Target product profiles for new diagnostics to inform 1

strongyloidiasis control programs 2

- 3
- 4 Short title: Diagnostics to inform strongyloidiasis deworming programs

5

- 6 Adama Kazienga^{1,2*}, Luc E. Coffeng², Sara Roose¹, Sake de Vlas², Dora Buonfrate³
- 7 Salvatore Scarso³, Francesca Tamarozzi³, Bruno Levecke¹

8

- 9 ¹Department of Translational Physiology, Infectiology and Public Health, Ghent
- 10 University, Merelbeke, Belgium
- 11 ²Department of Public Health, Erasmus MC, University Medical Center Rotterdam,
- 12 Rotterdam, The Netherlands
- 13 ³ Department of Infectious, Tropical Diseases and Microbiology, IRCCS Sacro Cuore
- 14 Don Calabria Hospital, Negrar di Valpolicella, Verona, Italy

15

16 *Corresponding author: kazienga adama@yahoo.fr

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

17 Abstract

Background: The World Health Organization calls for the development of new diagnostics to support large-scale deworming programs against strongyloidiasis. To better steer research and development (R&D) of new diagnostics, it is imperative to identify the minimal requirements that new diagnostics should meet, the so-called target product profiles (TPPs). While diagnostic TPPs exist for other major soiltransmitted helminthiases, none exist for strongyloidiasis.

24 **Methods**: We investigated a range of potential diagnostic TPPs using our previously 25 developed simulation framework for the effect of imperfect diagnostics on the cost and 26 correctness of program decisions. With this framework, we studied the minimum 27 requirements for diagnostic performance, cost per test and sample throughput for 28 future assays while comparing the survey costs with those of the reference Baermann 29 method. As potential assay platforms, we considered antibody (Ab)-detecting assays, 30 including a point-of-care lateral flow assay (LFA) and a laboratory-based Ab-ELISA. 31 We also determined cost-efficient school-based survey designs for two currently 32 available assays: Bordier Ab-ELISA and a prototype NIE-LFA.

Principal findings: Our findings highlighted that (i) specificity rather than sensitivity is a critical parameter to consider for R&D of new diagnostic methods for monitoring control programs; (ii) the requirements for diagnostic performance became less stringent with an increasing sample size and when higher risks of incorrect decisionmaking were accepted. When focusing on the assay formats, the LFA resulted in lower survey costs compared to the Baermann method. Ab-ELISA was cost-efficient only if the diagnostic performance was nearly perfect combined with low cost per test and

- 40 high sample throughput. Of all the three assays considered here, the prototype NIE-
- 41 LFA allowed for the most cost-efficient survey designs.
- 42 **Conclusion/significance**: R&D should focus on developing point-of-care assays with
- 43 high specificity. The prototype NIE-LFA is a cost-efficient alternative to Baermann to
- 44 support control programs for strongyloidiasis.
- 45
- 46 Keywords: strongyloidiasis, diagnostics, sensitivity, specificity, sample throughput,
- 47 cost-analysis, target product profiles

48 Author summary

49 The World Health Organization calls for the development of rapid, easy-to-use, and 50 performant point-of-care diagnostics to follow up large-scale deworming programs 51 against strongyloidiasis. However, there are no further recommendations regarding the 52 required performance and cost of such new diagnostics. We performed a simulation 53 study and a cost analysis to assess the minimum requirements in terms of diagnostic 54 sensitivity and specificity, cost per test, and sample throughput for future assays while 55 comparing the survey costs with those of a reference method. In addition, we 56 determined the most cost-efficient survey designs to support control programs for 57 strongyloidiasis applying currently available assays. Our results indicate that research 58 & development efforts should focus on developing point-of-care assays with high 59 specificity. Of the currently available diagnostics, a prototype of a rapid diagnostic test resulted in the lowest total survey cost, while restricting the risk of incorrect policy 60 61 decisions to the minimum.

62 Introduction

63 Strongyloidiasis is caused by the parasitic worm *Strongyloides stercoralis* and is 64 one of the 21 neglected tropical diseases (NTDs), as classified by the World Health 65 Organization (WHO) [1]. This parasitic roundworm is transmitted to humans through 66 skin contact with contaminated soil, and hence belongs to the group of soil-transmitted 67 helminths (STHs) [1–3]. As global burden, it is estimated that 600 million people 68 worldwide are infected by S. stercoralis, being prevalent mainly in tropical and 69 subtropical areas [4]. In response to this burden on public health, and after the long 70 neglect, the WHO has now explicitly incorporated a strongyloidiasis-specific target in 71 its 2020-2030 roadmap for STHs, namely the establishment of efficient strongyloidiasis control programs [1]. To this end, the WHO recommends preventive chemotherapy 72 73 (PC) with a single oral dose of ivermectin (200 µm/kg) to entire communities in endemic 74 areas [5].

The initiation of these large-scale deworming programs is recommended when the detected prevalence of *S. stercoralis* larvae in stool, diagnosed through Baermann method or agar plate culture [6–9], exceeds 5% (~10% true prevalence) in a schoolbased survey or 10% (~20% true prevalence) in a community-based survey. When deploying serology-based assays, the detected prevalence thresholds for initiating deworming are higher (school-based survey: 15%; community-based survey: 25%) [5].

Today, there is an unmet need for affordable and scalable diagnostics to monitor and evaluate (M&E) *S. stercoralis* infections in (suspected) endemic populations. To better steer the development of new diagnostics, it is imperative to identify the minimal requirements that such new diagnostics should meet, the so-called target product profiles (TPPs). To date, the WHO has already supported the development of

86 diagnostic TPPs for 12 NTDs [10–19]. While a TPP exists for M&E of the major STHs 87 control programs [13], it does not include strongyloidiasis. Here, we considered 88 serological tests and determined the minimal requirements of diagnostic performance, 89 sample throughput and cost per test, with the aim to support the development of a TPP 90 for diagnostics deployed to inform strongyloidiasis control programs. In addition, we 91 determined cost-efficient school-based survey designs for two currently available Ab-92 based assays: a commercially available Ab-ELISA and a prototype of a lateral flow 93 assay (LFA).

