

1 **Temporal changes in SARS-CoV-2 clearance kinetics and the optimal design**
2 **of antiviral pharmacodynamic studies: an individual patient data meta-**
3 **analysis of a randomised, controlled, adaptive platform study (PLATCOV)**

4
5 Phrutsamon Wongnak¹, William HK Schilling^{1,2}, Podjane Jittamala^{1,3}, Simon Boyd^{1,2}, Viravarn Luvira⁴,
6 Tanaya Siripoon⁴, Thundon Ngamprasertchai³, Elizabeth M Batty^{1,2}, Shivani Singh^{1,2}, Jindarat
7 Kouhathong¹, Watcharee Pagornrat¹, Patpannee Khanthagan¹, Borimas Hanboonkunupakarn^{1,4},
8 Kittiyod Poovorawan^{1,4}, Mayfong Mayxay^{2,5,6}, Kesinee Chotivanich^{1,4}, Mallika Imwong^{1,7}, Sasithon
9 Pukrittayakamee^{1,4}, Elizabeth A Ashley^{2,5}, Arjen M Dondorp^{1,2}, Nicholas PJ Day^{1,2}, Mauro M Teixeira⁸,
10 Watcharapong Piyaphanee⁴, Weerapong Phumratanaprapin⁴, Nicholas J White^{1,2,†}, James A
11 Watson^{2,9,‡}, on behalf of the PLATCOV Collaborative Group[‡]

12
13 *Correspondence to: James A Watson, Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department
14 of Medicine, University of Oxford, New Richards Building, Old Road Campus, Roosevelt Drive, Oxford, OX3 7LG,
15 UK, jwatowatson@gmail.com; Nicholas J White, Mahidol Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit, Faculty of
16 Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok 10400, Thailand, nickw@tropmedres.ac

17
18 †Equal contribution

19 ¹ Mahidol Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok,
20 10400, Thailand;

21 ² Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, New
22 Richards Building, Old Road Campus, Roosevelt Drive, Oxford, OX3 7LG, UK;

23 ³ Department of Tropical Hygiene, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok,
24 Thailand;

25 ⁴ Department of Clinical Tropical Medicine, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok,
26 Thailand;

27 ⁵ Lao-Oxford-Mahosot Hospital-Wellcome Trust Research Unit, Microbiology Laboratory, Mahosot Hospital,
28 Vientiane, Lao P.D.R.;

29 ⁶ Institute for Research and Education Development, University of Health Sciences, Vientiane, Lao P.D.R.;

30 ⁷ Department of Molecular Tropical Medicine and Genetics, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University,
31 Bangkok, Thailand.;

32 ⁸ Clinical Research Unit, Center for Advanced and Innovative Therapies, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais,
33 Brazil;

34 ⁹ Oxford University Clinical Research Unit, Hospital for Tropical Diseases, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.

35 ‡A full list of the PLATCOV Collaborative Group is given in the appendix.

36

37

38 Abstract

39 **Background** Effective antiviral drugs prevent hospitalisation and death in COVID-19. Antiviral efficacy can be
40 assessed efficiently in-vivo by measuring rates of SARS-CoV-2 clearance estimated from serial viral genome
41 densities quantitated in nasopharyngeal or oropharyngeal swab eluates. We carried out an individual patient
42 data meta-analysis of unblinded arms in the PLATCOV platform trial to characterise changes in viral clearance
43 kinetics and infer optimal design and interpretation of antiviral pharmacometric evaluations. PLATCOV is
44 registered at ClinicalTrials.gov, NCT05041907.

45
46 **Methods** Serial viral density data were analysed from symptomatic, previously healthy, adult patients (within
47 4 days of symptom onset) enrolled in a large multicentre randomised adaptive pharmacodynamic platform
48 trial (PLATCOV) comparing antiviral interventions for SARS-CoV-2. Viral clearance rates over one week were
49 estimated under a hierarchical Bayesian linear model with B-splines used to characterise temporal changes in
50 enrolment viral densities and clearance rates. Bootstrap re-sampling was used to assess the optimal duration
51 of follow-up for pharmacometric assessment, where optimal is defined as maximising the expected z-score
52 when comparing effective antivirals with no treatment.

53
54 **Results** Between 29 September 2021 and 20 October 2023, 1262 patients were randomised. Unblinded data
55 were available from 800 patients (16,818 oropharyngeal viral qPCR measurements) of whom 63% (504/800)
56 were female. 98% (783/800) had received at least one vaccine dose and over 88% (703/800) were fully
57 vaccinated. SARS-CoV-2 viral clearance was biphasic (bi-exponential). The first phase (α) was accelerated by
58 effective interventions. For all the effective interventions studied, maximum discriminative power (maximum
59 expected z-score) was obtained when evaluating serial data from the first 5 days after enrolment. Over the
60 two-year period studied, median viral clearance half-lives estimated over 7 days have shortened from 16.6
61 hours (interquartile range [IQR]: 15.3 to 18.2) in September 2021 to 9.2 hours (IQR: 8.0 to 10.6) in October
62 2023 in patients receiving no antiviral drugs, equivalent to a relative reduction of 44% [95% credible interval
63 (CrI): 19 to 64%]. A parallel trend was observed in treated patients. In the 158 patients randomised to ritonavir-
64 boosted nirmatrelvir (3,380 qPCR measurements), the median viral clearance half-life declined from 6.4 hours
65 (IQR: 5.7 to 7.3) in June 2022 to 4.8 hours (IQR: 4.2 to 5.5) in October 2023, a relative reduction of 26% [95%CrI:
66 -4 to 42%].

67
68 **Conclusions** SARS-CoV-2 viral clearance kinetics in symptomatic vaccinated individuals have accelerated
69 substantially over the past two years. Antiviral efficacy in COVID-19 can now be assessed efficiently in-vivo
70 using serial qPCRs from duplicate oropharyngeal swab eluates taken daily for 5 days after drug administration.

71
72 **Funding** Wellcome Trust Grant ref: 223195/Z/21/Z through the COVID-19 Therapeutics Accelerator.

