

A prospect on the use of antiviral drugs to control local outbreaks of COVID-19

Andrea Torneri^{1†}, Pieter Libin^{2,3,4†}, Joris Vanderlocht²,
Anne-Mieke Vandamme^{4,5}, Johan Neyts⁴, Niel Hens^{1,2*}

¹ Centre for Health Economic Research and Modelling Infectious Diseases,
University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium

² Interuniversity Institute of Biostatistics and statistical Bioinformatics, Data Science Institute,
Hasselt University, Hasselt, Belgium

³ Artificial Intelligence lab, Department of computer science,
Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium

⁴ KU Leuven - University of Leuven, Department of Microbiology and Immunology
Rega Institute for Medical Research, Clinical and epidemiological virology, Leuven, Belgium

⁵ Center for Global Health and Tropical Medicine, Unidade de Microbiologia,
Instituto de Higiene e Medicina Tropical, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal

† joint first author

* corresponding author

Abstract

Background: Current outbreaks of COVID-19 are threatening the health care systems of several countries around the world. Control measures, based on isolation and quarantine, have been shown to decrease and delay the burden of the ongoing epidemic. With respect to the ongoing COVID-19 epidemic, recent modelling work shows that this intervention technique may be inadequate to control local outbreaks, even when perfect isolation is assumed. Furthermore, the effect of infectiousness prior to symptom onset combined with a significant proportion of asymptomatic infectees further complicates the use of contact tracing. Antivirals, which decrease the viral load and reduce the infectiousness, could be integrated in the control measures in order to augment the feasibility of controlling the epidemic.

Methods: Using a simulation-based model of viral transmission we tested the efficacy of different intervention measures for the control of COVID-19. For individuals that were identified through contact tracing, we evaluate two procedures: monitoring individuals for symptoms onset and testing of individuals. Moreover, we investigate the effect of a potent antiviral compound on the contact tracing process.

Findings: The use of an antiviral drug, in combination with contact tracing, quarantine and isolation, results in a significant decrease of the final size, the peak incidence, and increases the probability that the outbreak will fade out.

Interpretation: For an infectious disease in which presymptomatic infections are plausible, an intervention measure based on contact tracing performs better when realized together with testing instead of monitoring, provided that the test is able to detect infections during the incubation period. In addition, in all tested scenarios, the model highlights the benefits of the administration of an antiviral drug in addition to quarantine, isolation and contact tracing. The resulting control measure, could be an effective strategy to control local and re-emerging outbreaks of COVID-19.

1 Introduction

1 To control local outbreaks of COVID-19, we investigate the use of contact tracing and isolation in
2 combination with an antiviral compound. Even when perfect isolation is in place, it may not be
3 sufficient to contain a local COVID-19 outbreak.¹ Therefore, in the absence of a vaccine, an antiviral
4 drug in addition to isolation could be used to contain the current COVID-19 epidemic. Today there
5 are no Corona-specific drugs and the development of potent and safe drugs typically takes years.
6 However, there are a number of drugs, originally targeted towards other viral infections, in clinical
7 trials for their ability to control SARS-CoV-2 infection. Most of these drugs inhibit key components
8 of the coronavirus infection life cycle including viral entry, replication, RNA synthesis and protein
9 synthesis. We therefore assume that an antiviral compound will reduce the viral load of an infected
10 individual with COVID-19. For our modeling experiments we searched for an experimental drug
11 for which viral load data were available to inform our model. Remdesivir, was recently shown to
12 inhibit SARS-CoV-2 in vitro² and is currently under evaluation in clinical trials. Remdesivir is an
13 investigational broad-spectrum antiviral agent that has been developed against the Ebola-virus. It
14 functions as a nucleotide-analog inhibitor of the viral RNA-dependent RNA polymerase and has
15 activity against a wide range of RNA-viruses.³ In addition, it is also active against SARS-CoV and
16 MERS-CoV, which is expected given the high level of similarity between the genes that are involved
17 in the replication cycle of these corona viruses. For the aforementioned reasons we inform our
18 model with data on the control of MERS-CoV viral load by Remdesivir in a translational murine
19 model.⁴ The animal model that was utilized was specifically developed to better approximate the
20 pharmacokinetics and drug exposure profile in humans. Therefore, the measure of viral titers in
21 lung tissue at different time-points in this model serves as a reasonable proxy for viral dynamics
22 upon compound exposure in the controlled setting of a viral challenge. To this end, we calibrate
23 the model to represent the viral load decrease thereof.

