1	Molnupiravir clinical trial simulation suggests that polymerase chain
2	reaction underestimates antiviral potency against SARS-CoV-2
3	
4	
5	Authors
6 7 0	Shadisadat Esmaeili, ¹ * Katherine Owens, ¹ Jessica Wagoner, ² Stephen J. Polyak, ² Shengyuan Zhang ³ , Joseph F. Standing ^{3,4} , David M. Lowe ^{5,6} , Joshua T. Schiffer ^{1,7}
8 9	Affiliations
10	¹ Vaccine and Infectious Disease Division, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center; Seattle, WA, USA.
11	² Department of Laboratory Medicine & Pathology, University of Washington; Seattle, WA, USA.
12	³ Infection, Immunity and Inflammation, Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, University
13	College London, London, UK
14	⁴ Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Trust, London, UK
15 16	⁵ Department of Clinical Immunology, Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK. ⁶ Institute of Immunity and Transplantation, University College London, London, UK
17	⁷ Department of Medicine, University of Washington; Seattle, WA, USA.
18	
19	*Corresponding Author: sesmaeil@fredhutch.org
20	
21	

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

22 Abstract

23

24 Molnupiravir is an antiviral medicine that induces lethal copying errors into SARS-CoV-2 RNA.

25 Molnupiravir reduced hospitalization in one pivotal trial by 50% and had variable effects on

26 reducing viral RNA levels in three separate trials. We used mathematical models to simulate

these trials and closely recapitulated their virologic outcomes. Model simulations suggest lower

antiviral potency against pre-omicron SARS-CoV-2 variants than against omicron. We estimate
 that in vitro assays underestimate in vivo potency 7-8 fold against omicron variants. Our model

30 suggests that because polymerase chain reaction detects molnupiravir mutated variants, the true

reduction in genetically intact viral RNA is underestimated by ~0.5 log in the two trials, which

32 included participants with omicron. Our results reinforce past work suggesting that in vitro

33 assays are unreliable for estimating in vivo antiviral drug potency and suggest that virologic

34 endpoints for respiratory virus clinical trials should be catered to the drug mechanism of action.

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

42 Introduction

43

Molnupiravir is an antiviral drug that induces errors in the SARS-CoV-2 genome, which 44

45 typically renders the virus unable to replicate further.¹ In the randomized double-blinded MOVe-

OUT trial, which enrolled unvaccinated individuals when delta, mu, and gamma variants of 46

47 concern (VOC) were circulating, molnupiravir reduced hospitalization by 50% and viral load after treatment by 0.3 log relative to placebo.² In the platform adaptive PANORAMIC trial, 48

49 which enrolled vaccinated individuals when omicron VOCs were circulating, molnupiravir did

not lower hospitalization rates, which were only 1% in both arms, but lowered viral load after 50

51 treatment by 0.94 log relative to usual care.³ In the platform adaptive PLATCOV trial, which

enrolled low-risk individuals when omicron VOCs were circulating, molnupiravir lowered viral 52

53 load after treatment by 1.09 log relative to usual care.⁴ Taken together, these trials demonstrate

54 that molnupiravir has both clinical and virologic efficacy which varied across trials and viral

55 variants.

56

57 Overall, use of molnupiravir has been lower than that of nirmatrelvir / ritonavir based on lower

reduction in hospitalization in MOVe-OUT relative to the EPIC-HR trial for nirmatrelvir / 58

59 ritonavir.⁵ A concern has also been raised that molnupiravir's mechanism of action could

60 generate novel mutants that persist after cessation of treatment,⁶ and then spread in the

population.⁷ Nevertheless, PANORAMIC and PLATCOV results suggest high potency, and 61

molnupiravir is still considered in individuals in whom nirmatrelvir / ritonavir is contraindicated, 62

63 and in combination with other drugs in immunocompromised hosts.^{8,9} There is currently no

explanation for the disparate antiviral effects in MOVe-OUT versus PANORAMIC and 64

65 PLATCOV. Moreover, the fact that polymerase chain reaction (PCR) detects drug-altered viral

RNA molecules⁶ has not always been considered in the analysis of trial outcomes. 66

67

We previously used clinical trial simulation to reproduce results from nirmatrelvir / ritonavir 68

trials for SARS-CoV-2.^{10, 11} We first validated a viral immune dynamic model (VID) against a 69

very large prospective cohort of infections that included multiple VOCs.¹¹ We used diverse 70

71 virologic output from this model to create simulated cohorts for the control arms of trials. We

then layered pharmacokinetic (PK) and pharmacodynamic (PD) models for nirmatrelvir / 72

ritonavir on the VID models to simulate treatment arms.¹⁰ This approach recapitulated mean viral 73

load reduction in the EPIC-HR and PLATCOV trials, as well as individual viral load trajectories 74

75 in PLATCOV. The validated model was then used to explain the high frequency of virologic and

concurrent symptomatic rebound with use in the community,¹² despite very low levels of virologic and symptomatic rebound in the EPIC-HR trial.^{13, 14} Model output suggests that 76

77

extending therapy from 5 to 10 days would nearly eliminate rebound,¹⁰ a result confirmed with 78

79 modeling of separate data by another group.¹⁵

80

Here we expand this approach to develop a new joint VID-PK-PD model to account for the 81

unique mechanism of action of molnupiravir. We simulate by fitting the model to results from the 82

MOVe-OUT, PLATCOV and PANORAMIC trials. Our results suggest that quantitative viral 83

84 PCR likely underestimates the reduction in non-mutated viral RNA and therefore the true

- 85 potency of molnupiravir during omicron infections.
- 86

87

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

- 88
- 89

90 **Results**

91

92 Viral immune dynamic, pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic clinical trial simulation93 models.

94 We previously described our viral immune dynamic (VID) model that was fit to diverse viral

95 loads from 1510 SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals in the National Basketball Association

96 cohort.^{11, 16} The model assumes a finite number of susceptible cells. An eclipse phase delays viral

97 production by infected cells. In keeping with an early innate immune response, susceptible cells

98 become refractory to infection in the presence of infected cells but also revert to a susceptible 99 state at a constant rate. Infected cells are cleared by cytolysis and delayed acquired immunity.

- 99 state at a constant rate. Infected cells are cleared by cytolysis and delayed acquired immunity,100 which is activated in a time-dependent fashion (Fig 1a). We used a mixed-effect population
- approach implemented in Monolix to estimate model parameters.¹⁷
- 102



103

Fig 1. Schematic of the (a) viral dynamic model and (b) molnupiravir PK-PD model.

105

To reproduce levels of molnupiravir, we used a three-compartment pharmacokinetic (PK) model
(Fig. 1b). Using Monolix and the mixed-effect population approach, we estimated parameter
values by fitting the model to the average plasma concentration of healthy subjects.¹⁸ The model
closely recapitulated observed drug levels following multiple doses of 50, 100, 200, 300, 400,
600, and 800 mg given twice daily for five days (Fig S1, Table S1). The estimated value for the
transition rate from plasma to peripheral compartment (was dose-dependent in the form of

- 112 . All other PK parameters were dose independent. For the pharmacodynamic
- (PD) model, we assumed drug efficacy follows a Hill equation with respect to concentration. We
- parameterized the model using in vitro efficacy data collected at different concentrations (details
 in Materials and Methods, Fig S2, Table S2).¹⁹

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

- 116 We combined the VID and PKPD models by using treatment efficacy to convert non-mutated
- 117 virus to mutated virus, both of which are assumed to be detected with polymerase chain reaction
- 118 (PCR) assays, given the low probability of drug-induced mutations in the PCR primer region.
- This assumption is based on the observed drug-induced mutation of approximately 1 in 2000
 sites.²⁰ Given the average length of most PCR primers of ~25 base pairs, the chance of the
- primer remaining unmutated after treatment is $(1999/2000)^{25}$, or 98.76%. A limitation of viral
- 122 load data from the included clinical trials is that it lacks early pre-symptomatic endpoints to
- estimate the viral expansion slope. To further train the model, we included 1023 Omicron-
- 124 infected participants from the NBA cohort to inform rates of viral upslope in the trials.¹¹ We first
- 125 fit the combined model to individual viral load data from 149 low-risk, symptomatic vaccinated
- 126 participants infected with omicron VOCs in the PLATCOV trial (65 treated and 84 controls) and
- 127 from 80 high-risk, symptomatic vaccinated participants infected with omicron VOCs in the
- 128 PANORAMIC trial (38 treated and 42 controls) (Fig 2a, 2b, Fig S3, S4, S5, S6). We next fit the
- 129 combined model to trial endpoint data (mean viral load drop from baseline) reported in three
- 130 randomized, controlled trials: PLATCOV (Fig 3a, 4a-d),⁴ PANORAMIC (Fig 3b, 4e-h),³ and
- the MOVe-OUT trial with 1093 high-risk unvaccinated symptomatic individuals infected with
- 132 pre-omicron VOCs (549 treated + 544 placebo, **Fig 3c, 4i-k**).² All model fitting was using
- 133 Monolix with non-linear mixed effects approaches described in the Materials and Methods.