73

74 **Background**

75 Effective SARS-CoV-2 antivirals taken early in the course of COVID-19 illness accelerate viral clearance, hasten
76 symptom resolution, reduce transmission, and lower the probability of progression to severe disease [1–4].
77 Several small molecule drugs and monoclonal antibodies have proven antiviral efficacy in COVID-19, although
78 monoclonal antibodies are no longer used widely as immune evasion resulting from viral evolution has reduced
79 or abrogated their antiviral effects. Currently the most effective approved small molecule antiviral drug is
80 ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir, a main (3C-like) protease inhibitor [5]. Nirmatrelvir reduces progression to
81 severe disease in an unvaccinated high-risk population by around 90% [3]. But the combination drug is
82 expensive, ritonavir is contraindicated in many individuals because of drug-drug interactions, and ritonavir-
83 boosted nirmatrelvir frequently results in troubling dysgeusia [3]. The development of better tolerated drugs
84 (for example ensitrelvir, also a main protease inhibitor [6]) which could be administered more widely would
85 be of considerable public health value, particularly if they were affordable. To guide policies and practices the
86 antiviral activities of new drugs need to be compared against current treatments. Antiviral interventions can
87 be assessed and compared using acceleration in the rate of viral clearance as a surrogate for clinical benefit
88 [7–9]

89
90 The natural history of SARS-CoV-2 infection has changed markedly over the past four years since the beginning
91 of the pandemic [10]. Serious clinical outcomes, notably life-threatening inflammatory pneumonitis, are now
92 very rare. As a result, it has become very difficult to demonstrate clinical efficacy for new antiviral drugs
93 because the required trial sample sizes have become prohibitively large. This was illustrated in the very large
94 PANORAMIC trial of molnupiravir in the UK where only 203 primary events were observed in >25,000
95 randomised at-risk patients [11]. An alternative approach is to use rates of in-vivo viral clearance to
96 characterise and compare antiviral efficacies [12]. This is relatively straightforward and requires orders of
97 magnitude fewer patients [13]. PLATCOV is an ongoing multicentre phase 2 adaptive, open label, randomised,
98 pharmacometric platform trial in symptomatic low risk adults with COVID-19 (NCT05041907) [13]. Results from
99 this trial have demonstrated the utility of this approach in identifying ineffective drugs, and assessing and
100 comparing those which are clinically effective [5, 13–16].

101
102 Viral clearance in COVID-19 follows an approximate bi-exponential (biphasic) decay pattern [17–19]. Previous
103 studies have shown that effective antiviral interventions increase the rate of viral clearance in the first phase
104 [12, 20]. The effect of antivirals on the second phase is less clear and of lesser importance as viral densities are
105 usually fairly low (i.e., unlikely to be transmissible), close to the limit of detection, and clear spontaneously in
106 individuals who are not immunocompromised. The majority of small molecule drugs are given for up to 5 days
107 (e.g., remdesivir, molnupiravir, ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir) and have short elimination half-lives. Thus, the
108 primary aim of the PLATCOV trial was to characterise and compare antiviral effects during the first phase of
109 viral clearance. For this reason, the primary endpoint included measured viral densities only up until day 7. In
110 this paper we present an analysis of viral clearance in all patients with unblinded data in the PLATCOV study in
111 order to characterise temporal changes in viral kinetics and re-assess the optimal approach for characterising
112 and comparing antiviral effects in-vivo.

113

114 **Methods**

115 **The PLATCOV trial**

116 PLATCOV is an ongoing, open-label, multicentre, phase 2, randomised, controlled, adaptive pharmacometric
117 platform trial in Thailand, Brazil, Pakistan, and Laos. The trial provides a standardised quantitative comparative
118 method for in-vivo assessment of potential antiviral treatments in adults at low risk with early symptomatic
119 COVID-19. The primary endpoint is the rate of viral genome clearance estimated under a linear model fitted to
120 the log viral load (measured by qPCR in daily duplicate oropharyngeal viral swab eluates) data currently

121 sampled on Day 0 and over 7 days of follow-up (8 days in total), denoted α_{0-7} . All patients receive symptomatic
122 treatment (mainly paracetamol).

123 PLATCOV is coordinated and monitored by the Mahidol Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit (MORU) in
124 Bangkok. The trial was overseen by a trial steering committee and was conducted according to Good Clinical
125 Practice principles. PLATCOV is registered at ClinicalTrials.gov, NCT05041907.

126

127 *Ethics statement*

128 The trial was approved by the Oxford University Tropical Research Ethics Committee (Oxford, UK) and ethics
129 committees in each country. The results were reviewed regularly by a data and safety monitoring board. In
130 Thailand the trial was approved by the Faculty of Tropical Medicine Ethics Committee, Mahidol University,
131 (reference TMEC 21-058); in Brazil by the Research Ethics Committee of the Universidade Federal de Minas
132 Gerais (COEP-UFGM, Minas Gerais, Brazil, COEP-UFGM) and National Research Ethics Commission- (CONEP,
133 Brazil, COEP-UFGM and CONEP Ref: CAAE:51593421.1.0000.5149); in Laos by the National Ethics Committee
134 for Health Research (NECHR, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Submission ID 2022.48) and the Food & Drugs
135 Department (FDD, Lao People's Democratic Republic, 13066/FDD_12Dec2022); in Pakistan by the National
136 Bioethics Committee (NBC No.4-87/COVID-111/22/842) the Ethics Review Committee (ERC 2022-7496-21924)
137 and the Drug Regulatory Authority (DRAP Ref: No.0318/2022-CT (PS)).

138

139 *Participants*

140 Eligible participants were previously healthy adults aged 18–50 years who gave fully informed consent for full
141 participation in the study. The entry criteria were: (i) SARS-CoV-2 positive as defined either as a nasal lateral
142 flow antigen test that became positive within 2 minutes (STANDARD Q COVID-19 Ag Test, SD Biosensor, Suwon-
143 si, South Korea) or a positive PCR test with a cycle threshold value less than 25 (all viral gene targets) within
144 the previous 24 h (both these tests ensure the majority of recruited patients have high viral densities); (ii)
145 reported symptoms of COVID-19 for less than 4 days (<96 h); (iii) oxygen saturation on room air $\geq 96\%$
146 measured by pulse oximetry at the time of screening; (iv) unimpeded in activities of daily living; (v) agreed to
147 adhere to all procedures, including availability and contact information for follow-up visits.

148

149 Exclusion criteria included taking any concomitant medications or drugs, chronic illness or condition requiring
150 long-term treatment or other clinically significant comorbidity, laboratory abnormalities at screening
151 (haemoglobin <8 g/dL, platelet count <50 000/ μ L, abnormal liver function tests, and estimated glomerular
152 filtration rate <70 mL/min per 1.73 m²), pregnancy (a urinary pregnancy test was performed in females),
153 actively trying to become pregnant, lactation, contraindication or known hypersensitivity to any of the
154 proposed therapeutics, currently participating in a COVID-19 therapeutic or vaccine trial, or evidence of
155 pneumonia (although imaging was not required). After a detailed explanation of study procedures and
156 requirements all patients provided fully informed written consent.

157

158 Block randomisation was performed for each site via a centralised web-based application. At enrolment, after
159 obtaining fully informed consent and entering the patient details, the app provided the study drug allocation.
160 The no study drug group (unblinded, no placebos were used) comprised a minimum proportion of 20% of
161 patients at all times, with uniform randomisation ratios applied across the active treatment groups. The
162 laboratory team were masked to treatment allocation and the clinical investigators were masked to the
163 virology results until the study group was terminated. Apart from the trial statisticians (JAW and PW), the
164 clinical investigators were all masked to the quantitative PCR (qPCR) results.

