovid was reported to be efficacious. As such, even if testing rates could sufficiently 490 support test-and-treat programs, delays in accessing antivirals, which had been reported in 491 various LMICs,³⁶ must be minimized for these programs to remain effective. Ideally, testing 492 and treatment of infected patients should occur at the same clinical interaction.

493

494 Next, others have showed that with greater vaccine effectiveness against infection (60%), a 495 high vaccination coverage (~70-80%) coupled with antivirals that have an effect in lowering 496 transmissions could synergistically reduce infections in the population.⁵ However, for only 497 ~20% of infections to be averted in an Omicron-like wave (i.e. doubling time of 2-3 days³⁷), 498 the antiviral must block onward transmission completely after initiating treatment and 30% of 499 symptomatic infected adults must be administered antivirals daily.⁵ Even if an antiviral that is 500 100% effective in truncating transmissions exist and there was high willingness to test, the 501 testing rate must at least be 764 tests/100K/day to initiate 30% of symptomatic infected 502 individuals to treatment daily with >95% probability based on our estimates.

503

Finally, we did not factor in changes to individual immunity levels due to previous infections or immune waning. As a simplification, we assumed that these effects have been implicitly captured by various initial R_e values and were able to simulate epidemics with prevalence ranges similar to those reported during the spread of Omicron subvariants BA.5 and XBB.1.5 (Figure S1). However, it is currently unclear how changing immunity dynamics in the future could affect severe disease outcomes.

Taken all together, while test-and-treat programs have substantial theoretical utility for reducing population-level burden of disease, there remain fundamental challenges in terms of the availability of diagnostics and the willingness of people to seek testing in general and particularly within the relatively short window of effectiveness of the antivirals considered here. The potential benefits and resource requirements of test-and-treat programs must also be carefully considered if budget constraints make vaccination programs a competing interest.

518

519 Methods

520 The PATAT simulation model

521 PATAT creates an age-structured population of individuals within contact networks of multi-522 generational households, schools, workplaces, regular mass gatherings (e.g. religious 523 gatherings) and random community settings with country-specific demographic data (see 524 Supplementary Text). Epidemic simulations begin with 1% of the population infected with 525 SARS-CoV-2 and compute transmissions between individuals across different contact 526 networks each day. The computational flow of a PATAT simulation is summarised as 527 follows: First, an age-structured population of agents is created. Close contact networks are 528 subsequently created based on the given demographic data. The simulation is then initialised 529 and iterates over a given period of time where each time step corresponds to a day. The 530 operations during each timestep encompass updating the disease progression of infected 531 individuals, the status of isolated/quarantined agents, application of community testing 532 strategies and computation of transmission events within contact networks. 533

534 PATAT implements a SEIRD epidemic model where the simulated population is

535 distinguished between five compartments: susceptible, exposed (i.e. infected but is not

536	infectious yet; latent phase), infected (which include the presymptomatic infectious period for
537	symptomatic agents), recovered and dead. The infected compartments are further stratified by
538	their presented symptoms, including asymptomatic, presymptomatic, symptomatic mild or
539	severe. All symptomatic agents will also first undergo an infectious presymptomatic period
540	after the exposed latent period. They will either develop mild symptoms who will always
541	recover from the disease or experience severe infection which could either lead to death or
542	recovery. As a simplification, PATAT assumes that all agents presenting severe symptoms
543	are sufficiently isolated from the population (e.g. through hospitalization) that they are
544	unlikely to contribute to further transmissions.

545

546 When an infectious agent *i* comes into contact with a susceptible individual *j*, the probability 547 of transmission $(p_{transmission,(i,j)})$ is given by:

548 $p_{transmission,(i,j)} = \beta \times \Phi_i \times f_c \times f_{asymp,i} \times f_{load,i} \times f_{immunity,j} \times f_{susceptibility,j} \times \rho_i \times \rho_j$ 549 where β is the base transmission probability per contact, Φ_i is the overdispersion factor 550 modelling individual-level variation in secondary transmissions (i.e. superspreading events), f_c is a relative weight adjusting β for the network setting c where the contact has occurred, 551 $f_{asymp,i}$ is the assumed relative transmissibility factor if infector *i* is asymptomatic, 552 $f_{immunity,j}$ measures the immunity level of susceptible j against the transmitted virus (i.e. 553 $f_{immunity,j} = 1$ if completely naïve; $f_{immunity,j} = 0$ if fully protected), $f_{susceptibility,j}$ is the 554 555 age-dependent susceptibility of j, ρ_i and ρ_j are the contact rates of infector i and susceptible 556 *i* respectively.

