

1 **Potential Impact of a Diagnostic Test for Detecting Prepatent Guinea Worm Infections in**
2 **Dogs**

3

4 Hannah Smalley¹, Pinar Keskinocak¹, Julie Swann^{1,2}, Christopher Hanna³, and Adam Weiss⁴.

5 *1 Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia*

6 *2 North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina*

7 *3 Global Project Partners, LLC*

8 *4 The Carter Center, Atlanta, Georgia*

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 **ABSTRACT**

21 Chad has seen a considerable reduction in cases of Guinea worm disease (or dracunculiasis) in
22 domestic dogs in recent years. Tethering of dogs and application of Abate[®] larvicide to water
23 sources appear to have contributed to this progress, but with 767 reported dog cases in 2021,
24 accelerating elimination of the disease in Chad may require additional tools. We investigate the
25 potential benefits of a hypothetical diagnostic test which could be capable of detecting pre-patent
26 infections in dogs. We adapt an agent-based simulation model for forecasting the impact of
27 interventions on guinea worm disease in dogs to examine the interaction of multiple test factors
28 including test accuracy, when the test can detect infection, dog selection, and dog-owner
29 compliance with tethering recommendations. We find that a diagnostic test could be successful
30 if used in conjunction with existing interventions, and elimination can be achieved within two
31 years with 80% or higher test sensitivity, 90% or higher specificity, systematic testing of each
32 dog twice per year, and over 90% long-term tethering compliance when a dog tests positive or a
33 worm is emerging. Because of the long incubation period of Guinea worm disease (10-14
34 months) and the fact that no treatment exists, the benefits of the test rely on the testing rollout
35 and response of dog owners. If the test could estimate the timing of worm emergence, long-term
36 tethering could be eliminated and infected dogs could be tethered only when the worms are
37 expected, minimizing the related resources (human and financial) to support the intervention.

38

39

40

41

42 INTRODUCTION

43 In 2021, 767 dogs were reportedly infected with Guinea worm disease (or dracunculiasis) in
44 Chad.¹ This is a vast reduction in cases of Guinea worm (GW) in dogs in recent years, but the
45 number and geographic distribution of cases poses risks for the human population as infections
46 are passed through shared water sources. Chad reported 8 human cases in 2021. There is no
47 treatment for infected animals or humans, and there is no vaccine to prevent infection.²

48 GW is a parasitic nematode. When a dog ingests freshwater copepods harboring infective GW
49 third-stage larvae, either through surface water or a paratenic/transport host, the dog becomes
50 infected and after an incubation period of 10-14 months, a gravid female worm (or worms)
51 emerges from the dog's skin.³ If the emergent worm is exposed to water, tens of thousands of
52 first-stage larvae are released. Copepods ingest the larvae, and the cycle continues.²

53 Interventions employed to reduce dog infections include proactive tethering to minimize
54 exposure to potentially infected water sources, tethering of known infected dogs to prevent the
55 dogs from seeking water sources for relief when worms are emerging, the safe disposal of
56 aquatic waste, and application of Abate[®] (Ludwigshafen, Germany) larvicide to water sources to
57 kill infectious copepods in the water. These interventions, coupled with robust surveillance,
58 appear to have reduced infections.⁴

59 When a dog is infected with GW, there are no external signs until near the end of the incubation
60 period.² Based on the experience of field teams in Chad, dogs are often tethered during the day,
61 but some are released at night and fewer are tethered intermittently or not at all. Unfortunately,
62 if a dog is released even just at night, they may still interact with the water sources and aquatic
63 waste and acquire infection or exude worms; “a single missed emerged worm could delay

64 elimination by a year or more.”² Elimination of the disease may require additional tools to
65 either interrupt transmission or inform the International Commission for the Certification of
66 Dracunculiasis.