165

166 Patients were included in this analysis if they had been randomised to a currently unblinded treatment arm
167 and had at least two days of follow-up (i.e., sufficient to estimate a clearance slope).

168

169 **Procedures**

170 All treatments were directly observed. Oropharyngeal swabs were taken as follows by trained study nurses. A
171 flocked swab (Thermo Fisher MicroTest® [Thermo Fisher, Waltham, MA, USA] and later COPAN FLOQSwabs®
172 [COPAN Diagnostics, Murrieta, CA, USA]) was rotated against the tonsil through 360° four times and placed in
173 Thermo Fisher M4RT (Thermo Fisher, Waltham, MA, USA) viral transport medium (3 mL). Swabs were
174 transferred at 4–8°C, aliquoted, and then frozen at –80°C within 48 h.

175

176 On day 0, following randomisation, four separate swabs (two swabs from each tonsil) were taken. Separate
177 swabs from each tonsil were then taken once daily from day 1 to day 7, on day 10, and on day 14 (total of 22
178 swabs). Each swab was processed and tested separately. Vital signs were recorded three times daily by the
179 patient (initial vital signs on the first day were recorded by the study team), and symptoms and any adverse
180 effects were recorded daily. The TaqCheck SARS-CoV-2 Fast PCR Assay (Applied Biosystems, Thermo Fisher
181 Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) quantitated viral density (RNA copies per mL). This multiplexed real-time PCR
182 method detects the SARS-CoV-2 N and S genes, and human RNase P gene in a single reaction. RNase P provides
183 a measure of the human cell content in the swab eluate, thus allowing for adjustment for variation in intra-
184 cellular viral RNA. Whole-genome sequencing was performed to identify viral variants and allocate genotypes
185 (appendix pages 2-4).

186

187 **Drugs evaluated**

188 The drugs or monoclonal antibodies evaluated in the platform were ivermectin (until 11th April 2022);
189 remdesivir (until 10th June 2022); casirivimab/imdevimab (Thailand only, until 20th October 2022); favipiravir
190 (until 30th October 2022); molnupiravir (until 22nd February 2023); fluoxetine (until 8th May 2023, data not
191 included in this analysis); tixagevimab/cilgavimab (until 4th July 2023, data not included in this manuscript);
192 nitazoxanide (Brazil, Laos and Pakistan, from 18th January 2022, ongoing); ensitrelvir (Thailand and Laos only,
193 from 17th March 2023, ongoing); and ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir (from 6th June 2022, ongoing as positive
194 control). All treatment doses were either directly observed or video observed.

195

196 **Statistical analysis**

197 **Data pre-processing**

198 Oropharyngeal eluate viral densities were quantified by PCR on 96-well plates. Each plate contained 10 or 12
199 ATCC controls (Manassas, VA, USA; these are heat-inactivated SARS-CoV-2 viruses [VR-1986HK strain 2019-
200 nCoV/USAWA1/2020]) varying from 10 to 10⁶ copies per mL. We fitted a linear mixed-effects model to all ATCC
201 control data from all available plates (using R package *lme4* version 1.1.34 [21]) with the genome copies per
202 mL on the log₁₀ scale (i.e., a linear relationship between CT values and known log₁₀ genomes per ml). The model
203 included fixed effects on the slope and intercept by laboratory (reference laboratory was Thailand), and
204 random effects on the slope and intercept by plate. Visual checks were done to make sure that controls on all
205 plates were in a reasonable range. The mixed-effects model was then used to transform the observed CT values
206 for the oropharyngeal eluates into log₁₀ genomes per mL. A CT value of 40 was considered left censored and
207 the plate specific censoring value was used in subsequent analyses. Appendix page 7 shows the estimated
208 standard curves and the model residuals by laboratory.

209

210 **Baseline viral densities**

211 The baseline viral density was defined as the geometric mean of the oropharyngeal eluate SARS CoV-2 densities
212 from the four independent swabs taken before randomisation. Temporal trends in the baseline viral densities
213 were characterised using generalised additive models (GAM) with penalised splines, as implemented in the
214 *mgcv* package version 1.9.0 [22]. As the timing of patient recruitment relative to their onset of symptoms could
215 have also changed over time (and this could affect baseline viral densities), the temporal effect was stratified
216 by the reported number of days since symptom onset. Pearson correlation coefficients between baseline
217 covariates were estimated using the R function *cor.test*.

218 *Bayesian hierarchical model to estimate viral clearance rates*

219 The analysis of the serial viral density data used the same core analytical model as in previous publications [5,
220 13–16]. We characterised oropharyngeal viral clearance under a single exponential decay model (linear decay
221 on the log scale). Under this model, the rate of viral clearance is defined as the slope parameter of a linear fit
222 to the serial log viral density measurements.

223 The general model likelihood takes the following form:

$$224 \quad y_{i,j,t} \sim \text{Student-t}(\lambda, a_0 + a_i + a_{\text{cov}} + \gamma x_{i,j,t} + b_0 e^{b_i + b_{\text{cov}} + b_{T(i)}} t, \sigma^2)$$

225 where:

- 226 • $y_{i,j,t}$ is the log viral density (\log_{10} genomes per mL) for the j -th swab of patient i at time t .
- 227 • $T(i)$ is the randomized treatment allocation for individual i .
- 228 • σ^2 is the variance of the residual error in the model fit; λ is the degrees of freedom for the Student-t error
229 model.
- 230 • a_0 and b_0 are the population mean intercept (baseline viral density) and slope (viral clearance rate),
231 respectively.
- 232 • a_i and b_i are the individual random effects on the intercept and slope, respectively.
- 233 • a_{cov} and b_{cov} are the linear covariate effects on the intercept and slope, respectively.
- 234 • $x_{i,j,t}$ is the human RNase P CT (scaled to have mean 0) for the j -th swab from patient i at time t , with a γ
235 parameter adjusting for the effect of human RNase P on the estimated viral density in the oropharyngeal
236 eluates.

237 Covariate terms for the slope and intercept were the reported days since symptom onset, study site, age, sex,
238 and number of vaccine doses received. This model parameterised the treatment effect relative to a reference
239 intervention (e.g. no study drug) as a proportional change ($e^{b_{T(i)}}$). As a sensitivity analysis, we parameterised
240 the treatment effect as an additive change ($b_0 e^{b_i + b_{\text{cov}}} + b_{T(i)}$). Model comparison was done using leave-one-
241 out as implemented in the package *loo* version 2.6.0 [23].

242
243 All viral densities below the lower limit of quantification (defined as a CT value of 40) were treated as left-
244 censored (the likelihood is the integral of the likelihood function below the censoring value). The linear model
245 fitted to data between days 0 and T_{max} (T_{max} was 7 days in the primary analysis) estimates the average clearance
246 rate over T_{max} days. We denote this as $\alpha_{0-T_{\text{max}}}$.

