1 Classification:

2 Biological Sciences, Biophysics and Computational Biology

3 Modelling SARS-CoV-2 Dynamics: Implications

4 for Therapy

Kwang Su Kim^a, Keisuke Ejima^b, Yusuke Ito^a, Shoya Iwanami^a, Hirofumi Ohashi^c,
Yoshiki Koizumi^d, Yusuke Asai^d, Shinji Nakaoka^{e,f}, Koichi Watashi^{c,g,h,i,j}, Robin N.
Thompson^{k,l,1}, and Shingo Iwami^{a,h,i,m,1}

8

9 ^aDepartment of Biology, Faculty of Sciences, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan 10 8190395. ^bDepartment of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Indiana University School 11 of Public Health-Bloomington, IN, USA 47405. Department of Virology II, National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Tokyo, Japan 1628640. ^dNational Center for Global 12 Health and Medicine, Tokyo, Japan 1628655. eFaculty of Advanced Life Science, 13 Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan 060-0808. PRESTO, JST, Saitama, Japan 14 15 3320012. ^gDepartment of Applied Biological Science. Tokyo University of Science. 16 Noda, Japan 2788510. hMIRAI, JST, Saitama, Japan 3320012. iCREST, JST, Saitama, Japan 3320012. ^jInstitute for Frontier Life and Medical Sciences, Kyoto 17 18 University, Kyoto, Japan 6068507. ^kChrist Church, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 1DP, UK. Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford OX2 6GG, UK, 19 20 Fukuoka, UK. ^mScience Groove Inc., Fukuoka, Japan 8100041.

21

¹To whom correspondence may be addressed.

23 Email: robin.thompson@chch.ox.ac.uk (R.N.T.) and siwami@kyushu-u.org (S.I.).

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

24 Abstract (230/250)

25 The scientific community is focussed on developing antiviral therapies to mitigate the impacts of the ongoing novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak. 26 27 This will be facilitated by improved understanding of viral dynamics within infected 28 hosts. Here, using a mathematical model in combination with published viral load data collected from the same specimen (throat / nasal swabs or nasopharyngeal / 29 30 sputum / tracheal aspirate), we compare within-host dynamics for patients infected in the current outbreak with analogous dynamics for MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV 31 32 infections. Our quantitative analyses revealed that SARS-CoV-2 infection dynamics 33 are more severe than those for mild cases of MERS-CoV, but are similar to severe 34 cases, and that the viral dynamics of SARS-CoV infection are similar to those of 35 MERS-CoV in mild cases but not in severe case. Consequently, SARS-CoV-2 generates infection dynamics that are more severe than SARS-CoV. Furthermore, 36 37 we used our viral dynamics model to predict the effectiveness of unlicensed drugs that have different methods of action. The effectiveness was measured by AUC of 38 39 viral load. Our results indicated that therapies that block *de novo* infections or virus 40 production are most likely to be effective if initiated before the peak viral load (which 41 occurs around three days after symptom onset on average), but therapies that promote cytotoxicity are likely to have only limited effects. Our unique mathematical 42 43 approach provides insights into the pathogenesis of SARS-CoV-2 in humans, which 44 are useful for development of antiviral therapies.

45 Keywords:

46 SARS-CoV-2, MERS-CoV, SARS-CoV, mathematical model, antiviral therapy

47 Significance Statement (80/120)

48 Antiviral agents with different mechanisms of action have different curative effects depending on precisely when therapy is initiated. Based on a model of viral 49 50 dynamics, parameterised using viral load data from SARS-CoV-2 infected patients 51 reported by Zou et al. (1), computer simulations were performed. We propose that 52 effective treatment of SARS-CoV-2 infection requires an appropriate choice of class-53 specific drugs and initiation timing as reported for treatment of other viral infections (2); otherwise, antivirals do not have a significant effect on the within-host viral 54 55 dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 and are wasted.

56 \body

57 **Text**

The ongoing coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak was first 58 59 reported in Wuhan, China in late December 2019 (3, 4). Since then, the causative 60 agent (severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2, SARS-CoV-2) has been 61 transmitted elsewhere in China and to 80 other countries and territories around the world. The number of confirmed cases currently stands at 139,061 (as of 13 March 62 2020). The possibility of presymptomatic or asymptomatic cases (5), combined with 63 64 underreporting of symptomatic infections, suggests that the true number of cases is likely to be even higher than this. 65

66 Antiviral drugs (for treatment and to avoid onwards transmission) and a 67 vaccine (for prevention) are currently under development to counter this outbreak. To aid the development process, characterisation of the viral dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 68 69 both *in vivo* and *in vitro* is crucial. The virus has been isolated, genome sequencing 70 has been completed and the resulting data were made publicly available early in the outbreak (6, 7). Furthermore, the viral load in upper respiratory specimens (throat 71 72 and nasal swabs) of infected patients over 20 days after symptom onset has been reported (2). However, the viral dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 infections have not been 73 studied quantitatively, and the data have not been compared with analogous 74 75 datasets for other coronaviruses. Such quantitative analyses are informative for the development of antiviral agents, addressing questions such as the optimal viral-host 76 77 processes for antiviral drugs or vaccines to target.