24 In this manuscript we first present the effect of isolation, considering both home quarantine (for
25 individuals that are part of a contact trace network and for infected individuals with mild symptoms)
26 and hospital isolation (for severe cases). We argue that when an individual is quarantined at home,
27 this will only result in a partial reduction of contacts, accounting for contacts with household
28 members and other isolation imperfectness. To compensate for this imperfect isolation, we consider
29 the use of an antiviral compound. We test these different control measures in a simulation study
30 that aims at representing, given the available information, the current COVID-19 epidemic. While
31 at this phase of the epidemic, many countries are already beyond the point of local containment. We
32 do however expect that the methodology we propose will be key to avoid a second peak, especially
33 given the limited depletion of susceptibles.

2 Methods

2.1 Epidemiological model

34 The disease dynamics are depicted in the left panel of Figure 1. The possible transitions between
35 epidemic classes are described by the arrows.

36 Individuals are initially susceptible (S) and once infected, they enter the exposed class (E). The
37 infection, that is at first asymptomatic (I_a), can lead to the onset of mild (I_m) or severe symptoms
38 (I_s). Symptomatic individuals are hospitalized (H), where they are isolated, or are confined in
39 home quarantine (Q), based on the severity of symptoms. Ultimately, all infectives are assumed to
40 either recover from infection or die (R). Individuals that are hospitalized are immediately isolated;
41 therefore they can no longer transmit the disease. The quarantined individuals, can still make
42 contacts, although at a decreased rate.

43 The transition from the susceptible to the exposed class is governed by a stochastic process based




Figure 1: **Disease dynamics:** Possible transitions among the different epidemic compartments (left panel). A measure describing how infectiousness is distributed over time since infection (right panel).

44 on the notion of infectious contact processes.⁵ First, contacts between individuals are generated.
 45 When such contacts are generated between susceptible and infectious people, these can result in
 46 an infection event according to a Bernoulli probability value based on the time since infection.
 47 This probability is computed, at a precise time point, as the product of two components: the
 48 infectiousness measure, $\nu(t)$, which quantifies the level of infectiousness over time, and the total
 49 amount of infectivity q , i.e. the number of infections over the contact rate.⁶ The function $\nu(t)$ is
 50 defined over the exposed and infectious period, or analogously over the incubation and symptomatic
 51 period, along which it integrates to one. This function is scaled to have a similar shape among
 52 different infectives, based on their lengths of exposed and infectious period. According to this
 53 framework, an infectious individual makes effective contacts at a rate, $r(t)$ given by:

$$r(t) = \lambda * q * \nu(t) \quad (1)$$

54 where λ is the contact rate. The mean number of effective contacts is an approximation of the
 55 reproduction number. The two quantities are identical in an infinite and homogeneous population,
 56 where the probability of making two effective contacts with the same person is zero. For the
 57 considered population size, the probability of this event is extremely low. Therefore, throughout
 58 the manuscript, we approximate the reproduction number with the mean number of secondary
 59 cases.

60 In the considered framework, isolation/quarantine is implemented by reducing the contact rate λ at
 61 the time of diagnosis. To date, little is known about the difference in viral load among severe and
 62 mild cases. Zhou et al.⁷ indicate that in nasal and throat swabs the viral load is higher in mild cases.
 63 Due to this uncertainty, we assume that the same curve is defined for all the infected individuals.
 64 In this work, we assume the population to be homogeneous, closed and finite population. These
 65 assumptions relate to the control measures currently in place, e.g. in Italy, aiming at containing
 66 immigration and emigration in a country with an ongoing outbreak.