247
248 All models were fitted using weakly informative priors on all parameters (appendix pages 5-6). These priors
249 help computational convergence but have no effect on the parameter estimates (we showed this in previous
250 analyses [13]). In previous analyses we also used a nonlinear ‘up-down’ model (linear increase followed by
251 linear decrease), but this also had no effect on treatment effect estimates [13].

252 253 *Temporal changes in viral clearance dynamics*

254 To assess the temporal changes in viral clearance we added a penalised B-spline of degree 4 to the population
255 mean intercept a_0 (baseline viral density) and population mean slope b_0 (population viral clearance rate) in the
256 reference arm (for most analyses this is the no study drug arm). This was done by having many knots at regular
257 intervals (20 knots in the main analysis) with an informative penalisation prior on parameter changes across
258 knots. The penalisation prior governs the smoothness of the spline fit
259 (https://github.com/milkha/Splines_in_Stan).

260 *Meta-analysis of treatment effects*

261 The interventions studied (ivermectin, remdesivir, favipiravir, molnupiravir, ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir, and
262 casirivimab/imdevimab) were not randomised concurrently (appendix page 8). Thus, the large observed
263 temporal changes in baseline viral clearance rates bias cross-comparisons. We adjusted for temporal
264 confounding by explicitly incorporating into the model the temporal changes in viral clearance rates in the
265 treatment effect estimation. We fitted the full Bayesian linear model with a spline term on the baseline
266 clearance rate in the no study drug arm (which spans the entire study period) as a function of the calendar
267 date, with treatment effects parameterised as proportional changes in the average clearance. As a sensitivity
268 analysis, we assessed treatment effect heterogeneity with respect to the SARS-CoV-2 major lineages. This was
269 done by incorporating interaction terms between the intervention and the and viral lineage.

270

271 *Optimal design*

272 In light of the substantial changes observed in the viral clearance rates α_{0-7} in COVID-19 over the past two
273 years, we used the available comparative data to assess the optimal trial design for pharmacometric
274 assessment and thus the rapid identification and evaluation of effective antivirals. We define ‘optimal’ as the
275 design (duration and frequency of sampling) which maximises the expected z-score for differences in viral
276 clearance rates when comparing an effective randomised intervention with the concurrent no treatment arm
277 or comparing two concurrently randomised interventions with different antiviral efficacies. The z-score is the
278 estimated effect size divided by the estimated standard error. We bootstrapped the data (sampling patients in
279 each comparison with replacement) to obtain uncertainty intervals for the z-score estimates for each
280 comparison. In order for the z-scores to be comparable, each bootstrap sample contained 50 patients per arm.

281

282 The following designs were compared:

- 283 • Varying the duration of follow-up from 2 days (i.e., using qPCR measurements taken on days 0, 1 and 2)
284 to 14 days (using all available qPCR data);
- 285 • Varying the number of swabs taken each day (1 or 2);
- 286 • Comparing twice daily swabs taken on days 0 to 4 (10 qPCR measurements), versus twice daily every
287 other day (0, 2, and 4: 6 qPCR measurements), versus twice daily only on days 0 and 4 (4 qPCR
288 measurements).

289 Empirical expected z-scores were estimated under the linear model for six separate intervention comparisons
290 (each comparison used concurrently randomised patients): remdesivir versus no study drug;
291 casirivimab/imdevimab versus no study drug; molnupiravir versus no study drug; ritonavir boosted nirmatrelvir
292 versus no study drug; and ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir versus molnupiravir. The data for ritonavir-boosted
293 nirmatrelvir versus no study drug spanned 16 months with a brief hiatus in recruitment from January to
294 February 2023. We therefore arbitrarily split these data into two separate comparisons, before January 2023
295 and after February 2023. This allowed assessment of how much the temporal change in viral clearance was
296 driving the observed results. For each of these six comparisons, and each sampling design (duration of follow-
297 up and number of samples), we bootstrapped the data 50 times (sampling the patients with replacement) and
298 fitted the linear model to estimate the treatment effect and standard error.

299 Analysis code

300 All Bayesian models are written in stan and fitted using the *rstan* interface version 2.32.3 [24]. All analyses
301 were done using R programming language version 4.3.2 [25].

302


303 **Role of the funding source**

304 The funder of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or
305 writing of the report.

306 Results

307 Patient cohort


308 Between the 29th September 2021 and 20th October 2023, 1262 patients were randomised in the PLATCOV trial
 309 across six sites in four countries (Thailand, Brazil, Pakistan, and Laos). Patients randomised to ensitrelvir, the
 310 combination treatment of ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir and molnupiravir, and nitazoxanide were not included
 311 in this analysis as these comparisons are ongoing and their data are still blinded (Figure 1). Patients randomised
 312 to fluoxetine and tixagevimab/cilgavimab were not included as their data had not been published at the time
 313 of the analysis [26]. After excluding patients who withdrew consent, or who were not SARS-CoV-2 positive on
 314 any follow-up samples, or who had fewer than 2 days follow-up, the analysis population consisted of 800
 315 patients randomised across seven arms (not all concurrently, see appendix page 8). Nearly all included patients
 316 had received at least one vaccine dose (>98%) and the majority were fully vaccinated (>88%) prior to symptom
 317 onset (Table 1; appendix page 9). The majority (85%) of patients were randomised at one site in Thailand
 318 (Hospital for Tropical Diseases, Bangkok). The mean time from symptom onset to randomisation was 2.1 days
 319 (standard deviation [SD]: 0.8) and the geometric mean baseline viral density in oropharyngeal eluates was
 320 approximately 5.5 log₁₀ genomes per mL (SD: 1.2). Nearly all patients had complete viral density data between
 321 days 0 and 7 (less than 5% missing data in all intervention arms, see appendix page 10).
 322
 323



324
 325 Figure 1: PLATCOV trial profile and selection of patients used in this analysis. This analysis includes patients enrolled
 326 between 30th September 2021 and 20th October 2023 who met the modified intention to treat (mITT) criteria and whose
 327 viral clearance data have been unblinded and published. Patients are only excluded from the mITT if protocol deviations
 328 occur on days 0 to 2.
 329
 330
 331

332 **Baseline viral densities**

333 The baseline oropharyngeal eluate viral densities remained high over the two-year period (appendix page 11)
 334 but there were systematic trends over time associated with different SARS-CoV-2 variants. The reported
 335 interval since symptom onset was negatively correlated with the baseline viral density (correlation coefficient
 336 $\rho = -0.22$ [95% confidence interval (CI): -0.29 to -0.16]; $R^2 = 0.05$) (Figure 2A). Each reported additional day
 337 since symptom onset corresponded to a 1.9-fold [95% CrI: 1.5 to 2.4] decrease in the baseline viral density;
 338 and males had 1.4-fold [95% CrI: 1.0 to 2.1] higher baseline viral load densities (appendix page 12). There were
 339 small changes in the mean reported number of days since symptom onset over time. For example, during the
 340 Omicron BA.1 wave (1st January 2022 to 11th March 2022) patients were recruited slightly later on average,
 341 Figure 2B. In a multivariable spline model stratified by the interval since symptom onset, there was evidence
 342 of systematic temporal changes in baseline viral density over time which were not explained by differences in
 343 time from symptom onset (Figure 2C). As these are observational data it is not possible to determine causality
 344 (e.g., whether these differences result from variant specific mutations in the spike protein) but the data are
 345 compatible with higher peak viral densities with specific variants such as BA.2 and XBB.1.5-like.
 346
 347



348
 349 Figure 2: Changes in symptoms duration at enrollment and baseline viral densities over a two year period (2021-2023).
 350 Panel A: relationship between reported time since symptom onset and baseline viral density; panel B: temporal changes
 351 in the reported time since symptom onset. The vertical dashed line indicates the first Omicron BA.1 infection enrolled in
 352 the study; panel C: temporal changes in the baseline viral density stratified by reported time since symptom onset. Red
 353 lines (shaded areas) represent mean estimated values (95% confidence intervals) under a generalised additive model.