94 Methods

95 We assessed the minimal requirements for four attributes (sensitivity, specificity, 96 throughput, and cost per test) for three hypothetical serological tests in three steps. In 97 the first step, we applied a previously developed simulation framework [20] to 98 determine those combinations of sensitivity and specificity that minimize the risk of 99 incorrect program decisions in the presence of logistic constraints (the number of 100 schools and the number of children per school that can be sampled). In the second step, we determined those combinations of sensitivity and specificity that also fulfilled 101 102 budget constraints, where the total survey costs should not exceed that of a survey 103 based on the Baermann method. In the third step, we determined the minimal 104 requirements for sample throughput and cost per test of new diagnostics, along with 105 their diagnostic accuracy (sensitivity and specificity), that meet both the logistic and 106 budget constraints.

107 In addition, we determined the most cost-efficient survey designs when using two 108 currently available Ab-based assays: the commercially available *Strongyloides ratti* 109 IgG ELISA (Bordier Affinity Products, Crissier, Switzerland), and a prototype point-of-

care lateral flow assay (LFA) developed by the Institute for Research in MolecularMedicine of the Universiti Sains Malaysia [6].

112

113 Required diagnostic performance in the presence of logistic constraints

114 To determine those combinations of sensitivity and specificity that minimize the risk 115 of incorrect program decisions in the presence of logistic constraints, we applied a 116 previously developed simulation framework [20]. This framework is based on a two-117 stage lot-guality assurance sampling (LQAS) strategy and allows to determine the risk 118 of incorrect program decisions when imperfect tests are deployed. The general details 119 of this framework have been described elsewhere to inform school-based STH control 120 programs [20]. Here, we limit ourselves to justifying the values for the eight input 121 parameters that are required to determine the risk of incorrect decision-making (see 122 Table S1). These eight input parameters can be divided into three groups. The first 123 group represents the parameters of primary interest: test sensitivity (se) and specificity 124 (sp). Next, we have setting-specific parameters: the program prevalence decision 125 threshold (T) and the intracluster correlation coefficient (ICC) which represents the 126 degree of geographical variation in prevalences. Finally, we have the framework 127 constraints, which consist of logistic constraints and several parameters related to the 128 risk of incorrect decisions. For the logistic constraints, we capped the maximum 129 number of sampled schools $(n_{schools})$ and the number of children per school $(n_{children})$. 130 With regard to risk of incorrect decisions, we defined the maximum allowed probability 131 of unnecessary continuing STH control ($E_{overtreat}$) when the true prevalence is at some 132 value (lower limit or LL) under the prevalence decision threshold. Similarly, we defined 133 the maximum allowed risk of prematurely stopping $(E_{undertreat})$ the program when the 134 true prevalence is at some value above the decision thresholds (upper limit or UL).

135 We let the diagnostic test sensitivity and specificity vary from 50% to 100% (with 136 increments of 2 percentage points), resulting in 676 theoretical diagnostic tests with 137 different diagnostic performance (26 values for sensitivity x 26 values for specificity). 138 The program prevalence decision threshold T represents the true underlying 139 prevalence that triggers distribution of ivermectin and was set at 10%, assuming that 140 school-age children will be sampled [5]. The chosen value for the intra-cluster correlation (ICC = 0.0014) reflects the spatial heterogeneity in strongyloidiasis 141 142 measured across 6,846 SAC from 64 schools in Ethiopia who were screened for the 143 presence of anti-Strongyloides antibodies in their plasma (see **S1 Info**). We quantified 144 the *ICC* using a generalized linear mixed model using these data. We further let the 145 number of schools visited $(n_{schools})$ vary from 5 to 10 with increments of 1. Assuming 146 that at most 100 children can be sampled per school, for each combination of sensitivity 147 and specificity we determined the minimum number of schools that would have to be 148 sampled to achieve a sufficiently low risk of incorrect program decisions (details 149 below). To calculate the risk of incorrect program decisions, the prevalence limits (LL 150 and UL) surrounding T were arbitrarily set at $T \pm 25\% \times T$ (LL = 7.5%, UL = 12.5%) 151 [20]. Then, for each combination of se, sp, and $n_{schools}$, we determined the risk of 152 overtreating and undertreating using Monte Carlo simulation (10,000 iterations). We 153 kept all the combinations of sensitivity, specificity, and number of schools that satisfied the condition of ideal decision-making ($E_{overtreatment} = 10\%$ and $E_{undertreat} = 5\%$) or 154 adequate decision-making ($E_{overtreatment}$ = 25% and $E_{undertreat}$ = 5%), as in the previous 155 156 study [20].

158 **Required diagnostic performance in the presence of budget constraints**

159 After having considered logistic constraints, we assessed which combinations of 160 performance of hypothetical serological diagnostic tests (sensitivity, specificity). 161 number of schools, and number of children of schools allow for ideal or adequate 162 decision-making while remaining within a target budget. Here, we restricted the target 163 budget to the total cost of a Baermann-based survey that was sufficiently powered for 164 ideal or adequate decision-making. For each combination of diagnostic performance 165 and sample size, we calculated the survey cost considering two alternative diagnostic 166 assay formats for the detection of anti-Strongyloides antibodies (Ab): an LFA that 167 allows for point-of-care testing of whole blood and an Ab-ELISA that can be used in a 168 central laboratory testing approach. For the Ab-ELISA, we considered the possibility of 169 testing either plasma or eluate from dry blood spot (DBS) samples, resulting in three 170 implementation choices: LFA, Ab-ELISA/plasma, and Ab-ELISA/DBS. We distinguish 171 between these three implementation choices as they have different impacts on survey 172 costs (details below).

