

Algorithm 1 Moment Matching Algorithm for Estimating EVSI

-
- 1: **Input:** Number of outer samples K , number of inner samples L
 - 2: **Output:** Estimated EVSI
 - 3: Initialize $\text{NMB}_{\text{outer}} \leftarrow 0$ and $\text{NMB}_{\text{baseline}} \leftarrow 0$
 - 4: **for** $k = 1$ to K **do**
 - 5: Sample θ_k from the prior distribution $p(\theta)$
 - 6: Generate data x_k from the likelihood $p(X|\theta = \theta_k)$
 - 7: Approximate the posterior $p(\theta|x_k)$ using moment matching:
 - 8: Compute the sample mean $\hat{\mu}_k$ and sample covariance $\hat{\Sigma}_k$ of the posterior samples $\theta_{l,k}$ given x_k
 - 9: $\text{NMB}_{\text{inner},k} \leftarrow 0$
 - 10: **for** $l = 1$ to L **do**
 - 11: Sample $\theta_{l,k}$ from $\mathcal{N}(\hat{\mu}_k, \hat{\Sigma}_k)$
 - 12: Compute $\text{NMB}(j, \theta_{l,k} | \text{WTP}_{\text{DALY}}, \text{WTP}_{\text{Elimination}})$ for each $j = \{1, 2, \dots, J\}$
 - 13: $\text{NMB}_{\text{inner},k} \leftarrow \text{NMB}_{\text{inner},k} + \frac{1}{L} \max_{j=\{1,2,\dots,J\}} \text{NMB}(j, \theta_{l,k})$
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: $\text{NMB}_{\text{outer}} \leftarrow \text{NMB}_{\text{outer}} + \frac{1}{K} \text{NMB}_{\text{inner},k}$
 - 16: **end for**
 - 17: **Estimate the maximum expected NMB without additional data:**
 - 18: **for** $i = 1$ to K **do**
 - 19: Sample θ_i from the prior distribution $p(\theta)$
 - 20: Compute $\text{NMB}(j, \theta_i | \text{WTP}_{\text{DALY}}, \text{WTP}_{\text{Elimination}})$ for each $j = \{1, 2, \dots, J\}$
 - 21: $\text{NMB}_{\text{baseline}} \leftarrow \text{NMB}_{\text{baseline}} + \frac{1}{K} \max_{j=\{1,2,\dots,J\}} \text{NMB}(j, \theta_i)$
 - 22: **end for**
 - 23: **Compute EVSI:**
 - 24: $\text{EVSI} = \text{NMB}_{\text{outer}} - \text{NMB}_{\text{baseline}}$
 - 25: **Return** EVSI
-

Algorithm 2 Compute EVSI using LOT + PCA + LDA

-
- 1: **Input:** Data matrices $\{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^N$, Reference measure σ , Class labels $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^N$, Number of PCA components p , Number of simulated datasets M , Utility function $U(\hat{y}_j, y_j)$ such that $U(\hat{y}_j, y_j) = 1$ if $\hat{y}_j = y_j$, else 0.
 - 2: **Output:** EVSI estimate
 - 3: **Step 1: Compute the Linear Optimal Transport (LOT)**
 - 4: **for** $i = 1$ to N **do**
 - 5: Compute optimal transport map T_i^* between σ and μ_i such that:

$$d_{W^p}(\mu_i, \sigma) := \left(\int_{\Omega} |x - T_i^*(x)|^p d\sigma(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