2.2 Simulation parameters and distributions

67 In Table 1 we report the parameters and distributions that were utilized in the simulation study.
 68 Where distributions are not reported, the parameters are assumed to be constant. In the last
 69 column, when available, we report the references to the literature that justifies the choice of the
 70 parameter value, or distribution, we use.

71 We assume infectious individuals to make, on average, between two and three effective contacts.
 72 This value, is set accordingly to the current estimate of the basic reproduction number.^{8,9,11,12}
 73 The infectiousness measure is set to represent the viral load observations reported in^{7,15,16}, the

Table 1: Model Parameters

Name	Mean Value (sd)	Distribution	Reference
Incubation period	5.2 days (2.8 days)	Weibull	8,9
Symptomatic period length	18 days	Exponential	7
Time to hospitalization	1.6 days	Exponential	10
Reproduction number:	2.5	NA	8,9,11,12
Symptomatic Individuals	100%	NA	Assumed
Severe cases	16%	NA	13
Population size	500	NA	Motivated in the text
Daily contact rate	12 contacts	NA	14
Infectiousness measure	10 days (3.8 days)	Gamma	7,15,16

74 peak of which is reached within a few days after symptoms onset. The total length is modeled
75 as the convolution of incubation and symptomatic period. Incubation and symptomatic period,
76 are set, respectively, to have a mean length of 5.2 days and 18 days. There is no precise estimate
77 of the length of the symptomatic period to date, thus we choose it according to the aggregated
78 nasal and throat swabs data.⁷ The time to hospitalization is estimated from the data presented in
79 Backer et al.¹⁰ We assume that the time to hospitalization coincides with the time of diagnosis. At
80 this time-point, depending on the severity of the symptoms, individuals are isolated (severe cases)
81 or quarantined (mild cases). The population size is set to 500 to represent a localised outbreak of
82 COVID-19. Furthermore, we assume that the contact tracing starts when individuals are diagnosed.

2.3 Contact tracing and isolation

83 In order to implement contact tracing we keep track of a contact history \mathcal{H}_i for each individual
84 i for all contacts made since the time of infection. When an individual i is found to be infected
85 with SARS-CoV-2, a contact tracing procedure is started. We assume that each contact in \mathcal{H}_i will
86 be traced back successfully with probability η . Depending on the considered scenario, traced-back
87 individuals will be monitored or tested. When individuals are found positive for SARS-CoV-2, they
88 will be put in quarantine/isolation. For certain scenarios, next to quarantine, we also inject infected
89 individuals with an antiviral drug (i.e., Remdesivir).

90 We assume that the test can detect infection after two days since infection. Traced individuals who
91 test negative the first time, are tested again after two days. The quarantine will result in a decreased
92 contact rate (i.e. imperfect isolation), λ_q , while in case of perfect isolation the contact rate is set
93 to zero. Similarly, diagnosed individuals will also be quarantined: at home (mild symptoms), with
94 a decreased contact rate λ_q , or in the hospital (severe symptoms), where we assume that perfect
95 isolation is possible. In all the considered scenarios, the 16% of individuals is isolated while the
96 rest is put in quarantine. The selected proportion reflects the proportion of severe cases reported
97 in Guan et al.¹³

2.4 Antiviral compounds

98 To compensate for imperfect isolation we investigate the use of antiviral compounds to reduce the
99 infectiousness of an infected individual. We assume that, once the antiviral compound has been
100 administered, the infectiousness measure will exponentially decay according to an inverse Malthusian
101 growth model (shown in Figure 2).¹⁷ The rate of this decay is set to represent the reduction in viral
102 load, due to Remdesivir, as reported in⁴ for the MERS coronavirus.




Figure 2: **Reduction of infectiousness.** The blue and the orange lines describe the infectiousness measure, respectively, before (dashed blue) and after antiviral injection (solid yellow). The red arrows indicate the injection times.

