1 **Full Title**

2 Effect of a single dose of 8 mg moxidectin or 150 µg/kg ivermectin on *O. volvulus* skin
3 microfilariae in a randomized trial: Differences between areas in the Democratic Republic of the
4 Congo, Liberia and Ghana and impact of intensity of infection

5 **Short title:**

6 Moxidectin vs ivermectin by Phase 3 study area and *O. volvulus* infection intensity

7 Didier Bakajika^{1, #a}, Eric M Kanza^{2, #b}, Nicholas O Opoku^{3, #c}, Hayford M Howard^{4, #d}, Germain L
8 Mambandu^{1, #e}, Amos Nyathirombo^{1, #f}, Maurice M Nigo^{1, #g}, Kambale Kasonia Kennedy^{2, #h}, Safari
9 L Masembe^{2, #i}, Mupenzi Mumbere², Kambale Kataliko^{2, #j}, Kpehe M Bolay^{4, #k}, Simon K Attah^{3, #l},
10 George Olipoh^{3, #m}, Sampson Asare^{3, #n}, Michel Vaillant⁵, Christine M Halleux⁶, Annette C
11 Kuesel^{6*}

12 ¹ Centre de Recherche en Maladies Tropicales de l'Ituri, Hôpital Générale de Référence de
13 Rethy, Ituri, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)

14 ² Centre de Recherche Clinique de Butembo, Université Catholique du Graben, Site Horizon,
15 Butembo, Nord Kivu, DRC

16 ³ Onchocerciasis Chemotherapy Research Center, Hohoe, Ghana

17 ⁴ Clinical Research Center, Liberia Institute for Biomedical Research, Bolahun, Liberia

18 ⁵ Competence Center for Methodology and Statistics, Luxembourg Institute of Health, Strassen,
19 Grand Duchy of Luxembourg

20 ⁶ UNICEF/UNDP/World Bank/WHO Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical
21 Diseases (WHO/TDR), World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland

22

23 ^{#a} Current Address: ESPEN, African Regional Office of the World Health Organization
24 (WHO/AFRO/ESPEN), Brazzaville, Republic of Congo

25 ^{#b} Current Address: Programme Nationale de Lutte contre les Maladies Tropicales Négligées à
26 Chimiothérapie Préventive (PNLMTN-CTP), Ministère de la Santé Publique, Kinshasa,
27 Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)

28 ^{#c} Current Address: Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics School of Public Health,
29 University of Health and Allied Sciences, Hohoe, Ghana

30 ^{#d} Current Address: Ganta United Methodist Hospital, Ganta City, Nimba County, Liberia

31 ^{#e} Current Address: Inspection Provinciale de la Santé de la Tshopo, Division Provinciale de la
32 Santé de la Tshopo, Kisangani, Province de la Tshopo, DRC

33 ^{#f} Current Address: Department of Ophthalmology, Faculty of Medicine, Gulu University,
34 Uganda

#^g Current Address: Institut Supérieur des Techniques Médicales de Nyankunde, Bunia, Ituri, DRC

#^h Current Address: Department of Clinical Research, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK

#ⁱ Current Address: Department of Paediatrics and Child Health, Kampala International University, Kampala, Uganda

#^j Current Address: Centre de Santé CECA 20 de Mabakanga, Beni, Nord Kivu, DRC.

#^k Current Address: National Public Health Institute of Liberia, Public Health & Medical Research, Monrovia, Liberia

#^l Current Address: Department of Microbiology, University of Ghana Medical School, Accra, Ghana

#^m Current Address: Precious Minerals Marketing Company Ltd., National Assay Centre, Technical Department, Diamond House, Accra, Ghana

#ⁿ Current Address: GlycoScience Research Inc, Brookings, South Dakota, United States of America

*Corresponding author: kuesela@who.int, ORCID ID: [0000-0002-1696-1784](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1696-1784)

Abstract

Background: Community-directed treatment with 150 µg/kg ivermectin (CDTI), the current control strategy, is insufficient for eliminating *Onchocerca volvulus* transmission across sub-Saharan Africa. Our study in CDTI-naïve areas in Nord Kivu and Ituri (Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Lofa County (Liberia) and Nkwanta district (Ghana) showed that a single 8 mg moxidectin dose reduced skin microfilariae density (microfilariae/mg skin, SmfD) better and for longer than a single 150µg/kg ivermectin dose.

Methodology/Principal Findings: We analysed drug efficacy by study area and pre-treatment SmfD (intensity of infection, Iol). Four and three Iol categories were defined for across-study and by-study area analyses, respectively. We used a general linear model to analyse SmfD 1, 6, 12 and 18 months post-treatment, a logistic model to determine the odds of undetectable SmfD from month 1 to month 6 (UD1-6), month 12 (UD1-12) and month 18 (UD1-18), and descriptive statistics to quantitate inter-individual response differences. Twelve months post-treatment, treatment differences were 92.9%, 90.1%, 86.8% and 84.5% in Nord Kivu, Ituri,

Lofa and Nkwanta, and 74.1%, 84.2%, 90.0% and 95.4% for participants with SmfD 10-20, ≥ 20 -
 < 50 , ≥ 50 - < 80 , ≥ 80 , respectively. Ivermectin's efficacy was lower in Ituri and Nkwanta than Nord
Kivu and Lofa ($p \leq 0.002$) and moxidectin's efficacy lower in Nkwanta than Nord Kivu, Ituri and
Lofa ($p < 0.006$). Odds ratios for UD1-6, UD1-12 or UD1-18 after moxidectin versus ivermectin
treatment exceeded 7.0. Suboptimal response (SmfD 12 months post-treatment $> 40\%$ of pre-
treatment SmfD) occurred in 0%, 0.3%, 1.6% and 3.9% of moxidectin and 12.1%, 23.7%,
10.8% and 28.0% of ivermectin treated participants in Nord Kivu, Ituri, Lofa and Nkwanta,
respectively.

Conclusions/significance: The benefit of moxidectin vs ivermectin treatment increased with
pre-treatment IOL. The possibility that parasite populations in different areas have different drug
susceptibility without prior ivermectin selection pressure needs to be considered and further
investigated.

Author Summary

Onchocerciasis or river blindness is a parasitic disease primarily in sub-Saharan Africa and
Yemen. It can cause debilitating morbidity including severe itching, skin changes, visual
impairment and even blindness. Many years of control efforts, today primarily based on mass
administration of ivermectin (MDA) in endemic communities, have reduced morbidity and the
percentage of infected individuals so that elimination of parasite transmission is now planned.
WHO estimated that in 2020 more than 239 million people required MDA. Ivermectin may not
be sufficiently efficacious to achieve elimination everywhere. Our study in areas in Liberia,
Ghana and the Democratic Republic of the Congo where MDA had not been implemented yet
showed that moxidectin reduced parasite levels in the skin better and for longer than ivermectin.
Here we show that people with higher numbers of parasites in the skin benefit more from
moxidectin treatment than those with lower numbers and that the efficacy of ivermectin and
moxidectin differs between study areas. Provided WHO and countries include moxidectin in

92 guidelines and policies, this information could help decisions on when and where to use
93 moxidectin.

94 **Keywords**

95 Onchocerciasis; ivermectin; moxidectin; efficacy; skin microfilariae; suboptimal response;
96 suboptimal microfilariae response; *O. volvulus* infection prevalence in Nord Kivu DRC; *O.*
97 *volvulus* infection prevalence in Ituri DRC; *O. volvulus* infection prevalence in Lofa County
98 Liberia; *O. volvulus* infection prevalence in Nkwanta North Ghana; variability in response to
99 ivermectin; variability in response to moxidectin.

100 **Introduction**

101 Onchocerciasis is a vector-borne disease, caused by the helminth *Onchocerca volvulus*,
102 endemic primarily in remote rural areas of sub-Saharan Africa. Different parasite life stages live
103 in humans: the infective larvae transmitted by blackflies of the genus *Simulium* develop into
104 macrofilariae which live primarily in subcutaneous and deep tissue nodules and produce for
105 around 12 years millions of microfilariae which have an estimated life span of 1-2 years. The
106 dermatological, lymphatic and ocular symptoms are due to the host inflammatory reactions to
107 the dead microfilariae [1]. Evidence is increasing that *O. volvulus* infection is a risk factor for
108 development of seizures and epilepsy [2].

109 Onchocerciasis morbidity, including severe itching, visual impairment and blindness, and its
110 socio-economic impact have motivated large scale control programmes. Initially implemented in
111 West Africa using vector control, these programmes are now based on mass drug
112 administration (MDA) of ivermectin to the 'eligible population' (≥ 5 years or ≥ 90 cm, not pregnant
113 or acutely sick) [1]. In the six Central and South American countries with an estimated 0.56
114 million people living in areas where the parasite was transmitted, between 23 and 36 rounds of
115 biannual ivermectin MDA, complemented with quarterly MDA in around 300 communities, have
116 eliminated onchocerciasis [3]. The exception is the endemic area across the border between

Venezuela and Brazil where around 35,000 highly mobile people required MDA in 2020 [4,5]. In Sudan and Yemen, 0.79 million people required MDA in 2020 [5]. Onchocerciasis elimination faces the biggest challenge in Africa where >100 Million people live in meso- or hyperendemic areas [6–8] and more than 239 million were estimated to require MDA in 2020 [5]. In 11 countries, the Onchocerciasis Control Programme of West Africa (OCP, 1974-2002) eliminated onchocerciasis as a public health problem in the savannah areas through large scale weekly aerial larviciding of vector breeding sites along around 50,000 km of rivers, complemented later by ivermectin MDA [1]. In the other countries, the African Programme for Onchocerciasis (APOC, 1995-2015 [9]) facilitated ivermectin MDA implemented via community directed treatment with ivermectin (CDTI) in meso- and hyperendemic areas. Long term CDTI has significantly decreased morbidity [10,11]. For many years, it was, however, considered impossible to eliminate parasite transmission across Africa with CDTI [12]. This has motivated investments into discovery and development of more effective anti-onchocercal drugs [13]. A research study and APOC-supported evaluations of infection prevalence in areas under long term CDTI suggested that CDTI may be more effective than initially expected and could eliminate parasite transmission in many areas [14–17]. This resulted in the objective to eliminate onchocerciasis transmission in some African countries by 2020 and in 80% of endemic countries by 2025 [18,19]. These targets have recently been revised to achieve WHO-verified interruption of parasite transmission in 12 countries world-wide by 2030 [20].

Expert consultations and detailed analyses of available data spearheaded by APOC concluded that alternative treatment strategies (ATS), including those with more effective drugs than ivermectin, are needed to eliminate parasite transmission in many areas [21].

The development of moxidectin, a milbemycin macrocyclic lactone, for onchocerciasis was initiated by the UNICEF/UNDP/World Bank/WHO Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases (TDR) through pre-clinical pharmacology studies. Their results, combined with the non-clinical toxicology data acquired for registration of moxidectin for veterinary use (Document 2 in Annex 2 in [22], identified moxidectin as a clinical development

candidate. Six Phase 1 studies in healthy volunteers were conducted [23–28]. A Phase 2 and a Phase 3 study in *O. volvulus* infected individuals [29,30] showed that a single oral dose of 8 mg moxidectin reduces skin microfilariae (mf) density (microfilariae/mg skin, SmfD) better and prevents repopulation of the skin with microfilariae for longer than a single oral dose of ivermectin as used during CDTI (150 µg/kg). In the Phase 3 study, the treatment difference (calculated as the difference between the adjusted geometric mean SmfD in the two treatment arms in percentage of the adjusted geometric mean SmfD in the ivermectin treatment arm) was 86%, 97%, 86% and 76% at 1, 6, 12 and 18 months after treatment ($p < 0.0001$). The treatment difference was independent of sex, but higher for individuals with ≥ 20 SmfD (93% at month 12) than for individuals with < 20 SmfD (76.0% at month 12) pre-treatment [30]. Both studies showed that moxidectin and ivermectin have comparable safety profiles. In conjunction with the safety data from the healthy volunteer studies and non-clinical toxicology studies, the Phase 2 and Phase 3 study safety data suggest that moxidectin may have the safety profile required for Community-Directed Treatment with Moxidectin (CDTM). The Food and Drug Administration of the United States of America (US FDA) approved moxidectin for the treatment of onchocerciasis in ≥ 12 -year-olds on 13 June 2018 following priority review of a New Drug Application submitted by Medicines Development for Global Health (MDGH). MDGH is the Australian not-for-profit biopharmaceutical company to whom WHO had licensed all moxidectin-related data at its disposal to register moxidectin. [31]

The previous report of the Phase 3 study [30] analyzed the efficacy of moxidectin and ivermectin across all participants and by the two pre-treatment SmfD categories used for stratifying participants at randomization. Here, we are reporting analyses conducted to investigate whether the efficacy of the drugs differs between study areas, to better characterize the dependency of the treatment difference on pre-treatment SmfD and to explore the significant inter-individual variability of response to ivermectin the raw data suggested [30]. Furthermore, we are reporting the *O. volvulus* infection relevant data obtained in all individuals screened by study area.

Methods

Details for all methods except the statistical analyses for this manuscript have been provided previously [30] and are only summarized briefly.

Trial registration

The study was registered on 14 November 2008 in Clinicaltrials.gov (ID: NCT00790998).

Ethics Committee approval and participant consent

Conduct of this study, including protocol, information documents for potential participants and the participant consent forms, were approved by the Ghana Food and Drugs Authority and the Ghana Health Service Ethics Review Committee, the Liberia Ministry of Health and Social Welfare and the Ethics Committee of the Liberia Institute for Biomedical Research, the Ministère de la Santé Publique of DRC and the Ethics Committee of the Ecole de la Santé Publique Université de Kinshasa in DRC, and the WHO Ethics Review Committee.

Volunteers provided their consent or assent with parental consent to study participation through signature or thumbprint in the presence of a literate witness in their villages. This included consent to publication of summaries of the results.

Study design and objectives

The double-blind, randomized, ivermectin-controlled study in *O. volvulus* infected individuals was designed to determine whether a single 8 mg oral dose of moxidectin achieves SmfD $\leq 50\%$ of SmfD after a single oral dose of 150µg/kg ivermectin one year after treatment and to collect safety data.

Study timing and areas

The study was conducted from 2009 to 2012 in four onchocerciasis endemic areas in which CDTI had not yet been initiated: Nord Kivu province (current Zones de Santé Kalunguta and

Mabalako) in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Ituri province in DRC (Zone de Santé Logo in Northern Ituri, subsequently referred to as Nord Ituri), Lofa county in Liberia (subsequently referred to as Lofa or Liberia) and the Kpasa subdistrict within the Nkwanta North health district in Ghana (subsequently referred to as Nkwanta or Ghana).

Participant eligibility criteria

Volunteers had to be ≥ 12 years old, weigh ≥ 30 kg and have ≥ 10 SmfD. Women of reproductive capacity could not be pregnant and had to commit to using reliable contraception (abstinence, condoms or hormonal contraception are medically recognized methods) for 6 months after treatment (for ivermectin and moxidectin labelling regarding use in pregnant women see, respectively, https://www.merck.com/product/usa/pi_circulars/s/stromectol/stromectol_pi.pdf and <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cder/daf/index.cfm?event=overview.process&varApplNo=210867>). To include a population as similar to that which would be participating in CDTM as possible, volunteers meeting inclusion criteria consistent with available pre-clinical and clinical safety data were excluded only if they met criteria potentially compromising their safety, efficacy assessments or safety assessments.

Randomization and treatment

Eligible participants were randomized by study area, sex and pre-treatment SmfD (< 20 vs. ≥ 20 mf/mg skin) in a ratio of 2:1 to 8 mg moxidectin or 150 μ g/kg ivermectin using computer-generated randomization lists. To ensure double blinding, a pharmacist not involved in participant evaluation provided for each participant four identical looking capsules containing 2 mg moxidectin tablets, 3 mg ivermectin tablets or placebo, as required by treatment allocation and weight. A study team member observed participants while they were swallowing the capsules.

Measurement of skin microfilariae densities

Four skin snips were obtained (one snip from each iliac crest and calf) pre-treatment and 1, 6, 12 and 18 months post-treatment and SmfD (microfilariae/mg skin) determined as described previously [29,30].

Duration of follow up

The study was initiated with last follow up occurring 18 months post-treatment. From July 2011 onward, WHO was the sole study sponsor. Resulting resource limitations required a protocol amendment eliminating the 18 months follow up examinations. This resulted in 96% of moxidectin treated and 97% of ivermectin treated participants with 12 months follow up but only 78% of participants in both treatment arms with month 18 follow up data [30].

Sample size

The sample size required to show a $\geq 50\%$ difference in the primary efficacy outcome SmfD 12 month after treatment with $\alpha=0.05$ and 90% power and the 2:1 (moxidectin:ivermectin) randomization ratio was 185. For a better characterization of the safety profile, the planned sample size was 1000 moxidectin and 500 ivermectin treated individuals.

