



Supplementary: Role of gene drives in malaria elimination strategy: modeling impact and cost-effectiveness in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Supplementary 1, Non-spatial simulation framework: number and frequency of driving-Y gene-drive mosquitoes released


Bas Uele




Equateur




Haut Katanga




Kasai Central




Kinshasa



Kwango




Nord Ubangui




Supplementary 2, Non-spatial simulation framework: driving-Y parameters of gene-drive mosquitoes released

Basuele




Equateur


Post-release of 100 gene-drive mosquitoes



Post-release of 200 gene-drive mosquitoes




Post-release of 300 gene-drive mosquitoes




Haut Katanga


Post-release of 100 gene-drive mosquitoes



Post-release of 200 gene-drive mosquitoes




Post-release of 300 gene-drive mosquitoes




Kasai Central


Post-release of 100 gene-drive mosquitoes



Post-release of 200 gene-drive mosquitoes




Post-release of 300 gene-drive mosquitoes




Kinshasa


Post-release of 100 gene-drive mosquitoes



Post-release of 200 gene-drive mosquitoes




Post-release of 300 gene-drive mosquitoes




Kwango


Post-release of 100 gene-drive mosquitoes



Post-release of 200 gene-drive mosquitoes




Post-release of 300 gene-drive mosquitoes




Nord Ubangui


Post-release of 100 gene-drive mosquitoes



Post-release of 200 gene-drive mosquitoes




Post-release of 300 gene-drive mosquitoes




Supplementary 3: Spatial simulation framework: simulation outputs


Bas Uele - scenarios without gene drives




Bas Uele - scenarios with 300 gene drives released at year 0




Equateur - scenarios without gene drives




Equateur - scenarios with 300 gene drives at year 0




Haut Katanga - scenarios without gene drives




Haut Katanga - scenarios with 300 gene drives released at year 0




Haut Katanga - scenarios with 300 gene drives released at year 0




Kasai Central - scenarios without gene drives




Kasai Central - scenarios with 300 gene drives released at year 0




Kinshasa - scenarios without gene drives




Kinshasa - scenarios with 300 gene drives released at year 0




Kwango - scenarios without gene drives




Kwango - scenarios with 300 gene drives released at year 0



Nord Ubangui - scenarios without gene drives



Nord Ubangui - scenarios with 300 gene drives released at year 0



Supplementary 4: Economic analysis

Table S1 Average DALYs averted per year per one million population across all locations estimated from model's outputs in spatial simulation framework. Estimates of each scenario were compared with baseline scenario, which 50% ITNs and 19% ACT coverage were applied. For scenarios that included gene drives, only the estimates from scenarios that resulted in malaria elimination were included.

		Average DALYs averted per year per one million population				
		Model's estimates				
		Intervention	Coverage	Average over 15 years	The first interval: year 1-5	The second interval: year 6-10
Scenarios without gene drives	ITNs	50%	-3,696	-6,818	-2,361	-1,910
		80%	1,482	12,827	-1,990	-6,390
		95%	8,727	27,165	2,158	-3,143
	ACT	50%	1,680	-7,733	2,506	10,266
		80%	12,962	10,390	10,212	18,283
		95%	21,437	25,261	15,883	23,169
	ITNs & ACT	50%	8,004	14,973	4,432	4,606
		80%	33,477	60,693	21,288	18,451
		95%	72,706	81,875	69,014	67,230
Scenarios with gene drives	300 gene drive mosquitoes with X-shredding rates = 1.0 alone	NA	57,298	2,888	82,542	86,464
	ITNs plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.95 and 1.0	80	57,561	12,201	81,580	78,904
	ITNs plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.95 and 1.0	95	68,222	43,505	75,420	85,741
	ACT plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.95 and 1.0	95	68,006	40,162	83,090	80,766
	ITNs & ACT plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.95 and 1.0	50	67,740	39,311	83,142	80,766
	ITNs & ACT plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.95 and 1.0	80	81,029	73,234	82,414	87,441
	ITNs & ACT plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.9, 0.95 and 1.0	95	85,307	86,609	81,819	87,492

Notes for Table S1:

- 1) NA: Not applicable
- 2) Green highlight: the scenario achieved malaria elimination
- 3) It is possible that the DALY averted results turned out to be negative figures in some scenarios since the combination of ITNs at 50% coverage and ACT at 19% coverage was applied in the baseline scenarios that were used as a comparator to reflect reality. For example, a 50%ITNs scenario means only ITNs at 50% coverage was applied as a single intervention in the scenario. Therefore, it is understandable that the lower efficacy of 50%ITNs alone could be observed once compared to the comparator in which the combination of 50%ITNs and 19%ACT was applied. Negative DALYs averted are in red texts.
- 4) WHO estimated the DALYs averted using null (do nothing) scenario as a comparator.

Table S2 Average cost per DALY averted of interventions and combinations applied estimated from model's outputs.

			Scenarios without gene drives										Scenarios with gene drives										
			Intervention(s)																				
			ITNs			ACT			The combination of ITNs and ACT				300 gene-drive mosquitoes with X-shredding rates = 1.0 alone	ITNs plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.95 and 1.0	ITNs plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.95 and 1.0	ACT plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.95 and 1.0	ITNs & ACT plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.95 and 1.0	ITNs & ACT plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.95 and 1.0	ITNs & ACT plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.9, 0.95 and 1.0				
			Coverage (%)																				
Parasite prevalence at the end of the 50-year run-in (%)	Coverage (%)	Interval	50	80	95	50	80	95	50	80	95	Bound	NA	80	95	95	50	80	95				
WHO's estimates for Afr E (4)			49	42	41	21	14	12	43	35	28	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
Estimates from model's outputs	7.27	Haut Katanga	Year 1-5	Lower bound	-36	111	37	23	36	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
				Upper bound	-355	641	205	184	200	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
			Year 6-10	Lower bound	9	17	26	11	17	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
				Upper bound	96	142	89	95	96	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
			Year 11-15	Lower bound	9	17	18	12	17	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
				Upper bound	99	98	91	97	99	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

20.81	Kwango	Year 1-5	-60	51	26	-24	23	9	47	11	8	Lower bound	-340	NA	32	NA	NA	20	NA
			Upper bound	-3,382	NA	175	NA	NA	101	NA									
		Year 6-10	-	-494	-156	55	17	12	112	59	9	Lower bound	9	NA	17	NA	NA	18	NA
			-427	Upper bound	85	NA	95	NA	NA	94	NA								
		Year 11-15	-	-117	-106	18	11	9	120	89	8	Lower bound	8	NA	16	NA	NA	18	NA
			-275	Upper bound	82	NA	90	NA	NA	91	NA								
29.65	Kasai Central	Year 1-5	-69	51	26	-29	11	8	46	11	8	Lower bound	11,661	NA	32	NA	NA	20	NA
			Upper bound	116,124	NA	176	NA	NA	103	NA									
		Year 6-10	-	-245	-161	64	20	14	157	68	9	Lower bound	9	NA	18	NA	NA	19	NA
			-175	Upper bound	87	NA	97	NA	NA	97	NA								
		Year 11-15	-	-102	-81	20	11	9	142	121	9	Lower bound	8	NA	16	NA	NA	18	NA
			-220	Upper bound	83	NA	91	NA	NA	92	NA								
45.03	Nord Ubangui	Year 1-5	-64	53	30	-27	20	8	48	11	8	Lower bound	82	NA	31	NA	NA	20	NA
			Upper bound	816	NA	172	NA	NA	102	NA									
		Year 6-10	-	-925	-206	125	22	15	138	66	9	Lower bound	9	NA	17	NA	NA	19	NA
			-168	Upper bound	88	NA	96	NA	NA	98	NA								
		Year 11-15	-	-96	-82	17	10	9	129	98	8	Lower bound	8	NA	16	NA	NA	17	NA
			-419	Upper bound	82	NA	89	NA	NA	91	NA								