173

174

Simulating the impact of diagnostic test performance and survey design

175 To determine the required performance of serological diagnostics, we used our 176 simulation framework as described above, but we now allowed the number of sampled 177 children per school to vary from 10 to 100, by increments of 2. This is because with 178 improved diagnostic performance, generally, fewer children might be required per 179 school. For each combination of *se*, *sp*, and $n_{schools}$ and $n_{children}$, we performed 10,000 180 repeated Monte Carlo simulations and again determined the risk of overtreating and 181 undertreating. We kept all the combinations of diagnostic performance and survey 182 design that satisfied the conditions of ideal decision-making ($E_{overtreatment} = 10\%$ and

183 $E_{undertreat}$ = 5%) or adequate decision-making ($E_{overtreatment}$ = 25% and $E_{undertreat}$ = 184 5%), as in the previous study [20].

185 For the Baerman method, we only determined which combinations of number of 186 schools and number of children per school allowed for adequate and ideal decision-187 making, fixing the sensitivity and specificity at 50.0% and 98.0% as reported in 188 literature [6]. However, we note that such high specificity can only be attained by well-189 trained microscopists. Since less optimal specificity requires a larger samples size (and 190 thus more expensive surveys) [20,21], we also assessed the outcome of survey design 191 when the specificity of the Baermann method was reduced from 98% to 93%, while 192 keeping the sensitivity at 50%.

193

Estimate the total survey costs

194 For each diagnostic test (Baermann and hypothetical serological tests) and survey 195 design we calculated the total survey costs, which comprised four cost items: (i) the 196 operational cost to inform all schools about the survey (*Cost_{inform}*), (ii) the cost to collect and prepare all individual samples for further analysis (Cost_{collect}), (iii) the cost 197 to transport all samples to a central laboratory (*Cost*_{transport}; Ab-ELISA only), and (iv) 198 199 the cost to analyze all samples (*Cost*_{analysis}). To estimate the total survey cost for any 200 given survey design, we assumed that a working day consists of 8 hours. 201 Consequently, the number of samples that can be collected and further analyzed daily 202 is limited and varies between deployed diagnostic methods. Therefore, for each survey 203 design and deployed diagnostic method, we determined the number of working days 204 required to collect and further analyze all samples from the recruited children. This 205 required number of days depends on the number of laboratory technicians in the mobile team, the number of working hours per day, the number of samples collected 206

207 per hour, and the sample throughput per hour that one person can analyze (see S2 208 Info). We considered that 4 laboratory technicians would be needed per day when 209 deploying the Baermann method, while only 2 technicians would be needed if using 210 the Ab-based assays (LFA, Ab-ELISA/Plasma, and Ab-ELISA/DBS). We further 211 included the costs of various required items (see S3 Info) based on an itemized cost-212 assessment representing the real costs of a school-based survey carried out in 213 Ecuador [6]. This itemized cost-assessment included the cost of consumables to 214 collect one sample (*Cost_{collect}*), the cost to prepare one sample (*Cost_{prep}*), the cost to test one sample (*Cost_{test}*), the daily salary for every technician and nurse in the mobile 215 216 team ($Cost_{tech}$), the daily salary for local helper ($Cost_{helper}$, only required when 217 deploying the Baermann method) and the daily cost of car rental, petrol, and driver 218 wages (*Cost*_{drivers}). Note that we did not consider costs for establishing and maintaining 219 laboratory infrastructures. We further assumed that all work takes place on regular 220 working days and that the team does not take any breaks during processing. Further 221 details on how we estimated the total survey costs can be found in S2 Info.

222

223 Required diagnostic performance to not exceed the total cost of Baermann-based224 survey

After we determined the total survey cost for each combination of diagnostic performance and survey design, we set a benchmark for the total survey cost for new hypothetical serological tests, using Baermann as the reference. For this, we considered those combinations of $n_{schools}$ and $n_{children}$ that allowed a Baermann-based survey to result in adequate and ideal decision-making for the lowest total survey cost. Given this benchmark cost, we identified for each implementation scenario (LFA, Ab-ELISA/plasma, and Ab-ELISA/DBS) those combinations of diagnostic sensitivity and

specificity that were logistically feasible and resulted in a total survey cost that did notexceed the benchmark cost.

234

235 Minimal requirements for sample throughput and cost per test

236 We previously showed that higher diagnostic performance allows for a reduction of 237 sample size for the same level of program decision-making (adequate or ideal), thus 238 allowing for less stringent requirements in terms of sample throughput and cost per 239 test [20]. We therefore explored the minimal requirements for sample throughput and 240 cost per test such that the total survey cost does not exceed that of a survey based on 241 the Baermann method (benchmark cost). To this end, we repeated the total survey 242 cost analysis for the three implementation scenarios while varying the sample 243 throughput (5, 10, 20, and 40 samples per hour) and cost per test (0.20 EUR to 15 244 EUR, with 0.20 EUR increment). Finally, we determined those combinations of 245 diagnostic performance, sample throughput and cost per test that met both the logistic 246 and budget constraints.

247

248 Most cost-efficient survey design for existing serological assays

We determined the most cost-efficient survey designs for two existing serological assays, including a commercially available Ab-ELISA and a prototype LFA. For the Ab-ELISA, we based our assumptions about sensitivity (79%) and specificity (93%) on the commercially available *Strongyloides ratti* IgG ELISA (Bordier Ab-ELISA, Bordier Affinity Products, Crissier, Switzerland), based on crude antigens of the parasite *Strongyloides ratti*. For the prototype LFA, we considered a cassette-format immunochromatographic rapid diagnostic test developed by the Institute for Research

256 in Molecular Medicine of the Universiti Sains Malaysia. This LFA is based on the 257 recombinant antigen NIE (NIE-LFA) [22]. To determine the most cost-efficient survey 258 design for these assays, we calculated the total survey costs for each combination of 259 survey design $(n_{schools} \times n_{children})$ as described in **S2 Info**, while fixing the sensitivity 260 and specificity at 79.0% and 93.0%, respectively [6]. These tests are assumed to only 261 differ in terms of cost to test one sample, cost to prepare sample, cost to test one 262 sample and the number of samples that can be analyzed by one person in one hour 263 (see **S2 Info**). The most cost-efficient survey design is the one $(n_{school} \times n_{children})$ that 264 minimized the total survey cost while attaining an adequate and an ideal program 265 decision-making.

