

1 **Modelling the potential use of pre-exposure prophylaxis to reduce nosocomial**  
2 **SARS-CoV-2 transmission**

3

4 Lauren Stewart<sup>1</sup>, Stephanie Evans<sup>2,3</sup>, Teresa Brevini<sup>4</sup>, Fotios Sampaziotis<sup>4,5,6</sup>,  
5 Christopher J. R. Illingworth<sup>1</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup>MRC University of Glasgow Centre for Virus Research, Glasgow, UK

8 <sup>2</sup>Fungal, HCAI, AMU & Sepsis Division, UK Health Security Agency, London, AMR,  
9 UK

10 <sup>3</sup>Statistics, Modelling and Economics, UK Health Security Agency, London, UK

11 <sup>4</sup>Wellcome–MRC Cambridge Stem Cell Institute, Cambridge, UK

12 <sup>5</sup>Cambridge Liver Unit, Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust,  
13 Cambridge, UK

14 <sup>6</sup>Department of Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

15

16 **Abstract**

17 The nosocomial transmission of respiratory pathogens is an ongoing healthcare  
18 challenge, with consequences for the health of vulnerable individuals. Outbreaks in  
19 hospitals can require the closure of bays or entire wards, reducing hospital capacity  
20 and having a financial impact upon healthcare providers. Here we evaluate a novel  
21 strategy of pre-exposure prophylaxis as a means to reduce the nosocomial  
22 transmission of SARS-CoV-2. We model the effect of ursodeoxycholic acid (UDCA)  
23 upon levels of ACE2 expression, SARS-CoV-2 viral entry, and ultimately the  
24 probability of an infection. We then implement this model within simulations  
25 describing the spread of SARS-CoV-2 infections within a hospital context, simulating

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26 an intervention in which UDCA is given to patients on a ward for 10 days following  
27 the detection of a case of SARS-CoV-2 on that ward. Under default model  
28 parameters we infer a potential 16.5% reduction (95% C. I. 14% - 20%) in the  
29 nosocomial transmission of SARS-CoV-2 to patients, with increased importation of  
30 cases into the hospital increasing the effectiveness of the intervention. Our study  
31 provides preliminary evidence of the value of pre-exposure prophylaxis with UDCA  
32 as a strategy to reduce nosocomial SARS-CoV-2 transmission.

33

## 34 **Introduction**

35

36 The SARS-CoV-2 virus has had a major impact upon human health<sup>1,2</sup>. As such, a  
37 key priority has been the identification of public health interventions which either  
38 prevent or reduce the impact of infection.

39

40 Vaccines have been shown to reduce the chances of infection leading to  
41 hospitalisation or death<sup>3</sup>, albeit that the immunity gained from vaccination wanes  
42 over time<sup>4</sup>, while virus evolution creates a need to continually re-evaluate vaccine  
43 effectiveness<sup>5</sup>. Other lines of defence against SARS-CoV-2 include antiviral drugs,  
44 such as pavloxi<sup>6</sup>, remdesivir<sup>7</sup> and molnupiravir<sup>8</sup>. The US Food and Drug  
45 Administration has issued an emergency use authorisation for a monoclonal  
46 antibody therapy for pre-exposure prophylaxis<sup>9</sup>. These interventions have their own  
47 limitations, with for example a five-day course of molnupiravir being associated with  
48 a lower SARS-CoV-2 viral load five days after treatment, but a higher viral load after  
49 14 days<sup>10</sup>. Non-pharmaceutical interventions, such as handwashing, masking, and  
50 social distancing, have helped to prevent infection<sup>11</sup>.

51

52 Hospitals and care homes have been the focus of particular attention in the  
53 monitoring and prevention of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Even as the consequences  
54 of COVID have attenuated for the general population<sup>12</sup>, the concentration of  
55 potentially vulnerable individuals in these environments creates an enhanced need  
56 for action. One study early in the pandemic estimated that close to 15% of SARS-  
57 CoV-2 cases in hospital were the result of hospital-acquired infection<sup>13</sup>. Accordingly,  
58 studies have evaluated the use of mask-wearing by health care workers and patients  
59 in hospitals<sup>14,15</sup>. The installation of air cleaning units on a hospital ward was shown  
60 to reduce the concentration of airborne particulates of a size commensurate with  
61 airborne viral transmission<sup>16</sup>. Air cleaning has been associated with a 22% reduction  
62 in nosocomial transmission (95% CI 47% to -14%)<sup>17</sup>.

63

64 A mathematical study identified pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) as being potentially  
65 the most effective complement to vaccination in preventing SARS-CoV-2 infection<sup>18</sup>.  
66 Mathematical modelling provides a valuable insight into potential therapeutic  
67 approaches in advance of committing financial and clinical resources to a real-world  
68 trial. However, PrEP approaches to combatting SARS-CoV-2 are not simply  
69 theoretical constructs. A Mendelian randomisation study of potentially druggable  
70 proteins identified the genes ACE2 and IFNAR2 as priority targets for intervention<sup>19</sup>.  
71 The former is a cell receptor which critically must be bound by SARS-CoV-2 Spike  
72 protein prior to cellular entry<sup>20</sup>, while the latter participates in the host innate immune  
73 response<sup>21</sup> against the virus. ACE2 expression has been associated with more  
74 severe clinical outcomes of SARS-CoV-2 infection<sup>22</sup>.