- 6: Compute the projections $P(\mu_i) = T_i^* - \text{Id}$, where Id is the identity map.
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: **Step 2: Apply PCA on the projections**
 - 9: Construct matrix $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$ where each row is $\{P(\mu_i)\}_{i=1}^N$.
 - 10: Center the data: $\mathbf{P}_c \leftarrow \mathbf{P} - \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{P})$.
 - 11: Compute the covariance matrix: $\mathbf{C} \leftarrow \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{P}_c^T \mathbf{P}_c$.
 - 12: Compute eigenvalues and eigenvectors of \mathbf{C}
 - 13: Select top p dominant eigenvectors to form the PCA projection matrix $\mathbf{P}_{\text{PCA}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times p}$
 - 14: Project the centered data onto PCA components: $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{P}_c \mathbf{P}_{\text{PCA}}$.
 - 15: **Step 3: Train the LDA classifier**
 - 16: Train the LDA classifier once using the PCA components for different $L = 20\%, 40\%, 60\%, 80\%$ of the data i.e., $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^L$ with the class labels $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^L$ where L is the size of the training dataset.
 - 17: **Return** Predicted labels $\{\hat{y}_j\}_{j=1}^V$ on the test data $\{\mathbf{X}_j\}_{j=1}^V$ where $V = N - L$ is the size of the test dataset. Decision boundary giving the estimate for $\text{WTP}_{\text{Elimination}}$ for 65% MDA coverage.
 - 18: **Step 4: Evaluate Utility function**
 - 19: Compute expected utility $\text{EU}_{\text{current}} = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{j=1}^V U(\hat{y}_j, y_j)$.
 - 20: **Step 5: Train on the Augmented Dataset**
 - 21: **for** $k = 1$ to M **do**
 - 22: Generate bootstrap samples from the LOT projections $\{P(\mu_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, namely $\{P'(\mu_i)\}_{i=1}^N$.
 - 23: Follow Steps 2-3 and compute the PCA components for the new bootstrap sample resulting in $\{\mathbf{X}'_i\}_{i=1}^L$ with class labels $\{y'_i\}_{i=1}^L$. Train LDA on this bootstrapped dataset for $L = 20\%, 40\%, 60\%, 80\%$.
 - 24: Obtain predicted class labels $\{\hat{y}'_j\}_{j=1}^V$ for test data $\{\mathbf{X}'_j\}_{j=1}^V$ where $V = N - L$.
 - 25: Compute expected utility for the k -th bootstrap sample: $\text{EU}_{\text{new},k} = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{j=1}^V U(\hat{y}'_j, y'_j)$.
 - 26: **end for**
 - 27: **Step 6: Compute EVSI**
 - 28: Compute average expected utility with additional data: $\text{EU}_{\text{sample}} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M \text{EU}_{\text{new},k}$.
 - 29: Compute EVSI: $\text{EVSI} = \text{EU}_{\text{sample}} - \text{EU}_{\text{current}}$.
 - 30: **Return** EVSI
-

Table B.1: Probability of Elimination for different stopping thresholds for TAS sampling for people aged ≥ 20 years (adults)

MDA coverage	Mean baseline prevalence	Probability of Elimination for different stopping thresholds for TAS			
		(<0.5%)	(<1%)	(<2%)	(<5%)
80%	5-10%	91.8% (90.2 - 92.28)	83.8% (80.97 - 84.8)	81.47% (80.23 - 82.27)	72.16% (70.67 - 72.28)
	10-20%	77.28% (75.56 - 78.23)	71.03% (70.03 - 68.97)	65.88% (64.26 - 67.28)	61.78% (60.23 - 62.97)
	20-30%	67.68% (63.24 - 68.52)	65.91% (64.06 - 67.28)	63.96% (61.34 - 65.34)	61.51% (60.23 - 63.23)
65%	5-10%	90.7% (88.13 - 92.02)	87.65% (85.34 - 89.70)	85.43% (82.02 - 89.22)	80.03% (79.89 - 82.27)
	10-20%	75.12% (72.02 - 77.36)	70.10% (69.89 - 72.81)	65.76% (64.83 - 67.86)	60.47% (58.96 - 62.21)
	20-30%	65.63% (62.54 - 68.35)	62.73% (60.83 - 69.43)	60.15% (59.24 - 62.35)	59.24% (54.10 - 62.37)

Table B.2: Probability of Elimination for different stopping thresholds for TAS sampling for people aged ≥ 5 years (including, children)