557

558 Φ_i is randomly drawn from a negative binomial distribution with mean of 1.0 and shape

parameter of 0.45.³⁸ As evidence have been mixed as to whether asymptomatic agents are

560 less transmissible, we conservatively assume there is no difference relative to symptomatic

561 patients (i.e. $f_{asymp,i} = 1$). The age-structured relative susceptibility values $f_{susceptibility,j}$ are 562 derived from odds ratios reported by Zhang et al.²² (Table S1).

563

 β is determined by running initial test simulations with a range of values on a naïve population with no interventions that would satisfy the target reproduction number as computed from the resulting exponential growth rate and distribution of generation intervals.³⁹ f_c is similarly calibrated during these test runs such that the transmission probabilities in households, workplaces, schools, and all other community contacts are constrained by a relative weighting of 10:2:2:1.²³

570

571 The total duration of infection since exposure depends on the symptoms presented by the patient and is comprised of different phases (i.e. latent, asymptomatic, presymptomatic, 572 573 onset-to-recovery/death). The time period of each phase is drawn can be found in Table S1. 574 For each infected individual, PATAT randomly draws a within-host viral load trajectory over the duration of infection, which impacts the sensitivity of Ag-RDTs⁴⁰, based on known 575 distributions for Omicron BA.1⁴¹. Similar viral load trajectories were drawn for both 576 asymptomatic and symptomatic infected individuals⁴² using a stochastic model modified 577 from the one previously developed by Quilty et al.⁴³ A baseline Ct value ($Ct_{baseline}$) of 40 is 578 579 established upon exposure. The infected agent becomes infectious upon the end of the latent 580 period and their Ct value is assumed to be \leq 30. A peak Ct value is then randomly drawn 581 from a normal distribution (Table S1). Peak Ct is assumed to occur upon symptom onset for 582 symptomatic agents and one day after the latent period for asymptomatic individuals. 583 Cessation of viral shedding (i.e. return to $Ct_{baseline}$) occurs upon recovery or death. PATAT 584 assumes that the transition rate towards peak Ct value should not be drastically different to 585 that when returning to baseline upon cessation (i.e. there should be no sharp increase to

586 baseline Ct value after gradual decrease to peak Ct value or vice versa). As such, the time 587 periods of the different phases of infection are randomly drawn from the same quintile of their respective sample distribution. The viral load trajectory is then simulated by fitting a 588 589 cubic Hermite spline to the generated exposed ($t_{exposed}$, $Ct_{baseline}$), latent (t_{latent} , $Ct_{latent} = 30$), peak (t_{peak}, Ct_{peak}) and cessation values $(t_{recovered/death}, Ct_{baseline})$. The 590 591 slope of the fitted curve is assumed to be zero for all of them except during t_{latent} where its slope is assumed to be $\frac{Ct_{peak}-Ct_{baseline}}{t_{peak}-t_{exposed}}$. PATAT then uses the fitted trajectory to linearly 592 interpolate the viral load transmissibility factor $(f_{load,i})$ of an infectious agent *i* assuming that 593 they are twice as transmissible at peak Ct value (i.e. $f_{load} = 2$) relative to when they first 594 become infectious (i.e. Ct value = 30; $f_{load} = 1$). 595 596

597 Unlike PCR which is highly sensitive due to prior amplification of viral genetic materials, the 598 sensitivity of Ag-RDT will depend on the viral load of the tested patient. While the 599 specificity of Ag-RDT is assumed to be 98.9%, its sensitivity depends on the Ct values of the 600 tested infected agent: Ct > 35 (0%); 35 - 30 (20.9%); 29 - 25 (50.7%); Ct $\leq 24 (95.8\%)$.⁴⁰

601

We assumed that agents would change their behaviour when (i) they start to present 602 603 symptoms and go into self-isolation (10% compliance assumed, 71% endpoint adherence)²⁷; (ii) they test positive and are isolated for 10 days (50% compliance assumed, 86% endpoint 604 adherence)²⁷; or (iii) they are household members (without symptoms) of positively-tested 605 agents and are required to be in quarantine for 14 days (50% compliance assumed, 28% 606 endpoint adherence)²⁷. Once an agent goes into isolation/quarantine, we linearly interpolate 607 608 their probability of adherence to stay in isolation/quarantine over the respective period. Given 609 the lack of infrastructure and resources to set up dedicated isolation/quarantine facilities in 610 many LMICs, we assumed that all isolated and guarantined individuals would do so at home.

