# Economic evaluation of disease elimination: an extension to the net benefits framework and application to human African trypanosomiasis

Marina Antillon $^{a,b,1}$ , Ching-I Huang $^{c,d}$ , Kat S Rock $^{c,d,2}$ , and Fabrizio Tediosi $^{a,b,2}$ 

<sup>a</sup>Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Basel, Switzerland; <sup>b</sup>University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland; <sup>c</sup>Zeeman Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK; <sup>d</sup>Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

This manuscript was compiled on February 10, 2021

The net benefits framework has become a mainstay of the costeffectiveness literature, guiding decision-makers to select among 2 strategies in the presence of budget constraints and imperfect in-3 formation. However, disease elimination programs are socially desirable but not always cost-effective. Therefore, analytical frame-5 works are necessary to consider the additional premium for reach-6 ing global goals that are beyond the cost-effective use of country re-7 sources. We propose a modification to the net benefits framework to 8 consider the implications of switching from an optimal strategy (in 9 terms of cost-per-burden-averted) to a strategy with a higher likeli-10 hood of meeting the global target (i.e. elimination of transmission by 11 a specified date). Our expanded framework informs decisions under 12 uncertainty, determines the share of funding necessary to align local 13 and global priorities, enabling local partners to use their resources 14 efficiently while cooperating to meet global health targets. We illus-15 trate the advantages of our framework by considering the economic 16 17 case of efforts to eliminate transmission by 2030 of gambiense human African trypanosomiasis (gHAT), a vector-borne parasitic dis-18 ease in West and Central Africa. 19

gHAT | elimination | economic evaluation | net benefits framework | mathematical modeling

he successful eradication campaigns of smallpox and rinderpest have curried the political support for the elim-2 ination and eradication of a host of other diseases. Thus far, 3 regional elimination has been achieved for land-transmitted 4 rabies in Europe and for malaria in large parts of the world. 5 Yet, due to the strong correlation between many of the diseases 6 targeted for elimination and eradication and poor sanitation, 7 health infrastructure, or overall material conditions, such dis-8 ease campaigns are disproportionately focused in low-resource settings, bringing to the fore important questions about the 10 11 economic efficiency of such efforts (1, 2).

On the one hand, expensive interventions are often justified 12 on the basis of future cessation of activities; one front-loads 13 the expenses on a disease on the premise that public health 14 activities can cease in the not-too-distant future, at which time 15 16 one may recover investments. Smallpox eradication is claimed 17 to have saved, within just a few years, billions of dollars (3). However, falling just short of elimination or eradication could 18 be the worst of all possible scenarios: one has diverted ever-19 increasing resources from other purposes, but one has not 20 reached a situation where investment can be recovered. In 21 part because of the risk of failure and in part because of the 22 accelerating per-case costs of elimination and eradication cam-23 paigns near the end-game, such efforts might not be considered 24 an efficient use of resources in a typical 10- or 20-year time 25

horizon from the perspective of decision-makers with limited 26 budgets contending with a variety of health challenges. For 27 instance, there were 22-180 wild-type poliomyelitis cases re-28 ported annually in recent years but eradication campaigns cost 29 approximately \$1B due to the continued need for surveillance 30 and vaccination globally (4, 5). Guinea worm disease (GWD), 31 which has a more restricted geographic reach than polio, is 32 the subject of campaigns that cost approximately \$30M when 33 the disease causes only 54 cases yearly (6, 7). The eradication 34 targets of both diseases have experienced delays 23 years and 35 10 years, respectively, therefore stalling the promise to recover 36 investments (7, 8). 37

To explore, scrutinize, and provide insights into questions 38 surrounding disease elimination and eradication, the epidemi-39 ology and health economics fields have a rich toolbox that 40 captures the non-linear transmission dynamics, temporal fea-41 tures, and economic implications of disease control. However, 42 that toolbox presents shortcomings in the face of elimination 43 and eradication: the diseases targeted for elimination and 44 eradication are in hard-to-reach populations usually in low 45 socio-economic strata, but traditional cost-effectiveness is ag-46 nostic to concerns of equity, which a few studies have just 47 begun to address (9-13). Separately, a few studies have tried 48

# Significance Statement

Various diseases have now been earmarked for elimination by the global health community. While the health economic implications of elimination have been discussed before, one important topic remains unexplored: uncertainty and its consideration within extant cost-effectiveness frameworks. Here we extend the ubiquitous net benefits framework to consider the comparative efficiency of alternative elimination strategies when these strategies have different probabilities of reaching elimination. We evaluate the premium of elimination, and we apply our method to efforts against human African trypanosomiasis in three settings. This method could be directly applied to simulation-based studies of the cost-effectiveness of other disease elimination efforts, therefore giving the global health community a common metric by which to budget for such initiatives.

M.A. performed the formal analysis and created visualisations. M.A., K.S.R. and F.T. conceptualized the study and wrote the original draft. K.S.R. and F.T. acquired funding and supervised the study. C.H. performed simulations and reviewed and edited the final draft.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

 $^{2}$  K.S.R. contributed equally to this work with F.T.

<sup>1</sup> To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: marina.antillon@swisstph.ch

to grapple with questions around the economic implications 49 of disease elimination and eradication by employing game

theoretical approaches, conceptualising investment cases for 51 disease eradication with multiple stakeholders (3, 14, 15). 52

50

For policy-makers and advocates, it may be useful to know 53 the portion of the resources aimed at averting morbidity 54 and mortality versus the additional costs of strategies that 55 promise elimination or eradication. A previously described 56 57 approach has been to designate different levels of coverage (i.e. vaccine coverage) necessary for "control" and "elimina-58 tion/eradication", and the difference in costs between "control" 59 and "elimination/eradication" strategies constitutes the price 60 for elimination (3, 14, 16). While making the problem theoreti-61 cally tractable, the application is quite narrow: addressing the 62 burden of a disease may require various distinct activities in 63 practice, and parsing the activities that contribute to "control" 64 or "elimination/eradication" is not possible, as each activity 65 contributes to both goals to varying degrees. 66

Moreover, there is a lot of uncertainty in whether strategies 67 would lead to elimination or eradication. In practice one cannot 68 purchase elimination or eradication and then be certain it will 69 70 happen, as GWD and polio have shown, one merely invests in 71 activities that are conducive to eradication, and therefore, the absence of probabilistic thinking in previous literature fails to 72 capture a key component of the decision-making process. 73