MDA coverage	Mean baseline prevalence	Probability of Elimination for different stopping thresholds for TAS			
		(<0.5%)	(<1%)	(<2%)	(<5%)
80%	5-10%	89.2% (87.22 - 91.23)	80.05% (79.23 - 81.28)	75.04% (72.28 - 78.97)	68.08% (65.07 - 67.83)
	10-20%	72.63% (70.86 - 77.53)	62.04% (60.23 - 63.27)	57.33% (54.62 - 59.90)	52.49% (50.23 - 56.24)
	20-30%	55.99% (51.02 - 56.87)	53.5% (50.23 - 58.75)	50.5% (48.23 - 52.55)	48.23% (45.23 - 50.12)
65%	5-10%	85.23% (82.78 - 89.23)	78.23% (76.89-80.23)	72.25% (70.02 - 75.23)	65.13% (62.34-68.23)
	10-20%	72.15% (71.03 - 75.45)	60.23% (58.89 - 63.23)	55.13% (52.82-57.86)	51.23% (50.96 - 56.87)
	20-30%	55.23% (50.54 - 58.35)	51.23% (50.83 - 56.43)	48.23% (46.24 - 50.35)	46.73% (44.78 - 48.87)

Table B.3: Probability of Elimination for different stopping thresholds for TAS sampling for everyone eligible

MDA coverage	Mean baseline prevalence	Probability of Elimination for different stopping thresholds for TAS			
		(<0.5%)	(<1%)	(<2%)	(<5%)
80%	5-10%	90.7% (87.23 - 92.18)	81.76% (80.17 - 83.63)	80.07% (78.86 - 82.27)	71.58% (70.57 - 72.28)
	10-20%	74.57% (75.56 - 78.23)	71.03% (70.03 - 68.97)	65.88% (64.26 - 67.28)	61.78% (60.23 - 62.97)
	20-30%	60.08% (59.84 - 62.52)	57.64% (55.23 - 60.12)	54.23% (51.24 - 57.98)	50.23% (49.93 - 53.29)
65%	5-10%	88.13% (83.23 - 90.02)	78.23% (75.34-79.70)	70.24% (69.75 - 73.25)	68.23% (65.89-70.87)
	10-20%	72.13% (70.02-77.36)	65.52% (60.23 - 68.87)	60.23% (59.83-62.86)	58.23% (55.86 - 60.81)
	20-30%	58.23% (57.04 - 60.05)	55.23% (54.03 - 57.89)	52.12% (50.04 - 55.85)	48.23% (46.23 - 50.91)

Table B.4: Total MDA rounds with TAS surveys for different MDA coverage levels sampling for people aged ≥ 20 years and above.

Mean baseline prevalence	Total Number of MDA rounds (TAS surveys)	Total MDA rounds (TAS surveys)							
		(<0.5%)		(<1%)		(<2%)		(<5%)	
	MDA coverage	80%	65%	80%	65%	80%	65%	80%	65%
5-10%	5 rounds (3 surveys)	80	76	86	80	92	88	93	90
	≥ 7 rounds (4 surveys)	20	24	14	20	8	12	7	10
	7 restart (5 surveys)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-20%	5 rounds (3 surveys)	82	70	88	72	90	77	88	82
	≥ 7 rounds (4 surveys)	18	26	12	24	10	17	9	12
	7 restart (5 surveys)	0	4	0	4	0	6	3	6
20-30%	5 rounds (3 surveys)	45	35	43	38	44	39	46	41
	≥ 7 rounds (4 surveys)	50	57	50	55	46	54	45	48
	7 restart (5 surveys)	5	8	7	7	10	7	9	11

Table B.5: Total MDA rounds with TAS surveys for different MDA coverage levels sampling for people aged ≥ 5 years and above.

Mean baseline prevalence	Total Number of MDA rounds (TAS surveys)	Total MDA rounds (TAS surveys)							
		(<0.5%)		(<1%)		(<2%)		(<5%)	
	MDA coverage	80%	65%	80%	65%	80%	65%	80%	65%
5-10%	5 rounds (3 surveys)	78	74	82	80	86	82	88	84
	≥ 7 rounds (4 surveys)	22	26	18	20	14	20	12	0
	7 restart (5 surveys)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-20%	5 rounds (3 surveys)	82	68	85	70	87	77	88	80
	≥ 7 rounds (4 surveys)	18	28	15	26	13	18	8	13
	7 restart (5 surveys)	0	4	0	4	0	5	4	7
20-30%	5 rounds (3 surveys)	37	36	42	39	41	41	40	43
	≥ 7 rounds (4 surveys)	54	52	46	52	43	46	42	42
	7 restart (5 surveys)	9	12	12	9	16	13	18	15