67 In this study, we assess the potential impact of a diagnostic test for GW disease in dogs. If a
68 diagnostic test could detect pre-patent infections in dogs when there are no signs, then tethering
69 resources could be targeted for dogs testing positive. We use an agent-based simulation to model
70 GW infections in dogs over time while accounting for the impacts of currently used interventions
71 as well as a diagnostic test. There are several important test performance factors that need to be
72 considered.⁵ Sensitivity and specificity rates which define the test accuracy represent the
73 probabilities that the test will, in our case, designate an infected dog as positive and an
74 uninfected dog as negative. Levecke et al. (2021) evaluated the minimal and ideal sensitivity
75 and specificity for new diagnostic tests for soil-transmitted helminthiasis (parasitic worms).⁶
76 Other studies have assessed the sensitivity and specificity requirements for hypothetical
77 diagnostic tests using simulation (e.g., leprosy⁷, statin-induced myopathy⁸, acute lower
78 respiratory infections⁹), including assessing the cost for false positives and false negatives.⁸
79 Other important factors we consider relate to deployment. Particularly when considering
80 implementation under resource-limited field conditions, performance must be considered in
81 combination with cost and ease of use.¹⁰ Similar to diagnostic testing for COVID-19, a highly
82 accurate but expensive test that is resource-intensive may not produce desired results in such a
83 setting as quickly as a less accurate but inexpensive and relatively simple test.^{11,12} Finally, with
84 no treatments available for GW in dogs, we address the necessary response of dog owners to
85 positive test results.

86 We compare various testing strategies using the simulated number of infections after multiple
87 years of implementing the testing intervention. We determine the necessary test characteristics,
88 deployment features, and owner behaviors for such a test to lead to faster GW elimination than
89 current intervention methods alone.

90 DATA AND METHODS

91 We received data from the Guinea Worm Eradication Program (GWEP) which reports the
92 number of dogs exuding worms and the number of worms exuded by village and month for years
93 2016-2021. We also collected temperature and rainfall data for the region which is made freely
94 available by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).¹³

95 We group villages into clusters (“Central”, “East”, and “West”) based on districts along the
96 Chari River (methodology reported by Wang et al.¹⁴). The number of dogs exuding worms over
97 time by geographic cluster (2016-2021) and by village (year 2021) are reported in Figure 1.



98
99 *Figure 1 The number of dogs with emerging worms from 2016-2021 by geographic cluster and by village for year 2021.*

100

101 We adapt the agent-based simulation model developed by Perini et al.¹⁵ and revised for multiple
102 water sources by Wang et al.¹⁴ to incorporate the testing intervention. The simulation model
103 simulates daily interactions between dogs, worms, and water sources, considering the life cycle
104 of GW, the impact of Abate[®] larvicide and weather on water infectivity, and the tethering of
105 dogs. Infectivity and weather parameter values used in this simulation model are reported in the
106 supplemental materials. These parameters were calibrated by Perini et al.¹⁵ and Wang et al.¹⁴
107 based on infection data provided by GWEP and weather data from NOAA for years 2016-2018.
108 In 2019, Chad reported an 86% increase in infected dogs and a 28% increase in villages with
109 infected dogs compared to 2018.¹⁶ When attempting to recalibrate model parameters using more
110 recent data (i.e., 2019-2021), we find that due to high variability/spikes in dog infections during
111 years 2019 and 2020, we can more closely simulate dog infections in year 2021 by using the
112 original infectivity and weather parameters calibrated based on years 2016-2018 (for details on
113 parameter calibration, see ^{14,15}).

114 During the dry season, dogs may visit multiple water sources but we assume that dogs will only
115 visit their cluster-specific water source during the rainy season because water is more plentiful.
116 Travel behavior for dogs in the dry season and a compartmental diagram of the transmission
117 cycle between dogs and a single water source are presented in the supplemental materials. Dogs
118 become infected by ingesting copepods which carry the infective mature GW larvae or short-
119 term transport/paratenic hosts. A dog with an emerging worm on a given day may infect the
120 water sources it visits. Emerging worms and corresponding GW larvae cohorts which are
121 released into the water are tracked by the simulation; when GW larvae mature (10-14 days),
122 water infectivity increases, and when GW larvae die (after 30 days), water infectivity decreases.
123 Pseudocode for the simulation model is provided in the supplemental materials.

124 Using the adapted simulation model with the added diagnostic-testing intervention, we examine
125 the interaction and impact of the following factors related to a potential diagnostic test:

- 126 1) sensitivity and specificity of the test,
- 127 2) timing of when the test can detect infection,
- 128 3) which dogs to test (and how often), and
- 129 4) dog-owner behaviors (i.e., compliance with tethering recommendations).