74 Here we develop a framework that can handle strategies that have different probabilities of elimination, rather than 75 strategies that are conceived as certain to reach elimination 76 or not, as well as strategies where activities are not easily 77 classified as "control" or "elimination" activities. Disease 78 campaigns with eradication objectives can be examined anal-79 ogously. Specifically, we extend the net-benefits framework, 80 useful for decision-analysis in the presence of uncertainty, in 81 order to simultaneously evaluate cost-effectiveness of public 82 health strategies while explicitly outlining the 'premium' of 83 elimination, or the additional resources that are necessary to 84 bring a countries activities in line with global goals. One im-85 86 portant feature of our framework is that it is operationalized 87 within a probabilistic simulation framework, which makes it a simple extension to ubiquitously used approaches for decision 88 89 analysis in the face of uncertainty, thereby being applicable in a wide array of situations. 90

We then apply our new framework to gambiense human 91 African trypanosomiasis (gHAT) in three distinct regions of 92 the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). The three regions 93 highlight the strengths of our framework and its applications 94 under different circumstances: circumstances of certainty, un-95 certainty, and where more than two strategies are reasonable 96 candidates to abate disease burden and interrupt disease trans-97 mission. 98

Economic evaluation framework. Our objective is to introduce 99 an extension of the net benefits framework to account for the 100 resource implications of aligning local targets with global goals 101 like elimination. 102

A detailed overview of the relationship between the incre-103 mental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) and the net benefits 104 framework is found in SI section 1, but we provide a brief 105 summary here as a point of departure for our framework. The 106 keystone metric of value-for-money in cost-effectiveness analy-107 sis is ICER, defined as the ratio of the difference in costs,  $\Delta C$ , 108

and the difference in health effects,  $\Delta E$  of two interventions: 109

Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) = 
$$\frac{\Delta C}{\Delta E}$$
, 110

where the change in costs and health effects are computed as 111 the net difference in strategies. Effects are usually denominated 112 in disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) averted, a metric 113 that is comparable across diseases. For the purpose of our 114 analysis, the effects will be distinguished between DALYs and 115 the probability of elimination of transmission (EOT). 116

Most often, even when one is simply concerned with DALYs and costs, uncertainty in these metrics exists, in particular with regards to populations that are difficult to study or diseases that have been historically neglected. There exists a literature devoted to the difficulties of accounting for parameter uncertainty and ICERs while remaining consistent with the economic principles on which cost-effectiveness is grounded (17, 18). The net benefits framework was therefore developed to circumvent some of the issues surrounding ICERs and uncertainty. The NMB is characterised as a simple arithmetic rearrangement of the ICER, provided that the threshold for cost-effectiveness,  $\lambda^{\text{WTP}}$ , is explicitly stated:

$$ICER = \frac{\Delta C}{\Delta E} \le \lambda^{WTP}$$
$$0 \le \lambda^{WTP} \times \Delta E - \Delta C$$
$$= Net Monetary Benefits (NMB(\lambda^{WTP}))$$

The linear additive formulation avoids the mathematical issues 117 with samples of ratios. In a Monte Carlo sample of N iterates 118 of the disease and the cost model, the preferred strategy is 119 the one with the highest expected NMB,  $\mathbb{E}(NMB)$ , over all 120 N samples. The algorithm therefore presents a measure of 121 certainty that the strategy with the highest expected NMB 122 is optimal over all other strategies: the probability that the 123 strategy is optimal at a  $\lambda^{\text{WTP}}$  value is given by the proportion 124 of samples where the strategy has a higher NMB (18, 19). 125

The NMB is conditional on the threshold of cost-126 effectiveness ( $\lambda^{\text{WTP}}$ ), or the willingness-to-pay (WTP) per 127 DALY averted (18, 20). A cost-effective intervention should 128 have a WTP that is equal or smaller to the the least efficient 129 strategy in a decision-maker's health portfolio (21-24). Re-130 cently the World Health Organization (WHO) has advocated 131 that cost-effectiveness results should be shown at a range of 132 WTP values (Table 1). 133

Premium of elimination. A useful metric easily calculated from 134 the formulation of NMB is the  $Premium_{EOT}$ . We begin our 135 exploration of the premium of elimination with a simple con-136 text (almost never seen in practice). If we suppose there are 137 two strategies, one which is certain to reach elimination and 138 a strategy that is certain not to reach elimination, and we 139 suppose that the elimination strategy would not avert any 140 additional DALYs over the non-elimination strategy (suppose 141 that detection and treatment are superb), then the expected 142  $Premium_{EOT}$  would equal the expected cost difference between 143 the two strategies 144

$$\mathbb{E}(\text{Premium}_{\text{EOT}}) = \Delta \mathbb{E}(\text{C}).$$
 145

However, in practice any two or more strategies are unlikely 146 to avert the same number of DALYs; in fact, most often the 147 elimination-prone strategy is likely to avert some additional 148

Table 1. Contextualizing willingness-to-pay values  $\left(\lambda_{\rm DALY}^{\rm WTP}\right)$  for low-income settings.

$\lambda_{DALY}^{WTP}$	Rationale
\$0	This is cost-saving or cost-neutral over the chosen time horizon of
	the analysis. Annual expenditure is not necessarily static across
	the whole period for all (or any) strategies.
\$250	Two studies that modelled the real investments made across
	countries estimated that the investments in DRC are \$5-\$230 per
	DALY averted in 2013 US\$(24) or \$54-\$69 per DALY averted in
	2015 US\$ (25). We rounded up to \$250 for convenience.
\$500	Approximately equivalent to the annual gross national income
	(GDP) of DRC in 2018, which was the definition of a "very
	cost-effective" strategy as delineated in the WHO CHOICE
	program (26).
\$1500	Approximately equivalent to three times the annual gross
	domestic product (GDP) of DRC, which was the definition of a
	λ <sub>DALY</sub> \$0 \$250 \$500 \$1500

"cost-effective" strategy as delineated in the WHO CHOICE

program (26).

DALYs, albeit at a potentially high cost. The health planner
has a certain WTP for those additional DALYs that the elimination strategy averts, though perhaps not a WTP that would
completely bridge the gap in costs between the two strategies.
To convince that health planner to undertake the costlier,
elimination strategy, the overall expected Premium<sub>EOT</sub> must
be:

156  $\mathbb{E}(\text{Premium}_{\text{EOT}}) = \max \left\{ \Delta \mathbb{E}(C) - \Delta \mathbb{E}(\text{DALYs}) \times \lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}, 0 \right\}$ 

We argue that this is a sensible formulation of Premium<sub>EOT</sub>
because the more the health planner is willing to pay for DALYs
averted, the lower the degree to which the health planner must
justify costlier elimination-prone strategies on the grounds of
elimination alone.