Table B.6: Total MDA rounds with TAS surveys for different MDA coverage levels sampling everyone eligible in the population

Mean baseline prevalence	Total Number of MDA rounds (TAS surveys)	Total MDA rounds (TAS surveys)							
		(<0.5%)		(<1%)		(<2%)		(<5%)	
	MDA coverage	80%	65%	80%	65%	80%	65%	80%	65%
5-10%	5 rounds (3 surveys)	85	80	88	82	86	83	87	85
	≥ 7 rounds (4 surveys)	15	20	9	12	7	9	5	9
	7 restart (5 surveys)	0	0	3	6	7	8	8	6
10-20%	5 rounds (3 surveys)	78	63	76	65	77	68	80	72
	≥ 7 rounds (4 surveys)	18	32	18	28	15	23	11	17
	7 restart (5 surveys)	4	5	6	7	8	9	9	11
20-30%	5 rounds (3 surveys)	41	35	40	36	42	42	44	41
	≥ 7 rounds (4 surveys)	52	59	51	55	47	49	43	47
	7 restart (5 surveys)	7	6	9	9	11	9	13	12

Table B.7: : Expected incremental net monetary benefit (in dollars) of switching from <1% threshold to <0.5% threshold in the TAS for each setting for a sample of adults aged 20 years and above. Note: The comparator for computing the EINMB is the <1% threshold in people aged 5 years and above for the individual baseline prevalence and MDA coverage of the total population. This has been chosen for a range of WTP for DALY averted and probability of elimination so that we can estimate the cost-effectiveness of the threshold at different known baseline prevalence and MDA coverage.

	(WTP per DALY averted)					
Baseline Prevalence	\$ 500		\$2500		\$5000	
	MDA Coverage		MDA Coverage		MDA Coverage	
	80%	65%	80%	65%	80%	65%
Willingness to pay \$0 per 1% increase in the probability of elimination to switch thresholds						
5-10%	\$3,286	\$189	\$1,009	-\$1589	\$5,79	-\$3503
10-20%	\$5,575	\$275.32	\$3,781	-\$2589	\$1,334	-\$2892
20-30%	\$8,373	-\$102	\$6,823	-\$803	\$3,534	-\$1106
Willingness to pay \$10,000 per 1% increase in the probability of elimination to switch thresholds						
5-10%	\$3,286	\$5189	\$1,009	\$3,411	\$5,79	\$1497
10-20%	\$5,575	\$5275	\$3,781	\$2,411	\$1,334	\$2108
20-30%	\$8,373	\$4898	\$6,823	\$5198	\$3,534	\$5898
Minimum willingness to pay \$5,000 per 1% increase in probability of elimination to switch thresholds						
5-10%	\$3,286	\$3189	\$1,009	\$1,411	\$5,79	\$497
10-20%	\$5,575	\$3275	\$3,781	\$1411	\$1,334	\$1,008
20-30%	\$8,373	\$2398	\$6,823	\$2197	\$3,534	\$2,894

Table B.8: Expected incremental net monetary benefit (in dollars) of switching from <1% threshold to <0.5% threshold in the TAS for each setting when everyone eligible in the population has been considered. Note: The comparator for computing the EINMB is the <1% threshold in people aged 5 years and above for the individual baseline prevalence and MDA coverage of the total population. This has been chosen for a range of WTP for DALY averted and probability of elimination so that we can estimate the cost-effectiveness of the threshold at different known baseline prevalence and MDA coverage.

	(WTP per DALY averted)					
Baseline Prevalence	\$ 500		\$2500		\$5000	
	MDA Coverage		MDA Coverage		MDA Coverage	
	80%	65%	80%	65%	80%	65%
Willingness to pay \$0 per 1% increase in the probability of elimination to switch thresholds						
5-10%	\$4,398	\$979	\$2,469	-\$2569	\$8,29	-\$3593
10-20%	\$6,695	\$459	\$5281	-\$2793	\$1,524	-\$3092
20-30%	\$9,203	-\$112	\$7,243	-\$1243	\$4,864	-\$836
Willingness to pay \$10,000 per 1% increase in the probability of elimination to switch thresholds						
5-10%	\$4,398	\$5979	\$2,469	\$2,431	\$8,29	\$1407
10-20%	\$6,695	\$5459	\$5281	\$2,207	\$1,524	\$1907
20-30%	\$9,203	\$4888	\$7,243	\$3757	\$4,864	\$4164
Minimum willingness to pay \$5,000 per 1% increase in probability of elimination to switch thresholds						
5-10%	\$4,398	\$3979	\$2,469	\$431	\$8,29	\$407
10-20%	\$6,695	\$3459	\$5281	\$207	\$1,524	\$9,08
20-30%	\$9,203	\$2888	\$7,243	\$1757	\$4,864	\$3,164