266 **Results**

267 **Required diagnostic performance in the presence of logistic constraints**

268 Given the presence of logistic constraints, we investigated the combinations of 269 sensitivity and specificity that minimize the risk of incorrect programs decisions. Fig 1 270 represents the required diagnostic performance (minimum sensitivity and specificity) 271 for adequate (Fig 1A) and ideal (Fig 1B) decision-making when sampling 100 children 272 per school (the assumed maximum logistically feasible number) across five to 10 273 schools. Three important points can be noted in this figure. First, requirements are 274 more stringent for specificity than for sensitivity. For example, specificity cannot be 275 below 72% for adequate decision-making (Fig 1A) and 84% for ideal decision-making 276 (Fig 1B), whereas sensitivity could be as low as 50% in both cases. Second, the 277 requirements for sensitivity and specificity are inversely correlated. For example, when 278 sampling seven schools with a theoretical test with a specificity of 98%, the sensitivity 279 should be at least 50% to allow adequate decision-making, while when deploying a

280 theoretical test with a specificity of 84%, the sensitivity should be at least 92%. Third, 281 the requirements for diagnostic performance become less stringent as a function of an 282 increasing number of schools (thus more children are screened) and increasing risk of 283 incorrect decision-making. When focusing on adequate program decision-making and 284 fixing the specificity at 96% (Fig 1A), the required sensitivity was 58% when 7 schools 285 were sampled, while it was 50% when 10 schools were included. When now focusing 286 on ideal program decision-making (**Fig 1B**) while fixing the specificity at 96% and the 287 number of schools at 7 (Fig 1B), the required sensitivity was 78% (instead of 58% for

- 288 adequate decision making)
- 289
- 290

Fig 1. Required sensitivity and specificity when making adequate and ideal program decisions in the presence of logistic constraints. The figure indicates the required sensitivity and specificity for adequate ($E_{undertreatment} = 5\%$ and $E_{overtreatment} = 25\%$; Panel A) and ideal decision-making ($E_{undertreatment} = 5\%$ and $E_{overtreatment} = 10\%$; Panel B) when sampling 100 children per school for different number of schools (colored lines). The black dot represents the diagnostic performance of the Baermann method (sensitivity = 50.0% and specificity = 98.0%).

297

298

299

300 Required diagnostic performance in the presence of budget constraints

301 While we have considered logistic constraints so far, we further explored those 302 combinations of sensitivity and specificity that allowed for adequate and ideal decision-303 making in the presence of budget constraints. For this, we explored three 304 implementation choices (LFA, Ab-ELISA/plasma and Ab-ELISA/DBS) while not 305 allowing the total survey cost to exceed the cost of a Baerman-based survey. For 306 adequate decision-making, the most cost-efficient survey design for Baerman-based 307 survey involved a total of 644 children (= $n_{school} \times n_{child} = 7 \times 92$), resulting in a total 308 survey cost of 9.410 EUR. As soon as 41 children test positive (= decision cutoff c).

309 one could already stop screening and initiate a strongyloidiasis control program. For 310 ideal decision-making, the most cost-efficient design involved a total of 980 children (= 311 $n_{schools} \times n_{children} = 10 \times 98$), resulting in an estimated total survey cost of 13,968 312 EUR. For this level of decision-making, 65 positive test results would trigger large-scale 313 deworming. If the assumed specificity of Baermann was 93% instead of 98% because 314 of insufficiently trained laboratory technicians, the required sample size was beyond 315 what was considered logistically feasible (adequate: 13 schools x 96 children per 316 school; ideal: 20 schools x 96 children), resulting in a total cost of 17,625 EUR 317 (adequate) and 27,103 EUR (ideal). We will therefore base the benchmark for total 318 survey costs on the assumption that the Baermann method is performed by well-319 trained technicians (i.e., specificity of 98%).

320 After defining the cost benchmark, we continued identifying those combinations of 321 sensitivity and specificity of hypothetical new serological tests that allowed for a survey 322 that was not more expensive than the most cost-efficient Baermann-based survey 323 design. Table 1 presents the required diagnostic performance (sensitivity and 324 specificity) for adequate and ideal decision-making when deploying an LFA and Ab-325 ELISA/Plasma in the presence of both logistic and budget constraints. When focusing 326 on LFA, two crucial points can be made. First, this table indicates that when an LFA 327 format is applied, the test performance can take a wide range of values for sensitivity 328 and specificity, the two parameters again being inversely correlated. Second, when 329 looking more closely into the absolute values, they represent all possible combinations 330 of sensitivity and specificity illustrated in Fig 1 (all combinations above the purple line). 331 In other words, even when the sampling effort is maximized (10 schools and 100 332 children per school), the total survey costs never exceeded that of a Baermann-based

survey, highlighting that the budget constraints had no impact on the requirements forthe diagnostic performance of LFA.

For Ab-ELISA-based surveys, which are more expensive (see S2 Info), the impact of budget constraints on the requirements for diagnostic performance was more pronounced, resulting in fewer and more stringent diagnostic performance options. For an Ab-ELISA-based survey to be as cost-efficient as a Baermann-based survey for adequate decision-making, its required sensitivity should be at least 80%, while its specificity cannot be below 98% (Table 1). Additionally, the required number of schools and children that need to be sampled was lower for an Ab-ELISA-based surveys compared to LFA (5 schools vs. 10 schools and 100 children per school).

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

354 Table 1. Required specificity and sensitivity for adequate and ideal decision-making when 355 deploying LFA and Ab-ELISA/Plasma in the presence of both logistic and budget constraints. 356 The table summarizes the sensitivity and specificity for the LFA and Ab-ELISA/Plasma to achieve adequate ($E_{undertreatment}$ = 5% and $E_{overtreatment}$ = 25%) and ideal program decision-making (357 $E_{undertreatment} = 5\%$ and $E_{overtreatment} = 10\%$). Each of these combinations result in a total survey cost 358 359 that does not exceed that of a Baermann-based survey (assuming a specificity of 98% and sensitivity 360 of 50% for the Baermann method). Ab-ELISA/Plasma: Ab-ELISA assays that are based on plasma. Note 361 that the blank cells indicate that there were no combinations of sensitivity and specificity that resulted in 362 sufficiently low risk of incorrect decision-making.

