Cost-effectiveness analysis of targeted end-game interventions against gambiense human African trypanosomiasis in the Democratic Republic of Congo

Contents

A	Supplementary Methods	2				
	A.1 Key updates to the modelling in this study	2				
	A.2 Locations	4				
	A.3 New data extraction	8				
	A.4 Model formulation	12				
	A.5 Model fitting	19				
	A.6 Detected cases and undetected deaths	21				
	A.7 Projections	25				
	A.8 Strategies and interventions	27				
	A.9 Health outcomes denominated as disability-adjusted life-years	31				
	A.10 Treatment outcomes and cost functions	32				
	A.11 Cost-effectiveness analysis; example of Kikongo and Bas Uélé region health zones	45				
	A.12 Sensitivity analysis	51				
в	Supplementary Results	52				
	B.1 Results by coordination	54				
	B.2 Resource forecasts	63				
С	Supplementary Note 1: Glossary of Technical Terms	67				
D	Supplementary Note 2: Health Zone-Specific Parameters	68				
E	Supplementary Note 3: Parameter Glossary	72				
F	Supplementary Note 4: NTD PRIME Criteria96					
G	Supplementary Note 5: CHEERS Checklist 97					
н	Supplementary References	102				

A Supplementary Methods

A.1 Key updates to the modelling in this study

Data extraction

We now have four more years of data (covering 2000–2020) compared to previous modelling studies for the DRC (2000–2016) [1, 2]. In the current data extraction, we have more places which have "unknown" active screening (AS) numbers. This occurs where the apparent prevalence in AS was >10% or the recorded number screened was <20. In previous studies [1, 2], we assumed that these new cases arose from people being recorded in their home health zone although they were screened in a neighbouring health zone. We still believe this to be true, but we set the number of people screened in those "home health zones" to be "missing", which allowed us to impute the number of people that would have to be tested in that health zone, given the current prevalence, to generate the number of new active cases that was recorded. Data extraction is further described in Section A.3 of these Supplementary Methods.

Fitting assumptions and process

1. **Endemic Equilibrium.** We now assume no activity (and in particular no PS improvement) before the first detection year in all health zones where the first detection is after 2000. In all other health zones with detections in 2000, we assume some step improvement to PS in 1998 in line with our previous analyses [1, 2].

1.1. In Kasai Occidental and Kasai Oriental coordination, the model assumed transmission remained at endemic equilibrium until the year when cases were first reported. This was because of a lack of accessibility preventing interventions from taking place in the early 2000s.

1.2. In Bas Uélé region of Isangi coordination, passive screening (PS) began in 2004. As this region is difficult to access and hence no interventions were taking place in the early 2000s, we assumed that transmission was in equilibrium until 2004 instead of 1998.

2. **Specificity in AS.** Starting from the second published "Warwick gHAT model" [3] it was assumed that AS diagnostic specificity would increase to 100% due to additional cross-checking of confirmed cases at very low prevalence. A somewhat arbitrary threshold "fewer than 2 reported cases per 10,000 above the expected incidence of false positives based on the level of screening" was used in previous analyses if it was not clear when this might happen. More recently, the rollout of video confirmation, starting in Bandundu Nord and Sud coordinations, has provided a mechanism for this to happen. In this present study, we therefore assume fixed years when specificity would increase to 100% rather than using the previous threshold; this is 2015 in Yasa Bonga and Mosango health zones, 2018 for the remainder of Bandundu Nord and Sud coordinations, and 2024 elsewhere.

2.1. In previous modelling studies in the DRC [1, 2], we assumed that Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) were active in the health zones in the Bas-Uélé region (including in Ango, Ganga, and Doruma) of Isangi coordination from 2008 until 2012, and the PNLTHA was active for two years in 2013 and 2014. Two AS diagnostic algorithm specificity values were fitted: for MSF and PNLTHA activities, with the MSF specificity being lower. The specificity of MSF activity is fitted, while values for the PNLTHA specificity – higher than that of the MSF specificity – were taken from the prior distribution for use in future projections.

3. Passive screening

3.1. We now include gradual improvements in passive detection (from the start of activities to 2020) in more coordinations, expanding from Bandundu Nord, Bandundu Sud and Kongo Central coordinations in previous studies [1, 2], and now adding in Equateur Nord, Equateur Sud, Kinshasa, Kasaï Oriental.

3.2. Since 2014, there has been no AS and no PS (no tests available) in the Bas Uélé region and PS has been simulated as absent in the model to reflect this.

3.3. We are now using a smaller overdispersion value for passive case observations which results in less predicted variation in case reporting. This applies to all the coordinations except for the Bas Uélé region, where we keep the previous overdispersion value (and have more uncertainty).

Projections

4. This study includes more granular details about vector control (VC), particularly for the simulation of partial coverage of health zones with Tiny Target deployments (both past and future).

5. We now use a stochastic model for doing projections which tracks integer numbers of infections and is better at capturing the distribution in elimination times as it has a clearly defined time when zero is reached.

6. In our GUI (https://hatmepp.warwick.ac.uk/DRCCEA/v6/ we now show aggregations for coordinations or the whole country as well as individual health zones. Aggregations are computed by summing up outcomes across different health zones based on the optimal strategy in each health zone to achieve the specific objective – e.g. not all health zones would have the same optimal strategy to achieve the EoT by 2030 objective.

7. In previous studies for the DRC we have often used only one model [1, 4, 5]. Here our default outputs are from an ensemble model of the models with and without transmission from animals based on the weighted model evidence for each health zone, as done in Crump et al [2].

A.2 Locations

Health zones included. We have included 166 health zones in which 37.7M people live, and which have records of 135,029 cases in 2000–20. Our population data comes from the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs censuses for national vaccine days [6].

Health zones excluded. We have omitted any health zones with less than 10 years of either AS or passive detection records. The cut-off was 13 years for the model including animal transmission. We have simulated the disease in the health zones excluded from fitting the animal model using the model without animal transmission. Therefore our complete analysis omits 329 health zones, 71.2M people, and 737 cases – less than 1% of all cases reported in 2000–20 (see Supplementary Table 1).

Moreover, health zones with no major rivers or which are too urban to sustain tsetse populations are not simulated. These are primarily in urban Kinshasa, Kasai Orientale coordination, around the area of Mbuji-Mayi, a mining town without any rivers, and Kikwit Sud in Bandundu Sud. The cases reported there are approximately 4217, approximately 3% of all cases reported in 2000–20 (see Supplementary Table 1). We believe that these cases were reported due to the presence of large hospitals capable of diagnosing and treating people, but that these individuals were infected with the disease in other regions that could sustain transmission.

Population. It must be noted that population estimates of DRC are difficult, as the country has not held a census since 1984, and many other forms of population surveillance are inconsistent throughout the country. Our data on the population for each health zone comes from the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs [6], and a summary of the population per health zone is shown in Supplementary Table 1. We have assumed that the population has a 3% annual growth rate, compounded annually. Our total population comes out to 117.6 million, which roughly aligns with the population estimate from the CIA World Factbook estimate for 2023 [7], although it is higher than the UN World Population Prospects [8].

Coordinations. For the purpose of organising gHAT control and elimination efforts, the country is partitioned into eleven regions known as coordinations. See Supplementary Figure 1.

_			Included		Exclude	d - insuffici	ient data	Exclud	led - urban	locale
Coordination	Total	No.	Cases	Populatic	No.	Cases	Populatic	No.	Cases	Populati
	No.	HZ	2000-	(mil-	HZ	2000-	(mil-	HZ	2000-	(mil-
	HZ		2020	lions)		2020	lions)		2020	lions)
Bandundu Nord	20	18	36369	3.6	2	6	0.2	0	0	0.0
Bandundu Sud	32	19	30458	4.8	12	27	2.3	1	64	0.3
Equateur Nord	39	22	19340	4.7	17	21	3.6	0	0	0.0
Equateur Sud	30	9	1622	1.3	21	55	4.0	0	0	0.0
Isangi -	6	3	6370	0.4	3	222	0.3	0	0	0.0
Bas-Uélé										
Isangi -	29	4	2792	0.7	25	55	3.9	0	0	0.0
Tschopo										
Kasai	45	18	6314	4.4	26	66	6.5	1	172	0.3
Occidental										
Kasai Oriental	35	22	17415	6.4	5	31	1	8	2874	3.1
Kinshasa	36	13	3032	4.2	9	108	1.8	14	1107	5.0
Kongo Central	30	17	4681	2.6	13	41	1.9	0	0	0.0
Maniema	29	13	4583	3.3	16	30	3.3	0	0	0.0
Katanga										
Sankuru	16	8	2053	1.3	8	17	1.1	0	0	0.0
No	172	0	0	0.0	172	58	41.3	0	0	0.0
Coordination										
Total	519	166	135029	37.7	329	737	71.2	24	4217	8.7

Supplementary Table 1: Summary of demographics characteristics and HAT case burden of health zones that were included compared to those excluded from the analysis. Health zones were omitted if there were fewer than 10 data points: in other words the number of years in which AS activity was reported available plus the number of years in which cases were found through PS totalled to less than 10, or if we did not believe that transmission could take place in the health zone because it was urban. Around 0.5 percent of cases occurred in health zones with insufficient data to fit, and a further 3 percent occurred in health zones with enough data points, but that we have deliberately excluded because of their urban locale, where we believe there is no transmission. All populations are estimates of the 2023 population.

				2000-2020		2016-2020	
Coordination	No.	Pop. per HZ	Pop.	Cases per HZ ^a	Sum	Cases per	Sum
	HZ	(thousands)	subtotal		cases	HZ ^a	cases
			(millions)				
Bandundu Nord	18	180 [110-367]	3.60	1748 [37-7186]	36369	66 [3-210]	1278
Bandundu Sud	19	249 [154-358]	4.80	592 [10-6827]	30456	36 [1-183]	1194
Equateur Nord	22	188 [84-427]	4.70	474 [25-4298]	19340	2 [0-29]	113
Equateur Sud	9	171 [45-212]	1.30	92 [19-550]	1622	2 [0-15]	34
Isangi -	3	133 [88-159]	0.40	1907	6370	0 [0-0]	0
Bas-Uélé ^b				[1387-3076]			
Isangi -	4	198 [106-208]	0.70	579 [41-1593]	2792	23 [0-55]	101
Tschopo ^b							
Kasai	18	230 [117-420]	4.40	180 [9-1982]	6314	12 [0-85]	446
Occidental							
Kasai Oriental	22	265 [153-543]	6.40	472 [56-4567]	17415	8 [1-58]	307
Kinshasa	13	338 [90-594]	4.20	98 [35-858]	3027	5 [0-43]	143
Kongo Central	17	133 [83-251]	2.60	249 [15-912]	4673	4 [0-51]	169
Maniema	13	237 [107-417]	3.30	391 [31-691]	4583	14 [0-74]	309
Katanga							
Sankuru	8	150 [95-239]	1.30	218 [13-773]	2053	20 [1-104]	331
Total	166	210 [45-594]	37.74	350 [9-7186]	135014	9 [0-210]	4425

^a Cases are shown per health zone: median [minimum-maximum].

^b Isangi coordination has been separated into two subregions in this analysis. Bas-Uélé is constituted of Ango and Ganga health zones in Bas-Uélé Province and Doruma health zone in Haut-Uélé Province. Tshopo is constituted of Isangi, Yabaondo, Yahisuli, and Yakusu health zones in Tschopo province.

Supplementary Table 2: Summary of the demographic characteristics and recent vs complete case burden in health zones in the analysis, stratified by the coordinations delineated the programme national de lutte contre la Trypanosomiase humaine africaine (PNLTHA-RDC). Abbreviation: HZ: health zone.



Supplementary Figure 1: Map of gHAT coordinations in the DRC. N.B. Isangi is a single coordination, however we denote the region within Isangi we refer to as the Bas-Uélé region for context. Shapefiles used to produce this map were provided by Nicole Hoff and Cyrus Sinai under a CC-BY licence (current versions can be found at https://data.humdata.org/dataset/drc-health-data)

A.3 New data extraction

The methods presented in this section are adapted from the previous DRC fitting study by Crump et al. [1] which used data from 2000–2016. Here we extend the same method, producing both a health-zone level and health-area level extraction to allow more flexibility for future work, and also to include data from 2000–2020.

A.3.1 Data

HAT Atlas data The DRC WHO HAT Atlas data [9] were provided in a spreadsheet with rows representing case reports or screening events. Each record contains columns for the number of people screened, the number of cases reported at each stage, the type of screening method (active or passive), and the year. Each record also contains multiple fields describing the location: Province, Health Zone, Health Area, Location name, Neighbourhood, Quarter, Sector, Group, District, Territory, and a geolocation (latitude and longitude). In total, there were 153,876 records; of which 146,256 (95.0%) had their geolocation field populated. Note that health areas should be contained within exactly one health zone which are themselves contained in exactly one province and one coordination.

Entries for PS with no cases detected, and entries for AS where both the number of people screened and the number of cases detected are either zero or missing, were dropped from the dataset. After removing these records, we are left with 125,045 case and screening records (119,669 of which had geolocation data, 95.7%). Among these entries, there were 24,568 unique combinations of values in the geolocation, province, health zone, health area, location and territory fields, of which 21,575 had geolocation information and 2,993 did not.

_	Reco	Number		
	Province	Health zone	Health area	n
	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	120597
	\checkmark	\checkmark		3213
	\checkmark		\checkmark	14
	\checkmark			1221

Supplementary Table 3: Number of WHO HAT Atlas records with different combinations of the province, health zone and health area recorded.

Shapefiles To match geolocations to health zones (HZs) and health areas (HAs), we used two shapefiles provided by the American Red Cross (ARC) [10]. The first of these is a map of HZ boundaries, with 519 records covering the whole DRC. The second is a map of HAs covering most of the country (all of the DRC except Lualaba and Kasaï-Central provinces, most of Sankuru and Nord-Kivu provinces, portions of the north of former Equateur province, and Poko and Monkoto HZs). Both shapefiles provided fields stating the name of the province and HZ, and, in the case of the area map, also the HA. The province and HZ information in both shape files were used to augment the data with the coordination. The ARC HA file has more granular boundaries (HAs are smaller than HZs), so wherever possible we used the HZ and HA data from this file, however, it does not cover the whole of the DRC. The ARC HZ file, on the other hand, has slightly less granular boundaries and some inconsistencies with the HA shapefile in places; by comparing both shapefiles to maps with rivers (which are often used as boundary definitions) it is assumed that the HA shapefile is also more accurate. Nevertheless, the HZ shapefile is complete and covers the whole country. We also used the combined information from these two shapefiles to identify smaller gaps in HZs which are partially mapped on the HA shapefile. In particular, any contiguous gaps of at least 50km² in the HA shapefile which fell into the same zone in the HZ file were combined into pseudo-HAs and numbered to catch the cases that fell into unmapped HAs.

Additional geographic information The following geographical information sourced from the Humanitarian Data Exchange was also used [10]:

- a HZ shapefile from the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA);
- an OCHA file of geolocations of localities; and
- a file of geolocations of health facilities from the Global Healthsite Mapping Project.

These data were used to assist in matching and locating the gHAT data, by providing alternative spellings of names and potential geolocations for non-geolocated gHAT locations. The locality and health facility lists were concatenated, and this enlarged locality set and the OCHA HZ map were assigned geographical identifiers as per our shapefile of choice.

Matching HAT Atlas records to DRC shapefile Similarly, to [1], the names of all locations in both the data and the shapefiles were normalised to facilitate matching between different data sources. The normalisation process consisted of removing any diacritics, converting all names to lowercase, trimming superfluous whitespace, replacing Roman numerals with Arabic numerals, and normalising some spellings by removing leading 'm', 'n', or 'g' when followed by a consonant, and replacing leading 'ts' with 's'. Additionally, some alternative names and spellings were manually added as they were noticed.

Location records were then placed on the two shapefiles provided by the ARC, and the names of the matching HAs were stored. Locations were then matched in a series of stages, starting with the most precise matches and slowly becoming more permissive until the majority of data points had been matched.

- 1. Locations with known HZ and HA, which match a HA on the ARC HA shapefile, and where the recorded HZ and HA match the geolocated HZ and HA on the ARC HA shapefile. These locations were matched to the recorded HZ and HA. This matched 4,441 (34.5% of records with geolocation) locations.
- 2. Locations with known HZ and HA, which match a HA on the ARC HA shapefile, and where the recorded HZ matches the geolocated HZ and the geolocation is within 5km of the recorded HA on the ARC HA shapefile. These locations were matched to the recorded HZ and HA. This matched a further 2,117 (9.8% of records with geolocation) locations. [Cumulatively: 9,558 or 44.3%]
- 3. Next, we used the locality information. The long list of locations provided by the additional data sources was placed onto the same ARC shapefiles. Data records were then matched to any locations on this list with matching location and territory records (after normalisation), and when the record geolocation was within 10km of the geolocation associated with the locality. Again we only consider records where the recorded HZ matched the geolocated HZ on the ARC HA shapefile. This then gives three possible candidate HAs: the one stated in the record, the one matched on the HA shapefile, and the one matched by locality. If two of these agreed we used this value, however, if all three still disagreed then we chose to trust the HA matched with by geolocation. These records were matched to the recorded HZ and the HA as described above. This matched a further 662 (3.1% of records with geolocation) locations. [Cumulatively: 10,220 or 47.4%]
- 4. The remaining records which match a HA on the ARC HA shapefile, and where the recorded HZ and geolocated HZ on the HA map agree, were matched according to their geolocation. The records were matched to the recorded HZ and the geolocated HA according to the ARC HA shapefile. This matched a further 5462 (25.3% of records with geolocation) locations. [Cumulatively: 15,682 or 72.7%]
- 5. Now we consider records where the recorded HZ does not match the geolocated HZ but is nearby. Similarly to step 2, we consider records where the geolocation falls within 5km of the recorded HZ according to the ARC HA shapefile. We then perform three matching steps analogous to steps 1–3 for these close HZ matches.
 - We then consider records where the recorded HA matches the geolocated HA. These records are matched to the recorded HZ and the recorded HA. This matched a further 74 (0.3% of records with geolocation) locations. [Cumulatively: 15,756 or 73.0%]
 - We then consider records where the geolocation is within 5km of the recorded HA according to the ARC HA shapefile. These records are matched to the recorded HZ and the recorded HA. This matched a further 446 (2.1% of records with geolocation) locations. [Cumulatively: 16,202 or 75.1%]
 - We then consider records where the locality matches a nearby location as in step 3 above. To match the HZ for these records, we apply the following steps. If the record has entries for both HZ and HA, we match to the recorded HZ. If not, we check whether the record's geolocation matched an area present on the ARC HA shapefile. If so, we match to the geolocated HZ using the ARC HA shapefile, if not we use the ARC HZ shapefile. To match the HA, then as above, if the recorded HA and the HA from the locality agree then we use this, otherwise we fall back to the geolocated HA according to the ARC HA shapefile. This matched a further 54 (0.3% of records with geolocation) locations. [Cumulatively: 16,256 or 75.3%]

- 6. After mapping all the records where the recorded health zone matched the ARC HA shapefile, we were left with the records which either fall in the gaps between health zone polygons, or have inconsistent data.
 - First we considered locations where the recorded health zone matched the ARC HZ shapefile, and where they fall into an area which is not mapped on the ARC HA file. These records are matched to the recorded HZ and to the appropriate pseudo-HA based on their geolocation. This matched a further 2635 (12.2% of records with geolocation) locations. [Cumulatively: 18,891 or 87.6%]
 - Now we consider locations where the geolocation is within 5km of the recorded health zone according to the ARC HZ shapefile, and where the location does not map onto the ARC HA shapefile. These records are also matched to the recorded health zone. To assign a health area, we find the nearest health area (or pseudo-HA) which falls in the assigned health zone (according to its boundary in the ARC HZ shapefile), and use this. This matched a further 292 (1.4% of records with geolocation) locations. [Cumulatively: 19,183 or 88.9%]
- 7. For locations with inconsistent data:
 - Firstly, locations where the recorded health area matches the geolocated health area according to the ARC HA shapefile. For these, we used the recorded health area, and used the geolocated health zone according to the ARC HA shapefile (to match the health area). This matched a further 192 (0.9% of records with geolocation) locations. [Cumulatively: 19,375 or 89.8%]
 - Next, we match to the locality list and find any locations where the locality and territory match and the geolocations are within 5km of each other. If the health area of the locality according to the ARC HA shapefile matches either the recorded HA or the geolocation HA then we select that as the health area. Note that this includes the possibility of the geolocation and locality both matching the same pseudo-HA. To match the health zone, we use the health zone of the health area (or pseudo-HA) we have just assigned it to, either from the ARC HA map if we matched a real health area, or from the ARC HZ map if the location is not on the ARC HA shapefile. This matched a further 196 (0.5% of records with geolocation) locations. [Cumulatively: 19,471 or 90.2%]
- 8. Finally, if we cannot reconcile the recorded data with the geolocations, on advice of the WHO we accept the geolocations as the more authoritative source, matching the health area (or pseudo-HA) according to the ARC HA shapefile, and matching the health zone according the the ARC HA shapefile if possible, or the ARC HZ shapefile if not. This matched the final 2,104 locations with geolocations data present, giving a total of 21,575.
- 9. For records with no geolocation data available:
 - First, we try to match the locality data as above, matching the locality and territory columns. For any results with exactly one match, we use the geolocation from this locality to assign a health area or pseudo-HA from the ARC HA shapefile, and health zone from the same shapefile if possible or from the ARC HZ shapefile if not. This matched 49 (1.6% of records without geolocation) locations.
 - Now, we instead match by location (but not territory) and health zone, again keeping any unique matches and using the geolocation fromt he territory. This matched a further 11 (0.4% of records without geolocation) locations. [Cumulatively: 60 or 2.0%]
 - Now, we match by location and province. We match any locations from the location list with the same (normalised) name, and where the recorded province in the data record matches any of the former province name, province name, or co-ordination name of the location according to either of the ARC shapefiles. Again, we filter for unique matches and match according to the geolocation of the matched location. This matched a further 19 (0.6% of records without geolocation) locations. [Cumulatively: 79 or 2.6%]
- 10. Finally, we matched the remaining records to the health zone and health area polygon that according to the health zone or health area stated in WHO HAT Atlas. This allowed us to match 2,710 records (90.5% of records without a specific geolocation), giving a final cumulative total of 2,789 matched ungeolocated records, making 93.2% of non-geolocated records or 99.2% of all records. The remaining records (totalling 316 cases and 193,035 people screened) were missing the majority of location fields and were deemed unable to be matched, and so were not included in our data.

Missing screening data In some HZs there are instances of years of ASs with either very high (or impossible) prevalences (e.g. >10% or with active case numbers exceeding the number of people recorded as having been screened) or where the total number of people actively screened is extremely low (i.e. <20 people). This occurs in 56 HZs for 1 or more years. For these screenings we denote the number of people screened as "unknown" and this is later inferred during model fitting (see A.5) as has been done in previous studies.

A.4 Model formulation

In this study, we use two mechanistic transmission model variants, both of which have a group of people at high risk of gHAT infection who do not participate in AS and a low-risk group of people who participate at random. The model variants differ concerning the presence or absence of non-human animal transmission cycles [2]. Below, we show the diagram and model equations, both reproduced from [2].



Supplementary Figure 2: Warwick gHAT intervention model compartmental diagram. Purple boxes denote human infection/risk compartments, red boxes denote tsetse infection compartments, and green boxes denote non-human animal infection compartments (only in the model variant with possible animal transmission). Solid lines represent the transition between infection states, and dashed lines are transmission pathways. Reproduced from [2] under a CC-BY licence.

