

1 **Cost-effectiveness of public health strategies for COVID-19 epidemic control**  
2 **in South Africa: a microsimulation modelling study**

3  
4 Krishna P. Reddy, MD<sup>1,2,3</sup>

5 Fatma M. Shebl, PhD<sup>1,3</sup>

6 Julia H. A. Foote, BA<sup>1,3</sup>

7 Guy Harling, ScD<sup>4,5,6,7</sup>

8 Justine A. Scott, MPH<sup>1</sup>

9 Christopher Panella, BA<sup>1</sup>

10 Kieran P. Fitzmaurice, BS<sup>1</sup>

11 Clare Flanagan, MPH<sup>1</sup>

12 Emily P. Hyle, MD<sup>1,3,8,9</sup>

13 Anne M. Neilan, MD<sup>1,3,8,10</sup>

14 Amir M. Mohareb, MD<sup>1,3,8</sup>

15 Prof. Linda-Gail Bekker, MBChB<sup>11</sup>

16 Richard J. Lessells, PhD<sup>12</sup>

17 Andrea L. Ciaranello, MD<sup>1,3,8,9</sup>

18 Prof. Robin Wood, DSc<sup>11</sup>

19 Prof. Elena Losina, PhD<sup>3,13,14,15</sup>

20 Prof. Kenneth A. Freedberg, MD<sup>1,3,8,16,17</sup>

21 Pooyan Kazemian, PhD<sup>1,3\*</sup>

22 Mark J. Siedner, MD<sup>1,3,5,8\*</sup>

23  
24 \* PK and MJS contributed equally to this work.  
25  
26

27

28 **Affiliations**

29 <sup>1</sup> Medical Practice Evaluation Center, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

30 <sup>2</sup> Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston,  
31 MA, USA

32 <sup>3</sup> Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

33 <sup>4</sup> Department of Epidemiology and Harvard Center for Population & Development Studies,  
34 Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

35 <sup>5</sup> Africa Health Research Institute, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa

36 <sup>6</sup> Institute for Global Health, University College London, London, UK

37 <sup>7</sup> MRC/Wits Rural Public Health & Health Transitions Research Unit (Agincourt), University of  
38 Witwatersrand, South Africa

39 <sup>8</sup> Division of Infectious Diseases, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

40 <sup>9</sup> Harvard University Center for AIDS Research, Cambridge, MA, USA

41 <sup>10</sup> Division of General Academic Pediatrics, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

42 <sup>11</sup> Desmond Tutu HIV Foundation, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

43 <sup>12</sup> KwaZulu-Natal Research Innovation and Sequencing (KRISP), College of Health Sciences,  
44 University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa

45 <sup>13</sup> Department of Biostatistics, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

46 <sup>14</sup> Orthopedic and Arthritis Center for Outcomes Research (OrACORe), Department of  
47 Orthopedic Surgery, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

48 <sup>15</sup> Policy and Innovation eValuation in Orthopedic Treatments (PIVOT) Center, Department of  
49 Orthopedic Surgery, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

50 <sup>16</sup> Division of General Internal Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

51 <sup>17</sup> Department of Health Policy and Management, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health,  
52 Boston, MA, USA

53

54 **Corresponding Author**

55 Krishna P. Reddy, MD, MS

56 Medical Practice Evaluation Center

57 Massachusetts General Hospital

58 100 Cambridge Street, Suite 1600

59 Boston, MA 02114

60 USA

61 Phone: +1 617-726-1993

62 Fax: +1 617-726-4120

63 Email: [kpreddy@mgh.harvard.edu](mailto:kpreddy@mgh.harvard.edu)

64

65 **Keywords:** COVID-19, cost-effectiveness, resource-limited setting, South Africa, resource  
66 allocation

67

68 **Running title:** Cost-effectiveness of COVID-19 interventions in South Africa

69

70 **Abstract Word Count:** 299

71

72 **Main Text Word Count:** 3,493

73

74 **ABSTRACT**

75 **Background**

76 Healthcare resource constraints in low and middle-income countries necessitate selection of  
77 cost-effective public health interventions to address COVID-19.

78

79 **Methods**

80 We developed a dynamic COVID-19 microsimulation model to evaluate clinical and economic  
81 outcomes and cost-effectiveness of epidemic control strategies in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.  
82 Interventions assessed were Healthcare Testing (HT), where diagnostic testing is performed  
83 only for those presenting to healthcare centres; Contact Tracing (CT) in households of cases;  
84 Isolation Centres (IC), for cases not requiring hospitalisation; community health worker-led Mass  
85 Symptom Screening and molecular testing for symptomatic individuals (MS); and Quarantine  
86 Centres (QC), for household contacts who test negative. Given uncertainties about epidemic  
87 dynamics in South Africa, we evaluated two main epidemic scenarios over 360 days, with  
88 effective reproduction numbers ( $R_e$ ) of 1.5 and 1.2. We compared *HT*, *HT+CT*, *HT+CT+IC*,  
89 *HT+CT+IC+MS*, *HT+CT+IC+QC*, and *HT+CT+IC+MS+QC*, considering strategies with  
90 incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) <US\$3,250/year-of-life saved (YLS) cost-effective.  
91 In sensitivity analyses, we varied  $R_e$ , molecular testing sensitivity, and efficacies and costs of  
92 interventions.

93

94 **Findings**

95 With  $R_e$  1.5, *HT* resulted in the most COVID-19 deaths over 360 days. Compared with *HT*,  
96 *HT+CT+IC+MS+QC* reduced mortality by 94%, increased costs by 33%, and was cost-effective  
97 (ICER \$340/YLS). In settings where quarantine centres cannot be implemented,  
98 *HT+CT+IC+MS* was cost-effective compared with *HT* (ICER \$590/YLS). With  $R_e$  1.2,  
99 *HT+CT+IC+QC* was the least costly strategy, and no other strategy was cost-effective.

100 *HT+CT+IC+MS+QC* was cost-effective in many sensitivity analyses; notable exceptions were  
101 when  $R_e$  was 2.6 and when efficacies of ICs and QCs for transmission reduction were reduced.

