

1 **Determining population-level allocation strategies for COVID-19 treatments in the United
2 States using a quantitative framework, a case study using nirmatrelvir/ritonavir**

3
4 Alexandra Savinkina^{1,2}, Gregg Gonsalves^{1,2}, Joseph S. Ross^{3,4,5}, A. David Paltiel^{2,3}

- 5
6 1. Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, Yale School of Public Health, New
7 Haven, CT
8 2. Public Health Modeling Unit, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT
9 3. Department of Health Policy and Management, Yale School of Public Health, New
10 Haven, CT
11 4. Section of General Internal Medicine and the National Clinician Scholars Program, Yale
12 School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut.
13 5. Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluation, Yale New Haven Hospital, New Haven,
14 Connecticut.

15

16

17

18

19 **Corresponding Author:**

20 Alexandra Savinkina

21 Alexandra.savinkina@yale.edu

22

23 **Alternative Corresponding Author:**

24 David Paltiel

25 David.Paltiel@yale.edu

26

27

28 **Abstract Word Count:** 234/250

29 **Word Count:** 2434/3000

30 **Tables:** 3

31 **Figures:** 3

32 **References:** 38/40

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40 **Abstract**

41

42 **Background:** New COVID-19 medications force decision makers to weigh limited evidence of
43 efficacy and cost in determining which patient populations to target for treatment. A case in
44 point is nirmatrelvir/ritonavir, a drug that has been recommended for elderly, high-risk
45 individuals, regardless of vaccination status, even though clinical trials have only evaluated it in
46 unvaccinated patients. A simple optimization framework might inform a more reasoned
47 approach to the tradeoffs implicit in the treatment allocation decision.

48

49 **Methods:** We used a mathematical model to analyze the cost-effectiveness of four
50 nirmatrelvir/ritonavir allocation strategies, stratified by vaccination status and risk for severe
51 disease. We considered treatment effectiveness at preventing hospitalization ranging from 21%
52 to 89%. Sensitivity analyses were performed on major parameters of interest. A web-based tool
53 was developed to permit decision-makers to tailor the analysis to their settings and priorities.

54

55 **Results:** Providing nirmatrelvir/ritonavir to unvaccinated patients at high-risk for severe disease
56 was cost-saving when effectiveness against hospitalization exceeded 33% and cost-effective
57 under all other data scenarios we considered. The cost-effectiveness of other allocation
58 strategies, including those for vaccinated adults and those at lower-risk for severe disease,
59 depended on willingness-to-pay thresholds, treatment cost and effectiveness, and the
60 likelihood of severe disease.

61

62 **Conclusions:** Priority for nirmatrelvir/ritonavir treatment should be given to unvaccinated
63 persons at high-risk of severe disease from COVID-19. Further priority may be assigned by
64 weighing treatment effectiveness, disease severity, drug cost, and willingness to pay for deaths
65 averted.

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84 **Introduction**

85
86 More than two years into the COVID-19 pandemic, the U.S. is still experiencing hundreds of
87 COVID-19 deaths a day [1]. In January 2022, COVID-19 was among the top four leading causes
88 of death in the US for every age group, and was the top cause of death for those over age 45
89 [2]. Fortunately, vaccines and other medical treatments have reduced the severity of COVID-19
90 infection in both hospitalized and non-hospitalized patients. Through March 21, 2022, vaccines
91 alone have averted an estimated 2.3 million deaths in the U.S., saving the country nearly \$900
92 billion [3].

93
94 Alongside vaccination, several effective treatments for COVID-19 have been developed. One of
95 the more promising is Pfizer's 5-day oral antiviral treatment regimen of nirmatrelvir/ritonavir
96 (brand name Paxlovid), granted emergency use authorization by the U.S. Food and Drug
97 Association (FDA) in December 2021. In clinical trials, nirmatrelvir/ritonavir showed an 89%
98 reduction in hospitalizations and no deaths in high-risk unvaccinated COVID-19 positive patients
99 [4]. Such a reduction in disease severity could ease strain on scarce hospital and critical care
100 resources. Other treatments have shown more modest effects in this setting and more
101 treatments continue to be developed [5].