For this set of model compartments, we can describe both deterministic and stochastic variations of the model. Below are the ODEs describing the deterministic dynamics. It was this version of the model which was used for fitting, whereas the analogous stochastic model, simulated using tau-leaping with a one-day time step, was used for sampling and projections into the future. More detail on the advantages and disadvantages of the deterministic and stochastic models is presented in Davis et al. [11], however, this previous work has demonstrated that using the deterministic model for fitting followed by the stochastic model for projections provides the speed of the deterministic fitting process but the integer outputs and stochastic variation generated by the stochastic model.

$$\text{Humans} \begin{cases} \frac{\mathrm{d}S_{Hi}}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \mu_H N_{Hi} + \omega_H R_{Hi} - \alpha m_{\mathrm{eff}} f_i \frac{S_{Hi}}{N_{Hi}} I_V - \mu_H S_{Hi} \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}E_{Hi}}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \alpha m_{\mathrm{eff}} f_i \frac{S_{Hi}}{N_{Hi}} I_V - (\sigma_H + \mu_H) E_{Hi} \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}I_{1Hi}}{\mathrm{d}} &= \sigma_H E_{Hi} - (\varphi_H + \eta_H(Y) + \mu_H) I_{1Hi} \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}I_{2Hi}}{\mathrm{d}} &= \varphi_H I_{1Hi} - (\gamma_H(Y) + \mu_H) I_{2Hi} \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}R_{Hi}}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \eta_H(Y) I_{1Hi} + \gamma_H(Y) I_{2Hi} - (\omega_H + \mu_H) R_{Hi} \\ \end{cases}$$
Animals
$$\begin{cases} \frac{\mathrm{d}E_A}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \mu_A N_A - \alpha m_{\mathrm{eff}} f_A \frac{S_A}{N_A} I_V - \mu_A S_A \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}E_A}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \alpha m_{\mathrm{eff}} f_A \frac{S_A}{N_A} I_V - (\sigma_A + \mu_A) E_A \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}I_A}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \sigma_A E_A - \mu_A I_A \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\mathrm{d}P_V}{\mathrm{d}t} &= B_V N_H - (\xi_V + \frac{P_V}{K}) P_V \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}S_V}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \xi_V \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{survive pupal stage}) P_V - \alpha S_V - \mu_V S_V \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}E_{1V}}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \alpha (1 - f_T(t)) P_V (\sum_i f_i \frac{(I_{1Hi} + I_{2Hi})}{N_{Hi}} + f_A \frac{I_A}{N_A}) (S_V + \varepsilon G_V) \\ - (3\sigma_V + \mu_V + \alpha f_T(t)) E_{1V} \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}E_{2V}}{\mathrm{d}t} &= 3\sigma_V E_{2V} - (3\sigma_V + \mu_V + \alpha f_T(t)) E_{2V} \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}E_{3W}}{\mathrm{d}t} &= 3\sigma_V E_{3V} - (\mu_V + \alpha f_T(t)) I_V \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}G_V}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \alpha (1 - f_T(t)) (1 - p_V (\sum_i f_i \frac{(I_{1Hi} + I_{2Hi})}{N_{Hi}} + f_A \frac{I_A}{N_A}) S_V \\ - \alpha (f_T(t) + (1 - f_T(t)) P_V (\Sigma_i f_i \frac{(I_{1Hi} + I_{2Hi})}{N_{Hi}} + f_A \frac{I_A}{N_A}) S_V \\ - \alpha (f_T(t) + (1 - f_T(t)) D_V (\Sigma_i f_i \frac{(I_{1Hi} + I_{2Hi})}{N_{Hi}} + f_A \frac{I_A}{N_A}) S_V \\ - \alpha (f_T(t) + (1 - f_T(t)) D_V (\Sigma_i f_i \frac{(I_{1Hi} + I_{2Hi})}{N_{Hi}} + f_A \frac{I_A}{N_A}) S_V \\ - \alpha (f_T(t) + (1 - f_T(t)) D_V (\Sigma_i f_i \frac{(I_{1Hi} + I_{2Hi})}{N_{Hi}} + f_A \frac{I_A}{N_A}) S_V \\ - \alpha (f_T(t) + (1 - f_T(t)) D_V (\Sigma_i f_i \frac{(I_{1Hi} + I_{2Hi})}{N_{Hi}} + f_A \frac{I_A}{N_A}) S_V \\ - \alpha (f_T(t) + (1 - f_T(t)) D_V (\Sigma_i f_i \frac{(I_{1Hi} + I_{2Hi})}{N_{Hi}} + f_A \frac{I_A}{N_A}) S_V \\ - \alpha (f_T(t) + (1 - f_T(t)) D_V (\Sigma_i f_i \frac{(I_{1Hi} + I_{2Hi})}{N_{Hi}} + f_A \frac{I_A}{N_A}) S_V \\ - \alpha (f_T(t) + (1 - f_T(t)) D_V (\Sigma_i f_i \frac{(I_{1Hi} + I_{2Hi})}{N_{Hi}} + f_A \frac{I_A}{N_A}) S_V \\ - \alpha (f_T(t) + (1 - f_T(t)) D_V (\Sigma_i f_i \frac{(I_{1Hi} + I_{2Hi})}{N_{Hi}} + f_A \frac{I_A}{N_A}) S_V \\ - \alpha (f_T(t) + (I - f_T(t)) S$$

The function which describes the probability of a host-seeking tsetse both hitting a Tiny Target and dying as a result, f_T , is time-dependent (*t*, in days) from when the targets were first deployed:

$$f_T(t) = f_{\max}\left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-0.068(\operatorname{mod}(t, 182.5) - 127.75))}\right)$$
(2)

and f_{max} is the maximum daily probability of contacting a Tiny Target and dying as a result. f_T modifies all the bite rates α in our tsetse equations to produce an additional Tiny-Target-induced mortality for tsetse. The choice of parameterisation of this function in different locations is described in the next section.

Notation	Description	Value						
N_H^*	Total human population size in 2015	Fixed for each health zone	[6]					
μ_H	Natural human mortality rate	$5.4795 \times 10^{-5} \rm \ days^{-1}$	[12]					
B_H	Total human birth rate	$= \mu_H N_H$						
σ_H	Human incubation rate	$0.0833 \ \rm days^{-1}$	[13]					
φ_H	Stage 1 to 2 progression rate	0.0019 days^{-1}	[14, 15]					
ω_H	Recovery rate or waning-immunity rate	0.006 days^{-1}	[16]					
Sens	Active screening diagnostic sensitivity	0.91	[17]					
$B_V{}^\dagger$	Tsetse birth rate (per capita rate of depositing new pupae)	$0.0505 \rm ~days^{-1}$	[3]					
ξ_V	Rate of pupal development to adult flies	0.037 days ⁻¹	[3]					
K^{\ddagger}	Pupal carrying capacity	$= 111.09N_H$	[3]					
$\mathbb{P}(\text{pupating})$	Probability of a pupa surviving to emerge as an adult fly	0.75	[3]					
μ_V	Tsetse mortality rate	0.03 days^{-1}	[13]					
σ_V	Tsetse incubation rate	0.034 days^{-1}	[18, 19]					
α	Tsetse bite rate	0.333 days ⁻¹	[20]					
p_V	Probability of tsetse infection per single infective bite	0.065	[13]					
З	Reduced susceptibility factor for non-teneral (previ- ously fed) flies	0.05	[21]					
fн	Proportion of blood-meals on humans	0.09	[22]					
η_{H}^{pre}	Treatment rate from stage 1, pre-1998	0	Assumed					
disp _{act} §	Overdispersion parameter for active detection	4×10^{-4}	[1]					
disp _{pass} [§]	Overdispersion parameter for passive detection	1.68×10^{-5}	[1]					
Parameters s	Parameters specific to the model with animal transmission							
μ_A	Natural animal mortality rate	0.0014 days^{-1}	Assumed					
σ_A	Animal incubation rate	0.0833 days^{-1}	[13]					

*The model is internally scaled such that the population size in all years corresponds to the population in 2015 (outputs are back-transformed to reflect an assumed annual population growth rate of 3% across the DRC). [†]The value of B_V was chosen to maintain constant population size in the absence of vector control interventions.

[‡]The value of K was chosen to reflect the observed bounce back rate.

[§]Over-dispersion values were originally chosen based on a comparison of the median of the distributions of log posterior probability from MCMC runs with ρ fixed at a range of values for two example health zones under the model without animal transmission [1].

[¶]The over-dispersion value for passive screening in the Bas-Uele region is 2.8×10^{-5} .

Supplementary Table 4: Model parameterisation (fixed parameters). Notation, a brief description, and the values used for fixed parameters. This table is updated from [1, 2].

Notation	Description	Prior distribution*	Percentiles of prior distribution [2.5, 50 & 97.5%]	Unit				
R_0	Basic reproduction number (NGM approach)	1 + Exp(10)	[1.003, 1.069, 1.369]	-				
r	Relative bites taken on high- risk humans	$1 + \Gamma(3.68, 1.09)$	[2.015, 4.654, 10.028]	-				
k_1	Proportion of low-risk people	B(16.97, 3.23)	[0.6564, 0.8514, 0.9609]	-				
$\eta_{H}^{\mathrm{post}\dagger}$	Treatment rate from stage 1, post endemic equilibrium	$\Gamma(3.54, 5.32 \times 10^{-5})$	[4.59, 17.1, 42.9]×10 ⁻⁵	days ⁻¹				
$\gamma_{H}^{ m post}$	Combined treatment and disease-induced death rate from stage 2, 1998 onwards	Γ(6.2082, 0.001)	[2.33, 5.88, 12.0]×10 ⁻³	days ⁻¹				
$\gamma_{H}^{ m pre}$	Combined treatment and disease-induced death rate from stage 2, pre-1998	Γ(6.2082, 0.001)	[2.33, 5.88, 12.0]×10 ⁻³	days ⁻¹				
Spec	Active screening diagnostic specificity	0.998 + (1 – 0.998) B(7.23, 2.41)	[0.9989, 0.9995, 0.9999]	-				
и	Proportion of stage 2 cases reported from passive screen- ing	B(20, 40)	[0.2208, 0.3315, 0.4564]	-				
$d_{ m change}^{\dagger}$	Midpoint year for passive improvement	2000 + (2017 – 2000) B(5,6)	[2003.2, 2007.7, 2012.5]	year				
$\eta_{H_{\mathrm{amp}}}{}^{\dagger}$	Relative improvement in pas- sive screening stage 1 detec- tion rate	Γ(2.5133, 1.3216)	[0.556, 2.893, 8.509]	-				
$\gamma_{H_{\mathrm{amp}}}^{\dagger}$	Relative improvement in pas- sive screening stage 2 detec- tion rate	$\Gamma(2.3095, 0.5727)$	[0.198, 1.137, 3.493]	-				
$d_{\mathrm{steep}}^{\dagger}$	Speed of improvement in pas- sive screening detection rate	Γ(39.57, 0.0270)	[0.761, 1.058, 1.424]	years ⁻¹				
Parameter	Parameters specific to the model with animal transmission							
fA	Proportion of blood meals on reservoir animals	B(1.3, 1.3)	[0.046, 0.5, 0.954]	-				
k _A	Relative size of animal reservoir population	Γ(1.26, 19.3)	[1.18, 18.3, 81.4]	-				

*Where Exp(.), Γ (.) and B(.) are the exponential, gamma (parameterised with shape and scale) and beta distributions, respectively. [†]Former province-specific priors were originally used for η_H^{post} , d_{change} , $\eta_{H_{\text{amp}}}$, $\gamma_{H_{\text{amp}}}$ and d_{steep} ; prior distributions and percentiles for the former province of Bandundu presented (i.e., Bandundu Nord and Bandundu Sud coordinations), see Table 6 for other coordinations.

Supplementary Table 5: Model parameterisation (fitted parameters). Notation, brief description, and information on the prior distributions for fitted parameters. This table is updated from Crump et al. [2].

Parameter					
Coordination(s) health zone(s)	Prior distribution*	Percentiles of prior distribution			
η_{μ}^{post} – Treatment rate from stage	1, post endemic equilibrium				
Bandundu Nord & B. Sud Equateur Nord & E. Sud Isangi Kasai Occidental Kasai Oriental Kinshasa Kongo Central Maniema-Katanga	$ \begin{array}{c} \Gamma(3.54, 5.32 \times 10^{-5}) \\ \Gamma(4.92, 4.51 \times 10^{-5}) \\ \Gamma(1.16, 9.27 \times 10^{-5}) \\ \Gamma(10.9, 3.03 \times 10^{-5}) \\ \Gamma(2.90, 5.87 \times 10^{-5}) \\ \Gamma(1.26, 8.91 \times 10^{-5}) \\ \Gamma(12.0, 2.89 \times 10^{-5}) \\ \Gamma(4.25, 4.85 \times 10^{-5}) \\ \Gamma(4.20, 8.70 \times 10^{-5}) \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{l} [4.59, 17.1, 42.9] \times 10^{-5} \\ [7.12, 20.7, 45.7] \times 10^{-5} \\ [4.24, 79.0, 373] \times 10^{-6} \\ [1.64, 3.20, 5.53] \times 10^{-4} \\ [3.38, 15.1, 41.5] \times 10^{-5} \\ [5.44, 84.4, 376] \times 10^{-6} \\ [1.78, 3.36, 5.68] \times 10^{-4} \\ [5.90, 19.0, 44.3] \times 10^{-5} \\ [5.88, 86.2, 276] \times 10^{-6} \end{array} $			
Sankuru	$\Gamma(1.29, 8.79 \times 10^{-5})$	$[3.38, 50.2, 570] \times 10^{-5}$			
d. Midnoint yoon fon immer	(2.50, 5.61 × 10)	[0.00, 10.1, 11.0] ^ 10			
d _{change} – Midpoint year for improv Bandundu Nord & B. Sud Equateur Nord & E. Sud Kasai Oriental Kinshasa Masa health zone [‡] Kongo Central	vement in passive detection rate $2000 + (2017 - 2000) B(5, 6)$ $2000 + (2020 - 2000) B(2.79, 23.1)$ $2000 + (2020 - 2000) B(2.79, 23.1)$ $2000 + (2020 - 2000) B(2.79, 23.1)$ Fixed parameter value, $d_{change} = 201$ Fixed parameter value, $d_{change} = 201$	[2003.2, 2007.7, 2012.5] [2000.4, 2002, 2005] [2000.4, 2002, 2005] [2000.4, 2002, 2005] 5.5 5.5			
$\eta_{H_{amp}}$ – Relative improvement in	passive stage 1 detection rate				
Bandundu Nord & B. Sud Equateur Nord & E. Sud Kasai Oriental Kinshasa Masa health zone Kongo Central	$ \begin{array}{l} \Gamma(2.51, 1.32) \\ \Gamma(1, 2.17) \\ \Gamma(1, 2.17) \\ \Gamma(1, 2.17) \\ \Gamma(1, 2.17) \\ \Gamma(2.51, 1.32) \\ \Gamma(2.51, 1.32) \end{array} $	$\begin{matrix} [0.556, 2.89, 8.51] \\ [0.055, 1.510, 8.010] \\ [0.055, 1.510, 8.010] \\ [0.055, 1.510, 8.010] \\ [0.556, 2.89, 8.51] \\ [0.556, 2.89, 8.51] \end{matrix}$			
$\gamma_{H_{amp}}$ – Relative improvement in	passive stage 2 detection rate				
Bandundu Nord & B. Sud Equateur Nord & E. Sud Kasai Oriental Kinshasa Masa health zone Kongo Central	$ \begin{array}{c} \Gamma(2.31, 0.57) \\ \Gamma(1, 1.0014) \\ \Gamma(1, 1.0014) \\ \Gamma(1, 1.0014) \\ \Gamma(2.31, 0.57) \\ \Gamma(2.31, 0.57) \end{array} $	$ \begin{bmatrix} 0.198, 1.14, 3.49 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0.0254, 0.6943.69 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0.198, 1.14, 3.49 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0.198, 1.14, 3.49 \end{bmatrix} $			
d_{steep} – Speed of improvement in	passive detection rate				
Bandundu Nord & B. Sud Equateur Nord & E. Sud Kasai Oriental Kinshasa Kongo Central	$ \begin{split} & \Gamma(39.6, 2.70 \times 10^{-2}) \\ & \Gamma(15.7, 0.51) \end{split} $	$\begin{bmatrix} 0.761, 1.06, 1.42 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 4.55, 7.84, 12.4 \end{bmatrix} $			
Spec _{MSF} – Specificity of MSF act	tive screening algorithm				
Isangi – Bas-Uele region [§]	B(299, 2.87)	[0.977, 0.992, 0.998]			
*Where $\Gamma(.)$ and B(.) are the gamma (parameterised with shape and scale) and beta distributions, respectively.					

[†]Kabalo, Kongolo, Mbulula and Nyunzu health zones.

[‡]Masa health zone is in Kinshasa coordination but Kongo Central province. It was assumed to be subject to passive screening improvement in the same period as Kongo Central.

[§]Ango, Ganga and Doruma health zones, where intervention activities were carried out by MSF.

Supplementary Table 6: Model parameterisation (fitted parameters): coordination or health zone specific priors. Adapted from Crump et al. [2].

A.4.1 Assumptions about past interventions

Regions with no transmission

In the previous model fitting studies [1, 2], it was assumed that no transmission took place in the health zones that constituted urban Kinshasa. In this study we have added a few health zones into the analysis where we believe local transmission is possible due to tsetse presence: Nsele, Masa, Mont Ngafula 1 & 2, and Maluku 1 & 2. These are denoted as "no transmission" health zones in our graphical user interface maps https://hatmepp.warwick.ac.uk/DRCCEA/v6/.

Health zones with no data or insufficient data for fitting the model are excluded, as described in Section A.3. There may be some infection in these locations, although we believe that most of the "no data" health zones are unlikely to have transmission. The "no data" and "<10 data point" health zones can be viewed in our graphical user interface maps https://hatmepp.warwick.ac.uk/DRCCEA/v6/.

Passive detection

The integration of gHAT case detection through peripheral health centres using RDTs is an area with limited documented evidence in the DRC [23, 24]. While positive effects have been observed in other countries, such as Chad [25, 26], the follow-up for infection confirmation among RDT-positive cases in the DRC is reported to have a high level of attrition if the health centre where someone was screened does not have immediate confirmation available [27]. Despite this, there is evidence, particularly from the passive case staging data over time, that time to detection through PS has decreased over time [1, 28].

In the same manner as our previous study [2], for improvements between the start of activities and 2020 we use the same following equations to describe transmission rates from infected classes:

$$\eta_H(Y) = \eta_H^{\text{post}} \left[1 + \frac{\eta_{H_{\text{amp}}}}{1 + \exp\left(-d_{\text{steep}}(Y - d_{\text{change}})\right)} \right]$$
(3)

$$\gamma_H(Y) = \gamma_H^{\text{post}} \left[1 + \frac{\gamma_{H_{\text{amp}}}}{1 + \exp\left(-d_{\text{steep}}(Y - d_{\text{change}})\right)} \right]$$
(4)

We assume that all stage 1 infections are either reported as cases or progress to stage two, but that some of the exits from stage 2 are due to death from gHAT disease. In 1998 the reporting probability for an exit from stage 2 is given by u, however as the exit rate from stage 2 increases this reporting probability does not stay constant, but increases (proportionally more people would be detected and treated with higher exit rates). When we compute reporting rates from stage 2 we therefore use the following:

Death rate =
$$(1 - u)\gamma_H^{\text{post}}$$
 (5)

Stage 2 reporting incidence =
$$(\gamma_H(Y) - \text{Death rate})(I_{2H1} + I_{2H4})$$
 (6)

The Bas Uélé region

Previously, it was assumed that screening activities in the former province of Orientale (current-day Bas-Uele) had been carried out by Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) until 2012, allowing us to differentiate between MSF-specific specificity and sensitivity parameters and those associated with PNLTHA activities in the subsequent years. The specificity in these two periods was fitted with the MSF-specific specificity constrained to be lower than the PNLTHA specificity, while the sensitivity values were assumed to have constant values (0.91 in all years). In these fits we have refined this assumption based on patterns in the data and information received from PNLTHA and from an MSF report [29], with MSF-lead activity being limited to some health zones in the Bas-Uélé region: Ango, Bili, Doruma, Ganga, Poko and Titule. MSF were active in these health zones between 2007–2014, and there have been no gHAT control activities, neither active nor PS, in this region after this. As a result, there is no information on the specificity of PNLTHA screening, and so this parameter reflects the prior distribution (our prior belief).

Health zone	Year started	Tsetse reduction after 1 year	Estimated coverage (based on 2016–2020 cases)
Mosango	2015.5	assumed 80%	11%
Yasa Bonga	2016.5	reported 90%	73%
Kenge	2017.5	assumed 80%	28%
Masi Manimba	2018	assumed 80%	53%
Bandundu	2019.5	assumed 80%	66%
Bolobo	2019.5	assumed 80%	14%
Kikongo	2019.5	assumed 80%	18%
Kwamouth	2019.5	assumed 80%	46%
Bulungu	2021	assumed 80%	28%
Kimputu	2021	assumed 80%	35%
Mokala	2021	assumed 80%	15%
Bagata	2021.5	assumed 80%	47%
Bokoro	2021.5	assumed 80%	15%
Ipamu	2021.5	assumed 80%	10%

Supplementary Table 7: List of health zones with previous vector control (VC) deployments. This table includes health zones which have had "inadvertent VC" as boundary rivers had VC due to official deployments in neighbouring health zones. The year started is our modelled start time to the nearest half year, the tsetse reduction after 1 year is assumed to be 80% in all health zones apart from Yasa Bonga where a 90% reduction was reported. Case coverage is estimated using geolocated case data from 2016–2020 as described above.

Historical VC

 f_{max} in Equation 2 is chosen such that the tsetse population after one year is 80% multiplied by the proportion of recent gHAT cases coverage by the intervention, except for in Yasa Bonga in Bandundu Sud coordination which already has a measured 90% reduction in the intervention area [30].

To calculate an estimate of the case coverage of the intervention areas, we applied the following algorithm: First, we selected the river segments in the DRC where VC had previously been applied from the HydroRivers dataset and then created a 5km buffer zone around these areas. For each health zone, we then intersected these buffer zones with the health zone and counted the number of cases that fell inside this buffer between 2016 and 2020. Any cases that fell into multiple buffers (either for the same or multiple health zones) were split evenly between these buffers and counted fractionally to the relevant health zones. The total number of cases inside the buffers was then compared to the total number of cases in the health zone for the same period to estimate a fractional case coverage. The 80% (90% in Yasa Bonga) reduction was then scaled by this coverage to produce a new estimate for f_{max} .

A.5 Model fitting

An adaptive Metropolis-Hastings Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm was used to fit two deterministic transmission model variants to epidemiological data as in previous modelling studies in the DRC [1, 2]. The model variants differ with regard to the presence or absence of animals contributing to gHAT transmission. Since these earlier studies, the data has been updated to span the years 2000 to 2020 (rather than 2000 to 2016) before aggregation at the health zone level within a year. As before, model fitting was carried out independently within each health zone.

Our ODE models were run from their endemic equilibrium. Two chains were run in the MCMC, and they were initialised using the fixed parameters and by random perturbations around supplied, individually valid, initial values of each parameter being fitted, rejecting those parameter sets that do not produce a valid posterior probability.

Likelihood

As described in Crump et al. [2], eight parameters; R_0 , r, η_H , γ_H , $b_{\gamma_{H0}}$, k_1 , u, and Spec were fitted in all health zones for both models. A further two parameters; k_A and f_A , were fitted in all health zones for the model with the animal transmission. Additional parameters were included as required (combinations of d_{change} , $\eta_{H_{\text{amp}}}$, $\gamma_{H_{\text{amp}}}$, d_{steep} and $b_{\text{specificity}}$ as appropriate, see above).

For fitting the model to case data, we transform model ODE solutions (for S1.2.1) into annual case reporting denoted A_{M1} , A_{M2} , for active stage 1 and stage 2 and P_{M1} , P_{M2} , for passive stage 1 and 2. Since we always know the stage (1 or 2) in the model simulations, there is no requirement for a "U" (unknown stage) category for the model. These are computed using solutions to the ODEs for the given set of parameters aggregated across a year.

Detections relate to the transfer from infectious categories to the recovered category – the new annual reported case incidence. This is either by passive detection from stage 1 for year Y:

$$P_{M1}(Y) = \int_{Y}^{Y+1} \eta_H(Y) \big(I_{1H1}(t) + I_{1H4}(t) \big) \, \mathrm{d}t,$$

passive detection from stage 2

$$P_{M2}(Y) = \int_{Y}^{Y+1} (\gamma_H(Y) - \text{Death rate}) ((I_{2H1}(t) + I_{2H4}(t)) dt,$$

or by AS from the low-risk (H1) group in year Y

$$A_{M1}(Y) = z(Y) \operatorname{Sens} I_{1H1}(Y) + z(Y)(1 - \operatorname{Spec})(k_1 N_H - I_{1H1}(Y) - I_{2H1}(Y))$$

and

$$A_{M2}(Y) = z(Y) \times \text{Sens} \times I_{2H1}(Y)$$

with variable AS coverage by year, z(Y) and fixed diagnostic sensitivity. A_{M1} also contains any false positives that may have been incorrectly identified from non-infected people based on the high but imperfect specificity of the AS algorithm. We assume in the DRC that all false positives would be assigned to be stage 1 and treated, however, in the model false positives stay in the susceptible category, unlike true cases which move to the recovered category.

The log-likelihood function used in the adaptive Metropolis-Hastings MCMC contained two terms in each year for which reported case numbers were available for each source of reported cases (active or PS). These were:

- a beta-binomial probability that the total number of cases reported in that year for that source came from the available population (either the reported number of people actively screened for AS or the health zone population for PS) with probability calculated from solving the ODE for the current set of parameters, and
- a binomial probability that the reported stage 1 cases come from the total number of reported staged cases, where
 the probability parameter again comes from the solution of the ODE. In many years, staging is unknown, so this
 part of the log-likelihood will return zero and not contribute to our calculation. In some years, we only partially
 know staging information.