Statistical analysis for this manuscript

In analogy to the Community Microfilarial Load [32], the microfilarial load among screened individuals (ScMFL) was calculated as the geometric mean of $(\text{SmfD}+1)^{-1}$ for all villages in whom at least 18 individuals ≥ 20 years old were screened.

For analysis by pre-treatment SmfD, four SmfD categories, referred to as 'intensity of infection' (Iol) categories, were defined for analyses across study areas: 10 to <20 , 20 to < 50 , 50 to < 80 and ≥ 80 . Considering the number of participants with ≥ 80 pre-treatment SmfD, only three Iol categories (10 to <20 , 20 to < 50 , ≥ 50) were defined for analyses by study area.

For inferential statistical analysis, SmfD were log-transformed ($y=\log_e(\text{SmfD}+1)$) before analysis.

Longitudinal analysis of SmfD 1, 6, 12 and 18 months after treatment used a general linear model for repeated measures with pre-treatment SmfD, treatment, sex, lol category, time, treatment*lol category, and treatment*time interaction as fixed effects, time as repeated effect for the four SmfD measurements with participant as the statistical unit. In the across study area analysis, study area was a random effect (for sensitivity analysis regarding study area as fixed or random effect see [30]). The treatment difference was calculated as the difference in adjusted geometric means of the two treatment arms in percentage of the adjusted geometric means in the ivermectin arm. Pairwise comparison of the efficacy of ivermectin and of moxidectin between the four study areas was conducted through marginal means comparisons (least squares means from the model). All participants who received study drug were included in these analyses (modified Intent to Treat population, mITT).

The odds of participants having undetectable SmfD at month 1 and 6 (UD1-6), at month 1, 6 and 12 (UD1-12) and at month 1, 6, 12 and 18 (UD1-18) after treatment with moxidectin or ivermectin were calculated using a logistic model with treatment, lol category and lol category*treatment interaction as fixed effects. For the across study area analysis, the study area was a random effect. Only individuals who had SmfD determined at each of the relevant time points were included in these analyses. Note that the statistical analysis plan signed off prior to unblinding planned on analysis of percentage of participants with undetectable SmfD by measurement time point as presented in [30]. The analysis of UD 1-6, UD1-12 and UD1-18 was added.

Inter-individual differences in response to ivermectin and moxidectin between and within study areas and the extent to which the response might be explained by the pre-treatment SmfD, was explored with descriptive analyses by study area and lol category.

Descriptive statistics and figures were generated with STATA 13.1 (StataCorp LLC, USA) or Excel 2016. Inferential statistical analyses were conducted with SAS System version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA).

Results

Consort diagram

The CONSORT flow diagram has been reported previously [30].

Prevalence and intensity of *O. volvulus* infection among screened individuals

Table 1 shows for each study area the number of individuals screened by sex, age group and whether skin microfilariae were detected (0 mf/mg skin vs. >0 mf/mg skin). Presentation by <20 and ≥20 years was chosen because evaluation of 30-50 men ≥ 20 years for infection as indicated by the presence of palpable subcutaneous nodules is the basis for rapid epidemiological assessment (REA) and rapid epidemiological mapping of onchocerciasis prevalence (REMO). REA and REMO were used to identify and map onchocerciasis endemicity in the APOC countries. Percentages of ≥20 year old individuals with palpable nodules of approximately 20-30% and above approximately 30%, respectively, indicate meso-endemic (infection prevalence ≈40-60 %) and hyperendemic areas (infection prevalence above ≈60%) [33–35]. In these areas CDTI was to be implemented to eliminate onchocerciasis as a public health problem [6,7,9,36,37] since infection prevalence >40% was found to be associated with an increased risk of onchocercal blindness [38].

Fig 1, Fig 2 and Fig 3 provide overviews of SmfD among those screened by study area. Even taking into account that (a) no consideration was given to choosing villages for recruitment based on being first or higher line villages and that (b) those volunteering for screening were not randomly selected and may be biased towards those suspecting themselves to be infected, the screening data show that in each study area, onchocerciasis was meso- or hyperendemic.

Table 1: Sex, age and *O. volvulus* infection of individuals screened by study area and village

Category	Statistic/ parameter	DRC Nord Kivu	DRC Nord Ituri	Liberia Lofa	Ghana Nkwanta
Men	N	733	885	581	384

Women	N	636	524	522	261
Number screened (% within sex/age group indicated)					
Men <20 yrs	N	9 (1.2%)	109 (12.3%)	24 (4.1%)	108 (28.1%)
Men ≥20 yrs	N	724 (98.8%)	776 (87.7%)	557 (95.9%)	276 (71.9%)
Women <20 yrs	N	17 (2.7%)	47 (9.0%)	4 (0.8%)	93 (35.6%)
Women ≥20 yrs	N	619 (97.3%)	477 (91.0%)	518 (99.2%)	168 (64.4%)
Number by detectable SmfD (% within sex/age group)					
Men <20 yrs	0 mf/mg skin	8 (88.9%)	39 (35.8%)	15 (62.5%)	15 (13.9%)
	>0 mf/mg skin	1 (11.1%)	70 (64.2%)	9 (37.5%)	93 (86.1%)
Men ≥20 yrs	0 mf/mg skin	200 (27.6%)	251 (32.2%)	246 (44.2%)	30 (10.9%)
	>0 mf/mg skin	524 (72.4%)	525 (67.7%)	311 (55.8%)	246 (89.1%)
Women <20yrs	0 mf/mg skin	10 (58.8%)	23 (48.9%)	0 (0)	21 (22.6%)
	>0 mf/mg skin	7 (41.2%)	24 (51.1%)	4 (100%)	72 (77.4%)
Women ≥20yrs	0 mf/mg skin	237 (38.3%)	135 (28.3%)	264 (51.0%)	37 (22.0%)
	>0 mf/mg skin	382 (61.7%)	342 (71.7%)	254 (49.0%)	131 (78.0%)
Age					
Men <20 yrs	Mean±SD	16.2±1.64	16.4±1.98	18.0±1.59	16.1±2.10
	Min, Median, Max	14, 16, 19	12, 17, 19	14, 19, 19	12, 16, 19
Men ≥20 yrs	Mean±SD	43.5±14.90	39.1±15.21	46.6±18.00	33.7±12.3
	Min, Median, Max	20, 43, 86	20, 36.5, 93	20, 45, 95	20, 30, 72
Women <20yrs	Mean±SD	16.5±1.91	15.7±2.00	17.0±2.71	15.7±2.30
	Min, Median, Max	13, 17, 19	12, 16, 19	13, 18, 19	12, 16, 19
Women ≥20yrs	Mean±SD	49.9±13.13	49.9±13.55	50.8±13.88	44.1±14.08
	Min, Median, Max	20, 50, 92	20, 50, 85	20, 50, 90	20, 44, 80

292

293

294 **Fig 1: Distribution of skin microfilariae density among those screened by study area and sex**

296 **Fig 2: Skin microfilariae density across all individuals screened by study area and sex**

297

Fig 3: Skin microfilariae density among those screened by study area, sex and age

Table 2 shows for villages where at least 18 individuals were screened two indicators of onchocerciasis endemicity: the percentage of ≥ 20 year olds with detectable skin microfilariae levels and their screening microfilarial load (ScMFL), calculated in the same way as the Community Microfilarial Load (CMFL) [32]. GPS coordinates of the villages from where the majority of participants were recruited are provided in S1 Table S1.

Table 2: Community infection indicators among screened individuals ≥20 years by study area and village

Study area	Village	Number ≥20 years old screened	% ≥20 years old with detectable SmfD	ScMFL ¹	Number all ages enrolled (% enrolled) ²
Nord Kivu	Kanyatsi	26	30.8	1.0	2 (0.4%)
	Luala	21	81.0	11.3	9 (2.0%)
	Mambingi	479	70.4	5.9	178 (38.7%)
	Tutu	21	71.4	4.3	6 (1.3%)
	Mambena	164	76.8	7.7	74 (16.1%)
	Masangi	107	50.5	2.3	20 (4.3%)
	Visiki	472	66.5	5.2	153 (33.3%)
Nord Ituri	Adrasi	43	79.1	12.9	26 (5.5%)
	Draju	48	70.8	9.4	22 (4.7%)
	Jupadogo	25	48.0	4.8	7 (1.5%)
	Jupagasa	116	71.6	7.6	47 (10.0%)
	Kpana	224	72.3	8.5	96 (20.3%)
	Ndroy	67	89.6	24.0	37 (7.8%)
	Ngbungbu	34	91.2	17.8	17 (3.6%)
	Rudju	93	82.8	17.5	52 (11.0%)
	Umulo	309	65.4	4.7	96 (20.3%)
	Yawu	63	58.7	4.8	22 (4.7%)
	Juparima	25	80.0	8.3	6 (1.3%)
	Kanga	82	53.7	2.7	13 (2.8%)
	Ulyeko	22	13.6	0.3	1 (0.2%)
	Fangoda	88	19.3	0.6	9 (3.0%)
	Fokolahun	79	72.2	6.9	36 (12.0%)
Lofa	Kamatahun	138	68.1	4.9	63 (21.1%)
	Koilahun	18	66.7	4.6	8 (2.7%)
	Massabolahun	143	7.0	0.2	4 (1.3%)
	Mbalotahun	20	25.0	1.9	2 (0.7%)
	Ngohombu	24	95.8	9.9	12 (4.0%)
	Popalahun	116	44.8	1.4	19 (6.4%)
	Porlowu	107	28.0	0.6	8 (2.7%)
	Yallahun	138	76.8	6.1	63 (21.1%)
	Yandohun	52	73.1	7.9	25 (8.4%)
	Yengema	152	79.6	4.8	50 (16.7%)
Nkwanta N	Azua	277	80.1	6.9	154 (63.9%)
	Bitaaaba	74	94.6	19.8	22 (9.1%)
	Jagri Akura	75	92.0	10.9	55 (22.8%)
	Wii	18	88.9	14.7	10 (4.1%)

¹ScMFL – Microfilarial load for ≥20 year olds screened (Geometric mean (SmfD+1) – 1) for villages with ≥ 18 individuals ≥20 year olds screened. ² % enrolled per study area, remaining participants were enrolled from villages in whom <18 individuals were screened.

Demographic and pre-treatment *O. volvulus* infection

characteristics of enrolled study participants by study area

Table 3 shows the demographic and pre-treatment characteristics of enrolled study participants by study area and treatment arm.

316 **Table 3: Demographics and intensity of infection of enrolled study participants by study area**

Study area	Parameter (unit)	Statistic	Moxidectin	Ivermectin
Nord Kivu	Women	N (%)	112 (36.7)	58 (37.4)
	Men	N (%)	193 (63.3)	97 (62.6)
	Age (yrs)	Mean±SD	45.5±14.1	47.9±14.7
	Age (yrs)	Min, Max	16, 82	13, 86
	Height (cm)	Mean±SD	155.9±7.95	156.0±8.35
	Weight (kg)	Mean±SD	49.8±7.79	49.2±8.06
	Iol (mf/mg skin)	Mean±SD	34.4±23.36	39.1±28.84
	Iol 10-<20 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	92 (30.2)	51 (32.9)
	Iol 20-<50 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	151 (49.5)	53 (34.2)
	Iol 50-<80 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	48 (15.7)	42 (27.1)
Nord Ituri	Iol ≥80 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	14 (4.6)	9 (5.8)
	Women	N	115 (36.5)	57 (36.3)
	Men	N	200 (63.5)	100 (64.7)
	Age (yrs)	Mean±SD	39.6±15.12	41.7±14.29
	Age (yrs)	Min, Max	12, 74	15, 81
	Height (cm)	Mean±SD	159.0±8.50	160.7±7.52
	Weight (kg)	Mean±SD	52.0±8.00	53.3±6.95
	Iol (mf/mg skin)	Mean±SD	48.1±39.23	52.6±38.36
	Iol 10-<20 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	64 (20.3)	33 (21.0)
	Iol 20-<50 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	145 (46.0)	53 (33.8)
Lofa	Iol 50-<80 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	57 (18.1)	37 (23.6)
	Iol ≥80 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	49 (15.6)	34 (21.7)
	Women	N (%)	80 (40.0)	40 (40.4)
	Men	N (%)	120 (60.0)	59 (59.6)
	Age (yrs)	Mean±SD	48.0±17.47	46.9±16.49
	Age (yrs)	Min, Max	19, 95	18, 76
	Height (cm)	Mean±SD	161.3±8.03	162.5±7.71
	Weight (kg)	Mean±SD	53.2±7.83	53.6±6.83
	Iol (mf/mg skin)	Mean±SD	30.7±22.33	29.3±19.53
	Iol 10-<20 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	83 (41.5)	42 (42.4)
Nkwanta	Iol 20-<50 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	84 (42.0)	39 (39.4)
	Iol 50-<80 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	26 (13.0)	15 (15.2)
	Iol ≥80 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	7 (3.5)	3 (3.0)
	Women	N (%)	45 (28.5)	24 (28.9)
	Men	N (%)	113 (71.5)	59 (71.1)
	Age (yrs)	Mean±SD	29.4±14.42	30.6±14.85
	Age (yrs)	Min, Max	12, 65	12, 64
	Height (cm)	Mean±SD	161.7±9.69	159.8±9.58
	Weight (kg)	Mean±SD	52.2±10.26	50.5±9.15
	Iol (mf/mg skin)	Mean±SD	39.2±27.25	37.5±25.08
	Iol 10-<20 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	42 (26.6)	24 (28.9)
	Iol 20-<50 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	76 (48.1)	38 (45.8)
	Iol 50-<80 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	26 (16.5)	14 (16.9)
	Iol ≥80 (mf/mg skin)	N (%)	14 (8.9)	7 (8.4)

317 Iol intensity of infection (pre-treatment skin microfilariae density), mf microfilariae

318

Effect of moxidectin and ivermectin on skin microfilariae

density

The number of individuals treated and with follow up data as well as descriptive statistics of SmfD by lol category across all study areas and by study area are available in S1 Table S2 to Table S6. Across the study, follow-up rates in the two treatment arms were >99% at month 1, 98-99% at month 6, 96-97% at month 12 and, due to the protocol amendment, 78% at month 18 [30].

Post treatment skin microfilariae densities by study area

Fig 4 shows the SmfD before and 1, 6, 12 and 18 months post treatment by study area. The percentage reduction in geometric mean SmfD at baseline to month 1 ranged from 99.7%-100% in the moxidectin and from 97.4%-97.9% in the ivermectin treatment arm. Table 4 shows the moxidectin – ivermectin treatment difference at each post-treatment evaluation by study area.

SmfD increased from month 1 onward in the ivermectin arm and from month 6 onward in the moxidectin treatment arm. These increases were higher in Nord Ituri and Nkwanta North than in Nord Kivu and Lofa County. The similar mean lol for Nord Kivu and Nkwanta North and similar percentage of participants with ≥ 50 mf/mg skin lol suggest that the differences in SmfD increases between the study areas is unlikely to be due solely to differences in lol among participants (Fig 4). Pairwise study area comparison of the SmfD 12 months after treatment with adjustment for lol showed that the efficacy of IVM was similar in Nord Kivu and Lofa County as well as in Nord Ituri and Nkwanta district whereas the efficacy in Nord Kivu and Lofa County was significantly higher than that in Nord Ituri and the Nkwanta district ($p \leq 0.0002$). The efficacy of moxidectin was similar in Nord Kivu, Nord Ituri and Lofa County and significantly higher in these three areas than in Nkwanta district ($p < 0.006$).

Fig 4: Geometric mean (95% CI) SmfD before and after treatment by study area

N Kivu Nord Kivu, N Ituri Nord Ituri, Lofa Lofa County, Nkwanta Nkwanta North district

Table 4: Treatment difference 1, 6, 12 and 18 months post-treatment by study area

Time post treatment	DRC Nord Kivu	DRC Nord Ituri	Liberia Lofa	Ghana Nkwanta
Month 1	98.6 %	83.7 %	97.1 %	110.7 %
Month 6	100.4 %	98.8 %	98.8 %	103.2 %
Month 12	92.9 %	90.1 %	86.8 %	84.5 %
Month 18	84.1 %	78.0 %	78.2 %	78.2 %

Treatment difference: difference between adjusted geometric means of IVM and Moxi in percentage of the adjusted geometric means in the ivermectin treatment arm obtained from the linear model. Treatment differences >100% are due to low values of SmfD in the moxidectin arm that are log-transformed to calculate geometric mean differences. For summaries of raw SmfD, geometric means, adjusted means and geometric means and adjusted difference of means and geometric means see S1 Table S2 to Table S6.

Post treatment skin microfilariae densities by pre-treatment intensity of infection

The difference in SmfD post-treatment between the moxidectin and ivermectin treatment arm increased with increasing lol category (Fig 5). Twelve months post-treatment, (i.e. the time of the next treatment during an annual moxidectin treatment strategy) the treatment difference across study areas was 74.1%, 84.2%, 90.0% and 95.4% among those with lol of 10-<20, ≥20-<50, ≥50-<80, ≥80, respectively ($p<0.0001$). In the linear model, both the interaction of treatment and time and the interaction of treatment and lol category confirmed ($p<0.0001$) that

the difference in SmfD post-treatment between the moxidectin and ivermectin treatment arms increased over time as well as between lol categories.