354 Table 1: Baseline demographics for the 800 patients included in the analysis. Unless specified, data are shown
 355 as *n* (%); †mean (standard deviation); ‡median (interquartile range).
 356


	No study drug (n=263)	Ritonavir- boosted nirmatrelvir (n=158)	Favipiravir (n=114)	Casirivimab/ imdevimab (n=88)	Remdesivir (n=67)	Molnupiravir (n=66)	Ivermectin (n=44)
Brazil	26 (10)	4 (3)	16 (14)	0	9 (13)	0	0
Thailand	230 (88)	150 (95)	98 (86)	88 (100)	58 (87)	65 (99)	44 (100)
Laos	3 (1)	4 (3)	0	0	0	1 (2)	0
Pakistan	4 (2)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Age (years)†	31.1 (8.1)	31.3 (8.9)	30.2 (7.5)	27.9 (7.3)	30.1 (8.2)	31.3 (7.5)	30.0 (7.0)
Female	173 (66)	109 (69)	71 (62)	55 (62)	35 (52)	37 (56)	24 (55)
Weight (kg)†	63.0 (13.6)	61.5 (12.3)	63.0 (13.6)	60.4 (12.3)	63.9 (11.0)	63.4 (14.7)	61.6 (12.3)
BMI†	23.2 (4.1)	23.0 (3.8)	23.1 (3.7)	22.1 (3.1)	22.7 (3.1)	23.1 (4.0)	22.3 (3.2)
Interval since symptom onset (days)‡	2 (1-3)	2 (1-2)	2 (2-3)	2 (2-3)	2.5 (2-3)	2 (2-2)	2 (2-3)
Admission viral load (log ₁₀ genomes/mL)‡	5.6 (4.7-6.4)	5.6 (4.6-6.4)	5.5 (4.7-6.2)	5.7 (5.0-6.4)	5.3 (4.8-6.3)	5.8 (5.0-6.4)	5.6 (5.0-6.6)
Vaccinated (%)	253 (96)	153 (97)	112 (98)	85 (97)	64 (96)	65 (99)	43 (98)
Start date	Sep 29, 2021	Jun 5, 2022	Oct 10, 2021	Oct 1, 2021	Oct 4, 2021	Jun 5, 2022	Sep 29, 2021
Finish date	Oct 20, 2023 (ongoing)	Oct 20, 2023 (ongoing)	Oct 29, 2022	Oct 19, 2022	Jun 7, 2022	Feb 14, 2022	Apr 11, 2022
SARS-CoV-2 variants							
Delta	10 (4)	0	11 (10)	13 (15)	10 (15)	0	12 (27)
BA.1	13 (5)	0	21 (18)	15 (17)	20 (30)	0	14 (32)
BA.2	52 (20)	1 (1)	42 (37)	30 (34)	37 (55)	5 (8)	18 (41)
BA.2.75	43 (16)	30 (19)	5 (5)	5 (6)	0	28 (42)	0
BA.4	2 (1)	3 (2)	3 (3)	0	0	2 (3)	0
BA.5	42 (16)	26 (17)	32 (28)	25 (28)	0	28 (42)	0
XBB	29 (11)	22 (14)	0	0	0	3 (5)	0
XBB.1.5-like	67 (26)	75 (48)	0	0	0	0	0
Other	5 (2)	1 (2)	0	0	0	0	0

357
 358

359 Viral clearance rates over time

360 Viral clearance increased substantially over the two years of the trial, as shown clearly in patients randomised
361 to no study drug (appendix page 13). Figure 3 shows the individual clearance rate estimates α_{0-7} under the
362 hierarchical Bayesian model with a spline term to capture temporal changes. In the no study drug arm, median
363 viral clearance rates have doubled approximately from $-0.43 \log_{10}$ units per day in September 2021
364 (corresponding to a half-life of around 16.6 hours [interquartile range (IQR): 15.3 to 18.2]), to $-0.78 \log_{10}$ units
365 per day in October 2023 (half-life of around 9.2 hours; IQR: 8.0 to 10.6). This change corresponds to a relative
366 shortening in viral clearance half-life of 44% [95% credible interval [CrI]: 19 to 64%] over two years. Similar
367 trends were noted for the treated individuals. For example, the mean viral clearance rate in the ritonavir-
368 boosted nirmatrelvir arm increased from $-1.12 \log_{10}$ units per day in June 2022 (half-life of 6.4 hours; IQR: 5.7
369 to 7.3) to $-1.50 \log_{10}$ units per day in October 2023 (half-life of 4.8 hours; IQR: 4.2 to 5.5). This change
370 corresponds to a relative shortening in viral clearance half-life of 26% [95%CrI: -4 to 42%]. The reduction of
371 viral clearance half-life was most apparent early in the study between September 2021 (Delta variant) to in
372 mid-February 2022 (BA.2 variant, appendix page 14). Subsequently, the half-life plateaued at around 12.5
373 hours during the BA.2, BA.4, BA.5, and BA.2.75 variants, and gradually reduced again after the emergence of
374 XBB and XBB.1.5-like variants in January 2023. There was no clear relationship between individual viral
375 clearance rate estimates and the number of days since symptom onset, sex, age, or the number of vaccine
376 doses received (appendix page 12).

377



378


379

380 Figure 3: Individual patient data meta-analysis of the platform trial showing estimated rates of viral clearance between
381 days 0 and 7 (α_{0-7}). Average clearance rates for each intervention (coloured lines) and the no study drug arm (black line)
382 are estimated from a spline fit. Treatment effects were parameterised as a proportional change in rate. The grey circles
383 and black lines for the no study drug arm are identical in each panel. Vertical lines show 95% credible intervals under the
linear model. A negative sign of the clearance rate indicates a decreasing directional change in viral density.