This formulation allowed over-dispersion in the observed cases to be included, via the beta-binomial distribution, and any proportion of cases with reported disease stage to be appropriately accounted for (assuming that the reporting of

staging information is independent of the disease stage). The log-likelihood function was as follows:

$$\begin{split} LL(\theta|x) &= \log(P(x|\theta)) \\ &\propto \sum_{i=2000}^{2016} \left(\log \left[\text{BetaBin} \left(A_{D1}(i) + A_{D2}(i) + A_{DU}(i); z(i), \frac{A_{M1}(i) + A_{M2}(i)}{z(i)}, \text{disp}_{\text{act}} \right) \right] \\ &+ \log \left[\text{Bin} \left(A_{D1}(i); A_{D1}(i) + A_{D2}(i), \frac{A_{M1}(i)}{A_{M1}(i) + A_{M2}(i)} \right) \right] \\ &+ \log \left[\text{BetaBin} \left(P_{D1}(i) + P_{D2}(i) + P_{DU}(i); N_{H}, \frac{P_{M1}(i) + P_{M2}(i)}{N_{H}}, \text{disp}_{\text{pass}} \right) \right] \\ &+ \log \left[\text{Bin} \left(P_{D1}(i); P_{D1}(i) + P_{D2}(i), \frac{P_{M1}(i)}{P_{M1}(i) + P_{M2}(i)} \right) \right] \right) \end{split}$$

The model takes parameterisation θ , *x* is the data, $P_{Dj}(i)$ and $A_{Dj}(i)$ are the number of cases detected by passive or AS (of stage *j*, which may be 1, 2 or unknown, *U*) in year *i* of the data. $P_{Mj}(i)$ and $A_{Mj}(i)$ are the number of cases detected by passive or AS (of stage *j*) in year *i* of the model, and *z*(*i*) is the number of people actively screened in year *i*. BetaBin(*m*; *n*, *p*, ρ) gives the probability of obtaining *m* successes out of *n* trials with probability *p* and overdispersion parameter ρ . The overdispersion accounts for a larger variance than under the binomial. The probability density function of this distribution is given by:

$$BetaBin(m; n, p, \rho) = \frac{\Gamma(n+1)\Gamma(m+a)\Gamma(n-m+b)\Gamma(a+b)}{\Gamma(n-m+1)\Gamma(n+a+b)\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)}$$

where $a = p(1/\rho - 1)$ and b = a(1 - p)/p.

Missing active screening numbers

There are instances in the data where the number of cases from within year $t (A_D(t) = A_{D1} + A_{D2})$ is not consistent with the number of people recorded as having been screened in that year for that health zone (z(t)), i.e. (i) $A_D(t) > z(t)$ or (ii) $A_D(t)/z(t)$ is a much higher prevalence than is biologically realistic for gHAT (e.g. more than 10%).

In the previous DRC modelling studies [1, 2], we did not take any action concerning the very high prevalence of years within a health zone. Instead, we considered only two scenarios:

- 1. If $A_D(t) < 20$ and $z(t) \le A_D(t)$ we assumed that these people attended a screening outside of their home health zone and that the record has been allocated correctly to their home health zone. in this case we set $z(t) = A_D(t)$.
- 2. Where z(t) = 0 and $A_D(t) > 0$, then we imputed the number of negative tests.

In the current study, we have chosen to impute the number of negative tests in more situations. We still believe that where the number of cases reported is low these people probably attended screening elsewhere, but imputing a missing screening value, in our independent health zone analyses, is expected to reflect the model's underlying prevalence better. We, therefore, imputed the number of negative tests for a year within a health zone where:

- 1. the number of cases from was more than 10% of the number screened $(A_D(t) > 0.1 \times z(t);$
- 2. the number screened was zero, or not recorded, or less than $20 (z(t) \le 20)$.

Imputation of the number of negative tests takes place within the MCMC fitting procedure.

We use a Geometric prior for the number of negative screening tests in year t, $A_D^-(t) \sim \text{Geom}(\lambda_t)$, where $\lambda_t = \frac{1}{1+\bar{N}_t}$ and $\bar{N}_t = \frac{\sum_{j=2000, j\neq t}^{2020} N_j e^{-|t-j|}}{\sum_{j=2000, j\neq t}^{2020} e^{-|t-j|}}$, a weighted mean of the number of people screened in years other than t. The proposal distribution for $A_D^-(t)$ was a negative binomial distribution:

$$A_D^{-}(t)|A_D(t), p(t) \sim \text{NB}(A_D(t) + 1, 1 - (1 - p(t))(1 - \lambda_t))$$

where the probability of active case detection, p(t), was sampled from the following Beta distribution:

$$p(t)|\theta \sim \text{Beta}\left(\hat{p}(t)\left(\frac{1}{\text{disp}_{\text{act}}(t)}-1\right), (1-\hat{p}(t))\left(\frac{1}{\text{disp}_{\text{act}}(t)}-1\right)\right)$$

and $\hat{p}(t)$ is the probability of active case detection in year t calculated from the ODE outputs.

Here we briefly show the results for one health zone for illustrative purposes.



Supplementary Figure 3: Fit to historical case data (2000–2020) from active and passive screening in the Kikongo health zone of the DRC. Outputs include estimating unobservable new infections per year (bottom row). Blue box-and-whiskers present within-year summaries of model fits (median for centre line; and 50% and 95% credible intervals for the box and whiskers, respectively).

A.6 Detected cases and undetected deaths

As there is no data available to inform this projection in the DRC, we have to infer the unreported deaths. In the model, the number of unreported cases (assumed to all result in deaths) are triangulated by the number of active cases screened, the presence or absence of VC, the cases detected and the proportion of cases detected that are S1 vs S2 cases. For a more extended discussion of the subject of detected and undetected cases in the model, see the S1 Text for Antillon et. al (2023) [26], pages 11-14.

An illustration of the cases (reported, unreported, and false-positives) as well as the proportion of cases reported is

illustrated in Supplementary Figures 4 and 5. As seen in other results, the totals including and excluding Bas Uélé differ to a substantial amount, not particularly for the early years in the analysis, but substantially for the proportion of cases detected in recent years (see right side of the bottom panels). For clarity, the proportion of cases reported is illustrated in 6 for the region of Bas Uélé alone.



Supplementary Figure 4: Comparison of detected and undetected infections generated by the model and their relationship to active screening intensity, including Bas Uélé region. A) detected cases, undetected cases – which result in deaths – and false positive cases. Box-and-whisker plots show the mean estimate, interquartile range, and 95% prediction intervals of the total number of cases. B) the proportion of cases detected, and the population tested by mobile screening teams. TP: true positives, FP: false positives. See Supplementary Figure 5 for results that include the region of Bas Uélé, and see Supplementary Figure 6 for the results for the region of Bas Uélé alone.

22



Supplementary Figure 5: Comparison of detected and undetected infections generated by the model and their relationship to active screening intensity, excluding Bas Uélé region. A) detected cases, undetected cases – which result in deaths – and false positive cases. Box-and-whisker plots show the mean estimate, interquartile range, and 95% prediction intervals of the total number of cases. B) the proportion of cases detected and the population tested by mobile screening teams. See Supplementary Figure 4 for results that include the region of Bas Uéle, and see Supplementary Figure 6 for the region of Bas Uélé alone.



Supplementary Figure 6: Comparison of detected and undetected infections generated by the model and their relationship to active screening intensity, including Bas Uélé region. A) detected cases, undetected cases – which result in deaths – and false positive cases. Box-and-whisker plots show the mean estimate, interquartile range, and 95% prediction intervals of the total number of cases. B) the proportion of cases detected and the population tested by mobile screening teams. Operations in the region ceased in 2015 until exploratory research last year, which was not included in this analysis. Therefore, the detection rate has been very low.

A.7 Projections

Samples and future projections were run using a stochastic model analogous to the deterministic model used during the MCMC fitting. This approach allowed us to avoid the computational expense of fitting a stochastic model (e.g. via particle filter MCMC or approximate Bayesian computation), but still gain the advantages of stochastic model outputs, in particular being able to directly assess the model when elimination of transmission or elimination of infection has occurred. This is not possible in the deterministic framework without using a proxy threshold [4, 31]. Recent work by Davis et al. has demonstrated the very good alignment between posteriors from deterministic MCMC and stochastic pMCMC fitting of this gHAT model [32].

Model projections were carried out by taking 2,000 random samples from the joint posterior distribution of the model parameters, using these to simulate the stochastic model 10 times for each sample from the joint posterior distribution of the model parameters with observational samples for case reporting using the beta-binomial distributions described earlier. The stochastic model covered the period for which data were fitted (2000 to 2020) as well as projecting into the future under various intervention strategies (see section A.8).

Ensemble model

The results from the stochastic projections for the two model variants were combined into an ensemble model, with the proportion taken from each model based on the relative model evidence. The model evidence, or marginal likelihood, for each model, was estimated using the importance sampled estimator [33].

The following description of the important sampling method to estimate the model evidence has been adapted slightly from that in the Supplementary Information for Crump et al. [2].

The joint distribution of (θ_m, \mathbf{x}) , for parameters $\theta_m = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{d_m})$ of model *m* and data $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ satisfies

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m | \mathbf{x}) \,\pi(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{m}) = \pi(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_m) \,\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m) \,, \tag{7}$$

where $\pi(\theta_m | \mathbf{x})$ is the joint posterior distribution of parameters $1 \dots d$, $\pi(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{m})$ is the marginal likelihood or *evidence*; $\pi(\mathbf{x} | \theta_m)$ is the likelihood, and $\pi(\theta_m)$ is the prior distribution.

By use of MCMC methods to investigate the posterior distribution of the parameters, calculation of $\pi(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{m})$ is avoided. Calculation of the evidence for use in model comparison requires computing the integral:

$$\pi(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{m}) = \int \pi(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_m) \,\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m) \,\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\theta}_m \tag{8}$$

$$= \int \pi(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_m) \, \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m)}{q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m)} q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m) \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\theta}_m \tag{9}$$

Equation 8 cannot be calculated analytically except for some small set of tractable models. It can, however, be rewritten as equation 9, where $q(\theta_m)$ is a d_m -dimensional probability density function. From this, an importance sampled estimator of $\pi(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{m})$ is:

$$\hat{P}_q = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \pi(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{m,i}) \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{m,i})}{q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{m,i})},\tag{10}$$

where the $\theta_{m,i}$ are N samples drawn from q.

A defence mixture [34] was used for $q(\theta_m)$:

$$q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m) = p\phi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*; n, \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \dots \boldsymbol{\mu}_n, \mathbf{C}_1 \dots \mathbf{C}_n) \left| \frac{\boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*}{\boldsymbol{\theta}_m} \right| + (1-p) \,\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m) \tag{11}$$

where $\phi(\cdot)$ is a mixture of *n* multivariate Gaussian distributions with vectors of means μ_j ($j = \{1 \dots n\}$), and covariance matrices \mathbf{C}_j , $\left|\frac{\theta_m^*}{\theta_m}\right|$ is the Jacobian transformation relating probability on transformed and original scales, and *p* is a mixing proportion (p = 0.95 was chosen for use, being a typical value [33]).

In each of our health-zone-level MCMC analyses of the models with and without animal transmission, 2 000 samples from the joint posterior distribution were generated and stored, and $\phi(\theta_m; n, \mu_1 \dots \mu_n, \mathbf{C}_1 \dots \mathbf{C}_n)$ for each health zone and model was chosen using the Matlab fitgmdist function, selecting *n* based on Akaike's Information Criterion

(AIC). To account for the high correlations between some of our model parameters, regularisation was applied to ensure that the covariance matrices, C_k , would be positive semi-definite. Before passing to fitgmdist, transformations were applied to the posterior samples to put them in the range $(-\infty, \infty)$ – appropriate for Gaussian distributions – followed by scaling and centring to keep the regularisation consistent across analyses, at least at the simple, single overall covariance matrix level.

Having defined $\phi(\cdot)$ for a given analysis (health zone, model combination), \hat{P}_q was calculated (equation 10) using $N = 10\,000$ samples drawn from $q(\theta_m)$. Note that this is an increase from the 2 000 samples used previously [2], and is expected to reduce the possible influence of sampling on the model evidence results.

A.8 Strategies and interventions



Supplementary Figure 7: Core gHAT intervention toolbox.

Intervention	Description
Active screening (AS)	Mobile teams travelling to at-risk villages to test any person willing to
	participate
High risk	Individuals with greatest risk of gHAT infection
Intensified (Int.) active	Screening coverage (% people) at either the historic maximum or at 30% if the
screening	historic maximum is lower than this value
Intervention	Tools, treatments or approaches used to prevent or treat the infection
Low risk	Individuals with lowest risk of gHAT infection
Mean active screening	Screening coverage (% people) at the mean of the last five years for a region
Passive screening (PS)	Testing self-presenting individuals for gHAT at fixed health facilities
Reactive screening (RS)	Testing in specific locations in response to cases detected through passive screening
Treatment	Treatment of confirmed cases with either fexinidazole (oral drug course) if eligible, or pentamidine or NECT. Acoziborole (oral single-dose cure) may be used in the future if approved but is not considered in this analysis.
Vector control (VC)	Methods used to reduce the abundance of the vector, i.e. tsetse, that transmit infection.
Targeted vector control	An adapted method based on that previously used by LSTM to identify areas
(VC)	with high case density at which to focus Tiny Target deployment efforts along
	large rivers.
Full Vector control (VC)	Considers the deployment of Tiny Targets throughout all large rivers in a health zone.

Supplementary Table 8: Intervention components which make up key strategies

A.8.1 Interventions

The definition of the interventions is shown in Supplementary Table 8 and depicted in 7. A summary of the levels of each of the interventions are in Supplementary Table 9.

Active screening. Two levels of active screening coverage are considered in our strategy sets. They are *Mean AS* and *Int. AS* in the general set, and *No AS* (sometimes skipped in the strategy names) and *Int. AS* for the special set for the Bas Uélé region. *Mean AS* represents maintaining AS at a recent level, we used the average numbers of people screened between 2016–2020. *Int. AS* refers to the realistic maximum level of AS that can be achieved in each health zone. For health zones outside the Bas Uélé region, it was assumed to be the higher of the historical maximum

(in 2000–2020) or 30% of the health zone population in 2018. For health zones inside the Bas Uélé region, the *Int. AS* is assumed to be the average number of people screened between 2000–2014 because of the absence of recent HAT control activities. The values of *Mean AS* and *Int. AS* are calculated individually in each health zone. Finally, *No AS* means no activity at all in the future.

Cessation of active screening. The planning of AS in the DRC is done by the end of the year and follows the WHO guidelines. AS should continue at the village level until 3 consecutive years of no case detection and then pause for 1 year before a final screening in the fifth year. In other words, this is a two-step cessation algorithm for AS. The first step happens after no case reporting for 3 years and the second step happens after no case reporting for 5 years. In our simulations, we assumed both steps occur in the future. To ensure *Mean AS* is a distinct strategy from *Int. AS*, we further assumed the earliest possible year for the first step cessation is 2024 and 2025 for strategies with mean and intensified coverage respectively.

Reactive screening to case detections after cessation. Reactive screening (RS) is the screening activities that react to any passive cases reporting after AS ceases. Its cessation also follows the same WHO guidelines explained above. Therefore, RS has a minimum length of 5 years (with 4 screening activities), but the actual duration depends on case finding.

Passive screening including post-elimination surveillance. In the transmission model, all simulated strategies assumed PS remains at the current level in future projections. Although we did not consider cessation of PS in the transmission model, we assumed that PS scales back to one health centre per health zone in the cost model after 5 years of no case reporting and this assumed post-elimination surveillance is equally effective as current PS (ignoring the possible impact of losing skilled clinicians and population awareness as the disease becomes rare).

Future VC

For our future strategies, we consider three possible levels of VC: *No VC*, *Targeted VC* and *Full VC*. The *Full VC* strategy consists of treating the banks of all candidate rivers in a health zone with tiny targets. Candidate rivers are either "large rivers", which we defined as those with an average long-term discharge estimate for river reach of $> 20m^3/s$, or any other rivers where VC has historically been deployed.

In order to select rivers for the *Targeted VC* strategy, we use a similar method to our coverage calculations, buffering each river segment by 5 km in every direction and taking the intersection of this buffer and the health zone in question. In all areas other than Bas Uélé, we then take all geo-located cases from 2016-2020 and intersect them with these buffered river segment areas. The number of cases falling in each buffered area is then counted; any cases that fall into multiple health buffers being split fractionally and equally between them so that they are counted as one case in total. We count "river length to be treated" as any river segments with a case density of at least 1 case per 10 km of treated riverbank. In the Bas Uélé region, we instead use cases from 2010 to 2014 since there was no capacity for detecting cases in this region between 2016-2020.

If our *Targeted VC* and *Full VC* scenarios have the same length of riverband and case coverage, and VC has historically been deployed in the area, then instead of using the above calculations for *Targeted VC*, we use the maximum historical deployment length and case coverage of VC.

To compute the case coverage for the *Targeted VC* and *Full VC* strategies, we select the relevant rivers as above, then split them at any junctions, and prune any dead-end segments of less than 10 km. The rivers are then recombined and split again at health zone boundaries or any junctions between remaining river segments.

To calculate the length of the riverbank treated for each river segment, we apply the following steps. If a segment falls entirely along or within 5km of a health zone boundary (inside or outside), we treat it as if one bank (the interior bank) is being treated. If a segment falls entirely on the interior of the health zone (more than 5km from the boundary), we count it as having both banks treated. If it lies both near a boundary and also on the interior of the health zone, we count both banks on the portion in the interior, and one bank in the portion near the boundary. We then sum the length of the banks as above to estimate the total length of riverbank where control is deployed under the strategy.

Cessation of vector control

We assume VC cessation can occur when there are no reported cases for three consecutive years. On top of the criterion based on case reporting, we also considered a minimum of 3 years of VC to reflect the operational constraints such as training new people and sensitization to reach its maximum impact. As the earliest possible year to scale back VC varies depending on the VC history in individual health zones, our simulations did not allow cessation to happen before the analytical present and earlier than 2025 to ensure strategies with VC in the name have at least 1 year of VC. In our

Coordination	PS	Sum	Sum PS	AS mean	AS historical	AS	VC bank	VC bank full
	clinics	PS	clinics, in		maximum	total	targeted	(km)
		clinics	analysis			(thou-	(km)	
						sands)		
Bandundu Nord	8 [2-21]	169	54	0.18 [0-0.45]	0.31	621	83 [0-409]	279 [0-916]
					[0.02-0.64]			
Bandundu Sud	5 [0-25]	111	39	0.09 [0-0.61]	0.17 [0-0.74]	699	11 [0-417]	272 [26-483]
Equateur Nord	1 [0-4]	28	34	0.02 [0-0.12]	0.22	186	0 [0-0]	161 [0-394]
					[0.05-0.41]			
Equateur Sud	1 [0-4]	12	13	0.01 [0-0.06]	0.1 [0-0.2]	22	0 [0-15]	181 [25-892]
Isangi -	0 [0-0]	0	3	0 [0-0]	0.22	0	458 [0-753]	554 [320-1460]
Bas-Uélé					[0.21-0.33]			
Isangi -	2 [0-11]	16	17	0.09	0.17	61	108 [0-142]	237 [197-300]
Tschopo				[0.01-0.11]	[0.04-0.21]			
Kasai	1 [0-3]	17	23	0.02 [0-0.17]	0.06 [0-0.23]	143	0 [0-113]	185 [0-639]
Occidental								
Kasai Oriental	2 [0-8]	54	57	0.02 [0-0.13]	0.05	182	0 [0-89]	94 [0-329]
					[0.02-0.23]			
Kinshasa	2 [0-6]	24	28	0 [0-0.07]	0.01 [0-0.1]	37	11 [0-69]	21 [11-542]
Kongo Central	4 [0-11]	81	82	0.01 [0-0.12]	0.05	53	0 [0-25]	72 [0-379]
					[0.01-0.27]			
Maniema	1 [0-2]	9	14	0.02 [0-0.08]	0.06 [0-0.12]	94	0 [0-144]	235 [0-628]
Katanga								
Sankuru	1 [0-3]	10	12	0.03 [0-0.23]	0.08 [0-0.27]	64	0 [0-190]	258 [94-564]
Total	2 [0-25]	531	376	0.02 [0-0.61]	0.1 [0-0.74]	2162	0 [0-753]	176 [0-1460]

Supplementary Table 9: Summary of the screening and vector control activities in health zones in the analysis, stratified by the coordinations delineated the programme national de lutte contre la Trypanosomiase humaine africaine (PNLTHA-RDC). Distributions are the median followed by the minimum and maximum values for health zones. Abbreviation: HZ: health zone, PS: passive screening, AS: active screening, VC: vector control. The number of PS clinics in the analysis and the number in the 2019 WHO survey differ for two reasons. First, in Bandundu Nord and Bandundu Sud, TrypElim had expanded the network of clinics with capacity for serological confirmation followed by a referral to the main hospital, but the referral system did not work as most patients were lost-to-follow-up. For more information, see Snijders et. al [27]. Therefore, the clinics we assume can still diagnose and treat patients were equivalent to the clinics reported before the TrypElim project in Bandundu: 54 clinics in Bandundu Nord and 40 clinics in Bandundu Sud [35]. Second, we have assumed all health zones have at least one clinic that can screen for HAT with an RDT or a CATT test; even if the clinic is not present in that health zone there is a clinic in a nearby health zone committing resources to screen patients from the health zone in question.

simulations, we checked simulated case numbers by the end of each year to decide whether the cessation criterion has been met from 2025 (for health zones with VC already, listed in Supplementary Table 7) or 2028 (for rest health zones). We assumed VC will stop from the following year if the cessation criterion is met and no reactive VC will take place to react to any simulated case reporting after scaling back.

There are two sets of strategies considered from the analytical present (i.e. from 2024 onward), the special set for health zones in the Bas Uélé region and the general set for the rest of the analysed health zones (see Figure 1(b) and 1(c) in the main text). The Bas Uélé region had a very distinct intervention history (i.e. no HAT control activities such as active and PS since MSF left in 2015) due to operational feasibility, and therefore the general strategies are not suitable nor feasible for health zones in the Bas Uélé region. Detailed descriptions of each intervention can be found below. N.B. We assumed that PS and VC carried on as they were, and actively screened covered populations at the average level from 2016–2020 during the period between the end of the data period and the analytical present (i.e. in 2021–2023).

A.8.2 Strategies

The strategies are listed in Figure 1B for 163 health zones, and in Figure 1C for the three health zones of Bas Uélé region that required different strategies. The health zones are characterized by six typologies, which determine the

Category	Strategies	Comparator	No. HZ
1	All six	Mean AS	26
2	All six	Mean AS + Targeted VC	11
3	No Targeted VC	Mean AS	116
4	No VC	Mean AS	10
5	Alternative eight	No AS, PS, nor VC	2
6	Alternative six	No AS, PS, nor VC	1

Six typologies of health zones, depending on the strategies simulated and the comparator.

strategies simulated and the comparator:

- 1. All six strategies, *Mean AS* is the comparator. Health zones where there is no current VC but where there is potential for targeted VC based on recent case clustering near large rivers have a status quo strategy of *Mean AS* which includes PS in fixed health facilities and mobile screening activities that screen a number of the population equal to the mean number screened in AS in 2016–2020. One of these health zones, Bolobo, had VC in the recent past but has no ongoing VC. The five additional strategies are made up of different combinations of AS and VC *Int. AS, Mean AS* + *Targeted VC, Int. AS* + *Targeted VC, Mean AS* + *Full VC*, and *Intensified AS* + *Full VC* are simulated to compare the health benefits and the costs against this status quo strategy. The number of health zones in this category is 26.
- 2. All six strategies, *Mean AS* + *Targeted VC* is the comparator. Zones where there is ongoing VC will have a status quo strategy of *Mean AS* + *Targeted VC* but we still run the six strategies. The *Mean AS* and *Intensified AS* strategies would imply cessation of the current VC activities. Health zones with historical and ongoing deployments are Bagata, Bandundu, Bokoro, Bolobo, Kwamouth and Yumbi in Bandundu Nord and Bulungu, Kimputu Masi Manimba, Mokala in Bandundu Sud. Yasa Bonga in Bandundu Sud has had historical VC but the extent has approximated Full VC, so the comparator is *Mean AS* + *Full VC*. Kikongo had planned VC but now doesn't so it is in category 1. The total number of health zones in this category is 11.
- 3. Four strategies; no Targeted VC strategies. In health zones where there is no clear way to perform targeted VC, as the recent cases are not sufficiently geographically clustered– but where there are large rivers have a status quo strategy equivalent to *Mean AS*. We still simulate VC along all large rivers and so the three additional strategies are: *Intensified AS*, *Mean AS* + *Full VC*, and *Intensified AS* + *Full VC*. The number of health zones in this category is 116.
- 4. **Two strategies; no VC strategies.** For health zones where no major rivers were detected during the analysis, we only simulated the two strategies that exclude VC. *Mean AS* is the comparator. These health zones were: Ntand Embelo in Bandundu Nord; Gemena and Tandala in Equateur Nord; Katende in Kasai Occidental; Kabinda, Mpokolo, and Nzaba in Kasai Orientale; Muanda and Seke Banza Kongo Central; and Mbulula in Maniema-Katanga for a total of 10 health zones.
- 5. Bas Uélé region; eight alternative strategies. Health zones in the Bas Uélé region including Ango, Ganga, and Doruma have an alternative set of strategies as shown in Figure 1C. These health zones have an alternative set of strategies because activities there were formerly run by an international organization, Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), rather than under the purview of the national programme. MSF ran screening with alternative diagnostic algorithms [29] and therefore the data are interpreted separately. Since the departure of MSF, due to challenges in access, the national programme has not had the opportunity to run activities there, and therefore, there is less data and more uncertainty about transmission in this region. As a result, we model activities that would keep the status quo (*No AS, PS, nor VC*) as the comparator, putting into place activities similar to the rest of the country, and conducting additional VC: *Int. AS + no PS, Restart PS, Int. AS + restart PS, Targeted VC + restart PS, Full VC + restart PS, Int. AS + Full VC + restart PS.* Ango and Ganga are in this category.
- 6. **Doruma in Bas Uélé region; six alternative strategies.** Doruma has cases that are so diffuse throughout the health zone that the algorithm to determine VC extents was not able to find any hotspots. Therefore, no Targeted VC strategies were simulated.