If one strategy has both a higher probability of achieving the elimination and a relatively low incremental cost at reasonable time-horizon, then the premium of elimination is defined to be zero, as no additional resources are needed above those traditionally considered cost-effective to avert disease in order to justify elimination.

We now turn our attention, and the plurality of the results 168 and the discussion in the current analysis, to contexts in which 169 the more expensive strategy bolsters the probability of elimi-170 nation but does not necessarily guarantee it.  $\mathbb{E}(\text{Premium}_{\text{FOT}})$ 171 factors in the risk of switching to a more expensive strategy 172 that does not necessarily achieve the EOT goal. We therefore 173 extend our framework to determine whether a costlier strategy 174 is sufficiently efficient at raising the probability of elimination 175 to justify the additional cost by a decision-maker. 176

Efficiency of elimination in the presence of uncertainty. We 177 propose the following re-formulation, which makes explicit the 178 relationship between the WTP for averting disease burden 179 denominated in DALYs averted, while taking into account 180 the uncertainty in costs, intervention impact on morbidity 181 and mortality, and elimination. We consider a two-strategy 182 scenario and we present how it generalises to the multiple-183 strategy scenario in the next subsection. 184

Generally, a second strategy will be favoured (cost-effective) compared to the first (comparator) if the additional costs are less than the product of reduction in burden (DALYs averted) and the WTP. Given any parameter set of a disease and cost model,  $\theta_i$ , a strategy is cost-effective if 189

$$\Delta C(\theta_i) < \lambda_{DALY}^{WTP} \times \Delta DALYs(\theta_i)$$
 190

194

195

196

197

199

200

201

202

where  $i \in \{1, ..., N\}$ . In this paper, we call the term  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}} \times \Delta_{\text{DALYs}}(\theta_i)$  the justifiable costs (on the grounds of averting disease burden).

Our proposal is that if there is a premium that a stakeholder is willing to pay for elimination, above and beyond the justifiable costs, then we include that justifiable premium for elimination as an additive term:

$$\Delta C(\theta_i) < \lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}} \times \Delta \text{DALYs}(\theta_i) + 100\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}} \times \Delta \mathbb{I}_{\text{EOT}}(\theta_i)$$
 198

where the indicator function,  $\mathbb{I}_{\text{EOT}}$  is 1 if EOT is achieved by only one strategy and 0 if neither or both strategies achieve EOT (for parameter set  $\theta_i$  and strategy j):

$$\Delta \mathbb{I}_{\text{EOT}}(\theta_i) = \mathbb{I}_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{strat B}}(\theta_i) - \mathbb{I}_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{strat A}}(\theta_i).$$

The use of  $100\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}} \times \Delta \mathbb{I}_{\text{EOT}}(\theta_i)$  incorporates the WTP to raise the probability of elimination. In simulations where strategy A reaches elimination and strategy B does not, the NMB is lower, favouring strategy A. A further discussion of the term representing the justifiable costs of EOT is found in SI section 2.

The term  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}$  is interpreted as the highest price paid to avert an additional DALY, whereas we interpret the new  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}}$  as how much a decision-maker would pay per additional percentage point increase in the probability of elimination.

Net Monetary and Elimination Benefits  $(NMEB(\theta_i))$ 

$$=100\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}} \times \Delta \mathbb{I}_{\text{EOT}}(\theta_i) + \lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}} \times \Delta \text{DALYs}(\theta_i) - \Delta C(\theta_i)$$

The linear additive scale allows us to decompose the resource 209 expenditure into two portions: the portion that is justifiable 210 based on disease burden averted and the portion of the ex-211 penditure that is justifiable by concerns about global goals. 212 While elimination and disease control are not separable or 213 independent, which is accounted for in the dynamic transmis-214 sion model, the linear form in this formulations allows us to 215 separate the elimination benefits related to disease control 216 (decreasing DALYs) and all other benefits of elimination above 217 and beyond averted disease burden. 218

We can then re-arrange these terms to express that a strategy should be adopted if the  $100\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}} \times \Delta \mathbb{I}_{\text{EOT}}(\theta_i)$  is greater than the the difference between the costs and the costs justifiable for averting disease burden, analogous to our decision rule in the conventional context of optimal disease control:

$$100\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}} \times \Delta \mathbb{I}_{\text{EOT}}(\theta_i) \ge \Delta C(\theta_i) - \lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}} \times \Delta \text{DALYs}(\theta_i)$$
$$= \text{Premium}_{\text{EOT}}(\theta_i)$$

In other words, if the comparator strategy (strategy A) is the preferred strategy under the traditional NMB framework, then in order to select strategy B on the basis of elimination, the WTP for 'efficient' elimination must be at least as large as the Premium<sub>EOT</sub>, provided that (using parameter set  $\theta_i$ ) strategy A does not lead to elimination, but strategy B does (i.e.  $\mathbb{I}_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{strat A}}(\theta_i) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{I}_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{strat B}}(\theta_i) = 1$ ).

In order to compute the probability that a strategy is cost effective across all parameter sets, rather than a single one we marginalise over all iterations of the model: 227

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{Strategy } j \text{ is CE}|\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}, \lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{M}(\theta_i)$$
 229

230 where

231

$$\mathbb{M}(\theta_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & 100\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}} \times \Delta \mathbb{I}_{\text{EOT}}(\theta_i) \ge -\text{NMB}(\theta_i) \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This formulation is directly analogous to the traditional construction of a cost-effectiveness acceptability curve (see SI section 2). Therefore, the probability that strategy j is costeffective at  $\lambda_{\text{DALYs}}^{\text{WTP}}$  and  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}}$  is the proportion of times in a simulation of N iterates where the strategy j has the highest net monetary and elimination benefits among all strategies. After marginalising over all i (taking the mean net benefit), then the  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}}$  is the additional resources a health planner would be willing to put toward raising the probability of elimination by one percentage point. Generally, the strategy that ought to be implemented is indicated by:

$$\mathbb{E}(\text{NMEB}(\text{New strategy}|\theta, \lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}, \lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}})) > 0$$

Scenarios with multiple potential new strategies. The re-232 formulation of the net benefits framework easily generalises 233 to the multiple-strategy scenario due to the use of linear ad-234 ditive scale. However, instead of taking a net benefit greater 235 than zero (which is to be interpreted as greater than the 236 comparator intervention) one takes the maximum net benefit 237 among all possible (J) alternative strategies, denoted below 238 as  $j \in \{2 : J\}$ . This generalisation follows a similar form as 239 in the conventional case where elimination considerations are 240 absent (see SI section 2): 241

P(Strat j is CE|
$$\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}, \lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}}$$
) =  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{M}(j, \theta_i)$ 

