### The influence of biological, epidemiological, and treatment 1 factors on the establishment and spread of drug-resistant 2 Plasmodium falciparum 3

- Thiery Masserey<sup>1, 2</sup>, Tamsin Lee<sup>1, 2</sup>, Monica Golumbeanu<sup>1, 2</sup>, Andrew J Shattock<sup>1, 2</sup>, Sherrie L Kelly<sup>1, 2</sup>, 4 5 lan M Hastings<sup>3</sup>, Melissa A Penny<sup>1, 2\*</sup>
- 6 <sup>1</sup> Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Basel, Switzerland
- 7 <sup>2</sup> University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland
- 8 <sup>3</sup> Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK
- 9 \*corresponding author: melissa.penny@unibas.ch

#### Abstract 10

11 The effectiveness of artemisinin-based combination therapies (ACTs) to treat Plasmodium 12 falciparum malaria is threatened by resistance. The complex interplay between sources of selective pressure - treatment properties, biological factors, transmission intensity, and access 13 14 to treatment - obscures understanding how, when, and why resistance establishes and 15 spreads across different locations. We developed a disease modelling approach with emulator-16 based global sensitivity analysis to systematically quantify which of these factors drive 17 establishment and spread of drug resistance. Drug resistance was more likely to evolve in low 18 transmission settings due to the lower levels of (i) immunity and (ii) within-host competition 19 between genotypes. Spread of parasites resistant to artemisinin partner drugs depended on 20 the period of low drug concentration (known as the selection window). Spread of partial 21 artemisinin resistance was slowed with prolonged parasite exposure to artemisinin derivatives 22 and accelerated when the parasite was also resistant to the partner drug. Thus, to slow the 23 spread of partial artemisinin resistance, molecular surveillance should be supported to detect 24 resistance to partner drugs and to change ACTs accordingly. Furthermore, implementing more 25 sustainable artemisinin-based therapies will require extending parasite exposure to artemisinin 26 derivatives, and mitigating the selection windows of partner drugs, which could be achieved by 27 including an additional long-acting drug.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

### **Impact Statement:** 28

29 Detailed models of malaria and treatment dynamics were combined with emulator-based

- 30 global sensitivity analysis to elucidate how the interplay of drug properties, infection biology,
- 31 and epidemiological dynamics drives evolution of resistance to artemisinin-based combination
- 32 therapies. The results identify mitigation strategies.

#### Introduction: 33

34 Malaria remains a global health priority [1]. The World Health Organization (WHO) 35 recommends several artemisinin-based combination therapies (ACTs) to treat uncomplicated 36 Plasmodium falciparum malaria [2]. ACTs combine a short-acting artemisinin derivative to 37 rapidly reduce parasitaemia during the first three days of treatment and a long-acting partner 38 drug to eliminate remaining parasites [2]. These drug combinations are intended to delay the 39 evolution of drug resistance, which has frequently occurred under monotherapy treatment [3-40 6]. However, parasites partially resistant to artemisinin have emerged in the Greater Mekong 41 Subregion (GMS) and, more recently, in Rwanda, Uganda, Guyana, and Papua New Guinea 42 despite the use of ACTs [2, 7-11]. Partial artemisinin resistance leads to slower parasite 43 clearance following treatment with ACTs, but not necessarily to treatment failure [2]. However, 44 high rates of treatment failure have been observed in the GMS due to parasites being less 45 sensitive to artemisinin derivatives and their partner drugs [2]. To prevent the evolution of drug-46 resistant parasites and to preserve the efficacy of ACTs or triple combination therapies (TACT, 47 including a second long-acting drug) now being tested [12], it is essential to understand which 48 factors drive this process.

49 The evolution of drug resistance follows a three-step process of mutation, establishment, and spread. First, mutations conferring drug resistance emerge in the population at a rate that 50 51 depends on multiple factors, such as organism mutation and migration rates [13, 14]. Second, 52 establishment is a highly stochastic step as the parasite with the drug-resistant mutation needs 53 to infect other hosts [13-16]. The resistant strain establishes in the population once its 54 frequency is high enough to minimise its risk of stochastic extinction [13-16]. Several forces 55 influence the establishment of mutations. In settings with higher heterogeneity of parasite 56 reproductive success, establishment of mutations is less likely because the effects of 57 stochasticity are more substantial [13, 15-17]. This heterogeneity depends on the level of 58 transmission and health system strength [13, 15-18]. In addition, the more selection favours 59 the resistant strain, the more likely it is to establish [13, 15-17]. The strength of selection depends on many factors, such as the parasite and human biology, the transmission setting, 60 61 drug properties, and health system strength [5, 19-24]. Third, resistance spreads through a 62 region after a resistant mutation has become established. The mutation spreads at a rate that 63 depends on the strength of selection [13, 16].

64 It is not fully understood how factors intrinsic to the transmission setting, health system, human and parasite biology, and drug properties interact to influence the establishment and spread 65 66 of drug-resistant parasites. Mathematical models of infectious disease have not previously 67 been used to systematically assess the joint influence of multiple factors on the establishment 68 and spread of drug resistance, e.g. [23, 25-37]. Simple models, based on the Ross and 69 MacDonald model [38, 39], have considered specific components of the epidemiology of 70 resistance and, therefore, are not sophisticated enough to answer questions on how factors 71 have jointly impacted establishment and spread of drug resistance [26, 30-33, 36, 37]. Most models have investigated specific transmission scenarios and questions, such as how within-72 73 host competition between parasites influences development of drug resistance [25, 28, 35], 74 and did not systematically assess the impact of assumptions used on their results. 75 Consequently, previous studies have not systematically compared the influence of multiple 76 drivers, nor assessed how their influence varies under different transmission settings or health 77 system strengths.

78 In addition, most models have made simplifications concerning drug action and consequences 79 of partial resistance. They have not explicitly modelled the pharmacokinetics and 80 pharmacodynamics of the drugs and have assumed that resistant parasites are fully resistant 81 to the drugs. Parasites partially resistant to artemisinin exhibit an extended ring-stage during which they are not sensitive to artemisinin, however, parasites remain sensitive to artemisinin 82 83 during other stages [40-44]. In addition, parasites resistant to partner drugs have an increased 84 minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC), meaning that they are not sensitive to low drug 85 concentrations but remain susceptible to high concentrations of partner drugs [45-47]. 86 Consequently, many models have ignored the residual effect of drugs on resistant parasites 87 and have not investigated the influence of the degree of resistance and drug proprieties on the 88 establishment and spread of drug resistance. Models that have explicitly considered drug 89 action have focused on specific questions such as how half-life impacts the spread of 90 resistance or how resistance to the partner drug influences evolution of artemisinin resistance [48, 49]. However, they did not investigate how the impact of drug proprieties and the degree 91 92 of resistance interact with other biological, transmission, and health system factors.

93 In this study, we developed a disease model with an emulator-based approach to quantify the 94 influence of factors intrinsic to the biology of the parasite and human, the transmission setting, 95 the health system strength, and the drug properties on the establishment and spread of drug-96 resistant parasites. Our approach is based on a detailed individual-based malaria model, 97 OpenMalaria (https://github.com/SwissTPH/openmalaria/wiki), that includes a mechanistic within-host model (based on [50]). We first adapted our model. OpenMalaria, to explicitly 98 99 include mechanistic drug action models at the individual level (as a one, two, or three-100 compartment pharmacokinetic model with a pharmacodynamics component of parasite killing 101 [51-54]) and to track multiple parasite genotypes to which we could assign fitness costs and 102 drug susceptibility (i.e. pharmacodynamic) properties. We then built an emulator-based 103 workflow to quantify, through a series of global sensitivity analyses, the influence of multiple 104 factors on the establishment and spread of parasites having different degrees of resistance to 105 artemisinin derivatives and/or their partner drugs when used in monotherapy and combination 106 (as ACTs). Emulators are predictive models that can approximate the relationship between 107 input and output parameters of complex models and can run much faster than complex models 108 to perform global sensitivity analyses more efficiently [55]. OpenMalaria is a mechanistic 109 model, so the observed dynamics at the population level (for example, the spread of resistant 110 genotypes) emerges from the relationship between the different model components and their 111 input parameters. These dynamics can only be understood and tested through extensive 112 analyses as undertaken here. Identifying which factors (e.g. drug properties and/or setting 113 characteristics) favour the evolution of resistance, enables us to identify drug properties or 114 strategies to slow or mitigate resistance and guides the development and implementation of 115 more sustainable therapies.

### Results 116

#### 117 **Development of drug resistance**

118 We investigated the establishment and spread of drug-resistant genotypes by varying the 119 degrees of resistance for three different treatment profiles. The first treatment profile 120 considered was a monotherapy using a short-acting drug referred to in this study as drug A. 121 Drug A has a short half-life and a high killing efficacy, simulating artemisinin derivatives (Figure 122 1A and 1B). Patients received a daily dose of drug A for six days (see Methods). To mimic the 123 mechanism of resistance to artemisinin derivatives, we assumed that genotypes resistant to 124 drug A had lower maximum killing rates (Emax) than sensitive ones (Figure 1B) (see Methods). 125 We defined the degree of resistance to drug A as the relative decrease of the Emax of the 126 resistant genotype compared with the sensitive one. The second treatment profile was also a 127 monotherapy but with a long-acting drug referred to in this study as drug B. Drug B has a 128 longer half-life and a lower Emax than drug A, typical of partner drugs used for ACTs (such as 129 mefloquine, piperaguine, and lumefantrine) (Figure 1A and 1B). Patients received a daily dose 130 of drug B for three days (see Methods). We assumed that genotypes resistant to drug B had 131 higher half-maximal effective concentrations (EC50) than sensitive ones (Figure 1B) (see 132 Methods). We defined the degree of resistance to drug B as the relative increase of the EC50 133 of the resistant genotype compared with the sensitive genotype. The last treatment profile was 134 a daily dose of a combination of drugs A and B for three days, simulating ACTs. In this last 135 case, only the resistant genotype had some degree of resistance to drug A, but both the 136 sensitive and resistant genotypes could have the same degree of resistance to drug B.

137 Our analysis had two steps. First, we quantified the impact of factors listed in Table 1 on the 138 spread of drug-resistant parasites through global sensitivity analyses using an emulator trained 139 on our model simulations (Figure 1C, purple area, see Methods). For each simulation, we 140 tracked a drug-sensitive genotype and a drug-resistant genotype, and we estimated the rate 141 of spread using the selection coefficient, which measures the rate at which the logit of the 142 resistant genotype frequency increases each parasite generation (see Methods, note that a 143 selection coefficient below zero implies that resistance does not spread in the population) [16]. 144 Then, we assessed the probability of establishment for a sub-set of resistant genotypes with known and positive selection coefficients to observe the relationship between selection 145 146 coefficient and the probability of establishment (Figure 1C, orange area, see Methods). We 147 could then extrapolate the probability of establishing any mutations with a known selection 148 coefficient, which made the process more efficient since estimating the probability of 149 establishment requires running many more stochastic realisations than estimating the 150 selection coefficient due to the stochasticity of this step.

#### 151 Figure 1

#### 152 Overview of treatment profiles and the workflow.

153 (A) Curves represent examples of the modelled within-host concentration (mg/l) of drugs A (short-acting 154 like artemisinin derivatives) and B (long-acting like partner drugs of artemisinin) used in monotherapy. 155 Patients received a daily dose of drug A for six days (see Methods). Patients received a daily dose of 156 drug B for three days (see Methods). Drugs A and B used in combination (like ATCs) had the same 157 respective profile as in monotherapy, but patients received a daily dosage of each drug over three days, 158 as recommended by WHO for ACTs [56]. (B) Curves illustrate examples of the modelled relationship 159 between the concentration (log(mg/l)) and the killing effect (per day) of drugs A and B on the resistant 160 (brown) and sensitive genotypes (blue). For the use of drugs in combination, the resistant genotype was 161 resistant to drug A, and both sensitive and resistant genotypes could have some degree of resistance 162 to drug B. (C) The orange area highlights steps that evaluate how the probability of establishment of 163 mutations with a specific selection coefficient varies under different settings. The purple area highlights 164 the steps for assessing the influence of factors on the rate of spread (selection coefficient) of a resistant 165 genotype through global sensitivity analysis. The brown curve represents an example of the relative 166 frequency of the resistant genotype in infected humans. HGP: Heteroskedastic Gaussian Process.



#### 167 Table 1

#### 168 Potential drivers of the spread of drug resistance.

169 List of factors and their parameter ranges investigated in the global sensitivity analyses of the spread of 170 parasites resistant to each treatment profile. The parameter ranges were defined based on the literature as described in the Methods. Parameter ranges of drug A captured the parameter values of typical 171 artemisinin derivatives (see Methods). The parameter ranges of drug B captured the parameter values 172 173 of partner drugs of artemisinin derivatives such as mefloquine, piperaquine, and lumefantrine (see 174 Methods). Note that the ratio Cmax/EC50 is not a direct input of the model, but we varied this ratio by 175 varying the EC50 of the sensitive genotype and the drug dosage (which impacted the maximum drug 176 concentration (Cmax)) (see Methods). A Latin Hypercube Sampling (LHS) algorithm was used to sample 177 from the ranges [57].