384

385 Optimising trial design

386 Figure 4 shows the expected z-scores for 6 randomised comparisons with a sample size of $n=50$ per arm as a
387 function of the duration of follow-up data included in the estimated viral clearance rate (varying from day 2
388 until day 14). For all pairwise comparisons there was a clear inverted-parabolic relationship between the
389 expected z-score and the duration of follow-up. The expected z-score was maximised for durations between 4
390 and 5 days. This implies that 4-5 days follow-up is optimal in terms of power when the data are analysed under
391 a linear model framework. Fitting a single component log-linear model over a longer time period systematically
392 reduced the estimate of the slope (i.e., lengthens the half-life) as it incorporated more of the slower β -phase
393 (second phase) of viral elimination in the estimate. Additional analyses highlighted the importance of taking
394 duplicate oropharyngeal swabs (appendix page 15). Reducing the frequency of the viral density measurements
395 reduced the expected z-score but with a lesser effect.
396




397
398 Figure 4: Z-scores for the six treatment effects as a function of the follow-up duration. The boxplots show the median and
399 interquartile range of the z-scores for the 50 bootstrap iterations. Each bootstrap dataset contained 50 patients per arm.
400 The red vertical dashed lines indicate the follow-up durations with maximal z-scores. All comparisons use concurrent
401 controls only.

402 Comparative assessment of antiviral interventions

403 Under the linear model with adjustment for temporal changes in clearance rates, there was a clear hierarchy
404 between the studied interventions (Figure 5). This hierarchy remained consistent when estimating treatment
405 effects using the average viral clearance rates up until day 5 (α_{0-5}) or up until day 7 (α_{0-7}). Ritonavir-boosted
406 nirmatrelvir had the greatest effect on viral clearance rates (approximately 90% increase in average clearance
407 rates α_{0-7} ; approximately 130% increase in average clearance rates α_{0-5}). The small molecule drugs remdesivir
408 and molnupiravir had very similar effects (approximately 35% increase in average clearance rates α_{0-7} ;
409 approximately 50 to 60% increase in average clearance rates α_{0-5}). The average treatment effect for the

410 monoclonal antibody casirivimab/imdevimab was of similar magnitude (ignoring known treatment effect
411 heterogeneity [14]). This meta-analysis confirmed the absence of any measurable effect of high-dose
412 ivermectin or high-dose favipiravir. For all four effective interventions, the analysis using the α_{0-5} average
413 clearance rates estimated substantially larger effect sizes, albeit with slightly wider uncertainty intervals. There
414 was no evidence of treatment effect heterogeneity for the small molecule drugs by viral variants, whereas the
415 effect of casirivimab/imdevimab varied considerably across the major viral variants (appendix page 16).
416
417



418
419 Figure 5: Individual patient 6data meta-analysis of the treatment effect of the six randomised interventions relative to no
420 study drug. Red: treatment effects based on the average clearance rates over 5 days (α_{0-5}); blue: treatment effects based
421 on the average clearance rates over 7 days (α_{0-7}). The models explicitly adjusted for temporal changes in viral clearance
422 in the no study drug arm using penalised B-splines. Points: median posterior estimate; thick and thin lines: 80% and 95%
423 credible intervals, respectively.
424

425 Discussion

426 SARS-CoV-2 oropharyngeal clearance rates in uncomplicated COVID-19 infections have become substantially
427 faster over the past two years. Natural viral clearance is now twice as fast as it was in September 2021. This
428 very granular prospectively gathered dataset confirms the findings of other larger scale observational cohorts
429 [27]. In this studied cohort, most of whom were fully vaccinated, waves of different viral variants succeeded
430 each other, following a generally similar pattern to that observed in most areas of the world. There was no
431 clear association between particular viral variants and increases in viral clearance rates. Instead, there appears
432 to have been a steady increase in clearance rates across all variants over time. Some variants (e.g., BA.2.75)
433 were clearly associated with higher baseline viral densities, which was not explained by differences in the
434 interval from symptom onset. It is not possible to ascribe with confidence the underlying cause for these higher
435 baseline viral loads, but it would be compatible with either differences in viral replication [28] or differences
436 in tropism [29].

437
438 The substantial acceleration in natural viral clearance over the past two years presumably reflects the interplay
439 between the acquisition of immunity and the antigenic changes in the evolving variants. This acceleration in
440 natural viral clearance has important implications for the assessment of in-vivo antiviral activity. SARS-CoV-2
441 oro/nasopharyngeal clearance is biphasic [17–19]. Effective drugs substantially accelerate the first phase. Two
442 years ago, when viral clearance rates were much slower, the inflexion in the clearance curve (transition from
443 the first to the second slower phase) was close to seven days, so fitting a single rate constant to the log-linear
444 decline in viral densities over seven days incurred relatively little bias. At current rates of viral clearance, the
445 inflexion point is much earlier, so forcing a single rate constant to the serial qPCR values over seven days incurs
446 greater bias resulting in progressive underestimation of the initial phase rate of clearance. This is important
447 for historical comparisons of antiviral activity as, with any viral clearance measure, drugs today will result in
448 faster viral clearance than they did earlier in the pandemic. Moderately effective drugs evaluated two years
449 ago (e.g., remdesivir) resulted in viral clearance rates that are similar to those in the no treatment arm of the
450 study today.

451
452 The PLATCOV study has characterised the effect of several antiviral drugs with findings which are generally
453 consistent with earlier clinical trials assessing their efficacy in the prevention of disease progression.
454 Comparative estimates of in vivo antiviral activity allow for rational selection of drugs now that comparison
455 based on clinical endpoints is no longer possible because of the prohibitively large sample sizes required in
456 clinical trials. Using the observed differences in the viral clearance profiles between effective and ineffective
457 drugs or the no treatment arm allowed determination of the sampling duration which best characterised these
458 differences. The greatest differences between effective and ineffective (or no) drugs were observed for
459 assessments made from serial samples taken over 4-5 days. Although there is substantial inter-individual
460 variation in clearance rates, and also intra-individual variation between the serial viral density estimates, with
461 current viral clearance rates daily sampling still has adequate discriminatory power. But, if this trend of
462 increasing rapidity of viral clearance continues, then it may be necessary to sample twice daily over a shorter
463 period. Shortening the viral clearance serial sampling to five days simplifies the comparative assessment of
464 antiviral drugs in COVID-19 (although later sampling is still necessary if rebound is being assessed).

465
466 These data emphasise the critical importance of fixed ratio contemporary comparators in platform trials.
467 Temporal confounding across non-currently randomised interventions or for time varying randomisation ratios
468 (this occurs in response adaptive trials) requires model dependent adjustment. Even an ineffective drug will
469 appear effective if compared with a historical control. The exact ranking of all unblinded interventions studied
470 on the platform in the meta-analysis is dependent in part on correct adjustment for the temporal trends. This
471 issue is particularly salient for the comparison between remdesivir and molnupiravir.