78 **Results and Discussion**

79 Characterising SARS-CoV-2 and MERS-CoV infections by analysing viral load

80 measurements collected from throat swabs

We analysed data describing SARS-CoV-2 viral loads reported by Zou et al. 81 82 (1) and MERS-CoV viral loads reported by Oh *et al*. (8) using a simple mathematical model (see Methods). To consider inter-individual variations in viral loads, a 83 nonlinear mixed-effect modelling approach was employed to estimate parameters 84 (see Methods). The estimated parameters and initial values are listed in Table 1, 85 and the typical behaviour of the model using these best-fit parameter estimates is 86 87 shown together with the data in Fig. 1A for SARS-CoV-2 (pink) and MERS-CoV 88 (black and grey for severe and mild case, respectively). In addition, to parameterise 89 and compare these coronaviruses infections, we calculated the following important 90 quantities (Fig. 2) using estimated parameter values; the mean length of virus 91 production of an infected cell $(L = 1/\delta)$, the within-host basic reproduction number 92 $(R_0 = \gamma/\delta)$ which is the average number of newly infected cells produced by any single infected cell (9), and the critical inhibition rate ($C^* = 1 - 1/R_0$) induced by 93 94 antivirals to prevent primary virus infection (10, 11). We showed that L is not significantly different for SARS-CoV-2 and MERS-CoV. However, interestingly, we 95 96 found that R_0 and C^* for SARS-CoV-2 are significantly different from analogous values for mild cases of MERS-CoV ($p = 8.9 \times 10^{-4}$ and 2.0×10^{-6} by the bootstrap 97 98 *t*-test, respectively), but not for severe MERS-CoV (p = 0.41 and 0.41) (see Fig. 2), although we were unable to separate mild and severe cases of SARS-CoV-2 due to 99 limited clinical information for the cases. This demonstrates that SARS-CoV-2 100 101 causes infection more effectively than in mild cases of MERS-CoV, but a general SARS-CoV-2 infection follows infection dynamics that are similar to severe cases 102

103 due to MERS-CoV. In addition, as a median estimate, 65% inhibition of the initial 104 virus expansion is required to prevent the establishment of SARS-CoV-2 infection 105 (we provide a detailed analysis later). We also calculated the duration of infection in 106 which the viral load is above the detection limit (T_{VL}) in **Table 1**, showing that SARS-107 CoV-2 is maintained in hosts for more than a week based on the median estimate.

108

Characterising SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV infections by analysing viral load measurements collected from nasopharyngeal/sputum/tracheal aspirate

111 To extend our analysis to include SARS-CoV, we analysed SARS-CoV viral loads in nasopharyngeal aspirate reported by Peiris et al. (12) and MERS-CoV viral 112 loads reported by Oh et al. (8) in sputum or tracheal aspirate. The estimated 113 114 parameters, viral load at symptom onset, and the indices derived from the estimated parameters are listed in **Table 1** and **Fig. 2**, and the typical behaviour of the model is 115 116 shown together with the data in **Fig. 1B** for SARS-CoV (blue) and MERS-CoV (black 117 or grey). The estimated values of L for SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV are not significantly different. Surprisingly, the estimated values of R_0 and C^* for SARS-CoV 118 119 are significantly different from those for severe cases of MERS-CoV (p = 0.03 and 120 0.02 from bootstrap *t*-test), but not for mild MERS-CoV cases (p = 0.52 and 0.47 121 from bootstrap *t*-test) (Fig. 2). This demonstrates that in vivo viral dynamics of 122 SARS-CoV infection are similar to those for MERS-CoV in mild cases but not in 123 severe cases. Collectively, the findings from the viral load data analyses for the two 124 different specimens (throat/nasal swabs and nasopharyngeal/sputum/tracheal 125 aspirate) implied that SARS-CoV-2 also causes infection more effectively than 126 SARS-CoV.

127

128 Evaluation of anti-SARS-CoV-2 therapies

129 Our quantitative analyses provide insights into optimal usage of anti-SARS-CoV-2 therapies under development. In particular, it remains poorly understood how 130 131 a delay of treatment initiation after primary infection, or how incomplete blocking of 132 virus infection/replication, impacts the viral load dynamics. Based on our 133 mathematical model and estimated parameter values (Table 1), we conducted in 134 silico experiments for possible anti-SARS-CoV-2 therapies to investigate the 135 expected outcome under hypothetical drug therapies (or vaccine use) possessing 136 different antiviral mechanisms (Fig. 3).

137

138 (i) Blocking *de novo* infection

139 One of the major mechanisms of action for antivirals is blocking de novo 140 infections. This can be induced by drugs including human neutralising antibodies, 141 viral entry-inhibitors and/or antibodies raised by vaccination (13, 14). For example, a 142 SARS-CoV-specific human monoclonal antibody has been reported to cross react 143 with SARS-CoV-2 (14). We conducted in silico experiments with varying drug 144 efficacy (considering inhibition rates from 10% to 100%, i.e. $0.1 \le \varepsilon \le 1$) and with the 145 timing of initiation of therapy from 0 days (i.e., post-exposure prophylactic use of antivirals) until 5 days after symptom onset (i.e., $0 \le t^* \le 5$) (see **Methods**). Our 146 results show that early initiation of therapy (especially within two to three days) with 147 148 even a relatively weak drug (inhibition rates as low as 50%) might effectively reduce 149 the area under the curve of viral load (AUC) and prevent significant reductions in the 150 numbers of target cells because of cytopathic effects due to cell invasion. A therapy 151 of this type initiated four days after symptom onset, on the other hand, is not 152 predicted to induce a clear antiviral effect (Fig. 3AD). This suggests that blocking de

novo infections is not likely to be effective unless the intervention is initiated before the peak viral load. Hence, appropriate initiation timing (i.e., before or very soon after symptom onset) is an important factor for suppressing viral load in addition to the therapy having the potential for antiviral effects.