0	Determinant	Definition	Parameter range	
Component		Definition	Drug A	Drug B
	Half-life	Time for the drug concentration to fall by 50% (days)	(0.035, 0.175)	(6, 22)
	Emax	Maximum killing rate the drug can achieve (per day)	(27.5, 31.0)	(3.45, 5.00)
Drug properties	Cmax/EC50	The ratio between the maximum drug concentration (Cmax) and the half-maximal effective concentrations (EC50) of the sensitive genotype. This calculated ratio captures the drug killing effect by capturing how high is the Cmax compared to the EC50.	(55.0–312.0)	(5.1–21.7)
Parasite biology	Degree of resistance	For drug A: relative decrease of the Emax of the resistant genotype compared with the sensitive one For drug B: relative increase of the EC50 of the resistant genotype compared with the sensitive one (see Methods)	(1, 50)	(1, 20)
	Fitness cost	Relative reduction of the resistant genotype multiplication rate within the human host compared to the sensitive one	(1.0, 1.1)	
Transmission level	Entomological inoculation rate	Mean number of infective mosquito bites received by an individual during a year (inoculations per person per year)	(5, 500)	
Health	Level of access to treatment	The probability of symptomatic cases to receive treatment within two weeks from the onset of symptom onset (%)	(10, 5	80)
system	Diagnostic detection limit	Parasite density for which the probability of having a positive diagnostic test is 50% (parasites/µI)	(2, 50)	

#### Key drivers of the spread of drug-resistant parasites 178

- 179 Under monotherapy, access to treatment and degree of resistance of a monotherapy were the 180 main drivers of the spread of resistance (Figure 2A). For drugs A and B used as monotherapy, 181 the selection coefficient increased with increasing access to treatment (the probability of 182 symptomatic cases to receive treatment within two weeks from the onset of symptoms) (Figure 183 S1). In addition, higher degrees of resistance of the resistant genotype to drug A (relative 184 decrease in the resistant genotype Emax compared with the sensitive one) and B (relative 185 increase in the resistant genotype EC50 compared with the sensitive one) promoted the spread of parasites resistant to drugs A and B, respectively (Figure S1). 186
- 187 When drugs A and B were used in combination, we assumed the resistant genotype had some 188 degree of resistance to drug A, but both the sensitive and resistant genotypes could have some 189 degree of resistance to drug B. In this case, the most important driver of spread was the degree 190 of resistance of both genotypes to drug B (Figure 2A). The median selection coefficient was 191 below zero when both genotypes were susceptible to drug B (the minimum degree of 192 resistance to drug B) (Figure 2B), indicating that using an efficient partner drug can limit the 193 spread of artemisinin resistance. The spread of parasites resistant to drug A was accelerated 194 when parasites were also resistant to the partner drug, highlighting that resistance to the 195 partner drug can facilitate the spread of artemisinin resistance. We further illustrated with 196 concrete examples (Supplementary file 1: section 1.2) how the spread of partial resistance to 197 drug A accelerates with higher degrees of resistance to drug B. These results further confirmed 198 that resistance to partner drugs facilitates the spread of resistance to artemisinin, highlighting 199 the importance of combining artemisinin derivatives with an efficient partner drug.

#### 200 Figure 2

#### 201 Influence of drug properties, fitness costs, resistance levels, transmission levels, and health 202 system factors on predicted selection coefficients for three treatment profiles.

203 (A) The first-order indices from our variance decomposition analysis indicate the level of importance of 204 drug properties, fitness costs, resistance levels, transmission levels, access to treatment, and diagnostic 205 limits in determining the spread of drug resistance. Indices are shown for each treatment profile in a 206 non-seasonal setting with a population fully adherent to treatment. Selection coefficients are considered 207 for drug A and drug B when each drug is used as monotherapy and for drug A when both drugs are 208 used in combination. Definitions and ranges of parameters investigated are listed in Table 1. (B) 209 Influence of factors on the selection coefficient of genotypes resistant to drug A in a population that used 210 drugs A and B in combination. Curves and shaded areas represent the median and interguartile range 211 of selection coefficients estimated during the global sensitivity analyses over the following parameter 212 ranges: access to treatment (10-80%); the degree of resistance of the resistant genotype to drug A 213 (1-50-fold reduction in Emax); and the degree of resistance of both sensitive and resistant genotypes 214 to drug B (1–20-fold increase in EC50). A selection coefficient below zero implies that resistance does 215 not spread in the population but is being lost due to its fitness costs. The transmission setting was non-216 seasonal and, all treated individuals were fully adherent to treatment.





#### Variation in the influence of factors across settings and degrees of resistance 217

218 We compared the effects of drug properties and fitness cost on the selection coefficients for a 219 fixed set of degrees of resistance, transmission levels, seasonality patterns, treatment levels, 220 and levels of adherence to treatment (percentage of treatment doses adhered by patients) 221 (see the legend of Figure 3 for the values of each fixed factor). Across settings with a low 222 access to treatment, we found that fitness cost had the largest influence on the selection 223 coefficient (Figure S2-5). The fitness cost of a resistant genotype was defined as the relative 224 decrease in the resistant genotype multiplication rate within an untreated human host 225 compared with the sensitive genotype. Consequently, high fitness costs prevented the spread 226 of resistance (Figure S2). At a high level of access to treatment, drug properties played a 227 critical role in the spread of drug resistance, and their influence varied for each treatment profile 228 as described below (Figure 3, Figure S3-5).

229 For drug A used as monotherapy, the half-life had the biggest influence on the rate of spread (Figure 3, Figure S3). A long half-life reduced the spread of resistant parasites by extending 230 231 the period during which the drug killed partially resistant parasites (Figure 3). Furthermore, the 232 spread of the resistant genotype was faster in populations with low adherence to treatment 233 (Figure 3–Figure S6) because with fewer treatment doses, the parasite was exposed to the 234 drug for a shorter time, leading to higher parasite survival. Overall, these results highlight that 235 the time during which the parasite is exposed to artemisinin is a critical driver of the spread of 236 partial artemisinin resistance.

237 For parasites resistant to drug B when used as monotherapy, the drug half-life also had an 238 important influence on the selection coefficient (Figure 3, Figure S4). However, long half-lives were associated with large selection coefficients (Figure 3). Drugs with a long half-life have an 239 240 extended period of low drug concentration in treated patients during which only resistant 241 parasites can infect the host. This period of low drug concentration is called the selection 242 window [49, 58]. These results confirm that the selection window plays a crucial role in the 243 spread of resistance to long-acting drugs.

244 In addition, for parasites resistant to drug B as monotherapy, the drug killing rate captured by 245 the ratio Cmax/EC50 had an important influence on the rate of spread in settings with low level 246 of treatment adherence or a high degree of resistance (Figure 3, Figure S4). When we 247 modelled a low level of treatment adherence or a high level of resistance, this ratio was 248 reduced due to lower Cmax or higher EC50, respectively. Lower Cmax/EC50 ratios cause 249 lower drug killing rates, and when this ratio was too low the spread of drug resistance was 250 favoured. These results highlight the importance of treatment adherence to assure that the 251 drug concentration is high enough to eliminate partially resistant genotypes and limit their 252 spread.

253 When the genotype was resistant to drug A in a population that used drugs A and B in 254 combination, factors related to drug B had the most influence on the selection coefficient 255 (Figure 3, Figure S5). When the ratio Cmax/EC50 or the half-life of drug B was large, the killing 256 effect of drug B on parasites resistant to drug A was higher, reducing their spread (Figure 3). 257 In addition, the rate of spread rose when the level of adherence to treatment was low (Figure 258 S6). These results highlight that the spread of partial resistance to artemisinin strongly depends 259 on the capacity of the partner drug to kill them.

260 The influence of the transmission intensity (represented by EIR) and its seasonality on the 261 selection coefficient varied by treatment profiles. When the parasite was resistant to drug A 262 when used as monotherapy or in combination with drug B, selection coefficients were higher 263 in settings with lower EIR (Figure S6). Two factors account for this trend. First, the selection of 264 parasites resistant to drug A depends on the proportion of infections that are treated and can 265 thus select for resistance. This proportion is higher at lower EIR due to the lower level of 266 immunity (Figure S7) which makes infections more likely to be symptomatic and hence receive 267 treatment. Second, there is a high multiplicity of infection in high transmission settings. The multiplicity of infection enhanced within-host competition between genotypes, which inhibit the 268 269 multiplication of resistant parasites within hosts due to their fitness cost, and thus limit their 270 spread. Similarly, the spread of resistant parasites was higher in the seasonal settings than in 271 non-seasonal settings (Figure S6) due to the reduction of immunity levels and a decline in 272 within-host competition between genotypes during the low transmission season of the seasonal settings. Overall, these results indicate that the spread of partial artemisinin 273 274 resistance is faster in seasonal settings with low transmission levels.

275 However, for parasites resistant to drug B used in monotherapy, selection coefficients were 276 higher in settings with a large EIR (Figure S6). This relationship arises because resistant 277 parasites are more likely to emerge from the liver in high transmission settings during selection 278 window (which select for resistant parasites). This is because the proportion of people treated 279 (and thus with residual drug concentrations) is lower at lower EIR due to lower infection rates 280 (Figure S7). Note that this trend was only valid for settings with high access to treatment. In 281 settings with low access to treatment, we observe similar trends than for parasites resistant to 282 drug A (Figure S8) since here, the impact of the selection window was more negligible. These 283 results highlight that the selection window of the long-acting drug can change the interplay 284 between the transmission setting and the spread of drug resistance.

#### 285 Figure 3

#### 286 Magnitude and direction of effect of drug properties and fitness cost on predicted selection 287 coefficients for low and high levels of transmission, degrees of drug resistance, treatment 288 adherence, in seasonal or perennial settings with monotherapy or combination treatment.

289 The curves represent median selection coefficients over the parameter ranges estimated in each setting 290 that had high access to treatment (80%) and an entomological inoculation rate (EIR) of 5 (solid curves) 291 or 500 (dashed curves) inoculations per person per year. Settings were varied in their seasonality 292 pattern of transmission and level of adherence to treatment (67% (low) or 100% (high) of treatment 293 doses adhered to by the population). For each treatment profile, results are shown for parasites with 294 two different degrees of resistance; degree of resistance of 7 (low) and 18 (high) to drug A (Emax shift), 295 2.5 (low) and 10 (high) to drug B (EC50 shift), for the combination of drugs A and B, 7 (low) and 18 296 (high) to drug A and 10 to drug B. Parameter ranges are as follows: fitness cost (1.0-1.1, light green 297 curves); drug A half-life (0.035–0.175 days, pink curves); drug B half-life (6–22 days, purple curves); 298 Cmax/EC50 ratio for drug A (55.0–312.0, blue curves); Cmax/EC50 ratio for drug B (dark green curves) 299 at a high level of adherence to treatment (5.4–21.7) and at a low level of adherence (4.0–16.2).



#### 300 Probability of establishment of drug resistance and its key drivers

301 In each non-seasonal setting, we selected 10 different resistant genotypes having a known 302 selection coefficient and quantified their probability of establishment (see Methods). By doing 303 so, we evaluated the relationship between the selection coefficient and probability of 304 establishment and assessed how this relationship varies across settings due to variation in the 305 heterogeneity of parasite reproductive success.

306 As expected, the establishment of a mutation was more probable when its selection coefficient 307 was high (Figure 4). For each treatment profile, the probability of establishment of mutations 308 with similar selection coefficients was higher at low EIR than at high EIR (Figure 4), especially 309 for mutations with a high selection coefficient. These results highlight that the heterogeneity in 310 parasite reproductive success increases with the transmission level, causing more uncertainty 311 in the establishment of mutations. Two factors increase the heterogeneity of parasite 312 reproductive success in settings with a high EIR. First, in these settings, there is considerable 313 variation in the number of independent infections carried by hosts, which are competing for 314 reproductive success. This variation leads to more heterogeneity of parasite reproductive 315 success and thus to less certainty that a parasite with an emerging mutation will replicate. 316 Second, settings with a high EIR have a large variation in the level of individual immunity. Host 317 immunity influences parasite reproductive success by reducing parasite growth within the 318 human host. Therefore, in high transmission settings, the greater variation of immunity leads 319 to higher heterogeneity of parasite reproductive success and a lower probability that an 320 emerging mutation successfully replicate.

#### 321 Figure 4

#### 322 Predicted probability of establishment of mutations conferring drug resistance across 323 transmission settings.

324 Solid curves and dashed curves represent the relationship between the selection coefficient and the

325 estimated probability of establishment of resistant parasites across settings that differ in transmission

326 intensities (5 and 500 inoculations per person per year, respectively). The range of selection coefficients

327 include higher values at a low EIR. For each setting, the level of access to treatment was specified as

328 80%, the population was assumed to be fully adherent to treatment (100%), and transmission was non-

329 seasonal.



### Discussion 330

331 Understanding which disease, transmission, epidemiological, health system, and drug factors 332 systemically drive the evolution of drug resistance is challenging. A full understanding requires 333 vast observational data or clinical trials on a scale that is not possible or mathematical models 334 that are sufficiently detailed to capture all these factors while remaining computationally 335 feasible to simultaneously assess the impact of these factors. In response to this need, we 336 updated a detailed individual-based model of malaria dynamics to include a full 337 pharmacological (i.e. PK/PD) description of antimalarial treatments. We introduced a global 338 sensitivity analysis approach based on emulators for computationally intensive models to 339 systematically assess which factors jointly drive the evolution of drug-resistant parasites. As 340 discussed below, our approach allowed us to understand the guiding principles of the evolution 341 of drug resistance against ACTs and to explain the difference in trends observed in the Greater 342 Mekong Subregion (GMS) and in malaria endemic Africa. Improving our understanding of the 343 factors that lead to drug resistance establishment and spread allows us to identify strategies 344 to mitigate these dynamics and guides initial considerations for developing more sustainable 345 malaria treatment.