134



to 9 control and 9 treatment participants in PLATCOV. (b) Model fits to 9 control and 9 treatment

participants in PANORAMIC. (c) Individual estimates for potency adjustment factor (ratio of *in vivo : in*

140 Model fitting to individual viral load trajectories in PLATCOV and PANORAMIC.

¹³⁹ *vitro* EC50) in the two trials.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

- 141 For each participant, we defined the in vivo EC_{50} as the plasma drug concentration required to 142 inhibit viral replication by 50% and the potency adjustment factor (paf) as the ratio between the in vivo and in vitro EC_{50} .^{21, 22} To estimate the paf, we fit the combined VID-PKPD model to 143 144 individual viral load data of both arms of PLATCOV and PANORAMIC trials and Omicron 145 infected individuals in the NBA cohort using the population mixed effect approach in Monolix. 146 We achieved good model fit to individual viral load trajectories in the control and treatment arms 147 of PLATCOV (Fig 2a, Fig S3, S4) and PANORAMIC (Fig 2b, S5, S6). The model projected 148 higher levels of total detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in most participants relative to non-mutated viral RNA (Fig 2a,b). We estimated a range of individual paf values with similar mean and 149 150 median values estimated for both trials (Fig 2c). These values suggest that in vivo potency of molunpiravair is on average 7-8 fold higher than in vitro estimates. Each participant had an 151 estimated paf less than one indicating that enhanced potency is necessary to include to optimize 152 153 fit to the data.
- 154



155

Figure 3. Mean viral load reduction in (a) PLATCOV, (b) PANORAMIC, and (c) MOVe-OUT
 which are targets for model fitting.

157 158

159 Model fit to trial virologic endpoint data from PLATCOV, PANORAMIC, and MOVe-

160 **OUT.**

- 161 As a second approach, we assessed whether a virtual cohort strategy where control participants
- are modeled from pre-existing cohorts can predict virologic trial endpoints. This approach is
- 163 necessary for situations where individual viral load data are not available as with MOVe-OUT
- and is important as it demonstrates that the model can reproduce the primary virologic endpoint
- 165 of the study. We simulated virtual cohorts using the combined VID-PKPD model and fit results
- to viral load decay from baseline in the three trials. For each trial arm, we randomly selected 400
- 167 individuals from the NBA cohort with the closest matching viral variant, symptom, and vaccine
- 168 status and used their estimated individual viral dynamic parameters in simulations. To address

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

- 169 variability in timing of baseline viral load measurement relative to infection, we randomly
- assigned all individuals an incubation period selected from a variant-specific gamma distribution
- 171 found in the literature.^{23, 24} Treatment start day was randomly selected from a distribution based
- 172 on observed enrollment windows in the three trials. Due to the lack of individual PK data, the
- 173 same estimated population PK parameters were used for all simulated treated individuals
- 174 (**Table S1**). PD parameters were randomly selected from a log-normal distribution with
- 175 estimated mean and standard error (**Table S2**).
- 176 Our model closely reproduced kinetics of viral decay in PLATCOV in control (**Fig 3a, 4a**) and
- treatment arms (Fig 3a, 4b) and estimated a paf=0.13 (Fig 4c) similar to our mean estimate using
- 178 individual fits (**Fig 2c**). The model also predicted individual-level variability in virologic
- 179 responses observed in PLATCOV, including instances of increased viral load following therapy
- 180 (Fig 4d). We compared simulated and actual distributions of viral load change among trial
- 181 participants in the control and treatment arms. On most post-treatment days, simulated and actual
- 182 distributions were not statistically dissimilar. Wider distributions of observed versus simulated
- viral load change were noted on post-randomization days 1 and 2 for control and treatment (**Fig**
- **4d**), likely due to noise in viral load data from oral swabs: differences of 1–2 logs were often
- 185 noted between replicates collected from PLATCOV participants at equivalent timepoints, 186 noticipal to be a days $1 \text{ and } 2^{10}$
- **186** particularly on days 1 and 2^{10}
- 187



188

189 Figure 4. Model fit to virologic trial outcomes for (a-d) PLATCOV, (e-h) PANORAMIC, (i-k)

- 190 MOVe-OUT. Results include (a, e, i) control groups, (b, f, j) treatment groups, (d,h) comparing
- individual variability of data vs simulation in control and treatment arms, and (c, g, k) estimate for
- 192 potency adjustment factor. To only capture the effect of treatment and address potential identifiability
- 193 issues, data from the first seven days after baseline were used to estimate the paf. Therefore, the crossed-194 out data points were not included in the calculation of the R^2 .
- 195

196 Similarly, our model closely reproduced kinetics of viral decay in PANORAMIC in control (Fig

- 197 **3b**, **4e**) and treatment arms (**Fig 3b**, **4f**) and estimated a paf=0.19 (**Fig 4g**) similar to our mean
- 198 estimate using individual fits (Fig 2c). The model also predicted individual-level variability in

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

- 199 virologic responses observed in PANORAMIC, including instances of increased viral load
- 200 following therapy (Fig 4h). We compared simulated and actual distributions of viral load change
- among trial participants in the control and treatment arms. On all post-treatment days other than
- 202 day 2 control, simulated and actual distributions were not statistically dissimilar (**Fig 4h**). This
- 203 likely indicates less noise in viral load data from nasopharyngeal swabs collected in
- 204 PANORAMIC relative to oral swabs in PLATCOV.
- 205

Finally, the model reproduced kinetics of viral decay in MOVe-OUT in control (Fig 4i) and

- treatment arms (Fig 4j) but estimated a higher paf=2.64 (Fig 4k). The higher paf maps to the far
- 208 less substantial viral load reduction in MOVe-OUT relative to the other two trials which in turn
- 209 may be explained by less potency against pre-omicron variants which has been observed
 210 experimentally.²⁵
- 211

212 As a further validation step, we performed counterfactual simulations which assess viral kinetics

- 213 of control study participants assuming treatment and treatment participants assuming
- 214 placebo/usual care. Counterfactual control simulations slightly overestimated late viral loads for
- 215 PLATCOV (Fig S7a) and PANORAMIC (Fig S8a). This may be because therapy suppresses
- acquired immune responses, which is not captured in our model.¹⁵ Counterfactual treatment
- 217 simulations fit the data well for PLATCOV (Fig S7b) and PANORAMIC (Fig S8b). Simulations
- 218 occasionally predicted viral rebound following treatment (Fig S7c,d and S8c,d).
- 219 220



221 222

Figure 5. PCR underestimates the true reduction in non-mutated SARS-CoV-2 RNA in PLATCOV

and PANORAMIC but not MOVe-OUT. Simulated mean viral loads including non-mutated viral RNA
 in (a) PLATCOV, (b) PANORAMIC and (c) MOVe-OUT. (d) Individual reduction at day 5 in the

simulated control group (blue), simulated total viral RNA (grey) and simulated non-mutated viral RNA

226 (pink) in the three trials showing no statistical difference between total and non-mutated viral RNA

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

despite a lower median. (e) Individual viral area under the curve from the start of the treatment through

day 5 in the simulated control group (blue), simulated total viral RNA (grey), and simulated non-mutated

- viral RNA (pink) in the three trials showing a statistical difference between total and non-mutated viral
- RNA. Boxplots include the interquartile range (IQR) with whiskers equaling 1.5 the IQR. (f) Table of
- mean viral load reductions in the trials and simulations including the predicted mean difference in totalversus mutated viral RNA.
- 233