130 Interactions between these factors affect outcomes (e.g., specificity vs. tethering compliance,
131 accuracy vs. reach).¹⁷

132 **Sensitivity and Specificity of a Potential GW Diagnostic Test**

133 Test accuracy is determined by the sensitivity and specificity of the test. In our case, the test
134 sensitivity, or true positive rate, is the percentage of infected dogs that will correctly test positive.
135 Specificity, or true negative rate, is the percentage of infection-free dogs that will correctly test
136 negative. We consider varying sensitivity and specificity levels from 60% to 100%. We evaluate
137 the interaction of these values as well as the impacts on potential tethering compliance as the
138 rates of true positives and false positives impact the trust of dog owners and resulting compliance
139 with recommended interventions (i.e., tethering).

140 **Infection Detection Test Timing**

141 When infection can be detected is an important component in evaluating the potential impact of a
142 diagnostic test. We consider two possibilities:

- 143 1) immediate detection: positive result from initial infection until worm emergence, and

144 2) 30-day detection: worms are detected only if they will emerge within 30 days.

145 We also consider the possibility that a positive test result under the first option (immediate
146 detection) could include an estimated time interval until worm emergence. This might be
147 possible if the test measures and reports the parasite load and if this value could be used to
148 calculate how long the dog has been infected. Since GW infections in dogs last 10-14 months,
149 testing positive too early during this incubation period without an idea of when to expect worms
150 could undermine tethering compliance.

151 **Selecting Dogs to Test**

152 We assume a fixed population of dogs. Dogs are assigned to specific clusters but with the
153 potential to travel between clusters based on an ecological study of GW infection in dogs.¹⁸ We
154 consider two possibilities for dog selection for testing: random and systematic. Under random
155 testing, we consider scenarios with 10% or 20% of dogs randomly selected for testing during
156 each testing period. Under systematic testing, we divide dogs into cohorts, with one cohort
157 tested during each testing period (cohort sizes from 10%-100%). We consider testing dogs
158 monthly throughout the year. Due to the seasonality of GW in Chad, with more instances of
159 worm emergence during the rainy season than the dry season, and because of the long incubation
160 period of GW, we also consider testing dogs only during the off-peak season (dry season) for
161 worm emergence.

162 **Tethering of Dogs by Owners**

163 Whether or not a dog owner will tether a dog that tests positive for GW is potentially the most
164 important factor in determining the potential impact of a diagnostic test.

165 Because of the extent of possible owner behaviors and presence of stray or ownerless dogs, we
166 account for various options in the simulation model and make the following assumptions.

- 167 ▪ When a worm is emerging, we assume there is a 70% probability that the exuding dog
168 will be tethered, which aligns with recent reports.^{19,20}
- 169 ▪ When a dog has a positive test result, we assume that the probability that the dog will be
170 tethered at all is equal to the test specificity level. Scenarios where tethering probability
171 is independent of test specificity lead to unrealistic results. For example, scenarios with
172 high tethering probability and low test specificity lead to better outcomes and faster GW
173 elimination due to high tethering rates of mostly “false positive” dogs. In reality, when
174 specificity is low, dog owners over time will find the test to be unreliable and be less
175 likely to tether dogs following a positive test result.
 - 176 ➤ Based on the tethering probability, if a dog is tethered, then they have a daily
177 tethering probability, allowing for the possibility that they could be released at
178 night. We test daily tethering probabilities from 50% to 100%, and consider
179 tethering time periods of 30 days, 90 days, 180 days, and 360 days. If worms
180 emerge from a test-positive (tethered) dog during the tethering time period, we
181 assume 100% tethering and 100% daily tethering probability until the last worm
182 exudes.

183 We also consider dog owner behaviors for the case where the test will only detect infection
184 within 30 days of worm emergence. In this case, with a positive test result, we assume 100%
185 tethering and 100% daily tethering probability until the last worm exudes. Similarly, if an
186 estimated emergence window could be provided along with a positive test result under the

187 immediate detection test timing scenario, we assume 100% tethering and 100% daily tethering
188 probability during the exuding window, with no change in behavior until then.