Fig 5: Geometric mean (95% CI) SmfD by intensity of infection category across study areas

SmfD: skin microfilariae density, moxi: moxidectin, IVM: ivermectin, N: number treated (for number with follow up data at each time point, see S1 Table S2).

The analysis by study area showed the same trend towards higher treatment differences among participants in the higher lol categories as the across study area analysis. In all study areas, participants in the highest lol category benefitted more from moxidectin treatment than those in the lowest lol category (Fig 6, Table 5). Descriptive statistics for the SmfD by lol category across and by study area are provided in S1 Table S2 to Table S6.

Fig 6: Geometric mean (95% CI) SmfD by intensity of infection category and study area

Moxi: moxidectin, IVM: ivermectin, N: number treated (for number with follow up data at each time point, see S1 Tables A2-A5), Iol intensity of infection: <20: 10-20 mf/mg skin; 20-50: 20-50 mf/mg skin, ≥50: ≥50 mf/mg skin pre-treatment.

Table 5: Treatment difference 12 months post-treatment by study area across and by intensity of infection

Pre-treatment SmfD	DRC Nord Kivu	DRC Nord Ituri	Liberia Lofa	Ghana Nkwanta
(Any) ≥ 10 mf/mg	92.9 %	90.1 %	86.8 %	84.5%
10 - <20 mf/mg	68.1 %	75.7 %	81.2 %	83.9 %
≥ 20 - <50 mf/mg	89.6 %	83.9 %	85.3 %	80.2 %
≥ 50 mf/mg	101.6 %	89.9 %	87.9 %	88.2 %

The percentage treatment difference was calculated as the difference in adjusted geometric means between treatment arms in percentage of the post-ivermectin adjusted geometric mean obtained from a linear model for repeated measures with pre-treatment lol, treatment, lol category, time, treatment*lol category, and treatment*time interaction as fixed effects, time as repeated effect for the four SmfD measurements with participant as statistical unit. $p < 0.0001$ for all treatment differences. Treatment difference $> 100\%$ is due to low values of SmfD in the moxidectin arm that are log-transformed to calculate geometric mean differences. For adjusted means and geometric means and adjusted difference of means and geometric means see S1 Table S2 to Table S8

Percentage of participants with undetectable SmfD post treatment by study area and pre-treatment intensity of infection

Across all study areas, 151/959 (15.7%) of participants with data at both 1 and 6 months after moxidectin treatment had lower SmfD 6 months (0.02 ± 0.11 mf/mg, range 0-1.23 mf/mg) than 1 month (0.53 ± 1.03 , range 0.05-8.37 mf/mg) after treatment resulting in 136 participants achieving undetectable SmfD only at 6 months. Since a high percentage of moxidectin treated participants retained undetectable SmfD from month 1 to month 6, this resulted in a higher percentage of participants with undetectable SmfD from Month 1 to Month 6 (Fig 7) than at month 1 (84%, [30]). Such an increase was not observed in the ivermectin treatment arm, but 107/490 (21.8%) of participants in the ivermectin treatment arm with data at both 1 and 6 months had lower SmfD 6 months (4.50 ± 8.66 mf/mg, range 0-43.1 mf/mg) than 1 month (7.81 ± 13.36 mf/mg, range 0.08-53.6 mf/mg) after treatment.

Fig 7: Percentage of participants with undetectable SmfD by study area, pre-treatment SmfD and post-treatment time

M1, M6, M12, M18: month 1, 6, 12, 18 after treatment (for numbers treated see Fig 6, for numbers with follow up data at each time point, see S1 Table S2 to Table S6)

It is noteworthy that small changes in SmfD from one follow up time point to the other may not reflect actual changes in SmfD but rather the accuracy of SmfD detection. This has a relatively low impact on analyses based on mean SmfD, but can have a significant impact on categorical analyses such as the percentage with undetectable SmfD. The majority of moxidectin treated participants with detectable SmfD at Month 1 and undetectable SmfD at Month 6 had <0.25 mf/mg skin at Month 1 (Fig 8).

416

417

418 **Fig 8: Skin microfilariae levels pre-treatment, at month 1 and at month 6 among participants who**
419 **had detectable levels 1 month after treatment**

420 SmfD: Skin microfilariae density, to allow displaying these data on a logarithmic scale, 1 was added to
421 the SmfD values at Month 1 and 6.

422

423 Duration of undetectable levels of SmfD

424 The number of individuals in each study area with and without undetectable SmfD (UD) and
425 those not evaluable for this analysis because SmfD data were missing for at least one of the
426 relevant time points is provided in S1 Table S9. The logistic model derived odds and their lower
427 and upper limits are provided in S1 Table S10 and displayed in S1 Fig S1 and the odds ratios
428 are provided in S1 Table S11. Table S9 shows that there were not zero participants with
429 undetectable SmfD in the ivermectin arm in the higher Iol categories which resulted in the
430 logistic model not providing odds and odds ratios (Table S10 and Table S11).

431 Fig 9 shows the logistic model derived odds of study participants across all study areas to have
432 UD from 1-6, 1-12 and 1-18 months after treatment with moxidectin or ivermectin by the four Iol
433 categories defined for the across study area analysis.

The odds of moxidectin treated participants to have UD of any duration were significantly higher than those of ivermectin treated participants in each lol category ($p < 0.0002$ for each lol category) but the difference in odds between the moxidectin and ivermectin arms was not significantly different between lol categories ($p > 0.8$ for the interaction between treatment and lol which was discarded from the models). The highest odds in the ivermectin treatment arm were 0.13 for individuals with <20 mf/mg lol to have UD 1-6.

Fig 9: Odds for undetectable SmfD from 1 to 6, 12 or 18 months by lol across study areas
SmfD: skin microfilariae density, UD1-6, UD 1-12, UD 1-18 undetectable levels of SmfD at month 1 and 6, at month 1, 6 and 12, and at month 1, 6, 12 and 18, respectively (for number with follow up data at each relevant time point, see Table A8).

The same trends were observed in the analysis by study area. Moxidectin treated participants had significantly higher odds of having UD1-6, 1-12 and 1-18 than ivermectin treated participants ($p < 0.008$ for each study area) where data was sufficient to allow the comparison in marginal means. The difference in odds for moxidectin and ivermectin treated participants was not significantly different between the different lol categories (treatment – lol interaction not significant).

Inter-individual variability in response to moxidectin and ivermectin

‘Suboptimal microfilariae response’ to treatment

Awadzi et al. considered $\geq 60\%$ reduction of SmfD from pre-treatment to day 8 as indicating an ‘adequate parasite response’. In the first study comparing the effect of moxidectin and ivermectin on SmfD, 3/45 ivermectin treated participants had an SmfD reduction on day 7 or 8 after treatment lower than that and were referred to as ‘suboptimal microfilariae responders’ (SOMR) [29]. In this study, the first post-treatment SmfD measurement occurred 1 month after treatment. SmfD decreases from Day 8 to 1-2 months after a single dose of ivermectin [29,39,40]. Therefore, the criterion used here to assess SOMR was reduction of $\leq 80\%$ in SmfD from pre-treatment to month 1 (SOMR80).

In the moxidectin treatment arm, no individual met the SOMR80 criteria: the % reduction in SmfD from pre-treatment to month 1 ranged from 91.9 - 100% in Nord Kivu, 94.2 - 100% in Nord Ituri, 96.9% - 100% in Lofa County, 99.0 - 100% in the Nkwanta District. All 42 individuals with $< 99\%$ SmfD reduction at month 1 had $> 99\%$ SmfD reduction at month 6.

In the ivermectin arm, the percentage reduction in SmfD from pre-treatment to month 1 ranged from 51.0% – 100% in Nord Kivu, 2% – 100% in Nord Ituri, -4.7% – 100% in Lofa County and -49.6% – 100% in Nkwanta District. Across study areas, 8.9% of ivermectin treated met the SOMR80 criteria. Fig 10 shows the SmfD at each post treatment time point for the 44 individuals meeting the SOMR80 criteria. Among these, 21 also met the ‘suboptimal response’ (SOR) criteria (see below), including 4/14 in Nord Kivu, 10/18 in Nord Ituri, 1/5 in Lofa Country and 6/7 in Nkwanta District. The data do not suggest a dependency of the percentage of SOMR individuals on lol or study area. This is also not the case when stricter criteria for SOMR are used, i.e. reduction of $\leq 90\%$ in SmfD from pre-treatment to month 1 (SOMR90) (Table 6).

Table 6: Percentage of participants with 'suboptimal microfilariae response'

lol (mf/mg)	DRC Nord Kivu SOMR80 (SOMR90)		DRC Nord Ituri SOMR80 (SOMR90)		Liberia Lofa County SOMR80 (SOMR90)		Ghana Nkwanta district SOMR80 (SOMR90)	
	Moxi	IVM	Moxi	IVM	Moxi	IVM	Moxi	IVM
(Any) ≥ 10	0 (0)	9.2 (15.6)	0 (0)	11.5 (14.7)	0 (0)	5.1 (14.1)	0 (0)	8.4 (13.3)
10 - <20	0 (0)	5.9 (14.0)	0 (0)	18.2 (24.2)	0 (0)	7.1 (16.7)	0 (0)	12.5 (16.7)
≥ 20 - <50	0 (0)	11.3 (15.4)	0 (0)	11.3 (13.2)	0 (0)	2.6 (10.3)	0 (0)	5.3 (13.2)
≥ 50	0 (0)	10.2 (18.4)	0 (0)	8.5 (11.3)	0 (0)	5.6 (16.7)	0 (0)	9.5 (9.5)

SOMR80: suboptimal microfilariae response based on $\leq 80\%$ SmfD reduction from pre-treatment to month 1 post treatment. SOMR90 suboptimal microfilariae response based on $\leq 90\%$ SmfD reduction from pre-treatment to month 1 post treatment

Table 7: Skin microfilariae density 1 month after ivermectin among participants without and with 'suboptimal microfilariae response'

lol (mf/mg)	DRC Nord Kivu		DRC Nord Ituri		Liberia Lofa County		Ghana Nkwanta district	
	OMR	SOMR80	OMR	SOMR80	OMR	SOMR80	OMR	SOMR80
	AM $\pm$ SD	AM $\pm$ SD	AM $\pm$ SD	AM $\pm$ SD	AM $\pm$ SD	AM $\pm$ SD	AM $\pm$ SD	AM $\pm$ SD
(Any) ≥ 10	0.9 $\pm$ 2.2	14.7 $\pm$ 11.5	0.8 $\pm$ 2.6	21.3 $\pm$ 18.1	0.6 $\pm$ 1.4	15.7 $\pm$ 21.3	0.6 $\pm$ 1.3	19.9 $\pm$ 16.9
10 - <20	0.4 $\pm$ 0.6	3.0 $\pm$ 0.8	0.3 $\pm$ 0.5	7.6 $\pm$ 3.3	0.3 $\pm$ 0.6	6.2 $\pm$ 3.1	0.3 $\pm$ 0.5	9.9 $\pm$ 5.5
≥ 20 - <50	0.6 $\pm$ 1.0	11.5 $\pm$ 4.4	0.5 $\pm$ 0.7	14.7 $\pm$ 11.2	0.5 $\pm$ 1.0	6.0	0.7 $\pm$ 1.6	32.1 $\pm$ 27.2
≥ 50	1.9 $\pm$ 3.6	25.4 $\pm$ 11.9	1.3 $\pm$ 3.8	41.5 $\pm$ 14.5	1.3 $\pm$ 2.6	53.6	0.8 $\pm$ 1.4	22.7 $\pm$ 17.1

OMR: Optimal microfilariae response to ivermectin based on $>80\%$ reduction of SmfD from pre-treatment by Month 1, SOMR80 suboptimal microfilariae response to ivermectin based on $\leq 80\%$ reduction of SmfD from pretreatment by Month 1, AM arithmetic mean SmfD at Month 1, SD standard deviation of arithmetic mean SmfD at Month 1

Fig 10: SmfD 1, 6, 12 and 18 month post-treatment in participants with 'suboptimal microfilariae response' to ivermectin as indicated by $\leq 80\%$ reduction of skin microfilariae levels from pre-treatment to 1 month after treatment'

Minimum SmfD in participants with detectable SmfD at all post-treatment measurements to Month 12

Among the 965 moxidectin and 491 ivermectin treated participants with Month 1 as well as Month 6 and/or 12 SmfD measurement, 19 (1.9%) and 257 (52.3%) of participants had detectable SmfD at all evaluated time points (range after moxidectin treatment 0.1 – 1.2 mf/mg, range after ivermectin treatment 0.1 – 36.8 mf/mg), respectively. The % of participants who did not achieve undetectable SmfD after treatment was highest among participants in the Iol ≥ 50 mf/mg category (Table 8). There was no correlation between pre-treatment SmfD and the minimum detectable post-treatment SmfD among either moxidectin or ivermectin treated individuals (Fig 11).

Table 8: Participants with detectable SmfD and SmfD data at 1 and 6 and/or 12 months post-treatment

	DRC Nord Kivu		DRC Nord Ituri		Liberia Lofa County		Ghana Nkwanta district	
Iol	Moxi	IVM	Moxi	IVM	Moxi	IVM	Moxi	IVM
(mf/mg)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
(Any) ≥ 10	1 (0.3)	88 (57.9)	13 (4.2)	91 (58)	0	33 (33.3)	5 (3.2)	45 (54.2)
10 - <20	0	24 (27.4)	0	16 (48.5)	0	12 (28.6)	1 (2.4)	13 (54.2)
≥ 20 - <50	1 (0.7)	29 (56.9)	7 (4.9)	29 (54.7)	0	11 (28.2)	2 (2.7)	18 (47.4)
≥ 50	0	35 (70.0)	6 (5.7)	46 (64.8)	0	10 (55.6)	2 (5.1)	14 (66.7)

SmfD Skin microfilariae density

Fig 11: Minimum SmfD for participants with detectable SmfD at all post-treatment evaluations. Left: moxidectin treated participants, center: ivermectin treated participants from DRC, right: ivermectin treated participants from Lofa country and Nkwanta North

'Suboptimal response' to treatment

A number of criteria have been developed for 'suboptimal response' (SOR) to ivermectin, i.e. individuals in whom the initial decrease in SmfD is followed by an increase 'larger than expected' or considered 'typical' (for overview of criteria and references see supplementary information in [30]). Using the SOR criterion of SmfD at month 12 post treatment of >40% of the pre-treatment SmfD proposed during the first investigation into SOR [39,41], the percentage of participants with SOR to moxidectin (10/947, 1.1%) was substantially lower than the percentage of participants with SOR to ivermectin (88/480, 18.3%). Among those with SOR to ivermectin, 21 also met the SOMR80 criteria, including 4/14 in Nord Kivu, 10/18 in Nord Ituri, 1/5 in Lofa Country and 6/7 in Nkwanta District. For both drugs, the percentage of SOR differed between study areas but did not increase with Iol category (Table 9). The independence of SOR of Iol is further supported by the across study area analysis of individuals with Iol ≥ 80 : Among the 83 moxidectin treated and 52 ivermectin treated individuals with Iol ≥ 80 and month 12 data, 0.0% and 21.2%, respectively, met the SOR criterion. Fig 12 shows for each participant meeting the SOR criterion the SmfD at each measurement by pre-treatment SmfD.

Table 9: Percentage of participants with 'suboptimal response' to moxidectin or ivermectin

	DRC Nord Kivu		DRC Nord Ituri		Liberia Lofa County		Ghana Nkwanta district	
Iol	Moxi	IVM	Moxi	IVM	Moxi	IVM	Moxi	IVM
(mf/mg)	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
(Any) ≥ 10	0	12.1	0.3	23.7	1.6	10.8	3.9	28.0
10 - <20	0	3.9	0	33.3	2.6	12.2	2.4	34.8
≥ 20 - <50	0	14.0	0.7	20.8	1.3	8.3	5.3	23.7
≥ 50	0	18.8	0	21.4	0.0	12.5	2.6	28.6

Iol – Intensity of infection quantitated as microfilariae/mg skin pre-treatment. Suboptimal response defined as SmfD 12 months post treatment >40% of pre-treatment SmfD. For the number of participants with data at month 12 see S1Table S3 to Table S6.

Fig 12: SmfD at Month 1, 6, 12 and 18 vs pre-treatment SmfD for the 10 moxidectin and 88 ivermectin treated participants with 'suboptimal response' participants with 'suboptimal response'

Discussion and Conclusions

Moxidectin treatment induced a maximum SmfD reduction from pre-treatment by 100% in 98.1% of the 978 treated participants and by 99.1%-99.9% in the remaining 19 participants. In conjunction with the minimum post-treatment SmfD of these 19 individuals (0.1-1.2 mf/mg), the data did not suggest any dependency of SmfD reduction on lol (Fig 11) or study area. Among the 494 ivermectin treated individuals, the by-study area analysis identified 5.1% - 11.5% SOMR80 (individuals with a SmfD 1 month after treatment reduced by $\leq 80\%$ from pre-treatment SmfD). Between 31.3% and 58.0% of ivermectin treated individuals with Month 1 and Month 6 and/or Month 12 measurements had detectable SmfD at all post-treatment time points. The data did not suggest a dependency of the extent of initial SmfD reduction on lol or study area and the SmfD in most of these individuals were too high to be attributed to the sensitivity of the skin snip method [42] (Table 7, Fig 11).