75

76 The discovery that the farnesoid X receptor (FXR) regulates ACE2 expression  
77 provided a novel approach to controlling SARS-CoV-2 infection<sup>23</sup>. Ursodeoxycholic  
78 acid (UDCA) is a well-tolerated and off-patent drug which downregulates FXR,  
79 leading to a reduction in ACE2 expression. A cohort study identified a significant  
80 reduction in the odds of developing SARS-CoV-2 infection among patients with  
81 cirrhosis who were treated with UDCA<sup>24</sup>, finding also a reduced risk of disease  
82 severity among treated individuals. Although another study found no significant  
83 reduction in the risk of hospitalisation for COVID among treated individuals<sup>25</sup>, the  
84 basic result has been replicated in independent studies<sup>26,27</sup>, with high adherence to  
85 UDCA treatment<sup>28</sup>, and an increased dose of UDCA<sup>29</sup> being associated with reduced  
86 rates of infection. A contrary result was reported in a smaller cohort of patients<sup>30</sup>.

87

88 While clinical studies have compared individuals treated with UDCA to those not  
89 receiving the drug, there may exist a broader scope to use the drug in a responsive  
90 fashion, for example as pre-exposure prophylaxis given an anticipated period of  
91 greater risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

92

93 In this study we use a mathematical model to evaluate the potential for UDCA to  
94 reduce nosocomial transmission. Our model encompasses the multiple scales on  
95 which the drug affects transmission, including the time-dependent effect of UDCA  
96 upon ACE2 expression, the relationship between ACE2 expression and SARS-CoV-2  
97 viral entry into cells, and the distribution of levels of exposure occurring during a  
98 potential transmission event. Briefly, our model describes the effect of UDCA in  
99 terms of a change in the distribution of effective levels of viral exposure. SARS-CoV-  
100 2 exposures vary according to a range of individual and environmental factors<sup>31</sup>,

101 such as the distance from an infected host. We characterise exposure in units of the  
102 number of viruses expected to initiate infection, using published data describing  
103 transmission bottlenecks<sup>32</sup> and secondary attack rates<sup>33</sup> for SARS-CoV-2 to derive  
104 an exposure distribution (Figure 1A). Treatment with UDCA reduces ACE2  
105 expression (Figure 1B), and therefore the proportion of viruses to which a person is  
106 exposed that initiate infection. This occurs in a time-dependent manner after the  
107 beginning of treatment, and is represented in our model in terms of a modification to  
108 the exposure distribution (Figure 1C). Our model describes a situation in which  
109 UDCA treatment reduces the probability that an exposure will lead to infection,  
110 lowering the odds ratio of infection (Figure 1D).

111

112 This mathematical approach enables the *in silico* evaluation of potential strategies  
113 for using UDCA to reduce SARS-Cov-2 infection; we here evaluate the potential  
114 effect of UDCA being administered to patients on a ward following the detection of a  
115 case of SARS-CoV-2. Details of the derivation of our basic model are shown in  
116 Supplementary Figures S1 to S3.

117

## 118 **Results**

119

### 120 *Hospital-based transmission*

121

122 We integrated our model of UDCA treatment and SARS-CoV-2 infection within a  
123 larger model describing nosocomial transmission in a hospital environment.

124 Simulations were run to describe an environment in which UDCA was not used, with  
125 the effect of treatment being represented by retrospective changes made to each

126 simulation. Data from an outbreak extracted from one simulation shows how UDCA  
127 had the potential to cut short chains of transmission events (Figure 2A). In this case,  
128 an infected individual, with ID number 953, was introduced onto a ward, leading to a  
129 large outbreak involving both patients and healthcare workers. We simulated an  
130 intervention in which, upon the detection of a case of SARS-CoV-2 on a ward, all  
131 patients on that ward, plus any arriving onto that ward during the intervention, were  
132 treated for 10 days with UDCA. Changes in individual probabilities of being infected  
133 upon the intervention are shown in Figure 2B. Here, the ward onto which patient 953  
134 was introduced was already marked as an intervention ward, so that patients in  
135 contact with patient 953, and those further down the network, were already treated  
136 with UDCA. In our simulation this reduced the probability of those patients being  
137 infected, further reducing the probabilities of individuals further down the  
138 transmission chain from being infected. Healthcare workers in the network were not  
139 treated, but acquired a lower risk of infection via a reduction in exposure to infected  
140 patients. Across multiple transmissions within the network the probability of an  
141 individual being infected can be greatly reduced; for example the intervention results  
142 in the individual 4665 having only a 7.5% chance of being infected. Within this  
143 network the numbers of secondary infections were reduced from 7 patients and 8  
144 HCWs to a mean of 1.9 patients and 4.6 HCWs (Figure 2C/D).

145

146 Applied to a set of simulated data, describing nosocomial transmission in 60  
147 hospitals over a window of 610 days, our simulated intervention reduced cases of  
148 nosocomial transmission among patients by 16.5% (95% C. I. 14% - 20%) (Figure  
149 3A). As modelled, the intervention reduced nosocomial infection of HCWs by close  
150 to 4% (Figure 3B). These figures are lower than obtained for the example network of

151 Figure 2, which was an outlier in terms of its large size. Across hospital simulations,  
152 the most common instance of nosocomial transmission involved one person infecting  
153 another, with no further transmission. The mean transmission network involved 3.1  
154 individuals, or equivalently 2.1 cases of nosocomial transmission (Supplementary  
155 Figure 3).

156

157 Our results were sensitive to the parameters of our model. For example, changing  
158 the window of intervention following the detection of a case led to changes in the  
159 reduction of nosocomial transmission among patients, from 16.5% at the default 10-  
160 day window of intervention to 10.3% for a 6-day window of intervention, or to 22.6%  
161 for a 14-day window of intervention (Figure 3C). Changing the length of the  
162 intervention window led to proportional changes in the number of ward-days for  
163 which the intervention was in place. Where under default parameters, the  
164 intervention was in place for a mean of 7440 ward-days, this statistic ranged  
165 between 5270 ward-days given a 6-day intervention to 9610 ward-days given a 14-  
166 day intervention (Figure 3D).

