1	Timing of antiviral treatment initiation is critical to reduce SARS-
2	Cov-2 viral load
3	Antonio Gonçalves ¹ , Julie Bertrand ¹ , Ruian Ke ² , Emmanuelle Comets ¹ , Xavier de
4	Lamballerie ³ , Denis Malvy ^{4,5} , Andrés Pizzorno ⁶ , Olivier Terrier ⁶ , Manuel Rosa Calatrava ⁶ ,
5	France Mentré ¹ , Patrick Smith ⁷ , Alan S Perelson ² and Jérémie Guedj ¹
6	¹ Université de Paris, IAME, INSERM, F-75018 Paris, France
7	² Theoretical Biology and Biophysics, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM
8	87545, USA
9	³ UMR "Emergence des Pathologies Virales" (EPV: Aix-Marseille University - IRD 190 -
10	Inserm 1207 - EHESP) - Institut Hospitalo-Universitaire Méditerranée Infection, F-13385
11	Marseille, France
12	⁴ Inserm, UMR 1219, Université de Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France
13	⁵ Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France
14	⁶ Virologie et Pathologie Humaine - VirPath team, Centre International de Recherche en
15	Infectiologie (CIRI), INSERM U1111, CNRS UMR5308, ENS Lyon, Université Claude
16	Bernard Lyon 1, Université de Lyon, Lyon, France.
17	⁷ Certara, Integrated Drug Development, Princeton, NJ, USA
18	Corresponding author: Jeremie Guedj, jeremie.guedj@inserm.fr
19	16 rue Henri Huchard, 75018, Paris, France
20	
21	Conflict of interest

22 Authors declare no conflict of interest.

23 Ethical statement

24	Data were originally provided in Young et al. (doi:10.1001/jama.2020.3204) where "waiver
25	of informed consent for collection of clinical data from infected individuals was granted by
26	the Ministry of Health, Singapore" and "written informed consent was obtained from study
27	participants".
28	
29	Funding statement
30	Antonio Gonçalves was funded by a grant from Roche Pharmaceutical Research and Early
31	Development.
32	Portions of this work were done under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy under
33	contract 89233218CNA000001. We also gratefully acknowledge the support of the U.S.
34	Department of Energy through the LANL/LDRD Program for this work as well as N.I.H.
35	grants R01 AI028433, R01 OD011095, R01 AI078881 and P01 AI131365 (ASP).
36	
37	
38	Abstract (word count: 100/100)
39	We modeled the viral dynamics of 13 untreated patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 to infer
40	viral growth parameters and predict the effects of antiviral treatments. In order to reduce peak
41	viral load by more than 2 logs, drug efficacy needs to be greater than 80% if treatment is
42	administered after symptom onset; an efficacy of 50% could be sufficient if treatment is
43	initiated before symptom onset. Given their pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic properties,

44 current investigated drugs may be in a range of 20-70% efficacy. They may help control virus

45 if administered very early, but may not have a major effect in severe patients.

47 Keywords

- 48 SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19; timing for treatment initiation; hydroxychloroquine; interferon-
- 49 beta-1a; lopinavir/ritonavir; viral dynamics; acute infection; simulations

50

52 Main text (word count: 1,991/2,000)

53 Background

54 The outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which 55 originated in Wuhan, China, has become a global pandemic. By March 29, 2020, this virus 56 had infected more than 700,000 people worldwide and caused more than 30,000 deaths. 57 Despite the unprecedented mobilization of the clinical and scientific community, the 58 development and large scale implementation of new antiviral drugs or vaccines will take 59 months or more. To readily propose a first line of defense and combat the virus in hospitalized 60 patients, the World Health Organization relies on already existing drugs ("repurposed") that 61 are immediately available in large quantities and have a good safety profile. In coordination 62 with other European institutions, France is implementing a randomized clinical trial in 63 hospitalized patients ("DisCoVery", NCT04315948) comparing the efficacy of 64 lopinavir/ritonavir \pm IFN- β -1a, remdesivir and hydroxychloroquine. Given the very limited 65 knowledge of the host/pathogen interaction the clinical efficacy of treatment strategies using these drugs is largely unknown and could be limited [1]. 66