346 Our results support the belief that evolution of resistance to ACTs begins with the 347 establishment and spread of parasites resistant to the partner drug and, once the protective 348 effect of the partner drug is reduced, drug selection falls on the artemisinin component, and 349 parasites then start to acquire resistance to artemisinin derivatives (e.g. [48, 59]). The fact that 350 resistance to the partner drug appears before resistance to artemisinin derivatives was 351 supported by two points elucidated in our study. First, resistance to the partner drug strongly 352 depends on the period of low concentration of this drug during which only resistant parasites 353 can multiply within the host (known as the selection window). As artemisinin derivatives are 354 short-acting, they cannot prevent patients from being reinfected by parasites resistant to the 355 partner drug during this selection window. Second, resistance to the partner drug was the most 356 critical factor that enhanced establishment and spread of partial artemisinin resistance. Without 357 resistance to the partner drug, parasites partially resistant to artemisinin could only spread at 358 a low rate as the partner drug could still eliminate them, thereby removing their selective 359 advantage. Our results are in line with recent molecular data which show that parasites 360 resistant to partner drugs (piperaquine and mefloquine) were already present in the GMS 361 before partial artemisinin resistance emerged and that the spread of resistance to artemisinin 362 accelerated when it became linked to resistance to the partner drugs [60-62]. Thus, the 363 presence of partner drug resistance has probably facilitated the spread of resistance to 364 artemisinin in the GMS. In contrast, in Africa, to date, only a low degree of resistance to the 365 most commonly used partner drugs (lumefantrine and amodiaguine) are present [2, 63], which 366 has likely limited establishment of resistance to artemisinin derivatives. We additionally note 367 that the evolution of drug resistance in the GMS may have been favoured by the low 368 transmission intensity (annual EIR range approximate from less than 1 to 25 inoculations per 369 person per year [64-66]) compare to Africa where the transmission intensity is overall higher 370 (annual EIR range from less than 1 to more than 500 inoculations per person per year [67, 371 68]). Similar to previous studies [4, 25, 28, 34, 69], establishment of drug resistance in our 372 model was more likely in low transmission settings due to the reduced level of within-host 373 competition between genotypes, as well as population immunity.

374 Our results suggest that a key strategy to mitigate the evolution of partial artemisinin resistance 375 is to ensure that the partner drug efficiently kills the partially resistant parasite. Therefore, to

delay the establishment of artemisinin resistance in Africa and to mitigate the spread of partial 376 377 artemisinin resistance in regions where it is already established, we should ensure that limited 378 or no genotypes are resistant to the partner drug for first-line ACT. One approach to ensure 379 this is to implement robust molecular surveillance of resistance markers and to specify more 380 sustainable treatment policies, such as changing first-line ACTs upon detection of resistance 381 or when the frequency of resistant parasites reach a threshold as recommended by the WHO 382 [2]. Furthermore, consistent with our results, adherence should continue to be promoted, as 383 lower treatment compliance can lead to treatment failure even in the absence of resistance to 384 the partner drug [2, 70, 71].

385 Our results suggest that future antimalarial therapies should shorten the selection windows of 386 long-acting partner drugs. We show that resistance to long-acting drugs (drug B) is the first 387 step in the evolution of resistance to ACTs, and it depends mainly on the length of the selection 388 window. We confirm that the selection window strongly depends on the drug half-life, also consistent with previous studies [4, 23, 27, 28, 49, 58]. Consequently, reducing the half-life of 389 390 the partner drug in an ACT regimen could reduce the spread of resistance. However, unless 391 selection windows are substantially minimised or completely eliminated, the evolution of 392 resistance would not totally be prevented [58]. Thus, a more sustainable option for ACTs would 393 be to use triple artemisinin-based combination therapies (TACTs). TACTs involve combining 394 an artemisinin derivative with two long-acting drugs [72].

395 If or when TACTs are to be widely used, our results emphasize that the two long-acting drugs 396 should have matching half-lives to ensure that parasites are not exposed to residual drug 397 concentrations of only one of the two partner drugs (noting that this is simple in principle, but 398 more difficult in practice [73]). In addition, the parasite population should be devoid of parasites 399 resistant to either of the two long-acting drugs. If resistance to one partner drug already exists 400 in the population, the second partner drug would not be protected, and mutations conferring 401 resistance to this second drug would be selected. Thus, ideally, we should avoid combining 402 previously used long-acting drugs (because resistance to these drugs may already be 403 present), and rather favour two partner drugs not routinely in use, and preferably having a new 404 mechanism of action. Therefore, selecting drugs to combine for TACTs requires balancing the 405 need to mitigate resistance against the development time of new partner drugs. Note that the 406 development of new partner drugs for TACTs may be challenging because combining three 407 drugs is likely to increase the risk of toxicity and the treatment price, and future antimalarial 408 medicines must remain tolerated by patients and affordable [72].

409 Another approach to delay the evolution of partial artemisinin resistance could focus on 410 extending the period of action of artemisinin derivatives. In our monotherapy analysis on the 411 spread of a genotype partially resistant to artemisinin, we found that the spread of partially 412 resistant genotypes decreased when the drug was present in patients for a longer time, such 413 as if it had a long half-life and there was proper treatment adherence. This result arises 414 because partially resistant parasites are still affected by the drug [40, 42-44]. Thus, increasing 415 their exposure to the drug leads to higher killing and reduced spread. Increasing the exposure 416 to artemisinin derivatives can be achieved by using the artemisinin derivative having the 417 longest half-life and, as highlighted in other studies [74-76], can be done by increasing the 418 number of doses and days that patients receive treatment. However, it is worth noting that 419 extending the dosage regimen will be efficient only with adequate adherence to treatment, 420 which may be challenging to achieve in practice. Also, as artemisinin derivatives are co-421 administrated with at least one long-acting drug, increasing the number of doses of this

422 combination therapy would require reducing the concentration of the partner drug to prevent 423 the partner drug from reaching toxic concentrations.

424 The evolution of drug resistance is a three-step process consisting of mutation, establishment, 425 and spread. Mutation rates in malaria can easily be measured, and spread, guantified by the 426 selection coefficient, is also easy to measure. However, the probability of establishment and 427 its relation to the selection coefficient constituted a significant knowledge gap. Standard 428 population genetic models assume that the number of secondary infections follows a Poisson 429 distribution [15, 77]. Under this assumption, for selection coefficients lower than 0.2 (according 430 to an informal literature review in [16], most selection coefficient estimates for malaria drug 431 resistance mutations from the field fall between 0.02 to 0.12), the probability of establishment 432 is approximately equal to twice the selection coefficient [15, 77]. However, the number of 433 secondary malaria infections more likely follows a negative binomial distribution due to the high 434 heterogeneity of transmission, which may substantially reduce the probability of establishment 435 (Box 2 of [15]). In this modelling study, we were uniquely able to quantify the link between 436 selection coefficients and the probability of establishment of mutations. On average, we 437 predicted that, for selection coefficients lower than 0.2, the probability of establishment was 438 equal to 0.87-times the selection coefficient. Therefore, our findings suggest that the variation 439 in the number of secondary infections of *P. falciparum* must be much greater than the Poisson 440 distribution assumed by standard population genetics models, and this higher variation 441 reduces the probability of establishment of emerging mutations.

442 As with all modelling studies, our approach has several limitations, primarily arising from 443 constraints imposed by the model. First, our drug action model does not capture stage-specific 444 killing effects, so we could not model parasites partially resistant to artemisinin being 445 insensitive to the drug only during extended ring-stage [40, 42-44], although previous analyses 446 suggested this would be captured by our variation in the maximum killing rate [78]. 447 Nevertheless, if we modelled a reduction of the drug effect restricted to the ring-stage, we 448 expect to obtain similar results. That is, a long half-life and high treatment adherence would 449 increase the likelihood that the drug is present within patients during any stage other than the 450 ring-stage, and thus the drug would kill more resistant parasites.

451 Second, our model did not capture the impact of artemisinin resistance on gametocytes. 452 Previous studies have highlighted that artemisinin kills gametocytes, and patients infected with 453 parasites partially resistant to artemisinin exhibit higher gametocyte densities than patients 454 infected with sensitive parasites [79, 80]. We did not model the impact of artemisinin and 455 resistance on gametocytes. This effect is likely to accelerate the spread of partial resistance. 456 However, the relationship between the different factors reported in this study should be 457 unchanged.

458 Third, our model, OpenMalaria, does not capture the recombination of *P. falciparum* parasites 459 in mosquitoes. Currently, OpenMalaria does not support chromosomal recombination as it 460 does not track the different genotypes in mosquitoes, and the genotype of new infections is 461 based on the genotype frequency in humans. Previous models have shown that if multiple 462 mutations are needed to confer drug resistance, recombination could slow the evolution of 463 drug resistance by separating these mutations, especially in settings with a high rate of 464 infection [69, 81]. We ignored the effect of recombination by assuming that only one mutation 465 differs between the resistant and sensitive genotypes, which is valid for resistance to certain 466 drugs, such as artemisinin [2, 3]. However, for other drugs, such as sulfadoxine-

467 pyrimethamine, drug resistance is due to the accumulation of multiple mutations in two genes 468 [82].

469 Lastly, to investigate the establishment of drug-resistant parasites, we modelled the 470 emergence of mutations through importation. Consequently, our estimations represent the 471 establishment of mutations imported into a population or mutations emerging in mosquitoes 472 (assuming that the mosquito has only transmitted the mutated genotype and not the wild type 473 genotype to the individual). A mutation emerging during the blood-stage within the human host 474 may have a lower probability of establishment because sensitive parasites would be present 475 in the host, leading to competition between them. It is still unclear whether mutations conferring 476 drug resistance arise during the blood-stage (due to the high parasite numbers) or during the 477 sexual stage in mosquitoes (because recombination generates many genetic variations). 478 Nevertheless, the probabilities of establishment estimated in this study are consistent with the 479 probabilities of establishment predicted by a previous study [15].

480 In summary, our results confirm that mutations conferring malaria drug resistance are more 481 likely to establish in low transmission settings. Our results demonstrate that the establishment 482 and spread of resistance to artemisinin derivatives have likely been facilitated by pre-existing 483 resistance to partner drugs. Thus, it is essential to prioritise monitoring and to limit the spread 484 of resistance to partner drugs in current or future ACT regimens. If resistance to the partner 485 drug is confirmed, response strategies should prioritise monitoring molecular markers and 486 treatment failure and switching to an ACT with an effective partner drug should be considered. 487 In addition, our results show that drug properties play an essential role in the evolution of 488 parasite drug resistance. Thus, the ongoing development of new antimalarial combinations 489 should limit selection windows of partner drugs by matching half-lives, hopefully leading to 490 longer lasting combination treatments against malaria. In the medium-term, for existing ACTs, 491 it would be advantageous to increase the time of parasite exposure to the short-acting 492 artemisinin derivate and/or to include a second long-acting partner drug with a matching half-493 life to the other long-acting partner drug (triple ACTs [72]) and for which limited or no parasite 494 resistance exists in the target population.

#### **Methods** 495

#### 496 Simulation model and the parameterisation of treatment profiles and resistant 497 genotypes

#### Overview of our OpenMalaria model 498 (i)

499 Our individual-based model, OpenMalaria, simulates the dynamics of *P. falciparum* in humans 500 and links it to a periodically forced deterministic model of *P. falciparum* in mosquitoes [83-85]. 501 The model structure and fitting are described in detail elsewhere [84, 85], including open-502 access code (https://github.com/SwissTPH/openmalaria) and documentation 503 (https://github.com/SwissTPH/openmalaria/wiki), and a recently published manuscript 504 provides a new calibration [86]. Here, we have summarised the main components of 505 OpenMalaria and its latest developments in version 40.1, which enabled us to model the 506 establishment and spread of drug-resistant parasites.

507 OpenMalaria is an ensemble of models in which mosquito and infection events, and parasite 508 and human attributes are updated every five days. A demography model maintains a constant

509 human population size and age structure across the simulation. Multiple parasite genotypes 510 and their initial frequency can be defined in more recent model versions. For each infection, a 511 mechanistic model simulates the parasite dynamics within the host and incorporates innate, 512 variant, and acquired immunity [50]. The within-host model allows for concurrent infection of 513 multiple parasite genotypes within the same host and captures indirect competition between 514 genotypes based on host immunity, which regulates the overall parasite load. The user can 515 specify a reduction of the within-host multiplication factors of each genotype to model a fitness 516 cost associated with the mutation. The host's parasite density determines the symptoms and 517 mortality of patients and diagnostic test results. The occurrence and severity of patient 518 symptoms depend on their pyrogenic threshold, which increases (until saturation) with recent 519 parasite exposure and decays over time [87]. Severe episodes of malaria occur due to a high 520 parasite density or due to co-morbidities [88]. Malaria mortality can be a consequence of a 521 severe episode or an uncomplicated episode with co-morbidity [88, 89]. The model also takes 522 into account neonatal deaths [88, 89]. Immunity to asexual parasites prevents severe cases 523 by decreasing the parasite multiplication rate within the host. Individual immunity depends on 524 the cumulative parasite and infection exposure frequency, as well as maternal immunity in their 525 newborn children for several months [90].

526 The case management component of OpenMalaria describes the use of treatment for 527 uncomplicated and severe cases and depends on access to health services and whether 528 patients have previously been treated for the same episode [91]. The disease model includes 529 explicit pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic (PK/PD) models that capture the process whereby 530 drugs reduce the parasite multiplication rate in treated hosts [51, 54]. Pharmacodynamic 531 parameters are parameterised individually for each genotype to allow different degrees of drug 532 susceptibility to be modelled.