51.64	Bas Uele	Year 0-5	-81	61	29	-36	19	8	48	12	10	Lower bound	65	NA	NA	NA	NA	20	16
			Upper bound	645	NA	NA	NA	NA	105	87									
		Year 6-10	-	-606	-322	117	22	15	140	170	9	Lower bound	9	NA	NA	NA	NA	19	18
			181	Upper bound	87	NA	NA	NA	NA	97	96								
		Year 11-15	-	-81	-73	19	11	9	180	111	9	Lower bound	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	17
			204	Upper bound	82	NA	NA	NA	NA	91	90								
52.33	Kinshasa	Year 1-5	-	104	51	-89	19	9	67	17	10	Lower bound	77	NA	NA	NA	NA	25	18
			103	Upper bound	765	NA	NA	NA	NA	129	97								
		Year 6-10	-	-366	-	110	20	13	181	69	23	Lower bound	9	NA	NA	NA	NA	19	18
			170	1,602	Upper bound	88	NA	NA	NA	NA	98	97							
		Year 11-15	-	-118	-98	18	10	8	143	82	36	Lower bound	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	17	17
			271	Upper bound	81	NA	NA	NA	NA	91	90								
54.33	Equateur	Year 1-5	-	76	40	-86	17	8	53	40	9	Lower bound	55	NA	NA	NA	NA	23	17
			104	Upper bound	547	NA	NA	NA	NA	120	91								
		Year 6-10	-	5,457	-706	115	21	13	143	75	19	Lower bound	9	NA	NA	NA	NA	19	18
			180	Upper bound	88	NA	NA	NA	NA	98	97								
		Year 11-15	-	-75	-74	20	12	9	164	115	31	Lower bound	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	17
			252	Upper bound	83	NA	NA	NA	NA	92	91								

- Note for Table S2:
- 1) NA: Not applicable
 - 2) The scenarios that could achieve malaria elimination when adding gene drives were highlighted in green.
 - 3) \$int: International Dollars
 - 4) upper bound: upper bound price, lower bound: lower bound price

Table S3 Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio in year 1-5 after applying intervention(s)

				ICER (\$int per DALY averted)					
				The first interval: year 1-5		The second interval: year 6-10		The last interval: year 11-15	
Intervention		Coverage	Label	Lower bound	Upper bound	Lower bound	Upper bound	Lower bound	Upper bound
Scenarios without gene drives	ITNs	50%	A	dominated	dominated	negative	dominated	negative	dominated
		80%	B	dominated	dominated	negative	dominated	negative	dominated
		95%	C	6.52	6.52	negative	dominated	negative	dominated
	ACT	50%	D	negative	negative	negative	negative	negative	negative
		80%	E	negative	negative	negative	negative	negative	negative
		95%	F	First point	First point	negative	First point	negative	First point
	ITNs & ACT	50%	G	dominated	dominated	negative	dominated	negative	dominated
		80%	H	0.43	0.43	dominated	2.82	dominated	dominated
		95%	I	0.23	0.23	dominated	0.25	dominated	0.30
Scenarios with gene drives	300 gene drive mosquitoes with X-shredding rates = 1.0 alone	NA	J	dominated	dominated	First point	2.62	First point	2.76
	ITNs plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.95 and 1.0	80	K	dominated	dominated	dominated	2.90	dominated	3.42
	ITNs plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.95 and 1.0	95	L	1.67	10.56	dominated	3.23	dominated	3.07

ACT plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.95 and 1.0	95	M	1.22	12.10	9.74	2.68	dominated	3.12
ITNs & ACT plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.95 and 1.0	50	N	2.12	13.66	28.36	2.85	dominated	3.33
ITNs & ACT plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.95 and 1.0	80	O	0.69	4.06	dominated	2.93	20.99	3.03
ITNs & ACT plus gene drives with X-shredding rates = 0.9, 0.95 and 1.0	95	P	0.51	3.14	dominated	2.92	17.93	2.99

Keys for Table S3:

- ICER: Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio
- Negative: the incremental cost and the incremental effect are negative
- Dominated: the incremental cost is positive, and the incremental effect is negative
- Vector control strategies that could reach malaria elimination were highlighted in green.
- **Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER)** is defined as the incremental change in cost, divided by the incremental change in its effectiveness. The first, second, and third points of each expansion path were highlighted in red, orange, and yellow accordingly.