167

168 The effect of the intervention was also sensitive to the simulated level of community  
169 infection, which in our model determines the rate of importation of SARS-CoV-2  
170 patients into a hospital. Halving the importation rate compared to the default led to  
171 an estimated 11% reduction in nosocomial cases in patients, while doubling the rate  
172 of importation relative to default led to an estimated 24% reduction in nosocomial  
173 cases (Figure 4A, B). Although a higher importation rate led to more cases of SARS-  
174 CoV-2 in hospital, and an increased number of cases of nosocomial transmission,  
175 the distribution of the sizes of transmission networks was not substantially altered

176 (Figure S4). Rather, the difference in outcome arises from an indirect effect of the  
177 number of cases: A greater number of cases in hospital meant that more  
178 transmission networks occurred on wards that had previously been marked out for  
179 intervention. UDCA has a time-dependent effect on ACE2 expression levels. In a  
180 hospital where SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks are sparse, there are few wards on which the  
181 intervention is in place. Given a new outbreak there is a delay arising from the time  
182 taken to detect a new outbreak, and then the time taken for UDCA treatment to have  
183 full effect, before the full impact of the drug is experienced. By contrast, where  
184 outbreaks are common, the probability of a new outbreak arising on a ward in which  
185 the intervention is already in place is increased. In such a case the delay is reduced,  
186 with UDCA potentially providing its maximal benefit from the first day of the outbreak.  
187 We note that, at the modelled high rate of importation, a situation is reached in  
188 which, at peak, nearly all hospital wards are included in the intervention (Figure 4C,  
189 D). At this point any new cases of nosocomial transmission occurring in the hospital  
190 involve already-treated patients, maximising the effect of the intervention.

191

## 192 **Discussion**

193

194 We have here considered the use of a potential candidate for use as pre-exposure  
195 prophylaxis against SARS-CoV-2 infection. Our approach combines mathematical  
196 models of changes in ACE2 expression, the consequences of those changes for  
197 virus entry into cells, and the likely levels of exposure to the virus encountered by  
198 individuals; combined these models produce a result consistent with observational  
199 studies. Applying our model to simulated data describing a hospital setting, our  
200 approach suggests that a proposed intervention using the drug might lead to a



201 reduction of around 17% in nosocomial transmission to patients. Our work provides  
202 an indicative and preliminary assessment of the potential for UDCA as to be used for  
203 pre-exposure prophylaxis to combat nosocomial transmission.

204

205 Our modelling provides some insight into the potential value of pre-exposure  
206 prophylaxis in a real-world setting. Where modelling has suggested the use of pre-  
207 exposure prophylaxis as an effective tool to prevent SARS-CoV-2 infection, the  
208 implicit need for action to be taken prior to an exposure limits its value. In modelling  
209 a hospital outbreak we have chosen a setting in which the potential risk of infection is  
210 unusually high, in which cases of infection are being actively monitored, and in which  
211 treatment could be administered by competent medical professionals. In this setting,  
212 the time-dependent effect of treatment was predicted to have an effect. A proportion  
213 of the effectiveness of the intervention is explained by the reduction in transmission  
214 events within outbreaks that occur on an intervention ward but are unrelated to the  
215 outbreak which triggered the intervention.

216

217 In this sense, our work highlights a distinction between preparatory and responsive  
218 approaches to reducing infectious disease transmission. Preparatory approaches,  
219 such as improving ventilation, mask-wearing, and hand hygiene, create an  
220 environment in which transmission is intrinsically less likely. Responsive  
221 approaches, which are implemented following the detection of an outbreak, are  
222 limited by imperfect surveillance, and in the case of UDCA, by transmission events  
223 having occurred prior to the intervention taking effect. Our calculated reduction in  
224 transmission of 17% compares to a recent study suggesting a 22% reduction in  
225 transmission with the use of improved ventilation<sup>17</sup>, but may be optimistic. The levels

226 of community importation into the hospital may be lower than reflected in the  
227 assumptions underlying the simulation, such that the effectiveness of the intervention  
228 we model would be reduced.

229

230 Our model has some implications regarding SARS-CoV-2 transmission, for example  
231 that people with higher baseline levels of ACE2 expression are more likely to be  
232 infected with SARS-CoV-2. Where someone's baseline ACE2 expression level is  
233 high, more of the viruses they are exposed to are likely to gain entry into cells and  
234 initiate infection. Our model also implies that a high baseline ACE2 expression level  
235 will reduce the efficacy of UDCA in preventing infection. UDCA reduces the number  
236 of viruses entering cells, but to prevent infection this number must be reduced to  
237 zero. The reduction to zero is less likely when the initial number, due to high ACE2  
238 expression, is large. Figure S5 describes expected reductions in transmission for  
239 high and low baseline levels of ACE2 expression.

240

241

242 Our modelling approach is built upon multiple assumptions. For example, our model  
243 of exposure to SARS-Cov-2 was constructed using data describing transmission in a  
244 domestic, rather than a hospital setting. The simulated hospital environment, while  
245 representing the state of the art, also contains multiple simplifications. For example,  
246 a healthcare worker who avoided being infected due to the indirect effect of UDCA  
247 would retain a risk of being infected at some later date via the local community. Our  
248 simulated approach neglected this risk: Once prevented from being infected on one  
249 occasion, HCWs stayed uninfected for the remainder of the simulation. As such our  
250 result about preventing infection in healthcare workers is open to some uncertainty.