Table B.9: Classification error on test data using LDA for different values of the training sample size and different thresholds using point cloud data of costs and DALYs averted using fixed WTP for DALYs averted for 80% MDA coverage for sample of adults.

Baseline Prevalence	Number of Training Sample	Classification Error on test data			
		0.5%	1%	2%	5%
5-10%	20%	0.2	0.27	0.35	0.37
	50%	0.17	0.21	0.27	0.32
	60%	0.10	0.12	0.19	0.23
	80%	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.12
10-20%	20%	0.42	0.46	0.49	0.51
	50%	0.37	0.43	0.45	0.48
	60%	0.32	0.35	0.37	0.39
	80%	0.21	0.24	0.29	0.31
20-30%	20%	0.59	0.64	0.67	0.72
	50%	0.52	0.43	0.37	0.35
	60%	0.32	0.35	0.39	0.42
	80%	0.33	0.37	0.42	0.44

Table B.10: Classification error on test data using LDA for different values of the training sample size and different thresholds using a point cloud of costs with DALYs averted, Probability of elimination using estimated WTP for 1% increase in probability of elimination for 65% MDA coverage using a sample of adults.

Baseline Prevalence	Number of Training Sample	Classification Error on the test data			
		0.5%	1%	2%	5%
5-10%	20%	0.3	0.34	0.37	0.41
	50%	0.27	0.31	0.35	0.39
	60%	0.23	0.27	0.29	0.31
	80%	0.15	0.17	0.19	0.22
10-20%	20%	0.43	0.47	0.52	0.57
	50%	0.41	0.43	0.47	0.52
	60%	0.37	0.39	0.41	0.43
	80%	0.35	0.37	0.39	0.41
20-30%	20%	0.56	0.61	0.63	0.62
	50%	0.42	0.43	0.53	0.57
	60%	0.35	0.37	0.41	0.47
	80%	0.27	0.33	0.37	0.44

Table B.11: Comparison of the EVSI per person for Moment Matching (MM), Nested Monte Carlo (MC) and LOT+PCA+LDA methods for 65% MDA coverage in 5-10% mf baseline prevalence

Threshold (%)	Sample Size (500)			Sample Size (1000)			Sample Size (1500)		
	MC	MM	LOT+LDA	MC	MM	LOT+LDA	MC	MM	LOT+LDA
EVSI per Person									
<0.5%	250	200	220	285	270	276	295	300	310
<1%	210	180	185	263	250	255	277	280	287
<2%	152	130	145	185	170	165	217	220	229
<5%	120	100	110	155	140	145	175	180	192
Computational Time									
<0.5%	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min
<1%	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min	>8 hrs	≈2.5 min	≈1 min
<2%	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈2 min	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈2 min
<5%	>8 hrs	≈2.5 min	≈2 min	>8 hrs	≈3 min	≈2 min	>8 hrs	≈3 min	≈2 min

Table B.12: Comparison of the EVSI per person for Moment Matching (MM), Nested Monte Carlo (MC) and LOT+PCA+LDA methods for 65% MDA coverage in 10-20% mf baseline prevalence

Threshold (%)	Sample Size (500)			Sample Size (1000)			Sample Size (1500)		
	MC	MM	LOT+LDA	MC	MM	LOT+LDA	MC	MM	LOT+LDA
EVSI per Person									
<0.5%	197	175	185	245	230	237	272	270	275
<1%	182	163	173	222	210	215	225	220	227
<2%	140	120	134	162	160	175	175	170	172
<5%	105	80	98	125	110	119	157	170	153
Computational Time									
<0.5%	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min
<1%	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min	>8 hrs	≈2.5 min	≈1 min
<2%	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈2 min	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈2 min
<5%	>8 hrs	≈2.5 min	≈2 min	>8 hrs	≈3 min	≈2 min	>8 hrs	≈3 min	≈2 min