189 **Additional Assumptions**


190 The model includes the following additional assumptions:

- 191 • Test results are instantaneous, and the test does not detect past infections.
- 192 • Abate[®] treatment impact = 50%. Bodies of water within a region are treated as a single
193 water source. If Abate[®] is applied to 50% of the bodies of water, then we assume a 50%
194 loss of infective stage guinea worm larvae in the combined water source.
- 195 • No proactive daily tethering apart from positive test results or worm emergence. While
196 proactive daily tethering is an intervention currently employed even in absence of a
197 known infection, we do not include this in the model so that the impact of the testing
198 intervention and tethering response can be more readily related to reductions in simulated
199 infections.

200 Figure 2 provides a conceptual diagram of monthly dog diagnostic testing.

201

202



203
204 *Figure 2 Conceptual diagram of monthly dog testing.*

205
206
207 We report results based on the average over 50 simulation iterations for each scenario; notably,
208 we observe minimal variation in results as iterations increase above 20.

209
210
211
212
213
11

214 **RESULTS**

215 **The impact of random versus systematic selection of dogs for testing:** Selecting dogs for
216 testing systematically is more beneficial than selecting dogs randomly; systematic selection helps
217 reduce the number of repeat tests given to a dog within a one-year timeframe. Table 1 reports the
218 percentage of dogs infected after 5 years of intervention for different scenarios with respect to
219 dog selection (random vs. systematic) as well as other factors including the percentage of dogs
220 tested monthly, test sensitivity, and owner behaviors (daily tethering probability and length of
221 tethering). For these scenarios, we assume 100% test specificity and immediate infection
222 detection. If the dogs tested each month are selected randomly, then one year of tethering
223 following a positive test result far outperforms 30-day tethering, but elimination is not achieved
224 within 5 years for either case. If dogs are selected systematically and tethered for one year
225 following a positive result, then elimination can be achieved if 10% of dogs are tested monthly
226 and test sensitivity is 100%, or if 20% of dogs are tested monthly with 90% or higher test
227 sensitivity. As test sensitivity goes down, infections increase but only under 1-year tethering. 30-
228 day tethering is insufficient to reduce infections over time regardless of test sensitivity.

229

230

231

232


233 *Table 1 The percentage of dogs infected after 5 years of the testing intervention under different scenarios with*
 234 *respect to daily tethering probability, length of time for daily tethering, sensitivity, dog selection (random vs.*
 235 *systematic), and percentage of dogs tested monthly.*

		30-Day Tethering		1-Year Tethering		1-Year Tethering	
Daily Tethering	(Se, Sp)	Dog Selection: Random		Dog Selection: Random		Dog Selection: Systematic	
		20%	10%	20%	10%	20%	10%
50%	(1,1)	1.54%	1.56%	0.35%	1.35%	0.00%	0.00%
	(.9,1)	1.54%	1.55%	0.55%	1.38%	0.00%	0.32%
	(.8,1)	1.54%	1.56%	0.81%	1.41%	0.02%	0.98%
	(.7,1)	1.55%	1.55%	1.04%	1.43%	0.22%	1.28%
70%	(1,1)	1.53%	1.54%	0.27%	1.31%	0.00%	0.00%
	(.9,1)	1.54%	1.55%	0.54%	1.35%	0.00%	0.25%
	(.8,1)	1.53%	1.54%	0.76%	1.39%	0.01%	1.00%
	(.7,1)	1.55%	1.55%	1.05%	1.43%	0.25%	1.24%
90%	(1,1)	1.53%	1.55%	0.36%	1.30%	0.00%	0.00%
	(.9,1)	1.55%	1.54%	0.55%	1.35%	0.00%	0.29%
	(.8,1)	1.55%	1.55%	0.78%	1.40%	0.02%	0.97%
	(.7,1)	1.53%	1.54%	0.99%	1.44%	0.25%	1.26%

236

237 **The interactions between test accuracy, tethering, and the percentage of dogs tested:** Figure
 238 3 reports the percentage of dogs infected after 5 years for systematic dog selection and varying
 239 test sensitivities and specificities from 60%-100%, tethering time periods (90, 180, and 360
 240 days), daily tethering probabilities (50%, 70%, and 90%) and percentage of dogs tested monthly
 241 (cohort sizes from 10%-100%); we assume immediate infection detection. As either the
 242 tethering time period increases in length, the percentage of dogs tested monthly increases, or test

243 sensitivity increases, the percentage of infections is reduced. In some cases, lower test
 244 specificity results in a lower percentage of infections due to the higher number of dogs tethered
 245 because of increases in false positive test results. In general, however, higher test specificity
 246 aligns with reductions in infections. The percentage of dogs infected after 5 years when also
 247 considering varying Abate[®] impact levels are reported in the supplemental material.