102

### 103 **Interpretation**

104 In South Africa, strategies involving household contact tracing, isolation, mass symptom  
105 screening, and quarantining household contacts who test negative would substantially reduce  
106 COVID-19 mortality and be cost-effective. The optimal combination of interventions depends on  
107 epidemic growth characteristics and practical implementation considerations.

108

109

### 110 **Funding**

111 National Institutes of Health, Royal Society, Wellcome Trust

112

113 **INTRODUCTION**

114 By early September 2020, 16 countries in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) had reported over 10,000  
115 COVID-19 cases.<sup>1</sup> High urban density, limited opportunities for physical distancing, and poor  
116 access to hygiene interventions raise the risk of severe epidemics in the region.<sup>2</sup> The existing  
117 public health infrastructure for epidemic response in SSA is also of concern: testing capacity,  
118 surveillance infrastructure, isolation facilities, and intensive care (ICU) services are sparse.<sup>3,4</sup>

119  
120 Low and middle-income countries (LMICs) are implementing epidemic control programs. The  
121 World Health Organization (WHO) promotes establishment of disease surveillance platforms,  
122 contact tracing, and isolation facilities.<sup>5</sup> Epidemiologic models of these interventions have  
123 generally suggested that their efficacy depends on intervention adherence and transmission  
124 dynamics.<sup>6,7</sup> Yet few studies have included resource costs to examine their cost-effectiveness  
125 and feasibility. Limitations in human resources, public health financing, and healthcare facility  
126 availability necessitate particular attention to these issues in LMICs.

127  
128 We used a dynamic microsimulation model to compare medical outcomes and costs for a range  
129 of COVID-19 control measures in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. Our objective was to inform  
130 policy decision making by projecting clinical and economic outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and  
131 budget impact of alternative control strategies, focusing on those proposed or currently in use in  
132 South Africa. Though the first wave of diagnosed COVID-19 cases in South Africa peaked in  
133 July 2020, this analysis can inform preparation for or response to a resurgence or subsequent  
134 waves.

## 135 **METHODS**

### 136 **Analytic Overview**

137 We developed the Clinical and Economic Analysis of COVID Interventions (CEACOV) dynamic  
138 state-transition Monte Carlo microsimulation model to reflect COVID-19 natural history,  
139 diagnosis, and treatment. We compared six public health intervention strategies (figure S1). In  
140 all strategies: (a) testing consists of polymerase chain reaction (PCR) for severe acute  
141 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) on a nasopharyngeal specimen; (b) those  
142 awaiting test results are instructed to self-isolate; (c) those severely ill (with dyspnoea and/or  
143 hypoxemia), regardless of test result, are admitted to hospital until hospital capacity is reached;  
144 (d) those with a negative test result are advised to practice physical distancing and hand  
145 hygiene; (e) those with an initial negative test result can present for repeat testing if they  
146 develop new or worsening symptoms; (f) those not initially admitted to hospital can be admitted  
147 later if they develop severe illness. Unique characteristics of each modelled strategy are:

148

149 1) *Healthcare Testing (HT)*: Approximately 30% of people with mild/moderate COVID-  
150 19-like symptoms and all with severe symptoms self-present to a healthcare centre for  
151 testing. Those with a positive result and not severely ill are instructed to self-isolate at  
152 home.

153

154 2) *Contact Tracing (HT+CT)*: In addition to *HT*, household contacts of COVID-19 cases  
155 are tested. Those with a positive result are instructed to self-isolate at home.

156

157 3) *Contact Tracing + Isolation Centre (HT+CT+IC)*: In addition to *HT+CT*, cases who are  
158 not severely ill are referred to an isolation centre (IC) offering food, shelter, and basic  
159 medical care without supplemental oxygen. They are discharged after 14 days.

160

161 4) *Contact Tracing + Isolation Centre + Mass Symptom Screening (HT+CT+IC+MS)*: In  
162 addition to *HT+CT+IC*, community healthcare workers screen the entire population for  
163 COVID-19 symptoms every 6 months and refer those with symptoms for PCR testing.  
164 Individuals with a positive PCR test but not severely ill are referred to an IC. As a frame  
165 of reference, epidemic control measures in South Africa in June 2020 included  
166 combinations of HT, CT, IC, and MS.

167  
168 5) *Contact Tracing + Isolation Centre + Quarantine Centre (HT+CT+IC+QC)*: In addition  
169 to *HT+CT+IC*, household contacts with a negative test result who cannot safely  
170 quarantine at home are referred to a quarantine centre (QC) where they receive food  
171 and shelter. They are discharged after 14 days, unless they develop COVID-19-like  
172 symptoms, in which case they are referred to ICs or hospitals, as available.

173  
174 6) *Contact Tracing + Isolation Centre + Mass Symptom Screening + Quarantine Centre*  
175 *(HT+CT+IC+MS+QC)*: This is a combination of all measures described above.

176  
177 Starting with SARS-CoV-2 infection prevalence of 0.1%, we simulated COVID-19-specific  
178 outcomes over 360 days, including daily and cumulative infections (detected and undetected),  
179 deaths, resource utilization, and healthcare costs from the health sector perspective without  
180 discounting. Outside the model, we calculated the average lifetime years-of-life saved (YLS)  
181 from each averted COVID-19 death during the 360-day model horizon, which equated to 16.8  
182 life-years (appendix p.5-6). The primary outcome was the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio  
183 (ICER), the difference in healthcare costs (2019 US dollars [US\$]) divided by the difference in  
184 life-years between strategies. We did not include costs beyond the 360-day model horizon.  
185 Average non-HIV public health expenditures in South Africa are approximately \$600/year per  
186 capita;<sup>8,9</sup> including those annual costs over a lifetime yields a lifetime ICER approaching



187 \$600/YLS. Therefore, our ICER estimates include healthcare costs during the 360-day model  
188 horizon and YLS over a lifetime from averted COVID-19 deaths during the 360-day model  
189 horizon. Recognizing no established threshold, we judged an ICER less than \$3,250/YLS cost-  
190 effective, based on an opportunity cost approach (appendix p.2).<sup>10</sup>

191

## 192 **Model Structure**

### 193 *Health States and Natural History*

194 At simulation initiation, each individual is either susceptible to, or infected with, SARS-CoV-2  
195 according to age-stratified probabilities (0-19, 20-59, ≥60 years). Once infected, an individual  
196 transitions to the pre-infectious latency state. Each individual faces an age-dependent  
197 probability of developing asymptomatic, mild/moderate, severe, or critical disease (appendix  
198 p.2, table S1, figure S2). Those with critical disease face daily probabilities of death. If they  
199 survive, they pass through a recuperation state (remaining infectious) before going to the  
200 recovery state. Those in other disease states can transition directly to the recovery state.  
201 “Recovered” individuals pose no risk of transmission and are assumed immune from repeat  
202 infection for the simulation duration. All simulated individuals advance through the model  
203 simultaneously to capture infection transmission dynamics. To validate our natural history  
204 assumptions, we compared model-projected COVID-19 deaths with those reported in KwaZulu-  
205 Natal (appendix p.4).