Despite the percentages of ivermectin treated individuals who were SOMR80s or did not have undetectable SmfD at any post-treatment time, the reduction from pre-treatment to Month 1 in the ivermectin treatment group ranged from 97.4-97.9%. This is similar to the 98-99% reduction at 1-2 months post treatment derived from meta-analysis of the aggregate data from 26 clinical

and community single ivermectin dose studies conducted in ivermectin-naïve individuals in Liberia, Mali, Ghana, Cameroon, Senegal, Togo, Ethiopia, Sierra Leone, Cote d'Ivoire and Guatemala [40] and the $\approx 98\%$ reduction 15 days after treatment among ivermectin-naïve and ivermectin multi-treated individuals from the Nkam and Mbam valley in Cameroon [43]. Given that the skin microfilariae are the reservoir for parasite transmission, including inter-individual heterogeneity in SmfD reduction may be important when modelling the long term effect of CDTI on time to parasite elimination [44,45].

In contrast to the initial SmfD reduction, the repopulation of the skin with microfilariae depended on lol, consistent with the fact that the lol reflects the number of reproductively active macrofilariae in an individual, our previous analysis which considered only the two lol categories used to according to which individuals had been stratified for randomization (10-20 mf/mg, ≥ 20) [30] and analyses of data obtained after the first ivermectin treatment of individuals from Cameroon [46]. The dependency was modest after moxidectin but pronounced after ivermectin treatment (Fig 5, Fig 6). This difference resulted in individuals with higher lol benefitting relatively more from moxidectin treatment than individuals with lower lol as indicated by across-study treatment differences 12 months post treatment of 74.1%, 84.2%, 90.0% and 95.4% among those with lol of 10-<20, ≥ 20 -<50, ≥ 50 -<80, ≥ 80 .

The by-study area analysis showed that repopulation of the skin with microfilariae, evident at month 6 in the ivermectin but only at month 12 in the moxidectin group, was more extensive among individuals in Nord Ituri and Nkwanta North than individuals in Nord Kivu and Lofa Country (Fig 4). This difference was not driven exclusively by differences in lol distribution among the participants in the different study areas (Fig 6). The percentages of SOR to ivermectin were higher in Nord Ituri and Nkwanta North District (23.7% and 28%, resp.) than in Nord Kivu and Lofa County (12.1% and 10.8%, resp.). The percentage of SOR was not consistently higher among individuals with lol ≥ 50 than among those with lol 10-20 and thus not driven by the lol.

The first study into differences in skin repopulation rates between individuals and communities was initiated in 2001 to evaluate potential causes of persistent significant microfilaridermia in some individuals in communities in the Lower Black Volta and Pru river basins after >10 years of ivermectin MDA. A clinical study excluded pharmacokinetic reasons and concluded that individuals with SmfD 3 and 12 months after treatment exceeding 6% and 40% of pre-ivermectin treatment SmfD (calculated per 4 mg skin based on four snips), respectively, and embryonic stages in the uteri of macrofilariae 90 days after treatment harbor parasites who respond as expected to ivermectin's 'microfilaricidal effect' but are non-responsive or sub-optimally responsive (SOR) to ivermectin's 'embryostatic effect' [39,41]. Ivermectin's 'embryostatic effect' results in skin repopulation with microfilariae starting weeks after ivermectin has been cleared [47]. Ivermectin has a half life of <1 day [48]. Investigation in Cameroon of skin repopulation rates in ivermectin-naïve individuals from the Nkam valley where CDTI had not yet been initiated and multi-treated individuals from the Mbam Valley with ongoing CDTI showed that skin repopulation rates were higher in multi-treated than ivermectin-naïve individuals to 80 days but comparable to 180 days after ivermectin treatment [43]. The investigators of further studies in the Lower Black Volta, Pru, and Daka river basins suggested that detectable levels of skin microfilariae (based on two snips) 90 days after treatment, SmfD (calculated per snip) 12 months after treatment exceeding 100% of pre-treatment SmfD and/or presence of embryonic stages of microfilariae in the uteri of macrofilariae 90 days after treatment may indicate emerging parasite resistance to ivermectin's embryostatic effect [49,50].

Provided that microfilariae produced by SOR *O. volvulus* have the same fitness as microfilariae from *O. volvulus* responding 'normally / as expected' to the embryostatic effect of ivermectin (i.e. the same probability of being ingested by the vector, developing into infective larvae, being transmitted and developing into reproductively capable macrofilariae if transmitted), earlier skin repopulation with the microfilariae from SOR than 'normally responding' parasites could result in increasing prevalence of SOR parasites if their appearance in the skin occurs while vectors are abundant. This emphasizes the importance of timing and frequency of CDTI relative to

transmission seasons. Optimization of CDTI timing was one of the recommendations emerging from the APOC consultations on 'Strategic Options and Alternative Treatment Strategies for Accelerating Onchocerciasis Elimination in Africa [21]. Such considerations would be less important if moxidectin rather than ivermectin was used for onchocerciasis control and elimination.

Our data on prevalence of SOR to ivermectin also highlight the need for longitudinal analysis of available data to determine whether or not SOR prevalence is increasing with CDTI duration. Should this be the case, tools suitable for large scale monitoring of SOR prevalence would be needed to guide national program decisions. Development of tools based on genetic correlates of SOR is one approach [51], but the need for phenotypic characterization via serial skin snipping or embryogramms remains a laborious and costly challenge [52].

CDTI had not yet been implemented in the areas where the study was conducted. Consequently, ivermectin selection pressure may not be the explanation for the differences in skin repopulation between the study areas that cannot be attributed to differences in Iol distribution. It takes 10-15 months for a transmitted larvae to mature into a microfilariae-releasing macrofilaria [1]. Therefore, it is unlikely that differences in endemicity and new infections between study areas are responsible for the differences in skin microfilariae repopulation to month 12. Consideration thus needs to be given to the possibility that 'ivermectin-naïve' *O. volvulus* populations in different areas differ in their susceptibility to ivermectin (and to a much lower degree to moxidectin). To date, this possibility has not yet been considered in analyses of data from different geographic areas [40,53]. The hypothesis that parasite populations in different geographic areas have different susceptibility to ivermectin and different inter-individual variability of this susceptibility is compatible with *O. volvulus* biology. Bottlenecks within the life cycle of *O. volvulus* severely restrict the fraction of the progeny of one generation which contribute to the next generation and genetic drift could result in different genetic make up of different parasite populations. Genome-wide association analyses of the *O. volvulus* nuclear genome of phenotypically characterized macrofilariae from Ghana [49,50] and

Cameroon [43,54,55] suggest significant genetic differentiation between the parasite populations investigated [51].

While our results are consistent with the hypothesis of different ivermectin susceptibility of different ivermectin-naïve parasite populations, they cannot be considered as supporting this hypothesis without further investigation: while the areas where we recruited participants were CDTI-naïve, , areas not far away (e.g. for Nkwanta district other villages within the Oti river basin, in the Pru River basins and across the border in Togo) had been benefitting from CDTI for many years. The parasites in our study participants could belong to the same parasite population as the parasites in individuals in nearby areas which have been undergoing CDTI for many years. The population genetic structure of parasites obtained in the SOR studies in Ghana [49,50] suggests that parasites in individuals in the Pru, Daka and Black Volta/Tombe river basins belong to the same transmission zone in which parasites interbreed, enabled through vector or people movement ([52]). Without genetic analysis of the parasites from the Kpasa subdistrict in Nkwanta North it cannot be excluded that they belong to that same interbreeding parasite population. If that is the case and if CDTI selects for SOR, this selection in the Pru, Daka and Black Volta/Tombe river basins could be reflected in the parasite population in our study participants. Long range transmission of parasites through infected/infective vector movement was a challenge for the Onchocerciasis Control Programme in West Africa, resulting in extensions of the original programme area [56–59]. Recently long range vector movement has been implicated in renewed transmission of *O. volvulus* in the Comoé valley of Burkina Faso, although movement of infected people could not be excluded [60,61].

The differences in efficacy of ivermectin and moxidectin in terms of the initial decrease in SmfD and in terms of maintaining undetectable or low SmfD through 18 months post treatment result in higher odds of moxidectin compared to ivermectin treated participants having undetectable SmfD at month 1-6, month 1-12 and month 1-18 in each study area and each lol category. Given that the skin microfilariae are the reservoir of transmission, this confirms our conclusion

from the across study area analysis that moxidectin treatment may be particularly advantageous for achieving elimination of *O. volvulus* transmission in areas where infection prevalence remains high despite long-term CDTI, where transmission seasons are long or have two peaks, where elimination programmes face operational barriers to implementing at least annual CDTI and where SOR to ivermectin has been observed [30]. This conclusion is supported by the results of modelling the effect of annual or biannual community directed treatment with moxidectin compared to annual or biannual CDTI [62].

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the contribution to data collection in Liberia of Mr. Mawolo Kpawor, who died in October 2016. We acknowledge Dr Fatorma Bolay who directed study center creation and preparation, community engagement, parasitologist training and management of the Liberian study site (see [30]). He died in March 2021. For others whose contribution to the study we want to acknowledge, see [30].

We are particularly grateful to all study participants for their co-operation.

The authors alone are responsible for the views expressed which do not necessarily represent the views, decisions or policies of the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Data availability

Participants consented to publication of summaries of the results, not to sharing of their individual data. Consequently, the Sponsor (WHO) and the authors do not have the participants' permission to make individual participant data publicly available. Individuals wanting to analyze the data should contact the Sponsor (via the corresponding author) or Medicines Development for Global Health to which WHO has licensed the data (via mark.sullivant@medicinesdevelopment.com). Requests should include the objectives, data analysis plan and plans to obtain applicable Ethics Committee approvals and involve the

investigators (co-authors on this manuscript) and commitment to not share the data with anybody else.

In view of the restriction to underlying data sharing, the figures and tables provided in the manuscript have been complemented with detailed output of the statistical analyses in the Supporting Information S1.

Financial Disclosure

WHO/TDR funded this study, utilizing contributions from the WHO African Programme for Onchocerciasis Control (APOC), 6.3 million \$US from Wyeth and following its acquisition by Pfizer, Pfizer, and WHO/TDR donor countries. Wyeth provided drug for this study and contributed to the study protocol. Wyeth prepared the submissions to the Ministries of Health and provided data management services until July 3, 2011. Pfizer was not further involved in this study in any way, including data verification or analysis and has not commented on this manuscript.

Competing interests

I have read the journal's policy and the authors of this manuscript have the following competing interests: ACK and CMH are staff of WHO which funded the work of all co-authors on the study whose data are analysed here through its department UNICEF/UNDP/World Bank/WHO Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases (TDR).

Copyright

© 2020 World Health Organization. Licensee Public Library of Science.

This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution IGO License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/igo/>. In any use of this article, there should be no suggestion that WHO endorses any specific organization,

products or services. The use of the WHO logo is not permitted. This notice should be preserved along with the article's original URL.

References

1. Remme JHF, Boatin B, Boussinesq M Helminthic Diseases: Onchocerciasis and Loiasis. In: Quah SR, Cockerham WC, editors. The International Encyclopedia of Public Health, Vol. 3. Oxford: Elsevier. 2017 pp. 576-587.
2. Chesnais CB, Nana-Djeunga HC, Njamnshi AK, Lenou-Nanga CG, Boulle C, Bissek AZ, Kamgno J, Colebunders R, Boussinesq M The temporal relationship between onchocerciasis and epilepsy: a population-based cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2018;18: 1278-1286.
3. Sauerbrey M, Rakers LJ, Richards FO Progress toward elimination of onchocerciasis in the Americas. *Int Health*. 2018;10: i71-i78.
4. World Health Organization Elimination of human onchocerciasis: progress report, 2018-2019. *Weekly Epidemiological Record*. 2019;94: 513-523.
5. World Health Organization Elimination of human onchocerciasis: progress report, 2020 - Elimination de l'onchocercose humaine: rapport de situation, 2020. *Weekly Epidemiological Record*. 2021;96: 557-567.
6. Noma M, Zoure HG, Tekle AH, Enyong PA, Nwoke BE, Remme JH The geographic distribution of Onchocerciasis in the 20 participating countries of the African programme for Onchocerciasis control: (1) priority areas for ivermectin treatment. *Parasit Vectors*. 2014;7: 325.
7. Zoure HG, Noma M, Tekle AH, Amazigo UV, Diggle PJ, Giorgi E, Remme JH The geographic distribution of onchocerciasis in the 20 participating countries of the African Programme for Onchocerciasis control: (2) pre-control endemicity levels and estimated number infected. *Parasit Vectors*. 2014;7: 326.

8. O'Hanlon SJ, Slater HC, Cheke RA, Boatn BA, Coffeng LE, Pion SD, Boussinesq M, Zoure HG, Stolk WA, Basanez MG Model-Based Geostatistical Mapping of the Prevalence of *Onchocerca volvulus* in West Africa. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2016;10: e0004328.
9. Fobi G, Yameogo L, Noma M, Aholou Y, Koroma JB, Zoure HM, Ukety T, Lusamba-Dikassa PS, Mwikisa C, Boakye DA, ROUNGOU JB Managing the Fight against Onchocerciasis in Africa: APOC Experience. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2015;9: e0003542.
10. Coffeng LE, Stolk WA, Zoure HG, Veerman JL, Agblewonus KB, Murdoch ME, Noma M, Fobi G, Richardus JH, Bundy DA, Habbema D, de Vlas SJ, Amazigo UV African Programme For Onchocerciasis Control 1995-2015: model-estimated health impact and cost. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2013;7: e2032.
11. Coffeng LE, Stolk WA, Zoure HG, Veerman JL, Agblewonus KB, Murdoch ME, Noma M, Fobi G, Richardus JH, Bundy DA, Habbema D, de Vlas SJ, Amazigo UV African programme for onchocerciasis control 1995-2015: updated health impact estimates based on new disability weights. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2014;8: e2759.
12. Dadzie Y, Neira M, Hopkins D Final report of the Conference on the eradicability of Onchocerciasis. *Filaria J*. 2003;2: 2.
13. Kuesel AC Research for new drugs for elimination of onchocerciasis in Africa. *Int J Parasitol Drugs Drug Resist*. 2016;6: 272-286.
14. Diawara L, Traore MO, Badji A, Bissan Y, Doumbia K, Goita SF, Konate L, Mounkoro K, Sarr MD, Seck AF, Toe L, Touree S, Remme JH Feasibility of onchocerciasis elimination with ivermectin treatment in endemic foci in Africa: first evidence from studies in Mali and Senegal. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2009;3: e497.
15. Traore MO, Sarr MD, Badji A, Bissan Y, Diawara L, Doumbia K, Goita SF, Konate L, Mounkoro K, Seck AF, Toe L, Toure S, Remme JH Proof-of-principle of onchocerciasis elimination with ivermectin treatment in endemic foci in Africa: final results of a study in Mali and Senegal. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2012;6: e1825.

16. Tekle AH, Zoure HG, Noma M, Boussinesq M, Coffeng LE, Stolk WA, Remme JH
Progress towards onchocerciasis elimination in the participating countries of the African
Programme for Onchocerciasis Control: epidemiological evaluation results. *Infect Dis
Poverty*. 2016;5: 66-91.
17. Walker M, Pion SD, Fang H, Gardon J, Kamgno J, Basáñez M-G, Boussinesq M The
macrofilaricidal efficacy of repeated doses of ivermectin for the treatment of river
blindness. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2017;65: 2026-2034.
18. World Health Organization. Accelerating work to overcome the global impact of neglected
tropical diseases. A roadmap for implementation. Geneva: World Health Organization;
2012.
19. African Programme for Onchocerciasis Control (APOC). Final Communiqué of the 18th
session of the Joint Action Forum (JAF18) of APOC.
[\[http://www.who.int/apoc/publications/recommendations/en/index.html\]](http://www.who.int/apoc/publications/recommendations/en/index.html); 2012.
20. World Health Organization Ending the neglect to attain the sustainable development
goals: a road map for neglected tropical diseases 2021–2030. 2020.
21. African Programme for Onchocerciasis Control (APOC). Report of the consultative
meetings on strategic options and alternative treatment strategies for accelerating
onchocerciasis elimination in Africa. Ouagadougou: African Programme for
Onchocerciasis Control, <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/343028>; 2015.
22. UNICEF/UNDP/World Bank/WHO Special Programme for Research and Training in
Tropical Diseases (TDR) Report of an informal meeting assessing the feasibility of
initiating the first Phase II study of moxidectin tablets in subjects infected with
Onchocerca volvulus. 2008.
23. Cotreau MM, Warren S, Ryan JL, Fleckenstein L, Vanapalli SR, Brown KR, Rock D, Chen
CY, Schwertschlag US The antiparasitic moxidectin: safety, tolerability, and
pharmacokinetics in humans. *J Clin Pharmacol*. 2003;43: 1108-1115.
24. Korth-Bradley JM, Parks V, Chalon S, Gourley I, Matschke K, cailleux K, Fitoussi S,
Fleckenstein L The effect of a high-fat breakfast on the pharmacokinetics of moxidectin

789 in healthy male subjects: a randomized phase I trial. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2012;86: 122-
790 125.