611

612 We simulated 90-day epidemic waves in a community of 1,000,000 individuals using 613 demographic data collected from three LMICs (i.e. Brazil, Georgia, Zambia) and the 614 Netherlands as a HIC counterpart. We simulated different vaccination coverage (10%, 50%) 615 and 90%) for all countries for comparability. In the separate analysis examining how 616 widespread availability of over-the-counter self-tests could impact test-and-treat programs in 617 HICs, we assumed that 80% of the population was vaccinated in the Netherlands based on estimates on July 2022,⁴⁴ which is largely comparable to other HICs.⁴⁵ As a simplification, 618 619 we assumed that vaccination protection rates against infection and severe disease were 29% 620 and 70% respectively, which were based on the more conservative, lower average estimates 621 of vaccine effectiveness against BA.1 across different vaccines (i.e. mRNA and ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine) and doses (i.e. 1-3 doses).¹⁹⁻²¹ We did not assume a specific protection 622 623 rate against death since the referenced studies had reported effectiveness estimates against 624 severe disease outcomes which include hospitalization and/or death. Nonetheless, protection 625 of deaths is implicitly accounted for since individuals could only die from COVID-19 if they 626 had progressed to severe disease in the model.

627

628 Diagnostic testing

In the model, individuals with symptomatic COVID-19 have a probability of seeking testing at a healthcare facility. We also estimated symptomatic testing demand from individuals without COVID-19 who sought clinic-provided testing (e.g. individuals who present with similar respiratory symptoms): Based on the range of test positivity rates reported by various countries during the second-half of 2021 (when community testing was assumed to still be prevalent in most countries),⁴⁵ we assumed that test positivity rate was 10% at the start as 635 well as end of an epidemic wave, and a 20% test positivity rate at the peak, linearly

636 interpolating the demand for periods between these time points.^{11,12}

637

We also simulated scenarios where household contacts of clinic-provided positively-tested individuals were given Ag-RDTs for self-testing for three consecutive days following the positive clinical test of the latter. Adherence (likelihood) to testing by asymptomatic household contacts was assumed to decrease linearly to 50% by the third day. We also simulated an alternative test distribution strategy where we restricted clinic-provided symptomatic testing to high-risk individuals only.

644

645 We performed simulations under three levels of average test availability at healthcare clinics: 10 (mean LMIC testing rate as of Q2/2022),⁹ 100 and 500 (mean HIC testing rate as of 646 Q2/2022)9 tests/100K/day. Regardless if symptomatic individuals choose to self-isolate, after 647 $\tau_{delay,symp-test}$ days from symptom onset, the symptomatic agent may decide to get tested 648 649 with a Bernoulli probability of $p_{symp-test}$. PATAT assumes that agents who have decided 650 against symptomatic testing (i.e. failed Bernoulli trial) or received negative test results will not seek symptomatic testing again. We assumed that average $p_{symp-test} = 65\%$ on average 651 based on surveys of test-seeking behaviour during the COVID-19 pandemic.^{30,31} In other 652 653 words, there is an average 65% chance that an individual with mild symptom would seek 654 clinic-provided testing and were only tested if there were available test stocks. We lowered $p_{symp-test}$ to 10% in a sensitivity analysis to estimate the impact of test-and-treat programs 655 under waning willingness to test. 656

657

In the separate analysis where over-the-counter self-tests were available in the Netherlands,
we assumed that only 10% of mild symptomatic individuals in the Netherlands would seek

660 clinic-provided testing upon symptom onset based on average daily testing rates reported by 661 all Dutch municipal health services in 2021-Q1/2022 (i.e. approximately up to the end of the 662 Omicron BA.1 wave; 7551 tests/100K/day) and Q2/2022 (post Omicron BA.1 wave; 641 663 tests/100K/day).⁴⁶ We assumed that 50% or 80% of individuals who opted not to seek clinic-664 provided testing would perform a self-test using an over-the-counter Ag-RDT. We assumed 665 that all high-risk individuals who tested positive would then seek reflexive testing at clinics 666 to be disbursed an antiviral course.

667

668 Oral antivirals

Regardless of their vaccination status (per WHO guidance),⁴⁷ all high-risk individuals who 669 670 tested positive within five days after symptom onset were eligible for a course of antiviral therapy.^{3,4} We did not impose any caps on antiviral availability as we wanted to estimate the 671 potential number of antiviral courses needed and thus their maximum achievable impact on 672 673 epidemic outcomes under different levels of test availability and antiviral distribution 674 strategies. We did not factor any risk reduction in transmissions or deaths given the lack and low certainty of evidence of the impact of oral antivirals on protection against transmission 675 and mortality respectively.⁴⁷ However, individuals could only die from COVID-19 if they 676 677 had progressed to severe disease in our model.