251 Our model assumes that the distribution of ACE2 levels in the hospital population  
252 mirror those of the general population. Further, simulations of hospitals simplify  
253 elements such as the movement of patients and staff between wards which likely  
254 impact upon transmission. Differences between hospital environments, such as  
255 those of hospital architecture, are not captured by our model. However our simple  
256 mathematical model describing the effect of UDCA upon SARS-CoV-2 transmission  
257 gave a result consistent with that described in a cohort study. Previously, John et al  
258 found an adjusted odds ratio for risk of symptomatic COVID infection of 0.54  
259 (confidence interval 0.39 – 0.73) among individuals with cirrhosis who were treated  
260 with UDCA<sup>23</sup>. Considering an individual who had been treated for at least 3 days  
261 prior to exposure to SARS-CoV-2, our model suggested that continuous treatment  
262 with UDCA would reduce the incidence of COVID infection by 56%, equivalent to an  
263 adjusted odds ratio of 0.44.

264

265 The intervention we propose is described in a simplified fashion. Although long-term  
266 therapy with UDCA is well-tolerated<sup>34</sup>, aspects such as negative drug-drug  
267 interactions may prevent the giving of the drug in a universal manner to a cohort of  
268 patients. We have here considered the use of UDCA for pre-exposure prophylaxis in  
269 a situation where full clinical supervision is possible. A realistic intervention might  
270 use the drug only in subsets of cases where SARS-CoV-2 infection would have  
271 particularly severe consequences, such as in a care home or with more vulnerable  
272 patients. The authors do not recommend the use of UDCA in any situation except  
273 under the explicit guidance of a qualified physician.

274

275 **Methods**

276

277 We built a model to estimate the effect of treatment with UDCA upon SARS-CoV-2  
278 transmission. Our model has three parts, the first modelling the effect of UDCA upon  
279 ACE2 expression in an individual, the second modelling the effect of changing ACE2  
280 expression upon virus entry into cells, and the third modelling the likely distribution of  
281 exposure to SARS-CoV-2 viruses, given knowledge of transmission bottlenecks from  
282 cases of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

283

284 *Changes in ACE2 expression given treatment with UDCA*

285

286 Given data from a set of individuals describing variation in ACE2 levels after  
287 commencing treatment with UDCA<sup>23</sup>, we used a time-dependent gamma distribution  
288 to represent the effects of the drug. In this equation  $x$  describes ACE2 expression  
289 level. The Mathematica software package was used to identify optimal parameters  $a$   
290 and  $b$  within this model.

291

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| $G(a, b, t, x) = P(ACE2 = x a, b, t) = \frac{x^{a(t)-1} b(t)^{-a(t)} e^{-x/b(t)}}{\Gamma(a(t))}$ | (1) |
|--|-----|

292

293

294  $G(a,b,t)$  was here characterised using data describing three discrete time intervals,  
295 for  $t=0$  days,  $t \in \{1, 2\}$  days, and  $t \geq 3$  days. Raw data are shown in Figure S1; the  
296 inferred distributions are shown in Figure 1B.

297

298

299 *Modelling of the relationship between ACE2 expression and viral infection*

300

301 Data describing ACE2 expression and SARS-CoV-2 infection levels from different  
302 cell types within a lung explant was used for modelling purposes<sup>23</sup>. Under a model  
303 of receptor association, the relationship between ACE2 receptor availability and virus  
304 entry are expected to follow the Hill equation<sup>35</sup>. To explore whether, at the  
305 physiological concentrations of ACE2 represented by our data, a linear model would  
306 be a reasonable approximation to this, we fitted both linear and sigmoidal curves to  
307 the data. Where the level of ACE2 expression is given by [ACE2], our models were

308

309 Linear model:

310

|  |               |     |
|--|---------------|-----|
|  | $V = a[ACE2]$ | (2) |
|--|---------------|-----|

311

312

313 Hill equation:

314

|  |                                      |     |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----|
|  | $V = \frac{m[ACE2]^a}{c + [ACE2]^a}$ | (3) |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----|

315

316 Models were fitted to the data using the NonlinearModelFit routine within the  
317 Mathematica software package, inferring different parameters for the lung and  
318 bronchaeal data; these data were not directly comparable due to different cell  
319 compositions of the different samples. Model fits were compared using the Bayesian  
320 Information Criterion (BIC)<sup>36</sup>. The difference between the BIC values for the models,

321 of 2.81 units in favour of the Hill equation model, was interpreted as positive support  
322 for this model but not strong support, following Raferty et al<sup>37</sup>. Data used in this  
323 modelling, and model fits, are shown in Figure S2.

324

325 *Inference of a distribution of levels of exposure to virus*

326

327 We generated a model of the number of viruses expected to initiate infection during  
328 SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Given a level of exposure to viruses E, we modelled the  
329 transmission bottleneck size  $N_b$  (i.e. the number of viruses initiating an infection<sup>38</sup>) as  
330 being Poisson distributed with parameter E.

331

|  |  |     |
|--|--|-----|
|  | $P(N_b = n E) = \frac{E^n e^{-E}}{n!}$ | (4) |
|--|--|-----|

332

333

334 We assumed that exposure can be described by a Gamma distribution, such that E  
335 obeys the formula

336

|  |   |     |
|--|---|-----|
|  | $P(E = x \alpha, \beta) = \frac{x^{\alpha-1} \beta^{-\alpha} e^{-x/\beta}}{\Gamma(\alpha)}$ | (5) |
|--|---|-----|

337

338

339 Where  $\Gamma(\alpha)$  describes the gamma function

340

|  |   |     |
|--|---|-----|
|  | $\Gamma(\alpha) = \int_0^{\infty} t^{\alpha-1} e^{-t} dt$ | (6) |
|--|---|-----|

341

342

343 We next inferred parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  for this model using data from two publications  
344 describing household SARS-CoV-2 transmission. A study of SARS-CoV-2  
345 transmission in households inferred bottleneck sizes for 20 cases of infection<sup>32</sup>. We  
346 took these sizes as being indicative of viral transmission events. Next, we used the  
347 result from a meta-analysis of household transmission studies, of a secondary attack  
348 rate for SARS-CoV-2 of 18.9%<sup>33</sup>, to estimate that for each 20 cases of infection,  
349 there were an additional 83 cases of exposure not leading to infection. We thus  
350 compiled a dataset of 103 outcomes of exposure, 20 of which matched the  
351 bottlenecks inferred by Lythgoe et al, and 83 of which involved zero viruses. Data  
352 describing inferred bottlenecks for these 20 cases is shown in Figure S3.