248
 249 *Figure 3 Percentage of dog infections after 5 years of the testing intervention, by daily tethering probability and length of*
 250 *tethering, test cohort size (systematic testing), sensitivity, and specificity.*

251
 252 **Impact of estimated worm emergence on tethering requirements:** Figure 4 reports the
 253 expected year of Guinea worm elimination (assuming the testing intervention began in 2022) and
 254 the total number of dogs that would need to be tethered monthly for 2 scenarios: (i) similar to the

255 analysis above, the test will return only a positive or negative (immediate detection), and (ii) the
256 test will return a positive or negative but with the addition of an estimated worm emergence
257 window. We assume 100% sensitivity and specificity for these scenarios. Elimination can be
258 achieved in 2 years with 1-year tethering and 10% of dogs tested monthly. With the addition of
259 worm emergence estimates, elimination can be achieved in 2 years with 20% or more dogs tested
260 monthly but fewer dogs tethered and for shorter time periods. If dogs are only tested during the
261 dry season, testing 25% monthly can lead to elimination in 2 years.

262

263



264

265 *Figure 4 The percentage of dog infections after five years of intervention and total dogs tethered monthly under two testing*
266 *strategies: (i) “positive/negative only” test and 50% daily tethering probability for one year following a positive test result, (ii)*
267 *test which reports positive/negative as well as an estimated worm emergence window with tethering only during the test-*
268 *positive dog’s worm emergence window, with (a) testing throughout the year and (b) testing only during the dry season.*

269

270 **30-day infection detection:** If infections are detectable only within 30 days prior to worm
271 emergence, then we find that more than 50% of dogs must be tested monthly to see a long-term
272 reduction in dog infections (dogs selected randomly or systematically). Elimination can be
273 achieved within 5 years for this scenario with a perfect test (100% sensitivity and specificity) and
274 100% tethering compliance only if 100% of dogs are tested monthly.

275

276 **DISCUSSION**

277 We find that a diagnostic test could be successful if used in conjunction with existing
278 interventions, and elimination can be achieved under the following conditions:

- 279 • 80% test sensitivity, 90% test specificity
- 280 • Systematic testing of each dog twice per year
- 281 • Long-term tethering (360 days) when a dog tests positive
- 282 • Very high tethering compliance (over 90%) when a dog tests positive or a worm is
283 emerging.

284 Systematically selecting dogs for testing is more effective than selecting dogs randomly. Fewer
285 dogs could be tested monthly when dogs are selected systematically; testing 10% of dogs
286 monthly with dogs chosen systematically results in fewer infections than testing 20% of dogs
287 monthly with dogs chosen randomly, for test sensitivities of 90% or higher (Table 1).

288 Shorter tethering time periods require higher test sensitivities and more frequent testing to lead to
289 elimination. Based on Figure 3, if the test is perfect (100% sensitivity, 100% specificity), then

290 elimination can be achieved within five years under the following owner tethering behaviors and
291 corresponding percentages of dogs tested monthly:

- 292 ▪ 360-day tethering → 10% of dogs tested monthly
- 293 ▪ 180-day tethering → 20% of dogs tested monthly
- 294 ▪ 90-day tethering → 33% of dogs tested monthly

295 As sensitivity and specificity decrease, the necessary tethering time to achieve elimination
296 increases. Notably, the impact of the test is heavily dependent on the length of tethering
297 following a positive test result, regardless of the sensitivity and specificity of the test.

298 The reported scenarios assume 50% Abate[®] impact and no proactive tethering. Proactive
299 tethering is an important tool for reducing the spread of GW. However, by assuming no
300 proactive tethering in the model, we can more confidently label greater reductions in GW disease
301 over time as direct consequences of the proposed testing intervention. Given the use of proactive
302 tethering in the field, the number of infected dogs reported herein should be overestimations and
303 elimination could be achieved even faster.