Fitting mathematical models of viral dynamics to *in vivo* data can provide estimates of parameters driving viral replication. Such models can then be used to predict the needed efficacy of treatments and to optimize their use [2]. By combining these predictions with the expected drug concentrations and EC_{50} of drug candidates, one can anticipate the effects of various dosing regimens (doses, timing of treatment initiation) on viral load dynamics.

72 Methods

73 **Data used for fitting**

We used published data from 13 untreated patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 that were followed in 4 Singapore hospitals [3]. Patients were hospitalized in median at day 3 after onset of symptoms (range: 1-10) and had a median symptomatic period of 12 days (range: 5-

77 24). Viral loads in nasopharyngeal swabs were measured by real time reverse transcriptase 78 polymerase chain reaction (RT PCR, lower limit of quantification: 38 cycles, CT) at multiple 79 time points with an observed peak of viral load at day 5 post onset of symptoms (range: 2-27 80 days). Data presented in CT were transformed to log10 copies/mL using a published 81 relationship in Zou et al. [4] and the model was fit to the log10 viral load. Of note, the 82 transformation from CT to log 10 copies/mL does not affect the estimates of parameters of 83 interest, in particular R_0 and the death rate of productively infected cells. Time since infection 84 was assumed to be 5 days before the onset of symptoms [5]. In a sensitivity analysis, we also 85 examined values of 2 and 10 days.

86 Model

87

Viral dynamics was fitted using a target cell limited model with an eclipse phase

$$\frac{dT}{dt} = -\beta VT$$
Equation 1
$$\frac{dI_1}{dt} = \beta VT - kI_1$$
Equation 1
$$\frac{dI_2}{dt} = kI_1 - \delta I_2$$

$$\frac{dV}{dt} = pI - cV$$

The model considers three populations of cells: target cells, *T*, infected cells in the eclipse phase, I_1 , and productively infected cells, I_2 . Given the timescale of the infection, we neglect target cell proliferation and natural death, and we focused on the process of cell depletion by virus infection. We assumed target cells become infected with rate constant β . After an average time of 1/k, these cells start producing virus and are cleared with per capita rate δ . Virions are released from productively infected cells I_2 at rate p per cell and are cleared from the circulation at per capita rate c. Based on this model, the basic reproduction number,

95 R_0 , the average number of cells infected by a single infected cell at the beginning of the 96 infection, is [6]

97
$$R_0 = \frac{p\beta T_0}{\delta c}$$
. Equation 2

We assumed that the target cell concentration is 1.33×10^7 cells/mL. Assuming a 30 mL volume for the nasopharynx [7] this gives a total number of target cells of 4×10^8 nasopharyngeal cells [8]. Following what was found in other viral infections, including acute infection [6], the clearance rate of virus was assumed to be fast and equal to 10 d⁻¹. We also performed a sensitivity analysis assuming c= 5 and 20 d⁻¹ and found that the estimate of δ remained unchanged and the estimate of R_0 varied from 12.4 to 15.5.

104 Model building strategy

Because not all parameters can be identified when only viral load data are available, the model was successively fitted with different values of $k=\{1, 3, 5\}d^{-1}$ and $V_0=\{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}\}$ copies/mL [6]. Parameters were estimated in a non-linear mixed-effect modeling framework using the SAEM algorithm implemented in Monolix (www.lixoft.com). The model providing the best description of the data was used for the predictions and the individual data fitting, and model averaging was used to correct for the model uncertainty when calculating confidence intervals of estimated parameters [9].