102
103 Given both the speed with which new therapeutic agents are being developed and the
104 continuing urgency of the COVID-19 pandemic, decision makers will inevitably and repeatedly
105 be asked to make approval and coverage decisions, long before the clinical and economic
106 impacts of these treatment options are fully understood. On the basis of its current price and
107 observed efficacy, the FDA has given emergency use authorization to nirmatrelvir/ritonavir for
108 treatment of the elderly and other high-risk adults, regardless of vaccination status [6]. Some
109 observers have questioned the breadth of this decision, noting that other studies have failed to
110 replicate the effectiveness observed in the initial trial [7-10] and that nirmatrelvir/ritonavir's
111 efficacy remains unproven in vaccinated patients [11, 12], in addition to the risks posed by
112 serious drug interaction and toxicity [13] and the uncertainty of rebound infections and
113 symptoms [14, 15]. Still others have wondered whether the substantial reduction in risks of
114 hospitalization and death in patients receiving nirmatrelvir/ritonavir might justify expanding the
115 indications for treatment far beyond the highest-risk patient population [16].

116
117 We sought to provide practical guidance to clinicians, policy-makers, and payers regarding the
118 clinical, epidemiological, and economic circumstances under which a new medication of
119 uncertain efficacy might serve as a cost-effective and appropriate use of COVID-19 treatment
120 resources across a range of different target populations. The significance of our analysis lies less
121 in the particular application to nirmatrelvir/ritonavir and more in the elaboration of a
122 generalized evaluation framework and the establishment of performance benchmarks for
123 future COVID-19 treatment options, many of which are likely to display therapeutic properties
124 against SARS-CoV-2 infection.

125

126

127

128 **Methods**

129

130 *Model structure*

131

132 We used a decision tree model to analyze the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of different
133 allocation strategies of nirmatrelvir/ritonavir in the United States (Figure 1). The target
134 population of the model includes those who are newly COVID-19 positive (COVID-19+) within
135 the timeframe eligible for nirmatrelvir/ritonavir prescription (within 5 days of positive test or
136 onset of symptoms) [4]. Individuals are assigned a probability of being at high-risk vs low-risk
137 for severe COVID-19, a probability of being vaccinated for COVID-19, a probability of
138 hospitalization dependent on risk and vaccination status, and a probability of death if
139 hospitalized.

140

141 *Strategies*

142

143 In addition to the baseline policy of treating nobody with nirmatrelvir/ritonavir, we considered
144 4 increasingly expansive eligibility policies for persons with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection:
145 1) Unvaccinated patients at high-risk for severe COVID-19;
146 2) All patients at high-risk for severe COVID-19, regardless of vaccination status;
147 3) All unvaccinated patients and vaccinated patients at high-risk for severe COVID-19; and
148 4) All patients

149

150 *Model parameter values*

151

152 “High-risk” for severe COVID-19 was determined according to inclusion criteria for Pfizer’s
153 nirmatrelvir/ritonavir trial [4], which included everyone over 60 years of age or with at least
154 one risk factor for severe COVID-19 [6]. Vaccination rates came from US data on vaccination
155 rates nationwide [1]. Only primary series vaccinations were considered for both vaccination
156 rates and vaccination effect. We present analyses using a range of nirmatrelvir/ritonavir
157 treatment effect modifiers on hospitalization: 89% from Pfizer’s nirmatrelvir/ritonavir trial [4],
158 and 21%-67% from more recent literature [7-10].

159

160 The only costs considered in this model were the cost of a course of nirmatrelvir/ritonavir in the
161 US [17], and the cost of a COVID-19 hospitalization in the United States, which was estimated
162 using published literature [18, 19]. We did not consider other costs as they were not expected
163 to differ between scenarios, and therefore were not expected to alter our results or
164 conclusions.

165

166 All model parameter values and ranges used in sensitivity analysis can be found in Table 1.

167

168 *Economic performance measures*

169

170 We modeled cost-effectiveness from a healthcare sector perspective, considering the cost of a
171 hospitalization for COVID-19 in the US as well as the cost of nirmatrelvir/ritonavir itself.