2.5 Scenarios

103 We assume the following parameters for the reduction of contacts because of home quarantine: $\lambda_q =$
 104 $0.1\lambda, 0.25\lambda, 0.5\lambda$ and for the probability of tracing back a contact in history \mathcal{H}_i : $\eta = 0.25, 0.5, 0.75$ ¹⁸.
 105 Scenarios: In all the considered scenarios we assume that individuals are isolated, or quarantined,
 106 when diagnosed. Moreover, we assume that contact tracing starts at the time of diagnosis.

IAS: Traced individuals are monitored for two weeks, and isolated/quarantined if they show symptoms during this period. This scenario is similar to the baseline scenario described by Hellewell et al.¹ with the exception that in our description only severe cases are isolated while the mild are home quarantined. This scenario reflects more realistically the current practice of containment.

IBS: Traced individuals are isolated/quarantined, as soon as they test positive for SARS-COV-2. We assume that an individual that is infected tests positive 2 days after infection. Therefore, a traced individual is tested immediately when traced, and, if this test was negative, we test the individual again two days later.

IBTBS: A diagnosed patient is immediately treated with the antiviral drug. Furthermore, traced individuals are isolated/quarantined and injected with the antiviral drug, as soon as they test positive for SARS-COV-2. We assume that an individual that is infected tests positive 2 days after infection. Therefore, a traced individual is tested immediately when traced, and, if this test was negative, we test the individual again two days later.

107 For each scenario we run 5000 simulations. Among these, we compute the final size and the cases
 108 at peak for the one in which at least the 10% of individuals have been infected. Doing this, we only
 109 account for outbreaks that are most challenging to contain.

3 Results

110 Quarantine, isolation and antiviral treatments lead, in different levels, to the mitigation of the
 111 outbreak by reducing the final size as well as by reducing the number of cases at the peak of
 112 the epidemic. The containment performance depends, among all the scenarios, on the probability

113 to successfully trace contacts and on the reduction in contact rate due to quarantine (Figure 3).
 114 Isolation and quarantine lead to a substantial decrease in final size and peak incidence. When
 115 performed prior to symptom onset their efficacy increases, which is important, as recent work
 indicates that infectees are infectious prior to symptom onset.¹⁹ The antiviral treatment is shown




Figure 3: **Final size and Mean peak incidence.** Left panel: distributions of the final size value for Scenario IAS (yellow), Scenario IBS (green) and Scenario IBTBS (blue) when the quarantine contact rate is $\lambda_q = 0.25\lambda$ together with the probability that a simulation leads to a number of cases smaller than the 10% of the population (purple asterisks). Right panel: mean peak incidence together with the 2.5 % and the 97.5 % percentiles.

116 to have a substantial impact and, together with quarantine and isolation, significantly reduces the
 117 final size, the peak incidence and the number of outbreaks that are most challenging to contain.
 118

4 Discussion

119 We assume that we have sufficient antiviral drugs doses to treat all individuals that are encountered
 120 via the contact tracing procedure. This is motivated by the fact that we consider an emerging
 121 outbreak and the required number of doses will thus be limited.
 122 Furthermore, we assume that all the individuals will show symptoms, sooner or later, during their
 123 infectious period, and therefore all infected individuals will be diagnosed. Due to the awareness of
 124 COVID-19 given by media and government officials, individuals are more likely to act upon even
 125 mild symptoms. This assumption is in line with the work of Hellewell et al.¹ Moreover, we assume
 126 that all infected individuals will eventually be diagnosed. While this is a limitation of our study,
 127 we argue that in the scenarios where we aggressively trace and treat the contacts of individuals,
 128 we are more likely to find (and constrain) cases that would otherwise go undetected. To challenge
 129 this assumption, we simulate the impact of asymptomatic individuals, defined to be infectives that
 130 do not show symptoms during their infectious periods. Results reported in the sensitivity analysis
 131 show that, for the tested scenarios, the use of an antiviral drug increases the control of the outbreak,
 132 even when undiagnosed individuals are circulating in the population.
 133 In the hospital, we assume perfect isolation, meaning that infected individuals cannot spread the
 134 infection. While this assumption is in line with earlier works¹, health care workers are at risk and
 135 they could be infected by infected individuals in isolation.
 136 In the IBS and IBTBS scenarios we assume that the traced individuals that test positive are isolated
 137 in the 16% of cases, even before showing actual severe symptoms.
 138 Although this model is informed with data on the control of MERS-CoV viral load using prophylaxis
 139 with Remdesivir, it stands to reason that different classes of viral inhibitors control the viral load
 140 in different ways. Additionally, despite the sequence similarity of MERS-CoV and SARS-COV-2 it