533 The entomological component of OpenMalaria simulates the mosquito vector feeding 534 behaviours and tracks the infectious status of mosquitoes [83]. The periodicity of this model 535 allows seasonal patterns of transmission to be captured. The probability that a feeding 536 mosquito becomes infected depends on the parasite density within bitten individuals [92]. No 537 recombination is modelled between the different genotypes in the mosquitoes. The number of 538 newly infected hosts depends on the simulated entomological inoculation rate (EIR) of the 539 vector model [83]. The genotype of new infections is based on the genotype frequencies in 540 humans from the previous five time steps [92].

#### 541 (ii) Parameterisation of the treatment profiles

542 This study investigated factors influencing the establishment and spread of parasites resistant 543 to three different treatment profiles.

544 The first treatment profile modelled was a short-acting drug administered as monotherapy, 545 referred to as drug A. Drug A has a short half-life and a high killing efficacy, simulating 546 artemisinin derivatives (Figure 1A and 1B). We modelled the pharmacokinetics of drug A using 547 a one-compartment model, which is considered sufficient when modelling short-acting 548 antimalarials [52, 54]. We varied key PK/PD parameters (half-life, EC50, Emax) in the global 549 sensitivity analysis to assess their influence on the rate of spread of resistance. The EC50 550 ranged from 0.0016 to 0.009 mg/l to include the EC50 of artemether, artesunate, and 551 dihydroartemisinin [52, 54]. The half-life parameter ranges represented the values for 552 artemether, artesunate, and dihydroartemisinin used by [52, 54] (Table 1). Note that in [52], the Emax of all short-acting drugs was equal to 27.6 per day. However, we varied the killing 553

554 rate and included higher values to investigate its effects on the rate of spread (Table 1). To 555 ensure that drug A killed the sensitive parasites efficiently for any combination of parameters, 556 we extended the treatment course from a daily drug dose for three days to a daily drug dose 557 for six days. Moreover, we parameterised the dosage and constant parameter values to that 558 for dihydroartemisinin (Table S1), as it is the artemisinin derivate with the shortest elimination 559 half-life and highest EC50 [52, 54]. By doing so, we also ensured that drug A had the typical 560 profile of an artemisinin derivative.

561 The second treatment profile modelled was a long-acting drug administered as monotherapy, referred to as drug B. Drug B had a long half-life and a lower Emax than drug A (Figure 1A 562 563 and 1B), typical of partner drugs used for ACTs. We modelled the PK of drug B with a two-564 compartment model, which is more typical of the clinical PK of partner drugs [51]. As for drug 565 A, key PK/PD parameters (half-life, EC50, Emax, and dosage) were varied in the global sensitivity analysis. The EC50 ranged from 0.01 to 0.03 mg/l to include the EC50 of mefloquine, 566 567 piperaquine and lumefantrine used by [52, 54]. The half-life range corresponded to the value 568 reported for mefloquine, piperaquine, lumefantrine in [93-97] (Table 1). We increased the 569 Emax range from 3.45 per day (as reported in [54]) to 5.00 per day to investigate the effect on 570 the rate of spread (Table 1). We also assessed the impact of Cmax on the rate of spread for 571 drug B because the Cmax varies between ACTs partner drugs and has a strong influence on 572 the post-treatment killing effect of drug B [73]. We varied drug dosage from 30 to 40 mg/kg to examine the influence of variation of Cmax on the spread rate for drug B. The lower limit of 30 573 mg/kg was fixed to ensure that drug B killed the sensitive genotype efficiently for any parameter 574 575 combination. The treatment course involved a daily drug dose for three consecutive days. To 576 ensure that drug B had the profile of typical partner drugs, the values of the constant 577 parameters were parameterised to the values of piperaguine reported in [54, 94] (Table S2).

578 The last treatment profile was a combination of drugs A and B, simulating ACT. We tracked 579 the concentration of each drug independently. We used the same models, parameter values 580 and ranges for the two drugs as when both drugs were used as monotherapy. However, the 581 treatment course involved a daily dose of both drugs for three days, as recommended by the 582 WHO for most ACTs [56]. In OpenMalaria, the killing effects of the two drugs were calculated 583 independently and acted simultaneously on the parasites.

584 (iii) Parameterisation of the drug-resistant genotypes

585 For each simulation, we tracked two genotypes, one drug-resistant and one drug-sensitive. 586 We investigated the spread of resistant parasites with different degrees of resistance (Table 587 1). We modelled the phenotype of drug resistance and the degree of resistance differently for 588 each drug profile.

589 Previous studies have shown that parasites partially resistant to artemisinin exhibit an 590 extended ring-stage during which they are not sensitive to artemisinin (even at high drug 591 concentrations) but remain sensitive to the drug during other stages of the blood replication 592 cycle [40-44]. OpenMalaria does not model the specific drug-killing effect for the different steps 593 of the blood-stage. As in [98, 99], we assumed that parasites resistant to drug A had a reduced 594 Emax compared with sensitive ones (Figure 1B). This assumption captured the fact that, 595 overall, drug A killed fewer resistant parasites than sensitive ones at any drug concentration 596 because they are not sensitive to artemisinin during the ring-stage and that this stage-specific 597 effect is best incorporated into PK/PD modelling by variation in Emax [78].

598 Previous studies reported that parasites resistant to long-acting drugs typically have an 599 increased EC50 [45-47]. Thus, as in other models, we defined parasites resistant to drug B to 600 have a higher EC50 than the sensitive ones (Figure 1B) [52, 54]. With an increased EC50, the 601 resistant parasites were less susceptible to the drug at low drug concentrations. Thus, these 602 resistant genotypes were more likely to survive drug treatment and are more likely to

603 successfully infect new hosts with higher residual drug concentrations [58].

604 Considering drugs A and B in combination, the resistant genotype was resistant to drug A. But 605 in the global sensitivity analysis, both the sensitive and resistant genotypes could have some 606 degree of resistance to drug B. The decreased susceptibility to drug B was the same for both 607 sensitive and resistant genotypes, meaning that we assumed the two genotypes differed only 608 in one mutation, which conferred resistance to drug A. This assumption allowed us to ignore 609 the effect of recombination in the mosquitoes. In effect, this assumed that the allele defining 610 the level of resistance to drug B was fixed in the population.

# 611 Approach to identify the key drivers of the spread of drug-resistant parasites

612 Through global sensitivity analyses, we quantified how the factors in Table 1 influenced the 613 spread of drug-resistant parasites for each treatment profile. First, we estimated the effect of 614 each factor in a non-seasonal setting with a population fully adherent to treatment. Based on 615 these results, we identified specific settings for further analysis. We performed additional 616 constrained sensitivity analyses to investigate the impact of varying drug properties and fitness 617 costs in a fixed set of settings (i.e. in low and high transmission settings, with low and high 618 treatment levels of monotherapy or combination therapy) and with a fixed degree of resistance. 619 In this secondary analysis, we also investigated the effect of drivers in seasonal transmission 620 settings (Figure S10) and where populations adhere to either 100% or 67% of treatment doses.

621 Due to the computational requirements for a large number of simulations of OpenMalaria, and 622 the number of factors investigated, it was not feasible to simulate either a full-factorial set of 623 simulations to perform a multi-way sensitivity analysis, or to perform a global sensitivity 624 analysis. Therefore, we trained a Heteroskedastic Gaussian Process (HGP) [100] on a set of 625 OpenMalaria simulations and performed global sensitivity analyses using this emulator (Figure 626 1C), adapting a similar approach to [101] and [86]. Our approach involved: (i) randomly 627 sampling combinations of parameters; (ii) simulating and estimating the rate of spread of the 628 resistant genotype for each parameter combination in OpenMalaria; (iii) training an HGP to 629 learn the relationship between the input (for the different drivers) and output (the rate of spread) 630 with iterative improvements to fitting through adaptive sampling, and (iv) performing a global 631 sensitivity analysis based on the Sobol variance decomposition [70]. Each step of the workflow 632 is detailed below.

# 633 *(i)* Randomly sample combinations of parameters

634 We randomly sampled 250 different parameter combinations from the parameter space shown 635 in Table 1 using a Latin Hypercube Sampling (LHS) algorithm [57]. The parameter ranges were 636 defined as follows. We defined the ranges for the properties of drug A and drug B to include 637 the typical parameter values of artemisinin derivatives and a long-acting partner drug, 638 respectively [52, 54, 93-97]. The range of the degree of resistance captured the spread of drug-639 resistant parasites, which vary from fully sensitive to having almost no drug sensitivity. The 640 fitness costs were extracted from studies investigating the decline of chloroquine-resistant 641 parasites after the drug pressure was removed [102, 103]. The variation in annual EIR captured

642 settings with low transmission to those with high transmission. The range of access to 643 treatment captured settings with low to high 14-days effective coverage. The values of the 644 diagnostic detection limit captured the sensitivity of typical diagnostics used for malaria (rapid 645 diagnostic test, microscopy, and polymerase chain reaction (PCR)) [104, 105].

#### (ii) Simulate and estimate the rate of spread of the drug-resistant genotype 646

647 We quantified the rate of spread through the selection coefficient, a measure widely used in 648 population genetics to assess the strength of selection on a genotype [16]. The selection 649 coefficient is the rate at which the logit of the resistant genotype frequency increases each 650 parasite generation and should be linear throughout the spread [16]. Population genetics 651 theory often assumes an infinite population size to remove stochastic fluctuation of the allele 652 frequency, also called genetic drift [16]. However, in our model the parasite population size is 653 finite, so stochastic fluctuations of the genotype frequency are present. Thus, we should avoid 654 estimating the selection coefficient when there is a low frequency of the resistant genotype (from a small human population size, a low EIR, and a small initial frequency of the resistant 655 656 genotype) because the resistant genotype may become extinct due to the stochastic 657 fluctuation. In addition, the effects of genetic drift that occurs when a genotype is present at a 658 low frequency may cause non-linearity during resistance spread which may obscure the estimation of the selection coefficient [16]. 659

660 Following the approach described in [16], we assumed an initial percentage of infected humans 661 carrying the resistant genotype of 50%. A high initial percentage minimises the impact of 662 random fluctuation on our estimation, and the subsequent risk of extinction, without affecting 663 our estimate because the selection coefficient was not frequency-dependent (Figure S11). We 664 simulated the spread of resistant parasites in a human population of 100.000 individuals with 665 an age structure of a typical African country [106]. We ran each parameter combination on five 666 stochastic realisations. The simulation started with a burn-in period of 100 years to reach the 667 expected level of immunity in the population and an additional 30 years to reach EIR equilibrium (Figure S12). Both genotypes were sensitive to the drug during this period, so the 668 669 percentage of infected humans carrying the resistant genotype remained stable. After the burn-670 in period, we introduced the fitness cost and the drug for which the resistant genotype had 671 reduced sensitivity. We then estimated the selection coefficient, s, as,

672

673 
$$s = \frac{1}{t} \left( ln \left( \frac{p(t+1)}{1-p(t+1)} \right) - ln \left( \frac{p(1)}{1-p(1)} \right) \right) = \frac{1}{12} \left( ln \left( \frac{p(13)}{1-p(13)} \right) - ln \left( \frac{p(1)}{1-p(1)} \right) \right)$$

674

675 where p(t) is the relative frequency of the resistant genotype in inoculations, t is the number of 676 parasite generations after introducing the new drug at t = 0. We assumed that a parasite 677 generation is two months (60 days) as in [16]. We started the regression at one parasite 678 generation after introducing the new drug (at 60 days). We stopped the regression 12 679 generations later, at 720 days, because, as shown in [16], it was computationally convenient 680 and returned stable selection coefficient estimates. The regression was stopped sooner if the 681 relative frequency of inoculations carrying the resistant genotype was higher than 90% or lower than 30% to prevent tracking a small number of a single genotype for which genetic drift is 682 683 strong. In seasonal settings, the rate of spread of the resistant genotype varied throughout the 684 year. Consequently, we estimated the selection coefficient using a moving average of the

685 relative frequency of the resistant genotype in inoculations (Figure S13). This method 686 prevented biasing the selection coefficient according to the period included in the regression.

687 Once the selection coefficient was estimated, it could be converted to the number of parasite 688 generations needed for the relative frequency of the resistant genotype in inoculations to 689 increase from p(1) to p(t),

$$t = \frac{1}{s} \left( ln \left( \frac{p(t+1)}{1-p(t+1)} \right) - ln \left( \frac{p(1)}{1-p(1)} \right) \right).$$

691 We could then convert the number of parasite generations to time in years, a more relevant 692 public health measure than the selection coefficient itself.

#### 693 (iii) Train the emulator and improve its accuracy

694 We randomly split our data into a training dataset containing 80% of simulations and a test 695 dataset containing 20% of simulations. We trained the Heteroskedastic Gaussian Process 696 (HGP) on the training dataset using the function mleHetGP from the R package 'hetGP' [100]. 697 To assess the accuracy of the emulator, we predicted the selection coefficient for the test 698 dataset with the emulator and compared these predictions with the expected selection 699 coefficient estimated using OpenMalaria. We iteratively improved the accuracy of our emulator 700 through adaptive sampling. Adaptive sampling involved resampling 100 parameter 701 combinations in the parameter space where we were less confident (higher variation) in the 702 HGP prediction and repeating the entire process until the emulator had a satisfactory level of 703 accuracy. The satisfactory level of accuracy was defined based on the correlation coefficient 704 and the root means squared error of the predicted selection coefficient and expected selection 705 coefficient (Figure S14-20).