157

158 (ii) Blocking virus production

159 The majority of antiviral drugs inhibit intracellular virus replication. Although 160 their antiviral efficacies need to be confirmed, lopinavir/ritonavir (HIV protease 161 inhibitors), remdesivir (anti-Ebola virus disease candidate) and other nucleoside 162 analogues, and interferon have the potential to suppress SARS-CoV-2 by blocking 163 virus production(15, 16). Interestingly, our results suggest that, even for relatively 164 small inhibition rates of around 30%, the AUC of viral load is partially reduced if 165 therapy is initiated early (within three days after symptom onset) (Fig. 3BE). 166 However, if treatment is applied after the peak viral load, even drugs with 100% 167 inhibition rate are not able to reduce viral loads, which is similar to the predicted 168 outcomes of *de novo* blocking therapy.

169

170 (iii) Promoting cytotoxicity

Another possible antiviral mechanism is cytotoxic effects by adaptive immunity including those mediated by cytotoxic T lymphocytes. Here, we assume that promoting cytotoxicity increases the virus death rate by at most two times (i.e., $0.1 \le \theta \le 1$), that is, achieves up to 50% reduction of the mean length of virus production. Compared with the other two therapies (blocking *de novo* infection and virus production), the induction of cytotoxicity had relatively mild effects on the AUC reduction if initiated before peak viral load. However, cytotoxicity induction initiated

after peak viral load could effectively reduce the viral load AUC (**Fig. 3CF**). This implies that there is an optimal time to apply this therapy, and that significant antiviral effects are expected unless the promoting rate is too low or therapy is initiated either too early or too late. However, large reductions of target cells due to ongoing *de novo* infection cannot be avoided even with very early initiation (i.e., immediately after symptom onset) of the therapy.

184 Conclusions

There are a number of potential transmission routes of SARS-CoV-2, 185 186 including direct person-to-person transmission due to viral particle inhalation and 187 contact transmission due to contact with nasal/oral/eye mucuous membranes. The 188 risk of transmission depends on the viral load of the potential infector. Consequently, 189 treatments reducing the viral load are important for the prevention of secondary 190 transmission and aid population-scale outbreak control. We characterised viral 191 infection dynamics using a mathematical model, and assessed potential strategies to 192 reduce viral loads. Our analyses showed that both blocking de novo infection and 193 virus production effectively reduces AUC of SARS-CoV-2 load; for example, if the 194 therapy can reduce more than 90% of *de novo* infections and is initiated 3 days after 195 symptoms onset, the viral load AUC is expected to be reduced by 81.4% (Fig. 3DE). 196 However, if therapy is initiated after peak viral load (more than 2-3 days following 197 symptom onset), the effect on viral load AUC is limited. Compared with either 198 blocking *de novo* infection or virus production, promoting cytotoxicity showed 199 relatively mild effects on AUC reduction, however initiation of that therapy after the 200 peak viral load has the potential to still reduce viral load AUC (Fig. 3F).

201 The effectiveness of the hypothetical drugs can be evaluated in detail using a 202 cell culture system supporting SARS-CoV-2 infection (13). Wang et al. proposed 203 different classes of drugs for treating SARS-CoV-2 infections: chloroguine inhibited 204 viral entry and remdesivir suppressed the virus post-entry, likely by suppressing viral 205 replication (13). Although animal models for testing treatments have not been 206 reported for SARS-CoV-2, a number of animal models exist for SARS-CoV including 207 mice, hamsters, ferrets, and macagues (17). Animals could be used to verify the 208 conclusions from our models, by monitoring the viral loads in animals treated with

different types of drugs at different doses and different initiation timings. Such viral load data would allow further investigation of the effectiveness of drugs with different action mechanisms, which would be informative for development of appropriate treatment strategies (i.e., the optimal dose/timing of antivirals) for SARS-CoV-2 infections.

214 In conclusion, effective treatment of SARS-CoV-2 infections requires an 215 appropriate choice of class-specific drugs; otherwise, the antivirals do not alter the 216 viral load significantly and are wasted. Identification of SARS-CoV-2-specific virus 217 characteristics is needed to design optimal treatments and to ensure that limited 218 resources are deployed effectively. Additionally, effective combinations of anti-219 SARS-CoV-2 drugs and vaccines will maximise the impacts of control, reduce the 220 required drug dose and potentially limit side effects, all of which are highly desirable. 221 Our theoretical approach could complement ongoing experimental investigations into 222 SARS-CoV-2 infection in BSL-3 laboratories and help establish a basis for COVID-223 19 treatment. To our knowledge, previous studies have neither characterised SARS-224 CoV-2 dynamics in humans using viral dynamics models, nor compared the resulting 225 dynamics against those of other coronaviruses (i.e., SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV). Our mathematical modelling approach has led to an improved understanding of the 226 227 characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 in vivo, and can be used to test possible treatments 228 for COVID-19 further going forwards.

229 Methods

230 Study data

The data examined in our manuscript came from studies of SARS-CoV-2, 231 232 MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV by Zou et al. (1), Oh et al. (8) and Peiris et al. (12), respectively. To extract the data from images in those publications, we used the 233 234 program datathief III (version 1.5, Bas Tummers, www.datathief.org). We excluded 235 patients for whom data were measured on only one day, and assumed that viral load values under the detection limit were set as the detection limit for the purposes of 236 237 fitting the model. We converted cycle threshold (Ct) values reported in Zou et al. (1), Oh et al. (8) and Peiris et al. (12) to viral RNA copies number values, where these 238 239 quantities are inversely proportional to each other (18).