206

### 207 *Transmission*

208 Individuals in asymptomatic, mild/moderate, severe, critical, or recuperation states of COVID-19  
209 may transmit infection to susceptible individuals at state-dependent daily rates. The number of  
210 daily infections is a function of the proportion of susceptible people in the population, the  
211 distribution of disease states among those with COVID-19, and interventions that influence  
212 transmission (appendix p.3).

213

### 214 *Testing and Interventions*

215 PCR testing specifications include sensitivity, specificity, time from testing to result, and  
216 cost. Interventions influence testing probability (e.g., CT and MS), infection transmission rate  
217 (e.g., IC and QC), and costs.

218

### 219 *Resource Utilization*

220 Individuals with severe or critical disease are referred to hospitals and ICUs, respectively. If  
221 those resources are not available, the individual receives the next lower available intervention,  
222 which is associated with a different mortality risk and cost (e.g., if a person needs ICU care  
223 when no ICU beds are available, s/he receives non-ICU hospital care).

224

### 225 **Model Calibration**

226 We populated CEACOV with COVID-19 natural history data from published literature (table  
227 1). We used estimates of the basic reproduction number ( $R_0$ ) and viral shedding duration in  
228 various disease states to calculate transmission rates. We then calibrated transmission rates to  
229 construct an effective reproduction number ( $R_e$ ) corresponding to South African estimates in  
230 May 2020, after implementation of physical distancing and lockdown policies (appendix p.4).<sup>11</sup>

231

### 232 **Input Parameters**

#### 233 *Cohort Characteristics*

234 We defined cohort demographic characteristics using 2019 population estimates (table 1).<sup>12</sup> In  
235 KwaZulu-Natal, 40.26% were aged 0-19 years, 51.48% were 20-59 years, and 8.26% were over  
236 60 years. Day 0 of the model represents a provincial 0.1% prevalence (approximately 11,000  
237 individuals) of active SARS-CoV-2 infection, with the remainder of the population susceptible to  
238 infection.

239

#### 240 *Natural History*

241 For those newly infected with SARS-CoV-2, average pre-infectious latency was 2.6 days. Table  
242 S1 indicates duration in each state, age-dependent probability of developing severe or critical  
243 disease, and age-dependent mortality for those with critical disease.

244

#### 245 *Transmission*

246 We stratified transmission rates by disease state (table 1). We adjusted transmission rates to  
247 reflect  $R_e=1.5$ .<sup>11</sup> Given uncertainty over  $R_e$ , both in the past and future, we also simulated  
248 alternative epidemic growth scenarios with lower (1.1 or 1.2) or higher (2.6)  $R_e$  (appendix p.4).

249

#### 250 *Testing and Interventions*

251 In the base case, we assumed a 70% sensitivity, 100% specificity, and five days to PCR result  
252 return and action across all active infection states.<sup>13</sup> We defined the probability of undergoing  
253 testing based on the health state and intervention strategy in place (table S2, appendix p.7).  
254 Given limited data about the precise efficacy of each intervention for reducing SARS-CoV-2  
255 transmission rates (e.g., IC), we made assumptions about efficacies and varied them in  
256 sensitivity analysis. Ongoing transmission after diagnosis was reduced by 50% from HT alone  
257 and by 95% when HT was combined with ICs or QCs (table S2).

258

#### 259 *Resource Utilization and Costs*

260 The maximum capacity of hospital and ICU beds was 26,220 and 748 per 11 million people, as  
261 reported for KwaZulu-Natal (table 1).<sup>14</sup> We assumed that IC and QC beds were available to all  
262 who needed them. We applied costs of PCR testing, contact tracing, and mass symptom  
263 screening, as well as daily costs of hospitalisation, ICU stay, and IC/QC stays based on  
264 published estimates and/or cost quotes obtained in KwaZulu-Natal (appendix p.6).

265

## 266 **Resource Utilization and Budget Impact Analysis**

267 We conducted resource utilization and budget impact analysis from a combined public/private  
268 health sector perspective for KwaZulu-Natal (population 11 million). We projected the total  
269 resources, including testing, hospital/ICU beds, and IC/QC beds, that would be used in each  
270 intervention strategy. IC/QC beds are offered to those who meet criteria, and we assumed in the  
271 base case that all offered would be used. In budget impact analysis, we projected total and  
272 component healthcare costs associated with each strategy over 360 days and compared them  
273 with the 2019 KwaZulu-Natal Department of Health budget of \$3.12 billion.<sup>15</sup> Because ICU care  
274 is relatively expensive and mostly in the private sector, we also considered costs exclusive of  
275 ICU care.

276

## 277 **Sensitivity Analysis**

278 We conducted one-way sensitivity analysis by varying key parameters across plausible ranges  
279 to determine the impact on clinical and cost projections (table 1, table S2). To extrapolate to  
280 other settings, we limited hospital and ICU bed availability to the average numbers in SSA  
281 countries (22,275 and 371 per 11 million people).<sup>16</sup> We performed multi-way sensitivity analysis  
282 in which we varied parameters influential in one-way sensitivity analysis, including reducing  
283 IC/QC efficacy and costs to reflect the impact of home-based isolation and quarantine  
284 strategies.