Table B.13: Comparison of the EVSI per person for Moment Matching (MM), Nested Monte Carlo (MC) and LOT+PCA+LDA methods for 65% MDA coverage in 20-30% mf baseline prevalence

Threshold (%)	Sample Size (500)			Sample Size (1000)			Sample Size (1500)		
	MC	MM	LOT+LDA	MC	MM	LOT+LDA	MC	MM	LOT+LDA
EVSI per Person									
<0.5%	165	157	160	182	175	177	192	180	185
<1%	115	103	109	123	110	115	130	125	127
<2%	95	87	92	105	93	100	120	110	117
<5%	63	52	57	87	75	82	107	98	105
Computational Time									
<0.5%	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min
<1%	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min	>8 hrs	≈2.5 min	≈1 min
<2%	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈1 min	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈2 min	>8 hrs	≈2 min	≈2 min
<5%	>8 hrs	≈2.5 min	≈2 min	>8 hrs	≈3 min	≈2 min	>8 hrs	≈3 min	≈2 min

1106 **Appendix C. Supplementary Material : Transmission**¹²⁶
 1107 **Model Details**¹²⁷

1108 The codes used in this paper, including the R version of the
 1109 TRANSFIL model is available from https://github.com/mca52/Codes_JTB.git.¹²⁸
 1110

same for both at 11.3 which was estimated as a fit to a dataset from India [13]. We further assume ADL to occur about twice per year (0–7 times) in 70% (45–90%) of hydrocele patients, and four (0–7 times) times annually for 95% (90–95%) of patients with lymphoedema [14].

Table C.14: Table with the parameters used for TRANSFIL model.

Parameter	Value/Scenario
Baseline mf prevalence (%)	5 -10%, 10-20%, 20-30%
Drug	IA
MDA frequency	Annual
MDA coverage	65%, 80%
MDA systematic non-adherence correlation	0.2806 - 0.5351
EPHP threshold (mf prevalence)	<0.5%, <1%, <2%, <5%
Primary vector species	Culex
Bite risk aggregation parameter, (k)	0.01 – 0.1
Annual biting rate (ABR)	0 – 1200
Vector control coverage	0
Insecticidal decay half-life	2 years
Bite rate per mosquito per month (b_m)	5-15
Proportion of mosquitoes infected by infectious bite (p_{mi})	0.37
L3 uptake and development parameter (θ_{L3})	4.395
L3 uptake and development parameter (σ_{L3})	0.055
Mosquito death rate per month	5
Mf birth rate per female worm per month (β_{mf})	1
Proportion L3 leaving mosquito per bite (η_{L3})	0.414
Proportion L3 leaving mosquito that enter host (ϕ_{L3})	0.32
Proportion L3 entering host that develop to adults (γ_{L3})	0.00275
Adult worm death rate per month (μ_w)	0.0104
Mf death rate per month (μ_{mf})	0.1
Host death rate per month (μ_h)	0.00167
Proportion of mf killed by IA treatment	0.99
Proportion of adult worms killed by IA treatment	0.35
Length of worm sterilisation after IA treatment (months)	9
Reduction in individual bite risk in presence of LLINs (efficacy)	0.97
Shape parameter for gamma distribution (lymphoedema - g_l)	0.02
Shape parameter for gamma distribution (hydrocele - g_h)	0.71

1111 *Appendix C.1. Calculation of the prevalence of morbidity (hy*¹³¹
 1112 *drocele, lymphoedema and ADL)*¹³²

1113 Each individual is assigned a susceptibility to having hydro-
 1114 cele (if female, this = 0) and lymphoedema. These susceptibil-
 1115 ities are drawn from a gamma distribution with a specific shape
 1116 gl and rate 1/gl (giving the distribution a mean of 1). This sus-
 1117 ceptibility is drawn at birth and is never changed for the in-
 1118 dividual. To assess if someone has one of these sequelae, we
 1119 multiply their susceptibility to the sequelae by the total worms
 1120 they have had over their lifetime. If this value is greater than
 1121 a chosen number, then they will be designated as displaying
 1122 this sequela. A consequence of this is that once a person has a
 1123 sequela, they will always have it.