234 Estimates of reduction in fully mutated viruses versus non-mutated SARS-CoV-2 RNA.

235 We used our optimized model with solved paf to project the trajectory of non-mutated viral RNA

- during treatment relative to values measured with PCR, which detects viral RNA with drug-
- induced mutations.⁶ In PLATCOV (**Fig 5a,d,f**) and PANORAMIC (**Fig 5b,d,f**), owing to higher
- drug potency, total SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA on treatment exceeded non-mutated viral RNA by
- ~0.48 and 0.59 log respectively, suggesting that measured endpoints underestimate the drug's
- true antiviral effect. However, these differences did not achieve statistical significance, perhaps
- because estimated total and non-mutated viral RNA levels converge at drug trough. In MOVe-
- OUT (Fig 5c,d,f), there was no significant difference between total SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA on
- treatment and non-mutated viral RNA.
- 244





Figure 6. Relationship of drug pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics to in vivo potency and

viral load reduction. (a) Molnupiravir plasma concentration during five days of treatment with 800 mg
 molnupirvir given twice daily. The dashed lines mark the EC₅₀ with different paf values which differ by

- trial. For Paf = 0.13, drug levels are almost entirely above EC_{50} . (b) Dynamic shifts in molnupiravir
- efficacy for different paf values which differ by trial. Efficacy only drops minimally at trough levels when
- 251 paf is low (i.e. 0.14 and 0.13 in PLATCOV and PANORAMIC) but drops significantly at trough levels in
- 252 MOVe-OUT. (c) Drug potency of SARS-CoV-2 antivirals according to trial. The in-vivo efficacy of
- 253 molnupiravir in PLATCOV and PANORAMIC trials is close to the in vivo efficacy of
- nirmatrelvir/ritonavir in the PLATCOV trial and higher than EPIC-HR. MOVe-OUT potency is
- significantly lower due to a higher paf and higher in vivo EC50 value. (d) Simulated mean drops in total
- viral RNA from baseline relative to counterfactual placebo/usual care arms on day 5 in the three
- 257 molnupiravir trials and two nirmatrelvir/ritonavir trials. (e) Simulated mean drops in non-mutated viral
- 258 RNA from baseline relative to counterfactual placebo on day 5 in the three molnupiravir trials and two
- 259 nirmatrelvir/ritonavir trials. In the molnupiravir trials, total viral RNA drops less than non-mutated viral

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

- 260 RNA due to PCR detection of drug-mutated viral RNA. Total possible reduction in non-mutated SARS-
- 261 CoV-2 RNA is less for MOVe-OUT than PLATCOV and PANORAMIC due to higher initial viral loads 262 and lower values of detection in the trials.
- 263
- In all 3 trials, the models suggest that non-mutated viral loads during treatment may be lowest at
- 265 drug peak, reflecting the short plasma half-life of molnupiravir. Therefore, the cumulative
- effective of drug is best estimated with viral area under the curve which accounts for highly
- 267 variable drug activity over time due to short drug half-life. By this estimate, the reduction in non-
- 268 mutated viral RNA far exceeds that of total measured viral RNA (Fig 5e). In the case of MOVe-
- 269 OUT, this may explain why significant clinical benefit is associated with only a marginal
- 270 reduction in observed decline in total viral RNA. This also suggests that there might be utility to
- 271 measure viral load after drug peak and trough for agents with short half-life as viral loads may
- differ by a full order of magnitude according to drug level.
- 273

274 Differences in trial participants and model parameters.

- 275 We also compared features of each trial as they related to model predictions by assessing the
- viral dynamic range in each trial (**Fig S9a**). Control participants in PLATCOV had lower mean
- 277 viral loads throughout the course of infection relative to PANORAMIC and MOVe-OUT (Fig
- **S9b**). Given PLATCOV and PANORAMIC enrolled participants with the omicron variant, we
- surmise that these differences relate to demographic differences in study participant
- 280 demographics, slightly shorter estimated time to treatment in PANORAMIC versus PLATCOV
- estimated by our model (t_0 in **Fig S10**), and/or characteristics of the PCR assay used in the
- studies. The trials also employed different limits of detection which impacted observed
- reductions in viral load (**Fig S9b**). Model parameters were largely equivalent between studies
- and between treatment and control arms, reflecting the flexibility of the model (**Fig S10**). The
- parameter governing transition of susceptible cells to a refractory state was higher in PLATCOV
- relative to PANORAMIC which likely was necessary to achieve lower viral loads overall and
- 287 may reflect the younger study participants (**Fig S10**).
- 288

Antiviral potency, viral load assessment and trial design all impact observed antiviral reduction.

- 291 We next combined PK and PD models to assess the average efficacy of the drug during days 0-5
- in all three trials (Fig 6a,b) and noted an efficacy of 53% in MOVe-OUT (Fig 6c). The efficacy
- of molnupiravir in PLATCOV (94%) and PANORAMIC (95%) was similar to that of
- nirmatrelvir in PLATCOV (94%) and EPIC-HR (82%) owing to a much lower paf for
- 295 molnupiravir relative to nirmatrelvir / ritonavir (**Fig 6c**).
- 296
- 297 These potencies mapped to different reductions in viral load relative to placebo/usual care. Total
- 298 viral RNA reduction in PANORMIC and PLATCOV exceeded that in MOVe-OUT owing to
- lower paf (**Fig 6d**), but also due to a larger viral dynamic range (defined as the distance from
- 300 baseline viral load to the lower threshold PCR (LOD) (Fig S9b)), which allows for a greater
- 301 observed reduction in viral load. PANORAMIC used LOD = 100 (imputed as 50), and
- 302 PLATCOV had LOD \cong 18 (copies/ml), versus LOD = 500 copies/ml for MOVe-OUT.
- 303 PANORAMIC also had much higher average starting viral loads (7.4 log10 (copies/ml)) versus
- 304 PLATCOV (5.8 log10 copies/ml) and MOVe-OUT (6.8 log10 copies/ml) (**Fig S9b**).
- 305 Molnupiravir approached maximal possible total viral load viral RNA reduction in

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

- 306 PANORAMIC and PLATCOV, whereas protease inhibitors could still achieve greater viral load 307 reduction at lower paf (Fig 6d) as recently observed with ansitral vir 26
- reduction at lower paf (**Fig 6d**) as recently observed with ensitrelvir.²⁶
- 308
- 309 The greater possible reduction in total viral load for protease inhibitors relative to molnupiravir
- 310 owes to different mechanisms of action. Model projected reductions in non-mutated viral RNA
- 311 reduction in PANORMIC and PLATCOV approximated viral load reductions observed in EPIC-
- 312 HR and PLATCOV on nirmatrelvir / ritonavir (Fig 6e), suggesting that PCR detection of mutated
- 313 viruses underestimates true molnupiravir potency and that a more potent mutagenic agent could
- 314 accrue further virologic benefit.
- 315

316 Optimization of molnupiravir therapy to avoid viral rebound.

- 317 Instances of viral rebound were observed in PLATCOV and PANORAMIC and have been
- 318 observed following molnupiravir treatment.^{4, 27} We analyzed higher doses and prolonged therapy
- and noted that as with nirmatrelvir, prolonging therapy is a better method to prevent rebound
- 320 than increasing dose (Fig S11).
- 321
- 322
- 323

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

324 Discussion

325

326 We recapitulated the virologic results of three clinical trials of molnupiravir with our combined 327 clinical trial simulation VID/PK/PD models. Model output highlights key differences in viral

328 load reduction between the trials and identifies mechanistic differences to explain this. The

329 MOVe-OUT trial was associated with significantly less reduction in viral load between treatment

330 and control arms than the other two trials. Accordingly, the drug efficacy (0.53) was lower in this

331 trial, and our estimate for paf was 2.64, signifying marginally lower potency in vivo than in vitro.