Predicting the effects of treatment according to the antiviral efficacy and the timing treatment of initiation

We assumed that antivirals with a constant effectiveness ε could reduce R₀ by a factor (1- ε), with ε taking values from 50% to 99% in Equation 2. We considered different timing of treatment initiation, from the time of infection to 3 days after the symptom onset. For each treatment strategy, we calculated the reduction in viral load at the peak of infection in the

absence of treatment, i.e., 5 days after symptom onset. The model providing the best description of the data was used for the simulations, and sensitivity analyses were conducted to evaluate the results obtained with different assumptions regarding the delay between time of infection and time of symptom onset either 2 or 10 days (Supplemental information, Fig S1 and S2).

123

PK/PD drug properties of lopinavir/ritonavir, hydroxychloroquine and IFN-β-1a

124 We relied on the literature to find PK population parameters of lopinavir/ritonavir 125 [10], hydroxychloroquine [11], and IFN- β -1a [12] as well as reported EC₅₀ values in vitro 126 (see Table 1). For lopinavir, EC₅₀ Vero E6 cells were infected by SARS-CoV-2 (strain 127 BetaCoV/France/IDF0571/2020) at a MOI of 0.01 and treated with several concentrations of 128 lopinavir one hour after infection. Supernatant samples were collected at 48 and 72 hour post 129 infection. Relative quantification of viral genome was performed by RT-qPCR from RNA 130 extracted using QIAamp viral RNA Mini Kit (Qiagen). IC50 values of lopinavir (5.246 µM 131 and 4.941 μ M at 48 and 72 hours post infection, respectively) were calculated from dose-132 response curve using a four-parameter logistic regression model. CC50 were determined 133 using a MTS viability assay in Vero E6 cells treated by a large range of lopinavir 134 concentrations. No published results on remdesivir pharmacokinetics was available at the time 135 of this publication. We then simulated 100 PK profiles according to the estimated distribution 136 and we calculated for each simulated individual the mean inhibitory coefficient during the 137 first week of treatment, to anticipate their effect on peak viral load. For comparison purposes, 138 we based the analysis on blood concentrations and did not adjust for plasma protein binding 139 when computing efficacy.

- 141 Table 1: PK/PD properties of candidate antiviral drugs. We assume that the total blood concentrations were the driver of
- 142 efficacy, and we did not consider intracellular metabolites or free drug concentrations

Drug	PK parameter	EC ₅₀ (μM)	Dosing regimen D0-D7	$\overline{\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{7} \times \int_0^7 \frac{C(u)}{C(u) + EC_{50}} du$
Lopinavir/ritonavir	Wang et al. [10]	5.2 (unpublished)	400/100 BID	66%
Hydroxychloroquine	Morita et al	0.72 [13]	400 mg BID at D0, followed by 400 mg QD	33%
IFN-β-1a	Hu et al. [12]	175 IU/mL [14]	12 MIU at D0, D2, D5	18%

143

144 **Results**

145 Here we used a "target-cell limited" model with an eclipse phase [8] given by Eq. (1) to 146 characterize the viral load dynamics of 13 hospitalized patients in Singapore for which data 147 obtained from frequent nasopharyngeal swabs were available [3] (Fig S3). Because this model 148 needs to incorporate a date of infection, an incubation period of 5 days was used to project the 149 most plausible date of infection in each patient [5] (see Supplemental Information for a 150 sensitivity analysis). The model fit the data well (Fig S3); using a model averaging approach 151 to take into account model uncertainty [9], the within-host basic reproductive number, R_0 152 was found equal to 12.9 (CI_{95%}=[2.3-46.7]), and the death rate of productively infected cells was estimated as 0.54 d⁻¹ (CI_{95%}=[0.21-0.87]), corresponding to a median half-life of 1.3 days 153 154 (See Supplemental information Fig S4 and Table S1). In influenza A, another respiratory 155 infectious disease, estimates of the within host R_0 varied greatly, but the half-life of infected 156 cells was shorter than 10 hours (see more details in [15]), suggesting a faster clearance of 157 influenza infected cells than SARS-CoV-2.