A.9 Health outcomes denominated as disability-adjusted life-years

For the purpose of incremental cost-effectiveness calculation, we define the health effects of gHAT interventions in terms of disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) [36, 37]. Using DALYs is in line with the recommendations of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation's reference case and WHO's guidelines for the conduct of cost-effectiveness analyses [36–38]. DALYs allow policy-makers to compare interventions across different disease programs with one common metric.

DALYs were discounted at a rate of 3% per year [37, 38]. We follow established conventions to calculate DALYs and evaluate the estimates in present-day terms (after applying discounting) [37–39].

A more general discussion of this is found in [5] (Supplementary Methods, pages 10-11), but we provide a brief description here for convenience.

Disability-adjusted life-years (DALY) = Years of life lost to disability (YLD) + Years of life lost due to death (YLL)

YLD = (YLDs before detection + YLDs during treatment + YLDs due to side effects) × DALY weight

where the DALY weight is a metric to measure the relative severity of gHAT compared to living with other diseases.

YLL = life-expectancy at age of death – age of death from gHAT

One important difference with the method described in [5] and the current study is that here we use the life-table method of accounting to calculate the years of life that a person with a fatal case would have lived absent gHAT. The previous study used the life-of-years lived at birth to less the age at death. In 2019 (the most recent year with data from the WHO), the life-expectancy in DRC was 62.4 and the age of death from gHAT is 26.62 (See Section E.7.1 of this supplement). The life-expectancy at age 25-29 is about 70 in DRC (it is usual that life-expectancy is higher in older ages after surviving the risky first few years of life). Therefore, the current method estimates a slightly higher number of YLLs, and by consequence, DALYs, than the previous method.

A.10 Treatment outcomes and cost functions

The cost functions and are described in this section separately for active screening, passive screening, vector control, and treatment. The health zone of Kikongo is used as an example to show intermediate calculations and final costs.

The total costs can be characterised by the expression

Total costs =
$$\sum_{i \in \text{all sub-categories}} (U_i \times C_i)$$

i is the cost sub-category. Where U is the units of a resources(i.e. people screened, teams in opertation, testing centres, etc) and C is the cost per resource unit. All costs were denominated in 2022 US\$. The process to update costs from the literature is detailed in Supplementary Note 3, Section E.1.

A.10.1 Active screening

Yearly costs of AS were calculated as a function of two groups of expenses: capital and management costs, as well as the costs of screening the population and confirming suspected cases. Because gHAT program activities are not combined with activities of any other disease programs, we employed a full costing, rather than an incremental costing, method. A more thorough explanation of active screening campaigns and their costs is available from Snijders and colleagues [40].

Notably, we do not include the costs of lumbar punctures in this portion of the analysis; rather, we include it in the costs of treatment. Because many patients are eligible for fexinidazole treatment, which does not require lumbar punctures, we include lumbar puncture costs in the treatment portion of the analysis for those patients that are not eligible for fexinidazole. See Supplementary Methods, section A.10.4.

8. Overhead costs: overhead costs are split between capital costs and recurrent (management) costs to run an active screening team. AS teams serve a "coordination"– a subnational designation of the PNLTHA program that manages a set of health zones. Therefore, a health zone where fewer than 60,000 people are targeted for screening does not necessarily incur larger overhead costs for active screening than a health zone where the coverage is closer to a multiple of the yearly capacity of a team.

8.1. Capital costs consist of vehicles, medical equipment, energy (solar panels) and training (which occurs once every few years).

8.2. Recurrent costs consist of management and consumables that are spent on the team: fuel, staff time, etc.

9. Costs related to the population screened:

9.1. Card Agglutination Trypanosomiasis Tests (CATT) are scaled up according to the number of people that are screened per year, and a factor of wastage of CATT tests is included.

9.2. Confirmation tests are counted for all of those who are positive according to the CATT test, including false positives (which are estimated as 1-specificity of the test) and true positives, calculated by the dynamic model.

10. For all costs, the national PNLTHA is assumed to consume resources, and there is a mark-up to account for the central management at the national program headquarters. We have made the same assumption as Snijders and colleagues [40] who estimate that PNLTHA management equals approximately 15% of costs.

The parameters for AS are described in Supplementary Note 3: Parameter Glossary, section E.5 and the cost parameters are described in Supplementary Note 3: Parameter Glossary, section E.9.

The cost for Kikongo health zone per year, given the number of people screened in that health zone under Mean and Intensified AS, is therefore:

Variable Name	Parameterization	Summary
AS coverage per year	Fixed	See Section E.5.4. But for
		Kikongo, it is 45,612 for
		Mean AS and 77,195 for Int.
		AS.
Wastage factor for CATT administration in	Beta(8, 92)	0.08 (0.04, 0.14)
AS context		
CATT specificity	Beta(4523, 22)	1.00 (0.99, 1.00)
AS capital costs (annualized)	Gamma(25.31, 747.18)	18,881 (12,240, 26,902)
AS recurrent costs (annualized)	Gamma(56.18, 1412.66)	79,453 (60,046, 101,414)
Cost of CATT test	Gamma(12.11, 0.1319)	1.60 (0.83, 2.63)
Cost confirmation (microscopy)	Gamma(8.47, 1.36)	11.53 (5.16, 20.46)
Cost of delivery (markup)	Beta(45, 55)	0.45 (0.35, 0.55)

Supplementary Table 10: Components of active screening costs

Item	Units (U)	Cost(C)
Capital (annualized)	AS coverage per year ÷ patients	AS capital
	screened by a team	
Management/recurrent	AS coverage per year ÷ patients	AS recurrent
expenses	screened by a team	
CATT testing (See Note 1)	AS coverage per year (traditional) \times	$CATT \times (1 + delivery mark-up)$
	(1+wastage factors for CATT in AS	
	context)	
RDT testing (See Note 1)	AS coverage per year (traditional) \times	$RDT \times (1 + delivery mark-up)$
	(1+wastage factors for RDT)	
Microscopy/confirmation	$(1-CATT \text{ specificity}) \times (AS \text{ coverage})$	Microscopy
	per year × Population)	

¹ Ideally, CATT tests would be used for active screening and RDT tests would be used for passive screening because of the high wastage of CATT tests in the context of passive screening settings.

Supplementary Table 11: Active screening: cost function



Supplementary Figure 8: Treatment model. Treatment for diagnosed gHAT patients is modelled as a branching tree process of possible health outcomes, including eligibility for novel fexinidazole. Abbreviations: SAE: Serious adverse events, IP: inpatient care, OP: outpatient care.

Item	Units (U)	Cost per unit (C)	Cost per category	
Mean AS	1			
Capital (annualized)	0.72 (0.53, 1.04)	18,881 (12,240,	13,680 (7,945, 22,342)	
		26,902)		
Recurrent expenses	0.72 (0.53, 1.04)	79,453 (60,046,	57,596 (37,416,	
		101,414)	88,350)	
Microscopy	205 (129, 300)	11.53 (5.16, 20.46)	2,366 (917, 4,661)	
CATT testing	45,612 (43,748,	2.31 (1.20, 3.81)	45,610 (43,746,	
	48,177)		48,174)	
Total			119,252 (95,260,	
			155,689)	
Int. AS				
Capital (annualized)	1.23 (0.90, 1.76)	18,881 (12,240,	23,152 (13,446,	
		26,902)	37,812)	
Recurrent expenses	1.23 (0.90, 1.76)	79,453 (60,046,	97,475 (63,323,	
		101,414)	149,525)	
Microscopy	347 (218, 507)	11.53 (5.16, 20.46)	4,005 (1,552, 7,888)	
CATT testing	77,195 (74,039,	2.31 (1.20, 3.81)	77,193 (74,037,	
	81,536)		81,532)	
Total			201,825 (161,220,	
			263,492)	

Supplementary Table 12: Cost breakdown for active screening activities for 1 year in Kikongo health zone.

A.10.2 Passive screening

The costs of passive screening each year were calculated as a function of two groups of expenses: 1) overhead costs, and 2) the number of consultations, screening and confirmation tests that are performed in any clinic in the health zone capable of performing a serological or confirmatory test for a person that comes in with suspected gHAT according to the 2019 WHO survey of clinics in DRC [41]. The process of passive screening and its costs is described in more detail by Snijders and colleagues [27].

11. Overhead costs: overhead costs include capital costs and recurrent (management) costs to equip a health center to perform serological screening for HAT and microscopic confirmation, as well as to keep personel in the clinics trained. These costs scale by the number of health clinics in the health zone capable of doing serological testing for gHAT [41]. 11.1. Capital costs consist of medical equipment, energy (solar panels) and training (which occurs periodically every few years). These costs are scaled by the number of facilities that can perform serological confirmation.

11.2. Recurrent/management costs consist of health zone and provincial management and supervision.

12. Costs that scale by population served:

12.1. Rapid diagnostic tests (RDT) are scaled up according to the number of people that are screened per year, including a mark-up to account for wastage of tests.

12.2. Confirmation tests are accounted for all of those who are positive according to the RDT test: both false positives (which are modelled as a factor equal to 1-specificity of the test) and the true positives outputted by the dynamic model. 12.3. Lumbar punctures are not depicted as part of the passive surveillance diagnosis costs, but are included as part of the treatment costs. Because many patients are eligible for fexinidazole treatment, which does not require lumbar punctures, we include lumbar puncture costs in the treatment portion of the analysis for those patients that are not eligible for fexinidazole. See Supplemental Methods, section A.10.4.

The parameters for PS are described in Supplementary Note 3: Parameter Glossary, section E.5 and the cost parameters are described in Supplementary Note 3: Parameter Glossary, section E.9.

Variable Name	Parameterization	Summary
PS coverage per year per population per	Fixed, by coordination, see	86.11 (64.97, 110.31)
clinic	E.5.2. Gamma(55.53, 1.55)	
	for Bandundu Sud.	
Wastage factor for RDT	Beta(1, 99)	0.01 (<0.01, 0.04)
RDT specificity	Beta(1134, 11)	0.88 (0.84, 0.92)
PS capital costs (annualized, per facility)	Gamma(8.475 225.81)	1,918 (850, 3,416)
PS recurrent costs (annualized, per facility)	Gamma(8.475 1060.74)	9,011 (4,010, 15,896)
Cost of RDT test	Gamma(8.475, 0.19)	1.69 (0.76, 3.00)
Cost confirmation (microscopy)	Gamma(3.73 2.96)	11.53 (5.16, 20.46)
Cost of delivery (markup)	Beta(45, 55)	0.45 (0.35, 0.55)

Supplementary Table 13: Components of passive screening costs
Item	Units (U)	Cost (<i>C</i>)
Capital (annualized) -	Number of facilities capable of	Capital costs (clinic)
screening and confirmation	screening and confirmation within the	
sites	focus	
District management	Per district	District management costs
Consultation - screening and	PS coverage per year per clinic \times	Consultation cost
confirmation sites	Clinics in the focus	
RDT testing	PS coverage per year per clinic \times	$RDT \times (1 + delivery mark-up)$
	Clinics in the focus \times (1+wastage for	
	RDT)	
Microscopy/confirmation	$(1-RDT \text{ specificity}) \times (1-Pr. LTFU) \times$	Microscopy
(suspects first identified in	(PS coverage per year per clinic \times	
screening-only sites)	Clinics in the focus)	

¹ We assume that all testing in passive screening is done with RDT tests. This is not strictly true always, but the costs will be approximately similar if the testing is done with CATT.

Supplementary Table 14: Passive screening: cost function

Item	Units (U)	Cost per unit (C)	Cost per category
Capital - clinics	3	1,918 (850, 3,416)	5,753 (2,551, 10,248)
Management	3	9,011 (4,010, 15,896)	27,032 (12,031,
			47,687)
OP visit	258 (195, 331)	2 (1, 4)	567 (185, 1,189)
RDT	258 (195, 331)	2.45 (1.09, 4.36)	633 (266, 1,176)
Microscopy for false	31.15 (19.55, 46.00)	11.53 (5.16, 20.46)	359 (142, 706)
positives			
Total			34,344 (18,634,
			55,206)

The cost for each health zone per year, given the number of people screened per health zone and the number of health centres available for PS, is therefore:

Supplementary Table 15: Cost breakdown for passive screening activities for 1 year in Kikongo health zone

A.10.3 Vector control

The costs of vector control (VC) were calculated as a function of two features: 1) the extent of the rivers where VC is deployed, and 2) the number of targets per kilometre of river where the targets were deployed. The costs of entomological surveys (tsetse monitoring), sensitisation of the population (information campaigns), and district management were assumed to scale in relation to the extent of the health zone where VC would be deployed. The materials and labour-time related to target deployment was scaled according to the number of targets deployed. A full costing method was used. A more detailed account of vector control in DRC is given in publications by Tirados and colleagues [30] and the costs are detailed in Snijders and colleagues' publication [42].

The extent of the riverbank that is necessary to cover for adequate coverage is determined by the case reports of the previous five years. The method is further explained in Supplementary Methods, Section A.8.1. Thirty targets per kilometre are assumed to be used, in accordance with current practice in DRC.

The parameters for VC are described in Supplementary Note 3: Parameter Glossary, section E.8 and the VC cost parameters are described in Supplementary Note 3: Parameter Glossary, section E.11.

Variable Name	Parameterization	Summary
Linear km of river bank	Fixed	Varies by health zone. See
		section E.8.1 of the
		parameter glossary. For
		Kikongo, it is 79 km for
		targeted VC and 601 km for
		full VC.
Units per km of river bank	Fixed	15
Deployments per year	Fixed	2
Cost for entomological surveys,	Gamma(8.48, 14.17)	3.55 (1.58, 6.29)
sensitisation and district management per		
kilometer		
Cost per target deployment per target	Gamma(8.48, 14.17)	416.25 (185.42, 740.35)
PNLTHA markup	Uniform(0.1, 0.2)	0.15 (0.10, 0.20)

Supplementary Table 16: Components of vector control costs

Item	Units (U)	Cost(C)
Entomological surveys,	Kilometers of river covered	Cost for entomological surveys,
sensitization and		sensitisation and district management
management		per kilometer \times (1+PNLTHA markup)
Target deployment	Kilometers of river covered × Targets	Cost for target deployment per target \times
	per kilometer × Number of	(1+PNLTHA markup)
	deployments per year	

Supplementary Table 17: Vector Control: cost function

Per year, the simulated costs according to the above formulation and parameters result in the following estimates:

Item	Units (U)	Cost(C)
Targeted VC		
Entomological surveys, sensitization and	79 km	32,884 (14,648, 58,487)
management		
Target deployment	4740 targets	16,826 (7,486, 29,825)
Total		49,710 (28,217, 78,064)
Full VC		
Entomological surveys, sensitization and	601 km	250,165 (111,439, 444,948)
management		
Target deployment	36060 targets	128,005 (56,947, 226,896)
Total		378,170 (214,660, 593,877)

Supplementary Table 18: Cost breakdown for vector control activities

A.10.4 Treatment

Traditionally, the stage of disease determined by microscopic examination of the cerebro-spinal fluid, which is extracted via lumbar puncture for cases that have been confirmed by visualisation of the trypnosome (e.g. cases in which trypanosomes are present in the blood). If trypanosomes are present in the cerebro-spinal fluid, the patient is considered to have stage 2 disease; if not, he or she is considered to have stage 1 disease. According to the stage of disease, patients are referred to the appropriate health centre or health district hospital for treatment.

In the context of fexinidazole treatment, which has been present in DRC since 2020, lumbar punctures will not be performed by the active screening team, but once patients are referred to a health centre, the health centre will determine eligibility for fexinidazole treatment.

We assumed the treatment algorithm based on the WHO interim recommendations of 2019 [43].

13. **Step 1, Group A. Patients without clinical symptoms of severe gHAT.** These patients would be eligible for fexinidazole treatment if their presentation fulfills the following criteria:

13.1. **Patients age** < 6 years or weight < 20 kg. These patients would be ineligible for fexinidazole treatment. For simplicity, we assumed that all patients over 6 years old were also over 20 kg due to scant data on patient characteristics. See Step 2, Group A.

13.2. **Patients age** > 6 years old and weight > 20 kg. These patients would be eligible for fexinidazole treatment. See Step 2, Group B. WHO recommendations stipulated that a doctor ought to be certain of adherence in the part of the patient in order to prescribe fexinidazole on an outpatient basis. For simplicity, we have assumed that this is not an issue because it doesn't make a substantial difference in the total costs or effects of this particular analysis.

14. Step 1, Group B. Patients with clinical symptoms of severe HAT. Patients whose clinical assessment would be consistent with severe gHAT (see Annex 1 of the WHO Interim guidelines [43]) would undergo a lumbar puncture to determine the concentratin of white blood cells (WBCs) in the cerebro-spinal fluid. For a concentration < 100 WBC per microliter (μ L), the patient would be considered eligible for fexinidazole treatment, depending on age and weight, as detailed in Step 1, Group A. In our model, we assumed that no stage 1 patient will show more than 100 WBC/ μ L of CSF as no trypanosomes should be present in the CSF. Moreover, we assumed that some proportion of stage 2 patients will be in late-stage disease (see Supplementary Tables 19-20).

15. Step 2, Group A. Patients ineligible for fexinidazole treatment. Patients age < 6 years old or weight < 20 kg are assumed to submit to a lumbar puncture to determine disease stage with 100% adherence. In our treatment model, we consider the cost of a lumbar puncture in these patients (see Supplementary Table-23) but we take the outcome of the lumbar puncture (stage 1 or stage 2) from the transmission model, the stage of disease is a critical output of the transmission model.

15.1. WHO recommendations stipulate the following criteria: if there are no trypanosoma in the CSF, then the patient undergoes pentamidine treatment on an inpatient basis. If there are more than 5 leukocytes (or WBC)/ μ L then the patient undergoes NECT treatment on an inpatient basis.

15.2. Pentamidine treatment would consist of intra-muscular infections for 7 days.

15.3. NECT (Nifurtimox-effornithine combination therapy): Nifurtimox is administered orally for 10 days, while effornithine is administered intravenously for 7 days [43].

16. Step 2, Group B. Patients eligible for fexinidazole treatment. We assumed that patients would be treated on an inpatient basis if age > 6 years old and 20 kg < weight < 35 kg, otherwise, they would be treated on an outpatient basis as directly observed therapy.

Uncertainty Uncertainty in the treatment and cost parameters is parameterized according to the standard errors of estimates in the literature (see Supplementary Note 3: Parameter Glossary, sections E.6 and E.10).

We show here the components of the costs per case treated depending on the stage and the treatment. The parameters for the above table are available in Supplementary Note 3: Parameter Glossary, section E.10 and eligibility distributions are described in Supplementary Table 20.

Patient Characteristic	Parameterization	Summary
Under 6 years old	Beta(152.5, 2427.9)	0.06 (0.05, 0.07)
Under 35 kg of weight	Beta(8.3, 359.6)	0.02 (<0.01, 0.04)
Late stage-2 disease	Beta(76.9, 44.9)	0.63 (0.54, 0.72)

Supplementary Table 19: Parameters for treatment eligibility. Reproduced with permission from [5] under a CC-BY license.

Eligibility	Rationale	Summary
Stage 1		
Pentamidine	Under 6 years old (1)	0.06 (0.05, 0.07)
Fexinidazole-inpatient	Over 6 years old but under 35 kg of	0.02 (<0.01, 0.04)
	weight	
Fexinidazole-outpatient	Over 6 years old and over 35 kg of	0.92 (0.90, 0.93)
	weight	
Stage 2		
NECT	Under 6 years old or late-stage	0.65 (0.57, 0.73)
	disease	
Fexinidazole-inpatient	Over 6 years old but under 35 kg of	<0.01 (<0.01, 0.01)
	weight and early stage-2 disease	
Fexinidazole-outpatient	Over 6 years old, over 35 kg of	0.34 (0.26, 0.42)
	weight, and early stage-2 disease	

¹ For simplicity, all patients over 6 years old were assumed to be over 20 kg in weight.

Supplementary Table 20: Eligibility for treatment. Reproduced with permission from [5] under a CC-BY license.

Treatment	Outcomes	Estimate
Stage 1		
	Cured	0.05 (0.05, 0.06)
Dontomidino	Cured with SAEs	<0.01 (<0.01, <0.01)
rentamome	Rescue treatment	<0.01 (<0.01, <0.01)
	Death	<0.01 (<0.01, <0.01)
	Cured	0.02 (<0.01, 0.04)
Favinidazola inpatiant	Cured with SAEs	<0.01 (<0.01, <0.01)
Texindazole - inpatient	Rescue treatment	<0.01 (<0.01, <0.01)
	Death	<0.01 (<0.01, <0.01)
	Cured	0.89 (0.87, 0.91)
Fevinidazola outratient	Cured with SAEs	0.01 (<0.01, 0.02)
Texinidazole - Outpatient	Rescue treatment	0.02 (<0.01, 0.03)
	Death	<0.01 (<0.01, <0.01)
	Cured	0.97 (0.95, 0.98)
All treatments	Cured with SAEs	0.01 (<0.01, 0.03)
An treatments	Rescue treatment	0.02 (0.01, 0.03)
	Death	<0.01 (<0.01, <0.01)
Stage 2		
	Cured	0.56 (0.49, 0.64)
NECT	Cured with SAEs	0.06 (0.04, 0.08)
NECT	Rescue treatment	0.03 (0.01, 0.04)
	Death	<0.01 (<0.01, <0.01)
	Cured	<0.01 (<0.01, 0.01)
Fexinidazole - inpatient	Cured with SAEs	<0.01 (<0.01, <0.01)
rexinitiazoie - inpatient	Rescue treatment	<0.01 (<0.01, <0.01)
	Death	<0.01 (<0.01, <0.01)
	Cured	0.33 (0.25, 0.41)
Fexinidazole - outpatient	Cured with SAEs	<0.01 (<0.01, <0.01)
Texinidazoie outpatient	Rescue treatment	<0.01 (<0.01, 0.01)
	Death	<0.01 (<0.01, <0.01)
	Cured	0.90 (0.88, 0.92)
All treatments	Cured with SAEs	0.07 (0.05, 0.09)
An treatments	Rescue treatment	0.03 (0.02, 0.05)
	Death	<0.01 (<0.01, <0.01)

Supplementary Table 21: Treatments and outcomes distributions for stage 1 and 2 patients, calculated according to the probability tree in 8. SAE: severe adverse events.