678

For individuals who were treated with antivirals that were simulated to result in severe disease, we performed a Bernoulli trial with the probability of averting severe disease (i.e. 46%), provided that they were currently in the presymptomatic phase or were experiencing mild disease. If the Bernoulli trial succeeded, we re-simulated their disease progression and within-host viral dynamics using the procedures above but now under the assumption that they would develop only mild disease and conditioning that the maximum viral load is lower

than before. Changes were only made to the upcoming phases of disease progression from the then current phase of infection. The average recovery period of having mild symptoms was assumed to be 5.4 days as opposed to 18.1 days when presenting severe disease.^{41,48} In turn, while we did not parameterize the impact on transmission reduction by antivirals, the shortened recovery, and thus infectious period as well as lower maximum viral load of individuals who were effectively treated could result indirect reduction in onward transmissions.

692

693 We performed five independent simulations for each combination of parameters described

above. All key parameters are tabulated in Table S1. Further details of PATAT are described

695 in Han et al.^{11,12} and the Supplementary Information. The PATAT model source code is

696 available at <u>https://github.com/AMC-LAEB/PATAT-sim</u>.

697

698 Data and code availability:

- All data relevant to the study are included in the Article, the Supplementary Information and
- 700 the GitHub repository (<u>https://github.com/AMC-LAEB/PATAT-sim</u>). The PATAT model
- source code can also be found in the GitHub repository

702 (<u>https://github.com/AMC-LAEB/PATAT-sim</u>).

703

704 Acknowledgements:

- 705 This work was supported by the European Research Council [NaviFlu 818353 to A.X.H. and
- C.A.R.], the National Institutes of Health [5R01AI132362-04 to C.A.R.] and the Dutch
- 707 Research Council (Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek) [Vici
- 708 09150182010027 to C.A.R.]. This work was supported by the Rockefeller Foundation, and
- the Governments of Germany, Canada, UK, Australia, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait,

- 710 Netherlands and Portugal [all authors]. The authors are pleased to acknowledge that all
- 711 computational work reported in this paper was performed on the Shared Computing Cluster
- 712 which is administered by Boston University's Research Computing Services
- 713 (www.bu.edu/tech/support/research/).
- 714

715 Authors' contributions:

- 716 Conceptualization: A.X.H., E.H., S.C., B.R., B.E.N., C.A.R.
- 717 Methodology: A.X.H., B.E.N., C.A.R.
- 718 Software: A.X.H.
- 719 Validation: A.X.H., E.H., S.C., B.R., B.E.N., C.A.R.
- 720 Formal analysis: A.X.H.
- 721 Investigation: A.X.H., B.E.N., C.A.R.
- 722 Resources: B.E.N., C.A.R.
- 723 Data curation: A.X.H., B.E.N., C.A.R.
- 724 Writing original draft: A.X.H., B.E.N., C.A.R.
- 725 Writing review & editing: A.X.H., E.H., S.C., B.R., B.E.N., C.A.R.
- 726 Visualization: A.X.H., B.E.N., C.A.R.
- 727 Supervision: B.E.N., C.A.R.
- 728 Project administration: B.E.N., C.A.R.
- 729 Funding acquisition: E.H., S.C., B.R., B.E.N., C.A.R.
- 730
- 731 **Declaration of interests:**
- The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

734 **Figure legends**

735 Figure 1: Demography of simulated countries. (a) Bar plot shows the age distribution of 736 each simulated country archetype (Low and middle-income countries (LMICs): Brazil, 737 Georgia, Zambia; High-income country: Netherlands) stratified in 5-year bins. Each dashed 738 black line in the Brazil, Georgia and Zambia plots denotes the age distribution of one of 132 739 other LMICs¹⁴ that best matches (i.e. lowest mean absolute error) the age distribution of the 740 simulated country archetype. Age distribution of the population in each country is 741 downloaded from World Population Prospects compiled by the United Nations¹⁵. (b) 742 Heatmap showing the normalized relative contact rates between individuals of different age 743 groups in 5-year bins averaged across all contact networks generated by the PATAT 744 simulation model.