240

241 Mathematical model

To parameterise coronavirus infection dynamics from patient viral load data, we derived a simplified mathematical model from the following virus dynamics model:

245
$$\frac{dT(t)}{dt} = -\beta T(t)V(t), \qquad (1)$$

246
$$\frac{dI(t)}{dt} = \beta T(t)V(t) - \delta I(t), \qquad (2)$$

247
$$\frac{dV(t)}{dt} = pI(t) - cV(t), \qquad (3)$$

where the variables T(t), I(t) and V(t) are the numbers of uninfected target cells, infected target cells, and the amount of virus at time *t*, respectively. The parameters β , δ , *p*, and *c* represent the rate constant for virus infection, the death rate of infected cells, the viral production rate, and the clearance rate of the virus, respectively. Since

the clearance rate of virus is typically much larger than the death rate of the infected cells *in vivo* (10, 19, 20), we made a quasi-steady state (QSS) assumption, dV(t)/dt = 0, and replaced Eq.(3) with V(t) = pI(t)/c. Because data on the numbers of coronavirus RNA copies, V(t), rather than the number of infected cells, I(t), were available, then I(t) = cV(t)/p was substituted into Eq.(2) to obtain

257
$$\frac{dV(t)}{dt} = \frac{p\beta}{c}T(t)V(t) - \delta V(t).$$
(4)

Furthermore, we defined the ratio of the number of uninfected target cells at time *t* to the initial number of uninfected target cells T(0), that is, f(t) = T(t)/T(0). Accordingly, we obtained the following simplified mathematical model, which we employed to analyse the data in this study:

262
$$\frac{df(t)}{dt} = -\beta f(t)V(t), \qquad (5)$$

263
$$\frac{dV(t)}{dt} = \gamma f(t)V(t) - \delta V(t), \qquad (6)$$

where $\gamma = p\beta T(0)/c$ is defined as the maximum viral replication rate for coronavirus infections. Note that the ratio f(t) is always less than or equal to 1.

In our analyses, the variable V(t) corresponds to the viral load in throat swabs 266 267 for SARS-CoV-2 and MERS-CoV and in nasopharyngeal/sputum/tracheal aspirate 268 for SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV. In the case of acute coronavirus infection, the loss 269 of target cells by physiological turnover could be ignored, considering the long life-270 span of the target cells. Patient viral load data for SARS-CoV-2/SARS-CoV/MERS-271 CoV were fitted using a nonlinear mixed-effect modelling approach (described 272 below), which uses the whole sample to estimate population parameters but also 273 account for inter-individual variation.

275 *In silico* experiments for possible anti-SARS-CoV-2 therapies

276 By utilising our novel mathematical model and the estimated parameter 277 values, we investigated the antiviral effects of unlicensed but developing (promising) 278 drugs with the following different mechanisms of action, depending on inhibition rates 279 and timings of therapy initiation: (i) blocking *de novo* infection (e.g. via human neutralising antibodies, viral entry-inhibitors and antibody levels raised by 280 281 vaccination (13, 14)); (ii) blocking virus production (such as lopinavir/ritonavir (HIV 282 protease inhibitors), remdesivir (an anti-Ebola virus candidate) and other nucleoside 283 analogues, and interferon (15, 16)); and (iii) promoting cytotoxicity (by adaptive 284 immunity such as cytotoxic T lymphocytes). To simulate possible variations in the 285 viral load and in the target cell numbers under these different types of anti-SARS-286 CoV-2 therapy, the median parameter sets were used to predict the expected 287 outcome of each therapy. In other words, even though no drug administration trials 288 have been conducted yet, we were able to infer the efficacy of each drug treatment 289 based on our in silico experiments. We implemented the different mechanisms of 290 action in the model as follows:

(i) Blocking *de novo* infection. The antiviral effect of blocking *de novo* infection therapy ($0 < \varepsilon \le 1$. $\varepsilon = 1$ implies *de novo* infection is 100% inhibited) initiated at t^* days after symptom onset was modelled by assuming:

294
$$\frac{df(t)}{dt} = -(1 - \varepsilon \times H(t))\beta f(t)V(t), \qquad (7)$$

295
$$\frac{dV(t)}{dt} = (1 - \varepsilon \times H(t))\gamma f(t)V(t) - \delta V(t), \qquad (8)$$

where H(t) is a Heaviside step function defined as H(t) = 0 if $t < t^*$: otherwise H(t) = 1. We evaluated the expected antiviral effect of the therapy under different inhibition rates (ε) and initiation timings (t^*) using our estimated parameter values.

The mean reduction of cumulative virus production, i.e., the area under the curve of viral load (AUC: $\int_{0}^{28} V(s) ds$: because the observed durations COVID-19 infection are longer than previous coronavirus infection (i.e., SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV), we used the maximum length of observations 28 days as the upper bound for integration), induced by blocking *de novo* infection for SARS-CoV-2 was calculated. Note that the expected values at day 0 after symptom onset ($t^* = 0$) corresponds to the antiviral effect of therapy initiated immediately after symptom onset.

(ii) Blocking virus production. Alternatively, we assumed an inhibition rate of virus production of $0 < \eta \le 1$. The antiviral effect by blocking virus production ($0 < 0 \le 1$. $\eta \le 1$. $\eta = 1$ indicates that the virus reproduction from the infected cells are perfectly inhibited) is modelled as follows:

310
$$\frac{dV(t)}{dt} = (1 - \eta \times H(t))\gamma f(t)V(t) - \delta V(t).$$
(9)

Note that the difference between blocking *de novo* infection and virus production is that the former reduces β , whereas the latter reduces *p* in the full model (1)-(3).