## 285 RESULTS

286 For an epidemic with  $R_e=1.5$ , we projected that *HT* would result in the most COVID-19  
287 infections and deaths, most life-years lost, and lowest costs over 360 days (table 2, figures S3-  
288 S4). *HT+CT+IC+MS+QC* provided the greatest clinical benefit and was cost-effective (ICER  
289 \$340/YLS) (figure 1). *HT+CT+IC+MS+QC* decreased life-years lost by 94% and increased costs  
290 by 33% compared with *HT*. All other strategies resulted in higher costs while providing less  
291 clinical benefit than *HT+CT+IC+MS+QC*. In settings where quarantine centres cannot be  
292 implemented, *HT+CT+IC+MS* was the cost-effective strategy (ICER \$590/YLS compared with  
293 *HT*).

294  
295 With  $R_e=1.2$ , *HT+CT+IC+QC* was cost-saving compared with *HT* (table 2). *HT+CT+IC+MS+QC*  
296 resulted in 48% fewer life-years lost but was not cost-effective (ICER \$27,590/YLS) compared  
297 with *HT+CT+IC+QC*. *HT+CT+IC* was the least costly strategy in settings where quarantine  
298 centres cannot be implemented, and other strategies were not cost-effective compared with  
299 *HT+CT+IC*.

300  
301 Regarding resource utilization, with  $R_e=1.5$ , *HT* resulted in the highest peak daily use of hospital  
302 beds (table 3). Compared with *HT*, *HT+CT+IC+MS+QC* increased cumulative PCR test usage  
303 by 2.6 times (though with lower peak daily PCR use) and reduced peak daily hospital bed use  
304 by 86% (due to fewer cumulative infections), while requiring 12,380 IC beds and 18,140 QC  
305 beds at peak daily use. Only the *HT+CT+IC+MS*, *HT+CT+IC+QC*, and *HT+CT+IC+MS+QC*  
306 strategies maintained peak daily ICU bed demand below provincial capacity.

307  
308 With  $R_e=1.2$ , compared with *HT*, *HT+CT+IC+MS+QC* increased cumulative PCR test usage by  
309 4.1 times and reduced peak daily hospital bed use by 66%, while requiring 1,860 IC beds and

310 3,480 QC beds at peak daily use. All strategies except *HT* maintained peak daily ICU bed  
311 demand below capacity.

312

313 Over 360 days, for an epidemic with  $R_e=1.5$ , PCR testing contributed 9-27% to overall costs,  
314 depending on the strategy (figure 2). In strategies with QCs, these centres contributed 26-30%  
315 to overall costs. In strategies without QCs, ICU care was the largest contributor to costs, ranging  
316 from 38-71%. Costs exclusive of ICU care were \$125 million (*HT*), \$413 million  
317 (*HT+CT+IC+MS*), and \$461 million (*HT+CT+IC+MS+QC*), reflecting approximately 4%, 13%,  
318 and 15% of the 2019 KwaZulu-Natal Department of Health budget. CT and MS together  
319 contributed  $\leq 10\%$  and ICs contributed 22-31% to overall costs in strategies in which they were  
320 used. For an epidemic with  $R_e=1.2$ , costs exclusive of ICU care were \$71 million (*HT*), \$159  
321 million (*HT+CT+IC+MS*), and \$167 million (*HT+CT+IC+MS+QC*), reflecting 2%, 5%, and 5% of  
322 the 2019 KwaZulu-Natal Department of Health budget.

323

324 In sensitivity analyses, results were similar to the base case (i.e., *HT+CT+IC+MS+QC* remained  
325 cost-effective) when varying costs of CT and MS (table S3) and hospitalisation (table S4);  
326 varying PCR sensitivity and time to result (table S5) and PCR cost (table S6); and varying  
327 availability of hospital and ICU beds (table S7). When PCR sensitivity increased to 90%, both  
328 *HT+CT+IC+MS* (ICER \$440/YLS) and *HT+CT+IC+MS+QC* (ICER \$1,660/YLS) used resources  
329 efficiently.

330

331 Conversely, our projected ICERs changed meaningfully in a model with  $R_e=2.6$  – resource  
332 requirements increased substantially, making *HT+CT+IC+MS+QC* no longer cost-effective  
333 (ICER \$25,040/YLS), and all strategies had ICERs above our cost-effectiveness threshold  
334 compared with *HT* (table S8). The pattern of results with  $R_e=1.1$  was similar to that with  $R_e=1.2$   
335 (table S8). When the efficacies of CT and MS to detect infections were halved from the base

336 case values,  $HT+CT+IC+MS+QC$  was no longer cost-effective (ICER \$5,930/YLS) (table S9).  
337 When the efficacy of ICs/QCs for transmission reduction was decreased from 95% to 75%,  
338  $HT+CT+IC+MS+QC$  was not cost-effective (\$12,490/YLS) (table S10). When the IC/QC costs  
339 decreased,  $HT+CT+IC+MS+QC$  became more favourable in terms of cost-effectiveness, and it  
340 remained cost-effective when IC/QC costs were double those of the base case (table S11).  
341  
342 In a multi-way sensitivity analysis that varied CT/MS efficacy and reduced IC/QC efficacy and  
343 cost to assess lower-cost but potentially lower-efficacy home-based IC and QC programs,  
344  $HT+CT+IC+MS+QC$  or  $HT+CT+IC+QC$  were cost-effective in nearly all scenarios in which  
345 CT/MS efficacy for case detection was double that of the base case efficacy (figure S5). When  
346 CT/MS efficacy for case detection was half that of the base case efficacy, strategies involving  
347 quarantine centres were less likely to be cost-effective. If quarantine centers were not an option,  
348 then  $HT+CT+IC+MS$  was cost-effective in most scenarios (figure S6).  
349

350 **DISCUSSION**

351 Public health strategies combining contact tracing, isolation of those with confirmed COVID-19,  
352 community-based mass symptom screening, and quarantine of household contacts of confirmed  
353 cases will substantially reduce infections, hospitalisations, and deaths while efficiently using  
354 healthcare resources in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. We estimate that a strategy combining all  
355 interventions would cost an additional \$340 per year-of-life saved, which compares favourably  
356 with the cost-effectiveness of many established public health interventions in South Africa,  
357 including tuberculosis diagnostic testing<sup>17</sup> and cervical cancer screening.<sup>18</sup> In scenarios in which  
358 implementation of quarantine centres cannot be accomplished, a strategy of contact tracing,  
359 isolation centres, and mass symptom screening would be cost-effective.