#### 706 (iv) Global sensitivity analysis

707 Using the emulator, we undertook global sensitivity analyses using Sobol's method [107]. This 708 method attributed fractions of the selection coefficient variance to each input [107]. We 709 performed the global sensitivity analysis using the function soboljansen from the R package 710 'sensitivity' [108], and two random datasets with a sample size of 100,000, with 150,000 711 bootstrap replicates. With this function, we estimated first-order and total Sobol' indices 712 simultaneously. The first-order indices represent contributions of each parameter's main effect 713 to the model output variance. The total effect represents the contribution of each parameter to 714 the model output variance considering their interactions with other factors. We report only the 715 first-order indices in the Results section because we did not observe many interactions 716 between these factors. Some parameters supported the spread of resistance (increased the 717 selection coefficient), whilst others hindered the spread (decreased the selection coefficient). 718 To visualise the direction of the effect of each parameter, we calculated the 25th, 50th, and 719 75th quantiles of the predicted selection coefficient over the corresponding parameter ranges.

#### Establishment of drug resistance 720

721 As explained in the Introduction, the establishment of resistant mutations is a stochastic process that depends on the selection coefficient of the mutation and the heterogeneity of 722 723 parasites reproductive success in the setting, which in turn depends on the transmission level 724 and the health system strength [13, 15-18]. Estimating the probability of establishment requires 725 running many stochastic realisations due to the stochasticity of this step. To be more

726 computationally efficient, we assessed the probability of establishment of a subset of 10 727 resistant genotypes with a known selection coefficient per setting and treatment profile. Based 728 on the observed relationships between the selection coefficient and the probability of 729 establishment for each treatment profile and setting, we could then extrapolate the probability 730 of establishment of any mutations having a known selection coefficient.

731 To estimate the probability of establishment, we modelled the emergence of resistant 732 mutations in a fully susceptible population. We used the approach described in [16] in which 733 resistant infections were imported into the population at a low rate. In OpenMalaria, imported 734 infections have the same frequencies of genotypes as in initialisation, thus we cannot import 735 only resistant infections. Therefore, to import resistant infections in a population infected only 736 by sensitive parasites, we followed the step described below (Figure S21). We first defined a 737 50% relative frequency of resistant parasites in infected humans. The simulation started with 738 a burn-in phase of 100 years, during which both genotypes were sensitive to treatment. This 739 meant that the relative frequency of the resistant parasites was stable (at 50%). In the second 740 phase, we introduced a drug to which resistant parasites were hypersensitive (the drug EC50 741 was 100-times lower in the resistant genotype than the sensitive one). The second phase ran 742 for 100 years, and once complete, the parasite population was fully susceptible. In the third 743 phase, we imported new infections at a rate low enough to ensure that the previously imported 744 mutation either established or went extinct before a new resistant mutation was imported 745 (Supplementary file 1: section 5.1). The third phase ran until one mutation established (over 746 50% of infected humans carried the resistant genotype).

747 The probability of establishment, Pe, can be estimated based on the average number of 748 mutations that are imported until one mutation establishes,  $N_e$ , as follows (the probability of a 749 successful event can be estimated as one divided by the mean number of independent trials 750 required to achieve the first success [109]),

 $P_e = \frac{1}{N_e}.$ 751

752 We simulated 300 stochastic realisations, R, and estimated  $P_e$ , as,

753 
$$P_e = \frac{1}{N_e} = \frac{1}{(\sum_{j=1}^R N_{m,j})/R} = \frac{R}{\sum_{j=1}^R N_{m,j}}$$

754 where  $N_{m,i}$  is the number of imported mutations until one mutation established in run *j*. Re-755 arranging the formula shows that Pe is equal to the number of mutations established in all 756 stochastic realisations (this number is equal to R as only one mutation established per 757 stochastic realisation) divided by the total number of mutations imported into all stochastic 758 realisations (mutations that became extinct and established). Note that in each stochastic 759 realisation, we estimated  $N_m$ , as,

760 
$$N_m = t_e N_i,$$

761 where  $t_e$  is defined as the last time that the number of infections with a resistant genotype was 762 equal to zero, i.e. the time (in years) until the arrival of the first mutation that successfully 763 establishes.  $N_i$  is the number of imported resistant infections per year. Note that OpenMalaria 764 specifies the number of imported infections, V, in numbers of imported infections per 1,000 765 people per year, and half of the imported mutations were sensitive. Thus, the number of 766 imported resistant infections that occurred until one established can be estimated as,

767

$$N_m = t_e \left(\frac{NV}{2(1000)}\right) = 5t_e V,$$

where N is the human population size. We set the population size to 10,000 to be 768 769 computationally feasible (as since we were not measuring the selection coefficient, there was 770 no need to minimise the influence of stochastic processes).

#### 771 Acknowledgements

772 We sincerely acknowledge all members of the Disease Modelling Unit of the Swiss Tropical 773 and Public Health Institute and Dr Raman Sharma from Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine

774 for their inputs. Simulations were performed on the scientific computing core facility, sciCORE,

775 at the University of Basel (http://scicore.unibas.ch/).

### **Competing interests** 776

777 Authors declare no competing interests.

### Data and software availability 778

779 We did not use individual participant-level data. Parameters values used in the model were 780 informed from the literature as referred to in the main text or the supplementary file. The source 781 code for OpenMalaria was developed using the C++ language and is available at 782 https://github.com/SwissTPH/openmalaria. The analysis script was developed using the R 783 software. All generated data and the code used for data analysis and visualization will be made 784 available on request.

#### **Author contributions** 785

MAP Conceptualization. TM, MG, AJS, IMH, MAP Methodology; TM, MG, AJS Software; TM 786 787 Validation; TM Formal analysis; TM, TL, IMH, and MAP Investigation; TM Data curation; TM,

788 TL and MAP Writing – original draft preparation; TM, TL, MG, AJS, SLK, IMH, and MAP

789 Writing – review & editing; TM Visualization; MAP Supervision; MAP Project administration;

790 MAP Funding acquisition

### 791 Corresponding author

- 792 Name: Melissa Penny
- 793 Email: melissa.penny@unibas.ch
- 794 Institution: Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Basel, Switzerland. University of Basel, 795 Basel, Switzerland

#### Funding 796

797 This research was funded under the Swiss National Science Foundation Professorship of 798 Melissa Penny (PP00P3\_170702).

#### References 799

- 800 1. WHO. World malaria report 2020: 20 years of global progress and challenges. Geneva: 801 World Health Organization; 2020. Available from: 802 https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240015791.
- 803 2. WHO. Report on antimalarial drug efficacy, resistance and response: 10 years of 804 surveillance (2010-2019). Geneva: World Health Organization; 2020. Available from: 805 https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240012813.
- 806 3. Faroog U, Mahajan R. Drug resistance in malaria. Journal of Vector Borne Diseases. 807 2004;41(3/4):45-53.
- 808 4. White N. Antimalarial drug resistance and combination chemotherapy. Philosophical 809 Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B: Biological Sciences. 1999;354(1384):739-49. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0802 810
- 811 White NJ. Antimalarial drug resistance. The Journal of Clinical Investigation. 5. 812 2004;113(8):1084-92. https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI21682
- 813 Wongsrichanalai C, Pickard AL, Wernsdorfer WH, Meshnick SR. Epidemiology of drug-6. 814 resistant malaria. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2002:2(4):209-18. 815 https://doi.org/10.1016/s1473-3099(02)00239-6.
- 816 Chenet SM, Akinyi Okoth S, Huber CS, Chandrabose J, Lucchi NW, Talundzic E, et al. 7. 817 Independent emergence of the *Plasmodium falciparum* Kelch propeller domain mutant 818 allele C580Y in Guyana. The Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2016;213(9):1472-5. 819 https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiv752.
- 820 8. Uwimana A, Legrand E, Stokes BH, Ndikumana J-LM, Warsame M, Umulisa N, et al. Emergence and clonal expansion of in vitro artemisinin-resistant Plasmodium falciparum 821 822 kelch13 R561H mutant parasites in Rwanda. Nature Medicine. 2020;26(10):1602-8. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-1005-2 823
- 824 Uwimana A, Umulisa N, Venkatesan M, Svigel SS, Zhou Z, Munyaneza T, et al. 9. 825 Association of *Plasmodium falciparum* kelch13 R561H genotypes with delayed parasite clearance in Rwanda: an open-label, single-arm, multicentre, therapeutic efficacy study. 826 827 The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2021;21:1120-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-828 3099(21)00142-0
- 829 10. Miotto O, Sekihara M, Tachibana S-I, Yamauchi M, Pearson RD, Amato R, et al. 830 Emergence of artemisinin-resistant Plasmodium falciparum with kelch13 C580Y mutations on the island of New Guinea. PLoS Pathogens. 2020;16(12):e1009133. 831 832 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1009133
- 833 11. Balikagala B, Fukuda N, Ikeda M, Katuro OT, Tachibana S-I, Yamauchi M, et al. 834 Evidence of artemisinin-resistant malaria in Africa. New England Journal of Medicine. 835 2021;385(13):1163-71. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2101746
- 836 12. Van der Pluijm RW, Tripura R, Hoglund RM, Phyo AP, Lek D, UI Islam A, et al. Triple 837 artemisinin-based combination therapies versus artemisinin-based combination 838 therapies for uncomplicated *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria: a multicentre, open-label, 839 randomised clinical trial. The Lancet. 2020;395:1345-60. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-840 6736(20)30552-3
- 841 Wiesch PA, Kouvos R, Engelstädter J, Regoes RR, Bonhoeffer S. Population biological 13. 842 principles of drug-resistance evolution in infectious diseases. The Lancet Infectious 843 Diseases. 2011;11(3):236-47. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(10)70264-4
- 844 14. Mackinnon M. Drug resistance models for malaria. Acta Tropica. 2005;94(3):207-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actatropica.2005.04.006. 845

- 846 Hastings IM. The origins of antimalarial drug resistance. Trends in Parasitology. 15. 847 2004;20(11):512-8. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1403340.
- 848 16. Hastings IM, Hardy D, Kay K, Sharma R. Incorporating genetic selection into individual-849 based models of malaria and other infectious diseases. Evolutionary Applications. 850 2020;13(10):2723-39. https://doi.org/10.1111/eva.13077
- 851 17. Hastings I, Mackinnon M. The emergence of drug-resistant malaria. Parasitology. 852 1998;117(5):411-7. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0031182098003291
- 853 18. Klein EY. The impact of heterogeneous transmission on the establishment and spread 854 of antimalarial drug resistance. Journal of Theoretical Biology. 2014;340:177-85. 855 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2013.09.022
- 856 19. Antao T, Hastings IM. Environmental, pharmacological and genetic influences on the 857 spread of drug-resistant malaria. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological 858 Sciences. 2011;278(1712):1705-12. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2010.1907
- 859 20. Hughes D, Andersson DI. Evolutionary consequences of drug resistance: shared 860 principles across diverse targets and organisms. Nature Reviews Genetics. 861 2015;16(8):459-71. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg3922.
- 862 Huijben S, Bell AS, Sim DG, Tomasello D, Mideo N, Day T, et al. Aggressive 21. 863 chemotherapy and the selection of drug resistant pathogens. PLoS Pathogens. 864 2013;9(9):e100357. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1003578
- 865 Miotto O, Amato R, Ashley EA, MacInnis B, Almagro-Garcia J, Amaratunga C, et al. 22. 866 Genetic architecture of artemisinin-resistant Plasmodium falciparum. Nature Genetics. 867 2015;47(3):226-34. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3189
- 868 23. Slater HC, Okell LC, Ghani AC. Mathematical modelling to guide drug development for 869 malaria elimination. Trends in Parasitology. 2017;33(3):175-84. 870 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2016.09.004.
- 871 24. Mackinnon M, Marsh K. The selection landscape of malaria parasites. Science. 872 2010;328(5980):866-71. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1185410
- 873 Bushman M, Antia R, Udhayakumar V, de Roode JC. Within-host competition can delay 25. 874 evolution of drug resistance in malaria. PLoS Biology. 2018;16(8):1-25. 875 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2005712
- 876 Brock AR, Ross JV, Parikh S, Esterman A. The role of antimalarial quality in the 26. 877 emergence and transmission of resistance. Medical Hypotheses. 2018;111:49-54. 878 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2017.12.018
- 879 27. Watkins WM, Mosobo M. Treatment of Plasmodium falciparum malaria with 880 pyrimethamine-sulfadoxine: selective pressure for resistance is a function of long 881 elimination half-life. Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 1993;87(1):75-8. 882 https://doi.org/10.1016/0035-9203(93)90431-o
- 883 28. Pongtavornpinyo W, Yeung S, Hastings IM, Dondorp AM, Day NPJ, White NJ. Spread 884 of anti-malarial drug resistance: Mathematical model with implications for ACT drug 885 policies. Malaria Journal. 2008;7(1):229. https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2875-7-229
- 886 29. White NJ, Pongtavornpinyo W, Maude RJ, Saralamba S, Aguas R, Stepniewska K, et al. 887 Hyperparasitaemia and low dosing are an important source of anti-malarial drug 888 resistance. Malaria Journal. 2009;8(1):253. https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2875-8-253
- 889 Chiyaka C, Garira W, Dube S. Effects of treatment and drug resistance on the 30. 890 transmission dynamics of malaria in endemic areas. Theoretical Population Biology. 891 2009;75(1):14-29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tpb.2008.10.002