313 (iii) Promoting cytotoxicity. The antiviral effect of promoting cytotoxicity 314 therapy ($0 < \theta \le 1$. $\theta = 1$ indicates that the mean duration of virus production is 315 doubled) was modelled as follows:

316
$$\frac{dV(t)}{dt} = \gamma f(t)V(t) - (1 + \theta \times H(t))\delta V(t).$$
(10)

317

318 The nonlinear mixed effect model

MONOLIX 2019R2 (<u>www.lixoft.com</u>), a program that implements a maximum likelihood estimation procedure for parameters in a nonlinear mixed-effects model, was employed to fit to the viral load data. Nonlinear mixed-effects modelling approaches allow a fixed effect as well as a random effect describing the inter-

323 patient variability. Including a random effect amounts to a partial pooling of the data 324 between individuals to improve estimates of the parameters applicable across the population of patients. By using this approach, the differences between viral 325 326 dynamics in different patients were not estimated explicitly, nor did we fully pool the data which would bias estimates towards highly sampled patients. In this method of 327 estimation, each parameter estimate ϑ_i (= $\vartheta \times e^{\pi_i}$) depends on the individual where 328 329 ϑ is fixed effect, and π_i is random effect with an assumed Gaussian distribution with 330 mean 0 and standard deviation Ω . Population parameters and individual parameters were estimated using the stochastic approximation expectation-maximisation 331 332 algorithm and empirical Bayes' method, respectively. Individual estimated 333 parameters and initial values for patients are summarized in Table S1. Using 334 estimated individual parameters and a Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithm, the 335 conditional distribution is obtained which can represent the uncertainty in individual parameter values. We obtained 100 sets of estimated parameters for each individual 336 337 patient by fitting the simplified mathematical model (Eqs. (5-6)) to the data. The 338 estimation was performed for viral loads in throat swab from SARS-CoV-2, mild 339 MERS-CoV, and severe MERS-CoV separately, and the distributions of the 340 parameters were compared and tested using the bootstrap *t*-test. Due to the small 341 sample size for viral loads in sputum/tracheal aspirate for MERS-CoV, we assumed 342 the fixed effect was the same for mild and severe MERS-CoV cases. Otherwise, the 343 process was exactly the same as that described for the throat swab data.

344

345 The computation of *L*, R_0 , C^* and T_{VL}

Based on the estimated parameter distributions, we calculated several quantities: the duration of virus production (*L*), the basic reproduction number (R_0),

348	and the critical inhibition rate (C^*). We also calculated the period during which the
349	viral load was above the detection limit (T_{VL}) from the <i>in silico</i> simulations with
350	individual estimated parameters and an initial viral load equal the detection limit (i.e.
351	numerical experiments began at the point at which the virus became detectable).
352	The distributional estimates of R_0 , L , C^* and T_{VL} were calculated separately for
353	SARS-CoV-2 and SARS-CoV, as well as for severe and mild cases of MERS-CoV.

354 Acknowledgments

355 This study was supported in part by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea funded by the Ministry of 356 357 Education 2019R1A6A3A12031316 (to K.S.K.); Grants-in-Aid for JSPS Scientific Research (KAKENHI) Scientific Research B 17H04085 (to K.W.), 18KT0018 (to S.I.), 358 359 18H01139 (to S.I.), 16H04845 (to S.I.), Scientific Research S 15H05707 (to S.N.), 360 Scientific Research in Innovative Areas 19H04839 (to S.I.), 18H05103 (to S.I.); AMED CREST 19gm1310002 (to S.I.); AMED J-PRIDE 19fm0208019j0003 (to K.W.), 361 362 19fm0208006s0103 (to S.I.), 19fm0208014h0003 (to S.I.), 19fm0208019h0103 (to 363 S.I.); AMED Research Program on HIV/AIDS 19fk0410023s0101 (to S.I.); Research Program on Emerging and Re-emerging Infectious Diseases 19fk0108050h0003 (to 364 365 S.I.); Program for Basic and Clinical Research on Hepatitis 19fk0210036j0002 (to K.W.), 19fk0210036h0502 (to S.I.); Program on the Innovative Development and the 366 367 Application of New Drugs for Hepatitis B 19fk0310114j0003 (to K.W.), 19fk0310101j1003 (to K.W.), 19fk0310103j0203 (to K.W.), 19fk0310114h0103 (to 368 369 S.I.); JST PRESTO (to S.N.); JST MIRAI (to K.W. and S.I.); JST CREST (to K.W. 370 and S.I.); The Yasuda Medical Foundation (to K.W.); Smoking Research Foundation 371 (to K.W.): Takeda Science Foundation (to K.W.): Mochida Memorial Foundation for Medical and Pharmaceutical Research (to K.W.); Mitsui Life Social Welfare 372 373 Foundation (to S.I. and K.W.); Shin-Nihon of Advanced Medical Research (to S.I.); 374 Suzuken Memorial Foundation (to S.I.); Life Science Foundation of Japan (to S.I.); 375 SECOM Science and Technology Foundation (to S.I.); The Japan Prize Foundation (to S.I.); Toyota Physical and Chemical Research Institute (to S.I.); Fukuoka 376 Financial Group, Inc. (to S.I.); Kyusyu Industrial Advancement Center Gapfund 377

- 378 Program (to S.I.); Foundation for the Fusion Of Science and Technology (to S.I.); a
- 379 Junior Research Fellowship from Christ Church, Oxford (to R.N.T.)
- 380

381 Competing interests

382 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

383

384 Authors' contributions

- 385 Conceived and designed the study: KE KW RNT SI. Analysed the data: KSK
- 386 KE YI SI HO YK SN SI. Wrote the paper: KSK KE KW RNT SI. All authors read and
- 387 approved the final manuscript.