360  
361 Notably, the cost-effectiveness of strategies was sensitive to epidemic growth conditions. We  
362 conducted sensitivity analyses intended to generalize to other settings with resource  
363 constraints, to epidemics at varying degrees of acceleration (including published estimates in  
364 South Africa<sup>11,19</sup>), and with varying intervention costs.<sup>20</sup> With low epidemic growth ( $R_e$  1.1-1.2),  
365 *HT+CT+IC+QC* was the optimal strategy; QCs remained cost-effective but adding MS was not  
366 cost-effective. With high epidemic growth ( $R_e$  2.6), when the epidemic outpaced control  
367 measures and costs increased substantially, no combination of the modelled interventions was  
368 cost-effective compared with *HT* alone.

369  
370 Our model parameters and specifications were selected for their relevance to LMICs. Our  
371 estimates are based on the population structure of KwaZulu-Natal, with a median age of 25  
372 years (compared with 38 years in the USA), and thus are likely to reflect epidemic scenarios in  
373 LMICs with similarly young age structures. We chose intervention scenarios based on prior work  
374 supporting their efficacy for epidemic control, WHO recommendations, and particular relevance  
375 to settings with limitations in formal healthcare infrastructure.<sup>5-7</sup> We did not limit the PCR testing



376 availability – so that the total number of tests needed and associated costs could be estimated –  
377 and peak PCR use reached approximately 10,000-15,000 tests/day in the optimal strategies,  
378 marginally above established capacity in KwaZulu-Natal during the recent surge.<sup>21</sup> We specified  
379 the model to reflect the number of available hospital and ICU beds in KwaZulu-Natal,<sup>14</sup> and  
380 results were similar when we further restricted bed availability to that elsewhere in SSA.<sup>16</sup>  
381 Contact tracing and community-based screening have been frequently used for case-finding in  
382 LMICs.<sup>22</sup> Many SSA countries are thus theoretically poised to implement such interventions  
383 through established networks of community health workers. Finally, isolation centres, which are  
384 likely to require the greatest investment in new infrastructure, have been implemented  
385 successfully in response to Ebola epidemics in West Africa and the Democratic Republic of  
386 Congo, where healthcare resources are among the lowest in the world.<sup>23</sup> South Africa has  
387 rapidly implemented and expanded COVID-19 related services in recent months, but further  
388 scale-up would be required to meet demand in some of our modelled scenarios.<sup>21,24</sup>  
389  
390 Isolation centres in our model are designed as housing facilities for people with confirmed  
391 COVID-19 who do not require hospital-level care but cannot safely isolate at home. We  
392 estimated that their use reduces ongoing transmission after a confirmed diagnosis from 50% (in  
393 the *HT* strategy) to 5%. They are likely to be most effective in areas with high household density  
394 and limited capacity for in-home isolation, as is the case for many urban centres in SSA.  
395 Quarantine centres, which include optional housing for contacts who test negative and cannot  
396 safely distance during the latency period, have also been proposed for interrupting epidemic  
397 spread and were implemented in the early phases of the COVID-19 response in China. They  
398 were effective in our model at reducing the deleterious impact of the epidemic and were cost-  
399 effective in many modelled scenarios.  
400

401 Importantly, there are critical social and human rights considerations to implementation of  
402 isolation and quarantine in many settings, due to trade-offs between public health benefits and  
403 civil liberties.<sup>25</sup> In our model, both interventions are provided optionally for those who cannot do  
404 so safely at home, but we conservatively included costs to reflect needs should they be used.  
405 We also considered the use of home-based isolation and quarantine in a multi-way analysis that  
406 reduced efficacies and costs of both. We found that isolation and quarantine remained cost-  
407 effective in some lower efficacy scenarios, particularly if their costs were also reduced. On  
408 balance, from a public health perspective, our findings support use of quarantine centres in  
409 areas with individual and community support for their use.

410  
411 Our model should be interpreted within the context of several limitations. We did not account for  
412 heterogenous mixing within the population. Instead, we assumed that contact patterns were  
413 random, as commonly done in infectious disease models. We assumed that the age-adjusted  
414 prevalence of non-communicable co-morbidities in South Africa would be similar to that in the  
415 US and that age would be the primary driver of COVID-19 outcomes as demonstrated in  
416 multiple settings.<sup>26–28</sup> In line with most published studies, we conservatively assumed no  
417 modifying effect of HIV on the severity of COVID-19, though additional data are needed from  
418 HIV-endemic countries to support this.<sup>28,29</sup> If the high prevalence of non-communicable diseases  
419 and/or HIV in South Africa does worsen COVID-19 outcomes compared with resource-rich  
420 settings, then the benefit of public health interventions in terms of years-of-life saved and cost-  
421 effectiveness will likely be greater than our estimates. Nonetheless, in extending projections  
422 beyond the 360-day model horizon, we accounted for South Africa-specific mortality rates in our  
423 calculations of life expectancy and years-of-life lost. It will be crucial to consider how resources  
424 and interventions implemented in response to COVID-19 will impact available resources for  
425 other regional healthcare priorities. We did not include lifetime costs of healthcare beyond  
426 COVID-19 or of sequelae among the recovered, and we did not account for impacts of COVID-

427 19 interventions on other economic sectors. As with all modelling exercises, our estimates are  
428 determined by assumptions of input parameters. We selected COVID-19 clinical parameters  
429 based on the published literature, which are largely derived from high-income settings.  
430 Intervention efficacy estimates were hypothesized based on other model parameters, existing  
431 literature where available, or expert opinion if no data were available. Recognizing a lack of  
432 empiric data for some of these estimates, we focused our sensitivity analyses on varying those  
433 for which data was lacking. Finally, costing data were derived from the literature and direct cost  
434 estimates from local suppliers in KwaZulu-Natal and therefore might not reflect costs in other  
435 contexts nor full implementation and scale-up costs. Nonetheless, our primary findings and  
436 policy conclusions were largely consistent across a range of costing estimates.

437  
438 We recommend that policymakers consider contact tracing, isolation of confirmed cases, mass  
439 symptom screening, and quarantine of household contacts of cases to address COVID-19  
440 epidemic control efficiently. Where quarantine centres are not feasible – for example, due to  
441 budget constraints or lack of public support – a strategy that includes the other interventions  
442 would still provide clinical benefit in an economically efficient manner.