158 These numbers also inform us both on the time to initiate antiviral treatment, and the 159 level of efficacy that needs to be achieved to reduce viral load [6]. As limited information is 160 available on the mechanisms leading to viral clearance, and how they may be modulated by 161 treatment, we used our model to predict the effects of treatment at day 5 post symptoms, 162 which corresponds to the time the viral load tends to peak in the absence of treatment [3]. We 163 considered a simple case where the drug effectiveness is assumed to be constant after therapy 164 initiation (see methods) and we calculated the minimal efficacy that would be needed to 165 generate more than 2 logs of viral decline at peak viral load in the 13 studied patients (Fig. 1). 166 As predicted by viral kinetic modeling theory [2], we found that the impact of treatment on 167 peak viral load is inversely correlated with the time of treatment initiation. For a putative 168 treatment initiated at the time of infection, symptom onset, or 3 days post symptom onset, a 169 median efficacy of at least 60, 90 and 99% in reducing viral replication would be needed, 170 respectively, to generate more than 2 log of decline in the peak viral load (Fig. 1).



171

Figure 1: Reduction in viral load at day 5 post symptom onset according to the level of antiviral effectiveness and the timing
of treatment initiation (A: at time of infection; B: at time of symptom onset; C: 3days after symptom onset). We assumed an
incubation period of 5 days

175 How do these levels of effectiveness compare with the antiviral drugs that are currently 176 being investigated? To study this question, we assumed that the treatment antiviral 177 effectiveness at time t after treatment initiation, $\varepsilon(t)$, was related to the plasma total drug concentration, C(t): $\varepsilon(t) = \frac{C(t)}{C(t) + EC_{50}}$ and the mean antiviral effectiveness during the first 7 178 days of treatment is given by $\overline{\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{7} \times \int_0^7 \frac{C(u)}{C(u) + EC_{50}} du$. Given their pharmacokinetic and 179 180 pharmacodynamic properties (Table 1), we calculated a mean antiviral efficacy of up to 66% 181 for lopinavir/ritonavir, 18% for IFN-β-1a, and 33% for hydroxychloroquine. Given these 182 estimates, these compounds are unlikely to have a dramatic effect on peak viral load if 183 administered after the onset of symptoms. In fact, the effective concentrations will 184 presumably be lower in patients, as relevant drug may be further limited by protein binding 185 (in particular for lopinavir, which has a protein binding rate > 98%) or capability to penetrate 186 respiratory compartments, which is not well characterized. Importantly, levels of antiviral 187 efficacy of ~50% could nonetheless be relevant in a prophylactic setting, before symptom 188 onset, to reduce viral replication in the upper respiratory tract and reduce the risk of large 189 infiltration to the lung before an effective immune response is mounted to clear virus [2] 190 Note, above we calculated the effectiveness of drugs administered in monotherapy for their 191 usual dosing regimen. We also did not consider drugs that could directly target infected cells 192 and lead to their elimination, such as some monoclonal antibodies.

193 **Discussion**

Overall our results emphasize that the PK/PD properties of lopinavir/ritonavir, IFN- β -1a and hydroxychloroquine make them unlikely to have a dramatic impact on viral load kinetics in the nasopharynx if they are administered after symptom onset. Given this, it is possible that continued viral replication in the presence of drug will select for drug resistant mutations as has been seen with other RNA viruses [7], although coronaviruses are unusual in that they