Variable Name	Parameterization	Summary
Lumbar puncture and laboratory exam -	Gamma(2.42, 3.66)	11.03 (2.81, 24.49)
cost		
Duration of hospital stay for NECT	Fixed	10
treatment in days		
Duration of hospital stay fexinidazole for	Fixed	10
stage 1 or 2 disease in days		
Duration of severe adverse events in days	Gamma (1.219, 2.377)	2.88 (0.13, 9.77)
Probability of serious adverse events -	Beta(1,499)	0.0026 (0.0002, 0.0082)
pentamidine		
Probability of serious adverse events -	Beta(11.6,226.4)	0.10 (0.07, 0.13)
NECT		
Probability of serious adverse events -	Beta(3,261)	0.01 (<0.01, 0.03)
fexinidazole		
Outpatient consultation - cost	Gamma(2.48,0.79)	2.20 (0.74, 4.45)
Hospital day - cost	Gamma(5.45,1.76)	2.78 (0.99, 5.41)
Course of pentamidine - cost	Fixed	54
Course of NECT - cost	Fixed	360
Course of fexinidazole - cost	Fixed	50
Delivery mark-up	Beta(45,55)	0.45 (0.35, 0.55)

Supplementary Table 22: Parameters for treatment costs

	Pentamidine	NECT	Fexinidazole -	Fexinidazole -
			inpatient	outpatient
Staging	11.03 (2.81, 24.49)	11.03 (2.81, 24.49)	0	0
Doctor's consult	21.96 (7.44, 44.49)	2.20 (0.74, 4.45)	2.20 (0.74, 4.45)	21.96 (7.44, 44.49)
Inpatient care	0	27.77 (9.94, 54.07)	27.77 (9.94, 54.07)	0
Medicine	78.29 (73.04, 83.55)	521.91 (486.94,	72.49 (67.63, 77.36)	72.49 (67.63, 77.36)
		556.99)		
Treatment for SAE	<0.01 (<0.01, 0.02)	1.02 (0.19, 3.36)	0.12 (0.01, 0.47)	0.12 (0.01, 0.47)
Total	111.28 (92.31,	563.93 (521.71,	102.57 (83.83,	94.47 (78.92, 117.38)
	137.17)	608.41)	129.09)	

Supplementary Table 23: Cost per person for different gHAT treatments. Because these are costs averaged over all patients and SAEs are rare, the average cost per patient for SAE is low.



A.11 Cost-effectiveness analysis; example of Kikongo and Bas Uélé region health zones

Supplementary Figure 9: Decision tree, close up of Supplementary Figure 10. Decision nodes are square, and probabilistic nodes are ellipses. The transmission model is depicted in Supplementary Figure 2 and the probability tree model is depicted in Supplementary Figure 8.

Lastly, we calculate costs, treatment outcomes and disease burden to estimate the cost-effectiveness of each of the strategies according to a decision tree shown in 9 and shown in more full in 10. The costs here are denominated in 2022 USD, and health burden and benefits are denominated in disability-adjusted life-years, although we also present cases and deaths as intermediate outcomes. We have selected to show costs, benefits, and cost-effectiveness taking into account a 2040 horizon to calculate the costs of activities until 2030, the goal date for elimination of transmission, and to be able to take into account any savings from scale-back of activities that may stretch into the decade following 2030.

The potential cost differences and health effects were calculated for all health zones, but Table 24 shows an illustration for Kikongo health zone. In Kikongo, the status quo, or *M*ean AS will cost \$3.1M (not discounted) for the period of 2024-2040 and incur 42 (95% PI: 0, 157) cases between 2024 to 2040. The minimum cost strategy is *M*ean AS & Targeted VC which incurs only 25 (95% PI: 0, 82) cases and saves \$393 thousand (not discounted); therefore, this strategy dominates *Mean AS* & *Int. AS* because it costs less and averts DALYs. *Mean AS* & Full VC has an ICER = 11,885 and *Int. AS* & *Full VC* have an ICER = 15,583 in terms of costs that are discounted. These ICERs would indicate that these strategies are not cost-effective it the WTP thresholds are even as generous as 3 × GDP per capita (around \$1500 for DRC). *Int. AS* & *Targeted VC* is weakly dominated by *Int. AS* & *Full VC*, because although it averts DALYs at a lower overall cost than *Int. AS* & *Full VC*, it does so at a higher ICER than *Int. AS* & *Full VC*. A step-by-step explanation of weak dominance can be found in [5] in the Supplementary Methods, page 46.

When we look at the uncertainty in the choice of strategy, *Mean AS & Targeted VC* is optimal in 50-52% of the iterations at all WTP values, and the status quo is optimal in 28% of iterations at WTP=\$0, and in 19% of iterations at the highest WTP. The rest of the strategies have very low probability of being optimal, with more support for increasing VC coverage than for increasing AS.

In terms of EoT by 2030, Kikongo has a 46% probability of reaching EoT by that date, with a expected year of elimination of 2033 (95% PI: 2023, After 2053). The lower expected year of elimination indicates that there is a small chance (2.5%) that EoT has already been reached. With the minimum cost strategy, one could save money, save DALYs, as well as increase the probability of EoT by 2030 to 71% and bring the expected year of EoT forward to 2029 (95% PI: 2022, 2043). Implementing the more expensive strategies would not be cost-effective, but it would increase the probability of EoT by 9-13 percentage points.

Similar results for all health zones can be found in the GUI https://hatmepp.warwick.ac.uk/DRCCEA/v6/. The results for the Bas Uélé region, which was simulated with different strategies, are shown in Supplementary Tables 25 - 27.



Supplementary Figure 10: Decision tree of disease suppression and prevention strategies. Decision nodes are square, and probabilistic nodes are ellipses. One branch (one strategy) is depicted in detail in Supplementary Figure 9. The transmission model is depicted in Supplementary Figure 2 and the probability tree model is depicted in Supplementary Figure 8. A) Strategies against gHAT, including active screening (AS) by mobile teams, passive surveillance (PS) in fixed health facilities, and vector control (VC). In three strategies (*Mean AS*, *Mean AS* + *Targeted VC*, and *Mean AS* + *Full VC*) the proportion screened equalled the mean number screened during 2016–2020. In the three other strategies (*Int. AS*, *Int. AS* + *Targeted VC*, *Int. AS* + *Full VC*), the coverage is the maximum number screened during 2000–2020. In strategies 3-6, vector control (VC) is simulated assuming a reduction as described in the Supplementary Methods, Section A.8.1. PS is in place under all strategies. B) Strategies against gHAT in Bas Uélé region.

	Mean AS	Int. AS	Mean AS & Targeted VC	Int. AS & Torgeted VC	Mean AS & Full	Int. AS & Full VC
Health effects			Targeteu VC	Targeteu VC	vc	
Reported cases	21 (0.86)	20 (0.96)	12 (0, 53)	13 (0, 66)	10 (0, 46)	11 (0, 59)
Deaths	21 (0, 85)	16 (0, 61)	12(0, 33) 12(0, 43)	10 (0, 35)	10 (0, 34)	9 (0, 29)
undetected	21 (0, 05)	10 (0, 01)	12 (0, 13)	10 (0, 55)	10 (0, 51)	5 (0, 25)
Cases total	42 (0, 157)	36 (0, 140)	25 (0, 82)	23 (0, 87)	21 (0, 68)	20 (0, 75)
Deaths detected ^a	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)
YLD	31 (0, 119)	24 (0, 93)	19 (0, 72)	16 (0, 62)	16 (0, 60)	14 (0, 53)
YLL	1,093 (0, 4,349)	797 (0, 3,104)	637 (0, 2, 191)	518 (0, 1,789)	533 (0, 1,733)	438 (0, 1,473)
DALYs	1,124 (1, 4,445)	821 (0, 3,180)	656 (0, 2,226)	534 (0, 1,822)	549 (0, 1,777)	452 (0, 1,505)
ΔDALYs	127 (0, 1,462)	431 (-1,412, 3,915)	596 (-839, 4,238)	718 (-578, 4,563)	703 (-564, 4,517)	800 (-412, 4,650)
Costs, in thousands	US\$ (not discounted)	l	L	L	L	
AS costs	2065 (542, 4026)	3112 (863, 6200)	1626 (517, 3199)	2515 (828, 5056)	1467 (501, 2887)	2312 (800, 4576)
PS costs	1019 (588, 1573)	986 (579, 1530)	944 (570, 1465)	923 (561, 1437)	914 (558, 1420)	897 (556, 1386)
VC costs	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	125 (23, 289)	118 (23, 271)	891 (174, 1973)	857 (174, 1863)
Treatment	10 (0, 42)	10 (0, 45)	6 (0, 26)	6 (0, 32)	5 (0, 23)	6 (0, 28)
Costs total	3094 (1474, 5126)	4109 (1804, 7245)	2701 (1466, 4350)	3562 (1811, 6151)	3276 (1887, 5100)	4071 (2266, 6559)
ΔCosts	0 (0, 0)	1,015 (-1,287,	-393 (-2,205, 1,327)	468 (-1,532, 2,821)	182 (-1,770, 2,135)	977 (-1,017, 3,301)
		3,738)				
ЕоТ					-	
Year of EoT	2033 (2023, After	2031 (2023, 2049)	2029 (2023, 2045)	2029 (2022, 2043)	2028 (2022, 2042)	2027 (2022, 2040)
	2053)					
Prob EoT 2030	0.46	0.55	0.71	0.76	0.80	0.84
Cost-effectiveness w	ithout uncertainty (dise	counted) ^b				
ΔDALYs	0	134	202	260	250	297
ΔCosts	0	904,517	-263,698	518,455	310,701	1,038,983
ICER	Dominated	Dominated	Min Cost	Weakly Dominated	11,885	15,583
Cost-effectiveness w	ith uncertainty (discou	nted), conditional on V	VTP ^c .			
WTP: \$0	0.28	0.04	0.5(p)	0.06	0.1	0.01
WTP: \$250	0.25	0.04	0.52(p)	0.07	0.1	0.01
WTP: \$500	0.23	0.05	0.52(p)	0.08	0.11	0.01
WTP: \$750	0.22	0.05	0.52(p)	0.09	0.11	0.01
WTP: \$1000	0.21	0.05	0.52(p)	0.09	0.12	0.01
WTP: \$1500	0.19	0.05	0.5(p)	0.11	0.13	0.02

^b Cost-effectiveness results are given for discounted DALYs and costs as per convention

^c (p) is the preferred strategy; the strategy with the highest mean net monetary benefits

Supplementary Table 24: Summary of effects, costs, elimination of transmission (EoT) by 2030, and cost-effectiveness with and without uncertainty in Kikongo health zone. Means are given along with 95% prediction intervals (PIs). YLL: years of life lost (to fatal disease), YLD: years of life lost to disability, DALYs: disability-adjusted life-years, PS: passive screening, AS: active screening, VC: vector control, ICER: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio, WTP: willingness to pay (USD per DALY averted), EoT: elimination of transmission.

	No AS, PS, nor VC	Int. AS & no PS	Restart PS	Int. AS & Restart	Targeted VC &	Int. AS &	Full VC & Restart	Int. AS & Full VC
				PS	Restart PS	Targeted VC &	PS	& Restart PS
						Restart PS		
Health effects	1						1	
Reported cases	0 (0, 0)	1684 (1132, 2335)	317 (187, 477)	1834 (1243, 2540)	90 (39, 157)	661 (464, 888)	89 (40, 158)	661 (465, 891)
Deaths	13804 (6882,	8923 (4332, 13817)	13126 (6469,	8527 (4078, 13239)	3697 (2434, 5097)	2837 (1781, 4006)	3697 (2434, 5096)	2837 (1777, 4001)
undetected	20459)		19663)					
Cases total	13804 (6882,	10606 (5564,	13442 (6742,	10361 (5388,	3787 (2533, 5200)	3498 (2340, 4836)	3786 (2530, 5197)	3498 (2340, 4822)
	20459)	16088)	20024)	15703)				
Deaths detected ^a	0 (0, 0)	2 (1, 4)	1 (0, 1)	2 (1, 4)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 2)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 2)
YLD	17850 (11402,	11589 (7150,	16991 (10817,	11092 (6785,	4624 (2880, 7142)	3556 (2213, 5438)	4624 (2878, 7112)	3558 (2210, 5458)
	25768)	17496)	24693)	16820)				
YLL	706,429 (350,304,	456,730 (222,304,	671,762 (328,561,	436,514 (208,756,	189,232 (123,767,	145,251 (90,819,	189,215 (123,742,	145,237 (90,402,
	1,054,405)	711,535)	1,012,454)	682,763)	262,751)	206,497)	263,350)	206,318)
DALYs	724,279 (365,383,	468,319 (231,633,	688,752 (342,890,	447,606 (217,388,	193,857 (127,620,	148,807 (94,226,	193,838 (128,312,	148,795 (94,089,
	1,076,666)	727,001)	1,034,579)	696,249)	268,453)	211,079)	268,887)	210,391)
ΔDALYs	677,366 (334,885,	933,327 (463,271,	712,893 (348,865,	954,040 (479,348,	1,207,789 (568,361,	1,252,839 (604,840,	1,207,807 (568,948,	1,252,850 (603,800,
	1,021,355)	1,398,115)	1,102,107)	1,427,296)	1,829,987)	1,885,509)	1,830,485)	1,883,179)
Costs, in thousands	US\$ (not discounted)							
AS costs	0 (0, 0)	858 (577, 1214)	0 (0, 0)	858 (577, 1214)	0 (0, 0)	848 (570, 1204)	0 (0, 0)	849 (570, 1205)
PS costs	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	213 (124, 334)	213 (124, 334)	213 (124, 334)	213 (124, 334)	213 (124, 334)	213 (124, 334)
VC costs	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	3304 (1607, 5638)	3976 (2261, 6268)	6413 (3113, 10978)	7714 (4399, 12189)
Treatment	0 (0, 0)	803 (533, 1136)	167 (97, 258)	884 (591, 1250)	47 (21, 85)	325 (220, 453)	47 (21, 85)	325 (220, 453)
Costs total	0 (0, 0)	1660 (1254, 2139)	380 (261, 530)	1955 (1514, 2479)	3565 (1857, 5895)	5363 (3598, 7676)	6674 (3371, 11251)	9101 (5760, 13578)
ΔCosts	0 (0, 0)	1,660 (1,254, 2,139)	380 (261, 530)	1,955 (1,514, 2,479)	3,565 (1,857, 5,895)	5,363 (3,598, 7,676)	6,674 (3,371,	9,101 (5,760
							11,251)	13,578
ЕоТ								
Year of EoT	2054 (2054, 2054)	2054 (2054, 2054)	2054 (2054, 2054)	2054 (2054, 2054)	2054 (2050, 2054)	2050 (2039, 2054)	2054 (2050, 2054)	2050 (2039, 2054
Prob EoT 2030	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	<0.0 🕅
Cost-effectiveness w	ithout uncertainty (disc	counted) ^b						
ΔDALYs 1	0	100,868	13,807	109,065	208,515	228,685	208,519	228,692
ΔCosts	0	1,340,969	300,610	1,578,170	2,948,401	4,331,946	5,521,903	7,324,504
ICER	Min Cost	13	Weakly Dominated	Weakly Dominated	15	69	Dominated	426,788
Cost-effectiveness w	ith uncertainty (discou	nted), conditional on V	VTP ^c .			·		. 10
WTP: \$0	1(p)	0	0	0	0	0	0	<u>e</u>
WTP: \$250	0	0	0	0	0	1(p)	0	<u>E</u>
WTP: \$500	0	0	0	0	0	0.96(p)	0	0.04
WTP: \$750	0	0	0	0	0	0.9(p)	0	0.12
WTP: \$1000	0	0	0	0	0	0.84(p)	0	0.165
WTP: \$1500	0	0	0	0	0	0.75(p)	0	0.25.
a Detected deether and	41 414 41 4 4		4- f-11	1			1	·

^b Cost-effectiveness results are given for discounted DALYs and costs as per convention

^c (p) is the preferred strategy; the strategy with the highest mean net monetary benefits

Supplementary Table 25: Summary of effects, costs, elimination of transmission (EoT) by 2030, and cost-effectiveness with and without uncertainty in Ango health zone. Means are given along with 95% prediction intervals (PIs). YLL: years of life lost (to fatal disease), YLD: years of life lost to disability, DALYs: disability-adjusted life-years, PS: passive screening, AS: active screening, VC: vector control, ICER: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio, WTP: willingness to pay (USD per DALY averted), EoT: elimination of transmission.

analysis- PRE-PRINT

	No AS, PS, nor VC	Int. AS & no PS	Restart PS	Int. AS & Restart	Full VC & Restart	Int. AS & Full VC
				PS	PS	& Restart PS
Health effects						
Reported cases	0 (0, 0)	357 (125, 704)	439 (163, 825)	567 (202, 1091)	404 (149, 764)	530 (193, 1009)
Deaths	4054 (1505, 7820)	2576 (929, 5019)	2816 (959, 5740)	1841 (621, 3786)	2587 (892, 5286)	1712 (588, 3512)
undetected						
Cases total	4054 (1505, 7820)	2933 (1065, 5709)	3254 (1143, 6470)	2408 (836, 4842)	2992 (1063, 5960)	2242 (796, 4485)
Deaths detected ^a	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 1)	1 (0, 2)	1 (0, 2)	1 (0, 2)	1 (0, 2)
YLD	3530 (1239, 7205)	2250 (768, 4603)	2508 (819, 5284)	1644 (521, 3509)	2300 (762, 4854)	1526 (502, 3258)
YLL	207,436 (76,220,	131,820 (47,808,	144,108 (48,949,	94,222 (31,693,	132,423 (45,435,	87,653 (30,122,
	403,164)	259,058)	293,523)	194,502)	270,754)	180,003)
DALYs	210,966 (77,453,	134,071 (48,622,	146,615 (49,852,	95,867 (32,248,	134,723 (46,197,	89,179 (30,707,
	409,852)	263,440)	298,605)	197,928)	275,904)	183,089)
ΔDALYs	243,027 (73,410,	319,923 (93,353,	307,378 (88,293,	358,127 (112,774,	319,270 (94,674,	364,814 (115,573,
	494,618)	658,799)	628,808)	715,851)	647,856)	729,608)
Costs, in thousands	US\$ (not discounted)					
AS costs	0 (0, 0)	522 (352, 744)	0 (0, 0)	523 (352, 744)	0 (0, 0)	523 (352, 744)
PS costs	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	204 (115, 323)	204 (115, 323)	204 (115, 323)	204 (115, 323)
VC costs	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	1713 (992, 2680)	1713 (992, 2679)
Treatment	0 (0, 0)	165 (56, 332)	231 (83, 443)	279 (99, 543)	212 (77, 409)	261 (94, 505)
Costs total	0 (0, 0)	687 (471, 955)	435 (253, 671)	1006 (719, 1358)	2130 (1380, 3111)	2700 (1910, 3716)
ΔCosts	0 (0, 0)	687 (471, 955)	435 (253, 671)	1,006 (719, 1,358)	2,130 (1,380, 3,111)	2,700 (1,910, 3,716)
ЕоТ						
Year of EoT	2054 (2054, 2054)	2054 (2054, 2054)	2054 (2054, 2054)	2054 (2054, 2054)	2054 (2054, 2054)	2054 (2054, 2054)
Prob EoT 2030	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01
Cost-effectiveness w	ithout uncertainty (dise	counted) ^b				
ΔDALYs 1	0	29,777	24,855	44,842	29,386	47,426
ΔCosts	0	550,064	344,273	808,109	1,697,873	2,161,124
ICER	Min Cost	Weakly Dominated	14	23	Dominated	524
Cost-effectiveness w	ith uncertainty (discou	nted), conditional on W	VTP ^c .			
WTP: \$0	1(p)	0	0	0	0	0
WTP: \$250	0	0.03	0.02	0.65(p)	0	0.31
WTP: \$500	0	0.01	0.01	0.51(p)	0	0.47
WTP: \$750	0	0.01	0	0.46	0	0.52(p)
WTP: \$1000	0	0.01	0	0.43	0	0.55(p)
WTP: \$1500	0	0.01	0	0.4	0	0.58(p)

^b Cost-effectiveness results are given for discounted DALYs and costs as per convention

^c (p) is the preferred strategy; the strategy with the highest mean net monetary benefits

Supplementary Table 26: Summary of effects, costs, elimination of transmission (EoT) by 2030, and cost-effectiveness with and without uncertainty in Doruma health zone. Means are given along with 95% prediction intervals (PIs). YLL: years of life lost (to fatal disease), YLD: years of life lost to disability, DALYs: disability-adjusted life-years, PS: passive screening, AS: active screening, VC: vector control, ICER: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio, WTP: willingness to pay (USD per DALY averted), EoT: elimination of transmission.