304 Guinea worm infections among dogs has low prevalence when considering the total population
305 of dogs; less than 3% of dogs were reported to be infected in 2021, based on data provided by the
306 GWEP. Thus, short of 100% test specificity, testing in a large but low prevalence population will
307 result in many false positives. Because there is no treatment for guinea worm disease, the
308 response to a positive test result is tethering of the infected dog and requires continued and long-
309 term efforts by the dog's owner. Over time, if a dog tests positive and is therefore tethered but
310 no worms emerge, owners may begin to doubt the test results and no longer comply with

311 tethering recommendations. A high rate of false positives will undermine the goals of diagnostic
312 testing for GW infections because dog owner behaviors are essential to elimination.

313 The requirement for long-term tethering could be eliminated if the test could provide an estimate
314 of the timing of worm emergence. Tethering for 1 year following a positive test result, with a
315 daily tethering probability of 50%, can achieve elimination within 2 years even with only 10% of
316 dogs tested monthly (for 100% test sensitivity and specificity). However, this result relies
317 heavily on tethering consistency over a long period of time, requiring tethering of more than
318 1,000 dogs at one time in response to testing and/or worm emergence (Figure 4). If the test
319 provided an estimate of the timing of worm emergence, test-positive dogs would only need to be
320 tethered when the worms are expected; elimination could be achieved and the monthly tethering
321 burden would be considerably lower. Monthly testing of 10% of dogs throughout the year is
322 sufficient to achieve elimination in less than 4 years under this scenario. Increasing testing
323 capacity to 20% of dogs monthly could achieve elimination in 2 years, with a higher burden on
324 testing resources but without the reliance on long-term tethering compliance. Testing dogs only
325 during the dry season produces similar results if testing capacities of 25% of dogs or more each
326 month can be achieved. Concentrated high-capacity testing efforts in the dry season could reduce
327 (or eliminate) the need for testing in the wet season, when efforts could be focused towards
328 tethering (with some crossover of tethering into the dry season).

329 If the test could only detect infection within 30 days of worm emergence, elimination can only
330 be achieved within five years if 100% of dogs are tested monthly and test-positive dogs are
331 tethered until all worms emerge. This is unlikely to be feasible. Even testing the same dogs as
332 frequently as every other month will not lead to elimination. If infection could be detected 60

333 days from worm emergence, with test-positive dogs tethered until all worms emerge, then testing
334 dogs every other month would indeed lead to elimination but at a high testing burden.
335 Depending on owner behaviors, testing for prepatent infections could have negative
336 consequences for elimination. Owners may choose to untether test-negative dogs; untethered
337 dogs could be exposed to infections in the water sources. Testing too soon after initial infection
338 without any knowledge of worm emergence timing could also have negative consequences. If a
339 dog tests positive but no worm emerges within a few months, then the owner may untether the
340 dog, possibly due to a loss of confidence in the test or simply fatigue from implementing the
341 intervention for so long. It is possible that the test could accurately detect a GW infection (true
342 positive) but a worm may not emerge (e.g., a worm may not reach the surface of the skin or the
343 detected worm could be male²¹). Trust in the accuracy of the test could fall as these cases could
344 be viewed as false positives. Because of the long incubation period and the fact that no treatment
345 exists, the rollout of the test and the response to a positive test result are critical for a test to lead
346 to faster elimination.

347 **Limitations**

348 In practice, test sensitivity may be higher than expected if test-positive dogs which do not exude
349 worms are assumed to be uninfected rather than possible true-positive cases without worm
350 emergence. There may be logistical challenges to following up with specific dogs (systematic
351 testing) as microchipping and/or unique identifiers are not perfect and Chad experiences high
352 dog mortality. The reported average lifespan of a dog living along the Chari River in Chad is 3
353 years. Our model is flexible to incorporate age and corresponding death probabilities but does
354 not currently take into account dog births or deaths; rather, the model maintains the same group
355 of dogs throughout the simulation. Data is not currently available which accurately tracks dog

356 populations over time so this is left to future research. However, the probabilistic nature of the
357 model allows us to capture other heterogeneities in the dog population (e.g., behaviors,
358 susceptibility).