472

473 SARS-CoV-2 is today predominantly a mild infection in vaccinated individuals which does not require specific
474 antiviral treatment. This justifies the recruitment of patients into the pharmacometric assessment who receive
475 no specific treatment. But in patients with underlying conditions or the elderly, COVID-19 is still potentially
476 dangerous and specific antiviral treatment is required. There is no reason to believe that antiviral activities are
477 different in these high-risk subgroups to those observed in low-risk patients enrolled in this study. At the
478 beginning of the pandemic there were no effective interventions and so identifying minor accelerations in viral
479 clearance was relevant. Today modest acceleration in the rate of viral clearance may still be therapeutically
480 relevant for chemoprevention [26], but it is very unlikely that less effective drugs than those now being used
481 would be deployed for the treatment of symptomatic COVID-19. The simple methodology employed in the
482 PLATCOV trial is efficient, and very well tolerated, and it identifies efficacious antivirals (i.e., those which result
483 in viral clearance rates that are >20% faster than no drug) with sample sizes which are usually less than 40
484 studied patients per arm.

485
486 Although this is the largest detailed pharmacometric study in COVID-19, it has some limitations. Most of the
487 patients were studied in Bangkok, Thailand so the temporal trends observed could be different in other parts
488 of the world. The cause of the substantial inter-patient variations in viral clearance and the overall acceleration
489 in viral clearance over the past two years has not been characterised adequately. Over 95% of patients were
490 vaccinated before the enrolment infection and so we cannot characterise differences in treatment effects
491 between vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals. Although there is a clear rationale for using viral clearance
492 as a surrogate endpoint in assessing therapeutics [8, 9], additional data are still needed to characterise the
493 relationship between acceleration in viral clearance and clinical outcomes such as rate of symptom clearance.
494

495 In summary, SARS-CoV-2 viral clearance has accelerated substantially over the past two years necessitating a
496 shortening of the sampling time to evaluate and compare antiviral drugs efficiently.
497

498 **Acknowledgements**

499 NJW is a Principal Research Fellow funded by the Wellcome Trust (093956/Z/10/C). JAW is a Sir Henry Dale
500 Fellow funded by the Wellcome Trust (223253/Z/21/Z). This study is supported by Wellcome Trust grant
501 reference 223195/Z/21/Z through the COVID-19 Therapeutics Accelerator. We thank all the patients with
502 COVID-19 who volunteered to be part of the study. We thank the data safety and monitoring board (Tim Peto,
503 André Siqueira, and Panisadee Avirutnan); the trial steering committee (Nathalie Strub-Wourgaft, Martin
504 Llewelyn, Deborah Waller, and Attavit Asavisanu); Sompob Saralamba and Tanaphum Wichaita for developing
505 the Rshiny randomisation app; and Mavuto Mukaka for invaluable statistical support. We also thank all the
506 staff of the clinical trials unit at MORU, Thermo Fisher for their excellent support with this project, and all the
507 hospital staff at the Hospital for Tropical Diseases, as well as those involved in sample processing in MORU and
508 the processing and analysis at the Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, molecular genetics
509 laboratory, and the malaria laboratory. We thank the Department of Medical Services, Ministry of Public
510 Health, Thailand for the generous support and the donation of the molnupiravir and ritonavir-boosted
511 nirmatrelvir for this study. We thank the MORU Clinical Trials Support Group for data management, monitoring
512 and logistics, and the purchasing, administration and support staff at MORU.
513

514 This research was partly funded by Wellcome. A CC BY or equivalent licence is applied to the author accepted
515 manuscript arising from this submission, in accordance with the grant's open access conditions.
516

517 **Authorship contributions**

518 PW: conceptualisation, data curation, formal analysis, methodology, visualisation and writing original draft;
519 WHKS: conceptualisation, funding acquisition, investigation, methodology, project administration, supervision,
520 validation and writing- original draft; NJW: conceptualisation, funding acquisition, methodology, supervision,
521 validation and writing- original draft; JAW: conceptualisation, data curation, formal analysis, funding

522 acquisition, methodology, visualisation and writing original draft; PJ: investigation, methodology, project
523 administration, supervision, and validation; SB, and SS: investigation, methodology and project administration;
524 VL, TS, TN, BH, and KP: investigation, methodology, and supervision; EMB: data curation, and formal analysis;
525 JK, WPa, and PK: investigation, methodology; MM, and EAA: investigation, supervision, funding acquisition; KC
526 and MI: formal analysis, investigation, resources, supervision; SP, AMD, MMT, WPi, WPh: methodology,
527 investigation, resources, supervision; NPJD: funding acquisition, methodology, investigation, resources,
528 supervision. All authors were involved in writing, review, and editing of the manuscript. PW, WHKS, EMB, MI,
529 NJW, JAW have directly accessed and verified the underlying data reported in the manuscript. All authors had
530 full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

531

532 **Data Sharing**

533 All data and code necessary to reproduce the results in this analysis are openly available at
534 <https://github.com/jwatowatson/Determinants-viral-clearance>

535

536 All code and de-identified participant data required for replication of the study's endpoints are openly
537 accessible via Zenodo, as well as the study protocol and statistical analysis plan, from publication date onwards.
538 Individual patient data can be requested and may be shared according to the terms defined in the MORU data
539 sharing policy with other researchers to use in the future from the date of publication. Further information on
540 how to apply is on the MORU Tropical Health Network site.

541

542 **Declaration of interests**


543 We declare no competing interests.



544 **References**

- 545 1. Weinreich DM, Sivapalasingam S, Norton T, Ali S, Gao H, Bhore R, et al. REGEN-COV Antibody Combination
546 and Outcomes in Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;385(23):e81.
- 547 2. Gottlieb RL, Vaca CE, Paredes R, Mera J, Webb BJ, Perez G, et al. Early Remdesivir to Prevent Progression to
548 Severe Covid-19 in Outpatients. *N Engl J Med*. 2022 Jan 27;386(4):305–15.
- 549 3. Hammond J, Leister-Tebbe H, Gardner A, Abreu P, Bao W, Wisemandle W, et al. Oral Nirmatrelvir for High-
550 Risk, Nonhospitalized Adults with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2022;386(15):1397–408.
- 551 4. Jayk Bernal A, Gomes da Silva MM, Musungaie DB, Kovalchuk E, Gonzalez A, Delos Reyes V, et al. Molnupiravir
552 for Oral Treatment of Covid-19 in Nonhospitalized Patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2022;386(6):509–20.
- 553 5. Schilling WHK, Jittamala P, Watson JA, Boyd S, Luvira V, Siripoon T, et al. Antiviral efficacy of molnupiravir
554 versus ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir in patients with early symptomatic COVID-19 (PLATCOV): an open-label,
555 phase 2, randomised, controlled, adaptive trial. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2024 Jan 1;24(1):36–45.
- 556 6. Yotsuyanagi H, Ohmagari N, Doi Y, Yamato M, Bac NH, Cha BK, et al. Efficacy and Safety of 5-Day Oral
557 Ensitrelvir for Patients With Mild-to-Moderate COVID-19: The SCORPIO-SR Randomized Clinical Trial. *MedRxiv*
558 Prepr [Internet]. 2023; Available from:
559 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2023/07/13/2023.07.11.23292264>
- 560 7. Parienti JJ, de Grooth HJ. Clinical relevance of nasopharyngeal SARS-CoV-2 viral load reduction in outpatients
561 with COVID-19. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2022 Apr;77(7):2038–9.
- 562 8. Elias KM, Khan SR, Stadler E, Schlub TE, Cromer D, Polizzotto MN, et al. Viral clearance as a surrogate of
563 clinical efficacy for COVID-19 therapies in outpatients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *MedRxiv Prepr*.
564 2023;2023–06.
- 565 9. Singh S, Boyd S, Schilling W, Watson JA, Mukaka M, White NJ. The relationship between viral clearance rates
566 and disease progression in early symptomatic COVID-19; a systematic review and meta-regression analysis. *J*
567 *Antimicrob Chemother*. 2024; dkae045.


