Supplementary Information for

Potential Impacts of Mass Nutritional Supplementation on Dynamics of Measles: A Simulation Study

Navideh Noori[a,*], Laura Skrip[b], Assaf P. Oron[a], Kevin A McCarthy[a], Benjamin M. Althouse[a,c,d], Indi Trehan[e], and Kevin P.Q. Phelan[f]

[a]Institute for Disease Modeling, Global Health Division, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 500 5th Ave N, Seattle, WA, 98109, USA

[b]School of Public Health, University of Liberia, 1000 Monrovia, 10 Liberia

[c]Information School, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, 98104, USA

[d]Department of Biology, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM, 88003, USA

[e]Department of Global Health, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, 98104, USA

[f]The Alliance for International Medical Action (ALIMA), Paris, 75011, France

[a]Corresponding author: Navideh Noori, Email: nnoori@idmod.org

This PDF file includes:

Supplementary text

Figures S1 to S12

Supplementary Information Text

Measles-Undernutrition Model with Wasting Treatment (Scenario 1)

$$\frac{dS_{N0}}{dt} = (1-\omega)B - (1-\nu)\lambda S_{N0} - (\nu+\alpha+\mu)S_{N0} \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{dS_{M0}}{dt} = \omega B - (1-\nu w)\theta\lambda S_{M0} - (\nu w+\tau+\alpha+\mu m)S_{M0} \tag{2}$$

$$\frac{dS_{N1}}{dt} = \tau S_{M0} - (1-\nu t)\lambda S_{N1} - (\nu t+\chi+\alpha+\mu)S_{N1} \tag{3}$$

$$\frac{dS_{M1}}{dt} = \chi(S_{N1}+S_{N2}) - (1-\nu w)(\theta+\varsigma)\lambda S_{M1} - (\nu w+\tau+\alpha+\mu m)S_{M1} \tag{4}$$

$$\frac{dS_{N2}}{dt} = \tau S_{M1} - (1-\nu t)\lambda S_{N2} - (\nu t+\chi+\alpha+\mu)S_{N2} \tag{5}$$

$$\frac{dV}{dt} = \nu S_{N0} + \nu w(S_{M0}+S_{M1}) + \nu t(S_{N1}+S_{N2}) - (\alpha+\mu)V \tag{6}$$

$$\frac{dI_N}{dt} = (1-\nu)\lambda S_{N0} + (1-\nu t)\lambda(S_{N1}+S_{N2}) - (\gamma+\alpha+\mu)I_N \tag{7}$$

$$\frac{dI_M}{dt} = (1-\nu w)\theta\lambda S_{M0} + (1-\nu w)(\theta+\varsigma)\lambda S_{M1} - (\eta\times\gamma+\alpha+\mu m)I_M \tag{8}$$

$$\frac{dR_{NM}}{dt} = H(1-\sigma)\gamma I_N - (\rho+\alpha+\mu m)R_{NM} \tag{9}$$

$$\frac{dR_{NN}}{dt} = (1-H)(1-\sigma)\gamma I_N - (\alpha+\mu)R_{NN} \tag{10}$$

$$\frac{dR_{MN}}{dt} = \delta(1-\phi\times\sigma)\eta\gamma I_M - (\alpha+\mu m)R_{MM} \tag{11}$$

$$\frac{dR_{MM}}{dt} = (1-\delta)(1-\phi\times\sigma)\eta\gamma I_M - (\alpha+\mu m)R_{MM} \tag{12}$$

We developed a seasonally forced deterministic continuous-time SIR model. The seasonally forced system in our model is analyzed by making the transmission rate vary cosinusoidal which is given in the equations 13 and 14. λ is the force of infection. ϵ is number of imported cases from outside the population.The mean transmission rate is given by the parameter β, with the amplitude of seasonality b_1. β_0 is the mean transmission rate which is obtained based on the R_0 equation. μ and μm denote

constant *per capita* death rates, and ω represents proportion of infants under-6 months with Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM).

$$\lambda(t) = \beta(t)(I_N + I_M + \epsilon)/N \tag{13}$$

$$\beta(t) = \beta_0(1 + b_1 cos(2\pi t)) \tag{14}$$

$$R_0 = \frac{\beta_0}{\omega\eta\gamma + (1-\omega)\gamma + \mu + \mu m} \tag{15}$$

Measles-Undernutrition Model with Mass Nutritional Supplementation (Scenario 2)

We remove the wasting treatment and instead, model the effect of mass nutritional supplementation on the dynamics of measles by assuming that 60% of the population aged 6-23 months (shown as parameter MC) receive SQ-LNS (Fig. S1). We assume the rest of population $(1 - MC)$ do not receive the mass supplementation. The R_0 equations for the $MC = 60\%$ of population with mass supplementation and rest of population (40%) are shown in equations (16) and (17), respectively:

$$R_0 = \frac{\beta_0}{MC(1-K)\omega\eta\gamma + MC(1-(1-K)\omega)\gamma + \mu + \mu m} \tag{16}$$

$$R_0 = \frac{\beta_0}{(1-MC)\omega\eta\gamma + (1-MC)(1-\omega)\gamma + \mu + \mu m} \tag{17}$$