791 25. Korth-Bradley JM, Parks V, Chalon S, Gourley I, Matschke K, Gossart S, Bryson P,
792 Fleckenstein L Excretion of moxidectin into breast milk and pharmacokinetics in healthy
793 lactating women. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2011;55: 5200-5204.

794 26. Korth-Bradley JM, Parks V, Patat A, Matschke K, Mayer P, Fleckenstein L Relative
795 bioavailability of liquid and tablet formulations of the antiparasitic moxidectin. *Clinical*
796 *Pharmacology in Drug Development.* 2012;1: 32-37.

797 27. Korth-Bradley JM, Parks V, Wagner F., Chalon S, Gourley I, Matschke K, Gossart S, Ripp
798 S.L., Fleckenstein L Effect of moxidectin on CYP3A4 activity as evaluated by oral
799 midazolam pharmacokinetics in healthy subjects. *Clinical Pharmacology in Drug*
800 *Development.* 2014;3: 151-157.

801 28. Kinrade SA, Mason JW, Sanabria CR, Rayner CR, Bullock JM, Stanworth SH, Sullivan
802 MT Evaluation of the Cardiac Safety of Long-Acting Endectocide Moxidectin in a
803 Randomized Concentration-QT Study. *Clin Transl Sci.* 2018.

804 29. Awadzi K, Opoku NO, Attah SK, Lazdins-Helds J, Kuesel AC A Randomized, Single-
805 Ascending-Dose, Ivermectin-Controlled, Double-Blind Study of Moxidectin in
806 *Onchocerca volvulus* Infection. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2014;8: e2953.

807 30. Opoku NO, Bakajika DK, Kanza EM, Howard H, Mambandu GL, Nyathirombo A, Nigo
808 MM, Kasonia K, Masembe SL, Mumbere M, Kataliko K, Larbelee JP, Kpawor M, Bolay
809 KM, Bolay F, Asare S, Attah SK, Olipoh G, Vaillant M, Halleux CM, Kuesel AC Single
810 dose moxidectin versus ivermectin for *Onchocerca volvulus* infection in Ghana, Liberia,
811 and the Democratic Republic of the Congo: a randomised, controlled, double-blind
812 phase 3 trial. *Lancet.* 2018;392: 1207-1216.

813 31. Olliaro PL, Kuesel AC, Halleux CM, Sullivan M, Reeder JC Creative use of the priority
814 review voucher by public and not-for-profit actors delivers the first new FDA-approved
815 treatment for river blindness in 20 years. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2018;12: e0006837.

32. Remme J, Ba O, Dadzie KY, Karam M A force-of-infection model for onchocerciasis and its applications in the epidemiological evaluation of the Onchocerciasis Control Programme in the Volta River basin area. *Bull World Health Organ.* 1986;64: 667-681.
33. Ngoumou P, Walsh JF A Manual for Rapid Epidemiological Mapping of Onchocerciasis. 1993.
34. Ngoumou P, Walsh JF, Mace JM A rapid mapping technique for the prevalence and distribution of onchocerciasis: a Cameroon case study. *Ann Trop Med Parasitol.* 1994;88: 463-474.
35. Coffeng LE, Pion SD, O'Hanlon S, Cousens S, Abiose AO, Fischer PU, Remme JH, Dadzie KY, Murdoch ME, de Vlas SJ, Basanez MG, Stolk WA, Boussinesq M Onchocerciasis: the pre-control association between prevalence of palpable nodules and skin microfilariae. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2013;7: e2168.
36. Noma M, Nwoke BE, Nutall I, Tambala PA, Enyong P, Namsenmo A, Remme J, Amazigo UV, Kale OO, Seketeli A Rapid epidemiological mapping of onchocerciasis (REMO): its application by the African Programme for Onchocerciasis Control (APOC). *Ann Trop Med Parasitol.* 2002;96 Suppl 1: S29-S39.
37. Seketeli A, Adeoye G, Eyamba A, Nnoruka E, Drameh P, Amazigo UV, Noma M, Agboton F, Aholou Y, Kale OO, Dadzie KY The achievements and challenges of the African Programme for Onchocerciasis Control (APOC). *Ann Trop Med Parasitol.* 2002;96 Suppl 1: S15-S28.
38. Prost A, Hervouet JP, Thylefors B Epidemiologic status of onchocerciasis. *Bull World Health Organ.* 1979;57: 655-662.
39. Awadzi K, Boakye DA, Edwards G, Opoku NO, Attah SK, Osei-Atweneboana MY, Lazdins-Helds JK, Ardrey AE, Addy ET, Quartey BT, Ahmed K, Boatın BA, Soumbey-Alley EW An investigation of persistent microfilaridermias despite multiple treatments with ivermectin, in two onchocerciasis-endemic foci in Ghana. *Ann Trop Med Parasitol.* 2004;98: 231-249.

- 843 40. Basanez MG, Pion SD, Boakes E, Filipe JA, Churcher TS, Boussinesq M Effect of single-
844 dose ivermectin on *Onchocerca volvulus*: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*
845 *Infect Dis.* 2008;8: 310-322.
- 846 41. Awadzi K, Attah SK, Addy ET, Opoku NO, Quartey BT, Lazdins-Helds JK, Ahmed K,
847 Boatın BA, Boakye DA, Edwards G Thirty-month follow-up of sub-optimal responders to
848 multiple treatments with ivermectin, in two onchocerciasis-endemic foci in Ghana. *Ann*
849 *Trop Med Parasitol.* 2004;98: 359-370.
- 850 42. Bottomley C, Isham V, Vivas-Martinez S, Kuesel AC, Attah SK, Opoku NO, Lustigman S,
851 Walker M, Basanez MG Modelling Neglected Tropical Diseases diagnostics: the
852 sensitivity of skin snips for *Onchocerca volvulus* in near elimination and surveillance
853 settings. *Parasit Vectors.* 2016;9: 343.
- 854 43. Pion SD, Nana-Djeunga HC, Kamgno J, Tendongfor N, Wanji S, Njiokou F, Prichard RK,
855 Boussinesq M Dynamics of *Onchocerca volvulus* Microfilarial Densities after Ivermectin
856 Treatment in an Ivermectin-naive and a Multiply Treated Population from Cameroon.
857 *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2013;7: e2084.
- 858 44. Stolk WA, Walker M, Coffeng LE, Basanez MG, de Vlas SJ Required duration of mass
859 ivermectin treatment for onchocerciasis elimination in Africa: a comparative modelling
860 analysis. *Parasit Vectors.* 2015;8: 552.
- 861 45. Basanez MG, Walker M, Turner HC, Coffeng LE, de Vlas SJ, Stolk WA River Blindness:
862 Mathematical Models for Control and Elimination. *Adv Parasitol.* 2016;94: 247-341.
- 863 46. Pion SD, Grout L, Kamgno J, Nana-Djeunga H, Boussinesq M Individual host factors
864 associated with *Onchocerca volvulus* microfilarial densities 15, 80 and 180 days after a
865 first dose of ivermectin. *Acta Trop.* 2011;120 Suppl 1: S91-S99.
- 866 47. Schulz-Key H Observations on the reproductive biology of *Onchocerca volvulus*. *Acta*
867 *Leiden.* 1990;59: 27-44.
- 868 48. Prichard R, Menez C, Lespine A Moxidectin and the avermectins: Consanguinity but not
869 identity. *Int J Parasitol Drugs Drug Resist.* 2012;2: 134-153.

49. Osei-Atweneboana MY, Eng JK, Boakye DA, Gyapong JO, Prichard RK Prevalence and intensity of *Onchocerca volvulus* infection and efficacy of ivermectin in endemic communities in Ghana: a two-phase epidemiological study. *Lancet*. 2007;369: 2021-2029.
50. Osei-Atweneboana MY, Awadzi K, Attah SK, Boakye DA, Gyapong JO, Prichard RK Phenotypic Evidence of Emerging Ivermectin Resistance in *Onchocerca volvulus*. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2011;5: e998.
51. Doyle SR, Bourguinat C, Nana-Djeunga HC, Kengne-Ouafo JA, Pion SDS, Bopda J, Kamgno J, Wanji S, Che H, Kuesel AC, Walker M, Basanez MG, Boakye DA, Osei-Atweneboana MY, Boussinesq M, Prichard RK, Grant WN Genome-wide analysis of ivermectin response by *Onchocerca volvulus* reveals that genetic drift and soft selective sweeps contribute to loss of drug sensitivity. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2017;11: e0005816.
52. Hedtke SM, Kuesel AC, Crawford KE, Graves PM, Boussinesq M, Lau CL, Boakye DA, Grant WN Genomic Epidemiology in Filarial Nematodes: Transforming the Basis for Elimination Program Decisions. *Front Genet*. 2020;10: 1282.
53. Churcher TS, Pion SD, Osei-Atweneboana MY, Prichard RK, Awadzi K, Boussinesq M, Collins RC, Whitworth JA, Basanez MG Identifying sub-optimal responses to ivermectin in the treatment of River Blindness. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2009;106: 16716-16721.
54. Gardon J, Boussinesq M, Kamgno J, Gardon-Wendel N, Demanga N, Duke BO Effects of standard and high doses of ivermectin on adult worms of *Onchocerca volvulus*: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2002;360: 203-210.
55. Nana-Djeunga HC, Bourguinat C, Pion SD, Bopda J, Kengne-Ouafo JA, Njiokou F, Prichard RK, Wanji S, Kamgno J, Boussinesq M Reproductive status of *Onchocerca volvulus* after ivermectin treatment in an ivermectin-naive and a frequently treated population from Cameroon. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2014;8: e2824.
56. Garms R, Walsh JF, Davies JB Studies on the reinvasion of the Onchocerciasis Control Programme in the Volta River Basin by *Simulium damnosum* s.l. with emphasis on the south-western areas. *Tropenmed Parasitol*. 1979;30: 345-362.

57. Baker RH, Guillet P, Seketeli A, Poudiougou P, Boakye D, Wilson MD, Bissan Y Progress in controlling the reinvasion of windborne vectors into the western area of the Onchocerciasis Control Programme in West Africa. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.* 1990;328: 731-47, discussion.
58. World Health Organization and Onchocerciasis Control Programme in West Africa. Twenty years of onchocerciasis control in West Africa: review of the work of the Onchocerciasis Control Programme in West Africa from 1974-1994. Geneva: World Health Organization; 1997.
59. Le BR, Garms R, Davies JB, Walsh JF, Philippon B Displacements of *Simulium* *damnosum* and strategy of control against onchocerciasis. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.* 1979;287: 277-288.
60. Koala L, Nikiema A, Post RJ, Pare AB, Kafando CM, Drabo F, Traore S Recrudescence of onchocerciasis in the Comoe valley in Southwest Burkina Faso. *Acta Trop.* 2017;166: 96-105.
61. Koala L, Nikiema AS, Pare AB, Drabo F, Toe LD, Belem AMG, Boakye DA, Traore S, Dabire RK Entomological assessment of the transmission following recrudescence of onchocerciasis in the Comoe Valley, Burkina Faso. *Parasit Vectors.* 2019;12: 34.
62. Turner HC, Walker M, Attah SK, Opoku NO, Awadzi K, Kuesel AC, Basanez MG The potential impact of moxidectin on onchocerciasis elimination in Africa: an economic evaluation based on the Phase II clinical trial data. *Parasit Vectors.* 2015;8: 167-179.

920 Supporting information S1

921 **Table S1 GPS coordinates of participant villages, research center and towns in the vicinity**

Study area	Village where participants lived	Research Center	Towns for reference	Latitude	Longitude
Nord Kivu, DRC	Mambena			0.418306	29.225528
Nord Kivu, DRC	Mambingi			0.36656	29.27531
Nord Kivu, DRC	Visiki			0.37709	29.23835
Nord Kivu, DRC		Butembo		0.11405	29.30180
Nord Kivu, DRC			Beni	0.49901	29.45275
Nord Ituri, DRC	Adrasi			2.123217	30.969
Nord Ituri, DRC	Draju			2.118517	30.966067
Nord Ituri, DRC	Jupadrogo			2.1278	30.966067
Nord Ituri, DRC	Jupagasa			2.121	30.982133
Nord Ituri, DRC	Juparima			2.0868	30.955917
Nord Ituri, DRC	Kanga			2.074233	30.954283
Nord Ituri, DRC	Kpana			2.1114	30.96585
Nord Ituri, DRC	Ndroy			2.103917	30.974417
Nord Ituri, DRC	Ngbungbu			2.120117	30.97925
Nord Ituri, DRC	Rudju			2.124517	30.9835
Nord Ituri, DRC	Ulyeko			2.13545	30.956383
Nord Ituri, DRC	Umulo			2.131033	30.972117
Nord Ituri, DRC	Yawu			2.125017	30.965883
Nord Ituri, DRC		Rethy		2.07500	30.92165
Nord Ituri, DRC			Bunia	1.57428	30.23973
Nord Ituri, DRC			Logo	2.183167	30.927333
Nord Ituri, DRC			Mahagi	2.30547	30.97616
Lofa County, Lib.	Kamatahun			8.1368	-10.297133
Lofa County, Lib.	Yallahun			8.131033	-10.3124
Lofa County, Lib.	Yandohun			8.105333	-10.35805
Lofa County, Lib.	Yengma			8.170283	-10.307933
Lofa County, Lib.	Fokolahun			8.15935	-10.274517
Lofa County, Lib.		Bolahun		8.23092	-10.16064
Lofa County, Lib.			Foya	8.39492	-10.21516
Lofa County, Lib.			Lofa	8.19112	-9.72327
Lofa County, Liberia			Voinjama	8.42020	-9.75393
Nkwanta Dist., Ghana	Azua			8.57208	0.40642
Nkwanta Dist., Ghana	Bitaaaba			8.51159	0.31829
Nkwanta Dist., Ghana	Jagri Akura			8.53148	0.35278
Nkwanta Dist., Ghana	Wii			8.51974	0.33389
Ghana		Hohoe		7.15185	0.473829
Nkwanta District, Ghana			Kpasa	8.48962	0.30428
Nkwanta District, Ghana			Nkwanta	8.26031	0.52211
Ghana			Wiae	8.32275	-0.16192
Ghana			Asubende	7.91667	-1.16667
Ghana			Kyingakrom	8.10122	-2.05871

922

Table S2 SmfD pre-treatment, 1, 6, 12 and 18 months post treatment across all study areas by intensity of infection pre-treatment