- This result is compatible with 0.4-fold lower median EC50 values for molnupiravir in vitro 332
- against omicron relative to prior variants.²⁵ The higher paf in MOVe-OUT permitted drug 333
- troughs below the EC50, limiting potency throughout the dosing interval. In PLATCOV and 334
- 335 PANORAMIC, our model suggests drug levels remain above the in vivo EC50 throughout the 336 dosing interval though potency does fluctuate according to drug level.
- 337

338 The estimated drug efficacy in PLATCOV and PANORAMIC was considerably higher (0.94 and

339 0.95, respectively), and the paf was estimated to be 0.14 and 0.13, indicating greater potency in

340 vivo than in vitro. We have applied our clinical trial simulation technique to multiple drugs for

SARS-CoV-2,¹⁰ HSV-2,^{21, 22} and HIV,²⁸ and this is the first time we have identified this trend. 341

Allowing molnupiravir to be more potent in vivo in our modeling of PLATCOV and 342

343 PANORAMIC was necessary to capture the much greater reduction in total viral RNA relative to 344 off-treatment in these studies (1.09 log and 0.94 log respectively versus 0.3 log in MOVe-OUT).

345

A key outcome of our analysis is that SARS-CoV-2 PCR likely underestimates molnupiravir 346

potency because it still detects drug-mutated viral RNA.⁶ This appears to be most significant 347 when antiviral potency is higher, as in PANORAMIC and PLATCOV, leading to a 0.48-0.59 log 348

349

underestimation of reduction in non-mutated virus. Our results suggest that use of standard PCR 350

for assessing SARS-CoV-2 levels may lead to underestimation of drug potency. Multi probe 351 assays as have been used for the HIV reservoir may improve specificity for viruses that remain

intact and replication competent.²⁹ Viral culture is potentially a useful metric but lacks sufficient 352

sensitivity and precision and is too labor intensive to serve as a viable trial endpoint.¹² 353

354

355 Our results suggest that viral loads may vary according to drug level given molnupiravir's short 356 plasma half-life. A sub-study within future trials comparing viral loads between drug trough and 357

peak would be useful for the field. This could validate our model's prediction that even small

358 reductions in viral RNA may be associated with substantial reductions in total viral area under

359 the curve (a surrogate for infection surface area) particularly with a short half-life drug. Even

360 minor reductions in viral load may be associated with substantial clinical benefit in this case.

361 These fluctuations may be less evident if the intra-cellular half-life of the drug is longer or if PK

362 measures in our model underestimate true drug levels in PANORMIC due to older age or

363 impaired renal clearance. Model accuracy would be improved if viral load and PK data were available from the same patients in similar trials.

364 365

366 Another key practical outcome is that as for nirmatrelvir, extension of molnupiravir therapy to 10

367 days is likely to prevent rebound though our simulations do not suggest any benefit from

increasing dose.¹⁰ This suggests that prolonging therapy or using longer half-life agents is ideal 368

for treating SARS-CoV-2.³⁰ 369

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

370

- 371 Each trial represented a unique set of issues for model fitting. In MOVe-OUT, because the 372 treatment arm mean viral kinetics curve differed only slightly from the control arm, the model 373 without drug provided reasonable fit to the treatment arm. Nevertheless, the paf was identifiable 374 for this trial indicating that the model was able to detect and specify the very limited potency of 375 the drug. The fact that the drug's potency and clinical efficacy appears to have increased with 376 introduction of the omicron variant demonstrates a massive challenge for the therapeutics field: 377 as with vaccines, trials performed when prior variants were circulating may prove less relevant 378 as new variants continually emerge. A priority should be retesting existing agents against newly 379 emerging variants in small nimble trials such as PLATCOV, with viral load endpoints. 380 381 For PLATCOV, the model for the treatment arm matched the trial data very precisely and 382 identified the paf. The drug achieved nearly maximal observed viral load reduction in this trial.
- 383 We identified a similar trend for PANORAMIC. It is notable that the model had the flexibility to
- account for different viral loads between these trials by predicting more rapid innate immuneresponses in PLATCOV.
- 386

We arrived at similar estimate for paf in PLATCOV and PANORAMIC, while using two separate
methods: fitting to individual viral loads and fitting to mean viral load reduction trial endpoints.
This suggests that our approach using in silico cohorts and fitting to population level outcomes
produces reliable results.¹⁰ In many cases, it remains challenging for academics to obtain
individualized data from industry sponsored trials. Therefore, it is important that the endpoint
fitting approach should be considered when this is the only data available.

393

394 Finally, our results highlight challenges in trial design associated with the selection of PCR 395 assays and limits of detection. Different limits of detection were selected for each trial which in 396 turn impacts the degree of viral load decrease that can be observed. Initial viral loads were 397 notably higher in PANORAMIC and MOVe-OUT than PLATCOV. The equivalent viral loads 398 between PANORAMIC and PLATCOV may reflect a more sensitive PCR in the PANORAMIC 399 study as past immunity has consistently predicted lower viral loads and more rapid viral elimination for omicron variants.^{11, 31} On the other hand, PANORMIC viral loads could have 400 been higher than in PLATCOV despite both enrolling omicron infections due to an older and less 401 402 healthy population, Ideally, equivalent internationally standardized PCR quantitation would be 403 used across all trials.

404

405 Our study has a couple of limitations. The estimated paf is based on the in vitro assay data 406 against delta variant in Calu-3 cells. In vitro EC50 is sensitive to assay conditions, including cell 407 type, the variant of concern, the multiplicity of infection (MOI), and specific lab. In general, the 408 inability of in vitro assays to match in vivo conditions makes it an unreliable proxy for the in 409 vivo potency of the drug and explains the necessity of incorporating the paf parameter when 410 simulating an antiviral clinical trial.

- 411
- 412 In our model, we assumed all mutated viruses are noninfectious. While most drug-induced
- 413 random mutations reduce the fitness/viability of the virus, the molnupiravir mutation signature
- has been detected in circulating variants, especially in regions where the drug has been used most
- 415 commonly.⁷ Furthermore, in the PANORAMIC study, no statistical difference was observed

- 416 between the rate of culturable samples in the treatment and control arms which implies some
- 417 mutated viruses might be transmissible.³²
- 418
- 419 PK parameters were estimated using the data from the plasma concentration of healthy
- 420 individuals with the age range of 19-60 (mean 39.6) years old. The clearance rate of renally
- 421 cleared drugs often increase with age.³³ This implies that the paf may be larger in an older
- 422 population, such as in PANORAMIC participants. Further, we used the plasma concentration in
- the PD model to calculate the drug efficacy. However, using the drug's intracellular
- 424 concentration with a longer half-life, represented by the central compartment of the PK model,
- 425 would also likely lead to a larger estimated paf.
- 426
- 427 In summary, we further demonstrate the utility of clinical trial simulation using models that
- 428 capture drug PK and PD, as well as infection dynamics. In the case of molnupiravir, our results
- 429 suggest that final viral endpoints should be adjusted based on the drug's mechanism of action.
- 430
- 431

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

432 Materials and Methods

433

434 Study Design.

435 We developed a viral dynamics model recapitulating viral load data collected from symptomatic individuals in the NBA (National Basketball Association) cohort.¹¹ We used a two-compartment 436 model to reproduce the PK data of molnupiravir.¹⁸ For clinical trial simulation, we constructed a 437 virtual cohort by randomly selecting 400 individuals from the NBA cohort, trying to match the 438 439 trial populations regarding vaccine status and history of infection. Due to lack of individual PK 440 data, we used estimated population PK parameters for all individuals in the virtual cohort. The 441 PD parameters for each individual were randomly selected from a log-normal distribution with 442 their estimated means and standard errors. We fit the combined viral dynamic and PKPD model 443 to the average change in viral load from the baseline of the control and treatment arms of three previously published molnupiravir clinical trials.^{2-4, 34} Comparing our model to the control arms 444 validated our viral dynamic model and demonstrated how well our virtual cohorts represent the 445 trial control arms. We used the average data from the treatment arms to estimate the potency 446 adjustment factor (paf) by maximizing the R^2 of the fit.¹⁰ We also fit to individual viral load 447 trajectories in PLATCOV and PANORAMIC using the mixed-effect population approach 448 implemented in Monolix³⁵⁻³⁷ and obtained both individual paf values and a population 449

450 distribution.