745

746 Figure 2: Impact of test-and-treat on severe cases. No restrictions on access to 747 symptomatic testing at clinics (i.e. all symptomatic individuals who sought testing at clinics 748 would receive one if in stock) and high-risk household contacts of test-positive individuals 749 are not tested. All eligible high-risk individuals (i.e. ≥ 60 years of age or an adult ≥ 18 years 750 with a relevant comorbidity) who tested positive were given a course of oral antivirals. Line 751 plots (left y-axis) show the percentage change in severe cases relative to no distribution of 752 antivirals under different levels of mean test availability (different shades of color) after a 90-753 day epidemic wave in a population of 1,000,000 individuals with (a) 10%, (b) 50%, and (c) 754 90% vaccination coverage for different epidemic intensities (measured by the initial effective 755 reproduction number (\mathbf{R}_{e}) ; x-axis). Bar plots (right y-axis) show the number of severe cases 756 in each corresponding scenario. The dotted outline of each bar shows the number of severe 757 cases of each scenario when no antivirals were distributed.

759 Figure 3: Impact of test-and-treat on severe cases when restricting symptomatic testing to high-risk individuals only. High-risk household contacts of test-positive individuals are 760 761 not tested. All eligible high-risk individuals (i.e. ≥ 60 years of age or an adult ≥ 18 years with 762 a relevant comorbidity) who tested positive were given a course of oral antivirals. Line plots 763 (left y-axis) show the percentage change in severe cases relative to no distribution of 764 antivirals under different levels of mean test availability (different shades of color) after a 90-765 day epidemic wave in a population of 1,000,000 individuals with (a) 10%, (b) 50%, and (c) 766 90% vaccination coverage for different epidemic intensities (measured by the initial effective 767 reproduction number (\mathbf{R}_{ρ}) ; x-axis). Bar plots (right y-axis) show the number of severe cases 768 in each corresponding scenario. The dotted outline of each bar shows the number of severe 769 cases of each scenario when no antivirals were distributed.

770

Figure 4: Estimated need of oral antivirals. Line plots show the ratio of estimated oral 771 772 antiviral courses needed to number of people per year (expressed as 1 oral antiviral course 773 per *n* number of individuals; assuming two epidemic waves a year) in simulated countries 774 (color) under different simulated scenarios (i.e. testing rate at 100 or 500 tests/100,000 775 people/day (shading and linestyle) and distribution modality (left plot panel: test all 776 symptomatic individuals who sought testing at clinics; middle plot panel: test all 777 symptomatic individuals who sought testing as well as distributing clinic-provided self-tests 778 to high-risk asymptomatic household contacts of test-positive individuals; right plot panel: 779 test only high-risk symptomatic individuals who sought testing at clinics). All test-positive 780 eligible high-risk individuals from clinic-provided testing would receive a course of oral 781 antivirals. (a) 10%, (b) 50% and (c) 90% vaccination coverage assumed for the simulated 782 population.

783

784 Figure 5: Impact of test-and-treat in a high-income country (Netherlands) with wide 785 availability of over-the-counter self-tests. No restrictions on access to symptomatic testing 786 at clinics (i.e. all symptomatic individuals who sought testing at clinics would receive one if 787 in stock) and high-risk household contacts of test-positive individuals are not tested. Over-788 the-counter antigen rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) are assumed to be widely available with 789 unlimited stocks. As such, we assumed that only 10% of symptomatic individuals would seek 790 clinical testing directly while 80% of those who opted not to seek clinic-provided testing 791 would perform self-testing using over-the-counter Ag-RDTs. All high-risk individuals who 792 tested positive through self-testing would seek reflexive testing at clinics on the same day. 793 All eligible high-risk individuals (i.e. ≥ 60 years of age or an adult ≥ 18 years with a relevant 794 comorbidity) who tested positive at clinics, either directly or through reflexive testing, were 795 given a course of oral antivirals. Line plots (left y-axis) show the percentage change in (a) 796 total infections, (b) severe cases and (c) deaths relative to no distribution of antivirals under 797 different clinical testing rates (different shades of color) after a 90-day SARS-CoV-2 798 epidemic wave in a population of 1,000,000 individuals with 80% vaccination coverage for 799 different epidemic intensities (measured by the initial effective reproduction number (R_e) ; x-800 axis). Bar plots (right y-axis) show the number of severe cases in each corresponding 801 scenario. The dotted outline of each bar shows the number of severe cases of each scenario 802 when no antivirals were distributed.