243 where

244 
$$\mathbb{M}(j, \theta_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \operatorname{argmax NMEB}(\operatorname{Strat} j, \theta_i | \lambda_{\mathrm{DALY}}^{\mathrm{WTP}}, \lambda_{\mathrm{EOT}}^{\mathrm{WTP}}) \\ & j \in 2:J \\ 0 & \operatorname{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

<sup>245</sup> and the optimal strategy is indicated by:

246  $\operatorname{argmax}_{j \in 2:J} \mathbb{E} \left( \text{NMEB} \left( \text{Strategy } j, \theta_i | \lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}, \lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}} \right) \right)$ 

over all N samples of  $\theta$  where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{NMEB}(\text{Strat } j, \theta_i | \lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}, \lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}}) = \\ \lambda_{\text{DALYs}}^{\text{WTP}} \times \Delta \text{DALY}(j, \theta_i) + 100\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}} \times \Delta \mathbb{I}_{\text{EOT}}(j, \theta_i) - \Delta C(j, \theta_i) \end{aligned}$$

and the differences refer to the difference between the comparator strategy (j = 1) and any alternative strategy  $j \in 2: J$ in the analysis.

As a preferred strategy changes with higher  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}$  values, making EOT justifiable by DALYs averted, the premium of elimination shrinks.

An alternative derivation of NMEB, paralleling the derivation of the NMB from the ICER, is found in SI section 2.

## 255 Results

Health Outcomes, Costs, and Traditional ICERs. Using a joint transmission and cost model we made projections of the epidemiological impact the resource use over 2020–2040 of four strategies in three locations against gHAT (Table 2 provides an overview on the component interventions, while further details can be found in the Materials and Methods). In Region 1, success or failure of the 2030 EOT goal is certain depending

Table 2. Strategies for control and elimination of gHAT in a typical endemic health district.

		Stra	Strategy	
Component Interventions	Mean AS‡Max AS		Mean AS Max AS & VC & VC	
Mean active screening	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Additional active screening		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$
Passive surveillance	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Vector control			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Treatment of cases	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$

<sup>‡</sup> Status quo strategy.

- <sup>1</sup> Passive surveillance (PS): gHAT screening that occurs in local health posts of patients who present themselves with specific gHAT symptoms.
- <sup>2</sup> Active screening (AS): The examination of individuals in their village by mobile teams who screen and confirm cases.
- <sup>3</sup> Treatment: Detected cases (either active or passive) are referred to the district hospital for treatment according to WHO guidelines (27).
- <sup>4</sup> Vector control (VC): biannual deployment of tiny targets to control the population of tsetse. Our simulation assumes that the tsetse population decreases by 80% in the first year, consistent with field studies (28–30).

on the selected strategy, but in Regions 2 and 3 success and failure of the EOT goal is uncertain (Table 3).

If the status (comparator) strategy remains in place (Mean 265 active screening, AS) there will be an average of 477 cases and 266 215 deaths in Region 1, 23 cases and 13 deaths in Region 2, 267 and 47 cases and 24 deaths in Region 3. In terms of DALYs, 268 those incidence levels give rise to 3,934 DALYs in Region 1,274 269 DALYs in Region 2, and 501 DALYs in Region 3. Under any 270 strategy in all settings, the burden of disease is expected to 271 decline, but strategies with VC are expected to expedite this 272 decline substantially (see Fig S3). 273

The uncertainty of costs for each strategy overshadows 274 the differences in costs between strategies. Costs per year 275 show that while strategies that include vector control (VC) 276 are more costly in the short-run, the investments begin to 277 yield returns after 2028 in Region 1, after 2025 in Region 2, 278 and after 2031 in Region 3 (Fig S4). Nevertheless, a time-279 horizon of 20 years is not certain to show cost-savings by these 280 strategies, although total costs are only marginally higher 281 compared to the comparator (Mean AS). Costs are driven by 282 AS activities, and when applicable, by VC activities, so the 283 timing of cessation of these activities plays an important role 284 in the ability of ambitious investments to be recovered (see 285 Fig 5). 286

For all three regions, the current strategy is expected to be 287 the minimum-cost strategy even after accounting for uncer-288 tainty, and while it is certain that Mean AS will not deliver 289 EOT in Region 1, it has a 79% probability of reaching EOT in 290 Region 2 and a 46% probability of reaching EOT in Region 3. 291 In Regions 1 and 2, the strategy that yields >99% probability 292 of EOT involves adding VC to the status quo (Mean AS & 293 VC), which is cost-effective if  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}} >$  \$291 in Region 1 and 294 if  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}$  \$1,651 in Region 2. In Region 3, Mean AS & VC 295 is weakly dominated (see SI section 7) but a strategy that is 296 certain to reach elimination (Max AS & VC) is justifiable at 297 a very high willingness-to-pay ( $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}$ >\$4,355). 298

**Net Monetary Elimination Benefits: Region 1, where success** and failure are certain. The probability of EOT in Region 1 is shown in 1A and the results of our decision analysis under

263

264

	Mean AS	Max AS	Mean AS & VC	Max AS & VC
Region 1				
Cases	477 (144, 1,081)	463 (136, 1,047)	116 (41, 235)	120 (38, 270)
Deaths	215 (44, 629)	176 (37, 503)	63 (22, 132)	51 (17, 108)
DALYs	3,934 (887, 11,039)	3,332 (781, 9,157)	1,183 (401, 2,510)	1,075 (361, 2,293)
$\Delta DALYs$	Comparator	603 (-196, 2,250)	2,751 (342, 8,761)	2,859 (381, 9,011)
Costs (USD, $\times$ 1000)	2,952 (2,015, 4,535)	3,883 (2,607, 6,089)	3,753 (2,412, 5,866)	4,226 (2,666, 6,713)
$\Delta  extsf{Costs}$ (USD, $ imes$ 1000)	Comparator	931 (468, 1,613)	800 (-657, 2,823)	1,274 (-187, 3,492)
ICER	Minimum cost	Dominated	291	4,387
Pr. EOT	0	0	100	100
Region 2				
Cases	23 (1, 79)	22 (0, 92)	9 (0, 41)	10 (0, 54)
Deaths	13 (1, 42)	8 (0, 29)	5 (0, 16)	4 (0, 12)
DALYs	247 (20, 806)	167 (2, 563)	106 (1, 320)	82 (1, 263)
$\Delta DALYs$	Comparator	80 (-87, 367)	142 (-41, 550)	165 (-21, 596)
Costs (USD, $\times$ 1000)	1,019 (497, 1,822)	1,397 (627, 2,628)	1,252 (623, 2,059)	1,522 (733, 2,535)
$\Delta  extsf{Costs}$ (USD, $ imes$ 1000)	Comparator	378 (-160, 1,101)	234 (-447, 939)	503 (-214, 1,332)
ICER	Minimum cost	Dominated	1,651	11,534
Pr. EOT	79	92	100	100
Region 3				
Cases	47 (9, 115)	47 (7, 122)	23 (3, 59)	24 (2, 67)
Deaths	24 (5, 69)	20 (4, 55)	14 (3, 33)	12 (2, 30)
DALYs	501 (112, 1,327)	420 (91, 1,095)	305 (73, 708)	274 (58, 656)
$\Delta DALYs$	Comparator	81 (-152, 409)	196 (-73, 770)	227 (-50, 843)
Costs (USD, $\times$ 1000)	784 (505, 1,207)	846 (533, 1,342)	1,475 (829, 2,459)	1,483 (831, 2,473)
$\Delta  extsf{Costs}$ (USD, $ imes$ 1000)	Comparator	62 (-123, 269)	691 (83, 1,594)	700 (103, 1,618)
ICER	Minimum cost	771	Weakly dominated	4,355
Pr. EOT	46	55	100	100