Pre-Tx Iol (mf/mg)	Treatment Group	N	Raw Mean (SD)	Raw 95% CI	Raw Median (1Q,3Q)	Raw Min., Max.	Geometric Mean (95%CI)	Overall p-value (a)
Pre-treatment SmfD								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	281	13.9 (2.9)	[13.6,14.3]	13.0 (11.0,16.0)	9.0,19.0	13.7 [13.4,14.0]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	150	14.1 (2.9)	[13.6,14.5]	14.0 (11.0,17.0)	10.0,19.0	13.8 [13.3,14.2]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	456	32.3 (8.6)	[31.5,33.1]	31.0 (24.0,40.0)	20.0,49.0	31.2 [30.4,32.0]	
	Ivermectin	183	31.9 (8.3)	[30.7,33.1]	31.0 (25.0,38.0)	20.0,49.0	30.9 [29.7,32.1]	
50 - <80	Moxidectin	157	62.4 (7.9)	[61.2,63.7]	62.0 (56.0,69.0)	50.0,79.0	61.9 [60.7,63.2]	
	Ivermectin	108	62.0 (8.6)	[60.3,63.6]	60.5 (55.0,69.0)	50.0,79.0	61.4 [59.8,63.0]	
≥80	Moxidectin	84	113.7 (37.0)	[105.6,121.7]	100.5 (89.0,135.0)	80.0,299.0	109.1 [102.8,115.8]	
	Ivermectin	53	107.4 (32.7)	[98.4,116.5]	93.0 (87.0,112.0)	80.0,238.0	103.7 [96.7,111.3]	
Month 1								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	281	0.0 (0.1)	[-0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,1.0	0.0 [-0.0,0.0]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	150	0.9 (2.4)	[0.6,1.3]	0.0 (0.0,1.0)	0.0,16.0	0.4 [0.3,0.6]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	452	0.0 (0.2)	[0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,3.0	0.0 [0.0,0.0]	
	Ivermectin	183	1.7 (5.4)	[0.9,2.5]	0.0 (0.0,1.0)	0.0,51.0	0.6 [0.4,0.8]	
50 - <80	Moxidectin	157	0.1 (0.3)	[0.0,0.1]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,3.0	0.0 [0.0,0.1]	
	Ivermectin	106	3.2 (8.9)	[1.5,5.0]	0.0 (0.0,2.0)	0.0,54.0	0.9 [0.6,1.3]	
≥80	Moxidectin	83	0.5 (1.3)	[0.2,0.8]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,8.0	0.2 [0.1,0.4]	
	Ivermectin	53	6.2 (13.8)	[2.4,10.0]	0.0 (0.0,3.0)	0.0,52.0	1.5 [0.8,2.5]	
Month 6								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	275	0.0 (0.1)	[-0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,2.0	0.0 [-0.0,0.0]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	150	1.3 (2.6)	[0.9,1.8]	1.0 (0.0,1.0)	0.0,21.0	0.8 [0.6,1.0]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	449	0.0 (0.1)	[0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,1.0	0.0 [0.0,0.0]	
	Ivermectin	181	2.6 (4.4)	[2.0,3.3]	1.0 (0.0,3.0)	0.0,31.0	1.5 [1.2,1.8]	
50 - <80	Moxidectin	154	0.0 (0.1)	[-0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,1.0	0.0 [-0.0,0.0]	
	Ivermectin	107	5.1 (7.2)	[3.8,6.5]	2.0 (1.0,7.0)	0.0,36.0	2.8 [2.1,3.5]	
≥80	Moxidectin	84	0.0 (0.2)	[0.0,0.1]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,1.0	0.0 [0.0,0.1]	
	Ivermectin	53	10.5 (10.2)	[7.7,13.3]	7.0 (3.0,17.0)	0.0,43.0	6.5 [4.7,8.9]	
Month 12								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	270	0.4 (1.0)	[0.2,0.5]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,8.0	0.2 [0.1,0.3]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	148	3.4 (6.0)	[2.5,4.4]	2.0 (1.0,4.0)	0.0,58.0	1.9 [1.6,2.4]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	440	1.1 (2.7)	[0.9,1.4]	0.0 (0.0,1.0)	0.0,18.0	0.5 [0.4,0.6]	
	Ivermectin	177	7.0 (8.3)	[5.7,8.2]	4.0 (2.0,10.0)	0.0,49.0	4.2 [3.5,4.9]	
50 - <80	Moxidectin	154	2.3 (4.4)	[1.6,3.0]	0.0 (0.0,2.0)	0.0,28.0	1.0 [0.7,1.3]	
	Ivermectin	103	15.2 (13.0)	[12.6,17.7]	11.0 (6.0,22.0)	0.0,49.0	10.0 [8.0,12.3]	
≥80	Moxidectin	83	2.6 (4.5)	[1.6,3.5]	1.0 (0.0,2.0)	0.0,20.0	1.2 [0.8,1.6]	
	Ivermectin	52	28.6 (18.1)	[23.5,33.6]	24.5 (15.0,38.5)	1.0,77.0	22.5 [17.9,28.1]	
Month 18								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	270	0.4 (1.0)	[0.2,0.5]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,8.0	0.2 [0.1,0.3]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	148	3.4 (6.0)	[2.5,4.4]	2.0 (1.0,4.0)	0.0,58.0	1.9 [1.6,2.4]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	440	1.1 (2.7)	[0.9,1.4]	0.0 (0.0,1.0)	0.0,18.0	0.5 [0.4,0.6]	
	Ivermectin	177	7.0 (8.3)	[5.7,8.2]	4.0 (2.0,10.0)	0.0,49.0	4.2 [3.5,4.9]	
50 - <80	Moxidectin	154	2.3 (4.4)	[1.6,3.0]	0.0 (0.0,2.0)	0.0,28.0	1.0 [0.7,1.3]	
	Ivermectin	103	15.2 (13.0)	[12.6,17.7]	11.0 (6.0,22.0)	0.0,49.0	10.0 [8.0,12.3]	
≥80	Moxidectin	83	2.6 (4.5)	[1.6,3.5]	1.0 (0.0,2.0)	0.0,20.0	1.2 [0.8,1.6]	
	Ivermectin	52	28.6 (18.1)	[23.5,33.6]	24.5 (15.0,38.5)	1.0,77.0	22.5 [17.9,28.1]	

(a) p-value for the difference in SmfD at the indicated month between Iol categories, obtained from linear model where mean skin microfilarial density at 1, 6, 12 or 18 months was the outcome variable with treatment as explanatory variable controlling for other covariates such as intensity of infection pre-treatment and sex. p = <0.0001 for Iol <20, 20-<50, 50-<80, ≥80 for the interaction of Iol category and treatment across SmfD at Month 1, 6, 12, 18, obtained from linear model where mean skin microfilarial density at 1, 6, 12 or 18 months was the outcome variable with treatment as explanatory variable controlling for other covariates such as intensity of infection pre-treatment and sex. SmfD were logarithmic transformed ($y'=\log(y+1)$) before analysis and back transformed to give geometric means and difference of geometric means in the dimension of the raw data.

Table S3 SmfD pre-treatment, 1, 6, 12 and 18 months post treatment in Nord-Kivu (DRC) by intensity of infection pre-treatment

Pre-Tx Iol (mf/mg)	Treatment Group	N	Raw Mean (SD)	Raw 95% CI	Raw Median (1Q,3Q)	Raw Min., Max.	Geometric Mean [95%CI]	Overall p-value (a)
Pre-treatment SmfD								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	92	13.7 (3.0)	[13.0,14.3]	13.2 (11.0,16.2)	9.7,19.5	13.4 [12.8,14.0]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	51	14.2 (3.3)	[13.3,15.2]	14.7 (10.9,17.1)	9.7,19.3	13.9 [13.0,14.8]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	151	31.8 (8.7)	[30.4,33.2]	31.3 (23.8,39.7)	19.5,49.5	30.7 [29.3,32.1]	
	Ivermectin	53	32.4 (8.3)	[30.1,34.6]	30.8 (25.4,37.5)	20.7,48.5	31.4 [29.2,33.6]	
≥50	Moxidectin	62	71.5 (21.5)	[66.0,76.9]	65.4 (56.4,75.4)	51.2,150.0	69.0 [64.7,73.6]	
	Ivermectin	51	70.8 (27.9)	[63.0,78.7]	61.3 (55.5,74.1)	49.6,207.2	67.4 [62.1,73.2]	
Month 1								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	92	0.0 (0.1)	[-0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,1.0	0.0 [-0.0,0.0]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	51	0.5 (0.9)	[0.3,0.8]	0.2 (0.0,0.6)	0.0,3.8	0.4 [0.2,0.6]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	148	0.0 (0.1)	[0.0,0.1]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,0.8	0.0 [0.0,0.0]	
	Ivermectin	53	1.8 (3.9)	[0.7,2.9]	0.3 (0.0,0.9)	0.0,18.2	0.8 [0.4,1.2]	
≥50	Moxidectin	62	0.1 (0.3)	[0.0,0.2]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,1.5	0.1 [0.0,0.1]	
	Ivermectin	49	4.3 (8.7)	[1.8,6.8]	0.7 (0.0,3.1)	0.0,44.8	1.6 [0.9,2.5]	
Month 6								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	89	0.0 (0.2)	[-0.0,0.1]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,1.7	0.0 [-0.0,0.0]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	51	0.9 (1.3)	[0.5,1.2]	0.4 (0.1,1.2)	0.0,7.4	0.6 [0.4,0.9]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	148	0.0 (0.0)	[0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,0.5	0.0 [0.0,0.0]	
	Ivermectin	51	2.6 (4.9)	[1.3,4.0]	0.9 (0.3,2.9)	0.0,28.0	1.4 [0.9,2.0]	
≥50	Moxidectin	61	0.0 (0.1)	[-0.0,0.1]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,0.7	0.0 [0.0,0.1]	
	Ivermectin	50	6.8 (9.3)	[4.2,9.5]	2.9 (0.9,8.6)	0.0,36.3	3.5 [2.4,5.0]	
Month 12								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	90	0.1 (0.2)	[0.0,0.1]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,1.3	0.1 [0.0,0.1]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	51	1.6 (1.7)	[1.1,2.1]	0.9 (0.4,2.3)	0.0,7.1	1.2 [0.8,1.6]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	147	0.4 (0.8)	[0.3,0.6]	0.0 (0.0,0.5)	0.0,4.9	0.3 [0.2,0.4]	
	Ivermectin	50	6.3 (9.6)	[3.6,9.0]	2.7 (1.2,5.7)	0.0,49.3	3.3 [2.2,4.6]	
≥50	Moxidectin	61	1.1 (2.4)	[0.5,1.7]	0.2 (0.0,0.8)	0.0,12.1	0.6 [0.3,0.8]	
	Ivermectin	48	16.9 (15.5)	[12.4,21.4]	14.7 (3.4,23.3)	0.0,70.3	10.2 [7.1,14.4]	
Month 18								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	61	0.5 (1.4)	[0.2,0.9]	0.0 (0.0,0.2)	0.0,9.0	0.3 [0.1,0.4]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	34	2.3 (2.6)	[1.4,3.2]	1.6 (0.4,2.7)	0.0,12.1	1.6 [1.1,2.3]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	87	1.4 (2.2)	[0.9,1.9]	0.2 (0.0,2.3)	0.0,10.7	0.8 [0.6,1.1]	
	Ivermectin	34	7.9 (10.2)	[4.3,11.5]	3.5 (0.4,15.2)	0.0,49.8	3.8 [2.2,6.2]	
≥50	Moxidectin	53	3.4 (6.0)	[1.8,5.1]	1.2 (0.0,3.3)	0.0,26.5	1.6 [1.0,2.3]	
	Ivermectin	33	22.6 (18.5)	[16.0,29.1]	19.6 (7.0,35.9)	0.0,63.3	13.7 [8.8,21.1]	

(a) p-value obtained from linear model where mean skin microfilarial density at 1, 6, 12 or 18 months was the outcome variable with treatment as explanatory variable controlling for other covariates such as intensity of infection pre-treatment and sex.

p = <0.0001 for Iol <20, 20-<50, ≥80 for the interaction of Iol category and treatment across SmfD at Month 1, 6, 12, 18, obtained from linear model where mean skin microfilarial density at 1, 6, 12 or 18 months was the outcome variable with treatment as explanatory variable controlling for other covariates such as intensity of infection pre-treatment and sex.

SmfD were logarithmic transformed ($y'=\log(y+1)$) before analysis and back transformed to give geometric means and difference of geometric means in the dimension of the raw data.

Table S4 SmfD pre-treatment, 1, 6, 12 and 18 months post treatment in Nord-Ituri (DRC) by intensity of infection pre-treatment

Pre-Tx Iol (mf/mg)	Treatment Group	N	Raw Mean (SD)	Raw 95% CI	Raw Median (1Q,3Q)	Raw Min., Max.	Geometric Mean (95%CI)	Overall p-value (a)
Pre-treatment SmfD								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	64	13.9 (2.9)	[13.2,14.6]	13.9 (11.6,16.3)	9.6,19.5	13.6 [12.9,14.4]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	33	14.1 (2.9)	[13.1,15.1]	13.2 (12.0,16.4)	9.9,19.4	13.8 [12.8,14.9]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	145	32.9 (8.5)	[31.5,34.3]	31.9 (25.5,40.2)	19.8,49.3	31.8 [30.4,33.2]	
	Ivermectin	53	32.5 (8.8)	[30.0,34.9]	32.3 (23.7,39.9)	20.2,49.4	31.3 [29.0,33.8]	
≥50	Moxidectin	106	89.6 (41.6)	[81.6,97.6]	73.3 (61.3,104.0)	49.6,299.4	82.7 [76.9,89.0]	
	Ivermectin	71	85.5 (33.3)	[77.6,93.4]	77.7 (60.7,97.4)	50.2,238.3	80.7 [74.6,87.2]	
Month 1								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	64	0.0 (0.1)	[-0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,0.6	0.0 [-0.0,0.0]	0.014
	Ivermectin	33	1.6 (3.2)	[0.5,2.8]	0.2 (0.0,1.1)	0.0,11.5	0.8 [0.3,1.3]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	145	0.1 (0.4)	[0.0,0.2]	0.0 (0.0,0.1)	0.0,3.4	0.1 [0.0,0.1]	
	Ivermectin	53	2.1 (5.8)	[0.5,3.7]	0.1 (0.0,1.5)	0.0,34.6	0.8 [0.4,1.2]	
≥50	Moxidectin	105	0.4 (1.2)	[0.2,0.7]	0.0 (0.0,0.3)	0.0,8.4	0.2 [0.1,0.4]	
	Ivermectin	71	4.7 (12.5)	[1.7,7.6]	0.2 (0.0,1.7)	0.0,51.9	1.1 [0.6,1.7]	
Month 6								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	64	0.0 (0.0)	[-0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,0.1	0.0 [-0.0,0.0]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	33	1.9 (4.0)	[0.5,3.3]	0.5 (0.0,1.3)	0.0,21.2	0.9 [0.5,1.6]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	142	0.0 (0.1)	[0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,0.4	0.0 [0.0,0.0]	
	Ivermectin	53	2.9 (4.1)	[1.8,4.1]	1.6 (0.3,3.9)	0.0,21.6	1.8 [1.2,2.5]	
≥50	Moxidectin	106	0.0 (0.1)	[0.0,0.1]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,1.2	0.0 [0.0,0.1]	
	Ivermectin	71	8.2 (9.2)	[6.1,10.4]	4.3 (1.7,11.7)	0.0,43.1	4.8 [3.6,6.4]	
Month 12								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	62	0.4 (0.7)	[0.2,0.6]	0.0 (0.0,0.4)	0.0,3.6	0.3 [0.2,0.4]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	33	5.9 (10.8)	[2.1,9.7]	2.3 (0.5,6.5)	0.0,57.5	2.7 [1.5,4.4]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	140	1.2 (2.5)	[0.8,1.7]	0.2 (0.0,0.9)	0.0,14.9	0.6 [0.5,0.8]	
	Ivermectin	53	8.5 (7.9)	[6.4,10.7]	7.1 (3.0,10.2)	0.0,35.5	5.8 [4.3,7.7]	
≥50	Moxidectin	106	2.4 (3.9)	[1.6,3.1]	0.7 (0.1,3.0)	0.0,20.1	1.2 [0.9,1.6]	
	Ivermectin	70	22.3 (17.0)	[18.3,26.4]	17.3 (9.3,34.7)	0.0,76.5	16.1 [12.8,20.1]	
Month 18								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	59	2.0 (2.5)	[1.3,2.6]	0.7 (0.1,3.0)	0.0,10.3	1.2 [0.8,1.7]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	28	8.5 (10.2)	[4.5,12.5]	5.5 (2.1,9.3)	0.0,41.2	5.1 [3.2,7.8]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	125	4.9 (9.1)	[3.3,6.5]	1.6 (0.3,5.3)	0.0,63.2	2.2 [1.7,2.8]	
	Ivermectin	46	14.5 (13.5)	[10.5,18.5]	9.8 (7.0,18.7)	0.1,57.4	9.8 [7.3,13.2]	
≥50	Moxidectin	99	11.3 (14.4)	[8.4,14.1]	5.5 (0.9,18.4)	0.0,70.5	5.3 [4.0,7.0]	
	Ivermectin	68	35.1 (24.3)	[29.2,41.0]	30.1 (15.8,50.1)	0.5,101.3	26.4 [21.3,32.6]	

(a) p-value obtained from linear model where mean skin microfilarial density at 1, 6, 12 or 18 months was the outcome variable with treatment as explaining variable controlling for other covariates such as intensity of infection pre-treatment and sex.
p = <0.0001 for Iol <20, 20-<50, ≥80 for the interaction of Iol category and treatment across SmfD at Month 1, 6, 12, 18, obtained from linear model where mean skin microfilarial density at 1, 6, 12 or 18 months was the outcome variable with treatment as explanatory variable controlling for other covariates such as intensity of infection pre-treatment and sex.
SmfD were logarithmic transformed ($y'=\log(y+1)$) before analysis and back transformed to give geometric means and difference of geometric means in the dimension of the raw data.