- 803
- 804

805 Tables

806 Table 1: Number and proportion of severe cases averted due to distribution of oral

antivirals at 10% and 90% vaccination coverage. No restrictions on access to symptomatic
testing at clinics (i.e. all symptomatic individuals who sought testing at clinics would receive
one if in stock) and high-risk household contacts of test-positive individuals are not tested.

Country	Testing rate (tests/100,000 people/day)	R _e	10% vaccination coverage		90% vaccination coverage	
			No. of severe cases averted	Proportion of severe cases averted	No. of severe cases averted	Proportion of severe cases averted
Zambia	10	0.9	29	2.7	3	1.1
		1.2	16	0.3	20	1.1
		1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
		2.0	22	0.2	32	0.7
	100	0.9	147	16.9	48	20.1
		1.2	170	3.3	72	4.4
		1.5	172	1.9	131	3.7
		2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	500	0.9	242	35.0	102	45.6
		1.2	1053	26.5	441	38.0
		1.5	780	9.0	527	16.4
		2.0	824	7.2	433	8.8
Brazil	10	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
		1.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
		1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
		2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	100	0.9	303	23.7	133	54.6
		1.2	623	6.4	195	13.6
		1.5	245	1.2	196	3.7
		2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	500	0.9	511	47.4	134	55.3
		1.2	2739	43.1	545	55.4
		1.5	2005	10.7	1404	35.7
		2.0	1553	6.1	872	9.4
Georgia	10	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
		1.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
		1.5	163	0.4	80	1.2

	_	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	100	0.9	635	49.9	170	65.3
		1.2	1459	13.4	336	29.6
		1.5	929	2.6	483	8.7
		2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	500	0.9	792	63.4	167	63.5
		1.2	4344	65.3	597	66.9
		1.5	7481	24.3	2270	66.1
		2.0	4435	8.4	2115	13.6
Netherlands	10	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
		1.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
		1.5	0	0.0	21	0.2
		2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	100	0.9	598	48.2	171	66.6
		1.2	2333	20.1	362	30.7
		1.5	953	2.7	419	7.5
		2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	500	0.9	811	63.1	185	67.0
		1.2	4857	68.5	604	67.3
		1.5	8947	28.0	2123	65.1
		2.0	3190	5.9	2960	18.1

Table 2: Vaccination coverage and test-and-treat requirements to half the number of severe cases at 10% pre-existing vaccination coverage. For vaccination, the additional number of individuals per 1,000,000 people that must be vaccinated on top of the 10% preexisting vaccination coverage is tabulated. For test-and-treat, there are no restrictions on access to symptomatic testing at clinics (i.e. all symptomatic individuals who sought testing at clinics would receive one if in stock) and high-risk household contacts of test-positive individuals are not tested.

821

		Vaccination	Test-and-treat		
Country	R _e	No. of vaccinated individuals per 1,000,000 people	No. of antivirals distributed per 1,000,000 people	Testing rate (tests/100,000 people/day)	
	1.2	496,192	18,436	545	
Zambia	1.5	586,432	60,370	2,185	
	2.0	665,567	113,835	4,383	
	1.2	312,095	15,494	316	
Brazil	1.5	437,067	82,093	1,760	
	2.0	566,068	197,465	4,751	
	1.2	253,988	9,246	166	
Georgia	1.5	317,855	52,499	721	
	2.0	477,855	211,977	3,471	
	1.2	240,271	8,758	206	
Netherlands	1.5	319,695	49,952	701	
	2.0	474,469	394,414	6,802	

822

823

825		
826	Sup	plemental information
827	Doci	ument S1. Supplementary Text; Figures S1-S20; Table S1.
828		
829	Refe	erences
830	1.	Singh, M. & de Wit, E. Antiviral agents for the treatment of COVID-19: Progress and
831		challenges. Cell Rep Med 3, 100549 (2022).
832	2.	Jayk Bernal, A. et al. Molnupiravir for Oral Treatment of Covid-19 in Nonhospitalized
833		Patients. New England Journal of Medicine 386, 509-520 (2022).
834	3.	Hammond, J. et al. Oral Nirmatrelvir for High-Risk, Nonhospitalized Adults with
835		Covid-19. New England Journal of Medicine 386 , 1397–1408 (2022).
836	4.	Najjar-Debbiny, R. et al. Effectiveness of Paxlovid in Reducing Severe Coronavirus
837		Disease 2019 and Mortality in High-Risk Patients. Clinical Infectious Diseases (2022)
838		doi:10.1093/CID/CIAC443.
839	5.	Matrajt, L., Brown, E. R., Cohen, M. S., Dimitrov, D. & Janes, H. Could widespread
840		use of antiviral treatment curb the COVID-19 pandemic? A modeling study. BMC
841		Infect Dis 22, 1–16 (2022).
842	6.	Usher, A. D. The global COVID-19 treatment divide. The Lancet 399, 779–782
843		(2022).
844	7.	Leung, K., Jit, M., Leung, G. M. & Wu, J. T. The allocation of COVID-19 vaccines
845		and antivirals against emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern in East Asia and
846		Pacific region: A modelling study. Lancet Reg Health West Pac 21, 100389 (2022).
847	8.	Brault, A. et al. Modelling the end of a Zero-COVID strategy using
848		nirmatrelvir/ritonavir, vaccination and NPIs in Wallis and Futuna. Lancet Reg Health
849		<i>West Pac</i> 30 , (2023).