Table 3. Intermediate outcomes between 2020–2040, cost-effectiveness, and elimination of transmission in three example regions.

<sup>1</sup> Cases and deaths are undiscounted, whereas DALYs and costs are discounted at 3% per year.

<sup>2</sup> In Regions 1 and 2, Max AS is considered dominated because it has a higher cost but fewer DALYs averted than the next strategy (Mean AS & VC).

<sup>3</sup> In Region 3, Mean AS & VC is weakly dominated because it has a higher ICER than the next more expensive strategy (Max AS & VC). See SI section 7.

<sup>4</sup> Prediction intervals for ICERs are not computed due to a variety of issues with their mathematical properties (17).

the traditional net benefits framework is shown in Figure 1B. After taking into account parameter uncertainty, our analysis shows that Mean AS has an 80% probability of having the minimum cost (optimal at  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}} = 0$ ), and optimal at  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}} \leq \$291$ . However, if  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}} > \$291$ , the strategy Mean AS & VC is optimal with 47%-55% probability for values of  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}$  compatible with a setting like DRC.

The expected Premium<sub>EOT</sub>, is shown in 1C. In a policy 309 environment of low  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}$ , any health planner must be able 310 to justify the entire \$800,000 cost difference on the basis of 311 EOT alone. When health benefits are not valued monetarily 312  $(\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}=\$0)$ , the Premium<sub>EOT</sub> is simply equivalent to the 313 difference in costs between the two strategies. If, for instance, 314  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}$ =\$100, a health planner must be able to justify only a 315  $Premium_{EOT}$  of \$524,900, as the other \$275,100 that would 316 be justifiable for DALYs averted. In a policy environment of 317 a  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}$ =\$300 per DALY averted, the strategy that reaches 318 elimination is entirely justifiable on the health gains achieved 319 (DALYs averted), and the Premium<sub>EOT</sub> is therefore 0. 320

Fig 1C shows the optimal choice of strategy for a range of  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}$  and  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}}$  values. In a policy environment where  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}=0$  and  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}}=8,000$  per probability point of EOT, the optimal strategy guarantees elimination, as that is the  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}}$ that justifies the \$800,000 premium of elimination. Net Monetary Elimination Benefits: where success and failure are uncertain. Region 2 illustrates a setting in where the comparator strategy (Mean AS) has a 79% probability of EOT, and therefore the binary conception of "control" or "elimination" strategies fails to adequately capture the decision-maker's dilemma.

The conditions for which an economically optimal strat-332 egy maximizes the probability of EOT is shown in Fig 2. If 333  $\lambda_{\text{DALYs}}^{\text{WTP}}=0$ , a strategy that almost ensures EOT, Mean AS & VC, is optimal if  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}} \geq \$10,915$  per percentage point, and 334 335 the Premium<sub>EOT</sub> is 234,000 (-939,000) (Tables S14). If, 336 however,  $\lambda_{\text{DALYs}}^{\text{WTP}} = \$500$ , then the Premium<sub>EOT</sub> is \$163,000(\$0-\$93,000) and the  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}} > \$7,610$ . At  $\lambda_{\text{DALYs}}^{\text{WTP}} = 1,500$ , 337 338 then  $Premium_{EOT}$  decreases to \$21,000 (\$0-822,000) and 339  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}} = \$999.$ 340

Our most complex setting, Region 3, is shown in Figure 3. 341 Under the traditional net benefits framework, either the Mean 342 AS or Max AS strategy are cost-effective at  $\lambda_{\text{DALYs}}^{\text{WTP}}$  values 343 consistent with historical investment levels in low-income coun-344 tries (Fig 3C), but these strategies have only a 46% and 55%345 probability of EOT (inset Fig 3B). Without an investment 346 in elimination justified by benefits that extend beyond the 347 averted DALYs, achievement of EOT is uncertain. 348

At  $\lambda_{\text{DATYs}}^{\text{WTP}} = 0$ , then a decision-maker must be willing to have  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}} \ge \$6,489$  to bolster the chances of elimination from 46% to 55% or  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}} \ge \$14,113$  to bolster the probability of 350



Fig. 1. Cost-effectiveness acceptability curves and cost breakdown for Region 1.

elimination from 45% to >99%, representing a Premium<sub>EOT</sub> of 352 \$691,000 (\$0-1,594,000). If, however, the policy environment 353 is one where  $\lambda_{\text{DALYs}}^{\text{WTP}}$ =500, then the Premium<sub>EOT</sub> is \$22,000 354 (\$0–259,000) and the  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}}$  >\$2,280 to opt for the Max AS 355 strategy, which has a 55% probability of EOT. To maximise 356 the probability of EOT when  $\lambda_{\text{DALYs}}^{\text{WTP}}$ =500, one would deploy 357 Max AS & VC, for which the Premium<sub>EOT</sub> is \$586,000 (\$0–1,517,000), equivalent to  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}}$ >\$12,654. At  $\lambda_{\text{DALYs}}^{\text{WTP}}$ =1,500, 35 359

the strategy Max AS is cost-effective, so the Premium<sub>EOT</sub> is \$418,000 (\$0–1,407,000) and the  $\lambda_{\rm EOT}^{\rm WTP}{>}$9,372$  to deploy Max 360 361 AS & VC. 362