Specificity (%)	Minimum sensitivity LFA (%)		Minimum sensitivity Ab-ELISA/Plasma (%)			
-	Adequate	Ideal decision-	Adequate decision-	Ideal decision-		
	decision-making	making	making	making		
100	50	50	80	82		
98	50	50	94	96		
96	50	60				
94	54	70				
92	60	78				
90	68	82				
88	70	88				
86	76	92				
84	80	100				
82	84					
80	88					
78	90					
76	94					
74	96					
72	100					

363

364 Minimal requirements for sample throughput and cost per test

365 We then looked at how better diagnostic performance allows for less stringent 366 sample throughput and cost per test for all logistically feasible surveys. When focusing 367 on LFA (Fig 2A and 2B), we note two important aspects. First, results confirm that 368 improving the sensitivity and specificity of a test allowed for higher costs per test (shift 369 from dark green to red colored tiles), with the highest possible cost per test for a LFA 370 with 100% sensitivity and specificity. As illustrated in **Fig S1**, improving the diagnostic 371 performance required smaller sample sizes for the same level of program decision-372 making, thus allowing to have higher cost per test for the same total survey cost. 373 Second, by comparing **Figs 2A** and **2B**, we can see that the maximum cost per test 374 was very similar for tests with lower (5 samples per hour) and higher throughput (40 375 samples per hour). For example, when fixing diagnostic performance at 92%

376 specificity and 74% sensitivity, the maximum cost per test equaled 6.4 EUR when five 377 samples per hour were processed, and 7.6 EUR when 40 samples per hour can be 378 processed. As such, improving the diagnostic performance allows for a relatively 379 higher maximum cost per test than improving the sample throughput.

380 When comparing these findings for LFA (Figs 2A and 2B) with those for Ab-381 ELISA/Plasma (Figs 2C and 2D), two important differences can be noticed. First, as 382 expected from the performance options in presence of budget constraints (Table 1; 383 LFA: Fig 2A vs. Ab-ELSA: Fig 2C), there are fewer and more stringent diagnostic 384 performance options for Ab-ELISA (fewer colored tiles in the figure). Second, the 385 requirements for the cost per test are stricter for Ab-ELISA (fewer red tiles), indicating 386 that the cost per test should be relatively cheap. For example, if we focus on a 387 throughput of five samples per hour, the maximum cost for test with a specificity of 388 100% and sensitivity of 52% was 13.6 EUR when deployed as LFA format, while this 389 was 1.0 EUR when deployed as an Ab-ELSA format.

390

391 Fig 2. The maximum cost per test for an LFA and Ab-ELISA/Plasma for adequate decision 392 making. This figure presents the maximum cost per test for all possible combinations of sensitivity and 393 specificity, sample throughput (number of samples that can be analyzed by one technician in one hour) 394 that allowed for adequate ($E_{undertreatment}$ = 5% and $E_{overtreatment}$ = 25%) decision-making for an LFA 395 (Panel A: sample throughput of five samples per hour; Panel B: sample throughput of 40 samples per 396 hour) and Ab-ELISA format (Panel C: sample throughput of five samples per hour; Panel D: sample 397 throughput of 40 samples per hour). Note that the maximum cost per test is the true maximum cost per 398 test that could work in at least one logistically feasible survey design that is not more expensive than 399 the benchmark cost based on the Baermann method. Absence of tiles indicates that the combination of 400 sensitivity and specificity was inadequate for decision-making, given the logistic and budget constraints.

401 We next focus on the maximum cost per test for an LFA and Ab-ELISA/Plasma across 402 different combinations of diagnostic performance and sample throughput for ideal 403 (instead of adequate) decision-making (Fig 3). Overall, we noted two aspects. First, 404 for ideal decision-making (Fig 3), patterns in maximum cost per test (as function of 405 sensitivity, specificity and throughput) are essentially the same as for adequate 406 decision-making (Fig 2). However, diagnostic performance requirements are more 407 stringent, meaning there are fewer options. Next, given that the benchmark cost for 408 ideal decision-making was set to be higher than for adequate decision-making, the 409 maximum cost per test for a given diagnostic performance was actually very similar 410 between the two levels of certainty in decision-making.

411

412 Fig 3. The maximum cost per test for an LFA and Ab-ELISA/Plasma for ideal decision making. 413 This figure represents all possible combinations of sensitivity and specificity, sample throughput (number 414 of samples that can be analyzed by one technician in one hour), and the maximum cost per test (in 415 EUR) that allowed for adequate ($E_{undertreatment} = 5\%$ and $E_{overtreatment} = 10\%$) decision-making for an 416 LFA (Panel A: sample throughput of five samples per hour; Panel B: sample throughput of 40 samples 417 per hour) and Ab-ELISA format (Panel C: sample throughput of five samples per hour; Panel D: sample 418 throughput of 40 samples per hour). Note that the maximum cost per test is the true maximum cost per 419 test that could work in at least one logistically feasible survey design that is not more expensive than 420 the benchmark cost based on the Baermann method. Absence of tiles indicates that the combination of 421 sensitivity and specificity was inadequate for decision-making, given the logistic and budget constraints.

