**Supplemental information**

**Simulations supposing either 2 or 10 days between time of infection and symptom onset**

Analysis of Equation (1), shows that the model has two stable equilibria: a disease free equilibrium with V=0 and an infected equilibrium where V >0. The infected equilibrium only exists if $\frac{βpT\_{0}}{cδ}$> 1. This quantity, called R0, is the basic reproduction number and is defined as the the number of infected cells produced by the progeny of one infected cell at the start of the infection when the number of target cells is T0. We assumed that antivirals, could reduce R0 by limiting the viral production p by a factor (1-ε). By substituting *p* by *(1-ε)p* in Equation 1, we calculated the expected difference of log10 viral loads at time to peak $∆LVL=LVL\_{0}-LVL\_{peak }$ by simulating the model using best-fit parameter values. The peak is observed 5 days post symptom onset. Then, depending on the hypothesis we made for the delay between day of infection and of symptom i.e. 2, 5 or 10 days; we calculated via simulation the $∆LVL$ at 7, 10 or 15 days after infection, respectively. Similarly, we calculated $∆LVL$ for a treatment limiting the infectivity rate β by a factor (1-ε). Results are comparable to those obtained with a treatment acting on the viral production (not shown).



Figure S1: Reduction in viral load at day 5 post symptom onset according to the level of antiviral effectiveness and the timing of treatment initiation (A: at time of infection; B: at time of symptom onset; C: 3days after symptom onset). We supposed a delay of 2 days between the day of infection and the day of symptom onset.



Figure S2: Reduction in viral load at day 5 post symptom onset according to the level of antiviral effectiveness and the timing of treatment initiation (A: at time of infection; B: at time of symptom onset; C: 3days after symptom onset). We supposed a delay of 10 days between the day of infection and the day of symptom onset.



Figure S3 : Individual fits to viral load data in 13 patients from 4 obtained with the best model, i.e. V0=10-3 copies.mL-1 and k=1 d-1. The cross denotes data below the limit of detection (corresponding to CT=38).

**Sensitivity analysis on the fixed values of V0 and k supposing 5 days between time of infection and time of symptom onset**

Since all parameter could not be estimated, we evaluated the sensitivity of our parameter estimates to the choices of fixed parameter values by using different values of *k*={1;3:5}d-1 and *V*0={10-3;10-2;10-1} cp/mL9. In all cases, R0 was the most sensitive parameter: the lower the fixed values of *V*0 and *k*, the higher the estimated R0 (Fig. S4). In all cases, the model weight following the Bayesian Information criterion were similar across values of *V*0 and *k*, suggesting that the data do not allow one to differentiate between models. However, a model averaged computation of the R0 following the weight of each model, was possible and gave 12.9 (95%CI: [2.3; 46.7]). We also examined the sensitivity of our results on the change in viral load at the time of its expected peak supposing that symptom onset occurred 2, 5 or 10 days after infection (Fig. S5).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R0 | V0=10-1 | V0=10-2 | V0=10-3 |
| k = 1 | 19.3 | 27.1 | 27.4 |
| k = 3 | 9.5 | 12.8 | 14.7 |
| k = 5 | 8.6 | 10.0 | 12.3 |

 | **B.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| δ | V0=10-1 | V0=10-2 | V0=10-3 |
| k = 1 | 0.59 | 0.55 | 0.58 |
| k = 3 | 0.53 | 0.51 | 0.52 |
| k = 5 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.51 |

 |
| **C.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| BIC | V0=10-1 | V0=10-2 | V0=10-3 |
| k = 1 | 530.7 | 530.2 | 529.6 |
| k = 3 | 530.9 | 530.6 | 530.0 |
| k = 5 | 530.9 | 530.5 | 530.3 |

 | **D.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ω | V0=10-1 | V0=10-2 | V0=10-3 |
| k = 1 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.16 |
| k = 3 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.13 |
| k = 5 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.12 |

 |

Figure S4 : Results of the sensitivity analysis across candidate model for parameters R0 (Panel A), δ (Panel B), Bayesian information criteria (BIC, Panel C) and weights following model averaging procedure5 (Panel D).

Table S1: Median and confidence intervals of R0 and δ across models and following model averaging procedure

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| k (d-1) | V0 (log10 cp/mL) | R0 [IC95%] | δ [IC95%] |
| **1** | **10-1** | 18.5 [-5.8-42.5] | 0.59 [0.37-0.79] |
| **10-2** | 27 [16.7-37.9] | 0.56 [0.25-0.86] |
| **10-3** | 26.6 [9.9-43] | 0.58 [0.37-0.79] |
| **3** | **10-1** | 9.5 [5.9-13.6] | 0.52 [0.35-0.72] |
| **10-2** | 12.7 [8.6-17.4] | 0.5 [0.35-0.68] |
| **10-3** | 14.9 [7.6-22.4] | 0.53 [0.37-0.68] |
| **5** | **10-1** | 8.6 [2.1-15.4] | 0.53 [-0.46-1.46] |
| **10-2** | 9.9 [5.3-14.3] | 0.53 [0.33-0.72] |
| **10-3** | 12.3 [8.1-16.4] | 0.51 [0.35-0.67] |
| **Model averaging** | 12.9 [2.3-46.7] | 0.54 [0.21-0.87] |



Figure S5: Simulations of the expected ∆LVL at the observed viral peak across model and drug efficacies supposing that treatment is initiation at day of infection (A), day of symptom onset (B) and 3 days after symptom onset (C)