Health effects Restart PS Targeted VC & PS K ktsurt PS Health effects Reported cases 0 colspan="2">(Fig. 2374) 1061 (676, 1594) 1736 (1077, 2021) 228 (151, 400) 692 (450, 996) 253 (152, 996, 2242) (008 (613, 152) Deaths decicled 0 0 1731 (1182, 2333) 1732 (1182, 2353) 1732 (1182, 2353) 1732 (1182, 2353) 1732 (1182, 2353) 1732 (1182, 2353) 1732 (1182, 2353) 1732 (1182, 2353) 1732 (1182, 2353) 1732 (1182, 2353) 1424 (863, 2218) YLL 443,125 (232,164, 277,63) (2387, 237,275) 17375 (1154,03) 7,559 (112,03) 1,550 (2387, 78, 446,34,046,34,274,34) 1,560 (238,74,1,148,124,124,124,124,124,124,124,124,124,124		No AS, PS, nor VC	Int. AS & no PS	Restart PS	Int. AS & Restart	Targeted VC &	Int. AS &	Full VC & Restart	Int. AS & Full VC
Health effects VEXNUE Reparted cases 0.0.0.0 155 (956, 237) 1061 (676, 159) 128 (151, 400) 692 (451, 100) Deaths 8557 (666, 14098) 3447 (1819, 5805) 6204 (3120, 10647) 265 (1329, 4633) 152 (065, 2243) 108 (061, 1124, 2438) 182 (068, 14098) 3040 (2112, 256) 1700 (1121, 2438) Deaths 0 (0.0) 2 (1.4) 2 (1.5) 0 (0.1) 1700 (1121, 2438) Deaths 0 (0.0) 2 (1.4) 2 (1.5) 0 (0.1) 100 (0.1) 100 (121, 2438) VI.1 176,530 (2867, 271, 271, 271, 271, 271, 271, 271, 27					PS	Restart PS	Targeted VC &	PS	& Restart PS
Reported cases 0 (0, 0) 1556 (956, 2374) 1061 (676, 1594) 1736 (1077, 2621) 258 (151, 400) 692 (450, 996) 258 (152, 398) 692 (453, 1002) Daths 8657 (4686, 14098) 3447 (1819, 5505) 6204 (3120, 10647) 265 (1329, 4633) 1523 (965, 2245) 1008 (614, 1529) 1523 (968, 2242) 1008 (613, 1529) Cases total 8657 (4686, 14098) 5003 (2549, 8072) 7265 (3005, 12084) 4390 (2460, 7155) 1781 (1185, 2553) 1701 (1124, 2438) 1782 (1189, 2544) 1700 (112, 2438) Deaths detected* 0 (0, 0) 2 (1, 4) 2 (1, 4) 2 (1, 5) 0 (0, 1) 1 (12, 2335) 1242 (865, 2218) YLL 443, 125 (239, 164, 176, 539 (02, 867, 317, 630 (152, 264, 135, 958) 135, 968 (68, 008, 77, 902 (49, 120, 51, 664 (31, 328, 77, 907 (49, 193, 351, 655 (11, 284, 72, 193, 305, 523) 50, 9939) 243, 943 (11, 18, 087) 78, 549 (11, 128, 2453) 78, 449 (11, 128, 2453, 102, 1142 (186, 287, 102, 1142 (186, 287, 102, 1143, 128) 1142 (868, 264 (232, 29, 743, 044 (381, 845, 597, 86 (305, 614, 784, 755 (408, 404, 844, 550 (429, 964, 871, 582 (450, 227, 844, 540, 157, 871, 593 (1440, 94, 483, 1162) 78, 143, 3169 80, 320 (128, 343) DALYs 455, 520 (248, 407, 181, 1453, 597 (344, 943, 11, 103, 368)	Health effects						Kestart PS		
Deaths undetected 8657 (4686, 14098) 3447 (1819, 5805) 6204 (3120, 10647) 2654 (1329, 4633) 1523 (965, 2245) 1008 (614, 1529) 1523 (968, 2242) 1008 (613, 1528) Cases total 8657 (4686, 14098) 5003 (2849, 8072) 7255 (3905, 12084) 4390 (2460, 7155) 1781 (1185, 2553) 1701 (1124, 2438) 1782 (1189, 2544) 1700 (1121, 2436) Deaths detected* 0 (0, 0) 2 (1, 4) 2 (1, 4) 2 (1, 5) 0 (0, 1) 1 (0, 2) 0 (0, 1) 1 (0, 2) YLD (2070) 968 (2955, 8272) 9165 (519, 14881) 3948 (222, 6516) 2130 (1276, 3348) 1425 (865, 6216) 2131 (128, 23353) 1424 (85, 2218) 1424 (85, 2218) YLL 44312 (239, 164, 176, 539 (92, 877, 317, 639 (159, 264, 1328, 77, 997 (49, 193, 351, 655 (31, 283, 77, 997 (49, 193, 351, 655 (31, 283, 71, 742, 193, 249, 134, 720) 1564 (13, 288, 77, 997 (49, 193, 351, 655 (31, 283, 71, 742, 193, 249, 134, 720) 1442, 648, 245, 248, 947, 115, 530 (73, 67, 79, 736, 93, 936 (305, 614, 784, 755 (498, 404, 844, 550 (429, 864, 871, 582 (450, 227, 844, 544 (430, 157, 871, 593 (449, 494, 143, 120, 114, 742, 201, 1447, 201) 1445, 244 (430, 157, 871, 593 (449, 494, 1432, 158) 1575 (498, 404, 844, 550 (429, 864, 871, 582 (450, 227, 844, 544 (430, 157, 871, 593 (449, 494, 1432, 283, 791, 503, 2491, 2481, 1447, 201)	Reported cases	0 (0, 0)	1556 (956, 2374)	1061 (676, 1594)	1736 (1077, 2621)	258 (151, 400)	692 (450, 996)	258 (152, 398)	692 (453, 1002)
underected construct construction construction construction construction Cases total 8657 (4686, 14098) 5030 (2849, 807) 7265 (3905, 12084) 4390 (2460, 7155) 1781 (1185, 2533) 1782 (1189, 2544) 1700 (1121, 2438) YLD 12701 (7541) 5089 (2955, 8272) 9165 (5199, 14881) 3948 (222, 6516) 2130 (1276, 3348) 1422 (865, 2216) 2131 (1282, 3353) 1424 (865, 2218) YLL 443;125 (239,164) 176,539 (92,867, 317,639 (159,264, 1359,668 (680,08) 77.992 (49,120) 51.664 (31,328, 77.997 (49,193, 51.655 (31,284, 107, 109,173) DALYs 455,825 (248,407, 181.627 (96,319, 326,803 (165,750, 139,917 (701,88, 80,122 (50,946, 53.089 (32,459, 80,128 (50,866, 53.079 (33,31) DALYs 468,840 (23,229, 743,041 (811,845, 597,868 (305,614, 784,755 (408,404, 844,550 (429,864, 87,1582 (450,227, 844,544 (430,157, 877,933 (449,94, 13,42,241) 1.483,631) Dest otion 0 (0,0) 0 (0,0) 0 (0,0) 126 (128,434) 220 (128,434) 220 (128,434) 220 (128,434)	Deaths	8657 (4686, 14098)	3447 (1819, 5805)	6204 (3120, 10647)	2654 (1329, 4633)	1523 (965, 2245)	1008 (614, 1529)	1523 (968, 2242)	1008 (613, 1528)
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	undetected								
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Cases total	8657 (4686, 14098)	5003 (2849, 8072)	7265 (3905, 12084)	4390 (2460, 7155)	1781 (1185, 2553)	1701 (1124, 2438)	1782 (1189, 2544)	1700 (1121, 2436)
YLD 12701 (7541, 2027) 5089 (2955, 8272, 2027) 9165 (5199, 14881) 3948 (2222, 6516) 2130 (1276, 3348) 1425 (865, 2216) 2131 (1282, 3353) 1424 (863, 2218) YLL 443,125 (239, 164, 723, 189) 776,539 (92,867, 723, 189) 317,639 (159,264, 733,189) 135,968 (68,008, 77,992 (49,120, 743,443) 77,997 (49,193, 784,445) 51,665 (31,283, 77,997 (49,193, 784,445) DALYs 458,582 (238,229, 81,647) 743,044 (381,845, 12,287,118) 597,868 (305,614, 784,758) 784,754 (30,657,08, 743,044) 784,755 (31,234, 784,755) 801,285 (30,666, 53,079 (32,371, 743,044 (381,845, 81,691) 1,289,71 (182,343) 801,285 (30,664, 81,691) 1,289,71 (184,343,39) ΔDALYs 468,846 (232,229, 81,649) 743,044 (381,845, 12,287) 597,868 (305,614, 833,629) 784,755 (429,864, 81,8251) 871,582 (450,227, 844,5564 (429,854) 804,250 1,447,200 1,448,2541 (430,157, 871,993 (449,934, 1447,200 1,448,2541 (430,157, 871,993 (449,934, 1447,230) 1,448,2541 (430,157, 871,993 (449,934, 1447,230) 1,448,2541 (430,157, 871,993 (449,934, 1447,256) 1,447,200 1,448,2541 (430,157, 871,993 (449,934, 1447,230) 1,447,230 1,448,2541 (430,157, 871,993 (449,934, 1447,230) 1,482,541 (430,157, 871,993 (429,494,943, 1447,230) 1,425,241 (149,128, 149,230 (120,138,33) 220 (128,343,320)	Deaths detected ^a	0 (0, 0)	2 (1, 4)	2 (1, 4)	2 (1, 5)	0 (0, 1)	1 (0, 2)	0 (0, 1)	1 (0, 2)
202079 - <td>YLD</td> <td>12701 (7541,</td> <td>5089 (2955, 8272)</td> <td>9165 (5199, 14881)</td> <td>3948 (2222, 6516)</td> <td>2130 (1276, 3348)</td> <td>1425 (865, 2216)</td> <td>2131 (1282, 3353)</td> <td>1424 (863, 2218)</td>	YLD	12701 (7541,	5089 (2955, 8272)	9165 (5199, 14881)	3948 (2222, 6516)	2130 (1276, 3348)	1425 (865, 2216)	2131 (1282, 3353)	1424 (863, 2218)
YLL 443,125 (239,164, 723,189) 17,639 (92,867, 298,024) 135,986 (68,008, 547,352) 77,992 (49,120, 237,755) 51,15,403) 77,997 (49,193, 78,594) 51,655 (31,28, 78,44) DALYs 455,826 (248,407, 742,150) 181,627 (96,31), 305,523) 326,803 (165,750, 305,523) 139,917 (70,518, 747,21,50) 80,122 (50,946, 30,864 (232,29, 843,443) 50,079 (32,371, 181,807) 80,426 118,640 803,33) ADALYs 468,46 (232,29, 843,646 (232,29, 843,641 (31,52, 843) 743,044 (381,845, 597,868 (30,561,4) 784,755 (40,804, 844,504 (429,864, 843,504 (429,864, 871,582 (400,227, 844,544 (430,157, 871,582 (400,227, 844,544 (430,157, 871,582 (400,227, 844,544 (430,157, 871,582 (400,227, 844,544 (430,157, 871,582 (400,227, 844,544 (430,157, 871,582 (400,227, 844,544 (430,157, 871,582 (400,227, 845,543) 118,649 (120,73,876) 148,363 [) Costs, in thousand: USS foot discounter		20279)							
1 1 298,024 547,352 237,275 115,033 78,594 115,632 78,448 DALYs 455,862 (24,407, 742,150 18,1627 (96,319, 305,523 326,803 (165,750, 560,995) 243,943 118,087 80,426 81,801,808,66, 81,801,91 80,128 (30,227, 844,544 (430,157, 814,651) 81,021,183,044 81,691,126,9718 118,363 118,363 80,426 81,522,402,27, 844,544 (430,157, 844,544 (430,157, 1447,250) 844,524 (430,157, 814,583,1449,324 81,691,1447,200 1485,2410 118,5631 Costs, in housands US\$ (not discounted) A Sc osts 0 (0,0 1726 (108,2554) 0 (0,0 1726 (108,2554) 0 (10,0 1724 (108,7264) 1220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343)	YLL	443,125 (239,164,	176,539 (92,867,	317,639 (159,264,	135,968 (68,008,	77,992 (49,120,	51,664 (31,328,	77,997 (49,193,	51,655 (31,283,
DALYs 455,826 (248,407, 742,150) 191,627 (96,319, 305,523) 326,833 (165,750, 560,995) 1943,917 (70,518, 243,943) 80,122 (50,946, 118,807) 80,128 (50,946, 80,426) 118,864, 118,864 80,128 (50,866, 83,130) ADALYs 468,846 (232,229, 831,691) 743,044 (381,845, 1,269,718) 597,868 (30,5614, 1,269,718) 743,755 (408,404, 1,332,638) 844,550 (429,864, 844,550 (429,864, 844,550 (429,864, 844,550 (429,864, 845,50 (40,0) 871,582 (450,27, 844,544 (430,157, 1,483,58]) 871,593 (449,94, 1,483,58] 871,593 (449,94, 1,483,58] 871,582 (450,27, 845,54] 844,544 (430,157, 1,483,58]) 871,593 (449,94, 1,483,58] 871,582 (450,27, 1,483,58] 844,544 (430,157, 1,483,58] 871,582 (450,27, 845,54] 844,544 (430,157, 1,483,58] 871,582 (450,27, 1,483,58] 844,544 (430,157, 1,483,58] 871,582 (450,27, 845,143,333) 820 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 220 (128,343) 2307 (163,452) 469 (324,758)		723,189)	298,024)	547,352)	237,275)	115,403)	78,594)	115,632)	78,443)
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	DALYs	455,826 (248,407,	181,627 (96,319,	326,803 (165,750,	139,917 (70,518,	80,122 (50,946,	53,089 (32,459,	80,128 (50,866,	53,079 (32,371,
ADALYs 468,846 (232,229, 174,044 (381,845, 197,868 (305,014, 103,368) 784,755 (408,040, 144,500 (429,844, 144,020) 871,582 (450,227, 184,544 (430,157, 187,1593 (449,94, 1,447,200) 871,593 (449,94, 1,447,200) 1,447,200 1,447,201 1,421,20 1,		742,150)	305,523)	560,995)	243,943)	118,087)	80,426)	118,364)	80,330)
B B 1,269,718 1,033,638 1,332,234 1,447,200 1,482,541 1,447,201 1,447,201 Costs, in thousants US\$ (not discounted) AS costs 0(0,0) 1984 (1326, 2837) 0(0,0) 1726 (1082, 2554) 0(0,0) 1724 (1087, 2569) PS costs 0(0,0) 0(0,0) 2020 (128, 343) 230 (128, 347, 658) UTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT	ΔDALYs	468,846 (232,229,	743,044 (381,845,	597,868 (305,614,	784,755 (408,404,	844,550 (429,864,	871,582 (450,227,	844,544 (430,157,	871,593 (449,934,
Costs, in thousands US\$ (not discounted) AS costs 0 (0, 0) 1984 (1326, 2837) 0 (0, 0) 1984 (1326, 2837) 0 (0, 0) 1726 (1082, 2554) 0 (0, 0) 1724 (1087, 2564) PS costs 0 (0, 0) 0 (0, 0) 220 (128, 343) 230 (128, 345) 2402 (129, 345) 2402 (129, 345) 2402 (129, 345) 2402 (129, 345) 2402 (128, 345) 2402 (128, 345) 2402 (128, 345) 2402 (128, 345) 2402 (128, 345)		831,691)	1,269,718)	1,033,638)	1,332,234)	1,447,220)	1,482,541)	1,447,201)	1,483,631)
AS costs 0 (0,0) 1984 (1326, 2837) 0 (0,0) 1726 (1082, 2554) 0 (0,0) 1724 (1087, 2564) PS costs 0 (0,0) 0 (0,0) 220 (128, 343) 200 (128, 345) 200 (128, 343)	Costs, in thousands	US\$ (not discounted)							
PS costs0 (0,0)0 (0,0)220 (128, 343)220 (128, 345)205 (128, 345)337 (72, 31)337 (72, 31)337 (72, 31)337 (72, 31)337 (72, 31)337 (72, 31)337 (72, 31)337 (72, 31, 779, 31)337 (72, 31, 653)337 (72, 31, 653)337 (72, 31, 653)337 (72, 31, 653)335 (72, 74, 4025)2423 (1437, 3790)4285 (2984, 5943)2857 (1663, 4523)4693 (3247, 658)3057 (237, 2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)<	AS costs	0 (0, 0)	1984 (1326, 2837)	0 (0, 0)	1984 (1326, 2837)	0 (0, 0)	1726 (1082, 2554)	0 (0, 0)	1724 (1087, 2569)
VC costs 0 (0, 0) 0 (0, 0) 0 (0, 0) 0 (0, 0) 2066 (1095, 3429) 1992 (1072, 3320) 2500 (1323, 4159) 2402 (1290, 3987) Treatment 0 (0, 0) 747 (455, 1158) 559 (344, 866) 853 (520, 131) 137 (78, 218) 347 (220, 513) 137 (79, 216) 347 (221, 515) Costs total 0 (0, 0) 2732 (1973, 3676) 779 (538, 1104) 3057 (2274, 4025) 2423 (1437, 3790) 4285 (2984, 5943) 2857 (1663, 4523) 4693 (3247, 6581) ACosts 0 (0, 0) 2,732 (1973, 3,676) 779 (538, 1104) 3,057 (2274, 4025) 2423 (1437, 3790) 4285 (2984, 5943) 2857 (1663, 4523) 4693 (3247, 6581) DCost 0 (0, 0) 0,01 <0.01	PS costs	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	220 (128, 343)	220 (128, 343)	220 (128, 343)	220 (128, 343)	220 (128, 343)	220 (128, 343)
Treatment0 (0, 0)747 (455, 1158)559 (344, 866)853 (520, 1312)137 (78, 218)347 (220, 513)137 (79, 216)347 (221, 516)Costs total0 (0, 0)2732 (1973, 3676)779 (538, 1104)3057 (2274, 4025)2423 (1437, 3790)4285 (2984, 5943)2857 (1663, 4523)4693 (3247, 6581)Costs0 (0, 0)2,732 (1973, 3676)779 (538, 1104)3,057 (2274, 4025)2,423 (1,437, 3790)4,285 (2984, 5943)2,857 (1663, 4,523)4693 (3,247, 6581)EoTTear of EoT2054 (2054, 2054)2054 (2054, 2054)2054 (2054, 2054)2054 (2054, 2054)2043 (2032, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2043 (2032, 2054)2043 (2032, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2043 (2032, 2054)2043 (2032, 2054)2043 (2032, 2054)2043 (2032, 2054)2043 (2032, 2054)2043 (2032, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2043 (2032, 2054)2043 (2032, 2054)2043 (2032, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2054 (2054, 2054)2054 (VC costs	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	2066 (1095, 3429)	1992 (1072, 3320)	2500 (1323, 4159)	2402 (1290, 3987)
Costs total0 (0,0)2732 (1973, 3676)779 (538, 1104)3057 (2274, 4025)2423 (1437, 3790)4285 (2984, 5943)2857 (1663, 4523)4693 (3247, 6581)ΔCosts0 (0,0)2,732 (1973, 3,676)779 (538, 1104)3,057 (2,274, 4025)2,423 (1,437, 3,790)4,285 (2,984, 5,943)2,857 (1,663, 4,523)4,693 (3,247, 6581)ForVer of EoT2054 (2054, 2054)2054 (2054, 2054)2054 (2054, 2054)2043 (2032, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2043 (2032, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)<	Treatment	0 (0, 0)	747 (455, 1158)	559 (344, 866)	853 (520, 1312)	137 (78, 218)	347 (220, 513)	137 (79, 216)	347 (221, 516)
ΔCosts0 (0, 0)2,732 (1,973, 3,676)779 (538, 1,104)3,057 (2,274, 4,025)2,423 (1,437, 3,790)4,285 (2,984, 5,943)2,857 (1,663, 4,523)4,693 (3,247, 6,581) EoT Year of EoT2054 (2054, 2054)2054 (2054, 2054)2054 (2054, 2054)2034 (2032, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)2043 (2032, 2054)2037 (2030, 2054)Prob EoT 2030<0.01<0.01<0.01<0.01<0.01<0.01<0.01<0.01 Cost-effectiveness wit-uncertainty (disc-untertainty (disc-untertai	Costs total	0 (0, 0)	2732 (1973, 3676)	779 (538, 1104)	3057 (2274, 4025)	2423 (1437, 3790)	4285 (2984, 5943)	2857 (1663, 4523)	4693 (3247, 6581)
EoT Vear of EoT 2054 (2054, 2054) 2054 (2054, 2054) 2054 (2054, 2054) 2037 (2030, 2054) Z037 (2030, 2	ΔCosts	0 (0, 0)	2,732 (1,973, 3,676)	779 (538, 1,104)	3,057 (2,274, 4,025)	2,423 (1,437, 3,790)	4,285 (2,984, 5,943)	2,857 (1,663, 4,523)	4,693 (3,247, 6,581)
Year of EoT 2054 (2054, 2054) 2054 (2054, 2054) 2054 (2054, 2054) 2043 (2032, 2054) 2037 (2030, 2054) 2043 (2032, 2054) 2037 (2030, 2054) <th< td=""><td>ЕоТ</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td><td></td><td></td><td>·</td></th<>	ЕоТ					-			·
Prob EoT 2030<0.01<0.01<0.01<0.01<0.03<0.010.05Cost-effectiveness wit-out uncertainty (discounted)*ΔDALYs 10108,75150,321125,783149,329162,218149,326162,215ΔCosts02,213,490618,9222,488,7572,007,6943,575,4782,365,3423,916,03 \$ICERMin CostDominated12Dominated14122Dominated70,664Cost-effectiveness wit-uncertainty (discounted), conditional on WP*.WTP: \$01(p)000000WTP: \$25000000000WTP: \$25000000000WTP: \$25000000000WTP: \$25000000000WTP: \$100000000000WTP: \$100000000000WTP: \$150000000000WTP: \$150000000000WTP: \$150000000000WTP: \$150000000000WTP: \$150000000000 <td>Year of EoT</td> <td>2054 (2054, 2054)</td> <td>2054 (2054, 2054)</td> <td>2054 (2054, 2054)</td> <td>2054 (2054, 2054)</td> <td>2043 (2032, 2054)</td> <td>2037 (2030, 2054)</td> <td>2043 (2032, 2054)</td> <td>2037 (2030, 20548</td>	Year of EoT	2054 (2054, 2054)	2054 (2054, 2054)	2054 (2054, 2054)	2054 (2054, 2054)	2043 (2032, 2054)	2037 (2030, 2054)	2043 (2032, 2054)	2037 (2030, 20548
Cost-effectiveness without uncertainty (discounted) ^b ΔDALYs 1 0 108,751 50,321 125,783 149,329 162,218 149,326 162,225 ΔCosts 0 2,213,490 618,922 2,488,757 2,007,694 3,575,478 2,365,342 3,916,03 £ ICER Min Cost Dominated 12 Dominated 70,664 Cost-effectiveness with uncertainty (discounted), conditional on WTP*. WTP: \$0 1(p) 0 </td <td>Prob EoT 2030</td> <td>< 0.01</td> <td>< 0.01</td> <td>< 0.01</td> <td>< 0.01</td> <td>< 0.01</td> <td>0.03</td> <td>< 0.01</td> <td>0.05</td>	Prob EoT 2030	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.03	< 0.01	0.05
ΔDALYs 10108,75150,321125,783149,329162,218149,326162,225ΔCosts02,213,490618,9222,488,7572,007,6943,575,4782,365,3423,916,03 €ICERMin CostDominated12Dominated14122Dominated70,66€Cost-effectiveness with uncertainty (discourted), conditional on WTP*.WTP: \$01(p)000000WTP: \$250000000.010.72(p)00.27€WTP: \$5000000000.3€WTP: \$57500000000.3€WTP: \$1000000000.4€WTP: \$1500000000.4€	Cost-effectiveness wi	thout uncertainty (dis	counted) ^b						
ΔCosts02,213,490618,9222,488,7572,007,6943,575,4782,365,3423,916,03 €ICERMin CostDominated12Dominated14122Dominated70.66 €Cost-effectiveness wit-uncertainty (discourted), conditional on WTP*.WTP: \$01(p)000000WTP: \$250000000.010.72(p)00.2 €WTP: \$5000000000.3 €WTP: \$750000000.3 €WTP: \$1000000000.3 €WTP: \$1000000000.4 €WTP: \$1500000000.4 €	ΔDALYs 1	0	108,751	50,321	125,783	149,329	162,218	149,326	162,223
ICERMin CostDominated12Dominated14122Dominated 70.66^{2} Cost-effectiveness wit uncertainty (discourted), conditional on WTP:WTP: $\$0$ 1(p)000000WTP: $\$250$ 00000000000WTP: $\$500$ 000000000.010.72(p)000.27WTP: $\$500$ 000000000.010.72(p)000.27WTP: $\$750$ 000000000000.39000.39WTP: $\$1000$ 000000000.01(p)000.49WTP: $\$1500$ 000000000.49000.49	ΔCosts	0	2,213,490	618,922	2,488,757	2,007,694	3,575,478	2,365,342	3,916,032
Cost-effectiveness with uncertainty (discounted), conditional on WTP*. WTP: \$0 1(p) 0	ICER	Min Cost	Dominated	12	Dominated	14	122	Dominated	70,666 <mark>7</mark>
WTP: \$0 1(p) 0 <th0< td=""><td>Cost-effectiveness wi</td><td>th uncertainty (discou</td><td>nted), conditional on W</td><td>TP^c.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th0<>	Cost-effectiveness wi	th uncertainty (discou	nted), conditional on W	TP ^c .					
WTP: \$250 0 0 0 0.01 0.72(p) 0 0.27 WTP: \$500 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.34 WTP: \$750 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.34 WTP: \$750 0 0 0 0 0 0.45 WTP: \$1000 0 0 0 0 0 0.45 WTP: \$1000 0 0 0 0 0.45 WTP: \$1500 0 0 0 0 0.45	WTP: \$0	1(p)	0	0	0	0	0	0	l Set
WTP: \$500 0 0 0 0 0.34 WTP: \$750 0 0 0 0 0 0.35 WTP: \$750 0 0 0 0 0 0.66(p) 0 0.35 WTP: \$1000 0 0 0 0 0 0.42 WTP: \$1000 0 0 0 0 0.42 WTP: \$1500 0 0 0 0 0.42	WTP: \$250	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.72(p)	0	0.27
WTP: \$750 0 0 0 0 0.3% WTP: \$1000 0 0 0 0 0.61(p) 0 0.3% WTP: \$1000 0 0 0 0 0 0.4 E WTP: \$1500 0 0 0 0 0 0.4 E	WTP: \$500	0	0	0	0	0	0.66(p)	0	0.34
WTP: \$1000 0 0 0 0 0.4 E WTP: \$1500 0 0 0 0 0.4 E	WTP: \$750	0	0	0	0	0	0.61(p)	0	0.3%
WTP: \$1500 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	WTP: \$1000	0	0	0	0	0	0.59(p)	0	0.4 😫
	WTP: \$1500	0	0	0	0	0	0.56(p)	0	0.48

^b Cost-effectiveness results are given for discounted DALYs and costs as per convention

^c (p) is the preferred strategy; the strategy with the highest mean net monetary benefits

Supplementary Table 27: Summary of effects, costs, elimination of transmission (EoT) by 2030, and cost-effectiveness with and without uncertainty in Ganga health zone. Means are given along with 95% prediction intervals (PIs). YLL: years of life lost (to fatal disease), YLD: years of life lost to disability, DALYs: disability-adjusted life-years, PS: passive screening, AS: active screening, VC: vector control, ICER: incremental cost-effectiveness ratio, WTP: willingness to pay (USD per DALY averted), EoT: elimination of transmission.

stiveness analysis - PRE-PRINT

A.12 Sensitivity analysis

Our GUI (https://hatmepp.warwick.ac.uk/DRCCEA/v6/) provides health impact, cost calculations, and costeffectiveness results for alternative horizons of 2024–2030 and 2024–2050 with and without 3% discounting so the impact of these choices can be seen. By exploring the "Optimal Strategy" map it is noted that changing the time horizon or discounting only results in minor changes to a few health zones if the objective is elimination of transmission by 2030. Longer time horizons and lack of discounting do change recommended strategies to more intensive interventions in more health zones (such as adding vector control or increasing screening coverage) when we consider the minimum cost objective or objectives based on different WTP thresholds.

B Supplementary Results

Additional modelling figures

We take this opportunity to update some of the results presented in our previous paper on the fitting of the model including animal transmission [2]. We do this in light of the availability of a considerable amount of new data (2000–2020 rather than the previous 2000–2016) and modifications made to the modelling process.

To obtain the statistical support for the two model variants in each health zone following fitting we categorised the Bayes factors (BF), where BF may be used to describe the statistical support for either model relative to the other, in a widely accepted way: Weak ('Barely worth mentioning'), $10^0 < BF < 10^{\frac{1}{2}}$; Substantial, $10^{\frac{1}{2}} < BF < 10^1$; Strong, $10^1 < BF < 10^{\frac{3}{2}}$; Very Strong, $10^{\frac{3}{2}} < BF < 10^2$; and Decisive, $BF > 10^2$ [44]. If BF for the model with animal transmission was greater than 1, the categorisation indicating statistical support for the model with animal transmission [2]. Figure 11 shows the results from the current analyses and can be compared to Figure 3 of the previous article [2]. There is less support for the model with animal transmission than there was in our previous analyses [2]. In the previous article, 24 health zones were found to have substantial to decisive support for the model with animal transmission, whereas as a result of additional data and modifications to the modelling, there is now only a single health zone in this category.