141 remains to be established whether the impact of Remdesivir (or other antivirals) on the viral load
142 is similar. To this end, longitudinal data of the viral load on COVID-19 infected patients treated
143 with different viral inhibitors will be informative. Furthermore, Sheahan et al.⁴ demonstrated that
144 the degree of the clinical benefit of Remdesivir for MERS depends on the viral dose and also on
145 the timing of the treatment of the viral inhibitor. A lethal viral dose and delaying the initiation of
146 antiviral treatment failed to fully prevent viral pathogenesis. Although Remdesivir proved effective
147 at reducing the viral load also in these conditions, the argument for an early start of antiviral
148 treatment is evident. Presumably, reducing the viral load with an antiviral compound loses its
149 efficacy in advanced disease as the tissue damage is sustained by inflammatory processes in absence
150 of the viral initiator. In our implementation, antiviral injections are immediately administered to
151 successfully traced back individuals, mostly in their asymptomatic phase, and to the diagnosed
152 patient. Therefore, we believe that the assumptions on the use of this drug, in the considered
153 scenario, are reasonable.

5 Conclusion

154 The ongoing epidemic of COVID-19 threatens the health system of many countries. Although
155 control measures such as isolation and quarantine are of great importance, relying on their exclusive
156 use could fail to contain an outbreak. In addition, when a proportion of infected individuals requires
157 hospital care, the number of cases at peak should be minimized as much as possible to avoid
158 that regional health care infrastructure is overwhelmed. In the current study we highlight the
159 impact of an antiviral compound that reduces the viral load and, consequently, the infectiousness
160 of infectives. For this simulation study we utilized the data on the control of the viral load by
161 Remdesivir in a pathogen challenge experiment, however, this study can be easily extended to other
162 antivirals, given the availability of viral load data upon drug administration. Although the efficacy
163 of administering an antiviral compound, in addition to isolation and quarantine depends on the
164 effectiveness of the respective drug, it is plausible that drugs that interfere with the infection life
165 cycle show a comparable impact on the viral load. We demonstrate that the implementation of
166 such a compound together with quarantine leads to a substantial reduction of the final size and
167 the peak incidence. In addition, the number of outbreaks that are most challenging to contain
168 decreases when the antiviral is administered to diagnosed and traced individuals. Therefore, the
169 administration of an antiviral drug, together with isolation and quarantine, is expected to have
170 a major impact in the control of local COVID-19 outbreaks. Although antiviral compounds are
171 mostly evaluated in clinical trials for their capacity to control the disease manifestations and alter
172 the clinical outcome in individual patients, our study implies that antiviral compounds can be
173 implemented to alter the spread of a viral epidemic by influencing the viral load and infectiousness
174 of infectees upon quarantine. Additionally, it is expected that the implementation of such a strategy
175 during an epidemic outbreak might also prove effective to prevent hospitalisation and the pressure
176 on the health care capacity as these antiviral treatment is initiated earlier in the disease.
177 Currently, there remains a great deal of uncertainty with respect to the proportion of asymptomatic
178 infectees. Therefore, we performed a sensitivity analysis where we consider a proportion of 35%
179 asymptomatic individuals, which is in line with the findings of recent works.^{20,21} For this proportion
180 we consider a setting where the reproductive number between symptomatic and asymptomatic is
181 equal (Figure 9) and a setting where the asymptomatic infectees have a reproduction number that is
182 55% of the reproduction number set for symptomatic infectees (Figure 10).²⁰ For both settings, we
183 show a significant advantage with respect to the reduction of the final size and the peak incidence.
184 Yet, our analysis also shows that when the asymptomatic are as infectious as the symptomatic
185 infectees, it is important to have a high contact tracing success rate (η).
186 We remain hopeful that the ongoing clinical trials will reveal an antiviral compound that can be
187 used as a treatment and prophylaxis. Yet, our work shows that such compounds have an additional