850	9.	FIND. Test tracker	 FIND. https://www 	finddx.org/covid-19/	test-tracker/ (2022).
			1	U U	

- 851 10. Gill, C. J. *et al.* What is the prevalence of COVID-19 detection by PCR among
- 852 deceased individuals in Lusaka, Zambia? A postmortem surveillance study. *BMJ Open*
- **12**, (2022).
- 11. Han, A. X. et al. Strategies for using antigen rapid diagnostic tests to reduce
- transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in low- and middle-income countries: a mathematical
- 856 modelling study applied to Zambia. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* (2022)
- 857 doi:10.1093/CID/CIAC814.
- Han, A. X. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic testing rates determine the sensitivity of
 genomic surveillance programs. *Nature Genetics 2023 55:1* 55, 26–33 (2023).
- 13. Wroe, E. B., Seung, K. J., Baker, B. K. & Farmer, P. E. Test and treat: a missing link
- 861 in the global fight against COVID-19. *Lancet Glob Health* **10**, e181–e182 (2022).
- 862 14. World Bank Country and Lending Groups World Bank Data Help Desk.
- 863 https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank864 country-and-lending-groups.
- 865 15. World Population Prospects Population Division United Nations.
- 866 https://population.un.org/wpp/Download/Standard/MostUsed/.
- 16. Mefsin, Y. M. et al. Epidemiology of Infections with SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.2
- 868 Variant, Hong Kong, January–March 2022 Volume 28, Number 9—September 2022
- Emerging Infectious Diseases journal CDC. *Emerg Infect Dis* 28, 1856–1858
- 870 (2022).
- 871 17. Tegally, H. *et al.* Emergence of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron lineages BA.4 and BA.5 in
 872 South Africa. *Nat Med* 28, (2022).
- 873 18. UK Health Security Agency. SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern and variants under
- 874 investigation in England: Technical briefing 50. (2023).

- 875 19. Andrews, N. *et al.* Covid-19 Vaccine Effectiveness against the Omicron (B.1.1.529)
 876 Variant. *New England Journal of Medicine* 386, 1532–1546 (2022).
- 877 20. Buchan, S. A. et al. Effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines against Omicron or Delta
- 878 symptomatic infection and severe outcomes. *medRxiv* 2021.12.30.21268565 (2022)
- doi:10.1101/2021.12.30.21268565.
- Tseng, H. F. *et al.* Effectiveness of mRNA-1273 against SARS-CoV-2 Omicron and
 Delta variants. *Nature Medicine 2022 28:5* 28, 1063–1071 (2022).
- 22. Zhang, J. et al. Changes in contact patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19
- 883 outbreak in China. *Science (1979)* **368**, 1481–1486 (2020).
- Kerr, C. C. *et al.* Covasim: An agent-based model of COVID-19 dynamics and
 interventions. *PLoS Comput Biol* 17, e1009149- (2021).
- 886 24. Verity, R. *et al.* Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based
 887 analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis* 20, 669–677 (2020).
- 888 25. Ferguson, N. M. *et al.* Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to
- reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand. (2020) doi:10.25561/77482.
- 890 26. O'Driscoll, M. *et al.* Age-specific mortality and immunity patterns of SARS-CoV-2.
- 891 *Nature 2020 590:7844* **590**, 140–145 (2020).
- 892 27. Brazeau, N. F. et al. Report 34 COVID-19 Infection Fatality Ratio Estimates from
- 893 Seroprevalence | Faculty of Medicine | Imperial College London. (2020)
- doi:10.25561/83545.
- 895 28. Rawshani, A. et al. Severe COVID-19 in people with type 1 and type 2 diabetes in
- 896 Sweden: A nationwide retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet Regional Health* -
- *Europe* **4**, (2021).