Table S5 SmfD pre-treatment, 1, 6, 12 and 18 months post treatment in Lofa County, Liberia, by intensity of infection pre-treatment

Pre-Tx Iol (mf/mg)	Treatment Group	N	Raw Mean (SD)	Raw 95% CI	Raw Median (1Q,3Q)	Raw Min., Max.	Geometric Mean (95%CI)	Overall p-value (a)
Pre-treatment SmfD								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	83	13.9 (2.8)	[13.3,14.5]	13.1 (11.8,16.4)	9.2,19.4	13.7 [13.1,14.3]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	42	13.5 (2.7)	[12.7,14.3]	13.3 (10.9,15.3)	9.7,18.8	13.3 [12.5,14.1]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	84	31.9 (7.8)	[30.2,33.6]	30.7 (24.9,38.5)	19.5,47.3	31.0 [29.4,32.7]	
	Ivermectin	39	30.2 (7.7)	[27.7,32.7]	28.0 (23.9,33.4)	19.7,48.6	29.4 [27.1,31.8]	
≥50	Moxidectin	33	70.1 (24.2)	[61.5,78.7]	63.4 (54.9,73.8)	50.3,157.0	67.2 [60.9,74.1]	
	Ivermectin	18	64.1 (12.2)	[58.0,70.2]	61.3 (54.6,69.1)	51.2,90.4	63.1 [57.8,69.0]	
Month 1								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	83	0.0 (0.1)	[-0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,0.5	0.0 [-0.0,0.0]	0.053
	Ivermectin	42	0.7 (1.8)	[0.1,1.3]	0.0 (0.0,0.4)	0.0,9.8	0.3 [0.1,0.6]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	84	0.0 (0.1)	[0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,0.4	0.0 [0.0,0.0]	
	Ivermectin	39	0.7 (1.3)	[0.2,1.1]	0.0 (0.0,0.8)	0.0,6.0	0.4 [0.2,0.7]	
≥50	Moxidectin	33	0.1 (0.2)	[-0.0,0.1]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,1.0	0.0 [0.0,0.1]	
	Ivermectin	18	4.3 (12.6)	[-2.0,10.5]	0.1 (0.0,1.7)	0.0,53.6	1.0 [0.1,2.5]	
Month 6								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	80	0.0 (0.0)	[-0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,0.3	0.0 [-0.0,0.0]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	42	0.9 (1.0)	[0.6,1.2]	0.6 (0.2,1.2)	0.0,4.0	0.7 [0.5,1.0]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	83	0.0 (0.2)	[-0.0,0.1]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,1.1	0.0 [-0.0,0.0]	
	Ivermectin	39	1.6 (2.6)	[0.8,2.5]	0.9 (0.3,1.7)	0.0,15.3	1.1 [0.7,1.5]	
≥50	Moxidectin	33	0.1 (0.2)	[-0.0,0.1]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,1.4	0.0 [-0.0,0.1]	
	Ivermectin	18	3.9 (5.2)	[1.3,6.5]	1.9 (0.5,5.2)	0.0,21.5	2.3 [1.1,4.1]	
Month 12								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	77	0.5 (1.3)	[0.2,0.8]	0.0 (0.0,0.2)	0.0,8.3	0.2 [0.1,0.4]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	41	2.4 (2.7)	[1.6,3.3]	1.4 (0.8,2.9)	0.0,10.3	1.7 [1.1,2.3]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	78	1.1 (2.9)	[0.5,1.8]	0.1 (0.0,0.8)	0.0,18.2	0.5 [0.3,0.8]	
	Ivermectin	36	4.7 (6.2)	[2.6,6.8]	3.0 (1.1,5.4)	0.0,34.0	3.0 [2.0,4.2]	
≥50	Moxidectin	32	1.8 (3.8)	[0.5,3.2]	0.2 (0.0,1.5)	0.0,15.8	0.8 [0.3,1.4]	
	Ivermectin	16	12.0 (11.1)	[6.1,17.9]	7.5 (5.4,17.6)	0.6,43.8	8.5 [5.0,13.9]	
Month 18								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	75	1.1 (2.2)	[0.6,1.6]	0.2 (0.0,1.0)	0.0,14.9	0.6 [0.4,0.9]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	40	3.5 (3.3)	[2.4,4.5]	2.1 (1.0,5.1)	0.0,13.0	2.5 [1.7,3.4]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	75	2.0 (3.7)	[1.2,2.9]	0.3 (0.0,2.0)	0.0,16.0	0.9 [0.6,1.4]	
	Ivermectin	37	7.2 (9.3)	[4.1,10.3]	3.4 (2.2,7.7)	0.0,40.9	3.9 [2.5,6.0]	
≥50	Moxidectin	33	4.6 (7.1)	[2.1,7.1]	1.6 (0.0,5.7)	0.0,27.1	2.0 [1.0,3.4]	
	Ivermectin	16	15.6 (16.5)	[6.8,24.4]	11.5 (3.9,22.7)	1.7,66.4	10.1 [5.7,17.3]	

(a) p-value obtained from linear model where mean skin microfilarial density at 1, 6, 12 or 18 months was the outcome variable with treatment as explaining variable controlling for other covariates such as intensity of infection pre-treatment and sex.
p = <0.0001 for Iol <20, 20-<50, ≥80 for the interaction of Iol category and treatment across SmfD at Month 1, 6, 12, 18, obtained from linear model where mean skin microfilarial density at 1, 6, 12 or 18 months was the outcome variable with treatment as explanatory variable controlling for other covariates such as intensity of infection pre-treatment and sex.
SmfD were logarithmic transformed ($y'=\log(y+1)$) before analysis and back transformed to give geometric means and difference of geometric means in the dimension of the raw data.

Table S6 SmfD pre-treatment, 1, 6, 12 and 18 months post treatment in Nkwanta district, Ghana, by intensity of infection pre-treatment

Pre-Tx Iol	Treatment Group	N	Raw Mean (SD)	Raw 95% CI	Raw Median (1Q,3Q)	Raw Min., Max.	Geometric Mean (95%CI)	Overall p-value (a)
Pre-treatment SmfD								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	42	14.7 (2.8)	[13.9,15.6]	14.5 (12.3,17.6)	10.5,19.0	14.5 [13.6,15.4]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	24	14.5 (2.6)	[13.4,15.6]	14.5 (13.1,17.1)	10.0,18.6	14.3 [13.2,15.5]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	76	32.5 (9.5)	[30.3,34.6]	31.9 (23.2,40.5)	19.6,49.2	31.2 [29.1,33.3]	
	Ivermectin	38	32.1 (8.3)	[29.4,34.8]	32.1 (24.6,37.8)	20.4,48.1	31.1 [28.5,33.9]	
≥50	Moxidectin	40	77.8 (23.3)	[70.4,85.3]	75.0 (60.5,90.7)	49.8,160.6	75.0 [68.7,81.8]	
	Ivermectin	21	73.8 (19.4)	[65.0,82.6]	71.4 (58.5,82.4)	49.6,124.0	71.6 [63.9,80.2]	
Month 1								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	42	0.0 (0.0)	[-0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,0.2	0.0 [-0.0,0.0]	0.448
	Ivermectin	24	1.5 (3.7)	[-0.0,3.1]	0.2 (0.0,0.6)	0.0,15.9	0.6 [0.2,1.3]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	75	0.0 (0.0)	[0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,0.2	0.0 [0.0,0.0]	
	Ivermectin	38	2.3 (8.5)	[-0.5,5.1]	0.0 (0.0,0.5)	0.0,51.3	0.6 [0.2,1.1]	
≥50	Moxidectin	40	0.1 (0.2)	[0.0,0.1]	0.0 (0.0,0.1)	0.0,1.1	0.1 [0.0,0.1]	
	Ivermectin	21	2.9 (7.7)	[-0.6,6.4]	0.2 (0.0,2.2)	0.0,34.8	0.9 [0.2,2.0]	
Month 6								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	42	0.0 (0.1)	[0.0,0.0]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,0.3	0.0 [0.0,0.0]	0.105
	Ivermectin	24	2.5 (3.8)	[0.9,4.1]	1.1 (0.5,3.0)	0.2,17.1	1.6 [0.9,2.5]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	76	0.0 (0.1)	[0.0,0.1]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,0.9	0.0 [0.0,0.1]	
	Ivermectin	38	3.4 (5.2)	[1.7,5.1]	1.8 (0.8,4.8)	0.0,31.0	2.1 [1.4,3.0]	
≥50	Moxidectin	38	0.0 (0.1)	[0.0,0.1]	0.0 (0.0,0.0)	0.0,0.4	0.0 [0.0,0.1]	
	Ivermectin	21	5.2 (7.0)	[2.1,8.4]	2.1 (1.6,6.1)	0.2,29.7	3.2 [1.8,5.2]	
Month 12								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	41	0.8 (1.6)	[0.3,1.3]	0.1 (0.0,0.8)	0.0,8.3	0.5 [0.3,0.8]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	23	5.5 (5.2)	[3.2,7.7]	4.4 (1.6,6.5)	0.0,22.9	3.9 [2.4,5.9]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	75	2.5 (4.2)	[1.6,3.5]	0.6 (0.0,3.4)	0.0,18.4	1.3 [0.8,1.8]	
	Ivermectin	38	7.8 (8.4)	[5.0,10.6]	5.6 (2.3,11.3)	0.0,40.3	4.9 [3.4,7.1]	
≥50	Moxidectin	38	5.2 (6.8)	[2.9,7.4]	2.2 (0.1,6.2)	0.0,27.9	2.5 [1.4,4.0]	
	Ivermectin	21	23.0 (15.7)	[15.8,30.1]	18.0 (8.1,34.2)	0.5,49.2	17.1 [11.2,26.0]	
Month 18								
10 - <20	Moxidectin	32	2.8 (4.2)	[1.3,4.4]	1.0 (0.0,3.2)	0.0,18.9	1.5 [0.8,2.4]	<0.0001
	Ivermectin	15	9.6 (7.5)	[5.5,13.8]	8.2 (3.5,13.1)	0.0,29.8	7.0 [4.0,11.9]	
20 - <50	Moxidectin	49	7.9 (11.1)	[4.7,11.1]	3.1 (1.5,8.2)	0.0,47.5	4.0 [2.7,5.7]	
	Ivermectin	23	14.6 (10.1)	[10.2,18.9]	14.1 (6.2,20.2)	0.2,41.7	10.9 [7.3,16.2]	
≥50	Moxidectin	16	13.6 (19.2)	[3.4,23.8]	3.3 (0.9,25.1)	0.0,70.0	5.2 [1.9,12.2]	
	Ivermectin	12	33.4 (16.5)	[22.9,43.9]	32.1 (22.9,42.2)	4.7,61.7	28.8 [18.8,43.7]	

(a) p-value for the difference in SmfD at the indicated month between Iol categories, obtained from linear model where mean skin microfilarial density at 1, 6, 12 or 18 months was the outcome variable with treatment as explanatory variable controlling for other covariates such as intensity of infection pre-treatment and sex. p = <0.0001 for Iol <20, 20-<50, ≥50 for the interaction of Iol category and treatment across SmfD at Month 1, 6, 12, 18, obtained from linear model where mean skin microfilarial density at 1, 6, 12 or 18 months was the outcome variable with treatment as explanatory variable controlling for other covariates such as intensity of infection pre-treatment and sex. SmfD were logarithmic transformed ($y'=\log(y+1)$) before analysis and back transformed to give geometric means and difference of geometric means in the dimension of the raw data.

Table S7 Adjusted arithmetic and geometric means and mean differences in SmfD 1, 6, 12 and 18 months post treatment by study area

Study area Time post treatment	Treatment Group	Adjusted Mean (95%CI)	Difference of adj. means (95%CI)	Adjusted Geometric Mean (95%CI)	Difference of Adj geometric Mean (95%CI)	Percent Diffe- rence	p-value°
Nord Kivu							
Month 1	Moxidectin	0.0 [-0.1;0.1]		0.0 [-0.1;0.1]			
	Ivermectin	0.6 [0.5;0.7]	0.5 [0.4;0.7]	0.7 [0.6;0.9]	0.7 (0.6;0.8)	98.57	<0.0001
Month 6	Moxidectin	-0.0 [-0.1;0.1]		-0.0 [-0.1;0.1]			
	Ivermectin	0.9 [0.8;1.0]	0.9 [0.8;1.0]	1.4 [1.2;1.7]	1.4 (1.3;1.6)	100.42	<0.0001
Month 12	Moxidectin	0.2 [0.1;0.3]		0.2 [0.2;0.3]			
	Ivermectin	1.5 [1.4;1.6]	1.3 [1.1;1.4]	3.4 [3.0;3.9]	3.2 (2.8;3.5)	92.90	<0.0001
Month 18	Moxidectin	0.6 [0.5;0.6]		0.8 [0.6;0.9]			
	Ivermectin	1.8 [1.6;1.9]	1.2 [1.1;1.3]	4.8 [4.2;5.4]	4.0 (3.5;4.5)	84.12	<0.0001
Nord Ituri							
Month 1	Moxidectin	0.1 [0.0;0.2]		0.1 [0.0;0.2]			
	Ivermectin	0.6 [0.4;0.7]	0.5 [0.3;0.6]	0.8 [0.6;1.0]	0.6 (0.5;0.8)	83.70	<0.0001
Month 6	Moxidectin	0.0 [-0.1;0.1]		0.0 [-0.1;0.1]			
	Ivermectin	1.2 [1.1;1.3]	1.2 [1.0;1.3]	2.4 [2.0;2.8]	2.3 (2.0;2.7)	98.76	<0.0001
Month 12	Moxidectin	0.6 [0.5;0.6]		0.7 [0.6;0.9]			
	Ivermectin	2.1 [2.0;2.3]	1.6 [1.4;1.7]	7.5 [6.5;8.7]	6.8 (5.9;7.7)	90.14	<0.0001
Month 18	Moxidectin	1.3 [1.2;1.4]		2.8 [2.5;3.2]			
	Ivermectin	2.6 [2.5;2.8]	1.3 [1.1;1.4]	12.8 [11.1;14.8]	10.0 (8.6;11.6)	77.97	<0.0001
Lofa County							
Month 1	Moxidectin	0.0 [-0.1;0.1]		0.0 [-0.1;0.1]			
	Ivermectin	0.5 [0.4;0.6]	0.5 [0.3;0.6]	0.6 [0.4;0.9]	0.6 (0.5;0.7)	97.07	<0.0001
Month 6	Moxidectin	0.0 [-0.1;0.1]		0.0 [-0.1;0.1]			
	Ivermectin	0.8 [0.7;1.0]	0.8 [0.7;1.0]	1.3 [1.0;1.6]	1.3 (1.1;1.5)	98.75	<0.0001
Month 12	Moxidectin	0.4 [0.3;0.5]		0.4 [0.3;0.6]			
	Ivermectin	1.5 [1.3;1.6]	1.1 [0.9;1.3]	3.3 [2.8;3.9]	2.9 (2.5;3.3)	86.75	<0.0001
Month 18	Moxidectin	0.7 [0.6;0.8]		1.0 [0.8;1.2]			
	Ivermectin	1.7 [1.6;1.8]	1.0 [0.9;1.2]	4.4 [3.8;5.2]	3.5 (3.0;4.0)	78.23	<0.0001
Nkwanta N							
Month 1	Moxidectin	-0.1 [-0.2;0.0]		-0.1 [-0.2;0.0]			
	Ivermectin	0.5 [0.4;0.7]	0.6 [0.4;0.8]	0.7 [0.4;1.0]	0.8 (0.6;1.0)	110.69	<0.0001
Month 6	Moxidectin	-0.1 [-0.2;0.1]		-0.1 [-0.2;0.1]			
	Ivermectin	1.2 [1.0;1.3]	1.2 [1.0;1.5]	2.2 [1.7;2.8]	2.3 (1.9;2.8)	103.21	<0.0001
Month 12	Moxidectin	0.7 [0.6;0.8]		1.0 [0.8;1.3]			
	Ivermectin	2.0 [1.9;2.2]	1.3 [1.1;1.5]	6.6 [5.4;8.0]	5.6 (4.6;6.7)	84.48	<0.0001
Month 18	Moxidectin	1.3 [1.2;1.5]		2.9 [2.3;3.5]			
	Ivermectin	2.6 [2.4;2.8]	1.3 [1.0;1.5]	13.1 [10.5;16.2]	10.2 (8.2;12.8)	78.15	<0.0001

p-value for the difference in SmfD after moxidectin and ivermectin at each follow up time point obtained by marginal (least square means) means pairwise comparisons from the mixed effect model per study area where microfilarial density at 1, 6, 12 and 18 months was the outcome variable with treatment, follow up time point (1, 6, 12, 18 months), and interaction between treatment and follow up time point and interaction between treatment and intensity of infection at baseline as fixed effect, controlling for other covariates such as baseline density, baseline intensity of infection and sex.

>100% difference due to low SmfD values in the moxidectin treatment arm that are log-transformed to calculate the geometric means.