443 **AUTHOR ROLES**

444 All authors contributed substantively to this manuscript in the following ways: study and model  
445 design (all authors), data analysis (KPR, FMS, JHAF, GH, KPF, KAF, PK, MJS), interpretation  
446 of results (all authors), drafting the manuscript (KPR, MJS), critical revision of the manuscript  
447 (all authors) and final approval of submitted version (all authors).

448

449 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES**

450 The authors have no conflicts of interest or financial disclosures.

451

452 **DATA SHARING STATEMENT**

453 This modelling study involved the use of published or publicly available data. The data used and  
454 the sources are described in the manuscript and appendix. No primary data were collected for  
455 this study. Model flowcharts are in the appendix.

456

457 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

458 This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health [R37 AI058736, K24 AR057827,  
459 and T32 AI007433] and by a fellowship from the Royal Society and Wellcome Trust  
460 [210479/Z/18/Z].

461

462 The funding sources had no role in the study design, data collection, data analysis, data  
463 interpretation, writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to submit the manuscript for  
464 publication. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily  
465 represent the official views of the funding sources.

466

467 The authors thank Nicole McCann for technical assistance.

468 **REFERENCES**

- 469 1 Xu B, Kraemer MUG, Xu B, *et al.* Open access epidemiological data from the COVID-19  
470 outbreak. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020; **20**: 534.
- 471 2 Johnstone-Robertson SP, Mark D, Morrow C, *et al.* Social mixing patterns within a South  
472 African township community: implications for respiratory disease transmission and control.  
473 *Am J Epidemiol* 2011; **174**: 1246–55.
- 474 3 Siedner MJ, Gostin LO, Cranmer HH, Kraemer JD. Strengthening the detection of and early  
475 response to public health emergencies: lessons from the West African Ebola epidemic. *PLoS*  
476 *Med* 2015; **12**: e1001804.
- 477 4 Gilbert M, Pullano G, Pinotti F, *et al.* Preparedness and vulnerability of African countries  
478 against importations of COVID-19: a modelling study. *Lancet* 2020; **395**: 871–7.
- 479 5 World Health Organization. COVID-19 Strategic Preparedness and Response Plan:  
480 Operational planning guidelines to support country preparedness and response. 2020;  
481 published online Feb 12. [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/covid-19-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/covid-19-sprp-unct-guidelines.pdf?sfvrsn=81ff43d8_4)  
482 [sprp-unct-guidelines.pdf?sfvrsn=81ff43d8\\_4](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/covid-19-sprp-unct-guidelines.pdf?sfvrsn=81ff43d8_4) (accessed June 24, 2020).
- 483 6 Hellewell J, Abbott S, Gimma A, *et al.* Feasibility of controlling COVID-19 outbreaks by  
484 isolation of cases and contacts. *Lancet Glob Health* 2020; **8**: e488–96.
- 485 7 Peak CM, Childs LM, Grad YH, Buckee CO. Comparing nonpharmaceutical interventions for  
486 containing emerging epidemics. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2017; **114**: 4023–8.
- 487 8 Basu S, Wagner RG, Sewpaul R, Reddy P, Davies J. Implications of scaling up  
488 cardiovascular disease treatment in South Africa: a microsimulation and cost-effectiveness  
489 analysis. *Lancet Glob Health* 2019; **7**: e270–80.
- 490 9 Global Burden of Disease Health Financing Collaborator Network. Spending on health and  
491 HIV/AIDS: domestic health spending and development assistance in 188 countries, 1995-  
492 2015. *Lancet* 2018; **391**: 1799–829.

- 493 10Edoka IP, Stacey NK. Estimating a cost-effectiveness threshold for health care decision-  
494 making in South Africa. *Health Policy Plan 2020*; **35**: 546–55.
- 495 11National Institute for Communicable Diseases. The Initial and Daily COVID-19 Effective  
496 Reproductive Number (R) in South Africa. 2020; published online May 27.  
497 [https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/The-Initial-and-Daily-COVID-19-](https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/The-Initial-and-Daily-COVID-19-Effective-Reproductive-Number-R-in-South-Africa-002.pdf)  
498 [Effective-Reproductive-Number-R-in-South-Africa-002.pdf](https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/The-Initial-and-Daily-COVID-19-Effective-Reproductive-Number-R-in-South-Africa-002.pdf) (accessed June 24, 2020).
- 499 12Statistics South Africa. Mid-year population estimates 2019.  
500 <http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0302/P03022019.pdf> (accessed Sept 7, 2020).
- 501 13National Institute for Communicable Diseases. COVID-19 Testing Summary. 2020; published  
502 online May 23. [https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/NICD-COVID-19-Testing-](https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/NICD-COVID-19-Testing-Summary_-Week-21-2020-007.pdf)  
503 [Summary\\_-Week-21-2020-007.pdf](https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/NICD-COVID-19-Testing-Summary_-Week-21-2020-007.pdf) (accessed June 24, 2020).
- 504 14National Department of Health, South Africa. COVID-19 Public Health Response. 2020;  
505 published online April 10. [https://sacoronavirus.co.za/2020/04/11/covid-19-public-health-](https://sacoronavirus.co.za/2020/04/11/covid-19-public-health-response/)  
506 [response/](https://sacoronavirus.co.za/2020/04/11/covid-19-public-health-response/) (accessed June 24, 2020).
- 507 15Province of KwaZulu-Natal, Department of Health. Annual Performance Plan 2019/20-  
508 2021/22. 2019. <http://www.kznhealth.gov.za/app/APP-2019-20.pdf> (accessed June 24,  
509 2020).
- 510 16Craig J, Kalanxhi E, Hauck S. National estimates of critical care capacity in 54 African  
511 countries. *Public and Global Health*, 2020 DOI:10.1101/2020.05.13.20100727.
- 512 17Reddy KP, Gupta-Wright A, Fielding KL, *et al*. Cost-effectiveness of urine-based tuberculosis  
513 screening in hospitalised patients with HIV in Africa: a microsimulation modelling study.  
514 *Lancet Glob Health* 2019; **7**: e200–8.
- 515 18Goldie SJ, Gaffikin L, Goldhaber-Fiebert JD, *et al*. Cost-effectiveness of cervical-cancer  
516 screening in five developing countries. *N Engl J Med* 2005; **353**: 2158–68.