Supplementary Figure 11: Support for the model either with or without animals contributing to the transmission of gHAT. Levels of support taken from whichever of the two Bayes Factors (BF, with either evidence for the model with or without animal transmission as the denominator) exceeded 1. Weak, $10^0 < BF < 10^{\frac{1}{2}}$; Substantial, $10^{\frac{1}{2}} < BF < 10^1$; Strong, $10^1 < BF < 10^{\frac{3}{2}}$; Very Strong, $10^{\frac{3}{2}} < BF < 10^2$; and Decisive, $BF > 10^2$. Health zones used as examples in Crump et al (2022), Bokoro and Tandala, are indicated. Shapefiles used to produce this map were provided by Nicole Hoff and Cyrus Sinai under a CC-BY licence (current versions can be found at https://data.humdata.org/dataset/drc-health-data).

Figure 12 is a bivariate choropleth map which combines support for models with and without animal transmission with differences in the probability of achieving the end of transmission by 2030 under the strategy where active screening in the health zone continues at the mean level observed in the period 2012–2016 ($P_d = \mathbb{P}(\text{EOT by } 2030|\text{Model without animal transmission}) - \mathbb{P}(\text{EOT by } 2030|\text{Model with animal transmission})$. This is an update of Figure B in the Supplementary Information of the previous animal transmission modelling paper [2]. For presentation in Figure 12 both variables were put into three categories: without animals ($BF_{wo} > 10^{\frac{1}{2}}$), either ($BF_{wo} < 10^{\frac{1}{2}} \land BF_w < 10^{\frac{1}{2}}$), and with animals ($BF_w > 10^{\frac{1}{2}}$) for model support; and for difference in probability of achieving EoT by 2030 (P_d): low ($P_d \le 0.05$), medium ($0.05 < P_d \le 0.1$), and high ($P_d > 0.1$).

In Figure 12 there are 31 health zones (dark purple) with (i) more than 10% reduction in the probability of meeting



Supplementary Figure 12: Bivariate choropleth showing support for the models with or without animals contributing to transmission and the difference in the probability (P_d) of achieving EoT to humans by 2030 from these two models ("High" is more than 10% difference, "Medium" is 5-10% difference, and "Low" is less than 5% difference). Shapefiles used to produce this map were provided by Nicole Hoff and Cyrus Sinai under a CC-BY licence (current versions can be found at https://data.humdata.org/dataset/drc-health-data).

the EoT goal under the model with animal transmission compared to the model without animal transmission and (ii) with weak support for either model variant. In the previous article, this category contained 18 health zones. This discrepancy likely reflects both the additional data included and a change to the priors associated with the animal transmission model to remove the nesting of the models. In these 31 health zones, there is considerable uncertainty in whether animals contribute to transmission and this could alter policy recommendations for future strategy based on model predictions. The single health zone with strong support for the model with animal transmission also has a > 10% reduction in the probability of reaching the 2030 EoT goal.

Bandundu Nord Bandundu Sud 40 30 20 10 0 Equateur Sud Equateur Nord 40 30 20 10 0 Isangi-Tschopo Bas Uélé 40 30 Number of health zones 0 10 10 10 10 20 20 20 Kasai Oriental Kasai Occidental 10 0 Kinshasa Kongo Central 40 30 20 10 0 Maniema Katanga Sankuru 40 30 20 10 0 EoT by 2030 EoT by 2040 Min. Cost Min. Cost Status \$250 \$500 EoT by EoT by Status \$250 \$500 Quo 2030 2040 Quo Willingness to pay: US\$ per DALY averted Mean AS Mean AS + Targeted VC Mean AS + Full VC *No AS, PS, nor VC Int. AS + Targeted VC Int. AS + Full VC Int. AS *Int. AS + no PS

B.1 Results by coordination

Supplementary Figure 13: Histrogram of optimal strategies by coordination



Supplementary Figure 14: Total cases 2024-2040 at different levels of investment.



Supplementary Figure 15: Cases by the year 2024-2040 at different levels of investment.



Supplementary Figure 16: Total deaths 2024-2040 at different levels of investment.



Supplementary Figure 17: Deaths by the year 2024-2040 at different levels of investment.



Supplementary Figure 18: Total DALYs 2024-2040 at different levels of investment. Abbreviations: DALYs: disability-adjusted life-years.



Supplementary Figure 19: DALYs by the year 2024-2040 at different levels of investment.



Supplementary Figure 20: Total costs 2024-2040 at different levels of investment.



Supplementary Figure 21: Total costs 2024-2040 at different levels of investment.



B.2 Resource forecasts

Supplementary Figure 22: Costs allocated to different activities different levels of investment.



Supplementary Figure 23: Costs allocated to different activities different levels of investment by coordination.



Supplementary Figure 24: Drugs used by the year 2024-2040 at different levels of investment.



Supplementary Figure 25: Tests used by the year 2024-2040 at different levels of investment.

C Supplementary Note 1: Glossary of Technical Terms

Box 1: Glossary (adapted from Antillon et. al 2022 [5] under a CC-BY 4.0 license.)

Epidemiology Terms

- Intervention Interventions are separate activities to address a health need (e.g. active screening (AS) or vector control (VC)).
- **Strategy** A strategy combines interventions with specific coverage and in parallel. In this paper, we simulate strategies with and without an improvement in AS and with and without VC (e.g. Strategy 1 is passive screening (PS) and mean AS, and Strategy 6 is PS, intensified AS and full VC).
- **Elimination of transmission (EoT)** Globally this is the 2030 goal for gHAT; here we also consider local EOT for health zones. The feasibility of EoT is expressed as a probability equal to the proportion of our simulations in which new infections are zero before a given year (usually 2030).
- **Objective** The objective is the overarching goal of the decision maker; this could be EoT by 2030, minimising costs, or delivering a cost-effective programme compared to other diseases. We assume the objective is country-wide and different regions may need different strategies to meet the objective.
- **Disability-adjusted life-year (DALY)** In order to present the burden of disease as one common metric across diseases, DALYs are calculated in cost-effectiveness analyses. This is the sum of the years lived with disability due to the disease and the years of life lost by fatal cases.

HEALTH ECONOMICS TERMS

- **Parameter uncertainty** Uncertainty in the level of transmission or the costs of interventions due to unknown underlying parameters (see Supplementary Note 3 for an explanation of our parameterisation of the health outcomes and cost model).
- Willingness-to-pay (WTP) or cost-effectiveness threshold The amount of money that payers would pay to avert one DALY arising from the disease in the analysis (gHAT). No specific threshold is recommended, but a recent analysis shows that the WTP in DRC is between 5–230 USD per DALY averted [45–47].

Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio A ratio of marginal cost for a marginal benefit, calculated as follows:

ICER =
$$\frac{\Delta Costs}{\Delta DALYs} = \frac{Costs_{strategy} - Costs_{next best}}{Effects_{strategy} - Effects_{next best}}$$

- **Cost-effective strategy** The strategy where the ICER is less than the WTP (or cost-effectiveness threshold). We say that the cost-effective strategy is "conditional" on the WTP.
- **Dominated strategy** A strategy that costs more than the minimum cost intervention while reducing the burden by a smaller degree. This strategy ought not to be implemented.
- Weakly dominated strategy (or strategies under extended dominance) A strategy in which the ICER is higher than the next more expensive strategy. This strategy is less efficient than the next more expensive one and should not be implemented. For further illustration of weak dominance, see Supplementary Section, page 46 of Antillon et. al 2022 [5].

Net monetary benefit The net benefits (NMB) framework is derived from ICERs but also takes uncertainty into account.

NMB|WTP = WTP
$$\times \Delta DALYs - \Delta Costs$$

The optimal strategy at a given WTP is the strategy with the highest mean NMB at that value of WTP.

Optimal strategy Analogous to the cost-effective strategy when no uncertainty is assumed, this is the strategy that is recommended by the NMB framework.

D Supplementary Note 2: Health Zone-Specific Parameters

Health Zone	Province	Population	AS mean	AS int.	PS	VC	VC fu
		(2023)			clinics	targeted (km)	(km
Bandundu Nord						~ /	
Bagata	Kwilu	210,271	51,314	73,911	3	395.18	458.6
Bandjau	Mai-Ndombe	147,021	28,749	54,485	1	0.00	49.1
Bandundu	Kwilu	242,325	51,895	103,021	8	133.47	178.9
Bokoro	Mai-Ndombe	276,470	69,388	97,879	3	224.85	444.9
Bolobo	Mai-Ndombe	173,678	77,928	111,073	6	33.33	211.2
Bosobe	Mai-Ndombe	160,728	27,352	52,073	1	0.00	178.0
Djuma	Kwilu	269,689	35,783	69,791	6	88.09	105.6
Inongo	Mai-Ndombe	225,939	1,352	58,469	1	0.00	742.1
Kikongo	Kwilu	239,132	43,035	71,489	3	79.38	600.6
Kiri	Mai-Ndombe	140,587	0	36,381	1	0.00	633.1
Kwamouth	Mai-Ndombe	161,140	62,336	89,363	5	409.29	813.1
Mushie	Mai-Ndombe	159,222	29,415	43,774	5	86.61	345.8
Nioki	Mai-Ndombe	202,109	20,837	60,441	3	355.97	392.1
Ntand Embelo	Mai-Ndombe	109,868	28,561	58,098	2	0.00	0.0
Oshwe	Mai-Ndombe	185,952	4,216	48,121	1	0.00	916.3
Sia	Kwilu	140,256	21,403	36,296	1	139.69	139.6
Vanga	Kwilu	366,524	38,636	94,850	2	93.42	93.4
Yumbi	Mai-Ndombe	149,793	29,297	53,380	2	44.51	76.0
Bandundu Sud		· ·	·		·		
Boko	Kwango	264,635	7,727	68,484	2	10.95	482.9
Bulungu	Kwilu	347,987	60,251	90,053	3	56.09	137.3
Idiofa	Kwilu	358,183	29,260	92,692	1	107.04	152.7
Ipamu	Kwilu	250,413	35,472	64,803	4	232.63	400.6
Kasongo Lunda	Kwango	214,302	17,931	55,458	1	0.00	197.6
Kenge	Kwango	358,461	48,759	92,764	2	130.44	400.9
Kikwit Nord	Kwilu	273,345	51	70,737	1	25.83	25.8
Kimbau	Kwango	227,664	1,511	58,914	2	0.00	429.1
Kimputu	Kwilu	248,679	45,957	73,093	3	102.59	174.7
Koshibanda	Kwilu	233,393	18,874	60,398	1	0.00	384.7
Lusanga	Kwilu	298,567	26,179	77,263	1	0.00	248.5
Masi Manimba	Kwilu	245,840	91,636	107,678	3	161.82	293.4
Moanza	Kwilu	212,771	9,863	55,061	2	0.00	271.9
Mokala	Kwilu	273,648	53,173	70,815	5	54.93	253.3
Mosango	Kwilu	153,827	56,588	76,654	1	5.50	54.8
Mungindu	Kwilu	155,591	1,624	40,264	1	0.00	313.0
Pay Kongila	Kwilu	196,891	1,182	50,951	1	0.00	204.7
Popokabaka	Kwango	229,297	25,945	72,688	1	0.00	354.7
Yasa Bonga	Kwilu	272,929	166,959	201,251	4	417.00	417.0
Equateur Nord							
Bangabola	Sud-Ubangi	173,405	282	47,084	1	0.00	106.0
Bogose Nubea	Sud-Ubangi	222,573	23,957	57,598	1	0.00	356.3
Bokonzi	Sud-Ubangi	170,691	300	44,172	2	0.00	266.1
Bominenge	Sud-Ubangi	198,664	10,807	51,411	2	0.00	25.4
Boso Manzi	Mongala	159,168	788	41,190	1	0.00	293.2
Bosobolo	Nord-Ubangi	204,421	1,570	52,901	1	0.00	220.6
Boto	Sud-Ubangi	266,045	14,840	68,848	1	0.00	119.7
Budjala	Sud-Ubangi	164,096	367	44,632	2	0.00	142.1
Bulu	Sud-Ubangi	170,517	814	44,127	1	0.00	87.6
Businga	Nord-Ubangi	158,634	3,685	41,052	2	0.00	393.5
Bwamanda	Sud-Uhangi	289 733	16 481	79 273	3	0.00	232.0

Health zone-specific parameters, grouped by coordination. For a map of the coordinations, see Supplementary Figure 1.

Gbadolite	Nord-Ubangi	179,656	0	46,492	1	0.00	68.26
Gemena	Sud-Ubangi	426,803	23,391	110,449	1	0.00	0.00
Karawa	Nord-Ubangi	310,957	33,788	110,145	4	0.00	78.58
Kungu	Sud-Ubangi	274,325	9,724	83,355	3	0.00	87.13
Libenge	Sud-Ubangi	285,692	0	73,932	1	0.00	273.28
Loko	Nord-Ubangi	156,329	18,065	63,411	1	0.00	168.60
Mawuya	Sud-Ubangi	196,193	0	50,771	1	0.00	301.66
Mbava	Sud-Ubangi	84,186	0	21,786	1	0.00	155.51
Mobavi	Nord-Ubangi	139.236	0	36.033	1	0.00	256.20
Ndage	Sud-Ubangi	160,806	3.644	41.614	1	0.00	167.03
Tandala	Sud-Ubangi	348,292	23.421	93.818	2	0.00	0.00
Equateur Sud	buu obungi	0.10,272	20,121	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		0100	0100
Befale	Tshuana	212 378	1 384	54 960	1	0.00	891.60
Bikoro	Fauateur	192 101	4 212	49 712	1	0.00	180 53
Bomongo	Equateur	137,605	485	35.610	1	0.00	547.31
Iboko	Equateur	126 985	673	32 862	1	0.00	61.42
Irebu	Equateur	44.625	1 320	11 540	1	0.00	157.94
	Equateur	178 878	1,520	46 201	1	15.10	214.43
Mompono	Tahuana	170,677	1606	40,291		0.00	420.76
Ntanda	Egysteur	170,097	1,000	21 242	1	0.00	430.70
	Equateur	82,083	2,213	49.259	<u></u>	0.00	01.73
wangata	Equateur	180,802	0	48,538	1	0.10	24.78
Isangi-Ischopo		100 500	22 (22	51 202	4	107.62	2(0.00
Isangi	Isnopo	198,596	22,633	51,392	4	107.63	268.80
Yabaondo	Tshopo	208,445	21,831	53,942	11	141.60	204.47
Yahisuli	Tshopo	106,345	1,190	27,520	l	0.00	300.01
Yakusu	Tshopo	198,205	15,378	51,292	1	108.32	196.93
Kasai Occidental					-		
Bena Leka	Kasai-Central	357,282	834	92,458	1	0.00	259.52
Bulape	Kasai	217,982	6,172	56,411	2	0.00	182.50
Demba	Kasai-Central	420,288	157	108,763	1	0.00	187.33
Dibaya	Kasai-Central	273,154	0	70,687	1	0.00	22.81
Kakenge	Kasai	208,410	18,675	53,933	2	0.00	166.24
Katende	Kasai-Central	117,038	14,606	30,286	1	0.00	0.00
Luambo	Kasai-Central	349,796	3,422	90,521	1	0.00	286.83
Lubunga 2	Kasai-Central	128,006	21,383	33,126	1	112.54	133.41
Luebo	Kasai	311,576	0	80,630	1	0.00	321.49
Luiza	Kasai-Central	220,576	5,604	57,081	1	0.00	257.85
Masuika	Kasai-Central	267,402	30,125	69,199	1	109.88	234.58
Mikope	Kasai	239,645	114	62,016	1	0.00	475.07
Mushenge	Kasai	209,231	13,078	54,145	2	0.00	27.56
Mweka	Kasai	259,573	10,770	67,174	1	0.00	124.38
Tshibala	Kasai-Central	312,867	2,332	80,965	1	0.00	88.52
Tshikula	Kasai-Central	171,435	12,555	44,364	3	0.00	32.23
Yangala	Kasai-Central	196,524	3,073	50,857	1	0.00	221.68
Kapanga	Lualaba	188,362	382	48,745	1	0.00	639.29
Kasai Oriental			1				
Bibanga	Kasai-Oriental	169,065	22,423	43,750	8	74.10	152.90
Bonzola	Kasai-Oriental	259,302	3	67,103	2	20.03	20.03
Cilindu	Kasai-Oriental	234,503	7,303	60,685	1	49.70	98.67
Kabeya Kamuanga	Kasai-Oriental	210,427	9,046	54,455	2	0.00	132.99
Kabinda	Lomami	353,298	3,763	91,427	1	0.00	0.00
Kalambayi Kabanga	Lomami	201.056	19,411	52.030	2	70.92	280.32
Kalenda	Lomami	255.034	3.165	65.998	4	0.00	241.28
Kanda Kanda	Lomami	299.395	3.544	77.477	2	0.00	172.26
Kasansa	Kasai-Oriental	265.689	20.311	68.756	3	0.00	138.25
Lubao	Lomami	265.120	1.437	68.608	1	0.00	258.07
Luputa	Lomami	372.027	2 389	96 274	1	0.00	251.76
Miabi	Kasai-Oriental	188 071	11 256	48 669	2	0.00	40.48
		100,071	11,230	10,007	-	0.00	07.01

Mpokolo	Kasai-Oriental	393,264	3,612	101,770	3	0.00	0.00
Mukumbi	Kasai-Oriental	152,578	12,057	39,484	3	0.00	84.37
Mulumba	Lomami	368,899	10,006	95,465	4	0.00	118.39
Mwene Ditu	Lomami	542,962	7,746	140,508	1	0.00	46.05
Ngandajika	Lomami	399,796	7,133	103,459	7	34.33	78.68
Nzaba	Kasai-Oriental	377,559	2,033	97,707	1	0.00	0.00
Tshilenge	Kasai-Oriental	382,087	21,963	98,878	4	83.99	83.99
Tshitenge	Kasai-Oriental	297,337	7,089	76,946	3	88.72	88.72
Tshitshimbi	Kasai-Oriental	246,246	6,119	63,724	1	0.00	46.32
Tshofa	Lomami	172,721	372	44,698	1	0.00	329.18
Kinshasa							
Kimbanseke	Kinshasa	385,527	144	99,768	3	19.16	19.16
Kingabwa	Kinshasa	287,364	0	74,366	1	0.00	22.75
Kisenso	Kinshasa	593,525	0	153,594	2	0.00	15.67
Maluku 1	Kinshasa	246,514	9,808	63,794	2	69.42	345.91
Maluku 2	Kinshasa	90,243	5,871	23,353	6	0.00	542.18
Masa	Kongo-Central	129,020	693	33,388	1	0.00	111.81
Masina 1	Kinshasa	457,864	0	118,486	1	13.80	13.80
Masina 2	Kinshasa	378,110	0	97,848	1	10.97	10.97
Matete	Kinshasa	395,222	0	102,277	1	0.00	12.02
Mont Ngafula 1	Kinshasa	338,221	6,791	87,525	3	21.15	21.15
Mont Ngafula 2	Kinshasa	198,140	3,479	51,275	3	23.15	23.15
Ndjili	Kinshasa	441,354	0	114,215	1	0.00	14.54
Nsele	Kinshasa	241,160	9,807	62,409	3	50.40	116.90
Kongo Central							
Boma	Kongo-Central	251,100	0	64,980	3	24.71	24.71
Boma Bungu	Kongo-Central	105,720	5,158	27,358	4	0.00	91.14
Gombe Matadi	Kongo-Central	132,897	735	34,391	4	0.00	185.77
Inga	Kongo-Central	105,758	12,190	28,177	9	0.00	95.61
Kangu	Kongo-Central	131,965	1,200	34,150	2	0.00	72.35
Kibunzi	Kongo-Central	83,098	3,369	21,504	5	0.00	119.40
Kimpese	Kongo-Central	234,061	10,811	60,571	11	0.00	240.08
Kinkonzi	Kongo-Central	91,565	0	23,695	1	0.00	18.55
Kwilu Ngongo	Kongo-Central	189,452	4,507	49,027	6	0.00	78.91
Lukula	Kongo-Central	240,077	7,480	62,128	9	0.00	56.53
Luozi	Kongo-Central	117,418	831	30,386	6	0.00	93.29
Mangembo	Kongo-Central	93,713	397	24,251	2	0.00	30.45
Matadi	Kongo-Central	242,113	146	62,655	1	0.00	43.33
Muanda	Kongo-Central	176,470	625	45,667	8	0.00	0.00
Nsona Pangu	Kongo-Central	142,257	4,672	36,814	6	0.00	378.61
Seke Banza	Kongo-Central	186,948	675	48,378	4	0.00	0.00
Tshela	Kongo-Central	118,731	0	30,725	1	0.00	51.71
Maniema Katanga	1						
Kabalo	Tanganika	313,960	0	81,247	1	0.00	337.91
Kabambare	Maniema	147,506	0	38,172	1	0.00	407.46
Kalemie	Tanganika	416,591	0	107,807	1	0.00	141.02
Kasongo	Maniema	282,945	20,606	73,221	1	0.00	181.92
Kibombo	Maniema	132,833	7,493	34,376	1	0.00	628.31
Kongolo	Tanganika	416,590	20,434	107,806	1	143.89	184.61
Kunda	Maniema	337,462	8,144	87,328	1	88.78	223.89
Lusangi	Maniema	215,408	1,797	55,744	1	0.00	234.60
Mbulula	Tanganika	236,974	19,509	61,326	1	0.00	0.00
Nyunzu	Tanganika	322,497	7,633	83,457	1	0.00	318.34
Salamabila	Maniema	152,657	5,218	39,505	1	0.00	127.77
Samba	Maniema	183,967	2,760	47,609	2	0.00	342.70
Tunda	Maniema	107,209	197	27,743	1	0.00	359.77
Sankuru			10 515		-	0.55	0.4.5.1
Dikungu	Sankuru	183,360	19,792	47,449	3	0.00	94.21

Katako Kombe	Sankuru	174,648	0	45,196	1	0.00	564.42
Lodja	Sankuru	239,464	0	61,969	1	0.00	236.39
Lusambo	Sankuru	117,517	1	30,410	1	0.00	380.86
Minga	Sankuru	207,498	11,473	53,697	3	0.00	113.85
Pania Mutombo	Sankuru	95,225	611	24,642	1	0.00	233.41
Tshumbe	Sankuru	126,130	6,473	32,640	1	189.89	312.89
Wembo Nyama	Sankuru	109,592	25,408	29,871	1	72.90	279.63
Bas Uélé							
Ango	Bas-Uele	132,690	0	10,286	1	753.41	1,460.35
Doruma	Haut-Uele	87,509	0	6,273	1	0.00	319.71
Ganga	Bas-Uele	159,426	0	23,837	1	458.49	553.71

E Supplementary Note 3: Parameter Glossary

Contents

E.1	Principles for parameterization
E.2	Organization of parameters
E.3	Summary of health outcome parameters
E.4	Summary of cost parameters
E.5	Screening parameters
	E.5.1 Population
	E.5.2 PS: coverage of the population per facility
	E.5.3 PS: number of facilities 7
	E.5.4 AS: coverage
	E.5.5 AS: capacity per team per year
	E.5.6 CATT 1:8 algorithm: diagnostic specificity
	E 5.7 BDT algorithm: diagnostic sensitivity 7
	E 5.8 BDT algorithm: diagnostic specificity
	E 59 CATT algorithm: wastage during AS
	E 5 10 RDT algorithm: wastage during PS
E 6	Treatment parameters
2.0	F.6.1 Proportion of cases age < 6
	F62 Proportion of cases weight<35 kg among age>6
	F63 Proportion of \$2 cases that are severe 8
	E.6.4 Length of hospital stay: Rentamidine treatment
	E.6.5 Length of hospital stay: NECT treatment 8
	E.6.5 Length of hospital stay: fee index
	E.6.7 Per of relarger partamidation treatment
	E.6.9 Dr. of relapse, penalman failura). NECT
	E.60 Pr. of relapse (included failule). NECT
	E. 6.10 SAE: neutomidization traditional sector sec
	E.6.11 SAE: Defamining dealine in a second s
	E.6.17 SAE: favinidezela trastmant
	E.6.12 Days learned to disability: due to SAE
E 7	Life years lost (DALV) parameters
E./	Energeans lost (DALT) parameters
	E.7.1 Age of dealth from meetion
	E.7.2 Line expectation Stationary Statio
	E.7.5 Disability weights: S1 disease
	E.7.4 Disability weights: S2 disease
БО	E./.5 Disability weights: SAE
E.0	Vector control parameters
	E.8.1 Linear km of targets
	E.8.2 Target per km
EO	E.8.5 Replacement rate of targets per year
E.9	Screening cost parameters
	E.9.1 AS: capital costs of a team
	E.9.2 AS: inxed management costs of a team
	E.9.5 CATT algorithm: cost per test used
	E.9.4 Staging: lumbar puncture & lab exam
	E.9.5 Confirmation: microscopy
	E.9.0 KD1 algorithm: costs per test used
	E.9.7 Variable management costs (PNLTHA mark-up)
	E.9.8 PS: capital costs of a facility
E 10	E.9.9 PS: management costs
E.10	Treatment cost parameters
	E.10.1 Hospital stay: cost per day
	E.10.2 Outpatient consultation: cost
	E.10.3 Course of pentamidine: cost
	E.10.4 Course of NECI: cost
	E.10.5 Course of lexinidazole: cost
P 11	E.IU.O Drug denvery mark-up
E.11	Vector control cost parameters
	E.11.1 Operational cost per kilometer of riverbank covered

E.1 Principles for parameterization

Below are the guidelines our team follows to parameterize the parameters in the treatment and intervention model. The rationale behind the choices in the tables that describe parameters is easier with these guidelines in mind.