172 Effectiveness measures considered were decreases in risks of hospitalization and death.
173 Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICERs) were measured in dollars per hospitalization
174 averted and per death averted [20].
175
176 Net monetary benefit [21] of each strategy was also considered under a variety of willingness-
177 to-pay thresholds, ranging from \$10,000 per death averted to \$5 million per death averted. Net
178 monetary benefit was calculated by multiplying the incremental benefit of each strategy as
179 compared to no nirmatrelvir/ritonavir by the willingness to pay per death averted, and then
180 subtracting out the cost of the strategy.

181
182 We considered value of a statistical life (VSL) estimates as a way to think about willingness to
183 pay thresholds per death averted [23].
184
185

186 *Sensitivity analyses*

187
188 We conducted several one-way sensitivity analyses, varying key parameters to their highest or
189 lowest range, as reported in Table 1. Parameters analyzed included average cost of US COVID-
190 19 hospitalization, nirmatrelvir/ritonavir effectiveness in vaccinated individuals and low-risk
191 individuals, and risk of hospitalization from COVID-19.
192

193 In addition, we conducted a two-way sensitivity analysis, identifying the preferred allocation as
194 a function of both nirmatrelvir/ritonavir treatment effectiveness (0 to 100% effectiveness at
195 preventing hospitalization) and cost of nirmatrelvir/ritonavir treatment course (0 to \$2,000,
196 allowing for the need for a potential second course as well as variation in treatment price).
197

198 We also developed a [publicly available tool](#) which can be used to vary any model parameter
199 and determine the best allocation strategy when assessed using the net monetary benefit
200 approach. This tool can be used to reproduce all analyses reported here. It can also be used to
201 evaluate alternative treatment strategies with differing effectiveness measures, as well as
202 treatment strategies in different populations, in a range of alternative clinical and economical
203 circumstances.
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215

216 **Results**

217

218 All results are reported on a per-eligible-person basis. In the status quo scenario with no
219 treatment (Strategy 0), average population risk of hospitalization was 0.0268, risk of death was
220 0.00187, and cost was \$536 (Supplemental Table 1A, Supplemental Table 2A).

221

222 Offering nirmatrelvir/ritonavir to high-risk unvaccinated COVID+ patients (Strategy 1) was cost-
223 saving when nirmatrelvir/ritonavir effectiveness against hospitalization was assumed to exceed
224 33% (Table 2, Table 3). At 33% effectiveness against hospitalization, the cost per hospitalization
225 averted was \$5,000 and the cost per death averted was \$70,900. When nirmatrelvir/ritonavir
226 effectiveness against hospitalization was assumed to be 21%, the ICER for hospitalization
227 averted was \$19,500 and for death averted was \$279,000.

228

229 Offering nirmatrelvir/ritonavir to high-risk COVID+ patients regardless of vaccination (Strategy
230 2) led to costs per hospitalization averted ranging from \$700 to \$69,300 and costs per death
231 averted ranging from \$9,500 to \$989,800 for effectiveness assumptions ranging from 89% to
232 21%.

233

234 Using the same range of effectiveness assumptions (89% to 21%), we found that offering
235 nirmatrelvir/ritonavir to all high-risk patients and to unvaccinated low-risk patients (Strategy 3)
236 would have costs per hospitalization averted ranging from \$26,700 to \$179,800 and costs per
237 deaths averted of \$381,900 to \$2,568,200. Treating all patients (Strategy 4) yielded costs per
238 hospitalization averted ranging from \$88,600 to \$441,900 and costs per deaths averted of
239 \$1,265,600 \$6,313,500.

240

241 Some studies have shown significantly reduced effectiveness of nirmatrelvir/ritonavir in low-
242 risk patients [10]. When we reduced the effectiveness of nirmatrelvir/ritonavir against
243 hospitalization in these patients to one third of that seen in high-risk patients, costs per
244 hospitalization averted increased threefold to fivefold for Strategies 3 and 4 (Supplemental
245 Table 3).