**Table S8 Adjusted SmfD means and mean differences 12 months post-treatment by pre-treatment
lol**

Study area Screening intensity of Infection	Treatment Group	Adjusted Mean (95%CI)	Difference of adj. means (95%CI)	Adjusted Geometric Mean (95%CI)	Difference of Adj geometric Mean (95%CI)	Percent Difference	p-value°
Across all							
10 - <20 mf/mg	Moxidectin	0.5 [0.3;0.7]		0.6 [0.3;0.9]			
	Ivermectin	1.2 [1.0;1.4]	0.7 [0.6;0.8]	2.3 [1.7;3.0]	1.7 (1.4;2.1)	74.10	<0.0001
20 - <50 mf/mg	Moxidectin	0.3 [0.2;0.5]		0.4 [0.2;0.6]			
	Ivermectin	1.3 [1.1;1.4]	0.9 [0.8;1.0]	2.6 [2.0;3.2]	2.2 (1.8;2.6)	84.21	<0.0001
50 - <80 mf/mg	Moxidectin	0.3 [0.1;0.5]		0.4 [0.1;0.7]			
	Ivermectin	1.5 [1.4;1.7]	1.2 [1.1;1.4]	3.7 [2.9;4.7]	3.3 (2.7;4.1)	89.98	<0.0001
≥80 mf/mg	Moxidectin	0.2 [-0.0;0.5]		0.3 [0.0;0.6]			
	Ivermectin	1.9 [1.7;2.2]	1.7 [1.5;1.9]	5.7 [4.2;7.6]	5.5 (4.2;7.0)	95.38	<0.0001
Nord Kivu							
10 - <20 mf/mg	Moxidectin	0.5 [0.3;0.6]		0.6 [0.3;0.9]			
	Ivermectin	1.0 [0.8;1.2]	0.6 [0.4;0.7]	1.8 [1.3;2.4]	1.2 (1.0;1.5)	68.15	<0.0001
20 - <50 mf/mg	Moxidectin	0.2 [0.1;0.3]		0.2 [0.1;0.3]			
	Ivermectin	1.1 [1.0;1.2]	0.9 [0.7;1.1]	2.0 [1.6;2.4]	1.8 (1.5;2.1)	89.62	<0.0001
≥50 mf/mg	Moxidectin	-0.1 [-0.2;0.1]		0.0 [-0.2;0.2]			
	Ivermectin	1.4 [1.2;1.6]	1.4 [1.2;1.6]	3.0 [2.2;3.9]	3.0 (2.5;3.8)	101.63	<0.0001
Nord Ituri							
10 - <20 mf/mg	Moxidectin	0.6 [0.4;0.9]		0.9 [0.5;1.4]			
	Ivermectin	1.6 [1.3;1.8]	0.9 [0.7;1.2]	3.7 [2.6;5.2]	2.8 (2.1;3.8)	75.73	<0.0001
20 - <50 mf/mg	Moxidectin	0.5 [0.4;0.6]		0.6 [0.5;0.8]			
	Ivermectin	1.6 [1.4;1.7]	1.1 [0.9;1.3]	3.8 [3.1;4.7]	3.2 (2.7;3.9)	83.90	<0.0001
≥50 mf/mg	Moxidectin	0.4 [0.2;0.6]		0.5 [0.3;0.8]			
	Ivermectin	1.8 [1.6;2.0]	1.4 [1.2;1.6]	4.9 [3.9;6.2]	4.4 (3.7;5.4)	89.91	<0.0001
Lofa County							
10 - <20 mf/mg	Moxidectin	0.2 [0.1;0.4]		0.2 [0.1;0.5]			
	Ivermectin	0.8 [0.6;1.0]	0.6 [0.5;0.8]	1.3 [0.9;1.8]	1.1 (0.9;1.3)	81.16	<0.0001
20 - <50 mf/mg	Moxidectin	0.2 [0.1;0.3]		0.3 [0.1;0.4]			
	Ivermectin	1.0 [0.9;1.1]	0.8 [0.6;0.9]	1.7 [1.3;2.1]	1.5 (1.2;1.7)	85.29	<0.0001
≥50 mf/mg	Moxidectin	0.4 [0.1;0.6]		0.4 [0.1;0.9]			
	Ivermectin	1.5 [1.2;1.8]	1.2 [0.9;1.4]	3.6 [2.4;5.1]	3.1 (2.3;4.2)	87.85	<0.0001
Nkwanta							
10 - <20 mf/mg	Moxidectin	0.4 [0.1;0.7]		0.5 [0.2;1.0]			
	Ivermectin	1.4 [1.1;1.8]	1.0 [0.7;1.3]	3.2 [2.1;4.8]	2.7 (1.9;3.8)	83.87	<0.0001
20 - <50 mf/mg	Moxidectin	0.5 [0.4;0.6]		0.6 [0.4;0.9]			
	Ivermectin	1.4 [1.3;1.6]	1.0 [0.7;1.2]	3.3 [2.5;4.2]	2.6 (2.1;3.3)	80.18	<0.0001
≥50 mf/mg	Moxidectin	0.5 [0.2;0.8]		0.7 [0.2;1.3]			
	Ivermectin	1.9 [1.6;2.2]	1.4 [1.1;1.7]	5.7 [3.8;8.4]	5.0 (3.5;7.1)	88.22	<0.0001

p-value for the difference in SmfD after moxidectin and ivermectin for each lol category obtained by marginal (least square means) means pairwise comparisons from the mixed effect model across and per study area where microfilarial density at 12 months was the outcome variable with treatment, baseline intensity of infection and sex as covariates

1028

Table S9 Participants with undetectable SmfD from Month 1 to 6, 12 or 18 by lol and area

Area	Moxidectin					Ivermectin				
lol	ND	n UD Yes	n UD No	N	% with UD	ND	n UD Yes	n UD No	N	% with UD
All areas										
UD 1-6										
Any	20	741	217	958	77.3	5	35	454	489	7.2
10-<20	6	245	30	275	89.1		18	132	150	12
20-<50	10	354	92	446	79.4	2	14	167	181	7.7
50-<80	3	107	47	154	69.5	3	3	102	105	2.9
≥80	1	35	48	83	42.2		0	53	53	0
UD 1-12										
Any	40	360	578	938	38.4	16	7	471	478	1.5
<20	14	159	108	267	59.6	2	3	145	148	2
20-<50	20	156	280	436	35.8	6	3	174	177	1.7
50-<80	4	32	121	153	20.9	7	1	100	101	1
80+	2	13	69	82	15.9	1	0	52	52	0
UD 1-18										
Any	222	164	592	756	21.7	111	4	379	383	1
<20	55	76	150	226	33.6	33	1	116	117	0.9
20-<50	124	68	264	332	20.5	44	2	137	139	1.4
50-<80	27	15	115	130	11.5	25	1	82	83	1.2
80+	16	5	63	68	7.4	9	0	44	44	0
N Kivu										
UD 1-6										
Any	9	246	50	296	83.1	3	17	133	150	11.3
10-<20	3	80	9	89	89.9		7	44	51	13.7
20-<50	5	123	23	146	84.2	2	8	43	51	15.7
≥50	1	43	18	61	70.5	1	2	46	48	4.2
UD 1-12										
Any	14	145	146	291	49.8	9	4	143	147	2.7
<20	5	60	27	87	69		2	49	51	3.9
20-<50	7	67	77	144	46.5	4	1	49	50	2
≥50	2	18	42	60	30	5	1	45	46	2.2
UD 1-18										
Any	106	73	126	199	36.7	55	3	97	100	3
<20	31	31	30	61	50.8	17	1	33	34	2.9
20-<50	65	32	54	86	37.2	19	1	33	34	2.9
≥50	10	10	42	52	19.2	19	1	31	32	3.1
N Ituri										
UD 1-6										
Any	4	205	106	311	65.9	0	9	148	157	5.7
<20	0	56	8	64	87.5		5	28	33	15.2
20-<50	3	96	46	142	67.6		3	50	53	5.7
≥50	1	53	52	105	50.5	0	1	70	71	1.4
UD 1-12										
Any	9	77	230	307	25.1	1	1	155	156	0.6
<20	2	29	33	62	46.8		1	32	33	3
20-<50	5	36	104	140	25.7		0	53	53	0
≥50	1	12	93	105	11.4	1	0	70	70	0
UD 1-18										
Any	33	24	258	282	8.5	16	0	141	141	0
<20	5	8	51	59	13.6	5	0	28	28	0
20-<50	20	12	113	125	9.6	7	0	46	46	0
≥50	8	4	94	98	4.1	4	0	67	67	0
Lofa										
UD 1-6										
Any	4	173	23	196	88.3	0	8	91	99	8.1
<20	3	76	4	80	95		6	36	42	14.3
20-<50	1	73	10	83	88		2	37	39	5.1
≥50	0	24	9	33	72.7	0	0	18	18	0

Area	Moxidectin					Ivermectin				
lol	ND	n UD Yes	n UD No	N	% with UD	ND	n UD Yes	n UD No	N	% with UD
UD 1-12										
Any	13	99	88	187	52.9	6	1	92	93	1.1
<20	6	52	25	77	67.5	1	0	41	41	0
20-<50	6	36	42	78	46.2	3	1	35	36	2.8
≥50	1	11	21	32	34.4	2	0	16	16	0
UD 1-18										
Any	20	57	123	180	31.7	7	1	91	92	1.1
<20	9	31	43	74	41.9	2	0	40	40	0
20-<50	10	23	51	74	31.1	3	1	35	36	2.8
≥50	1	3	29	32	9.4	2	0	16	16	0
Nkwanta										
UD 1-6										
Any	3	117	38	155	75.5	0	1	82	83	1.2
<20	0	33	9	42	78.6		0	24	24	0
20-<50	1	62	13	75	82.7		1	37	38	2.6
≥50	2	22	16	38	57.9	0	0	21	21	0
UD 1-12										
Any	5	39	114	153	25.5	1	1	81	82	1.2
<20	1	18	23	41	43.9	1	0	23	23	0
20-<50	2	17	57	74	23		1	37	38	2.6
≥50	2	4	34	38	10.5	0	0	21	21	0
UD 1-18										
Any	63	10	85	95	10.5	33	0	50	50	0
<20	10	6	26	32	18.8	9	0	15	15	0
20-<50	29	1	46	47	2.1	15	0	23	23	0
≥50	24	3	13	16	18.8	9	0	12	12	0

lol: lol category; N: Number of participants included in the analysis; NC: OR not calculated since Odds for ivermectin group 0; ND: number of participants with a missing data point for at least one of the relevant time points and excluded from the analysis; n UD No: number of participants with data points at all relevant timepoints and detectable SmfD included in the analysis; n UD yes: number of participants with data points at all relevant timepoints and undetectable SmfD included in the analysis, OR: Odds ratio; UD 1-6, UD 1-12, UD 1-18: undetectable SmfD at M1 and M6, at M1, M6 and M12, at M1, M6, M12, M18, respectively.

Fig S1: Odds for UD from 1 to 6, 12 or 18 months by lol and study area

SmfD: skin microfilariae density, UD1-6, UD 1-12, UD 1-18 undetectable levels of SmfD at month 1 and 6, at months 1, 6 and 12, and at month 1, 6, 12 and 18, respectively (for number with follow up data at each relevant time point, see **Error! Reference source not found.**).

1043
1044

Table S10 Logistic model derived odds for undetectable levels of skin microfilariae from month 1 sustained to month 6, month 12 or month 18 among participants treated with moxidectin or ivermectin by lol across and by study area

Study area lol	Moxidectin:									Ivermectin								
	M1 and M6			M1, M6, and M12			M1, M6, M12, and M18			M1 and M6			M1, M6, and M12			M1, M6, M12, and M18		
	Odds	LL	UL	Odds	LL	UL	Odds	LL	UL	Odds	LL	UL	Odds	LL	UL	Odds	LL	UL
Across all																		
10-<20	8.48	5.12	14.05	1.54	0.92	2.59	0.41	0.18	0.93	0.13	0.07	0.23	0.02	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.04
20-<50	4.33	2.88	6.51	0.62	0.38	1.02	0.24	0.11	0.54	0.08	0.04	0.16	0.02	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.06
50-<80	2.59	1.60	4.20	0.27	0.15	0.50	0.10	0.04	0.27	0.03	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.00	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.08
≥80	0.90	0.52	1.58	0.23	0.11	0.48	0.09	0.03	0.32	0.00	0.00	Infty	0.00	0.00	Infty	0.00	0.00	Infty
Nord-Kivu																		
10-<20	9.84	4.85	19.97	2.37	1.48	3.79	1.00	0.60	1.66	0.15	0.07	0.34	0.04	0.01	0.16	0.03	0.00	0.21
20-<50	6.70	4.11	10.90	1.02	0.72	1.45	0.60	0.39	0.94	0.18	0.09	0.40	0.02	0.00	0.14	0.03	0.00	0.22
≥50	2.89	1.61	5.17	0.48	0.27	0.84	0.25	0.12	0.50	0.05	0.01	0.23	0.03	0.00	0.20	0.04	0.00	0.26
Nord Ituri																		
10-<20	7.11	3.37	15.01	0.96	0.58	1.61	0.17	0.08	0.34	0.18	0.07	0.47	0.03	0.00	0.24	0.00	0.00	Infty
20-<50	2.12	1.48	3.04	0.37	0.26	0.52	0.11	0.06	0.20	0.06	0.02	0.20	0.00	0.00	Infty	0.00	0.00	Infty
≥50	1.03	0.70	1.51	0.13	0.07	0.24	0.04	0.02	0.12	0.01	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	Infty	0.00	0.00	Infty
Lofa																		
10-<20	18.71	6.81	51.41	2.57	1.81	3.66	0.75	0.46	1.22	0.16	0.07	0.39	0.00	0.00	Infty	0.00	0.00	Infty
20-<50	7.09	3.63	13.83	1.06	0.65	1.72	0.52	0.31	0.87	0.05	0.01	0.22	0.03	0.00	0.22	0.03	0.00	0.23
≥50	2.67	1.23	5.76	0.48	0.22	1.05	0.09	0.03	0.30	0.00	0.00	Infty	0.00	0.00	Infty	0.00	0.00	Infty
Nkwanta																		
10-<20	4.32	1.92	9.73	1.08	0.61	1.90	0.24	0.09	0.64	0.00	0.00	Infty	0.00	0.00	Infty	0.00	0.00	Infty
20-<50	6.04	3.06	11.92	0.40	0.22	0.74	0.03	0.00	0.21	0.03	0.00	0.23	0.03	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.00	Infty
≥50	1.73	0.85	3.54	0.14	0.05	0.43	0.35	0.09	1.35	0.00	0.00	Infty	0.00	0.00	Infty	0.00	0.00	Infty

1045
1046
1047
1048

Infty – infinity, due to number of participants with undetectable SmfD = 0 (see S1 Table S9), LL lower limit, UL upper limit of the 95% confidence interval
Odds and 95% confidence intervals obtained from logistic model with treatment, lol category and lol category*treatment interaction as fixed effects. For the across study area analysis, the study area was a random effect. Only individuals who had SmfD determined at each of the relevant time points were included in these analyses.

1049
1050

Table S11 Logistic model derived odds ratios for undetectable levels of skin microfilariae from month 1 sustained to month 6, month 12 or month 18 among participants treated with moxidectin relative to among ivermectin treated participants by lol by study area

Study Area	p	Odds Ratio	LL OR	UL OR	p	Odds Ratio	LL OR	UL OR	p	Odds Ratio	LL OR	UL OR
IOI (mf/mg)	M1 and M6				M1, M6 and M12				M1, M6, M12 and M18			
Across												
10-<20	<.0001	67.461	35.771	127.224	<.0001	98.272	29.771	324.389	<.0001	76.591	10.355	566.524
20-<50	<.0001	51.528	28.196	94.165	<.0001	39.740	12.275	128.659	<.0001	20.990	4.994	88.225
50-<80	<.0001	87.156	26.074	291.329	0.0011	29.529	3.900	223.570	0.0245	10.652	1.356	83.684
≥80		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999
Nord Kivu												
10-<20	<.0001	65.173	21.956	193.455	<.0001	62.792	13.93	283.052	0.0008	35.038	4.452	275.777
20-<50	<.0001	36.366	14.461	91.456	0.0001	52.91	6.983	400.877	0.0041	20.38	2.627	158.094
≥50	<.0001	53.16	11.471	246.35	0.0071	17.321	2.182	137.495	0.072	6.99	0.84	58.185
Nord Ituri												
10-<20	<.0001	39.218	11.703	131.423	0.0014	29.02	3.691	228.18		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999
20-<50	<.0001	34.911	10.302	118.303		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999
≥50	<.0001	71.111	9.481	533.344		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999
Lofa												
10-<20	<.0001	115.007	30.296	436.59		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999
20-<50	<.0001	137.692	28.387	667.873	0.0008	35.537	4.448	283.957	0.0078	16.833	2.114	134.029
≥50		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999
Nkwanta												
10-<20		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999
20-<50	<.0001	196.761	23.954	>999.999	0.0139	14.546	1.732	122.176		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999
≥50		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999		>999.999	<0.001	>999.999

1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057

LL OR Lower Limit of 95% Confidence Interval of the Odds Ratio, OR Odds Ratio, UL Upper limit of 95% Confidence Interval of the Odds Ratio, OR, LL OR and UL OR >999.999 indicate that these values could not be estimated by the model because the number of ivermectin treated participants with undetectable SmfD was 0 (see S1 Table S9).
Odds ratio, 95% Confidence Intervals and p values obtained from logistic model with treatment, lol category and lol category*treatment interaction as fixed effects. For the across study area analysis, the study area was a random effect. Only individuals who had SmfD determined at each of the relevant time points were included in these analyses.

1058