898	29.	Bertagnolio, S. et al. Clinical features of, and risk factors for, severe or fatal COVID-
899		19 among people living with HIV admitted to hospital: analysis of data from the WHO
900		Global Clinical Platform of COVID-19. Lancet HIV 9, e486-e495 (2022).
901	30.	Rijksinstituut voor Volksgezondheid en Milieu. Research on behavioural rules and
902		well-being: round 3. https://www.rivm.nl/en/behavioural-science-and-covid-19/results-
903		of-study-behavioural-measures-and-well-being/round-3 (2020).
904	31.	Siegler, A. J. et al. Willingness to seek diagnostic testing for SARS-CoV-2 with home,
905		drive-through, and clinic-based specimen collection locations. Open Forum Infect Dis
906		7, (2020).
907	32.	Alvarez-Zuzek, L. G., Zipfel, C. M. & Bansal, S. Spatial clustering in vaccination
908		hesitancy: The role of social influence and social selection. PLoS Comput Biol 18,
909		(2022).
910	33.	Ante-Testard, P. A. et al. Temporal trends in socioeconomic inequalities in HIV
911		testing: an analysis of cross-sectional surveys from 16 sub-Saharan African countries.
912		Lancet Glob Health 8, (2020).
913	34.	Mendenhall, E., Kohrt, B. A., Norris, S. A., Ndetei, D. & Prabhakaran, D. Non-
914		communicable disease syndemics: poverty, depression, and diabetes among low-
915		income populations. The Lancet vol. 389 Preprint at https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-
916		6736(17)30402-6 (2017).
917	35.	Gold, J. A. W. et al. Dispensing of Oral Antiviral Drugs for Treatment of COVID-19
918		by Zip Code–Level Social Vulnerability — United States, December 23, 2021–May
919		21, 2022. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 71, (2022).
920	36.	World Health Organization. Update on the rollout of COVID-19 tools: a report from
921		the ACT-A Tracking & Monitoring Task Force - 15 February 2023.

- 922 https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/update-on-the-rollout-of-covid-19-tools--a-
- 923 report-from-the-act-a-tracking---monitoring-task-force---15-february-2023 (2023).
- 924 37. Viana, R. *et al.* Rapid epidemic expansion of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant in
 925 southern Africa. *Nature 2022* 1–10 (2022) doi:10.1038/s41586-022-04411-y.
- Bendo, A., Abbott, S., Kucharski, A. J. & Funk, S. Estimating the overdispersion in
 COVID-19 transmission using outbreak sizes outside China. *Wellcome Open Research*2020 5:67 5, 67 (2020).
- 929 39. Wallinga, J. & Lipsitch, M. How generation intervals shape the relationship between
- growth rates and reproductive numbers. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
- 931 *Biological Sciences* **274**, 599–604 (2006).
- 932 40. Brümmer, L. E. et al. Accuracy of novel antigen rapid diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2: A
- 933 living systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Med* **18**, e1003735- (2021).
- 41. Hay, J. A. et al. Quantifying the impact of immune history and variant on SARS-CoV-
- 935 2 viral kinetics and infection rebound: A retrospective cohort study. *Elife* 11, (2022).
- 936 42. Boyton, R. J. & Altmann, D. M. The immunology of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2
- 937 infection: what are the key questions? *Nature Reviews Immunology 2021 21:12* **21**,
- 938 762–768 (2021).
- 43. Quilty, B. J. *et al.* Quarantine and testing strategies in contact tracing for SARS-CoV-
- 940 2: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Health* **6**, e175–e183 (2021).
- 941 44. National Institute For Public Health and The Environment (RIVM). Figures on the
- 942 COVID-19 vaccination programme. https://www.rivm.nl/en/covid-19-
- 943 vaccination/figures-vaccination-programme (2022).
- 944 45. Ritchie, H. et al. Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19). Our World in Data (2020).
- 945 46. National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM). COVID-19 dataset.
- 946 https://data.rivm.nl/covid-19/ (2022).

- 947 47. World Health Organization. Therapeutics and COVID-19: living guideline.
- 948 https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-therapeutics-2022.3
- 949 (2022).
- 950 48. Wölfel, R. et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019.
- 951 *Nature 2020 581:7809* **581**, 465–469 (2020).
- 952









c) Vaccination coverage = 90%







10 tests/100,000 people/day

100 tests/100,000 people/day 500 tests/100,000 people/day







b) Vaccination coverage = 50%



c) Vaccination coverage = 90%