References 388

389	1.	Zou L, et al. (2020) SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of
390		Infected Patients. N Engl J Med.
391	2.	Fry AM, et al. (2014) Efficacy of oseltamivir treatment started within 5 days of
392		symptom onset to reduce influenza illness duration and virus shedding in an urban
393		setting in Bangladesh: a randomised placebo-controlled trial. Lancet Infect Dis
394		14(2):109-118.
395	3.	Li Q, et al. (2020) Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel
396		Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. N Engl J Med.
397	4.	Thompson RN (2020) Novel Coronavirus Outbreak in Wuhan, China, 2020: Intense
398		Surveillance Is Vital for Preventing Sustained Transmission in New Locations. J Clin
399		<i>Med</i> 9(2).
400	5.	Chan JF, et al. (2020) A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel
401		coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster.
402		Lancet 395(10223):514-523.
403	6.	Zhu N, et al. (2020) A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China,
404		2019. N Engl J Med 382(8):727-733.
405	7.	Lu R, et al. (2020) Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel
406		coronavirus: implications for virus origins and receptor binding. Lancet
407		395(10224):565-574.
408	8.	Oh MD, et al. (2016) Viral Load Kinetics of MERS Coronavirus Infection. N Engl J
409		<i>Med</i> 375(13):1303-1305.
410	9.	Perelson AS (2002) Modelling viral and immune system dynamics. Nat Rev Immunol
411		2(1):28-36.
412	10.	Martyushev A, Nakaoka S, Sato K, Noda T, & Iwami S (2016) Modelling Ebola virus
413		dynamics: Implications for therapy. Antiviral Res 135:62-73.
414	11.	Iwami S, et al. (2012) Identifying viral parameters from in vitro cell cultures. Front
415		Microbiol 3:319.
416	12.	Peiris JS, et al. (2003) Clinical progression and viral load in a community outbreak of
417		coronavirus-associated SARS pneumonia: a prospective study. Lancet
418		361(9371):1767-1772.
419	13.	Wang M, et al. (2020) Remdesivir and chloroquine effectively inhibit the recently
420		emerged novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in vitro. Cell Res.
421	14.	Tian X, et al. (2020) Potent binding of 2019 novel coronavirus spike protein by a
422		SARS coronavirus-specific human monoclonal antibody. Emerg Microbes Infect
423		9(1):382-385.
424	15.	Yao TT, Qian JD, Zhu WY, Wang Y, & Wang GQ (2020) A Systematic Review of
425		Lopinavir Therapy for SARS Coronavirus and MERS Coronavirus-A Possible
426		Reference for Coronavirus Disease-19 Treatment Option. J Med Virol.
427	16.	Lu H (2020) Drug treatment options for the 2019-new coronavirus (2019-nCoV).
428		Biosci Trends.
429	17.	Peiris JS, Yuen KY, Osterhaus AD, & Stohr K (2003) The severe acute respiratory
430		syndrome. <i>N Engl J Med</i> 349(25):2431-2441.
431	18.	Poon LL, et al. (2004) Detection of SARS coronavirus in patients with severe acute
432		respiratory syndrome by conventional and real-time quantitative reverse transcription-
433	10	PCR assays. <i>Clin Chem</i> 50(1):67-72.
434	19.	Ikeda H, et al. (2016) Quantifying the effect of Vpu on the promotion of HIV-1
435		replication in the humanized mouse model. <i>Retrovirology</i> 13:23.

436 Nowak MA & May RM (2000) Virus dynamics. (Oxford University Press Oxford). 20.

437 Figure legends

Fig. 1. Mathematical model outputs for individual patients based on fits to viral load data for SARS-CoV-2, MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV. Viral loads were measured using throat swabs for SARS-CoV-2 and MERS-CoV (A) and nasoparyngeal/sputum swabs or tracheal aspirate for SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV (B) infected patients. Severe and mild cases of MERS-CoV are shown in black and gray, respectively. Note that the detection limits of measurements of SARS-CoV-2, MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV viral loads are 14.6, 1000 and 1000 copies/ml, respectively.

445

446 Fig. 2. Characterisation and comparison of SARS-CoV-2, MERS-CoV and SARS-447 CoV infection dynamics in vivo. Distribution of estimates for (A) the mean duration of 448 virus production of an infected cell, $L = 1/\delta$, (**B**) the within-host basic reproduction number, $R_0 = \gamma/\delta$, and (C) the critical inhibition rate, $C^* = 1 - 1/R_0$. Estimates of R_0 449 and C* for SARS-CoV-2 are significantly different compared to analogous estimates 450 for mild cases of MERS-CoV, but not compared to estimates for severe MERS-CoV. 451 452 On the other hand, estimates for SARS-CoV are significantly different from those for 453 severe cases of MERS-CoV but not for mild cases of MERS-CoV.

454

Fig. 3. *In silico* experiments to predict the outcomes of possible anti-SARS-CoV-2 therapies. In each case, the therapy was initiated after 2 (\star) or 4 (\bullet) days from symptom onset with 90% inhibition rate. The expected dynamics of the viral loads (top) and the uninfected target cell ratio (bottom) under the hypothetical therapy (antiviral drug or vaccine) for blocking *de novo* infection, virus production, and promoting cytotoxic effects are shown in (**A**), (**B**) and (**C**), respectively, using the median values of our estimated parameters and an initial viral load that is equal to

462 the detection limit. The coloured solid curves and black dashed curves correspond to 463 SARS-CoV-2 infection dynamics with and without the therapies. In addition, we simulated the model for a range of therapy efficacies and times at which therapies 464 465 were introduced, and the results are summarised in (D), (E) and (F) for therapies that block de novo infection, block virus production and promote cytotoxic effects, 466 467 respectively. Darker regions of these panels indicate a larger reduction in AUC of 468 viral load which implies a stronger antiviral effect against SARS-CoV-2 infection. The expected values with $t^*=0$ indicate the antiviral effect of pre-exposure vaccines (or 469 470 post-exposure prophylactic use of antivirals).