363

386

387

388

389

390

39

399

403

# Discussion

Much of the early literature about cost-effectiveness and 364 decision-making in the presence of uncertainty was about 365 analytical methods to do what is now more easily done with 366 simulation (17, 20, 31, 32). Although simulation of a wide array 367 of epidemiological and policy questions is ubiquitous, the in-368 terpretation of those simulations must rest within frameworks 369 which decompose uncertainty and frame economic optimiza-370 tion in a manner that is in line with economic theory. The 371 existing tools in the health economics toolbox generally answer 372 the question "are public health efforts economically justified?" 373 but when the global health community has set ambitious goals, 374 such as elimination of infectious diseases, questions of resource 375 use across different administrative levels (local, national, re-376 gional, and global) do not fit neatly in existing frameworks 377 and one asks "to what degree are public health objectives 378 economically justified by various objectives". In the context 379 of infectious disease elimination, there is a tension between 380 reaching goals set by the global health community and main-381 taining an efficient use of scarce resources within each setting 382 (10). This is particularly salient because the same resources – 383 in-kind, capital, and financial - that vie for elimination efforts 384 could be diverted to address other urgent health goals. 385

We have presented an extension to the net benefits framework to inform decisions that contain an elimination objective that may stand at odds with concerns about efficient resource allocation. Our proposed framework explicitly models the additional premium for elimination activities in the presence of parameter uncertainty.

The illustrative analysis shows that in Region 1, EOT is 392 nearly impossible with the comparator strategy, but elimina-393 tion is cost-effective at a relatively low  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}} >$ \$300, then 394 yielding  $\lambda_{EOT}^{WTP}$  = \$0. The other regions present more compli-395 cated scenarios: EOT is likely in Region 2 (79%) and mod-396 erately likely in Region 3 (46%) even with the comparator 397 strategy (Mean AS), but the value-for-money in terms of EOT 398 objectives vary by location.

Although the Premium<sub>EOT</sub> is highest in Region 1, it is the 400 place where investments justified on the ground of elimination 401 alone are the most efficient,  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}} = \$8,001$ . In Region 2, the 402  $Premium_{EOT} = $210,000 - cheaper than in Region 1 - but on a$ per-percentage point basis the cost is 10,916 (see Tables S13 404 and S14). In Region 3, one would pay \$6,489 per percentage 405 point of EOT to bolster the chances of elimination from 46%406 to 55% for a Premium<sub>EOT</sub> of (0, -269,000), but to 407 maximize the probability of EOT, each percentage point has 408 an incremental cost of \$14,113, equivalent to a Premium<sub>EOT</sub> 409 of \$691,000 (\$83,000-1,594,000). 410

While one could justify strategies that maximize the proba-411 bility of elimination with a sufficiently high  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}$  in Regions 412 1 and 2, that would not be possible in Region 3. In Region 3, 413 one could not justify switching to one of the strategies that 414 would ensure EOT (strategies with VC included) purely on the 415 grounds of averting disease burden for the range of reasonable 416  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}$  thresholds considered here (see Fig 4 and Table S15). 417

Existing literature has illustrative analysis of strategies 418 against diseases of person-to-person transmission, so that 419



Fig. 2. Cost-effectiveness acceptability heatmaps for Region 2. On the left is the cost-effectiveness acceptability heatmap (CEAH). Along the x-axis is the cost-effectiveness threshold for averting disease burden,  $\lambda_{EOT}^{WTP}$ , and along y-axis is the cost-effectiveness threshold for elimination of transmission (EOT),  $\lambda_{EOT}^{WTP}$ , to raise the probability of EOT by 2030 by one percentage point. On the right are the more traditional cost-effectiveness acceptability frontiers (CEAFs) assuming  $\lambda_{EOT}^{WTP}$  of \$0 and \$10,000. The inset in the top-right graph is the probability of each strategy's EOT by 2030.

control vs elimination is a matter of degree of coverage of 420 vaccination (as with smallpox) or treatment (as with HIV 421 in some countries). In the case of gHAT, as well as other 422 vector-borne infections including malaria, multiple modalities 423 of control exist and it is not clear that one activity alone 424 is the key to elimination. Our framework expands the cate-425 gories of diseases that could be analyzed via a common set 426 of metrics amenable to simulation analysis:  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}}$ , 427 and Premium $_{EOT}$ . In presenting such a flexible and inclu-428 sive framework, it is tractable to perform analyses that could 429 inform elimination policy priorities across disease portfolios. 430

With this method, we can attest whether health-budget effi-431 ciency alone is enough to justify elimination efforts or whether 432 some of the efforts are being justified on grounds of additional 433 (non-health) benefits or externalities to other populations. Be-434 cause it would be difficult, if not impossible, to enumerate all 435 non-health benefits or externalities and integrate them into 436 one CEA, one can, at minimum, present a lower bound for 437 the utility that would have to be conferred on other sectors 438 or populations to consider a strategy efficient. This could 439 motivate advocating for transfers across government sectors or 440 across health budgets in different jurisdictions, a theme that 441 has only been recently considered in the literature (15, 33). 442

Limitations. The total costs of elimination will inevitably be
affected by the size of the population that must be treated,
and the size of the relevant population to attain a durable
elimination gain involves the concepts of critical community

size, meta-population, and importation probability that we do not examine here. Some diseases are worth eliminating in small patches because even one imported case will not reestablish transmission, while other diseases are only worth eliminating if you can eliminate entirely transmission in very large interconnected networks of settlements (34–36).

Unlike many neglected tropical diseases, gHAT interven-453 tions have been very heterogeneous, even across the same 454 administrative district, and so two regions with the same 455 transmission in 2017 may have quite different underlying epi-456 demiology. We captured this uncertainty by utilising posterior 457 parameters from various regions, however the present results 458 are not designed to be representative of a single area. Tailored 459 models, fitted to longitudinal case and intervention data will 460 yield more specific analyses for specific gHAT strategies. 461

It is worth noting that the premium of elimination is not 462 a subsidy, although this number could be used to inform 463 a subsidy. Incurring outlays in the short-term may require 464 financing products even if a setting is expected to save money 465 in the long run. One form of short-term financing might be 466 a subsidy, and this subsidy might go above and beyond the 467 premium if the country cannot secure financial inflows at the 468 right time, for instance in the form of loans. 469

While we do not address issues surrounding the elimination 470 of diseases that mainly afflict the extreme poor, there is a 471 budding literature regarding such concerns termed 'equity-472 enhanced CEA', 'extended CEA', and 'distributional CEA' 473 which look at how elimination and control can improve not 474



**Fig. 3.** Cost-effectiveness acceptability heatmaps for Region 3. On the left is the cost-effectiveness acceptability heatmap (CEAH). Along the x-axis is the cost-effectiveness threshold for averting disease burden,  $\lambda_{EOT}^{WTP}$ , and along y-axis is the cost-effectiveness threshold for elimination of transmission (EOT),  $\lambda_{EOT}^{WTP}$ , to raise the probability of EOT by 2030 by one percentage point. On the right are the more traditional cost-effectiveness acceptability frontiers (CEAFs). The inset in the top-right graph is the probability of each strategy's EOT by 2030.