- 517 19Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Disases, London School of Hygiene and  
518 Tropical Medicine. COVID-19 Estimates for South Africa. 2020; published online June 22.  
519 <https://epiforecasts.io/covid/posts/national/south-africa/> (accessed June 24, 2020).
- 520 20Siedner MJ, Harling G, Reynolds Z, *et al.* Social distancing to slow the US COVID-19  
521 epidemic: Longitudinal pretest-posttest comparison group study. *PLoS Med* 2020; **17**:  
522 e1003244.
- 523 21National Institute for Communicable Diseases, South Africa. COVID-19 Testing Summary.  
524 NICD. 2020; published online March 2. [https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-](https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/COVID-19-Testing-Summary-Week-34-2020.pdf)  
525 [content/uploads/2020/08/COVID-19-Testing-Summary-Week-34-2020.pdf](https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/COVID-19-Testing-Summary-Week-34-2020.pdf) (accessed Sept 2,  
526 2020).
- 527 22Shapiro AE, Variava E, Rakgokong MH, *et al.* Community-based targeted case finding for  
528 tuberculosis and HIV in household contacts of patients with tuberculosis in South Africa. *Am*  
529 *J Respir Crit Care Med* 2012; **185**: 1110–6.
- 530 23Legrand J, Grais RF, Boelle PY, Valleron AJ, Flahault A. Understanding the dynamics of  
531 Ebola epidemics. *Epidemiol Infect* 2007; **135**: 610–21.
- 532 24Abdool Karim SS. The South African response to the pandemic. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **382**:  
533 e95.
- 534 25Blendon RJ, Koonin LM, Benson JM, *et al.* Public response to community mitigation  
535 measures for pandemic influenza. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2008; **14**: 778–86.
- 536 26Lewnard JA, Liu VX, Jackson ML, *et al.* Incidence, clinical outcomes, and transmission  
537 dynamics of severe coronavirus disease 2019 in California and Washington: prospective  
538 cohort study. *BMJ* 2020; **369**: m1923.
- 539 27Docherty AB, Harrison EM, Green CA, *et al.* Features of 20 133 UK patients in hospital with  
540 covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol: prospective  
541 observational cohort study. *BMJ* 2020; **369**: m1985.



- 542 28Boulle A, Davies M-A, Hussey H, *et al.* Risk factors for COVID-19 death in a population  
543 cohort study from the Western Cape Province, South Africa. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020; published  
544 online Aug 29. DOI:10.1093/cid/ciaa1198.
- 545 29del Rio C. COVID-19 in Persons Living with HIV — What Do We Know Today? *NEJM J*  
546 *Watch* 2020; **2020**. DOI:10.1056/nejm-jw.NA52137.
- 547 30Yang Y, Yang M, Shen C, *et al.* Evaluating the accuracy of different respiratory specimens in  
548 the laboratory diagnosis and monitoring the viral shedding of 2019-nCoV infections.  
549 *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*, 2020 DOI:10.1101/2020.02.11.20021493.
- 550 31Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, *et al.* Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in different types of clinical  
551 specimens. *JAMA* 2020; **323**: 1843–4.
- 552 32Netcare Hospitals. Netcare Tariffs. 2016. <https://www.netcarehospitals.co.za/> (accessed June  
553 10, 2020).
- 554 33Mahomed S, Mahomed OH. Cost of intensive care services at a central hospital in South  
555 Africa. *S Afr Med J* 2018; **109**: 35.
- 556

557 **TABLES**

558

559

**Table 1. Input parameters for a model-based analysis of COVID-19 intervention strategies in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.**

Parameter	Base Case Value (Range)	Source
<b>Cohort Characteristics</b>		
Age distribution, %		12
0-19y	40.26	
20-59y	51.48	
≥60y	8.26	
<b>Natural History</b>		
Proportion in each health state at model start, %		Asm.
Susceptible	99.900	
Infected		
Pre-infectious latency	0.030	
Asymptomatic	0.030	
Mild/moderate disease	0.030	
Severe disease	0.005	
Critical disease	0.005	
Recuperation after critical disease	0.000	
Recovered	0.000	
<b>Transmission</b>		
Probability of onward transmission, daily, stratified by health state*		See Appendix
Asymptomatic	0.1556	
Mild/moderate disease	0.1266	
Severe disease	0.0088	
Critical disease	0.0070	
Recuperation after critical disease	0.0088	
Effective reproductive number ( $R_e$ , range)	1.5 (1.1-2.6)	11

560

561

562

563

564

565 **Table 1, continued.**

<b>PCR Testing</b>		
Sensitivity <sup>†</sup> , nasopharyngeal specimen, % (range)	70 (50-90)	30,31
Specificity, nasopharyngeal specimen, %	100	Asm.
Cost, 2019 US\$ (range)	26 (13-52)	AHRI
Time to result return and action, days (range)	5 (1-7)	AHRI
<b>Resource Utilization</b>		
Resources available per 11,000,000 people, n		
Hospital beds	26,220	14
ICU beds	748	14
Isolation centre beds	As needed, no capacity limitation	Asm.
Quarantine centre beds	As needed, no capacity limitation	Asm.
Cost, per person, 2019 US\$ (range)		
Hospital bed, daily	165 (83-330)	32
ICU bed, daily	2,059 (1,030-4,118)	33
Contact tracing/mass symptom screen, per instance	3 (2-6)	AHRI
Isolation centre bed, daily	44 (22-88)	AHRI
Quarantine centre bed, daily	37 (19-74)	AHRI

566  
 567 COVID-19: coronavirus disease 2019. y: years. Asm.: assumption. PCR: polymerase chain reaction. US\$: United States dollars. ICU:  
 568 intensive care unit. AHRI: Africa Health Research Institute (KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa; personal communication).

569  
 570 Values indicated are those applied in the base case analyses or, in parentheses, the ranges evaluated in sensitivity analysis.

571 \*These values reflect transmission probabilities in a scenario in which  $R_e$  is 1.5.

572 <sup>†</sup>Test sensitivity does not vary by disease stage, except that it is 0% in the pre-infectious latency phase.