Parameter Nama	Symbol (Lipit)		MERS-CoV				
Falameter Name		3AR3-CUV-2	Mild	Severe			
Parameters obtained from fitting to the clinical time-series datasets							
Maximum rate constant for viral replication	γ (day⁻¹)	4.55^{+}	3.36	3.76			
Rate constant for virus infection	β ((copies/ml) ⁻¹ day ⁻¹)	6.77×10^{-5}	2.10×10^{-6}	1.10×10^{-6}			
Death rate of infected cells	δ (day⁻¹)	1.59	2.47	1.32			
Viral load at symptom onset	V(0) (copies/ml)	21.8	2.43×10^{-4}	1.21×10^{-3}			
Quantities derived from estimated parameters							
Within-hots basic reproduction number	R ₀	2.87	1.36	2.84			
Critical inhibition rate	<i>C</i> *	0.65	0.26	0.65			
Length of virus production	L	0.63	0.41	0.76			
Length of viral load above detection limit	T _{VL} (days)	9.34	10.9	14.0			

Table 1. Estimated parameters for SARS-CoV-2 and MERS-CoV infection obtained from throat swabs

⁺Median value

Baramatar Nama	Symbol (Linit)	SARS Cold	MERS-CoV				
		3AN3-00V	Mild	Severe			
Parameters obtained from fitting to the clinical time-series datasets							
Maximum rate constant for viral replication	γ (day ⁻¹)	3.09 ⁺	3.14	3.10			
Rate constant for virus infection	β ((copies/ml) ⁻¹ day ⁻¹)	8.24×10^{-3}	8.37×10^{-2}	1.31×10^{-3}			
Death rate of infected cells	δ (day⁻¹)	0.66	0.67	0.46			
Viral load at symptom onset	V(0) (copies/ml)	2.54	5.89	3.05			
Quantities derived from estimated parameter	Quantities derived from estimated parameters						
Within-host basic reproduction number	R ₀	4.67	4.66	6.72			
Critical inhibition rate	С*	0.79	0.79	0.85			
Length of virus production	L	1.51	1.49	2.17			
Length of viral load above detection limit	T _{VL} (days)	29.6	31.9	16.3			

Table 2. Estimated parameters for SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV infection obtained from nasopharyngeal/sputum/tracheal aspirate

⁺Median value





B





Supplementary Appendix

Modelling SARS-CoV-2 Dynamics: Implications for Therapy

Kwang Su Kim¹, Keisuke Ejima², Yusuke Ito¹, Shoya Iwanami¹, Hirofumi Ohashi³, Yoshiki Koizumi⁴, Yusuke Asai⁴, Shinji Nakaoka^{5,6}, Koichi Watashi^{3,7,8,9,10}, Robin N. Thompson^{11,12*}, and Shingo Iwami^{1,9,10,13*}

¹Department of Biology, Faculty of Sciences, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan. ²Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Indiana University School of Public Health-Bloomington, IN, USA. ³Department of Virology II, National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Tokyo, Japan. ⁴National Center for Global Health and Medicine, Tokyo, Japan. ⁵Faculty of Advanced Life Science, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan. ⁶PRESTO, JST, Saitama, Japan. ⁷Department of Applied Biological Science, Tokyo University of Science, Noda, Japan. ⁸MIRAI, JST, Saitama, Japan. ⁹CREST, JST, Saitama, Japan. ¹⁰Institute for Frontier Life and Medical Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan. ¹¹Christ Church, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 1DP, UK. ¹²Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford OX2 6GG, UK, Fukuoka, UK. ¹³Science Groove Inc., Fukuoka, Japan.