451 Viral load data

- 452 The NBA cohort dataset published by Hay et al consists of 2875 documented SARS-CoV-2
- 453 infections in 2678 people detected through frequent PCR testing regardless of symptoms.¹⁶ We
- used the viral load data from 1510 infections in 1440 individuals that had at least 4 positive
- 455 quantitative samples to estimate viral dynamic parameters. We used parameter sets estimated for
- 456 the symptomatic subpopulation of these individuals to construct virtual cohorts.¹¹

457 Clinical trial data

- 458 We used viral load data from three molnupiravir clinical trials. MOVe-OUT by Jayk Bernal et al.
- included 544 and 549 symptomatic high-risk individuals in the control and treatment arms,
- 460 respectively.² We obtained the average change in viral load data of the control and treatment
- arms as shared in the supplementary material of their published manuscript in Table S6. Nasal
- viral load was measured using PCR assay on days 0, 3, 5, 10, and 14 after the treatment start day
- and adjusted by the baseline viral load. The lower limit of detection (LOD) of 500 copies/ml
- 464 were used in this trial. The treatment was started within five days of symptom onset.
- 465 PLATCOV by Schilling et al. is an open-label, randomized, controlled adaptive trial with 85 and
- 466 58 symptomatic, young, healthy individuals in the control and molnupiravir treatment arms,
- 467 respectively.⁴ The oropharyngeal samples from each participant were collected daily on days 0
- through 7 and on day 14 after the treatment start day, and viral load was measured using PCR
- assay. We used the individual viral load data published by the authors. From PLATCOV, we
- 470 averaged over the two oral samples collected from each individual and calculated viral load drop
- from baseline or used the individual-level viral load data. We used the maximum LOD reported
- 472 in the published data (\sim 1.26 log).
- 473 PANORAMIC is a platform adaptive randomized, controlled trial with 42 and 38 symptomatic,
- 474 vaccinated individuals with at least one risk factor in the control and treatment arms,

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

- 475 respectively.³ Nasal viral load was measured using PCR and samples were collected on days 0
- through 6 and on day 13. We used individual viral load data shared by the authors and adjusted
- by baseline viral load to obtain mean viral load drop from the baseline. Mean days since
- 478 symptom onset at baseline (sd) were 2.4 (0.78) for the treatment arm and 2.5(1.12) for the
- 479 control arm. The lower limit of detection of 100 copies/ml (imputed as 50 copies/ml) was used.

In all three trials, the study participants were treated with 800mg molnupiravir twice per day, forfive days.

482 PK data

- 483 Mean plasma concentration data of molnupiravir were obtained by digitizing Figure 3 of the
- 484 phase I trial by Painter et al. using WebPlotDigitizer.¹⁸ The data used in this paper belong to the
- 485 multiple-ascending part of the phase I trial where six participants were given 50, 100, 200, 300, 400, 600 and 800 mg of molecular trian doily for 5.5 days, and their plasma concentrations
- 486 400, 600, and 800 mg of molnupiravir twice daily for 5.5 days, and their plasma concentrations
- 487 were measured after the first and last doses.

488 PD data

- 489 The data on drug efficacy was obtained from experiments performed at the University of
- 490 Washington. The efficacy of molnupiravir was measured against the delta variant of SARS-
- 491 CoV2 in Calu-3 cells (human lung epithelial). Briefly, Calu 3 cells were treated with varying
- 492 concentrations of molnupiravir prior to infection with SARS-CoV-2 (delta isolate) at a
- 493 multiplicity of infection of 0.01. Antiviral efficacy and cell viability (of non-infected cells treated
- 494 with drugs) were assessed as described.^{9, 10} There were five replicates per condition, pooled from
- 495 2 independent technical experimental repeats (one experiment with triplicate conditions, one
- 496 experiment in duplicate conditions).

497 Viral dynamics model

498 We used our model of SARS-CoV-2 dynamics to model the viral load of symptomatic

- 499 individuals with SARS-CoV-2 infection.¹¹ Our model assumes that susceptible cells (S) are
- 500 infected at rate β VS by SARS-CoV-2 virions. The infected cells go through a non-productive
- $clipse phase (l_E)$ before producing viruses and transition to becoming productively infected
- 502 (I_P) at rate κI_E . When encountering productively infected cells, the susceptible cells become
- refractory to infection (R) at the rate $\phi I_P S$. Refractory cells revert to a susceptible state at rate
- 504 ρ R. The productively infected cells produce virus at the rate πI_P and are cleared at rate δI
- representing cytolysis and the innate immune response that lacks memory and is proportional to
- the amount of ongoing infection. If the infection persists longer than time τ , then cytotoxic acquired immunity is activated, which is represented in our model by the rate mI_p . Finally, free virions are cleared at the rate γ . Of note, this model, previously proposed by Ke et al. was
- selected against other models based on superior fit to data and parsimony.³⁸ The model written as
 a set of differential equations has the form,
- 511

512
$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\beta SV - \phi I_P S + \rho R$$
(1a)

513
$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \phi I_P S - \rho R$$
(1b)

514
$$\frac{dI_{\rm E}}{dt} = \beta SV - \kappa I_{\rm E}$$
(1c)

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

515
$$\frac{dI_{\rm P}}{dt} = \kappa I_{\rm E} - \delta I_{\rm P} - m(t)I_{\rm P}$$
(1d)

516
$$\frac{dV}{dt} = \pi I_{\rm P} - \gamma V \tag{1e}$$

517 where
$$\begin{cases} m(t) = 0 & t < \tau \\ m(t) = m & t \ge \tau \end{cases}$$
 (1f)

518

To estimate parameter values, we fit the model to viral load data from the NBA cohort using a
 mixed-effect population approach implemented in Monolix. Details on the model selection and
 fitting process can be found in Owens et al.¹¹

- 522 We start the simulations with 10^7 susceptible cells. The initial value of the refractory cells is
- assumed to be zero since the interferon signaling is not active prior to infection. We further
- assume there are no infected cells (eclipse or productive) at the beginning of the infection. We
- 525 fix the level of inoculum (V_0) at 97 copies/ml for each individual.
- To resolve identifiability issues, we fixed two parameter values, setting the inverse of the eclipse phase duration to $\kappa = 4$, and the rate of clearance of virions to $\gamma = 15$.¹¹

528 PK model

- 529 We used a two-compartmental PK model which includes the amount of drug in the GI tract
- 530 (A_{GI}) , the plasma compartment (A_p) , and the respiratory tract (A_L) . The drug is administered
- orally, passes through the GI tract and gets absorbed into the blood at the rate κ_a . The drug then
- transfers from the blood into the peripheral compartment (or the lung) at the rate κ_{PL} . The
- 533 metabolized drug transfers back into the plasma at the rate κ_{LP} from where it clears from the
- body at the rate κ_{CL} . The model in the form of ordinary differential equations is written as,

535
$$\frac{dA_{GI}}{dt} = -\kappa_a A_{GI}$$
(2a)

536
$$\frac{dA_{\rm P}}{dt} = \kappa_a A_{\rm GI} + \kappa_{LP} A_{\rm L} - (\kappa_{CL} + \kappa_{PL}) A_{\rm P}$$
(2b)

537
$$\frac{dA_{\rm L}}{dt} = \kappa_{PL}A_{\rm P} - \kappa_{LP}A_{\rm L}$$
(2c)

538

539 We used Monolix and a mixed-effect population approach to estimate the parameters and their A_{P}

- standard deviations. With the initial condition of $(A_{GI} = Dose, A_p = 0, A_L = 0)$; we fit $C_P = \frac{A_P}{Vol}$
- to the plasma concentration data where Vol is the estimated plasma volume. Details on
- 542 parameter values and the error model provided in **Table S1**.
- 543

544 PD model

For the pharmacodynamics model we used Hill equation, $\epsilon(t) = \frac{E_{max}C(t)^n}{C^{(t)n} + EC_{50}^n}$, where C(t) is the drug concentration in plasma, E_{max} is the maximum efficacy, *n* is the Hill coefficient, and EC_{50} is the drug concentration in plasma required for 50% efficacy. We used least-squared fitting to

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

obtain the three parameters (E_{max} , n, and EC_{50}) and their standard deviations. The average drug efficacy is measured using,