246

247 Clinical trials of nirmatrelvir/ritonavir effectiveness have yet to be conducted in vaccinated
248 patients. When we assumed a 50% reduction in nirmatrelvir/ritonavir effectiveness in
249 vaccinated patients, costs per hospitalization doubled in Strategy 2 and more than tripled in
250 Strategy 4 (Supplemental Table 4).

251

252 When we lowered our assumption of the average US cost of a COVID-19 hospitalization from
253 \$20,000 to \$10,000, the cost per death averted increased in every strategy, though providing
254 nirmatrelvir/ritonavir to high-risk vaccinated people remained cost-saving when the assumed
255 nirmatrelvir/ritonavir effectiveness against hospitalization was 89% (Supplemental Table 5).
256 While dropping the cost of hospitalization lowered the cost of a COVID-19 infection in every
257 scenario, it also raised the percentage of that cost attributable to nirmatrelvir/ritonavir
258 treatment.

259

260 To explore treatment cost-effectiveness under a potentially more severe viral variant, we
261 doubled the risk of hospitalization. Costs per hospitalization averted were roughly halved in
262 every strategy (Supplemental Table 6). Providing nirmatrelvir/ritonavir to both high-risk
263 unvaccinated and high-risk vaccinated people became cost-saving with a high
264 nirmatrelvir/ritonavir effectiveness against hospitalization.

265

266 Figures 2 and 3 report the optimal allocation strategy, under different willingness to pay
267 thresholds, as both nirmatrelvir/ritonavir cost and effectiveness were varied across their
268 plausible ranges.

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304 **Discussion**

305

306 Several conclusions emerge from both the paradigmatic examples presented in the sections
307 above and the countless alternative data scenarios that can be examined using the publicly
308 available companion tool. First, unvaccinated persons at high-risk of severe COVID-19 should
309 always have priority access to treatment, a strategy that was cost-saving across virtually every
310 scenario we examined. Second, one size does not fit all in the subsequent assignment of
311 priority: no single, “optimal” allocation plan captures the breadth of epidemiologic and drug
312 performance circumstances. The curves presented in the Results section are malleable and
313 dependent on the interplay of drug effectiveness, the comparative costs of both medications
314 and hospitalization, the variant-specific risk of severe disease, and the societal willingness to
315 pay to avert hospitalizations and deaths. Decision makers can and should tailor their allocation
316 strategies to their particular settings. The web-based companion app is available to support
317 such an exercise.

318

319 It is difficult to determine the societal willingness-to-pay to avert hospitalization and death.
320 One frequently used measure is the Value of a Statistical Life (VSL). In the US, VSL estimates
321 center around \$10 million dollars per life (with low and high values between \$5 million and \$16
322 million) [23]. Since decision-makers may not feel comfortable with such a high willingness-to-
323 pay threshold, we have offered a range of values here and a [webtool](#) that supports further
324 exploration of alternative scenarios.

325

326 Our analysis aims to establish *a priori* standards for priority setting in anticipation of future
327 developments in COVID-19 treatment. We use nirmatrelvir/ritonavir as an illustrative example
328 but, in the spirit of exploration, we allowed its effectiveness to range widely, from the clinical
329 trial estimate of 89% to a low of 21%. This reflects evidence that individual risk-level,
330 vaccination status, and time of treatment initiation will likely influence treatment effectiveness
331 [24]. It also acknowledges real-world studies suggesting reduced effectiveness with the newer
332 Omicron variant [4, 7-10] and potentially reduced effectiveness in low-risk individuals [10]. In
333 addition, there is evidence of people re-testing positive after their course of
334 nirmatrelvir/ritonavir was completed, accompanied by a resurgence of symptoms, something
335 that had not been seen in trials [14]. Finally, barriers to access (e.g., mandatory PCR testing and
336 a physician visit to receive a prescription) will delay or impede treatment—particularly among
337 poor and socially disadvantaged patients of color who are more likely to be at higher-risk for
338 severe disease—further reducing effectiveness and exacerbating the inequities of COVID-19
339 care [25]. For all these reasons, our cost-effectiveness estimates should be interpreted as a
340 best-case scenario for nirmatrelvir/ritonavir.