Patient ID	17	ß	3	V(0)	I	P	<i>C</i> *	Т
	<u>/</u> -2 nation	<u>p</u> hts: datasets or	u A obtair	r (U) and from throat	L swahe	Λ ₀	L	¹ VL
<u>000-000</u>		2 00 v 10-4			0.61	204	0.66	77
	4.05	2.00×10 2.42×10^{-5}	1.04	$\frac{1.00 \times 10}{2.71 \times 10^5}$	0.01	2.90	0.00	10.4
E	3.65	2.42×10 1 51 × 10 ⁻⁵	1.52	3.71×10^{-5}	0.00	2.05	0.00	12.7
<u>F</u>	4.86	1.51×10 4.15×10^{-5}	1.7	2.11 × 10	0.59	2.13	0.55	9.4
<u> н</u>	4.7	$\frac{4.13 \times 10}{5.92 \times 10^{-4}}$	1.01	$\frac{54.9}{61 \times 10^3}$	0.02	2.66	0.67	6.6
	4 4 7	$\frac{9.92 \times 10}{8.08 \times 10^{-8}}$	1.77	1 18	0.50	3.06	0.62	17.4
<u>к</u>	4.7	3.97×10^{-5}	1.58	9.1	0.63	2.97	0.66	9.7
L	3.89	6.55×10^{-6}	1.65	0.14×10^{-2}	0.61	2.36	0.58	13.5
 N	4.7	3.97×10^{-5}	1.58	9.1	0.63	2.97	0.66	9.7
0	4.86	1.09×10^{-4}	1.63	26.7	0.61	2.98	0.66	8.4
P	4.7	3.97×10^{-5}	1.58	9.1	0.63	2.97	0.66	9.7
Q	4.63	2.29×10^{-5}	1.60	8.38	0.63	2.89	0.65	10.4
S	4.7	3.97×10^{-5}	1.58	9.1	0.63	2.97	0.66	9.7
T	4.49	5.48×10^{-5}	1.57	2.27	0.64	2.86	0.65	9.7
MERS-Co\	/ severe	patients: datas	ets are	obtained from	throat s	wabs		
1	3.57	2.61×10^{-7}	1.16	0.80×10^{-3}	0.86	3.08	0.68	13.7
2	3.7	$\frac{1.00 \times 10^{-6}}{1.00 \times 10^{-6}}$	1.44	0.99×10^{-3}	0.69	2.57	0.61	11.0
3	3.82	2.21×10^{-6}	1.57	$\frac{2.08 \times 10^{-3}}{2.08 \times 10^{-3}}$	0.64	2.43	0.59	9.6
4	3.00	1.00×10^{-6}	1.48	0.33×10^{-3}	0.68	2.03	0.51	13.2
5	3.69	9.96×10^{-6}	1.43	1.03×10^{-3}	0.70	2.58	0.61	11.0
6	3.64	1.43×10^{-6}	1.54	1.19×10^{-3}	0.65	2.36	0.58	10.6
7	4.09	1.97×10^{-6}	1.19	2.79×10^{-2}	0.84	3.44	0.71	9.9
8	3.38	1.34×10^{-6}	2.3	0.47×10^{-3}	0.43	1.47	0.32	13.6
9	4.2	2.04×10^{-6}	1.58	4.22×10^{-3}	0.63	2.66	0.62	9.0
MERS-Co\	/ mild pa	tients: datasets	s are ob	tained from thr	oat swa	abs		
10	3.35	1.46×10^{-6}	2.63	0.60×10^{-3}	0.38	1.27	0.21	16.3
11	3.36	1.46×10^{-6}	2.46	0.58×10^{-3}	0.41	1.37	0.27	14.6
12	3.7	2.61×10^{-6}	1.97	0.49×10^{-3}	0.51	1.88	0.47	9.8
13	4.19	3.84×10^{-6}	1.98	0.36×10^{-3}	0.51	2.12	0.53	8.1
14	3.36	1.46×10^{-6}	2.53	0.63×10^{-3}	0.40	1.33	0.25	15.2
15	3.36	1.46×10^{-6}	2.46	0.58×10^{-3}	0.41	1.37	0.27	14.6
16	3.52	1.46×10^{-6}	1.76	0.81×10^{-3}	0.57	2.00	0.50	11.0
17	3.47	1.46×10^{-6}	1.89	0.68×10^{-3}	0.53	1.84	0.46	11.3
SAVS-CoV	' patients	: datasets are	obtaine	d from nasopha	aryngea	l aspira	ate	
А	3.05	2.59×10^{-8}	0.70	1.87	1.43	4.36	0.77	23.0
В	3.07	7.67×10^{-8}	0.70	2.28	1.43	4.39	0.77	20.6
С	3.12	2.41×10^{-7}	0.68	3.61	1.47	4.59	0.78	18.7
D	3.14	3.31×10^{-8}	0.52	4.55	1.92	6.04	0.83	26.7
E	3.05	1.51×10^{-7}	0.86	1.83	1.16	3.55	0.72	17.6
F	3.08	1.78×10^{-7}	0.82	2.37	1.22	3.76	0.73	17.6
G	3.06	6.67×10^{-8}	0.90	1.90	1.11	3.40	0.71	18.6
Н	3.05	3.41×10^{-8}	0.65	1.82	1.54	4.69	0.79	23.4
<u> </u>	3.03	2.82×10^{-7}	1.01	1.45	0.99	3.00	0.67	15.6
J	3.12	1.72×10^{-8}	0.51	3.97	1.96	6.12	0.84	28.8
K	3.11	2.62×10^{-8}	0.63	3.23	1.59	4.94	0.80	24.2
L	3.11	1.57×10^{-7}	0.65	3.31	1.54	4.78	0.79	20.0
М	3.13	3.22×10^{-7}	0.63	4.32	1.59	4.97	0.80	18.9

 Table S1. Individual estimated parameters and initial values

N	3.12	1.58×10^{-8}	0.55	3.80	1.82	5.67	0.82	27.6
MERS-CoV severe patients: datasets are obtained from sputum or tracheal aspirate								
1	3.10	3.26×10^{-8}	0.40	3.14	2.50	7.75	0.87	39.5
2	3.12	3.79×10^{-8}	0.44	3.75	2.27	7.09	0.86	30.4
3	3.08	0.46×10^{-8}	0.47	2.56	2.13	6.55	0.85	33.9
4	3.09	1.16×10^{-8}	0.59	2.69	1.69	5.24	0.81	27.0
5	3.09	1.13×10^{-8}	0.42	2.75	2.38	7.36	0.86	34.7
6	3.10	5.84×10^{-8}	0.53	2.89	1.89	5.85	0.83	25.4
MERS-CoV mild patient: datasets are obtained from sputum or tracheal aspirate								
10	3.16	5.84×10^{-7}	0.65	6.19	1.54	4.86	0.79	18.5
11	3.13	2.60×10^{-6}	0.62	4.85	1.61	5.05	0.80	14.8
12	3.12	4.63×10^{-7}	0.76	3.52	1.32	4.11	0.76	16.3