- 892 Esteva L, Gumel AB, De LeóN CV. Qualitative study of transmission dynamics of drug-31. resistant malaria. Mathematical and Computer Modelling. 2009;50(3-4):611-30. 893 894 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mcm.2009.02.012
- 895 Koella J, Antia R. Epidemiological models for the spread of anti-malarial resistance. 32. 896 Malaria Journal. 2003;2(1):3. https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2875-2-3
- 897 33. Lee TE, Penny MA. Identifying key factors of the transmission dynamics of drug-resistant 898 2019;462:210-20. malaria. Journal of Theoretical Biology. 899 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2018.10.050
- 900 34. Lee TE, Bonhoeffer S, Penny MA. The competition dynamics of drug resistant malaria. 901 BioRxiv. 2021. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.25.427822
- 902 Legros M, Bonhoeffer S. A combined within-host and between-hosts modelling 35. 903 framework for the evolution of resistance to antimalarial drugs. Journal of the Royal Society Interface. 2016;13(117):20160148. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2016.0148 904
- 905 36. Tchuenche JM, Chivaka C, Chan D, Matthews A, Mayer G. A mathematical model for 906 antimalarial drug resistance. Mathematical Medicine Biology: A Journal of the IMA. 907 2011;28(4):335-55. https://doi.org/10.1093/imammb/dqq017
- 908 37. Tumwiine J, Mugisha J, Luboobi LS. A mathematical model for the dynamics of malaria 909 in a human host and mosquito vector with temporary immunity. Applied Mathematics and 910 Computation. 2007;189(2):1953-65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amc.2006.12.084
- 911 38. Macdonald G. The Epidemiology and Control of Malaria. London: Oxford University 912 Press; 1957.
- 913 Ross R. Some a priori pathometric equations. British Medical Journal. 1915;1(2830):546-39. 914 7. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.1.2830.546
- 915 40. Klonis N, Xie SC, McCaw JM, Crespo-Ortiz MP, Zaloumis SG, Simpson JA, et al. Altered 916 temporal response of malaria parasites determines differential sensitivity to artemisinin. 917 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2013;110(13):5157-62. 918 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1217452110
- 919 Wang J, Xu C, Lun Z-R, Meshnick SR. Unpacking 'artemisinin resistance'. Trends in 41. 920 Pharmacological Sciences. 2017;38(6):506-11. 921 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tips.2017.03.007.
- 922 Sá JM, Kaslow SR, Krause MA, Melendez-Muniz VA, Salzman RE, Kite WA, et al. 42. 923 Artemisinin resistance phenotypes and K13 inheritance in a *Plasmodium falciparum* 924 cross and Aotus model. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 925 2018;115(49):12513-8. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1813386115
- 926 Witkowski B, Khim N, Chim P, Kim S, Ke S, Kloeung N, et al. Reduced artemisinin 43. 927 susceptibility of Plasmodium falciparum ring stages in western Cambodia. Antimicrobial 928 Agents and Chemotherapy. 2013;57(2):914-23. https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.01868-12.
- 929 44. Ye R, Hu D, Zhang Y, Huang Y, Sun X, Wang J, et al. Distinctive origin of artemisinin-930 resistant Plasmodium falciparum on the China-Myanmar border. Scientific Reports. 931 2016;6:20100. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep20100
- 932 Chaorattanakawee S, Lon C, Jongsakul K, Gawee J, Sok S, Sundrakes S, et al. Ex vivo 45. 933 piperaquine resistance developed rapidly in *Plasmodium falciparum* isolates in northern 934 Cambodia compared to Thailand. Malaria Journal. 2016;15(1):1-12. 935 https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-016-1569-y
- 936 Chaorattanakawee S, Saunders DL, Sea D, Chanarat N, Yingyuen K, Sundrakes S, et 46. 937 al. Ex vivo drug susceptibility testing and molecular profiling of clinical Plasmodium 938 falciparum isolates from Cambodia from 2008 to 2013 suggest emerging piperaquine 939 resistance. Antimicrobial Agents Chemotherapy. 2015;59(8):4631-43. 940 https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00366-15

- 941 47. Tahita MC, Tinto H, Yarga S, Kazienga A, Traore M, Valea I, et al. Ex vivo anti-malarial 942 drug susceptibility of *Plasmodium falciparum* isolates from pregnant women in an area 943 of highly seasonal transmission in Burkina Faso. Malaria Journal. 2015;14(1):1-6. 944 https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-015-0769-1
- 945 Watson OJ, Gao B, Nguyen TD, Tran TN-A, Penny MA, Smith DL, et al. Pre-existing 48. 946 partner-drug resistance facilitates the emergence and spread of artemisinin resistance: 947 a consensus modelling study. BioRxiv. 2021. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.08.437876
- 948 49. Hastings IM, Watkins WM, White NJ. The evolution of drug-resistant malaria: the role of 949 drug elimination half-life. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London 950 Series B: Biological Sciences. 2002;357(1420):505-19. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2001.1036 951
- 952 50. Molineaux L, Diebner H, Eichner M, Collins W, Jeffery G, Dietz K. Plasmodium falciparum parasitaemia described by a new mathematical model. Parasitology. 953 954 2001;122(4):379 - 91. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031182001007533
- 955 Bertrand J, Mentré F. Mathematical expressions of the pharmacokinetic and 51. 956 pharmacodynamic models implemented in the Monolix software. Paris Diderot 957 University: 2008.
- 958 52. Kay K, Hastings IM. Improving pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic modeling to 959 investigate anti-infective chemotherapy with application to the current generation of 960 antimalarial drugs. PLoS Computational Biology. 2013;9(7):e1003151. 961 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003151
- 962 53. Johnston GL, Gething PW, Hay SI, Smith DL, Fidock DA. Modeling within-host effects of 963 drugs on Plasmodium falciparum transmission and prospects for malaria elimination. 964 PLoS Computational Biology. 2014;10(1):e1003434. 965 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003434
- 966 Winter K, Hastings IM. Development, evaluation, and application of an in silico model for 54. 967 antimalarial drug treatment and failure. Antimicrobial Agents Chemotherapy. 968 2011;55(7):3380-92. https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.01712-10
- 969 55. Grow A, Hilton J. Statistical emulation. Wiley Online Library. 2018:1-8. 970 https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118445112.stat07987
- 971 56. WHO. WHO Guidelines for malaria. Geneva: World health organization; 2021. Available 972 from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/guidelines-for-malaria.
- 973 57. Gramacy RB. tgp: an R package for Bayesian nonstationary, semiparametric nonlinear 974 regression and design by treed Gaussian process models. Journal of Statistical 975 Software: 2007
- 976 Kay K. Hastings IM. Measuring windows of selection for anti-malarial drug treatments. 58. 977 Malaria Journal. 2015;14(1):1-10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-015-0810-4
- 978 Hastings IM, Hodel EM, Kay K. Quantifying the pharmacology of antimalarial drug 59. 979 combination therapy. Scientific Reports. 2016;6(1):32762. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep32762 980
- 981 60. Amato R, Pearson RD, Almagro-Garcia J, Amaratunga C, Lim P, Suon S, et al. Origins 982 of the current outbreak of multidrug-resistant malaria in southeast Asia: a retrospective 983 genetic study. Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2018;18(3):337-45. 984 https://doi.org/10.1016/s1473-3099(18)30068-9
- Hamilton WL, Amato R, van der Pluijm RW, Jacob CG, Quang HH, Thuy-Nhien NT, et 985 61. 986 al. Evolution and expansion of multidrug-resistant malaria in southeast Asia: a genomic The Infectious 2019;19(9):943-51. 987 epidemiology study. Lancet Diseases. 988 https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(19)30392-5

- 989 62. Wongsrichanalai C, Meshnick SR. Declining artesunate-mefloquine efficacy against 990 falciparum malaria on the Cambodia-Thailand border. Emerging Infectious Diseases. 991 2008;14(5):716-9. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1405.071601
- 992 63. Ehrlich HY, Bei AK, Weinberger DM, Warren JL, Parikh S. Mapping partner drug 993 resistance to guide antimalarial combination therapy policies in sub-Saharan Africa. 994 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2021;118(29):e2100685118. 995 https://doi.org//10.1073/pnas.2100685118
- 996 64. Edwards HM, Chinh VD, Le Duy B, Thanh PV, Thang ND, Trang DM, et al. 997 Characterising residual malaria transmission in forested areas with low coverage of core 998 vector control in central Viet Nam. Parasites & vectors. 2019;12(1):1-16. 999 https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-019-3695-1
- 1000 65. Chaumeau V, Fustec B, Hsel SN, Montazeau C, Nyo SN, Metaane S, et al. 1001 Entomological determinants of malaria transmission in Kayin state. Eastern Myanmar: a 1002 24-month longitudinal study in four villages. Wellcome Open Research. 2018;3. 1003 https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.14761.4
- 1004 Edwards HM, Sriwichai P, Kirabittir K, Prachumsri J, Chavez IF, Hii J. Transmission risk 66. 1005 beyond the village: entomological and human factors contributing to residual malaria 1006 transmission in an area approaching malaria elimination on the Thailand-Myanmar 1007 border. Malaria journal. 2019;18(1):1-20. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-019-2852-5
- 1008 Hay SI, Rogers DJ, Toomer JF, Snow RW. Annual Plasmodium falciparum 67. 1009 entomological inoculation rates (EIR) across Africa: literature survey, Internet access and 1010 review. Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2000;94(2):113-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0035-9203(00)90246-3 1011
- Yamba EI, Tompkins AM, Fink AH, Ermert V, Amelie MD, Amekudzi LK, et al. Monthly 1012 68. 1013 Entomological Inoculation Rate Data for Studying the Seasonality of Malaria 1014 Transmission in Africa. Data. 2020;5(2):31. https://doi.org/10.3390/data5020031
- Hastings IM. A model for the origins and spread of drug-resistant malaria. Parasitology. 1015 69. 1016 1997;115 (Pt 2):133-41. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0031182097001261
- 1017 70. Siddigui MR, Willis A, Bil K, Singh J, Sompwe EM, Ariti C. Adherence to artemisinin 1018 combination therapy for the treatment of uncomplicated malaria in the Democratic 1019 Republic of the F1000Research. Congo. 2015;4:4:51. 1020 https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.6122.2.
- 1021 71. Bruxvoort K, Goodman C, Kachur SP, Schellenberg D. How patients take malaria 1022 treatment: a systematic review of the literature on adherence to antimalarial drugs. PloS 1023 One. 2014;9(1):e84555. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0084555
- 1024 72. Krishna S. Triple artemisinin-containing combination anti-malarial treatments should be 1025 implemented now to delay the emergence of resistance: the case against. Malaria Journal. 2019;18(1):339. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-019-2976-7 1026
- Hastings IM, Hodel EM. Pharmacological considerations in the design of anti-malarial 1027 73. 1028 drug combination therapies-is matching half-lives enough? Malaria Journal. 1029 2014;13(1):1-15. https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2875-13-62
- 1030 Kay K, Hodel EM, Hastings IM. Altering antimalarial drug regimens may dramatically 74. 1031 enhance and restore drug effectiveness. Antimicrobial Agents Chemotherapy. 1032 2015;59(10):6419-27. https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00482-15
- 1033 Dogovski C, Xie SC, Burgio G, Bridgford J, Mok S, McCaw JM, et al. Targeting the cell 75. 1034 stress response of Plasmodium falciparum to overcome artemisinin resistance. PLoS 1035 Biology. 2015;13(4):e1002132. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002132

- 1036 Khoury DS, Cao P, Zaloumis SG, Davenport MP, Consortium IAtM. Artemisinin 76. 1037 Resistance and the Unique Selection Pressure of a Short-acting Antimalarial. Trends in 1038 Parasitology. 2020;36(11):884-7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2020.07.004
- 1039 Crow JF, Motoo K. An introduction to population genetics theory. Jodhpur: Scientific 77. 1040 Publishers; 2017.
- 1041 Hodel EM, Kay K, Hastings IM. Incorporating stage-specific drug action into 78. 1042 pharmacological modeling of antimalarial drug treatment. Antimicrobial Agents and 1043 Chemotherapy. 2016;60(5):2747-56. https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.01172-15
- 1044 Ashley EA, Dhorda M, Fairhurst RM, Amaratunga C, Lim P, Suon S, et al. Spread of 79. 1045 artemisinin resistance in Plasmodium falciparum malaria. New England Journal of 1046 Medicine. 2014;371(5):411-23. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1314981
- 1047 80. Witmer K, Dahalan FA, Delves MJ, Yahiya S, Watson OJ, Straschil U, et al. Transmission 1048 of artemisinin-resistant malaria parasites to mosquitoes under antimalarial drug Antimicrobial 1049 pressure. Agents and Chemotherapy. 2020;65(1):e00898-20. 1050 https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00898-20.
- 1051 Dye C, Williams BG. Multigenic drug resistance among inbred malaria parasites. 81. 1052 Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B: Biological Sciences. 1053 1997;264(1378):61-7. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1997.0009
- 1054 82. Vinayak S, Alam MT, Mixson-Hayden T, McCollum AM, Sem R, Shah NK, et al. Origin 1055 and evolution of sulfadoxine resistant Plasmodium falciparum. PLoS Pathogens. 1056 2010;6(3):e1000830. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1000830
- Chitnis N, Hardy D, Smith T. A periodically-forced mathematical model for the seasonal 1057 83. 1058 dynamics of malaria in mosquitoes. Bulletin of Mathematical Biology. 2012;74(5):1098-1059 124. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11538-011-9710-0
- 1060 Smith T, Killeen GF, Maire N, Ross A, Molineaux L, Tediosi F, et al. Mathematical 84. 1061 modeling of the impact of malaria vaccines on the clinical epidemiology and natural 1062 history of *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria: Overview. The American Journal of Tropical 1063 Medicine and Hygiene. 2006;75(2 suppl):1-10. https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2006.75.2 suppl.0750001 1064
- 1065 Smith T, Maire N, Ross A, Penny M, Chitnis N, Schapira A, et al. Towards a 85. 1066 comprehensive simulation model of malaria epidemiology and control. Parasitology. 1067 2008;135(13):1507-16. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031182008000371
- Reiker T, Golumbeanu M, Shattock A, Burgert L, Smith TA, Filippi S, et al. Emulator-1068 86. 1069 based Bayesian optimization for efficient multi-objective calibration of an individual-1070 based model malaria. Nature Communications of 2021;12(1):1-11. 1071 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-27486-z
- 1072 Smith T, Ross A, Maire N, Rogier C, Trape J-F, Molineaux L. An epidemiologic model of 87. 1073 the incidence of acute illness in *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria. The American Journal of 1074 Tropical Medicine Hygiene. 2006;75(2 suppl):56-62. and https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2006.75.56 1075
- 1076 88. Ross A, Maire N, Molineaux L, Smith T. An epidemiologic model of severe morbidity and 1077 mortality caused by Plasmodium falciparum. The American Journal of Tropical Medicine 1078 and Hygiene. 2006;75(2 suppl):63-73. https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2006.75.63
- 1079 89. Ross A, Smith T. The effect of malaria transmission intensity on neonatal mortality in 1080 endemic areas. The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene
- 1081 2006;75:74-81. https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2006.75.74.
- 1082 90. Maire N, Smith T, Ross A, Owusu-Aqyei S, Dietz K, Molineaux L. A model for natural 1083 immunity to asexual blood stages of *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria in endemic areas.