199	app	ear to have low mutation rates due to RNA proofreading capability. Drug combination				
200	therapy and more aggressive dosing, including consideration of loading doses to rapidly					
201	achi	eve therapeutic exposures, may be beneficial to maximize efficacy of these repurposed				
202	antiviral agents. However, they may be relevant in pre- or post-exposure prophylaxis					
203	adm	inistration to reduce viral replication and hence the risk of disease progression.				
204						
205	References					
206 207	1.	Cao B, Wang Y, Wen D, et al. A Trial of Lopinavir–Ritonavir in Adults Hospitalized with Severe Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2020 ; :NEJMoa2001282.				
208 209	2.	Friberg LE, Guedj J. Acute bacterial or viral infection—What's the difference? A perspective from PKPD modellers. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2019 ; :S1198743X19306639.				
210 211 212	3.	Young BE, Ong SWX, Kalimuddin S, et al. Epidemiologic Features and Clinical Course of Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. JAMA [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Mar 29]; . Available from: https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2762688				
213 214	4.	Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of Infected Patients. N Engl J Med. 2020 ; 382(12):1177–1179.				
215 216 217 218 219	5.	Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. Ann Intern Med [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Mar 29]; . Available from: https://annals.org/aim/fullarticle/2762808/incubation-period-coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-from-publicly-reported				

- Best K, Guedj J, Madelain V, et al. Zika plasma viral dynamics in nonhuman primates provides insights into early infection and antiviral strategies. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2017; 114(33):8847–8852.
- Perelson AS, Rong L, Hayden FG. Combination Antiviral Therapy for Influenza:
 Predictions From Modeling of Human Infections. J Infect Dis. 2012; 205(11):1642–
 1645.
- Baccam P, Beauchemin C, Macken CA, Hayden FG, Perelson AS. Kinetics of influenza
 A virus infection in humans. J Virol. 2006; 80(15):7590–7599.
- Gonçalves A, Mentré F, Lemenuel-Diot A, Guedj J. Model Averaging in Viral Dynamic Models. AAPS J. 2020; 22(2):48.
- Wang K, D'Argenio DZ, Acosta EP, et al. Integrated Population Pharmacokinetic/Viral
 Dynamic Modelling of Lopinavir/Ritonavir in HIV-1 Treatment-Naïve Patients. Clin
 Pharmacokinet. 2014; 53(4):361–371.

- 11. Morita S, Takahashi T, Yoshida Y, Yokota N. Population Pharmacokinetics of Hydroxychloroquine in Japanese Patients With Cutaneous or Systemic Lupus Erythematosus: Ther Drug Monit. 2016; 38(2):259–267.
- Hu X, Shang S, Nestorov I, et al. COMPARE: Pharmacokinetic profiles of subcutaneous peginterferon beta-1a and subcutaneous interferon beta-1a over 2 weeks in healthy subjects: Pharmacokinetics of peginterferon beta-1a and s.c. interferon beta-1a. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2016; 82(2):380–388.
- Yao X, Ye F, Zhang M, et al. In Vitro Antiviral Activity and Projection of Optimized
 Dosing Design of Hydroxychloroquine for the Treatment of Severe Acute Respiratory
 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). Clin Infect Dis. 2020; :ciaa237.
- 14. Sheahan TP, Sims AC, Leist SR, et al. Comparative therapeutic efficacy of remdesivir
 and combination lopinavir, ritonavir, and interferon beta against MERS-CoV. Nat
 Commun. 2020; 11(1):222.
- Smith AM. Host-pathogen kinetics during influenza infection and coinfection: insights
 from predictive modeling. Immunol Rev. 2018; 285(1):97–112.

Drug	PK parameter	EC ₅₀ (μΜ)	Dosing regimen D0-D7	$\overline{\varepsilon}(t) = \frac{1}{7} \times \int_0^7 \frac{C(u)}{C(u) + EC_{50}} du$
Lopinavir/ritonavir	Wang et al. ¹¹	5.2 (unpublished)	400/100 BID	66%
Hydroxychloroquine	Morita et al ¹²	0.72 ¹⁴	400 mg BID at D0, followed by 400 mg QD	33%
IFN-β-1a	Hu et al. ¹³	175 IU/mL ¹⁵	12 MIU at D0, D2, D5	18%

Table 1 PK/PD properties of candidate antiviral drugs. We assume that the total blood concentrations were the driver of efficacy, and we did not consider intracellular metabolites or free drug concentrations



0.99

0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 efficacy ε