- 422
- 423

424 Most cost-efficient survey design for existing Ab-based assays

We finally determined the most cost-efficient survey designs when deploying two currently available Ab-based assays. **Table 2** summarizes the most cost-efficient survey designs that allowed for adequate and ideal decision-making for these two tests when assuming the diagnostic performance reported by Tamarozzi et al. [6] (sensitivity = 79% and specificity = 93%). Compared to the Baermann method, two important differences can be noted for these Ab-based assays. First, the required sample size for the survey is slightly smaller when deploying Ab-based assays. For instance, when 19

considering adequate decision-making, a total of 644 children (= $n_{school} \times n_{child}$ 432 433 $= 7 \times 92$) need to be screened when using the Baermann method. This required 434 sample size decreased to 564 children (= $n_{school} \times n_{child} = 6 \times 94$) when deploying 435 Ab-based assays. Second, despite this smaller sample size, the surveys were more 436 expensive when deploying Ab-based assays compared to the cost of a cost-efficient 437 Baermann-based survey. For instance, when deploying the Bordier Ab-ELISA, the total 438 survey costs were 81% times higher when applied on plasma (Bordier Ab-439 ELISA/Plasma) and 82% times higher when applied on DBS (Bordier Ab-ELISA/DBS). 440 In contrast, deploying LFA resulted in cheaper surveys compared to the cost of a cost-441 efficient Baermann-based survey. For example, for adequate decision-making, the 442 total survey costs for NIE-LFA were 52% times lower than that of surveys based on 443 the Baermann method. If these Ab-based tests are implemented (6 schools and 94 444 children per school), 76 positive test results would trigger large-scale deworming 445 programs for adequate decision making and 123 for ideal decision-making (9 schools 446 and 98 children per school).

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

Table 2. The most cost-efficient survey design to initiate large-scale deworming against strongyloidiasis when deploying Baermann method and existing Ab-based assays. This table represents the required sample size $(n_{scchool} \times n_{children})$, the decision cutoff c, and the total survey cost to assess whether the true prevalence of strongyloidiasis is under or above 10% for adequate and ideal decision-making. Bordier Ab-ELISA represents a commercially available Strongyloides ratti IgG ELISA (Bordier Affinity Products, Crissier, Switzerland) applied on either plasma (Bordier Ab-ELISA/plasma) or dried blood samples (Bordier Ab-ELISA/DBS). NIE-LFA is a prototype (research use only) lateral flow assay (LFA) developed by the Institute for Research in Molecular Medicine of the Universiti Sains Malaysia. This LFA is based on the recombinant antigen NIE.

Method	Sensitivity	Specificity	n _{schools}	n _{children}	Decision cutoff (<i>c</i>)	Total survey cost (EUR)
Adequate decision making						
Baermann method	0.50	0.98	7	92	41	9,410
Bordier Ab-ELISA/Plasma	0.79	0.93	6	94	76	17,067
Bordier Ab-ELISA/DBS	0.79	0.93	6	94	76	17,197
NIE-LFA	0.79	0.93	6	94	76	4,949
Ideal decision making						
Baermann method	0.50	0.98	10	98	65	13,968
Bordier Ab-ELISA/Plasma	0.79	0.93	9	98	123	26,391
Bordier Ab-ELISA/DBS	0.79	0.93	9	98	123	26,448
NIE-LFA	0.79	0.93	9	98	123	7,424

465 **Discussion**

The WHO calls for the development of rapid, easy-to-use, and performant point-ofcare diagnostics for M&E of large-scale deworming programs [1]. While a TPP exists for M&E of STH control programs, it does not include strongyloidiasis. Therefore, we determined the minimal requirements of diagnostics for strongyloidiasis in terms of diagnostic performance (sensitivity and specificity), sample throughput and cost per test for diagnosing strongyloidiasis, with the aim to further support the development of a diagnostic TPPs for this NTD.

473 In the presence of logistic constraints (the number of schools that can be visited 474 per day and the number of children per school are limited), we found that sensitivity 475 and specificity are inversely correlated, and that specificity is critical to consider when 476 developing a diagnostic assay to be deployed in population-based surveys. Indeed, 477 depending on the acceptable risk of making a wrong program decision, specificity 478 should be at least 72% for adequate and 84% for ideal or even higher for both (e.g. 479 sensitivity is less than 100%). For the sensitivity, it should be at 50% for both program 480 decision-making (adequate and ideal) or even higher in case the specificity is less than 481 100% (Fig 1). This need for highly specific diagnostics aligns with the results of 482 previous studies [20,21] and the recently published WHO TPPs for diagnostics to be 483 deployed in M&E of large-scale deworming programs for NTDs such as lymphatic 484 filariasis, onchocerciasis, and schistosomiasis [11–14]. In each of these TPPs, the 485 minimum required specificity is 94%, while the minimum required sensitivity was set to 486 60%, which is roughly comparable to our recommendations for strongyloidiasis 487 diagnostics.

488 When also considering budget constraints and exploring different implementation 489 choices (LFA, Ab-ELISA/plasma, and Ab-ELISA/DBS) and scenarios of sample 490 throughput and cost per test, our results indicated that a LFA holds the most promise 491 as a diagnostic format to take cost-efficient program decisions. Implementing an LFA 492 allowed for a lower total survey costs compared to a Baermann-based survey, even 493 when its diagnostic performance is less optimal (lower specificity compared to 494 Baermann) and the cost per test is higher. In contrast, surveys based on Ab-ELISA 495 turned out to be more expensive compared to Baermann method, unless a nearly 496 perfect diagnostic performance, low cost per test, and high sample throughput was 497 reached. This can be explained by the additional cost of needing to prepare the 498 samples for testing (Ab-ELISA/plasma: 9.27 EUR per sample and Ab-ELISA/DBS: 499 11.49 EUR per sample) and the cost per test (10.79 EUR). A potential cost-saving 500 strategy would be using the same samples to test for multiple NTDs (or other diseases) 501 at the same time, and thus spreading the costs of the sample preparation step over 502 multiple disease control programs. This would also align with the WHO vision for 503 integrated disease surveillance and control, offering a streamlined approach to tackling 504 NTDs alongside other infectious diseases [1,13].