1124 For lymphoedema the shape parameter is 0.0033 and for hy-
 1125 drocele it is 0.02 [13]. The number they are compared to is the

Appendix C.2. Calculation of the DALY averted for morbidity

In order to estimate the burden of morbidity caused by lymphatic filariasis, we propose the following DALY framework. The burden of the disease can be mathematically estimated as follows,

$$\text{DALY} = \text{YLL} + \text{YLD} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where YLL is the years lost due to premature death of the disease and YLD is the years lived with disability caused by the disease. We modified this mathematical formula for the estimating the burden of morbidity caused by filariasis as a cause. Consequently, we compute the two components of DALYs as follows:

$$\text{YLD} = \text{Prevalence}_{\text{Morbidity}} \times \text{dw} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where $\text{Prevalence}_{\text{Morbidity}}$ is the prevalence of morbidity (computed as mentioned in Appendix C.1) and dw is the published

1144 disability weights for lymphoedema, hydrocele and ADL. [21].
1145 Now, we consider

$$YLL = N \times L \quad (C.3)$$

1146 where N is the number of deaths caused by the burden of the
1147 disease and L is the standard expected life expectancy at the
1148 age of death. According to GBD, no deaths occurred as a result
1149 of the burden of morbidity caused by lymphatic filariasis. In ad-
1150 dition, according to the WHO, although filariasis is one of the
1151 leading causes of disability, death from filariasis is rare. There-
1152 fore, we will assume $N \sim 0$. This in turn leads to the years lost
1153 due to premature death as zero. Hence, the estimated DALY
1154 burden due to morbidity is simply the prevalence of morbidity
1155 (computed from Appendix C.1) times the disability weights
1156 [26]:

$$DALY = YLD = \text{Prevalence}_{\text{Morbidity}} \times dw \quad (C.4)$$

1157 Therefore, the DALYs averted is computed as,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DALYs averted} &= \text{DALY burden before starting MDA} \\ &- \text{DALY burden after stopping MDA.} \end{aligned} \quad (C.5)$$

1158 *Appendix C.3. Calculation of the total costs*

1159 The total costs are computed as indicated below,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total costs} &= w_1 \times \text{Total MDA rounds} \\ &+ w_2 \times \text{Total TAS sureveys conducted} \end{aligned} \quad (C.6)$$

1160 where w_1 [47] and w_2 [7] are the estimated cost weightings
1161 computed in accordance with the current purchasing power par-
1162 ity in the US \$. The total MDA rounds and total TAS surveys
1163 conducted are computed from the TRANSFIL simulations by
1164 keeping a counter for each simulation under the different sce-
1165 narios. The expected estimated cost weightings of MDA [47]
1166 and TAS surveys [7] (excluding the costs for rapid diagnostic
1167 tests RDT) for LF programs with annual treatment from the per-
1168 spective of the endemic country government cover financial and
1169 economic costs. The financial costs are the costs of all inputs
1170 purchased in cash for MDA, including purchased MDA drugs,
1171 materials and supplies, ministry of health personnel salaries,
1172 and per diem payments for community drug distributors. Eco-
1173 nomic costs also include the costs of donated drugs for MDA.

Table C.15: Table with the definitions of the key acronyms used in the manuscript. Adapted from Box 1 in [3].