- 568 10. World Health Organization. Statement on the Fifteenth Meeting of the International Health Regulations
569 (2005) Emergency Committee regarding the Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Pandemic [Internet]. 2023.
570 Available from: [https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-fifteenth-meeting-of-the-](https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-fifteenth-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-pandemic)
571 [international-health-regulations-\(2005\)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-coronavirus-disease-\(covid-19\)-](https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-fifteenth-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-pandemic)
572 [pandemic](https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-fifteenth-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-pandemic). Date accessed: February 9, 2024.
- 573 11. Butler CC, Hobbs FDR, Gbinigie OA, Rahman NM, Hayward G, Richards DB, et al. Molnupiravir plus usual
574 care versus usual care alone as early treatment for adults with COVID-19 at increased risk of adverse outcomes
575 (PANORAMIC): an open-label, platform-adaptive randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*. 2023 Jan
576 28;401(10373):281–93.
- 577 12. Watson JA, Kissler SM, Day NPJ, Grad YH, White NJ. Characterizing SARS-CoV-2 Viral Clearance Kinetics to
578 Improve the Design of Antiviral Pharmacometric Studies. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2022 Jul
579 19;66(7):e00192-22.
- 580 13. Schilling WHK, Jittamala P, Watson JA, Ekkapongpisit M, Siripoon T, Ngamprasertchai T, et al.
581 Pharmacometrics of high-dose ivermectin in early COVID-19 from an open label, randomized, controlled
582 adaptive platform trial (PLATCOV). *eLife*. 2023 Feb 21;12:e83201.
- 583 14. Jittamala P, Schilling WHK, Watson JA, Luvira V, Siripoon T, Ngamprasertchai T, et al. Clinical antiviral efficacy
584 of remdesivir and casirivimab/imdevimab against the SARS-CoV-2 Delta and Omicron variants. *MedRxiv Prepr*.
585 2022;2022–10.
- 586 15. Luvira V, Schilling WHK, Jittamala P, Watson JA, Boyd S, Siripoon T, et al. Clinical antiviral efficacy of favipiravir
587 in early COVID-19 (PLATCOV): an open-label, randomised, controlled adaptive platform trial. *BMC Infect Dis*.
588 2024;24:89
- 589 16. Jittamala P, Schilling WHK, Watson JA, Luvira V, Siripoon T, Ngamprasertchai T, et al. Clinical Antiviral Efficacy
590 of Remdesivir in Coronavirus Disease 2019: An Open-Label, Randomized Controlled Adaptive Platform Trial
591 (PLATCOV). *J Infect Dis*. 2023 Jul 20;jjad275.
- 592 17. Néant N, Lingas G, Le Hingrat Q, Ghosn J, Engelmann I, Lepiller Q, et al. Modeling SARS-CoV-2 viral kinetics
593 and association with mortality in hospitalized patients from the French COVID cohort. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2021
594 Feb 23;118(8):e2017962118.
- 595 18. Ke R, Martinez PP, Smith RL, Gibson LL, Mirza A, Conte M, et al. Daily longitudinal sampling of SARS-CoV-2
596 infection reveals substantial heterogeneity in infectiousness. *Nat Microbiol*. 2022 May 1;7(5):640–52.
- 597 19. Ribeiro RM, Choudhary MC, Deo R, Giganti MJ, Moser C, Ritz J, et al. Variant-Specific Viral Kinetics in Acute
598 COVID-19. *J Infect Dis*. 2023 Aug 31;228(Supplement_2):S136–43.
- 599 20. Chew KW, Moser C, Daar ES, Wohl DA, Li JZ, Coombs RW, et al. Antiviral and clinical activity of bamlanivimab
600 in a randomized trial of non-hospitalized adults with COVID-19. *Nat Commun*. 2022 Aug;13(1):4931.
- 601 21. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *J Stat Softw*. 2015
602 Oct 7;67(1):1–48.
- 603 22. Wood SN. Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood estimation of semiparametric
604 generalized linear models. *J R Stat Soc Ser B Stat Methodol*. 2011 Jan;73(1):3–36.
- 605 23. Vehtari A, Gelman A, Gabry J. Practical Bayesian model evaluation using leave-one-out cross-validation and
606 WAIC. *Stat Comput*. 2017 Sep 1;27(5):1413–32.
- 607 24. Stan Development Team. RStan: the R interface to Stan [Internet]. 2023. Available from: [https://mc-](https://mc-stan.org/)
608 [stan.org/](https://mc-stan.org/)
- 609 25. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing [Internet]. Vienna, Austria: R
610 Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2023. Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 611 26. Podjanee Jittamala, Simon Boyd, William HK Schilling, James A Watson, Thundon Ngamprasertchai, Tanaya
612 Siripoon, et al. Antiviral efficacy of fluoxetine in early symptomatic COVID-19: an open-label, randomised,
613 controlled, adaptive platform trial (PLATCOV). *medRxiv*. 2024 Jan 1;2024.01.16.24301337.
- 614 27. Lin Y, Wu P, Tsang TK, Wong JY, Lau EHY, Yang B, et al. Viral kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 following onset of COVID-
615 19 in symptomatic patients infected with the ancestral strain and omicron BA.2 in Hong Kong: a retrospective
616 observational study. *Lancet Microbe*. 2023 Sep 1;4(9):e722–31.


- 617 28. Marc A, Marlin R, Donati F, Prague M, Kerioui M, Hérate C, et al. Impact of variants of concern on SARS-
618 CoV-2 viral dynamics in non-human primates. PLOS Comput Biol. 2023 Aug;19(8):1–16.
- 619 29. Meng B, Abdullahi A, Ferreira IATM, Goonawardane N, Saito A, Kimura I, et al. Altered TMPRSS2 usage by
620 SARS-CoV-2 Omicron impacts infectivity and fusogenicity. Nature. 2022 Mar 1;603(7902):706–14.
- 621












C Temporal dynamics of baseline viral densities by time since symptom onset








Z-score



Days follow-up included



Follow-up duration ● 5 days ● 7 days