- 1084 Medicine and Hygiene. 2006;75:19-31. The American Journal of Tropical 1085 https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2006.75.19
- 1086 91. Tediosi F, Maire N, Smith T, Hutton G, Utzinger J, Ross A, et al. An approach to model 1087 the costs and effects of case management of Plasmodium falciparum malaria in sub-Saharan Africa. The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 1088 1089 2006;75(2 suppl):90-103. https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2006.75.90.
- 1090 92. Ross A, Killeen G, Smith T. Relationships between host infectivity to mosquitoes and 1091 asexual parasite density in Plasmodium falciparum. The American Journal of Tropical 1092 Medicine and Hygiene. 2006;75(2 suppl):32-7. 1093 https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2006.75.32
- 1094 93. Charles B, Blomgren A, Nasveld P, Kitchener S, Jensen A, Gregory R, et al. Population 1095 pharmacokinetics of mefloquine in military personnel for prophylaxis against malaria infection during field deployment. European Journal of Clinical Pharmacology. 1096 1097 2007;63(3):271-8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00228-006-0247-3
- 1098 94. Hodel EMS, Guidi M, Zanolari B, Mercier T, Duong S, Kabanywanyi AM, et al. Population 1099 pharmacokinetics of mefloquine, piperaquine and artemether-lumefantrine in Cambodian and Tanzanian malaria patients. Malaria Journal. 2013;12(1):235. 1100 1101 https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2875-12-235.
- 1102 Jullien V, Valecha N, Srivastava B, Sharma B, Kiechel J-R. Population pharmacokinetics 95. 1103 of mefloquine, administered as a fixed-dose combination of artesunate-mefloquine in 1104 Indian patients for the treatment of acute uncomplicated Plasmodium falciparum malaria. 1105 Malaria Journal. 2014;13(1):187. https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2875-13-187
- 1106 Karunajeewa HA, llett KF, Mueller I, Siba P, Law I, Page-Sharp M, et al. 96. 1107 Pharmacokinetics and efficacy of piperaguine and chloroguine in Melanesian children 1108 with uncomplicated malaria. Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy. 2008;52(1):237-1109 43. https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00555-07.
- 1110 Maganda BA, Ngaimisi E, Kamuhabwa AA, Aklillu E, Minzi OM. The influence of 97. 1111 nevirapine and efavirenz-based anti-retroviral therapy on the pharmacokinetics of 1112 lumefantrine and anti-malarial dose recommendation in HIV-malaria co-treatment. 1113 Malaria Journal. 2015;14(1):179. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-015-0695-2
- Das JL, Dondorp AM, Nosten F, Phyo AP, Hanpithakpong W, Ringwald P, et al. 1114 98. 1115 Population pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic modeling of artemisinin resistance 1116 Southeast Asia. The AAPS Journal. in 2017;19(6):1842-54. https://doi.org/10.1208/s12248-017-0141-1 1117
- Das JPL, Kyaw MP, Nyunt MH, Chit K, Aye KH, Aye MM, et al. Population 1118 99. 1119 pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties of artesunate in patients with 1120 artemisinin sensitive and resistant infections in Southern Myanmar. Malaria Journal. 1121 2018;17(1):126. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-018-2278-5
- 1122 100. Binois M, Gramacy R. hetGP: Heteroskedastic Gaussian process modeling and 1123 sequential design in R. Journal of Statistical Software. 2021;98. (1):1-44. 1124 https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v098.i13
- 101. Golumbeanu M, Yang G, Camponovo F, Stuckey EM, Hamon N, Mondy M, et al. 1125 1126 Combining machine learning and mathematical models of disease dynamics to guide 1127 development of novel disease interventions. MedRxiv. 2021:2021.01.05.21249283. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.05.21249283 1128
- 102. Kublin JG, Cortese JF, Njunju EM, G. Mukadam RA, Wirima JJ, Kazembe PN, et al. 1129 1130 Reemergence of chloroquine-sensitive Plasmodium falciparum malaria after cessation 1131 of chloroquine use in Malawi. The Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2003;187(12):1870-5. 1132 https://doi.org/10.1086/375419

- 1133 103. Mita T, Kaneko A, Lum JK, Bwijo B, Takechi M, Zungu IL, et al. Recovery of chloroquine 1134 sensitivity and low prevalence of the Plasmodium falciparum chloroquine resistance 1135 transporter gene mutation K76T following the discontinuance of chloroquine use in 1136 Malawi. The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2003;68(4):413-5. 1137 https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2003.68.413
- 1138 104. Kilian AH, Metzger WG, Mutschelknauss EJ, Kabagambe G, Langi P, Korte R, et al. Reliability of malaria microscopy in epidemiological studies: results of guality control. 1139 1140 Tropical Medicine and International Health. 2000;5(1):3-8. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3156.2000.00509.x 1141
- 1142 105. Murray CK, Gasser RA, Jr., Magill AJ, Miller RS. Update on rapid diagnostic testing for 1143 Microbiology Reviews. malaria. Clinical 2008:21(1):97-110. 1144 https://doi.org/10.1128/cmr.00035-07
- 106. Ekström AM, Clark J, Byass P, Lopez A, De Savigny D, Moyer CA, et al. INDEPTH 1145 1146 network: contributing to the data revolution. The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology. 2016;4(2):97. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(15)00495-7 1147
- 1148 107. Sobol IM. Global sensitivity indices for nonlinear mathematical models and their Monte 1149 Carlo estimates. Mathematics and Computers in Simulation. 2001;55(1-3):271-80. 1150 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4754(00)00270-6
- 1151 108. Bertrand looss SDV, Alexandre Janon and Gilles Pujol, with contributions from Baptiste 1152 Broto, Khalid Boumhaout, Thibault Delage, Reda El Amri, Jana Fruth, Lau-rent Gilguin, 1153 Joseph Guillaume, Marouane II Idrissi, Loic Le Gratiet, Paul Lemaitre, Aman-dine Marrel, 1154 Anouar Meynaoui, Barry L. Nelson, Fil-ippo Monari, Roelof Oomen, Oldrich Rakovec, Bernardo Ramos, Olivier Roustant, Eun-hye Song, Jeremy Staum, Roman Sueur, Taieb 1155 1156 Touati, Frank Weber. Global Sensitivity Analysis of Model Outputs. 1.26.1 ed2021 1157 Available from: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/sensitivity/sensitivity.pdf
- 109. Dekking FM, Kraaikamp C, Lopuhaä HP, Meester LE. A Modern Introduction to 1158 1159 Probability and Statistics: Understanding why and how: Springer Science & Business 1160 Media: 2005.

### The influence of biological, epidemiological, and treatment 1 factors on the establishment and spread of drug-resistant 2 Plasmodium falciparum 3

### Supplementary file 4

- 5 Thiery Masserey<sup>1, 2</sup>, Tamsin Lee<sup>1, 2</sup>, Monica Golumbeanu<sup>1, 2</sup>, Andrew J Shattock<sup>1, 2</sup>, Sherrie L Kelly<sup>1, 2</sup>, Ian M Hastings<sup>3</sup>, Melissa A Penny<sup>1, 2\*</sup> 6
- 7 <sup>1</sup> Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Basel, Switzerland
- 8 <sup>2</sup> University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland
- 9 <sup>3</sup> Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK
- 10 \*corresponding author: melissa.penny@unibas.ch

### 1. Supplementary results 11

#### 12 1.1 Supplementary figures that illustrate the results

#### 13 Figure S1

#### 14 Influence of the access to treatment and degree of resistance on the selection coefficients of a 15 genotype resistant to drug A or drug B used in monotherapy.

16 Lines represent medians and shaded areas represent interguartile ranges of the selection coefficients

17 estimated during the global sensitivity analysis over the parameter range for levels of access to

18 treatment (10% to 80%), the degree of resistance to drug A (1- to 50-fold decrease in Emax), and the

19 degree of resistance to drug B (1- and 20-fold increase in EC50).



It is made available under a

#### 20 Figure S2

#### 21 Magnitude and direction of effect of drug properties and fitness cost on predicted selection 22 coefficients for low and high levels of transmission, degree of drug resistance, treatment 23 adherence, in seasonal or perennial settings with monotherapy or combination treatment.

24 The solid and dashed lines represent the median selection coefficients over the parameter ranges 25 estimated in each setting that had low access to treatment (10%) and an entomological inoculation rate 26 (EIR) of 5 (solid lines) or 500 (dashed lines) inoculations per person per year. Settings varied in their 27 seasonality pattern and level of adherence to treatment (low=67% and high=100%). For each treatment 28 profile, we show results for parasites with two different degrees of resistance; degree of resistance of 7 29 (low) and 18 (high) to drug A (Emax shift), 2.5 (low) and 10 (high) to drug B (EC50 shift), and with 30 combination of drugs A and B, 7 (low) and 18 (high) to drug A and 10 to drug B. The parameter ranges 31 were the following: fitness cost (1, 1.1); drug A half-life (0.035, 0.175) days; drug B half-life (6, 22) days; 32 Cmax/EC50 ratio of drug A (55, 312); Cmax/EC50 ratio of drug B at a high level of adherence to 33 treatment (5.4, 21.7); and at a low level of adherence (4.0, 16.2).



It is made available under a

#### 34 Figure S3

#### 35 First-order indices describing level of importance of each factor from the constrained sensitivity 36 analysis of the spread of a genotype resistant to drug A used in monotherapy.

37 The first-order indices were assessed for parasites that had different degrees of resistance to drug A

38 (low=7 and high=18 fold decrease in Emax) in settings that differ in their levels of access to treatment

39 (high=10% and low=80%), levels of transmission (5, 10, and 500 inoculations per person per year),

- 40 transmission patterns (no seasonality and seasonality), and levels of adherence to treatment (low=67%,
- 41 and high=100%). The explored parameter ranges were the following: the fitness cost (1, 1.1); the half-
- 42 life of drug A (0.035, 0.175) days; the ratio Cmax/EC50 for drug A (55, 312); the Emax of drug A (27.5,
- 43 31.0) per day; and the diagnostic detection limit (2, 50) parasites/microliter.



It is made available under a

#### 44 Figure S4

#### 45 First-order indices of each factor from the constrained sensitivity analysis of the spread of a 46 genotype resistant to drug B used in monotherapy.

47 The first-order indices were assessed for parasites that had different degrees of resistance to drug B

- 48 (low=2.5 and high=10 fold increase in EC50) in settings that differ in their levels of access to treatment
- 49 (low=10 %, and high=80%), levels of transmission (5, 10, and 500 inoculations per person per year),
- 50 transmission patterns (no seasonality and seasonality), and levels of adherence to treatment (low=67%,
- 51 and high=100%). The explored parameter ranges were the following: the fitness cost (1, 1.1); the half-
- 52 life of drug B (6, 22) days; the ratio Cmax/EC50 for drug B at a high level of adherence to treatment (5.4,
- 53 21.7) and at a low level of adherence to treatment (4.0, 16.2); the Emax of drug B (3.45, 5.00) per day;
- 54 and the diagnostic detection limit (2, 50) parasites/microliter.



It is made available under a

#### 55 Figure S5

#### 56 First-order indices of each factor from the constrained sensitivity analysis of the spread of a 57 genotype resistant to drug A when drug A and drug B are used in combination.

58 The first-order indices were assessed for parasites that had different degrees of resistance to drug A

59 (low=7 and high=18 fold decrease in Emax) in settings that differ in their levels of access to treatment

60 (low=10 %, and high=80%), levels of transmission (5, 10, and 500 inoculations per person per year),

61 transmission patterns (no seasonality and seasonality), and levels of adherence to treatment (low=67%,

62 and high=100%). The explored parameter ranges were the following: the fitness cost (1, 1.1); the half-

63 life of drug A (0.035, 0.175) days; the half-life of drug B (6, 22) days; the ratio Cmax/EC50 for drug A

64 (55, 312); the ratio Cmax/EC50 for drug B at a high level of adherence to treatment (5.4, 21.7) and at a

65 low level of adherence to treatment (4.0, 16.2); the Emax of drug A (27.5, 31.0) per day; the Emax of

66 drug B (3.45, 5) per day; and the diagnostic detection limit (2, 50) parasites/microliter.