550
$$E_{ave} = \frac{1}{t_{start} - t_{end}} \int_{t_{start}}^{t_{end}} \epsilon(t) dt$$
(3)

551 Where t_{start} and t_{end} are the treatment start day and end day, respectively.

552

553 **Combined PKPD and VL models**

The plasma concentration of molnupiravir obtained from the PK model is used in the PD model to obtain time-dependent efficacy. Since molnupiravir imposes lethal mutations during the virus replication process, in our model, a portion of produced viruses, measured by $\epsilon(t)$, are mutated (V_m) and therefore assumed to be non-infectious, with the addition that most detected viral RNA pre-treatment is also non-infectious. The production rate of non-mutated viruses is decreased by a factor of $(1 - \epsilon(t))$. Equation 1e is written as,

560
$$\frac{dV}{dt} = (1 - \epsilon(t))\pi I_{\rm P} - \gamma V$$
(4a)

561
$$\frac{dV_{\rm m}}{dt} = (\epsilon(t))\pi I_{\rm P} - \gamma V_{\rm m}$$
(4b)

562 Total viral load $(V + V_m)$ is used to fit the trial data.

563 Fitting the combined model to individual viral load data in the PLATCOV trial

564 We used the population mixed-effect approach and Monolix to estimate each individual's viral 565 dynamics parameters and the potency adjustment factor (paf). Due to the lack of data from the

566 initial phase of infection in the PLATCOV and PANORAMIC trials, we include the data from

567 Omicron-infected individuals in the NBA cohort to inform the model about the initial phase of

568 infection. We fixed the PK parameters to the estimated population values (Table S1), and the PD

569 parameters other than EC50 to the in vitro estimated population values (**Table S2**). We used the

570 study category (NBA vs PLATCOV and PANORAMIC) as a covariate for t_0 (timing of

571 infection) and τ (timing of the adaptive immune response) since the first recorded positive test is

572 likely much later for the clinical trials. In the NBA study, samples were collected almost daily

regardless of symptoms often leading to pre-symptomatic detection, while in the PLATCOV

study, the baseline measurement occurred after symptom onset, trial enrollment and consent.

575 Construction of a virtual cohort

576 To generate a cohort for our simulated clinical trials, we randomly selected 400 individuals (for 577 each arm of the simulated trials) from the unvaccinated symptomatic subpopulation of the NBA

578 cohort for MOVe-OUT and the vaccinated, Omicron infected subpopulation for PLATCOV and

579 PANORAMIC and used their individual viral load parameters estimated by fitting our viral

580 dynamics model to the data. A sample size of n=400 (out of 822 vaccinated individuals with

581 Omicron infection) was used to mimic a large-scale clinical trial and maintain relatively low

582 overlap between virtual cohorts used in each arm of the simulations and between different

simulations. Since the time of symptom onset is not available for all individuals in the NBA data,

584 we randomly drew an incubation period for each individual from gamma distributions with

585 variant-specific parameters estimated by Gamiche et al.³⁹ The start of treatment relative to

symptom onset was randomly selected according to a uniform distribution for MOVe-OUT and

587 PLATCOV, and a logit normal distribution for PANORAMIC with limits of [0,5] days and mean

- and standard deviation reported in the PANORAMIC trial for control and treatment arms. The
- same population PK parameters were assigned to each individual. The relevant dose in each
- scenario was added to the A_{GI} compartment (the absorption equation) of the PK model (eq 2a) at
- each dosing timepoint (t=0, 0.5, 1, 1.5,, 4.5 days). For each dose, the appropriate PK
- 592 parameter were used (**Table S1**). PD parameters were also randomly drawn from a log-normal 593 distribution with the estimated mean and standard deviation. The standard deviation of the PD
- distribution with the estimated mean and standard deviation. The standard deviation of the PD parameters represents the accuracy of the assays and not individual variability.

595 **Potency adjustment factor (paf)**

 $paf = \frac{EC_{50,in\,vivo}}{EC_{50,in\,vitro}}$

- 596 The paf is defined as,
- 597

598

599 We estimated the paf by maximizing R^2 when fitting the change in viral load of the treatment

(5)

arm of our simulation to the data from day 0 to day 7 of the treatment arm of the clinical trial.

601

602 Measuring rebound probability

A viral load rebound in the treatment arm was defined when the viral load at any time after
treatment ended exceeded the viral load at the end of the treatment by 1 log. In the control group,
viral rebound was defined in patients who had at least two peaks with minimum height of 1000
copies/ml in their viral load trajectories and the second peak was 1 log higher than its preceding
local minimum.

608

609 Software:

- All the model fittings in this study were performed using Monolix version 2023R1.
- 611 The data analysis and simulations were performed using Python 3.9.12.

612 Data availability:

- 613 The data analyzed in this work was previously published by Hay et al. and Schilling et al. and is 614 available on GitHub at
- 615 https://github.com/gradlab/SC2-kinetics-immune-history and
- 616 <u>https://github.com/jwatowatson/PLATCOV-Molnupiravir/tree/V1.0</u>
- 617 Pharmacodynamics data is available on GitHub at
- 618 https://github.com/sEsmaeili/MolnupiravirModeling
- 619

620 **Code availability:**

- 621 All codes and materials used in the analysis are available on GitHub
- 622 https://github.com/sEsmaeili/MolnupiravirModeling
- 623 Funding:

624 This work is supported by NIAID R01AI77512-01 (JTS, SP).

625 **References**

626

627 1. Abdelnabi R, Foo CS, De Jonghe S, Maes P, Weynand B, Neyts J. Molnupiravir Inhibits Replication of the Emerging SARS-CoV-2 Variants of Concern in a Hamster Infection Model. J 628 629 Infect Dis. 2021;224(5):749-53. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiab361. PubMed PMID: 34244768; 630 PMCID: PMC8408768. 631 2. Jayk Bernal A, Gomes da Silva MM, Musungaie DB, Kovalchuk E, Gonzalez A, Delos Reves V, Martín-Quirós A, Caraco Y, Williams-Diaz A, Brown ML, Du J, Pedley A, Assaid C, 632 633 Strizki J, Grobler JA, Shamsuddin HH, Tipping R, Wan H, Paschke A, ..., Group M-OS. 634 Molnupiravir for Oral Treatment of Covid-19 in Nonhospitalized Patients. N Engl J Med. 635 2022;386(6):509-20. Epub 20211216. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2116044. PubMed PMID: 636 34914868; PMCID: PMC8693688. 637 Butler CC, Hobbs FDR, Gbinigie OA, Rahman NM, Hayward G, Richards DB, Dorward 3. 638 J, Lowe DM, Standing JF, Breuer J, Khoo S, Petrou S, Hood K, Nguyen-Van-Tam JS, Patel MG, 639 Saville BR, Marion J, Ogburn E, Allen J, ..., Group PTC. Molnupiravir plus usual care versus 640 usual care alone as early treatment for adults with COVID-19 at increased risk of adverse 641 outcomes (PANORAMIC): an open-label, platform-adaptive randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 642 2023;401(10373):281-93. Epub 20221222. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(22)02597-1. PubMed 643 PMID: 36566761; PMCID: PMC9779781. 644 4. Schilling WHK, Jittamala P, Watson JA, Boyd S, Luvira V, Siripoon T, Ngamprasertchai 645 T, Batty EM, Cruz C, Callery JJ, Singh S, Saroj M, Kruabkontho V, Ngernseng T, 646 Tanglakmankhong N, Tubprasert J, Abdad MY, Madmanee W, Kouhathong J, ..., Group PC. 647 Antiviral efficacy of molnupiravir versus ritonavir-boosted nirmatrely in patients with early symptomatic COVID-19 (PLATCOV): an open-label, phase 2, randomised, controlled, adaptive 648 649 trial. Lancet Infect Dis. 2024;24(1):36-45. Epub 20230928. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(23)00493-650 0. PubMed PMID: 37778363; PMCID: PMC7615401. 651 5. Hammond J, Leister-Tebbe H, Gardner A, Abreu P, Bao W, Wisemandle W, Baniecki M, 652 Hendrick VM, Damle B, Simón-Campos A, Pypstra R, Rusnak JM, Investigators E-H. Oral 653 Nirmatrelvir for High-Risk, Nonhospitalized Adults with Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 654 2022;386(15):1397-408. Epub 20220216. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2118542. PubMed PMID: 655 35172054; PMCID: PMC8908851. 656 Fountain-Jones NM, Vanhaeften R, Williamson J, Maskell J, Chua IJ, Charleston M, 6. 657 Cooley L. Effect of molnupiravir on SARS-CoV-2 evolution in immunocompromised patients: a 658 retrospective observational study. Lancet Microbe. 2024;5(5):e452-e8. Epub 20240322. doi: 659 10.1016/S2666-5247(23)00393-2. PubMed PMID: 38527471. 660 Sanderson T, Hisner R, Donovan-Banfield I, Hartman H, Løchen A, Peacock TP, Ruis C. 7. 661 A molnupiravir-associated mutational signature in global SARS-CoV-2 genomes. Nature. 662 2023;623(7987):594-600. Epub 20230925. doi: 10.1038/s41586-023-06649-6. PubMed PMID: 663 37748513; PMCID: PMC10651478. 664 8. Rosenke K, Lewis MC, Feldmann F, Bohrnsen E, Schwarz B, Okumura A, Bohler WF, Callison J, Shaia C, Bosio CM, Lovaglio J, Saturday G, Jarvis MA, Feldmann H. Combined 665 666 molnupiravir-nirmatrelvir treatment improves the inhibitory effect on SARS-CoV-2 in macaques. 667 JCI Insight. 2023;8(4). Epub 20230222. doi: 10.1172/jci.insight.166485. PubMed PMID: 668 36574296; PMCID: PMC9977490.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