**Table 2. Model-projected life-years lost, healthcare costs, and cost-effectiveness of COVID-19 intervention strategies in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.**

Effective reproduction number ( $R_e$ )	Strategy	Total life-years lost,* n	Healthcare costs over 360 days, US\$ <sup>†</sup>	ICER, US\$/YLS <sup>‡</sup>
1.5	<i>HT</i>	450,940	437,000,000	--
	<i>HT+CT+IC+MS+QC</i>	27,220	581,000,000	340
	<i>HT+CT</i>	322,970	588,000,000	DOMINATED
	<i>HT+CT+IC+MS</i>	60,930	668,000,000	DOMINATED
	<i>HT+CT+IC</i>	128,890	780,000,000	DOMINATED
	<i>HT+CT+IC+QC</i>	60,190	965,000,000	DOMINATED
1.2	<i>HT+CT+IC+QC</i>	3,890	139,000,000	--
	<i>HT+CT+IC</i>	6,850	141,000,000	DOMINATED
	<i>HT+CT+IC+MS</i>	4,260	183,000,000	DOMINATED
	<i>HT+CT+IC+MS+QC</i>	2,040	190,000,000	27,590
	<i>HT+CT</i>	32,040	276,000,000	DOMINATED
	<i>HT</i>	97,600	393,000,000	DOMINATED

COVID-19: coronavirus disease 2019. ICU: intensive care unit. US\$: United States dollars. ICER: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio. YLS: year-of-life saved. HT: healthcare testing. CT: contact tracing within households. IC: isolation centre. MS: mass symptom screen. QC: quarantine centre. DOMINATED: strong dominance, resulting in more life-years lost and higher costs than an alternative strategy.

Strategies are listed in order of ascending costs, per convention of cost-effectiveness analysis. The cost-effective strategy is highlighted in light grey in each  $R_e$  scenario. The displayed life-years and costs are rounded, but the ICER was calculated with non-rounded life-years and costs.

\*We assumed that each death results in 16.8 life-years lost, on average, based on our derivation (appendix).

<sup>†</sup>This reflects costs to the healthcare sector.

---

\*The ICER is the difference between two strategies in costs divided by the difference in undiscounted life-years (16.8 YLS per averted COVID-19 death, see appendix p.5-6). We considered a strategy cost-effective if its ICER was less than US\$3,250/YLS.<sup>10</sup> When we used life-years discounted 3%/year (12.5 discounted YLS per averted COVID-19 death), cost-effectiveness interpretations were unchanged: in the  $R_e=1.5$  scenario,  $HT+CT+IC+MS+QC$  remained cost-effective with ICER \$460/YLS compared with  $HT$ ; in the  $R_e=1.2$  scenario,  $HT+CT+IC+MS+QC$  had ICER \$37,210/YLS compared with  $HT+CT+IC+QC$ .

574 **Table 3. Model-projected resource utilization of COVID-19 intervention strategies in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.**

Effective reproduction number ( $R_e$ )	Strategy	Cumulative PCR tests performed over 360 days, n	Peak daily resource use, n				
			PCR tests	Hospital beds (non-ICU)	ICU beds*	Isolation centre beds	Quarantine centre beds
1.5	<i>HT</i>	1,527,450	14,820	4,690	748	--	--
	<i>HT+CT+IC+MS+QC</i>	3,904,230	12,900	640	341	12,380	18,140
	<i>HT+CT</i>	5,951,180	31,050	3,440	748	--	--
	<i>HT+CT+IC+MS</i>	4,639,280	16,930	1,320	715	21,260	--
	<i>HT+CT+IC</i>	4,904,010	19,340	1,930	748	30,510	--
	<i>HT+CT+IC+QC</i>	4,478,770	16,710	1,380	737	26,710	39,470
1.2	<i>HT+CT+IC+QC</i>	2,963,280	9,870	590	363	1,840	3,110
	<i>HT+CT+IC</i>	3,025,260	9,870	590	363	1,620	--
	<i>HT+CT+IC+MS</i>	3,159,950	10,520	570	396	1,510	--
	<i>HT+CT+IC+MS+QC</i>	3,120,800	10,520	570	396	1,860	3,480
	<i>HT+CT</i>	3,647,570	12,450	770	506	--	--
	<i>HT</i>	766,140	4,440	1,680	748	--	--

COVID-19: coronavirus disease 2019. PCR: polymerase chain reaction. ICU: intensive care unit. HT: healthcare testing. CT: contact tracing within households. IC: isolation centre. MS: mass symptom screen. QC: quarantine centre.

Strategies are listed in order of ascending costs as indicated in table 2, per convention of cost-effectiveness analysis. The cost-effective strategy is highlighted in light grey in each  $R_e$  scenario.

\*The total number of available ICU beds was 748.

575 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

576

577 **Figure 1. Cost-effectiveness efficiency frontier: COVID-19 intervention strategies in**

578 **KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.**

579

580 COVID-19: coronavirus disease 2019. HT: healthcare testing. CT: contact tracing within

581 households. IC: isolation centre. MS: mass symptom screen. QC: quarantine centre.

582

583 Model results are shown for an effective reproduction number of 1.5. Strategies that are below the

584 line are dominated – i.e., an inefficient use of resources compared with other strategies. For non-

585 dominated strategies, ICERs are shown below the strategy label.

586

587

588 **Figure 2. Budget impact analysis: contributors to healthcare costs of COVID-19**

589 **intervention strategies in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.**

590

591 SARS-CoV-2: severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2. COVID-19: coronavirus disease

592 2019.  $R_e$ : effective reproduction number. HT: healthcare testing. CT: contact tracing within

593 households. IC: isolation centre. MS: mass symptom screen. QC: quarantine centre.

594

595 Panel A shows results for an epidemic with  $R_e=1.5$ , and Panel B shows results for an epidemic


596 with  $R_e=1.2$ . The figures show the total and component COVID-19-related healthcare costs, from

597 a health sector perspective, associated with different intervention strategies when applied to the

598 entire KwaZulu-Natal population of 11 million people. The costs are derived from model-generated


599 results. Percentages in parentheses represent the proportion of the 2019 KwaZulu-Natal

600 Department of Health budget.





(A)  $R_e=1.5$



(B)  $R_e=1.2$