188 potential to mitigate the pandemic when implemented in concert with quarantine and contact
189 tracing. Therefore research aimed at the identification of new drugs targeting different viral families
190 with pandemic potential is warranted.

Acknowledgements

191 This work is funded by the EpiPose project from the European Union’s SC1-PHE-CORONAVIRUS-
192 2020 programme, project number 101003688 and by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research
193 and innovation programme (grant agreement 682540 — TransMID). A.T. acknowledges support
194 from the special research fund of the University of Antwerp. P.L. was supported by funding from the
195 Flemish Government under the “Onderzoeksprogramma Artificiële Intelligentie (AI) Vlaanderen”
196 programme.

Author contributions

197 A.T. contributed to the conceptualization of the study, the construction and implementation of the
198 mathematical model, the experimental setting and the writing of the manuscript. P.L. contributed
199 to the conceptualization of the study, the construction of the mathematical model, the experimental
200 setting and the writing of the manuscript. J.V. contributed to the construction of the mathemat-
201 ical model, the experimental setting and the writing of the manuscript. A.V. contributed to the
202 conceptualization of the study and the writing of the manuscript. J.N. contributed to the conceptu-
203 alization of the study and the writing of the manuscript. N.H. contributed to the conceptualization
204 of the study, the construction of the mathematical model, the experimental setting, the writing of
205 the manuscript and the project supervision.

Competing interests

206 Besides his employment at the Hasselt University, JV is employed at Bioqube Ventures. Bioqube
207 Ventures was not involved in this work, nor does it prosper financially as a result of the current
208 study. The other authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Materials and Correspondence

209 Correspondence and material requests should be addressed to Prof. Dr. Niel Hens. Source code of
210 our model and experiments can be found on <https://github.com/AndreaTorneri/ViralTransm>.

References

- [1] Hellewell J, Abbott S, Gimma A, Bosse NI, Jarvis CI, Russell TW, et al. Feasibility of controlling COVID-19 outbreaks by isolation of cases and contacts. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2020;.
- [2] Wang M, Cao R, Zhang L, Yang X, Liu J, Xu M, et al. Remdesivir and chloroquine effectively inhibit the recently emerged novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in vitro. *Cell research*. 2020;30(3):269–271.
- [3] Warren TK, Jordan R, Lo MK, Ray AS, Mackman RL, Soloveva V, et al. Therapeutic efficacy of the small molecule GS-5734 against Ebola virus in rhesus monkeys. *Nature*. 2016;531(7594):381–385.
- [4] Sheahan TP, Sims AC, Leist SR, Schäfer A, Won J, Brown AJ, et al. Comparative therapeutic efficacy of remdesivir and combination lopinavir, ritonavir, and interferon beta against MERS-CoV. *Nature Communications*. 2020;11(1):222. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13940-6>.
- [5] Rhodes PH, Halloran ME, Longini Jr IM. Counting process models for infectious disease data: distinguishing exposure to infection from susceptibility. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*. 1996;58(4):751–762.
- [6] Svensson Å. A note on generation times in epidemic models. *Mathematical biosciences*. 2007;208(1):300–311.
- [7] Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, Liang L, Huang H, Hong Z, et al. SARS-CoV-2 viral load in upper respiratory specimens of infected patients. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;.
- [8] Zhang J, Litvinova M, Wang W, Wang Y, Deng X, Chen X, et al. Evolving epidemiology of novel coronavirus diseases 2019 and possible interruption of local transmission outside Hubei Province in China: a descriptive and modeling study. *medRxiv*. 2020; Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/02/23/2020.02.21.20026328>.
- [9] Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus - Infected Pneumonia. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001316>.
- [10] Backer JA, Klinkenberg D, Wallinga J. Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) infections among travellers from Wuhan, China, 20–28 January 2020. *Eurosurveillance*. 2020;25(5).
- [11] Flahault A. Has China faced only a herald wave of SARS-CoV-2? *The Lancet*. 2020;.
- [12] World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease 2019 - (COVID-19). Situation report - 46.; Available from: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200306-sitrep-46-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=96b04adf_2.
- [13] Guan Wj, Ni Zy, Hu Y, Liang Wh, Ou Cq, He Jx, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;.
- [14] Willem L, Hoang TV, Funk S, Coletti P, Beutels P, Hens N. SOCRATES: An online tool leveraging a social contact data sharing initiative to assess mitigation strategies for COVID-19. *medRxiv*. 2020; Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/03/06/2020.03.03.20030627>.
- [15] Zhou P, Yang XL, Wang XG, Hu B, Zhang L, Zhang W, et al. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature*. 2020; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7>.
- [16] Pan Y, Zhang D, Yang P, Poon LLM, Wang Q. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical samples. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2020;.
- [17] Malthus TR, Winch D, James P. *Malthus: 'An Essay on the Principle of Population'*. Cambridge University Press; 1992.
- [18] Klinkenberg D, Fraser C, Heesterbeek H. The effectiveness of contact tracing in emerging