359 We assume 44,000 dogs living along the Chari River based on regional data reported for years
360 2016-2018, and infectivity parameters were calibrated based on this population size. However,
361 recent estimates report that the population size for this region may be closer to 28,000. We
362 repeated the same analyses reported in Figure 3 with this smaller dog population size (keeping
363 infectivity parameters the same), and the results (percent of infections) are similar and
364 comparisons between different intervention strategies (e.g., tethering timing, dog selection) still
365 hold. The model does not consider diminishing tethering probabilities over time for test
366 specificities below 100%.

367 A diagnostic test could be a great asset in the fight for GW elimination. However, given that
368 there is no existing vaccine or treatment and because of the long incubation period of GW, the
369 impact of the test will greatly depend on the response of owners when a dog tests positive. The
370 strategy used to implement the test (i.e., dog selection and frequency) and education about the
371 importance of tethering compliance are critical factors to success.

372 This work has supported the development of a Target Product Profile (TPP) for a diagnostic test
373 to detect Guinea worm infection in animals. The TPP draft was released to the public for
374 comment by the World Health Organization on Oct. 6, 2023.²²

375

376

377

378 Acknowledgements

379 We thank Tyler Perini, Yifan Wang, Fernando Torres and Tchindebet Ouakou. This study was
380 supported by a grant from the Carter Center; the Global Campaign to Eradicate Dracunculiasis
381 receives financial support from a large coalition of organizations and agencies. Please refer to:
382 www.cartercenter.org/donate/corporate-government-foundation-partners/index.html. This
383 research was also supported in part by the Center for Health and Humanitarian Systems and the
384 following Georgia Tech benefactors: William W. George, Andrea Laliberte, Joseph C. Mello,
385 Richard “Rick” E. and Charlene Zalesky.

386

387 References

- 388 1. Hopkins D, Weiss A, Yerian S, Sapp S, Cama V. Progress Toward Global Eradication of
389 Dracunculiasis - Worldwide, January 2021-June 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*.
390 2022;71:1496-1502.
- 391 2. World Health Organization. Dracunculiasis (guinea-worm disease). 2022;
392 [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/dracunculiasis-\(guinea-worm-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/dracunculiasis-(guinea-worm-disease)#:~:text=As%20the%20incubation%20period%20of,by%20a%20year%20or%20more)
393 [disease\)#:~:text=As%20the%20incubation%20period%20of,by%20a%20year%20or%20more](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/dracunculiasis-(guinea-worm-disease)#:~:text=As%20the%20incubation%20period%20of,by%20a%20year%20or%20more).
394 Accessed January 13, 2023.
- 395 3. Eberhard ML, Ruiz-Tiben E, Hopkins DR, et al. The peculiar epidemiology of dracunculiasis in
396 Chad. *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene*. 2014;90(1):61.
- 397 4. Hopkins DR, Weiss A, Torres-Velez FJ, Sapp SGH, Ijaz K. Dracunculiasis Eradication: End-Stage
398 Challenges. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2022;107(2):373-382.
- 399 5. Olliaro P, Torreele E. Managing the risks of making the wrong diagnosis: First, do no harm. *Int J*
400 *Infect Dis*. 2021;106:382-385.
- 401 6. Levecke B, Coffeng LE, Hanna C, Pullan RL, Gass KM. Assessment of the required performance
402 and the development of corresponding program decision rules for neglected tropical diseases
403 diagnostic tests: Monitoring and evaluation of soil-transmitted helminthiasis control programs
404 as a case study. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2021;15(9):e0009740.
- 405 7. Blok DA-O, de Vlas SJ, Geluk A, Richardus JA-O. Minimum requirements and optimal testing
406 strategies of a diagnostic test for leprosy as a tool towards zero transmission: A modeling study.
407 *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2018;12(5):e0006529.
- 408 8. Mitchell D, Guertin JR, Dubois A, et al. A Discrete Event Simulation Model to Assess the
409 Economic Value of a Hypothetical Pharmacogenomics Test for Statin-Induced Myopathy in
410 Patients Initiating a Statin in Secondary Cardiovascular Prevention. *Mol Diagn Ther*.
411 2018;22(2):241-254.