341

342 COVID-19 remains a global pandemic and treatments are needed worldwide. In the US,
343 where a COVID-19 hospitalization can cost \$11,000 to over \$98,000, depending on its
344 complexity [18, 19, 26], it is comparatively easy to establish the cost-effectiveness of a \$500
345 course of treatment with nirmatrelvir/ritonavir. In low-income countries, hospitalization costs
346 of \$35 for a severe case and \$310 for a critical case [27] make it much more difficult to justify
347 the \$500 cost of nirmatrelvir/ritonavir. Drug pricing for nirmatrelvir/ritonavir must be both

348 context-specific and structured not to impede access to treatment. In a welcome development,
349 Pfizer has pledged to offer nirmatrelvir/ritonavir (along with 22 additional medications) at non-
350 profit prices for low-income countries [28]. Through work with the Clinton Health Access
351 Initiative, a generic formulation of nirmatrelvir/ritonavir will be offered to low-income countries
352 for \$25 a course [29], though this leaves out middle income countries with high burden of
353 COVID-19.

354

355 Our analysis has limitations. It does not consider drug supply or budgetary constraints,
356 both of which might play a significant role in determining treatment allocation for decision-
357 makers. We assume perfect adherence of those treated with the drug, which is likely unrealistic
358 in a real-world scenario. However, without data to inform whether certain groups (vaccinated
359 vs unvaccinated, high risk vs low risk) had different levels of adherence, we chose to keep this
360 assumption with the understanding that it might bias our results towards groups with lower
361 real-world adherence. In addition, we do not consider those who are contraindicated from
362 taking nirmatrelvir/ritonavir due to other medications in this analysis. We ignore potential side-
363 effects of treatment and drug-drug interactions, both of which may arise in clinical practice. We
364 also ignore the possibility that patients may be ineligible for nirmatrelvir/ritonavir due to other
365 medications, which might preclude a large percentage of the highest-risk population and
366 prevent a large percentage of the benefit seen in this analysis. Our model does not consider
367 disease transmission, nor does it account for any costs other than hospitalization and
368 nirmatrelvir/ritonavir treatment. Specifically, we do not consider the costs of either PCR testing
369 to confirm a diagnosis of COVID (required for treatment in the U.S.) or a physician's office visit
370 to be evaluated and receive a prescription.

371

372 In conclusion, our adaptable quantitative framework demonstrates that for almost
373 every scenario evaluating appropriate treatment allocation, prescribing nirmatrelvir/ritonavir to
374 unvaccinated patients at high-risk of severe COVID-19 was cost-saving, meaning this group
375 should almost always be treated if treatment is available. In other strategies, the most cost-
376 effective allocation of nirmatrelvir/ritonavir can be determined via a formal weighing of a
377 variety of factors, including treatment effectiveness, both overall and within allocation groups,
378 and the drug's cost. Such a framework can help decision-makers choose the most appropriate
379 allocation strategy given changing information and disease dynamics.