- epidemics. *PloS one*. 2006;1(1).
- [19] Ganyani T, Kremer C, Chen D, Torneri A, Faes C, Wallinga J, et al. Estimating the generation interval for COVID-19 based on symptom onset data. *medRxiv*. 2020; Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/03/08/2020.03.05.20031815>.
- [20] Li R, Pei S, Chen B, Song Y, Zhang T, Yang W, et al. Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV2). *Science*. 2020;
- [21] Nishiura H, Kobayashi T, Suzuki A, Katsuma Hayashi SMJ, Kinoshita R, Yang Y, et al. Estimation of the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus infections (COVID-19). *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2020; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.03.020>.

Appendix: sensitivity analyses

211 We report in Figure 4 and 5 the sensitivity analysis for the quarantine contact rate: $\lambda_q = 0.1\lambda, 0.5\lambda$.
 212 The introduction of an antiviral compound substantially contributes in reducing the final size, the
 213 peak incidence and the probability of a challenging outbreak in all the considered settings. This
 214 decrease, compared to the scenario in which only isolation/quarantine is implemented, increases
 215 when quarantine is less effective (left panels). In Figure 6 and 7, we vary the reproduction number
 216 that is set, respectively, to $\mathcal{R}_0 = 2$ and $\mathcal{R}_0 = 3$. The effect of the antiviral drug, in addition to
 217 isolation and quarantine, increases when the reproduction number increases. In case of $\mathcal{R}_0 = 3$,
 218 the peak incidence decreases when the antiviral compound is used, compared to control measures
 219 based only on isolation and quarantine after symptoms onset.




Figure 4: Distributions of the final size value for Scenario IAS (yellow), Scenario IBS (green) and Scenario IBTBS (blue) when the quarantine contact rate is $\lambda_q=0.5\lambda$ (left panel) and $\lambda_q=0.1\lambda$ (right panel) together with the probability that a simulation leads to a number of cases smaller than the 10% of the population (purple asterisks)

220 In Figure 8 we investigate the effect of a longer time needed for the test to detect an infectious
 221 individual. We assume the test is positive when performed on an infectious individual who has been
 222 infected since at least 4 days. Simulations show a substantial increase, both in the final size and
 223 the peak incidence for the IBS scenario. Instead, the use of an antiviral drug results also in this
 224 case of remarkable impact in both the final size and the peak incidence.
 225 We tested also the effect of an asymptomatic proportion of infectives. We assume that the 35%
 226 of individuals will not show symptoms during their infectious periods, according to result reported
 227 in recent studies.^{20,21} We consider two values of the reproduction number for the asymptomatic
 228 individuals. In Figure 9 asymptomatic and symptomatic individuals have the same reproduction




Figure 5: Mean peak incidence for Scenario IAS (yellow), Scenario IBS (green) and Scenario IBTBS (blue) when the quarantine contact rate is $\lambda_q=0.5\lambda$ (left panel) and $\lambda_q=0.1\lambda$ (right panel) together with 2.5% and 97.5% percentiles.