- 412 9. Lim YW, Steinhoff M Fau - Girosi F, Girosi F Fau - Holtzman D, et al. Reducing the global burden
413 of acute lower respiratory infections in children: the contribution of new diagnostics. *Nature*.
414 2006;444 Suppl 1:9-18.
- 415 10. Dhillon RS, Kelly JD, Srikrishna D, Garry RF. Overlooking the importance of immunoassays. *The*
416 *Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2016;16(10):1109-1110.
- 417 11. Frew E, Roberts D, Barry S, et al. A SARS-CoV-2 antigen rapid diagnostic test for resource limited
418 settings. *Scientific Reports*. 2021;11(1):23009.
- 419 12. Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity — A Strategy for
420 Containment. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;383(22):e120.
- 421 13. NOAA. Climate Data Online. 2022; <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/cdo-web/>. Accessed December
422 6, 2022.
- 423 14. Wang Y, Perini T, Keskinocak P, Smalley H, Swann J, Weiss A. Evaluating the Effectiveness of
424 Potential Intervention Methods for Guinea Worm Disease in Dogs in Chad Using Simulations.
425 *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*. 2023;Ahead of Print.
- 426 15. Perini T, Keskinocak P, Li Z, Ruiz-Tiben E, Swann J, Weiss A. Agent-Based Simulation for Seasonal
427 Guinea Worm Disease in Chad Dogs. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2020;103(5):1942-1950.
- 428 16. WHO Collaborating Center for Dracunculiasis Eradication C. *Guinea Worm Wrap-up #266*. 2020.
- 429 17. Kim D, Pekgün P, Yildirim İ, Keskinocak P. Resource allocation for different types of vaccines
430 against COVID-19: Tradeoffs and synergies between efficacy and reach. *Vaccine*.
431 2021;39(47):6876-6882.
- 432 18. McDonald RA, Wilson-Aggarwal JK, Swan GJF, et al. Ecology of domestic dogs *Canis familiaris* as
433 an emerging reservoir of Guinea worm *Dracunculus medinensis* infection. *PLOS Neglected*
434 *Tropical Diseases*. 2020;14(4):e0008170.
- 435 19. WHO Collaborating Center for Dracunculiasis Eradication, CDC. *Guinea Worm Wrap-up #291*.
436 2022;
437 [https://www.cartercenter.org/resources/pdfs/news/health_publications/guinea_worm/wrap-](https://www.cartercenter.org/resources/pdfs/news/health_publications/guinea_worm/wrap-up/291.pdf)
438 [up/291.pdf](https://www.cartercenter.org/resources/pdfs/news/health_publications/guinea_worm/wrap-up/291.pdf). Accessed November 15, 2022.
- 439 20. WHO Collaborating Center for Dracunculiasis Eradication C. *Guinea Worm Wrap-up #297*. 2023.
- 440 21. Rawla P, Jan A. *Dracunculiasis*. *StatPearls*. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2023 Jan-.
- 441 22. World Health Organization. Call for public consultation - Target Product Profile for diagnostic
442 test to detect *D. medinensis* infection in animals and Target Product Profile for diagnostic test to
443 detect *D. medinensis* presence in environmental samples. 2023; [https://www.who.int/news-](https://www.who.int/news-room/articles-detail/call-for-public-consultation-tpp-for-diagnostic-test-to-detect-d.-medinensis-infection-in-animals-and-tpp-for-diagnostic-test-to-detect-d.-medinensis-presence-in-environmental-samples)
444 [room/articles-detail/call-for-public-consultation-tpp-for-diagnostic-test-to-detect-d.-](https://www.who.int/news-room/articles-detail/call-for-public-consultation-tpp-for-diagnostic-test-to-detect-d.-medinensis-infection-in-animals-and-tpp-for-diagnostic-test-to-detect-d.-medinensis-presence-in-environmental-samples)
445 [medinensis-infection-in-animals-and-tpp-for-diagnostic-test-to-detect-d.-medinensis-presence-](https://www.who.int/news-room/articles-detail/call-for-public-consultation-tpp-for-diagnostic-test-to-detect-d.-medinensis-infection-in-animals-and-tpp-for-diagnostic-test-to-detect-d.-medinensis-presence-in-environmental-samples)
446 [in-environmental-samples](https://www.who.int/news-room/articles-detail/call-for-public-consultation-tpp-for-diagnostic-test-to-detect-d.-medinensis-infection-in-animals-and-tpp-for-diagnostic-test-to-detect-d.-medinensis-presence-in-environmental-samples). Accessed October 28, 2023.

447

448