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392 **References**

- 393
- 394 1. Hannah Ritchie EM, Lucas Rodés-Guirao, Cameron Appel, Charlie Giattino, Esteban
395 Ortiz-Ospina, Joe Hasell, Bobbie Macdonald, Diana Beltekian and Max Roser.
396 Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19). Published online at OurWorldInData.org, **2020**.
- 397 2. Jared Ortaliza KA, Cynthia Cox. COVID-19 leading cause of death ranking. Peterson-KFF
398 Health System Tracker, **2022**.
- 399 3. Eric C. Schneider AS, Pratha Sah, Thomas Vilches, Abhishek Pandey, Seyed M.
400 Moghadas, Alison Galvani. Impact of U.S. COVID-19 Vaccination Efforts: An Update on
401 Averted Deaths, Hospitalizations, and Health Care Costs Through March 2022. To the
402 Point (blog). Commonwealth Fund, **2022**.
- 403 4. Hammond J, Leister-Tebbe H, Gardner A, et al. Oral Nirmatrelvir for High-Risk,
404 Nonhospitalized Adults with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* **2022**; 386(15): 1397-408.
- 405 5. Carl Zimmer KJW, Jonathan Corum, Matthew Kristoffersen. Coronavirus Drug and
406 Treatment Tracker. *The New York Times*. **2022** 5/12/22.
- 407 6. PAXLOVID Fact Sheet for Healthcare Providers. Pfizer Inc, **2021**.
- 408 7. Mefsin Y, Chen D, Bond HS, et al. Epidemiology of infections with SARS-CoV-2 Omicron
409 BA.2 variant in Hong Kong, January–March 2022. *medRxiv* **2022**: 2022.04.07.22273595.
- 410 8. Yip CFaL, Grace C.Y. and Man Lai, Mandy Sze and Wong, Vincent Wai-Sun and Tse, Yee-
411 Kit and Ma, Bosco Hon-Ming and Hui, Elsie and Leung, Maria KW and Chan, Henry Lik-
412 Yuen and Hui, David S. C. and Hui, David Shu-Cheong. Impact of the Use of Oral Antiviral
413 Agents on the Risk of Hospitalisation in Community COVID-19 Patients. PrePrint
414 Available at SSRN **2022**.
- 415 9. Dryden-Peterson S, Kim A, Kim AY, et al. Nirmatrelvir plus ritonavir for early COVID-19
416 and hospitalization in a large US health system. *medRxiv* **2022**: 2022.06.14.22276393.
- 417 10. Ronen Arbel YWS, Moshe Hoshen et al. . Oral Nirmatrelvir and Severe Covid-19
418 Outcomes During the Omicron Surge. PREPRINT (Version 1) available at Research Square
419 **2022**.
- 420 11. Jarvis L. The U.S. Is Doing Too Little to Monitor Paxlovid Use. Bloomberg, **2022**.
- 421 12. Fenyves P. Does Paxlovid help people who have been vaccinated against Covid-19?
422 Show us the data! STAT, **2022**.
- 423 13. Ryan B. Pfizer antiviral pills may be risky with other medications. NBC News, **2021**.
- 424 14. Rubin R. From Positive to Negative to Positive Again-The Mystery of Why COVID-19
425 Rebounds in Some Patients Who Take Paxlovid. *Jama* **2022**.
- 426 15. Beasley D. U.S. doctors reconsider Pfizer's Paxlovid for lower-risk COVID patients.
427 Reuters, **2022**.
- 428 16. Sax PE. Should We Prescribe Nirmatrelvir/r (Paxlovid) to Low-Risk COVID-19 Patients?
429 HIV and ID Observations Vol. 2022. NEJM Journal Watch, **2022**.
- 430 17. Mishra M. U.S. to buy 10 mln courses of Pfizer's COVID-19 pill for \$5.3 bln. Reuters,
431 **2021**.
- 432 18. Tsai Y, Vogt TM, Zhou F. Patient Characteristics and Costs Associated With COVID-19-
433 Related Medical Care Among Medicare Fee-for-Service Beneficiaries. *Ann Intern Med*
434 **2021**; 174(8): 1101-9.