475 only health but correct past inequities (9, 10, 12, 37).

### 476 Materials and Methods

An application: human African trypanosomiasis. Gambiense human 477 African trypanosomiasis (gHAT) is a parasitic infection caused by 478 Trypanosoma brucei gambiense and transmitted by tsetse (biting 479 flies). gHAT infections are almost always fatal if untreated, and at 480 481 the peak of the epidemic at the turn of this century it is suspected that up to tens of thousands of cases went undetected and untreated 482 (38, 39). In 2012, the World Health Organization marked gHAT for 483 elimination of transmission by 2030 (40). 484

While gHAT has historically burdened 24 countries, the Demo 485 486 cratic Republic of Congo (DRC) remains the most affected, with over 74% of the worldwide caseload (41). Here we employed a 487 previously published model of gHAT transmission fitted to historic 488 data from three health zones in DRC: Kwamouth, in Mai Ndombe 489 province; Mosango, in Kwilu province; Yumbi, in Mai Ndombe 490 province. Details about these health zones are in SI section 3 and in 491 a previous publication (42). Previously published models are based 492 on epidemiological data provided by the WHO atlas of HAT (43). 493 We selected these locations as they provide interesting illustrative 494 examples of the NMEB framework. 495

Health effects, costs, and cost-effectiveness. All modelling choices 496 are described in previous publications (42, 44, 45) and summarised 497 in the supplement (SI section 3). The model provided projections 498 under alternative strategies for 2020-2040 of future case-reporting 499 500 as well as unobservable features such as transmission events, disease burden, and unreported deaths (44). Four strategies made up of 501 combinations of interventions are shown in Table 2 and illustrated 502 in SI Fig S1. 503

We then applied a model of the resource use for these strategies (45) to estimate the costs and health burden accrued and averted in terms of cases, deaths, and DALYs. Costs were denominated in 2018 US\$. Both costs and health effects are discounted at a rate of 3% in accordance with standard practice (26) and we performed our main analysis from the perspective of the healthcare providers collectively over a 20-year time-horizon (2020-2040).

Uncertainty was accounted for in two ways: 1) uncertainty in all model parameters was propagated via Monte Carlo simulation, drawing 10,000 random samples from probability distributions chosen to characterise the extant uncertainty in each parameter in accordance with established practice (19), and 2) the model-simulated stochasticity in case detections.

Our initial outcome metric to evaluate cost-effectiveness is the 517 ICER. Because we are concerned with cost-effectiveness and un-518 certainty, we construct cost-effectiveness acceptability frontiers 519 (CEAFs), which denote the optimal strategy (in terms of cost-520 effectiveness) at a range of willingness to pay values (20). Lastly, 521 we develop the cost-effectiveness acceptability heatmaps (CEAHs), 522 a form of two-way CEAF with both  $\lambda_{\text{DALY}}^{\text{WTP}}$  and  $\lambda_{\text{EOT}}^{\text{WTP}}$ . We use 523 no pre-defined thresholds for WTP values, as we aim to provide 524 guidance rather than prescription. 525

# Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Ron Crump for original epidemiological model fit to data (42), and Dr. Erick Miaka of the Programme National de Lutte contre la Trypanosomiase Humaine Africaine (PNLTHA) in DRC and Dr. Jose Ramon Franco at the World Health Organization (WHO) for providing the data (43) which was used for original model fitting (42) and

526



Fig. 4. Premium of elimination in Region 3, across different values of  $\lambda_{DALY}^{WTP}$ , contextualized in table 1.

ongoing discussions on gHAT with our group. This work was 533 funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF):

534

Human African Trypanosomiasis Modelling and Economic Pre-535

dictions for Policy (HAT MEPP) project (OPP1177824) and 536

the NTD Modelling Consortium (OPP1184344, OPP1156227, 537

and OPP1186851). 538

#### References 539

549

550

551

553

554

555

556

557

559

566

567

568

- 1. T Fürst, et al., Global health policy and neglected tropical diseases: Then, now, and in the 540 years to come. PLOS Neglected Trop. Dis. 11, e0005759 (2017). 541
- 2. M Bangert, DH Molyneux, SW Lindsay, C Fitzpatrick, D Engels, The cross-cutting contribution 542 of the end of neglected tropical diseases to the sustainable development goals. Infect. Dis. 543 Poverty 6, 1-20 (2017). 544
- 545 3. S Barrett, Economic considerations for the eradication endoame, Philos, Transactions Royal 546 Soc. B: Biol. Sci. 368, 20120149-20120149 (2013).
- 4. JS Lickness, et al., Surveillance to Track Progress Toward Polio Eradication Worldwide. 547 2018-2019. MMWR. Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep. 69, 623-629 (2020). 548
  - 5. M Zimmermann, B Hagedorn, H Lyons, Projection of Costs of Polio Eradication Compared to Permanent Control, J. Infect. Dis. 221, 561-565 (2020).
- 6. C Fitzpatrick, et al., The cost-effectiveness of an eradication programme in the end game: Evidence from guinea worm disease. PLoS Neglected Trop. Dis. 11 (2017). 552
  - 7. L Roberts, Battle to wipe out Guinea worm stumbles. World Health Organization delays target date for eradicating the parasite to 2030. Nature 574, 157-158 (2019).
  - 8. O Razum, et al., Polio: From eradication to systematic, sustained control. BMJ Glob. Heal. 4, 1-4(2019)
- 9. MW Merritt, CS Sutherland, F Tediosi, Ethical Considerations for Global Health Decision-Making: Justice-Enhanced Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of New Technologies for Try-558 panosoma brucei gambiense. Public Heal. Ethics 11, 275-292 (2018).
- 560 TC Bailey, MW Merritt, F Tediosi, Investing in justice: Ethics, evidence, and the eradication 561 investment cases for lymphatic filariasis and onchocerciasis. Am. J. Public Heal. 105, 629-562 636 (2015)
- 563 11. CS Sutherland, F Tediosi, Is the elimination of sleeping sickness' affordable? Who will pay the 564 price? Assessing the financial burden for the elimination of human African trypanosomiasis Trypanosoma brucei gambiense in sub-Saharan Africa. BMJ Glob. Heal. 4, 1-11 (2019). 565
  - 12. M Asaria, S Griffin, R Cookson, Distributional cost-effectiveness analysis: A tutorial. Med. Decis. Mak. 36, 8-19 (2016).
- 13. J Round, M Paulden, Incorporating equity in economic evaluations: a multi-attribute equity state approach. Eur. J. Heal. Econ. 19, 489-498 (2018). 569
- 570 P Klepac, I Megiddo, BT Grenfell, R Laxminarayan, Self-enforcing regional vaccination agree-571 ments. J. The Royal Soc. Interface 13, 20150907 (2016).
- 572 15. S Walker, S Griffin, M Asaria, A Tsuchiya, M Sculpher, Striving for a Societal Perspective: A 573 Framework for Economic Evaluations When Costs and Effects Fall on Multiple Sectors and Decision Makers. Appl. Heal. Econ. Heal. Policy 17, 577-590 (2019) 574
- 16. P Klepac, R Laxminarayan, BT Grenfell, Synthesizing epidemiological and economic optima 575 for control of immunizing infections. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 108, 14366-14370 (2011) 576
- 577 AA Stinnett, AD Paltiel, Estimating CE Ratios under Second-order Uncertainty. Med. Decis 578 Mak. 17, 483-489 (1997)
- 579 18. AA Stinnett, J Mullahy, Net Health Benefits: A New Framework for the Analysis of Uncertainty 580 in Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. Med. Decis. Mak. 18, S68-S80 (1998).
- 19. A Briggs, K Claxton, M Sculpher, Decision Modelling for Health Economic Evaluation. (Oxford 581 582 University Press, Oxford, UK), First edition, (2006).
- 20. E Fenwick, K Claxton, M Sculpher, Representing uncertainty: The role of cost-effectiveness 583 acceptability curves. Heal. Econ. 10, 779-787 (2001). 584