353

354 For a given set of parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , we represented the gamma distribution by a  
355 discrete set of 999 equally spaced quantiles  $E_i(\alpha, \beta)$ . We then calculated the mean  
356 likelihood of observing each bottleneck  $n_j$  in the dataset, summing these over the  
357 different bottleneck sizes.

358

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| $\log L(\alpha, \beta   \{n_j\}) = \sum_{j=1}^{103} \frac{1}{999} \sum_{i=1}^{999} \log P(N_b = n_j   E_i(\alpha, \beta))$ | (7) |
|--|-----|

359

360

361 Values of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  which maximised this likelihood were found using the Mathematica  
362 software package. We inferred the values  $\alpha = 0.1558$  and  $\beta = 2.797$ .

363

364 *Combined model of viral transmission in the presence or absence of treatment with*

365 *UDCA*

366

367 Under the assumption of a linear relationship between ACE2 expression and viral

368 infection, we derived a model of viral transmission in treated and untreated

369 individuals in a heterogeneous population. In our model, a person  $p$  receives a

370 stochastic exposure  $e$  to viruses characterised by a random draw from the Gamma

371 distribution  $E(\alpha, \beta)$ .

372

|  |                           |     |
|--|---------------------------|-----|
|  | $e \sim E(\alpha, \beta)$ | (8) |
|--|---------------------------|-----|

373

374

375 This exposure was scaled in a linear fashion by the individual-specific term  $I(r, t)$ ,

376 which describes the relative ACE2 expression of the person. Here the parameter  $r$

377 was uniformly sampled from the interval  $(0, 1)$ ; for example  $r=0.12$  would imply that

378  $I(r, t)=x$  was equal to the 12<sup>th</sup> centile of the distribution  $G(a, b, t, x)$ . In this manner,

379 the effective exposure of a person  $p$  who had undergone  $t$  days of treatment with

380 UDCA, was described as

381

|  |                                   |     |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----|
|  | $E_p = \frac{I(r, t)}{I(r, 0)} e$ | (9) |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----|

382

383



384 where the denominator represents the mean level of ACE2 expression for an  
385 untreated individual. The number of viruses initiating infection in this person was  
386 then given by the Poisson random variable

387

|  |  |      |
|--|--|------|
|  | $P(N_b = n   E_p) = \frac{E_p^n e^{-E_p}}{n!}$ | (10) |
|--|--|------|

388

389

390 In this model, infection occurred if  $N_b$  was greater or equal to 1, and did not occur if  
391  $N_b$  was equal to zero. Basic statistics of infection were calculated across  
392 distributions of ACE2 expression for treated and untreated individuals, integrating  
393 over a representative range of levels of exposure.

394

#### 395 *Simulation of hospital transmission events*

396

397 We used a published individual-based model of nosocomial transmission to simulate  
398 SARS-CoV-2 in hospitals, including the importation of cases from the community, the  
399 occasional spread of infection between patients and health care workers (HCWs) in  
400 hospitals, and the detection or non-detection of these cases<sup>39</sup>. Within this modelling  
401 framework simulations were conducted describing high, realistic, and low levels of  
402 importation of cases into hospitals. 'Realistic' levels were derived from now-casted  
403 community levels of infection for the East of England, spanning a window of 600  
404 days during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic<sup>40</sup>. High and low levels represented 2-fold  
405 and 0.5 fold changes to these values. For each level of importation, twenty sets of  
406 parameters representing rates of transmission to and from healthcare workers and  
407 patients were generated, consistent with evidence from a study of transmission in

408 hospitals<sup>41</sup>. Three statistical replicates were generated for each set of parameters,  
409 making a total of 180 simulations.

410

411 For each simulation, transmission networks were identified, comprising sets of  
412 patients and HCWs who infected each other in hospital, alongside the dates of these  
413 transmission events. We modelled an intervention in which, upon the detection of a  
414 case of SARS-CoV-2, all patients on the ward in which the case was detected were  
415 given a 10-day course of treatment with UDCA. Where new patients arrived on the  
416 ward within 10 days of the commencement of the intervention, these patients were  
417 also started on a 10-day course of UDCA treatment. We then retrospectively altered  
418 the identified transmission networks. Transmission events in these networks were  
419 assigned a probability of occurrence equal to one. These probabilities were then  
420 altered according to UDCA treatment, with a treated patient having a reduced  
421 probability of being infected. Alterations in probabilities were then evaluated in a  
422 compound manner. For example, if in a simulation person A infected person B, who  
423 infected person C, treating person B would reduce the probability of person C being  
424 infected, even if C was untreated. The expected reduction in the number of cases of  
425 SARS-CoV-2 nosocomial infection was therefore calculated.

426

427 Our model of nosocomial transmission accounted for the variation in baseline  
428 susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 infection implied by our model of infection and  
429 treatment. To achieve this we generated a distribution of the baseline ACE2  
430 expression of an individual conditional upon their having been infected with SARS-  
431 CoV-2. This distribution differs from the gamma distribution fitted to the untreated

432 ACE2 expression levels: The fact of having been infected increases the probability of  
433 an individual having a high level of baseline ACE2 expression.