Figure 6: Final size distribution (left panel) and mean peak incidence for Scenario IAS (yellow), Scenario IBS (green) and Scenario IBTBS (blue) when the quarantine contact rate is $\lambda_q=0.25\lambda$, and $\mathcal{R}_0 = 2$. In the left panel, for each scenario we report the probability that a simulation leads to a number of cases smaller than the 10% of the population (purple asterisks). In the right panel, together with the point estimates we report the 2.5% and 97.5 % percentiles.




Figure 7: Final size distribution (left panel) and mean peak incidence for Scenario IAS (yellow), Scenario IBS (green) and Scenario IBTBS (blue) when the quarantine contact rate is $\lambda_q=0.25\lambda$, and $\mathcal{R}_0 = 3$. In the left panel, for each scenario we report the probability that a simulation leads to a number of cases smaller than the 10% of the population (purple asterisks). In the right panel, together with the point estimates we report the 2.5% and 97.5 % percentiles.




Figure 8: Final size distribution (left panel) and mean peak incidence for Scenario IAS (yellow), Scenario IBS (green) and Scenario IBTBS (blue) when the quarantine contact rate is $\lambda_q=0.25 \lambda$, $\mathcal{R}_0=2.5$ and the test detect positively an infectious individual after 4 days since infection. In the left panel, for each scenario we report the probability that a simulation leads to a number of cases smaller than the 10% of the population (purple asterisks). In the right panel, together with the point estimates we report the 2.5% and 97.5 % percentiles.

229 number of value $\mathcal{R}_0 = 2.5$, while in Figure 10 the reproduction number for symptomatic and
 230 asymptomatic is set, respectively, to $\mathcal{R}_0^s=2.5$ and $R_0^a=0.55 R_0^s$.²⁰ Also in these scenarios we noticed
 231 that the administration of an antiviral drug lead to a substantial decrease in the final size and peak
 232 incidence compared to the values obtained when the other control measures are considered.




Figure 9: Final size distribution (left panel) and mean peak incidence for Scenario IAS (yellow), Scenario IBS (green) and Scenario IBTBS (blue) when the quarantine contact rate is $\lambda_q=0.25 \lambda$ and the proportion of asymptomatic individuals is 35%. We consider the same reproduction number for asymptomatic (\mathcal{R}_0^a) and symptomatic (\mathcal{R}_0^s) individuals: $\mathcal{R}_0^a = \mathcal{R}_0^s = 2.5$. In the left panel, for each scenario we report the probability that a simulation leads to a number of cases smaller than the 10% of the population (purple asterisks). In the right panel, together with the point estimates we report the 2.5% and 97.5 % percentiles.




Figure 10: Final size distribution (left panel) and mean peak incidence for Scenario IAS (yellow), Scenario IBS (green) and Scenario IBTBS (blue) when the quarantine contact rate is $\lambda_q=0.25 \lambda$, $\mathcal{R}_0=2.5$ and the proportion of asymptomatic individuals is 35%. We consider the a reproductive number that is different for asymptomatic (\mathcal{R}_0^a) and symptomatic (\mathcal{R}_0^s) individuals: $\mathcal{R}_0^s = 2.5$ and $\mathcal{R}_0^a = 0.55 \cdot \mathcal{R}_0^s$. In the left panel, for each scenario we report the probability that a simulation leads to a number of cases smaller than the 10% of the population (purple asterisks). In the right panel, together with the point estimates we report the 2.5% and 97.5 % percentiles.