Terminologies	Description	Page Defined
CEA (Cost-Effectiveness Analysis)	A method to compare the relative costs and outcomes (effects) of different interventions or treatments	pg. 1,2,3,11
DALYs (Disability Adjusted Life Years)	The number of years lost due to premature death of the disease and the years lived with disability caused by the disease.	pg. 1,2,3,4,7,8,9,10,11
Disability weights	A factor (between 0 and 1) which is used to calculate the number of years lost due to disability that accounts for the severity of the disease.	pg. 7,8
EINMB (Expected Incremental Net Monetary Benefit)	The mean of the difference in NMB between alternative interventions, a positive incremental NMB indicating that the intervention is cost-effective compared with the alternative at the given willingness-to-pay threshold. In this case, the incremental cost to derive the incremental benefit is less than the maximum amount that the decision-maker would be willing to pay for this benefit.	pg. 3,4,7,9,10,11
EVPI (Expected Value of Perfect Information)	The maximum amount a decision-maker would be willing to pay for perfect information, which would completely eliminate uncertainty.	pg. 4,5,9
EVPPPI (Expected Value of Partial Perfect Information)	The value of obtaining information that only partially resolves uncertainty, providing some but not complete clarity.	pg. 4,5,9,10
EVSI (Expected Value of Sample Information)	The value of acquiring information through sampling or additional data collection to reduce uncertainty in decision-making.	pg. 3,5,6,7,9,10
ICER (Incremental Cost-Effective Ratio)	The ratio of change in costs (ΔC) to the change in health impacts (ΔE). In this manuscript, we consider the health impacts due to the DALYs averted for morbidity and the probability of unit increase in elimination.	pg. 1,2,3,4
LOT (Linear Optimal Transport)	A mathematical approach for finding the most cost-effective way to transport resources from one distribution to another while minimizing the total transport cost. Also known as 'Linear Wasserstein Framework'	pg. 1,3,5,6,7,8,9,10,11
LDA (Linear Discriminant Analysis)	A statistical technique (supervised classifier) used for classifying data by identifying linear combinations of features that most effectively distinguish between different classes.	pg. 1,8,9,10
Morbidity	The prevalence or incidence of disease or illness within a population, often measured by the frequency and severity of health-related symptoms. In this study, lymphoedema refers to the improper functioning of the lymph system that results in fluid collection and swelling; hydrocele refers to the swelling of the scrotum due to infection	pg. 1,3,7,8,9,10,11
MDA (Mass Drug Administration)	A method of preventive chemotherapy involving the distribution of anthelmintic drugs to all eligible individuals within a specified area (such as a state, region, province, district, subdistrict, or village) on a routine basis, regardless of their individual infection status.	pg. 2,3,7,8,9,10,11
MDA coverage	The proportion of eligible people in the population who receive MDA.	pg. 3,7,8,9,10,11
NMB (Net Monetary Benefit)	A summary statistic that represents the value of an intervention (in this case, stopping and restarting MDA) in monetary terms when a willingness to pay threshold for a unit of benefit (DALYs averted for morbidity or 1% increase in probability of local elimination) is known.	pg. 4
PCA (Principal Component Analysis)	A dimensionality reduction technique that transforms data into a set of orthogonal components that capture the most variance in the data.	pg. 7,9,10
Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis (PSA)	A method that examines how uncertainty in the model's input parameters affects the outcomes by running multiple Monte Carlo simulations by varying the input parameters according to their probability distributions.	pg. 2,5
Stopping threshold	A prevalence threshold which is used to determine whether MDA can stop or if further rounds are required. The WHO recommended stopping threshold is <1% mf in children aged 5 years and above or <2% Ag in children aged 6-7 years old.	pg. 1,2,3,7,8,9,10,11
TAS (Transmission Assessment Surveys)	A survey designed to measure whether evaluation units have lowered the prevalence of infection to a level where recrudescence is unlikely to occur, even in the absence of MDA interventions.	pg. 2,3,7,8,10,11
VoI (Value of Information)	The framework used to assess the benefit gained from obtaining additional information to improve decision-making under uncertainty.	pg. 2,3,7
$d_{W^p}(\mu, \nu)$ (Wasserstein distance)	A measure of the difference between two probability distributions, defined as the minimum cost of transporting mass from one distribution to another, where the cost is quantified by the p th power of the Euclidean distance function between points in the distributions	pg. 5,6,11
WTP (Willingness To Pay)	The amount of money the decision maker (individual, organization, or government) would be willing to spend per unit of clinical effectiveness (in this case, DALYs averted for morbidity or 1% increase in probability of local elimination). In this study, we rely on the willingness to pay per capita government expenditure for three different example countries	pg. 1,3,4,7,8,9,10,11
Worm burden	The quantity of filarial worms present within a host organism, typically measured by the number or mass of worms within a specific anatomical location or system.	pg. 2,8