434

435 To calculate the conditional distribution of ACE2 we calculated quantiles of the  
436 distributions of baseline ACE2 expression  $G(a, b, 0, x)$ , and of the exposure  
437 distribution  $E(\alpha, \beta)(y)$ , calculating the products of these values. We then identified  
438 probabilities of infection for each datapoint, normalising these to sum to one

439

440

$$P(x, y) = \frac{1 - e^{-G(a,b,0,x)E(\alpha,\beta)(y)}}{\sum_{x,y} 1 - e^{-G(a,b,0,x)E(\alpha,\beta)(y)}}$$

441

442 These values were then normalised to sum to one across all  $x$  and  $y$ , before  
443 summing across exposures  $y$  to calculate a probability distribution from which values  
444 of ACE2 expression could be sampled. In evaluating nosocomial transmission,  
445 individuals who were infected in the initial simulation were assigned baseline levels  
446 of ACE2 expression from this discrete distribution before evaluating the individual-  
447 specific effect of UDCA upon their probability of having been infected. The discrete  
448 distribution and the inferred probability density function are shown in Supplementary  
449 Figure S6.

450

#### 451 **Availability of code**

452

453 Code used for processing simulation data is available at

454 <https://github.com/cjri/HospitalSimulationAnalysis>

455

456 **Acknowledgements**

457

458 This research is jointly funded by the UK Medical Research Council (MRC)  
459 (MC\_UU\_00034/6) and the Foreign Commonwealth and Development Office  
460 (FCDO) under the MRC/FCDO Concordat agreement.

461

## 462 References

463

- 464 1. Mizumoto, K. & Chowell, G. Estimating Risk for Death from Coronavirus Disease,  
465 China, January–February 2020. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **26**, 1251–1256 (2020).
- 466 2. Poletti, P. *et al.* Age-specific SARS-CoV-2 infection fatality ratio and associated risk  
467 factors, Italy, February to April 2020. *Eurosurveillance* **25**, (2020).
- 468 3. Andrews, N. *et al.* Duration of Protection against Mild and Severe Disease by Covid-  
469 19 Vaccines. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **386**, 340–350 (2022).
- 470 4. Goldberg, Y. *et al.* Protection and Waning of Natural and Hybrid Immunity to SARS-  
471 CoV-2. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **386**, 2201–2212 (2022).
- 472 5. Willett, B. J. *et al.* Omicron BA.2.86 cross-neutralising activity in community sera  
473 from the UK. *The Lancet* **402**, 2075–2076 (2023).
- 474 6. Najjar-Debbiny, R. *et al.* Effectiveness of Paxlovid in Reducing Severe Coronavirus  
475 Disease 2019 and Mortality in High-Risk Patients. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **76**, e342–e349  
476 (2023).
- 477 7. Gottlieb, R. L. *et al.* Early Remdesivir to Prevent Progression to Severe Covid-19 in  
478 Outpatients. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **386**, 305–315 (2022).
- 479 8. Jayk Bernal, A. *et al.* Molnupiravir for Oral Treatment of Covid-19 in Nonhospitalized  
480 Patients. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **386**, 509–520 (2022).
- 481 9. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA Roundup: March 22, 2024.  
482 [https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-roundup-march-22-](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-roundup-march-22-2024)  
483 [2024](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-roundup-march-22-2024) (2024).
- 484 10. Standing, J. F. *et al.* Randomized controlled trial of molnupiravir SARS-CoV-2 viral  
485 and antibody response in at-risk adult outpatients. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 1652 (2024).

- 486 11. Talic, S. *et al.* Effectiveness of public health measures in reducing the incidence of  
487 covid-19, SARS-CoV-2 transmission, and covid-19 mortality: systematic review and  
488 meta-analysis. *BMJ* e068302 (2021) doi:10.1136/bmj-2021-068302.
- 489 12. Horita, N. & Fukumoto, T. Global case fatality rate from COVID-19 has decreased by  
490 96.8% during 2.5 years of the pandemic. *J Med Virol* **95**, e28231 (2023).
- 491 13. Hamilton, W. L. *et al.* Applying prospective genomic surveillance to support  
492 investigation of hospital-onset COVID-19. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* S1473309921002516  
493 (2021) doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00251-6.
- 494 14. Ferris, M. *et al.* Efficacy of FFP3 respirators for prevention of SARS-CoV-2 infection in  
495 healthcare workers. *eLife* **10**, e71131 (2021).
- 496 15. Mehra, R., Patterson, B. J., Riley, P. A., Planche, T. D. & Breathnach, A. S. Impact of  
497 removing the healthcare mask mandate on hospital-acquired COVID-19 rates. *J.*  
498 *Hosp. Infect.* **145**, 59–64 (2024).
- 499 16. Butler, M. J. *et al.* Impact of supplementary air filtration on aerosols and particulate  
500 matter in a UK hospital ward: a case study. *J. Hosp. Infect.* **135**, 81–89 (2023).
- 501 17. Brock, R. C. *et al.* Efficacy of Air Cleaning Units for preventing SARS-CoV-2 and other  
502 hospital-acquired infections on medicine for older people wards: A quasi-  
503 experimental controlled before-and- after study. *J. Hosp. Infect.*  
504 S0195670124003256 (2024) doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2024.09.017.
- 505 18. Makhoul, M. *et al.* Modeling the population-level impact of treatment on COVID-19  
506 disease and SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *Epidemics* **39**, 100567 (2022).
- 507 19. Gaziano, L. *et al.* Actionable druggable genome-wide Mendelian randomization  
508 identifies repurposing opportunities for COVID-19. *Nat. Med.* **27**, 668–676 (2021).