- 435 19. Ohsfeldt RL, Choong CK, Mc Collam PL, Abedtash H, Kelton KA, Burge R. Inpatient
436 Hospital Costs for COVID-19 Patients in the United States. *Adv Ther* **2021**; 38(11): 5557-
437 95.
- 438 20. Sanders GD, Neumann PJ, Basu A, et al. Recommendations for Conduct, Methodological
439 Practices, and Reporting of Cost-effectiveness Analyses: Second Panel on Cost-
440 Effectiveness in Health and Medicine. *Jama* **2016**; 316(10): 1093-103.
- 441 21. Stinnett AA, Mullahy J. Net health benefits: a new framework for the analysis of
442 uncertainty in cost-effectiveness analysis. *Med Decis Making* **1998**; 18(2 Suppl): S68-80.
- 443 22. Landefeld JS, Seskin EP. The economic value of life: linking theory to practice. *Am J*
444 *Public Health* **1982**; 72(6): 555-66.
- 445 23. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation USDoHaHS. Guidelines for
446 regulatory impact analysis. 2016. . **2016**.
- 447 24. Wong CKH, Au ICH, Lau KTK, Lau EHY, Cowling BJ, Leung GM. Real-world effectiveness of
448 molnupiravir and nirmatrelvir/ritonavir among COVID-19 inpatients during Hong Kong's
449 Omicron BA.2 wave: an observational study. *medRxiv* **2022**; 2022.05.19.22275291.
- 450 25. Vasan A, Foote M, Long T. Ensuring Widespread and Equitable Access to Treatments for
451 COVID-19. *JAMA* **2022**.
- 452 26. FairHealth. National Average Charge for a Complex Hospital Stay for COVID-19 Is
453 \$317,810, FAIR Health Finds. **2021**.
- 454 27. Torres-Rueda S, Sweeney S, Bozzani F, et al. Stark choices: exploring health sector costs
455 of policy responses to COVID-19 in low-income and middle-income countries. *BMJ Glob*
456 *Health* **2021**; 6(12).
- 457 28. Mullin R. Pfizer, ViiV launch drug programs for low-income countries. *Chemical and*
458 *Engineering News*, **2022**.
- 459 29. CHAI. Press release: CHAI announces agreements with leading generic manufacturers to
460 make affordable COVID-19 treatment available in low- and middle-income countries.
461 Clinton Health Access Initiative, **2022**.
- 462 30. Bureau USC. National Demographic Analysis Tables: 2020, **2022**.
- 463 31. Koma WN, Tracy; Claxton, Gary; Rae, Matthew; Kates, Jennifer; Michaud, Josh. How
464 Many Adults Are at Risk of Serious Illness If Infected with Coronavirus? Updated Data:
465 Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, **2020** 4/23/2020.
- 466 32. Adams ML, Katz DL, Grandpre J. Population-Based Estimates of Chronic Conditions
467 Affecting Risk for Complications from Coronavirus Disease, United States. *Emerg Infect*
468 *Dis* **2020**; 26(8): 1831-3.
- 469 33. Ajufo E, Rao S, Navar AM, Pandey A, Ayers CR, Khera A. U.S. population at increased risk
470 of severe illness from COVID-19. *Am J Prev Cardiol* **2021**; 6: 100156.
- 471 34. Pfizer. EPIC-HR: Study of Oral PF-07321332/Ritonavir Compared With Placebo in
472 Nonhospitalized High Risk Adults With COVID-19. **2022**.
- 473 35. Jehi L, Ji X, Milinovich A, et al. Development and validation of a model for individualized
474 prediction of hospitalization risk in 4,536 patients with COVID-19. *PLoS One* **2020**; 15(8):
475 e0237419.
- 476 36. CDC. Risk for COVID-19 Infection, Hospitalization, and Death by Age Group, **2022**
477 3/28/2022.

478 37. Taylor CA, Whitaker M, Anglin O, et al. COVID-19-Associated Hospitalizations Among
479 Adults During SARS-CoV-2 Delta and Omicron Variant Predominance, by Race/Ethnicity
480 and Vaccination Status - COVID-NET, 14 States, July 2021-January 2022. MMWR Morb
481 Mortal Wkly Rep **2022**; 71(12): 466-73.

482 38. CDC. COVID Data Tracker. Atlanta, GA: US: Department of Health and Human Services,
483 CDC, **2022** 4/21/2022.

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507 **Table 1.** Model parameter values and ranges.

508

Parameter	Value	Range	Source
Demographics			
Proportion high risk for COVID, US	0.6	0.37-0.754	[30-33]
COVID			
Probability of COVID hospitalization for high-risk population	0.063	-	[6, 34]
Probability of COVID hospitalization for low-risk population	0.014	0.0126-0.014	[35, 36]
Probability in-hospital death from COVID	0.07	-	[37]
Vaccination			
US vaccinated percentage	0.656	-	[1]
Vaccination hospitalization multiplier ₁	0.43	-	[38]
Nirmatrelvir/ritonavir			
Nirmatrelvir/ritonavir hospitalization multiplier ₁	Varies (0.21-0.89)	-	[4, 7-10]
Costs			
Cost of nirmatrelvir/ritonavir in the US	\$530	-	[17]
Cost of COVID hospitalization in US	\$20,000	\$11,267-\$98,000	[18, 19, 26]

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

1. Hospitalization multipliers are the reciprocal of the effectiveness of the treatment against COVID-19 hospitalization. Vaccination has been shown to be 57% effective against hospitalization, and nirmatrelvir/ritonavir has been shown to be 21 to 89% effective against hospitalization. The multipliers are applied to the baseline risk of hospitalization from COVID-19 in the high and low-risk populations.