- 21. E Marseille, B Larson, DS Kazi, JG Kahn, S Rosen, Thresholds for the cost-effectiveness of interventions: Alternative approaches. Bull. World Heal. Organ. 93, 118-124 (2015)
- 22. MY Bertram, et al., Disease control programme support costs: an update of WHO-CHOICE methodology, price databases and quantity assumptions. Cost Eff. Resour. Allocation 15, 21 (2017).
- 23. AJ Culver, Cost-effectiveness thresholds in health care: a bookshelf guide to their meaning and use. Heal. Econ. Policy Law 11, 415-432 (2016).
- 24. B Woods, P Revill, M Sculpher, K Claxton, Country-Level Cost-Effectiveness Thresholds: Initial Estimates and the Need for Further Research. Value Heal. 19, 929-935 (2016).
- 25. J Ochalek, J Lomas, K Claxton, Estimating health opportunity costs in low-income and middleincome countries: A novel approach and evidence from cross-country data. BMJ Glob. Heal. 3 (2018).
- World Health Organization, Making Choices in Health: WHO guide to cost-effectiveness anal-26. vsis eds. TTT Edeier, et al. (Geneva, Switzerland), (2003).
- WHO Department of Control of Neglected Tropical Diseases, WHO interim guidelines for the 27. treatment of gambiense human African trypanosomiasis. (2019).
- 28. I Tirados, et al., Tsetse Control and Gambian Sleeping Sickness; Implications for Control Strategy. PLOS Neglected Trop. Dis. 9, e0003822 (2015).
- 29 F Courtin, et al., Reducing human-tsetse contact significantly enhances the efficacy of sleeping sickness active screening campaigns: A promising result in the context of elimination. PLoS Neglected Trop. Dis. 9, 1-12 (2015).
- 30. MH Mahamat, et al., Adding tsetse control to medical activities contributes to decreasing transmission of sleeping sickness in the Mandoul focus (Chad). PLoS Neglected Trop. Dis. 11. 1-19 (2017)
- 31. BA van Hout, MJ Al, GS Gordon, FFH Rutten, Costs , Effects and C / E-Ratios Alongside Heal. Econ. 3, 309-319 (1994).
- 32 ZN Lothgren M, Definition, Interpretation and Calculation of Cost-effectiveness. Heal. Econ. 630, 623-630 (2000)
- 33. M Remme, M Martinez-Alvarez, A Vassall, Cost-Effectiveness Thresholds in Global Health: Taking a Multisectoral Perspective. Value Heal. 20, 699-704 (2017).
- MJ Keeling, BT Grenfell, Disease extinction and community size: Modeling the persistence of measles. Science 275, 65-67 (1997).
- BT Grenfell, ON Bjørnstad, BF Finkenstädt, Dynamics of measles epidemics: Scaling noise, determinism, and predictability with the TSIR model. Ecol. Monogr. 72, 185-202 (2002).
- 36. CJE Metcalf, K Hampson, AJ Tatem, BT Grenfell, ON Bjørnstad, Persistence in Epidemic Metapopulations: Quantifying the Rescue Effects for Measles, Mumps, Rubella and Whooping Cough. PLoS ONE 8, 1-7 (2013).
- S Verguet, R Laxminarayan, DT Jamison, Universal Public Finance of Tuberculosis Treatment in India: An Extended Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. Heal. Econ. 24, 318-332 (2015).
- 38. M Ekwanzala, et al., In the heart of darkness: Sleeping sickness in Zaire. Lancet 348, 1427-1430 (1996).
- 39. D Mumba, et al., Prevalence of human African trypanosomiasis in the democratic republic of the Congo. PLoS Neglected Trop. Dis. 5, 1-5 (2011).
- WHO Expert Committee on human African trypanosomiasis, Control and surveillance of hu-40. man African trypanosomiasis: report of a WHO expert committee, Technical report (2013).
- 41. JR Franco, et al., Monitoring the elimination of human African trypanosomiasis at continental and country level: Update to 2018. PLOS Neglected Trop. Dis. 14, e0008261 (2020).
- 42. RE Crump, et al., Quantifying epidemiological drivers of gambiense human African Trypanosomiasis across the Democratic Republic of Congo, medRxiv (2020).
- 43. PP Simarro, et al., The Atlas of human African trypanosomiasis: a contribution to global mapping of neglected tropical diseases. Int. journal health geographics 9, 57 (2010).
- 44. CI Huang, et al., Shrinking the gHAT map : identifying target regions for enhanced control of gambiense human African trypanosomiasis in the Democratic Republic of Congo. medRxiv (2020).
- M Antillon, et al., Economic evaluation of gambiense human African trypanosomiasis elimi-45. nation campaigns in five distinct transmission settings in the Democratic Republic of Congo. medRxiv, 2020.08.25.20181982 (2020).