- 509 20. Lan, J. *et al.* Structure of the SARS-CoV-2 spike receptor-binding domain bound to  
510 the ACE2 receptor. *Nature* **581**, 215–220 (2020).
- 511 21. Yaugel-Novoa, M., Bourlet, T., Longet, S., Botelho-Nevers, E. & Paul, S. Association  
512 of IFNAR1 and IFNAR2 with COVID-19 severity. *Lancet Microbe* **4**, e487 (2023).
- 513 22. Rodrigues, R. & Costa De Oliveira, S. The Impact of Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme  
514 2 (ACE2) Expression Levels in Patients with Comorbidities on COVID-19 Severity: A  
515 Comprehensive Review. *Microorganisms* **9**, 1692 (2021).
- 516 23. Brevini, T. *et al.* FXR inhibition may protect from SARS-CoV-2 infection by reducing  
517 ACE2. *Nature* **615**, 134–142 (2023).
- 518 24. John, B. V. *et al.* Ursodeoxycholic acid is associated with a reduction in SARS-CoV-2  
519 infection and reduced severity of COVID-19 in patients with cirrhosis. *J. Intern. Med.*  
520 **293**, 636–647 (2023).
- 521 25. Corpechot, C., Verdoux, M., Frank-Soltysiak, M., Duclos-Vallée, J. & Grimaldi, L.  
522 Exploring the impact of ursodeoxycholic acid therapy on COVID-19 in a real-world  
523 setting. *J. Med. Virol.* **96**, e29418 (2024).
- 524 26. Gao, H., Wang, J., Zheng, X., Cao, Y. & Jiang, E. Effect of Ursodeoxycholic Acid for  
525 Sars-Cov-2 Prevention in Hematological Malignancies: An Observational Real-World  
526 Study. *Blood* **142**, 7308–7308 (2023).
- 527 27. Li, Y., Zhu, N., Cui, X., Lin, Y. & Li, X. Protective effect of ursodeoxycholic acid on  
528 COVID-19 in patients with chronic liver disease. *Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol.* **13**,  
529 1178590 (2023).
- 530 28. Ming, S. W. Y. M., Smith, M. & Zhou, Y. A Retrospective Study in Patients With Varying  
531 Prescription Coverage With Ursodeoxycholic Acid and Association With Incidence


- 532 of COVID-19 Diagnosis in Primary Care. *Microbiol. Infect. Dis. Am. Med. J.* (2023)  
533 doi:10.33590/microbiolinfectedisamj/10304488.
- 534 29. Hu, L. *et al.* Effect of ursodeoxycholic acid on preventing SARS-CoV-2 infection in  
535 patients with liver transplantation: a multicenter retrospective cohort study. *QJM*  
536 hcad254 (2023) doi:<https://doi.org/10.1093/qjmed/hcad254>.
- 537 30. Gao, H. *et al.* Ursodeoxycholic acid does not reduce SARS-CoV-2 infection in newly  
538 allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation recipients: a prospective NICHE  
539 cohort. *Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol.* **14**, 1324019 (2024).
- 540 31. Sinclair, P., Zhao, L., Beggs, C. B. & Illingworth, C. J. R. The airborne transmission of  
541 viruses causes tight transmission bottlenecks. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 3540 (2024).
- 542 32. Lythgoe, K. A. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 within-host diversity and transmission. *Science*  
543 eabg0821 (2021) doi:10.1126/science.abg0821.
- 544 33. Madewell, Z. J., Yang, Y., Longini, I. M., Halloran, M. E. & Dean, N. E. Factors  
545 Associated With Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: An Updated Systematic  
546 Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw. Open* **4**, e2122240 (2021).
- 547 34. Poupon, R. E., Poupon, R., Balkau, B. & The UDCA-PBC study group. Ursodiol for the  
548 long-term treatment of primary biliary cirrhosis. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **330**, 1342–47  
549 (1994).
- 550 35. Goutelle, S. *et al.* The Hill equation: a review of its capabilities in pharmacological  
551 modelling. *Fundam. Clin. Pharmacol.* **22**, 633–648 (2008).
- 552 36. Schwarz, G. Estimating the dimension of a model. *Ann. Statist.* **6**, 461–464 (1978).
- 553 37. Raferty, A. Bayesian Model Selection in Social Research. *Sociol. Methodol.* **25**, 111–  
554 163.



- 555 38. Bergstrom, C. T., McElhany, P. & Real, L. A. Transmission bottlenecks as  
556 determinants of virulence in rapidly evolving pathogens. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **96**,  
557 5095–5100 (1999).
- 558 39. Evans, S. *et al.* Impact of interventions to reduce nosocomial transmission of SARS-  
559 CoV-2 in English NHS Trusts: a computational modelling study. *BMC Infect. Dis.* **24**,  
560 475 (2024).
- 561 40. Birell, P., Blake, J., van Leeuwen, E., Gent, N., & De Angelis, Daniela. Real-time  
562 nowcasting and forecasting of COVID-19 dynamics in England: the first wave. *Philos.*  
563 *Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **376**, 20200279. (2021).
- 564 41. Lindsey, B. B. *et al.* Characterising within-hospital SARS-CoV-2 transmission events  
565 using epidemiological and viral genomic data across two pandemic waves. *Nat.*  
566 *Commun.* **13**, 671 (2022).
- 567
- 568

569 **Figures**

570




571

572

573 **Figure 1: Basic model details.** **A.** Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 exposure used in  
574 our model. An exposure of 1 means that an individual is infected by a Poisson  
575 random variable with parameter 1. If this random variable is equal to or greater than  
576 1, the individual is infected, rather than not infected. **B.** Derived distribution of ACE2  
577 expression levels in treated and untreated individuals. **C.** Effective exposure  
578 distributions for treated and untreated individuals. People who are taking UDCA are  
579 less likely to be infected by larger numbers of viruses. **D.** Adjusted odds ratios of  
580 infection calculated across a population of individuals with a distribution of ACE2  
581 levels.