Measles-Undernutrition Model with Mass Nutritional Supplementation and Wasting Treatment (Scenario 3)

We combine scenarios 1 and 2, and model the effect of mass nutritional supplementation as well as wasting treatment on the dynamics of measles by assuming that 60% of the population aged 6-23 months receive SQ-LNS (Fig. S2). All the equations are same as the previous model, only the following ones change and also μm and ν change to $\mu m'$ and ν', respectively.

$$\frac{dS_{N0}}{dt} = MC(1-(1-K)\omega)B - (1-\nu')\lambda S_{N0} - (\nu' + \alpha + \mu)S_{N0} \tag{18}$$

$$\frac{dS_{M0}}{dt} = MC(1-K)\omega B - (1-\nu w)\theta\lambda S_{M0} - (\nu w + \tau + \alpha + \mu m')S_{M0} \tag{19}$$



Figure S 1. Schematic of measles-undernutrition model with mass nutritional supplementation (Scenario 2).



Figure S 2. Schematic of measles-undernutrition model with wasting treatment and mass nutritional supplementation (Scenario 3).



Figure S 3. Impact of wasting treatment and vaccination coverage of wasted children (scenario 1) on reducing a) measles infection and b) mortality due to measles among wasted children, and c) overall mortality among wasted children.



Figure S 4. Impact of wasting treatment and vaccination coverage of wasted children (scenario 1) on reducing measles infection and mortality due to measles among all children aged 6-23 months old, using baseline wasting treatment coverage of (τ: 20%, 30% and 40%) and baseline vaccination coverage of (ν: 65%, 70%, 75%, 80%).



Figure S 5. Impact of wasting treatment and vaccination coverage of wasted children (scenario 1) on reducing measles infection and mortality due to measles among wasted children aged 6-23 months old, and overall mortality among wasted children, using baseline wasting treatment coverage of (τ: 20%, 30% and 40%) and baseline vaccination coverage of (ν: 65%, 70%, 75%, 80%).



Figure S 6. Impacts of mass nutritional supplementation + wasting treatment (scenario 3), on reducing measles infection and mortality due to measles among children aged 6-23 months old, assuming the vaccination coverage of nourished children (ν') after receiving the SQ-LNS changes from its baseline value of 75% to 80%, and 85% (x-axis). The baseline treatment coverage of wasted children (τ) was varied to 20%, 30% and 40%.



Figure S 7. Difference between mass nutritional supplementation + wasting treatment (scenario 3) and wasting treatment (scenario 1), in reducing measles infection and mortality due to measles among children aged 6-23 months old, assuming the vaccination coverage of nourished children after receiving SQ-LNS varies to 75%, 80%, and 85% (x-axis). The baseline treatment coverage of wasted children (τ) was varied to 20%, 30% and 40%.



Figure S 8. Difference between mass nutritional supplementation + wasting treatment (scenario 3) and wasting treatment (scenario 1), in reducing measles infection and mortality due to measles among wasted children, and overall mortality among wasted children, assuming the vaccination coverage of nourished children after receiving SQ-LNS varies to 75%, 80%, and 85% (x-axis). The baseline treatment coverage of wasted children (τ) was varied to 20%, 30% and 40%.



Figure S 9. Difference between mass nutritional supplementation + wasting treatment (scenario 3) and mass nutritional supplementation (scenario 2), in reducing measles infection and mortality due to measles among children aged 6-23 months old, assuming the vaccination coverage of nourished children after receiving SQ-LNS varies to 75%, 80%, and 85% (x-axis). The baseline treatment coverage of wasted children (τ) was varied to 20%, 30% and 40%.



Figure S 10. Difference between mass nutritional supplementation + wasting treatment (scenario 3) and mass nutritional supplementation (scenario 2), in reducing measles infection and mortality due to measles among wasted children, and overall mortality among wasted children, assuming the vaccination coverage of nourished children after receiving SQ-LNS varies to 75%, 80%, and 85% (x-axis). The baseline treatment coverage of wasted children (τ) was varied to 20%, 30% and 40%. The % reduction compares the combined mass supplementation and wasting treatment effect with the mass nutritional supplementation only effect.



Figure S 11. Difference between mass nutritional supplementation + wasting treatment (scenario 3) and wasting treatment (scenario 1), in reducing measles infection and mortality due to measles among children aged 6-23 months old, assuming the vaccination coverage of nourished children (ν') after receiving SQ-LNS changes from its baseline value of 75% to 80%.



Figure S 12. Result of partial rank correlation coefficient of scenario 1 simulations using different model parameters. The further the coefficient of each parameter is from the horizontal line, the more sensitive the model outcome is to that parameter.