669	9. Wagoner J, Herring S, Hsiang TY, Ianevski A, Biering SB, Xu S, Hoffmann M,
670	Pöhlmann S, Gale M, Aittokallio T, Schiffer JT, White JM, Polyak SJ. Combinations of Host-
671	and Virus-Targeting Antiviral Drugs Confer Synergistic Suppression of SARS-CoV-2. Microbiol
672	Spectr. 2022;10(5):e0333122. Epub 20221003. doi: 10.1128/spectrum.03331-22. PubMed PMID:
673	36190406; PMCID: PMC9718484.
674	10. Esmaeili S, Owens K, Wagoner J, Polyak SJ, White JM, Schiffer JT. A unifying model to
675	explain frequent SARS-CoV-2 rebound after nirmatrelyir treatment and limited prophylactic
676	efficacy. Nat Commun. 2024:15(1):5478. Epub 20240628. doi: 10.1038/s41467-024-49458-9
677	PubMed PMID: 38942778: PMCID: PMC11213957
678	11 Owens K Esmaeili S Schiffer IT Heterogeneous SARS-CoV-2 kinetics due to variable
679	timing and intensity of immune responses ICI Insight 2024.9(9) Epub 20240404 doi:
680	10 1172/ici insight 176286 PubMed PMID: 38573774: PMCID: PMC11141931
681	12 Edelstein GE Boucau I Uddin P. Marino C. Liew MV Barry M. Choudhary MC
601	Cilbert DE Dourolds 7 Li V Tion D. Sagar S. Wass TD. Kawana V. Snarks IA. Hammond SD.
002	Wellage 7, Vieg IM, Derevels AK, Sigdrer ML, SADS, CoW 2, Virgle via Dehound With
003	Wanace Z, Vyas JM, Barczak AK,, Stedner MJ. SAKS-COV-2 VITOlogic Rebound With Nimestashin Ditemestin Themenes An Observational Stades Ann Latern Med. 2022;17((12):1577
684	Nirmatreivir-Ritonavir Therapy : An Observational Study. Ann Intern Med. 2023;176(12):1577-
685	85. Epub 20231114. doi: 10./326/M23-1/56. PubMed PMID: 3/956428; PMCID:
686	PMC10644265.
687	13. Harrington PR, Cong J, Troy SB, Rawson JMO, O'Rear JJ, Valappil TI, McGarry
688	Connelly S, Farley J, Birnkrant D. Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 RNA Rebound After
689	Nirmatrelvir/Ritonavir Treatment in Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Trials -
690	United States and International Sites, 2021-2022. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.
691	2023;72(51):1365-70. Epub 20231222. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7251a2. PubMed PMID:
692	38127674; PMCID: PMC10754264.
693	14. Anderson AS, Caubel P, Rusnak JM, Investigators E-HT. Nirmatrelvir-Ritonavir and
694	Viral Load Rebound in Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2022;387(11):1047-9. Epub 20220907. doi:
695	10.1056/NEJMc2205944. PubMed PMID: 36069818; PMCID: PMC9513855.
696	15. Perelson AS, Ribeiro RM, Phan T. An explanation for SARS-CoV-2 rebound after
697	Paxlovid treatment. medRxiv. 2023:2023.05.30.23290747. doi: 10.1101/2023.05.30.23290747.
698	16. Hay JA, Kissler SM, Fauver JR, Mack C, Tai CG, Samant RM, Connolly S, Anderson DJ,
699	Khullar G, MacKay M, Patel M, Kelly S, Manhertz A, Eiter I, Salgado D, Baker T, Howard B,
700	Dudley JT, Mason CE,, Grad YH. Quantifying the impact of immune history and variant on
701	SARS-CoV-2 viral kinetics and infection rebound: A retrospective cohort study. Elife. 2022;11.
702	Epub 20221116. doi: 10.7554/eLife.81849. PubMed PMID: 36383192; PMCID: PMC9711520.
703	17. Clairon O. Pasin C. Balelli I. Thiébaut R. Prague M. Parameter estimation in nonlinear
704	mixed effect models based on ordinary differential equations: an optimal control approach
705	Computational Statistics 2023 doi: 10.1007/s00180-023-01420-x
706	18 Painter WP Holman W Bush IA Almazedi F Malik H Fraut NCIE Morin MI
707	Szewczyk I I Painter GR Human Safety Tolerability and Pharmacokinetics of Molnuniravir a
708	Novel Broad-Spectrum Oral Antiviral Agent with Activity Against SARS-CoV-2 Antimicrob
708	Agents Chemother 2021:65(5) Epub 20210301 doi: 10.1128/AAC 02/28-20 PubMed PMID:
705	23640113. DMCID: DMC202015
711	10 Shan I Datarson & Sadaghat AD MaMahan MA Callandar M Zhang U Zhan V Ditt E
/ 1 1 71 2	17. Sheh L, reteison S, Seuaghai AK, Micivianon MA, Cahender M, Zhang H, Zhou Y, Phi E, Anderson KS, Assets ED Silisiano DE Doss regrones surve slope sets close specific limits or
/12	Anderson K5, Acosta EF, Sinciano KF. Dose-response curve slope sets class-specific limits on
/13	innibitory potential of anti-HIV drugs. Nature Medicine. 2008;14(7):762-6. doi:

714 10.1038/nm1777.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

715 20. Zhou S, Long N, Rosenke K, Jarvis MA, Feldmann H, Swanstrom R. Combined 716 Treatment of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Reduces Molnupiravir-Induced 717 Mutagenicity and Prevents Selection for Nirmatrelvir/Ritonavir Resistance Mutations. J Infect 718 Dis. 2024. Epub 20240708. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiae213. PubMed PMID: 38973065. 719 21. Schiffer JT, Swan DA, Corey L, Wald A. Rapid viral expansion and short drug half-life 720 explain the incomplete effectiveness of current herpes simplex virus 2-directed antiviral agents. 721 Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2013;57(12):5820-9. Epub 2013/09/11. doi: 722 10.1128/AAC.01114-13. PubMed PMID: 24018260; PMCID: PMC3837890. 723 Schiffer JT, Swan DA, Magaret A, Corey L, Wald A, Ossig J, Ruebsamen-Schaeff H, 22. 724 Stoelben S, Timmler B, Zimmermann H, Melhem MR, Van Wart SA, Rubino CM, Birkmann A. 725 Mathematical modeling of herpes simplex virus-2 suppression with pritelivir predicts trial 726 outcomes. Sci Transl Med. 2016;8(324):324ra15. Epub 2016/02/05. doi: 727 10.1126/scitranslmed.aad6654. PubMed PMID: 26843190; PMCID: PMC4880060. 728 23. Backer JA, Eggink D, Andeweg SP, Veldhuijzen IK, van Maarseveen N, Vermaas K, 729 Vlaemynck B, Schepers R, van den Hof S, Reusken CB, Wallinga J. Shorter serial intervals in 730 SARS-CoV-2 cases with Omicron BA.1 variant compared with Delta variant, the Netherlands, 731 13 to 26 December 2021. Euro Surveill. 2022;27(6). doi: 10.2807/1560-732 7917.ES.2022.27.6.2200042. PubMed PMID: 35144721; PMCID: PMC8832521. 733 24. Wu Y, Kang L, Guo Z, Liu J, Liu M, Liang W. Incubation Period of COVID-19 Caused 734 by Unique SARS-CoV-2 Strains: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Netw Open. 735 2022;5(8):e2228008. Epub 20220801. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.28008. PubMed 736 PMID: 35994285; PMCID: PMC9396366. 737 25. Li P, Wang Y, Lavrijsen M, Lamers MM, de Vries AC, Rottier RJ, Bruno MJ, 738 Peppelenbosch MP, Haagmans BL, Pan Q. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant is highly sensitive to 739 molnupiravir, nirmatrelvir, and the combination. Cell Res. 2022;32(3):322-4. Epub 20220120. 740 doi: 10.1038/s41422-022-00618-w. PubMed PMID: 35058606; PMCID: PMC8771185. 741 Yotsuyanagi H, Ohmagari N, Doi Y, Yamato M, Bac NH, Cha BK, Imamura T, Sonoyama 26. 742 T, Ichihashi G, Sanaki T, Tsuge Y, Uehara T, Mukae H. Efficacy and Safety of 5-Day Oral 743 Ensitrelvir for Patients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19: The SCORPIO-SR Randomized 744 Clinical Trial. JAMA Netw Open. 2024;7(2):e2354991. Epub 20240205. doi: 745 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.54991. PubMed PMID: 38335000; PMCID: PMC10858401. 746 27. Cruciani M, Pati I, Masiello F, Piccinini V, Pupella S, De Angelis V. SARS-CoV-2 747 infection rebound among patients receiving antiviral agents, convalescent plasma, or no 748 treatment: a systematic review with meta-analysis. Blood Transfus. 2024. Epub 20240527. doi: 749 10.2450/BloodTransfus.764. PubMed PMID: 38814880. 750 Reeves DB, Mayer BT, deCamp AC, Huang Y, Zhang B, Carpp LN, Magaret CA, Juraska 28. 751 M, Gilbert PB, Montefiori DC, Bar KJ, Cardozo-Ojeda EF, Schiffer JT, Rossenkhan R, Edlefsen 752 P, Morris L, Mkhize NN, Williamson C, Mullins JI, ..., Edupuganti S. High monoclonal 753 neutralization titers reduced breakthrough HIV-1 viral loads in the Antibody Mediated 754 Prevention trials. Nat Commun. 2023;14(1):8299. Epub 20231214. doi: 10.1038/s41467-023-43384-y. PubMed PMID: 38097552; PMCID: PMC10721814. 755 756 Reeves DB, Gaebler C, Oliveira TY, Peluso MJ, Schiffer JT, Cohn LB, Deeks SG, 29. 757 Nussenzweig MC. Impact of misclassified defective proviruses on HIV reservoir measurements. 758 Nat Commun. 2023;14(1):4186. Epub 20230713. doi: 10.1038/s41467-023-39837-z. PubMed 759 PMID: 37443365; PMCID: PMC10345136.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Weinreich DM, Sivapalasingam S, Norton T, Ali S, Gao H, Bhore R, Musser BJ, Soo Y, 760 30. 761 Rofail D, Im J, Perry C, Pan C, Hosain R, Mahmood A, Davis JD, Turner KC, Hooper AT, 762 Hamilton JD, Baum A, ..., Investigators T. REGN-COV2, a Neutralizing Antibody Cocktail, in 763 Outpatients with Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2021;384(3):238-51. Epub 20201217. doi: 764 10.1056/NEJMoa2035002. PubMed PMID: 33332778; PMCID: PMC7781102. 765 31. Watson JA, Kissler SM, Day NPJ, Grad YH, White NJ. Characterizing SARS-CoV-2 766 Viral Clearance Kinetics to Improve the Design of Antiviral Pharmacometric Studies. Antimicrob 767 Agents Chemother. 2022;66(7):e0019222. Epub 20220623. doi: 10.1128/aac.00192-22. PubMed 768 PMID: 35736134; PMCID: PMC9295592. 769 32. Standing JF, Buggiotti L, Guerra-Assuncao JA, Woodall M, Ellis S, Agyeman AA, Miller 770 C, Okechukwu M, Kirkpatrick E, Jacobs AI, Williams CA, Roy S, Martin-Bernal LM, Williams 771 R, Smith CM, Sanderson T, Ashford FB, Emmanuel B, Afzal ZM, ..., Group PV. Randomized 772 controlled trial of molnupiravir SARS-CoV-2 viral and antibody response in at-risk adult 773 outpatients. Nat Commun. 2024;15(1):1652. Epub 20240223. doi: 10.1038/s41467-024-45641-0. 774 PubMed PMID: 38396069; PMCID: PMC10891158. 775 Lonsdale DO, Kipper K, Baker EH, Barker CIS, Oldfield I, Philips BJ, Johnston A, 33. Rhodes A, Sharland M, Standing JF. B-Lactam antimicrobial pharmacokinetics and target 776 attainment in critically ill patients aged 1 day to 90 years: the ABDose study. J Antimicrob 777 778 Chemother. 2020;75(12):3625-34. doi: 10.1093/jac/dkaa363. PubMed PMID: 32989452. 779 Singh S, Boyd S, Schilling WHK, Watson JA, Mukaka M, White NJ. The relationship 34. 780 between viral clearance rates and disease progression in early symptomatic COVID-19: a 781 systematic review and meta-regression analysis. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2024. Epub 20240222. 782 doi: 10.1093/jac/dkae045. PubMed PMID: 38385479. 783 Prague M, Lavielle M. SAMBA: A novel method for fast automatic model building in 35. 784 nonlinear mixed-effects models. CPT Pharmacometrics Syst Pharmacol. 2022;11(2):161-72. 785 Epub 20220201. doi: 10.1002/psp4.12742. PubMed PMID: 35104058; PMCID: PMC8846636. Bing A, Hu Y, Prague M, Hill AL, Li JZ, Bosch RJ, De Gruttola V, Wang R. Comparison 786 36. 787 of empirical and dynamic models for HIV viral load rebound after treatment interruption. Stat 788 Commun Infect Dis. 2020;12(Suppl 1). Epub 20200821. doi: 10.1515/scid-2019-0021. PubMed 789 PMID: 34158910; PMCID: PMC8216669. 790 Chan PL, Jacquin P, Lavielle M, McFadven L, Weatherley B. The use of the SAEM 37. 791 algorithm in MONOLIX software for estimation of population pharmacokinetic-792 pharmacodynamic-viral dynamics parameters of maraviroc in asymptomatic HIV subjects. J 793 Pharmacokinet Pharmacodyn. 2011;38(1):41-61. Epub 2010/11/19. doi: 10.1007/s10928-010-794 9175-z. PubMed PMID: 21088872; PMCID: PMC3020311. 795 Ke R, Zitzmann C, Ho DD, Ribeiro RM, Perelson AS. In vivo kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 38. 796 infection and its relationship with a person's infectiousness. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 797 2021;118(49). doi: 10.1073/pnas.2111477118. PubMed PMID: 34857628. 798 Galmiche S, Cortier T, Charmet T, Schaeffer L, Chény O, von Platen C, Lévy A, Martin 39. 799 S. Omar F. David C. Mailles A. Carrat F. Cauchemez S. Fontanet A. SARS-CoV-2 incubation 800 period across variants of concern, individual factors, and circumstances of infection in France: a 801 case series analysis from the ComCor study. Lancet Microbe. 2023;4(6):e409-e17. Epub 802 20230418. doi: 10.1016/S2666-5247(23)00005-8. PubMed PMID: 37084751; PMCID: 803 PMC10112864. 804 805