582



583

584

585 **Figure 2: Application of UDCA treatment to a transmission network** **A.** Case of

586 nosocomial transmission within a hospital simulation. Horizontal lines show times

587 when individuals were in the hospital, coloured blue for patients or red for HCWs.

588 Black dots indicate dates on which individuals were infected, while squares indicate


589 dates on which cases of infection were detected, where detection occurred. **B.**

590 Representation of one realisation of the impact of UDCA treatment upon the

591 transmission network. The ward upon which the outbreak began was an intervention

592 ward at the time of patient 953 being introduced onto the ward. UDCA treatment

593 reduced the probabilities of patients being infected with SARS-CoV-2, and by  
594 implication reducing the probabilities of their further transmitting the virus. The  
595 reductions in individual probabilities caused by UDCA are stochastic, representing  
596 random samplings of the baseline ACE2 levels of expression of individuals. **C.**  
597 Numbers of secondary cases of SARS-CoV-2 infection in patients and HCWs in the  
598 network in the absence of an intervention. **D.** Numbers of secondary cases given  
599 treatment with UDCA.  
600



601

602

603 **Figure 3. Reduction in transmission caused by the simulated use of UDCA. A.**

604 Reductions in nosocomial transmissions to patients, measured across five stochastic

605 replicates of each of 60 hospital simulations. **B.** Reductions in nosocomial

606 transmission events to healthcare workers, measured across five stochastic

607 replicates of each of 60 hospital simulations. **C.** Variation in the reduction in


608 nosocomial transmissions to patients, varying the length of the intervention, given

609 the detection of a case upon a ward. **D.** Total length of interventions in a hospital

610 according to the length of an individual intervention, measured in ward-days, across

611 the 624 days of the simulation.

612



613

614

615 **Figure 4: Effect of variation in the rate of importation of SARS-CoV-2 cases to**

616 **the hospital. A.** Reductions in nosocomial transmissions to patients, calculated

617 under a low importation rate. The vertical black dashed line shows the mean of this

618 statistic under a realistic importation rate, modelling importations in the UK between

619 2020 and 2021. **B.** Reductions in nosocomial transmissions to patients, calculated

620 under a low importation rate. The vertical black dashed line shows the mean of this

621 statistic under a realistic importation rate. **C.** Fraction of wards in which the

622 intervention was taking place, plotted by time. The black line shows the mean

623 calculated across 60 simulations with a low importation rate. The gray shaded

624 region shows the range across simulations. **D.** Fraction of wards in which the

625 intervention was taking place, plotted by time. The black line shows the mean

626 calculated across 60 simulations with a high importation rate. The gray shaded

627 region shows the range across simulations.


628

629

630

## 631 Supplementary Figures

632



633

634 **Figure S1. Data describing changes in ACE2 expression following the use of**

635 **UDCA.** qPCR measurements of the levels of ACE2 in nasal epithelial cells collected

636 with nasopharyngeal swabs from six individuals who received 15 mg per kg per day


637 of UDCA for five days, previously described by Brevini et al<sup>23</sup>. Shading indicates

638 windows of time into which samples were divided for model fitting. A gamma

639 distribution was fitted to the data within each window.

640





641

642

643 **Figure S2: Model fits to qPCR data describing levels of ACE2 expression and**

644 **SARS-CoV-2 infection in a human explant.** Data describing samples collected

645 from the lung and bronchi were originally described by Brevini et al<sup>23</sup>. Model fits

646 describe sigmoidal (red) and linear (blue) relationships between ACE2 and SARS-

647 CoV-2 expression values. Under the Bayesian Information Criterion, there was


648 positive evidence, though not strong evidence, favouring the sigmoidal model, which

649 follows the Hill equation. For the purpose of modelling a simple linear approximation

650 was made.

651


652



653

654

655 **Figure S3: Data describing SARS-CoV-2 transmission bottlenecks, from an**  
656 **earlier publication**<sup>32</sup>. Data describe the number of SARS-CoV-2 viruses initiating  
657 infection in 20 cases of household transmission. In our study these data were  
658 augmented with cases describing non-infection, that is with transmission bottleneck  
659 zero, reflecting a published secondary attack rate for SARS-CoV-2 in a domestic  
660 context<sup>33</sup>. Our basic exposure model, described in Figure 1A, was then fitted to the  
661 augmented data.



662

663


664 **Figure S4: Network size numbers and distribution for different simulated**

665 **importation rates.** A cluster size of 2 indicates one person infecting another, with

666 no further transmission.

667

668



669

670


671 **Figure S5: Expected distributions of SARS-CoV-2 transmission bottlenecks.**

672 Inferred values are shown for among individuals at the 10<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> centiles of ACE2  
673 expression, in untreated individuals, and in individuals treated for more than three  
674 days with UDCA. In both cases UDCA reduces expected bottleneck sizes, but with a  
675 more dramatic reduction in the probability of transmission (i.e. bottleneck size  $\geq 1$ )  
676 among individuals with low ACE2 expression.

677

678

679



680

681

682 **Figure S6: Distribution of baseline ACE2 expression conditional upon an**

683 **individual having been infected. A.** Probabilities of discrete values of baseline

684 **ACE2 expression. B.** Probability density function implied by the discrete distribution.