Drug A + Drug B

#### 67 Figure S6

#### 68 Distribution of selection coefficient across settings with high access to treatment.

69 The selection coefficients were estimated for each treatment profile during the constrained sensitivity

70 analysis of the spread of a resistant genotype having a low degree of resistance (equal to 7 for drug A

71 (Emax shift), and to 2.5 for drug B (EC50 shift)), in settings with a high access to treatment (80%). The distributions are stratified by (A) the intensity of transmission (B) the seasonality pattern, and (C) the

72 73 level of adherence to treatment in the settings.



#### 74 Figure S7

#### 75 Treatment usage.

76 The figure highlights the relationship between the transmission intensity (EIR) and the percentage of

- 77 people that received treatment during a month (orange dots) and the percentage of infected people that
- 78 received treatment during a month (blue dots). In this illustration, the level of access to treatment was
- 79 equal to 80%, and the transmission was perennial.



#### 80 Figure S8

#### 81 Distribution of selection coefficient across settings with a low access to treatment.

82 The selection coefficients were estimated for each treatment profile during the constrained sensitivity

83 analysis of the spread of a resistant genotype having a low degree of resistance (equal to 7 for drug A

84 (Emax shift) and to 2.5 for drug B (EC50 shift)), in settings with a low access to treatment (10%). The

85 distributions are stratified by (A) the intensity of transmission, (B) the seasonality pattern, and (C) the

86 level of adherence to treatment in the settings.



## **1.2** The benefit of combination therapy

We illustrated the benefit of combination therapy by assessing how the degree of resistance to drug B influenced (i) the time taken for mutations conferring different degrees of resistance to drug A to spread from 1% to 25% of inoculations carrying the resistant genotype, T25, (Figure 5, first y-axis) and (ii) their probability of establishment (Figure 5, second y-axis). Both the T25 and the probabilities of establishment were estimated based on selection coefficients predicted using the fitted emulators. To illustrate the impact of the transmission intensity on the two measurements, we predicted their values in low and high transmission levels. Note that, as discussed in the Results section, the relation between the selection coefficient and the probability of establishment changes slightly with the transmission level (Figure 4 of main text). In our example, drug A had the drug profile of dihydroartemisinin and drug B of piperaquine. We set the level of access to treatment to 100%, assumed no fitness cost, the transmission was perennial, and the population adhered to treatment fully.

In a low transmission setting, in a parasite population fully susceptible to drug B, parasites resistant to drug A had a low probability of establishment and required many years to spread from 1% to 25% of inoculations carrying the resistant genotype. For example, a mutation with a low (3.5-fold decrease in Emax) or high (13.5-fold decrease in Emax) degree of resistance to drug A had a probability of 1/1000 or 1/100, respectively, to establish in the population and required more than 39 years or over 18 years, respectively, to spread from 1% to 25% of inoculations carrying the resistant genotype (Figure 5). The probability of establishment and T25 decreased tremendously with increased degrees of resistance of both genotypes to drug B (Figure 5). When the parasite population had a high degree of resistance to drug B (degree of resistance of 13.5), the probability of establishment increased to more than 1/10 and the T25 was reduced to approximately three years, independent of the degree of resistance to drug A (Figure 5). These results confirm that resistance to partner drugs facilitates the establishment and spread of partial artemisinin resistance.

In high transmission settings, higher degrees of resistance to drug B also accelerated the establishment and spread of parasites resistant to drug A (Figure 5). However, the probability of establishment and the rate of spread were consistently lower in high transmission settings compared with low transmission settings (Figure 5). In addition, for a specific T50, the probability of establishment was slightly lower than in the low transmission setting due to the slight change in the relation between selection coefficients and probabilities of establishment with the EIR (see Results). These results agree with our observations that higher levels of within-host competition and immunity minimise the establishment and spread of resistance to artemisinin in high transmission settings.

### Figure S9

### Illustration of the benefit of combination therapy on the evolution of drug resistance as time to 25% relative frequency of resistant genotypes.

We estimated the probability of establishment and the time needed for parasites resistant to drug A to spread from 1% to 25% of inoculations carrying the resistant genotype, 725, for multiple degrees of resistance of the resistant genotype to drug A (Emax shift) and multiple degrees of resistance of both genotypes to drug B (EC50 shift). We assumed Drug A has a similar drug profile of dihydroartemisinin and drug B of piperaguine. We assumed a level of access to treatment of 100%. The population fully adhered to treatment. The resistant parasites had no fitness cost. The transmission intensity was equal to 5 (low transmission intensity) or 500 (high transmission intensity) inoculations per person per year (reflected low to very high transmission). The transmission was perennial.



# 2. Details on the parameterisation of OpenMalaria

## Table S1

### Pharmacokinetics (PK) and pharmacodynamics (PD) parameter values for drug A that were kept constant throughout the sensitivity analyses.

Component	Parameter	Value	Reference
РК	Volume distribution (I/kg)	1.49	[1]
	Treatment dosage (mg/kg)	4.00	[1, 2]
PD	Slope of the effect curve	4.00	[1, 2]

### Table S2

Pharmacokinetics (PK) and pharmacodynamics (PD) parameter values for drug B that were kept constant throughout the sensitivity analyses.

Component	Parameter	Value	Reference
	Absorption rate (per day)	11.16	[3]
РК	Rate at which the drugs move from the central compartment to the peripheral compartment (per day)	8.46	[3]
	Rate at which the drugs move from the peripheral compartment to the central compartment (per day)	3.30	[3]
	Volume distribution (I/kg)	173.00	[3]
PD	Slope of the effect curve	6.00	[2, 3]

### Figure S10

### The seasonal transmission of malaria.

Example of the EIR (inoculations per person per year) across a year in the seasonal setting of malaria transmission, based on field studies conducted in Tanzania. Here the total EIR is 360 inoculations per person per year.



# 3. Estimation of the selection coefficient

### Figure S11

### Proof that the selection coefficient is not frequency-dependent in OpenMalaria.

The figure illustrates the logit of the relative frequency of the resistant genotype over time when the initial relative frequency of infected humans carrying the resistant genotype was 5%. The selection coefficient slope of the logistic regression) was less stable after six years because the percentage of inoculations carrying the sensitive genotype was lower than 0.5%. Thus, the influence of stochastic processes was strong.



### Figure S12

### Illustration of typical simulations run in OpenMalaria to estimate the rate of spread of a drugresistant genotype.

The brown line represents the relative frequency of the resistant genotypes in inoculations. The solid line illustrates a simulation in which the resistant genotype spreads in the population (selection coefficient above 0). The dotted line illustrates a simulation in which the resistant genotype did not spread in the population (selection coefficient below 0). Phase 1 represents the burn-in phase. The vertical dotted black line highlights when we introduced the fitness cost and the drug for which the resistant genotype had reduced sensitivity. Phase 2 is the phase during which the rate of spread of the resistant genotype was assessed.



### Figure S13

### Illustration of the estimation of the selection coefficient in seasonal settings.

The black dots represent the logit of the relative frequency of the resistant genotype. The blue dots represent the logit of the moving average of relative frequency of the resistant genotype. The moving average of a measurement at a time t included all the measurements from six months before time t and six months after the time t. Using this method, the selection coefficient (slope of the logistic regression) was constant over time.



# 4. Fit of the emulators

### Figure S14

### Accuracy of the emulators used for the global sensitivity analyses of each treatment profile.

For each treatment profile, the comparison between the selection coefficients of the test dataset estimated using OpenMalaria (i.e., the observed 'true' selection coefficient) and the corresponding prediction from the emulator during the final round of adaptive sampling. 'Cor' is the Spearman correlation coefficient, 'RMSE' is the root means squared error, and the blue lines are the linear regression fits.



### Figure S15

## Accuracy of the emulators used for each constrained sensitivity analysis of the spread of a genotype resistant to drug A used in monotherapy in each setting with low access to treatment (10%).

The comparison between the selection coefficients for the test dataset between the observed 'truth' from OpenMalaria, and the prediction from the emulators during the final round of adaptive sampling. The EIR is in inoculations per person per year (5, 10, and 500). The degree of resistance is the relative decrease in the Emax of the resistant genotype compared with the sensitive one. 'Cor' is the Spearman correlation coefficient, 'RMSE' is the root means squared error, and the blue lines are the linear regression fits.



19

It is made available under a

### Figure S16

## Accuracy of the emulators used for each constrained sensitivity analysis of the spread of a genotype resistant to drug A used in monotherapy in each setting with high access to treatment (80%).

The comparison between the selection coefficients for the test dataset between the observed 'truth' from OpenMalaria, and the prediction from the emulators during the final round of adaptive sampling. The EIR is in inoculations per person per year (5, 10, or 500). The degree of resistance is the relative decrease in the Emax of the resistant genotype compared with the sensitive one. 'Cor' is the Spearman correlation coefficient, 'RMSE' is the root means squared error, and the blue lines are the linear regression fits.



It is made available under a

### Figure S17

## Accuracy of the emulators used for each constrained sensitivity analysis of the spread of a genotype resistant to drug B used in monotherapy in each setting with low access to treatment (10%).

The comparison between the selection coefficients for the test dataset between the observed 'truth' from OpenMalaria, and the prediction from the emulators during the final round of adaptive sampling. The EIR is in inoculations per person per year (5, 10, or 500). The degree of resistance is the relative increase in the EC50 of the resistant genotype compared with the sensitive one. 'Cor' is the Spearman correlation coefficient, 'RMSE' is the root means squared error, and the blue lines are the linear regression fits.



It is made available under a

### Figure S18

## Accuracy of the emulators used for each constrained sensitivity analysis of the spread of a genotype resistant to drug B used in monotherapy in each setting with high access to treatment (80%).

The comparison between the selection coefficients for the test dataset between the observed 'truth' from OpenMalaria, and the prediction from the emulators during the final round of adaptive sampling. The EIR is in inoculations per person per year (5, 10, or 500). The degree of resistance is the relative increase in the EC50 of the resistant genotype compared with the sensitive one. 'Cor' is the Spearman correlation coefficient, 'RMSE' is the root means squared error, and the blue lines are the linear regression fits.



It is made available under a

### Figure S19

## Accuracy of the emulators used for each constrained sensitivity analysis of the spread of a genotype resistant to drug A, when used in combination with drug B, in each setting with low access to treatment (10%).

The comparison between the selection coefficients for the test dataset between the observed 'truth' from OpenMalaria, and the prediction from the emulators during the final round of adaptive sampling. The EIR is in inoculations per person per year (5, 10, or 500). The degree of resistance to drug A is the relative decrease in the Emax of the resistant genotype compared with the sensitive one. 'Cor' is the Spearman correlation coefficient, 'RMSE' is the root means squared error, and the blue lines are the linear regression fits.



Drug A + Drug B

It is made available under a

### Figure S20

## Accuracy of the emulators used for each constrained sensitivity analysis of the spread of a genotype resistant to drug A, when used in combination with drug B, in each setting with high access to treatment (80%).

The comparison between the selection coefficients for the test dataset between the observed 'truth' from OpenMalaria, and the prediction from the emulators during the final round of adaptive sampling. The EIR is in inoculations per person per year (5, 10, or 500). The degree of resistance to drug A is the relative decrease in the Emax of the resistant genotype compared with the sensitive one. 'Cor' is the Spearman correlation coefficient, 'RMSE' is the root means squared error, and the blue lines are the linear regression fits.



Drug A + B

# 5. Probability of establishment

### Figure S21

## Illustration of typical simulations run in OpenMalaria to estimate the probability of establishment of a drug-resistant genotype.

The brown curve represents the relative frequency of the resistant genotypes in inoculations. Phase 1 represents the burn-in phase. In the second phase, we introduced a drug to which resistant parasites were hypersensitive. In the last phase, we imported mutation conferring drug resistance at a low rate until one mutation established.



## 5.1 Calculation of the importation rate for each setting

The importation rate, *I*, (imported infections per 1,000 individuals per year), was calculated to mimic a mutation rate of 5×10<sup>-5</sup> mutations per infection per year in each setting as in [4]. This low mutation rate ensured that the newly emerged genotype either established or became extinct before a new mutation was imported. The importation rate was calculated as:

$$I = \frac{1}{N} 2000 N_i u g,$$

where N is the human population size,  $N_i$  is the number of infections (i.e., the number of infected people), u is the mutation rate per infection (i.e., per transmission), and q is the number of malaria generations per year. Thus, Niug represents the number of de novo resistant mutations transmitted per year. This number was divided by the human population size and multiplied by 1,000 to obtain the number of imported infections per 1,000 persons per year. This is multiplied by two, as half of the imported infections were sensitive.

# 6. References

- Kay K, Hastings IM. Improving pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic modeling to 1. investigate anti-infective chemotherapy with application to the current generation of PLoS Computational Biology. 2013;9(7):e1003151. antimalarial drugs. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003151.
- 2. Winter K, Hastings IM. Development, evaluation, and application of an in silico model for antimalarial drug treatment and failure. Antimicrobial Agents Chemotherapy. 2011;55(7):3380-92. https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.01712-10.
- Hodel EMS, Guidi M, Zanolari B, Mercier T, Duong S, Kabanywanyi AM, et al. 3. Population pharmacokinetics of mefloquine, piperaquine and artemether-lumefantrine in Cambodian and Tanzanian malaria patients. Malaria Journal. 2013;12(1):235. https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2875-12-235.
- Hastings IM, Hardy D, Kay K, Sharma R. Incorporating genetic selection into individual-4. based models of malaria and other infectious diseases. Evolutionary Applications. 2020;13(10):2723-39. https://doi.org/10.1111/eva.13077