505 These results particularly welcomed are since. recently. а number of 506 immunochromatographic rapid tests for the diagnosis of strongyloidiasis have been 507 developed, most of which based on the recombinant antigens NIE and SsIR, [23] 508 Currently, none of these tests are commercially available, and they have been 509 evaluated mostly in laboratory-based studies [24-28]. However, their performance 510 seems promising in a number of studies (complying with the requirements defined 511 here, **Table 1**), importantly including two field-based projects [6,24,29]. These findings, 512 although requiring confirmation and validation in larger cohorts and different settings,

support further R&D of this type of assays for strongyloidiasis control programs. R&D
should carefully consider the physical characteristics of the LFA assay, such as
cassette *vs.* dipstick format, as these could impact the test's method protocol,
diagnostic performance, cost per test, and material disposal requirements.

517 Finally, we defined cost-efficient survey designs for the control of strongyloidiasis when 518 deploying Baermann and two existing Ab-based tests: the Bordier Ab-ELISA and NIE-519 LFA. When deploying the reference Baermann method in a school-based survey, we 520 estimated the need to sample seven schools (92 children per schools) and 10 schools 521 (98 children per school) for adequate and ideal decision-making, respectively. These 522 survey designs minimize the total survey cost, while ensuring reliable decision making 523 (adequate: 9,410 EUR; ideal: 13,968 EUR). When deploying the NIE-LFA, the total 524 survey costs could be further reduced (adequate decision making 4,949 EUR and ideal 525 decision making 7,424 EUR), making it a cost-efficient alternative to Baermann. On 526 the contrary, the Bordier Ab-ELISA turned out to be more resource demanding than 527 LFA, due to the high costs per test (Bordier Ab-ELISA: 10.79 EUR vs. NIE-LFA: 2.09 528 EUR) and the costs to prepare the samples for laboratory testing (Ab-ELISA/plasma: 529 9.27 EUR and Ab-ELISA/DBS: 11.49 EUR). Another reason to recommend an (NIE-530)LFA over the Baermann method, is the feasibility of implementing this kind of 531 diagnostic test. Indeed, we noted that the Baermann method needs adequate training 532 to ensure the high specificity (98%) reported in the ESTRELLA study [6], while the 533 training requirement to ensure accurate test performance is minimal for the (NIE-)LFA. 534 Using a less experienced team when deploying Baermann may result in a reduced 535 specificity, which in turn will increase the sample size (and total survey cost) required 536 to make adequate or ideal decision making. Note that all our recommended survey 537 designs aim to be no more costly than a well-trained team of experienced technicians.

538 Therefore, in case we accept that the benchmark cost does not necessarily represent 539 a team of experienced technicians, then such a cost benchmark would allow the 540 requirements for new diagnostics to be less stringent (lower performance, lower 541 sample throughput, and higher cost per test).

As a limitation of our study, it is important to note that the estimated costs were based on data obtained from a school-based survey carried out in Ecuador, and hence the reported values should not be interpreted as absolute. Despite of this, we are confident that our general conclusions are robust to context-dependent changes in cost components. A major strength of our simulation framework is therefore that assumptions about these itemized costs can be easily adapted to represent any setting.

549

550 **Conclusions**

551 We provided insights into the required diagnostic performance, cost per test and 552 sample throughput that may steer R&D choices for new diagnostics to inform 553 strongyloidiasis control programs. When focusing on Ab-based assays, our results 554 indicate that R&D should focus on the development of point-of-care diagnostics or 555 laboratory-based formats that allow for testing multiple NTDs on the same sample. Of 556 all current diagnostic tests, the NIE-LFA was a cost-efficient alternative to Baermann 557 decisions. further development to make program encouraging its for 558 commercialization.

559

560

561

562 Acknowledgments

563 We are grateful to our partner institutions in Ecuador: Mariella Anselmi, Cintia Caicedo 564 and Rosanna Prandi from the Centre for Community Epidemiology and Tropical 565 Medicine (CECOMET) and Yosselin Vicuña from the Universidad Central del Ecuador, 566 Quito, Ecuador, for providing support for completing the itemized costs of materials 567 used in the current study.

568 Funding

This work was funded through the Consortium of Experts in Neglected Tropical
Diseases (https://www.centd.org/en); and Research Foundation Flanders (G0F4320N;
https://www.fwo.be/en/).

578

579

581 **References**

- World Health Organization. Ending the neglect to attain the Sustainable
 Development Goals: A road map for neglected tropical diseases 2021–2030. In:
 World Health Organization [Internet]. 2021 [cited 10 Feb 2022]. Available:
 https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240010352
- 586 2. Jourdan PM, Lamberton PHL, Fenwick A, Addiss DG. Soil-transmitted helminth 587 infections. Lancet. 2018;391: 252–265.
- 5883.Soil-transmitted helminth infections. [cited 12 Aug 2022]. Available:589https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/soil-transmitted-helminth-590infections
- 591 4. Buonfrate D, Bisanzio D, Giorli G, Odermatt P, Fürst T, Greenaway C, et al. The 592 global prevalence of Strongyloides stercoralis infection. Pathogens. 2020;9: 468.
- 5935.WHO guideline on preventive chemotherapy for public health control of594strongyloidiasis.[cited 6 Aug 2024].595https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240094024
- 596 6. Tamarozzi F, Guevara ÁG, Anselmi M, Vicuña Y, Prandi R, Marquez M, et al. 597 Accuracy, acceptability, and feasibility of diagnostic tests for the screening of 598 Strongyloides stercoralis in the field (ESTRELLA): a cross-sectional study in 599 Ecuador. Lancet Glob Heal. 2023;11: e740–e748.
- Gelaye W, Williams NA, Kepha S, Junior AM, Fleitas PE, Marti-Soler H, et al.
 Performance evaluation of Baermann techniques: the quest for developing a
 microscopy reference standard for the diagnosis of Strongyloides stercoralis.
 PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2021;15: e0009076.
- 8. Buonfrate D, Formenti F, Perandin F, Bisoffi Z. Novel approaches to the
 diagnosis of Strongyloides stercoralis infection. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2015;21:
 543–552.
- 807 9. Requena-Méndez A, Chiodini P, Bisoffi Z, Buonfrate D, Gotuzzo E, Muñoz J.
 808 The laboratory diagnosis and follow up of strongyloidiasis: a systematic review.
 809 PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2013;7: e2002.
- Souza AA, Ducker C, Argaw D, King JD, Solomon AW, Biamonte MA, et al.
 Diagnostics and the neglected tropical diseases roadmap: setting the agenda for
 2030. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg. 2021;115: 129–135.
- 61311.WHO. Onchocerciasis: diagnostic target product profile to support preventive614chemotherapy.[cited16Aug2021].Available:615https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240024496
- 61612.WHO. Diagnostic test for surveillance of lymphatic filariasis: target product617profile.[cited16Aug2021].Available:618https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240018648
- 619 13. WHO. Diagnostic target product profile for monitoring and evaluation of soil-620 transmitted helminth control programmes. [cited 16 Aug 2021]. Available:

- 621 https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240031227
- 622 14. WHO. Diagnostic target product profiles for monitoring, evaluation and
 623 surveillance of schistosomiasis control programmes. [cited 11 Oct 2021].
 624 Available: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240031104
- Target product profile for the detection of a case of yaws and the detection of a case of yaws and the detection of azithromycin resistance. [cited 7 Aug 2024]. Available:
 https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/353978
- 16. Target product profile for a gambiense human African trypanosomiasis test to
 identify individuals to receive widened treatment. [cited 7 Aug 2024]. Available:
 https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/352579
- 631 17. Target product profile for a test for rhodesiense human African trypanosomiasis
 632 diagnosis usable in peripheral health facilities. [cited 7 Aug 2024]. Available:
 633 https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/344165
- 18. Target product profile for a gambiense human African trypanosomiasis individual
 test to assess infection in low prevalence settings. [cited 7 Aug 2024]. Available:
 https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/365383
- Target product profile for a gambiense human African trypanosomiasis highthroughput test for verification of elimination. [cited 7 Aug 2024]. Available:
 https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/365384
- Kazienga A, Coffeng LE, de Vlas SJ, Levecke B. Two-stage lot quality assurance
 sampling framework for monitoring and evaluation of neglected tropical
 diseases, allowing for imperfect diagnostics and spatial heterogeneity. PLoS
 Negl Trop Dis. 2022;16: e0010353.
- Levecke B, Coffeng LE, Hanna C, Pullan RL, Gass KM. Assessment of the
 required performance and the development of corresponding program decision
 rules for neglected tropical diseases diagnostic tests: Monitoring and evaluation
 of soil-transmitted helminthiasis control programs as a case study. PLoS Negl
 Trop Dis. 2021;15: e0009740.
- Balachandra D, Rahumatullah A, Lim TS, Mustafa FH, Ahmad H, Anuar NS, et
 al. A new antigen detection ELISA for the diagnosis of Strongyloides infection.
 Acta Trop. 2021;221: 105986.
- Buonfrate D, Tamarozzi F, Paradies P, Watts MR, Bradbury RS, Bisoffi Z. The
 diagnosis of human and companion animal Strongyloides stercoralis infection:
 challenges and solutions. A scoping review. Adv Parasitol. 2022;118: 1–84.
- 4. Yunus MH, Arifin N, Balachandra D, Anuar NS, Noordin R. Lateral flow dipstick
 test for serodiagnosis of strongyloidiasis. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2019;101: 432.
- 657 25. Noordin R, Osman E, Kalantari N, Anuar NS, Gorgani-Firouzjaee T, Sithithaworn
 658 P, et al. A point-of-care cassette test for detection of Strongyloides stercoralis.
 659 Acta Trop. 2022;226: 106251.
- 660 26. Tamarozzi F, Longoni SS, Mazzi C, Rizzi E, Noordin R, Buonfrate D. The 661 accuracy of a recombinant antigen immunochromatographic test for the

- 662 detection of Strongyloides stercoralis infection in migrants from sub-Saharan 663 Africa. Parasit Vectors. 2022;15: 142.
- Sadaow L, Sanpool O, Rodpai R, Boonroumkaew P, Maleewong W, Intapan PM.
 Development of immunochromatographic device as a point-of-care tool for serodiagnosis of human strongyloidiasis cases. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis.
 2020;39: 465–470.
- Boonroumkaew P, Sadaow L, Sanpool O, Rodpai R, Thanchomnang T,
 Phupiewkham W, et al. Effectiveness of Strongyloides recombinant IgG
 immunoreactive antigen in detecting IgG and IgG4 subclass antibodies for
 diagnosis of human strongyloidiasis using rapid immunochromatographic tests.
 Diagnostics. 2020;10: 615.
- Wongphutorn P, Noordin R, Anuar NS, Worasith C, Kopolrat KY, Homwong C, et al. Examination of Diagnostic Performance of New IgG4 Rapid Test Compared with IgG-and IgG4-ELISAs to Investigate Epidemiology of Strongyloidiasis in Northeast Thailand. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2024; tpmd230518– tpmd230518.

Supporting information 679

S1 Table. Values of the required parameters to assess the risk of incorrect decision-making when currently available test platforms are deployed.
S1 Info. Quantification of spatial heterogeneity in strongyloidiasis
S2 Info. Estimation of the total survey cost
S3 Info. Itemized cost-assessment
Fig S1. The impact of diagnostic performance on maximum cost per test and required sample size. This figure represents all possible combinations of sensitivity and specificity and the maximum cost per test (in EUR) (Panel A: LFA and Panel C: Ab-ELISA/Plasma) and the required sample size (Panel B: LFA and Panel D: Ab-ELISA/Plasma) that allowed for adequate ($E_{undertreatment} = 5\%$ and $E_{overtreatment} = 25\%$) decision-making. Note that the maximum cost per test is the true maximum cost per test that could work in at least one logistically feasible survey design that is not more expensive than the benchmark cost based on the Baermann method. Also, the required sample size corresponds to the minimum required number of schools and children per school that need to be sampled for each combination of sensitivity and specificity. Absence of tiles indicates that the combination of sensitivity and specificity.



Α



Fig1



Fig2



Fig3