517

518 **Table 2. Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios for hospitalizations prevented by**

519 **nirmatrelvir/ritonavir.** By differing allocation scenarios, and presented for different

520 effectiveness at preventing hospitalization estimates for nirmatrelvir/ritonavir from the

521 literature.

522

Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICER) per hospitalization averted, according to given nirmatrelvir/ritonavir effectiveness at preventing hospitalization measure

	89% effective, Hammond et al.[4]	67% effective, Arbel et al.[10]	45% effective, Dryden-Peterson et al.[9]	33% effective, Mefsin et al.[7]	21% effective, Yip et al.[8]
Strategy 0: No nirmatrelvir/ritonavir					
Strategy 1 - nirmatrelvir/ritonavir for unvaccinated high-risk	Cost saving	Cost-Saving	Cost-Saving	\$5,000	\$19,500
Strategy 2 - nirmatrelvir/ritonavir for all high-risk (regardless of vaccination)	\$700	\$7,600	\$21,400	\$36,600	\$69,300
Strategy 3 - nirmatrelvir/ritonavir all high risk and unvaccinated low-risk	\$26,700	\$42,300	\$72,900	\$106,900	\$179,800
Strategy 4 - nirmatrelvir/ritonavir for all	\$88,600	\$124,400	\$195,300	\$273,800	\$441,900

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534 **Table 3. Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios for deaths prevented by nirmatrelvir/ritonavir.**

535 By differing allocation scenarios, and presented for different effectiveness at preventing

536 hospitalization estimates for nirmatrelvir/ritonavir from the literature.

537

**Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICER) per death averted,
according to given nirmatrelvir/ritonavir effectiveness at
preventing hospitalization measure**

89% effective, Hammond et al.[4]	67% effective, Arbel et al.[10]	45% effective, Dryden- Peterson et al.[9]	33% effective, Mefsin et al.[7]	21% effective, Yip et al.[8]
--	--	---	--	---------------------------------

**Strategy 0: No
nirmatrelvir/ritonavir**

**Strategy 1 -
nirmatrelvir/ritonavir
for unvaccinated high-
risk**

**Strategy 2 -
nirmatrelvir/ritonavir
for all high-risk
(regardless of
vaccination)**

**Strategy 3 -
nirmatrelvir/ritonavir
all high risk and
unvaccinated low-risk**

**Strategy 4 -
nirmatrelvir/ritonavir
for all**

538

539

540

541

542

543


544

545

546

547 **Figure 1. Model structure**

548



549

550

551

552

553 **Figure 2.** Two-way sensitivity analysis presenting most cost-effective treatment allocation

554 strategy for hospitalizations averted, for given willingness-to-pay threshold, treatment

555 effectiveness estimate, and cost of drug estimate. Cost of drug is on the horizontal axis, and

556 treatment effectiveness is on the vertical axis.

557

558 **Figure 3.** Two-way sensitivity analysis presenting most cost-effective treatment allocation


559 strategy for deaths averted, for given willingness-to-pay threshold, treatment effectiveness


560 estimate, and cost of drug estimate. Cost of drug is on the horizontal axis, and treatment


561 effectiveness is on the vertical axis.

562

563









Best strategy according to \$10k willingness to pay per hospitalization averted

- No nirmatrelvir/ritonavir
- High-risk unvaccinated only
- All high-risk
- All high-risk and low-risk unvaccinated
- All




Best strategy according to \$20k willingness to pay per hospitalization averted


- No nirmatrelvir/ritonavir
- High-risk unvaccinated only
- All high-risk
- All high-risk and low-risk unvaccinated
- All



Best strategy according to \$10k willingness to pay per death averted

- No nirmatrelvir/ritonavir
- High-risk unvaccinated only
- All high-risk
- All high-risk and low-risk unvaccinated
- All





Best strategy according to \$1m willingness to pay per death averted