- **Transferability of costs across time** Costs from the literature are updated to 2022 USD values by converting to local currency units in the year of the study in the literature, inflated to 2022 values using the consumer price index (CPI) of the country, and then converted to USD using the exchange rate in 2022. It should be noted that the 2003 WHO Guide to Cost-effectiveness recommends that the GDP inflator be used (see 3.2.6 Transferability of costs across time, page 43) but we found that the data on this measure (from the World Bank) were sometimes sparse so we relied on the consumer price index instead ('NY.GDP.DEFL.KD.ZG' in the World Bank Development Indicator Database) [37].
- **Transferability of costs across settings** To 'borrow' data from other countries, we follow the 2003 WHO Guide to Cost-effectiveness recommendations in section 3.2.7 Transferability of costs across settings) [37]. For non-traded items (i.e. nurse and doctor time) we convert USD or LCU prices into PPP (international dollars) values in the year of the cost study and then turn the value in international dollars to local currency (still in the year of the study) of the country where a cost estimate is needed. Then, we use the CPI to inflate costs to 2022 levels and then use the exchange rate with USD to get 2022 USD values.
- Combining multiple sources of information Values from different publications are combined using meta-analytic methods.
- **Choice of probability distributions** Costs and ratios were modelled via gamma distributions and proportions or probability were modelled with beta distributions. These distributions were parameterized using the method of moments (see Briggs 2006 [48], Chapter 4).
- Missing information on uncertainty: Gamma distributions.
- 1. Option A: Whenever uncertainty was missing for a cost or a ratio in the literature, we assigned a gamma distribution for the parameter that would yield credible intervals between half and double the estimate.
- 2. Option B: If at least 2 studies listed a cost, then we take the range of the costs to parameterize a gamma distribution in which the range matched the 95 percent confidence interval (e.g. the 2.5th and 97.5th percentile). In these cases, we use a method to parameterize gamma distributions using quantiles rather than using the mean and standard error of a sample (e.g. "method of moments") [49].
- Missing information on uncertainty: Beta distributions.
- 1. Option A: Usually modeled assuming that 100 trials were observed with the **proportion_estimate x 100** as the alpha parameter and (1-proportion_estimate) x 100 as a beta parameter.
- 2. Option B: If at least 2 studies listed a probability or a proportion, then we take the range of the costs to parameterize a beta distribution by assuming the range matches the 95 percent confidence interval (the 2.5th and 97.5th percentile). We use a method to parameterize Beta distributions using quantiles rather than the mean and standard error of a sample (method of moments) [50].

E.2 Organization of parameters

In the code repository, found in https://osf.io/ezjxb/, the parameters are in an sql database: parameters.sqlite3.

Additionally, a list named epi_output (read in from Matlab output) holds the output from the dynamic model: stage 1 and stage 2 cases detected by passive and active screening, as well as person-time spent in stage 1 and 2 before detection.

E.3 Summary of health outcome parameters

Below are all the parameters that model health outcomes, as well as a summary of their characteristics. An extended discussion of our choices is featured in the sections annotated in the table.

Variable description	Variable name	Statistical Distribution	Descriptive Summary	Notes
Screening				
Population	рор	Fixed value	Varies by health zone	See section E.5.1
PS: coverage of the population per	ps_coverage	Beta(14, 2094)	0.007 (0.004, 0.010)	See section E.5.2
facility				
PS: number of facilities	ps_facilities	Fixed value	Varies by health zone	See section E.5.3
AS: coverage	as_traditional &	Fixed value	Varies by health zone	See section E.5.4
	as_traditional_int			
AS: capacity per team per year	as_capacity_traditional	Normal(60000, 10000)	60,055 (40,448, 79,471)	See section E.5.5
CATT algorithm: diagnostic specificity	dx-spec-catt-1-in-8	Beta(31, 2)	0.94 (0.84, 0.99)	See section E.5.6
RDT algorithm: diagnostic sensitivity	dx-sens-rdt	Beta(230, 1)	1.00 (0.98, 1.00)	See section E.5.7
RDT algorithm: diagnostic specificity	dx_spec_rdt	Beta(226, 31)	0.88 (0.84, 0.92)	See section E.5.8
CATT algorithm: wastage during AS	dx_wastage_catt_as	Beta(8, 92)	0.08 (0.03, 0.14)	See section E.5.9
RDT algorithm: wastage during PS	dx_wastage_rdt_ps	Beta(1, 99)	0.01 (<0.01, 0.04)	See section E.5.10
Treatment			•	
Proportion of cases age<6	treat_prob_under6yo	Beta(152.53, 2427.9)	0.06 (0.05, 0.07)	See section E.6.1
Proportion of cases weight<35 kg	treat_prob_under35kg	Beta(8.3, 359.6)	0.02 (<0.01, 0.04)	See section E.6.2
among age>6				
Proportion of S2 cases that are severe	prob_late_stage2	Beta(76.93, 44.87)	0.63 (0.54, 0.72)	See section E.6.3
Age of death from infection	age_of_death	Gamma(148, 0.18)	26.63 (22.41, 31.08)	See section E.7.1
Length, treatment: pentamidine (days)	treat-duration-penta	Fixed value	7	See section E.6.4
Length of hospital stay: NECT treatment	treat-duration-nect	Fixed value	10	See section E.6.5
Length of hospital stay: fexinidazole	treat-duration-fexi	Fixed value	10	See section E.6.6
treatment				
Pr. of relapse (treatment failure):	<pre>treat_prob_failure_pent_s1</pre>	Beta(50.3, 665.48)	0.07 (0.05, 0.09)	See section E.6.7
pentamidine				
Pr. of relapse (treatment failure): NECT	<pre>treat_prob_failure_nect_s2</pre>	Beta(15.87, 378.55)	0.05 (0.02, 0.08)	See section E.6.8
Pr. of relapse: fexinidazole	<pre>treat_prob_failure_fexi</pre>	Beta(9.49, 496.54)	0.02 (<0.01, 0.03)	See section E.6.9
SAE: pentamidine treatment	treat-prob-sae-pent-s1	Beta(1.43, 551.42)	0.002 (<0.001, 0.008)	See section E.6.10
SAE: NECT treatment	<pre>treat_prob-sae_nect_s2</pre>	Beta(40.88, 367.8)	0.05 (0.03, 0.08)	See section E.6.11
SAE: fexinidazole treatment	treat_prob_sae_fexi	Beta(3, 261)	0.01 (<0.01, 0.03)	See section E.6.12
Days lost to disability: due to SAE	<pre>treat_duration_sae</pre>	Gamma(1.22, 2.38)	2.96 (0.14, 9.99)	See section E.6.13
Life-years lost (DALY)				
Life expectancy	life_expectancy	Fixed value	60.02 change?	See section E.7.2
Disability weights: S1 disease	disability_weighting_s1	Beta(22.96, 147.21)	0.14 (0.09, 0.19)	See section E.7.3
Disability weights: S2 disease	disability_weighting_s2	Beta(18.37, 15.63)	0.54 (0.37, 0.70)	See section E.7.4
Disability weights: SAE	disability_weighting_sae	Uniform(0.04, 0.11)	0.08 (0.04, 0.11)	See section E.7.5
Vector control				
Linear km of targets	vc_length_default &	Fixed value	Varies by health zone	See section E.8.1
	vc_length_enhanced			
Targets per km	vc_density_linear	Fixed value	Varies by health zone	See section E.8.2
Replacement rate of targets per year	vc_deployments_yr	Fixed value	2	See section E.8.3

Supplementary Table 29: Health outcome parameters

E.4 Summary of cost parameters

Below are all the cost parameters and a summary of their characteristics in three tables for screening, treatment, and vector control costs. An extended discussion of our choices is featured in the sections annotated in the tables.

Variable description	Variable name	Statistical Distribution	Descriptive Summary	Notes
Screening				
AS: capital costs of a team	as_cost_team_capital	Gamma(81.02, 114.54)	9,276 (7,378, 11,375)	See section E.9.1
AS: fixed management costs of a team	as_cost_team_management	Gamma(63.31, 630.94)	39,955 (30,845, 50,435)	See section E.9.2
CATT algorithm: cost per test used	dx_cost_catt	Gamma(25.19, 0.02)	0.52 (0.34, 0.75)	See section E.9.3
Staging: lumbar puncture & lab exam	dx_cost_lumbar_exam	Gamma(2.42, 3.66)	8.90 (1.45, 23.20)	See section E.9.4
Confirmation: microscopy	dx_cost_microscopy	Gamma(8.47, 1.27)	10.68 (4.70, 18.84)	See section E.9.5
RDT algorithm: costs per test used	dx_cost_rdt	Gamma(8.47, 0.19)	1.60 (0.71, 2.83)	See section E.9.6
Variable management costs (PNLTHA	program-markup	Uniform(0.1, 0.2)	0.15 (0.10, 0.20)	See section E.9.7
mark-up)				
PS: capital costs of a facility	ps_cost_facility_capital	Gamma(8.47, 209.8)	1,777 (778, 3,157)	See section E.9.8
PS: management costs	ps_cost_management	Gamma(8.47, 985.55)	8,368 (3,743, 14,965)	See section E.9.9
Treatment				
Hospital stay: cost per day	treat_cost_ip_day	Gamma(5.81, 0.24)	1.39 (0.50, 2.71)	See section E.10.1
Outpatient consultation: cost	<pre>treat_cost_op_visit</pre>	Uniform(1.37, 3.33)	2.34 (1.42, 3.28)	See section E.10.2
Course of pentamidine: cost	<pre>rx_cost_pentamidine</pre>	Fixed value	54	See section E.10.3
Course of NECT: cost	rx_cost_nect	Fixed value	460	See section E.10.4
Course of fexinidazole: cost	rx_cost_fexinidazole	Fixed value	50	See section E.10.5
Drug delivery mark-up	rx_delivery_markup	Beta(45, 55)	0.45 (0.35, 0.55)	See section E.10.6
Vector control				
Operational cost per kilometer of	vc_cost_management	Gamma(8.47, 14.17)	120.28 (53.33, 212.26)	See section E.11.1
riverbank covered				
Deployment cost per target	vc_cost_deployment	Gamma(8.47, 0.54)	4.57 (2.02, 8.26)	See section E.11.2

Supplementary Table 30: Cost parameters

E.5 Screening parameters

E.5.1 Population

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: pop
- Source: [6]
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Fixed value
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): Varies by health zone

Notes

Our population data comes from the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs censuses for national vaccine days [6]. Determined by taking the population from [6] and assuming a 3% population growth. See population summaries for the health zones included and excluded in Supplementary Table 1. In Supplementary Note 2, we provide the population for each health zone.

E.5.2 PS: coverage of the population per facility

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: ps_coverage
- Source: PNLTHA administrative data.
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Specific per coordination, see table below.
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): Varies by coordination, see table below.

Notes

For a summary of the clinics per coordination and nationwide, see Supplementary Table 9 in Supplementary Section A.2.

	Kongo Cen- tral	Bandund Nord	Bandund Sud	Equateu Nord	Equateui Sud	Kasai Orien- tal	Kasai Occi- dental	Maniema - Katanga	Kinshasa	Isangi	Sankuru	Whole
Clinics in 2019	WHO Surv	ey										
Clinics	81	169	111	28	12	54	17	9	24	16	7	528
Screened												
2019	7,187	98,589	23,167	179,984	14,282	35,371	26,623	18,043	5,355	9,473	8,006	426,080
2020	27,079	151,914	23,915	141,817	5,831	5,985	24,290	13,932	3,028	6,391	11,739	415,912
2021	4	104,309	22,342	244,177	3,743	13,836	13,418	9,589	3,162	12,560	8,086	435,226
2022	10,313	88,789	276,553	762	5,461	12,077	24,951	4,921	3,000	6,819	5,889	459,535
Population in he	ealth zones	with clinics	(millions)									
2019	2.27	3.16	4.14	3.23	1.14	4.74	2.55	1.49	2.45	0.54	0.75	26.47
2020	2.34	3.26	4.27	3.32	1.18	4.88	2.63	1.53	2.52	0.55	0.78	27.26
2021	2.41	3.36	4.39	3.42	1.21	5.03	2.71	1.58	2.60	0.57	0.80	28.08
2022	2.48	3.46	4.53	3.53	1.25	5.18	2.79	1.63	2.68	0.59	0.82	28.92
Screened per site												
2019	89	583	209	6,428	1,190	655	1,566	2,005	223	592	1,144	807
2020	334	899	215	5,065	486	111	1,429	1,548	126	399	1,677	788
2021	0	617	201	8,721	312	256	789	1,065	132	785	1,155	824
2022	127	525	2,491	27	455	224	1,468	547	125	426	841	870
Screened per sit	te per 10K	рор										
2019	7	33	10	438	94	30	110	175	12	77	121	51
2020	24	50	10	335	37	5	98	131	6	50	173	48
2021	0	33	9	561	23	11	52	88	7	96	116	49
2022	9	27	105	2	33	9	95	44	6	51	82	50
Mean and stand	lard error i	n 2019-202	2									
Mean	10	36	33	334	47	14	89	109	8	69	123	49
St. Err.	5	5	24	120	16	6	13	28	1	11	19	1
Distribution sin	nulated											
Shape	3.72	55.53	1.93	7.75	8.58	6.24	49.74	15.00	32.09	38.06	42.70	6,860.98
Rate	0.37	1.55	0.06	0.02	0.18	0.45	0.56	0.14	4.14	0.55	0.35	139.12
Summary	9 (3,	36 (27,	28 (4,	320	45 (21,	13 (5,	88 (66,	107	8 (5,	68 (49,	122	49 (48,
	22)	46)	93)	(142,	83)	27)	115)	(61,	11)	92)	(89,	50)
				607)				171)			162)	

Supplementary Table 31: People screened in passive screening, 2019-22, and the parameters for simulations for the future. In the analysis, both Isangi - Tschopo and Isangi - Bas Uélé will have the same parameters.

E.5.3 PS: number of facilities

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: ps_facilities
- Source: [9, 35, 41]; see Supplementary Table 9 for summary by coordination.
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Fixed value
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): Varies by health zone

Notes

These values were retrieved from Simarro et. al. (see the supplement) and WHO surveys [35, 41]. These are facilities that can perform serological tests (CATT or RDT), microbiological confirmation, and/or treatment. In Supplementary Note 2, we provide the number of facilities for each health zone.

E.5.4 AS: coverage

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: as_traditional & as_traditional_int
- Source: HAT Atlas data
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Fixed value
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): Varies by health zone

Notes

The percent of the population that is screened by mobile teams in their villages each year. These were determined by the average percent of the population in each health zone that was screened over the years 2016-2020 (for *Mean AS*) and the maximum that was screening over the years in 2000-2020 (for *Int. AS*). See Supplementary Note 2 for the number of AS people screened per health zone.

E.5.5 AS: capacity per team per year

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: as_traditional_capacity
- Source: [40, 51, 52]
- · Country of estimate: DRC
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Normal(60,000, 10,000)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 60,055 (40,448, 79,471)

Notes

The capacity of an active screening team in DRC has a mean of 60,000, a lower bound of 40,000 [51] and an upper bound of 80,000 with a work year of 220 days [40]. Teams are managed by the coordination and serve a span of multiple health zones and dozens of villages.

To parameterize the model, we chose a normal distribution with upper and lower bounds of 40-80 thousand people, therefore the parameters are Normal(60,000, 10,000).

E.5.6 CATT 1:8 algorithm: diagnostic specificity

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: dx_spec_catt_1_in_8
- Source: [53]
- Country of estimate: Various
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(4523, 22)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.995 (0.993, 0.997)

Notes

Lumbala *et al*'s 2017 publication, which reported a CATT 1:8 specificity of 99.5% [99.3%, 99.7%] for active screening in the DRC. This was fairly in line (though a little wider) than their 2018 publication which reported a specificity of 99.5% [99.5%; 99.6%] in active screening and 97.6% [97.3%; 97.9%] for passive screening in the DRC. The beta distribution that corresponds with that (99.3, 99.7) as the 95% confidence interval is Beta(4523, 22).

As a form of validation, in a screening of 1.4M people (the total in 2022), that would equal 7,000 [4,200–9,800] false positives. In 2022, there were 7195 seropositives in AS, mostly done with CATT testing (Annual Report)

E.5.7 RDT algorithm: diagnostic sensitivity

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: dx_sens_rdt
- Source: [54]
- Country of estimate: Guinea and Cote d'Ivoire
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(230, 1)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 1.00 (0.98, 1.00)

Notes

Based on a study in Guinea and Cote d'Ivoire [54], there was 1 sample from a gHAT patient that tested negative out of 231. Therefore, the parameter distribution for specificity is Beta(230, 1).

E.5.8 RDT algorithm: diagnostic specificity

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: dx_spec_rdt
- Source:
- Country of estimate: Guinea and Cote d'Ivoire
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(1134, 11)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.990 (0.984, 0.995)

Notes

Over the last 5 years, the positivity rate for RDTs in PS is between 98.40 (in 2018, Fourth Stakeholders' meeting report) to 99.52 in 2022 (Annual Report). We have assigned that range as the 95% confidence interval of a beta distribution describing the specificity of the RDTs. When we derived a Beta distributions with that 95% confidence interval, we arrived at parameters of (1134, 11), or a distribution of 0.990 (0.984, 0.995).

Previous studies assigned a lower specificity, but the positivity rate would indicate specificity is now better. Based on a study in Guinea and Cote d'Ivoire [54], there were 31 samples from non-HAT patients that tested positive out of 257. Therefore, the parameter distribution for specificity is Beta(226, 31), or a specificity of 88% (95% CI: 84-92%). However, if we consider that about 400,000 people are tested in PS and a false positivity rate of 12% (the complement of the specificity), then that means that we have to confirm 48,000 patients. In 2018, 531,863 people were tested in DRC and only 8,485 RDT-positives were identified (for microscopic confirmation), and in 2022 459,535 people were tested and only 2181 people came out positive.

E.5.9 CATT algorithm: wastage during AS

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: dx_wastage_catt_as
- Source: [40]
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(8, 92)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.08 (0.03, 0.14)

Notes

CATT tests come in packs of 50, and the list cost is assumed to consider that a pack is used on 50 patients. Once a pack is opened, one test is used as a positive control and one test is used as a negative control, so wastage is at least 4 percent. The shelf life of the test is one week in refrigeration and wastage in active screening activities is relatively low; generally, wastage of CATT tests in the context of active screening occurs at the end of the day when there are tests remaining in an open pack. To be conservative, we doubled the 4-percent lower bound for wastage and assigned the parameter a distribution of Beta(8, 92).

E.5.10 RDT algorithm: wastage during PS

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: dx_wastage_rdt_ps
- Source: [27]
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(1, 99)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.01 (<0.01, 0.04)

Notes

We followed the same assumption as Snijders and colleagues that less than 1 percent of RDT tests would not be used [27]. Because there was no sense of uncertainty in this parameter, we assumed a Beta (1,99) distribution.

E.6 Treatment parameters

E.6.1 Proportion of cases age<6

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: treat_prob_under6yo
- Source: [55, 56]
- Country of estimate: South Sudan
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(152.53, 2427.9)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.06 (0.05, 0.07)

Notes

There were only two studies where the number of children under 5 or 6 years of age was stated explicitly [55, 56].

Study	Groups	Under 6 y.o.	Total		Est.	95% CI
Schmid 2012	Single arm	35	629		0.06	(0.04-0.08)
Eperon 2006	Pentamidine	56	850		0.07	(0.05–0.08)
Eperon 2006	Melarsoprol	62	1108		0.06	(0.04–0.07)
				-		
Common effect	model		2587		0.06	(0.05–0.07)
Random effects	model			\diamond	0.06	(0.05–0.07)
Heterogeneity: I^2 =	$= 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p =$	0.60				
	· · · ·			0 0.02 0.06	0.1	
				Pr. Age <6 yea	rs	

Because the data showed non-significant heterogeneity according to the tau-squared test for heterogeneity, we have chosen to use the fixed-effects combined estimate: 0.059 (0.051, 0.069). The beta parameters of the random-effects estimate Beta(153.53, 2427.90) for the probability of that a patient is under 6 years old.

E.6.2 Proportion of cases weight<35 kg among age>6

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: treat_prob_under35kg
- Source: [56–65]
- · Country of estimate: Various
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(8.3, 359.6)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.02 (<0.01, 0.04)

Notes

To determine whether a patient is eligible for fexinidazole treatment, we could not find any studies that would tell us the number of HAT patients who weighed less than 35 kg, but we have estimated the number of people who might weigh less than 35 kg by examining the distribution of weight among patients in the trials in the literature. Furthermore, we have examined how this variable is related to potential selection by age of the study population. We are interested in the proportion of older children and adults that might weigh less than 35 kg, as age under 6 is a contraindication for fexinidazole.

We fit a gamma distribution by the method of moments to the reported mean and standard deviations of each of the studies. For Priotto 2012, no SD was reported, but an interquartile range was reported, so we fit a gamma distribution by the method in Cook [49].

We then took the expected number of people under 35 kg, and then performed a single-proportion meta-analysis with the expected number of people in each study under and over the 35 kg threshold.

Citation	Group	Age Group	Mean weight	Measure of spread	No. of obser- vations	Gamma distr. alpha par.	Gamma distr. beta par.	Prop. <35kg	Simulated No. <35kg
Priotto 2006	Melarsoprol and Nifurtimox	All ages	49.20	SD = 14.4	18	11.67	4.21	0.16	3
Priotto 2006	Melarsoprol and Eflornithine	All ages	50.00	SD = 10.3	19	23.56	2.12	0.06	1
Priotto 2006	NECT	All ages	51.40	SD = 8.4	17	37.44	1.37	0.02	0
Priotto 2007	NECT	Over 15 years old	51.70	SD = 7.4	52	48.81	1.06	0.01	0
Priotto 2007	Eflornithine	Over 15 years old	53.10	SD = 7.2	51	54.39	0.98	0.00	0
Checchi 2007	NECT	All ages	44.80	SD = 15.1	31	8.80	5.09	0.28	9
Priotto 2009	NECT	Over 15 years old	53.00	SD = 8.7	143	37.11	1.43	0.01	2
Priotto 2009	Eflornithine	Over 15 years old	53.90	SD = 8.3	143	42.17	1.28	0.01	1
Ngoyi 2010	Pentamidine and Melarsoprol	Over 12 years old	56.00	SD = 10.0	360	31.36	1.79	0.01	3
Priotto 2012	Single arm	All ages	49.00	IQR: 40-56	2190	16.37	2.96	0.12	265
Schmid 2012	Single arm	All ages	45.00	SD = 16.0	629	7.91	5.69	0.29	182
Burri 2016	Pentamidine	Over 15 years old and >35 kg	48.50	SD = 7.6	40	40.83	1.19	0.03	1
Pohlig 2016	Pentamidine	Over 12 years old and >30 kg	45.70	SD = 7.8	137	34.15	1.34	0.08	10
Pohlig 2016	Pafuramidine	Over 12 years old and >30 kg	44.70	SD = 7.9	136	32.02	1.40	0.10	14
Kansiime 2018	All	Over 15 years old	51.69	SD = 9.7	109	28.22	1.83	0.03	3
Mesu 2018	NECT	Over 15 years old	50.70	SD = 9.6	130	27.89	1.82	0.04	5
Mesu 2018	Fexinidazole	Over 15 years old	50.50	SD = 8.2	264	37.93	1.33	0.02	5

Study	Arm	Events	Total		Est.	95% CI		
all_ages_lbl = A	Adolescents and adults							
Priotto 2007	NECT	0	52	H	0.00	(0.00-0.07)		
Priotto 2007	Eflornithine	0	51	H	0.00	(0.00-0.07)		
Priotto 2009	NECT	2	143	+-	0.01	(0.00-0.05)		
Priotto 2009	Eflornithine	1	143	+	0.01	(0.00-0.04)		
Ngoyi 2010	Pentamidine and Melarsoprol	3	360	+	0.01	(0.00-0.02)		
Burri 2016	Pentamidine	1	40	+	0.03	(0.00-0.13)		
Pohlig 2016	Pentamidine	10	137		0.07	(0.04–0.13)		
Pohlig 2016	Pafuramidine	14	136		0.10	(0.06–0.17)		
Kansiime 2018	All	3	109	+	0.03	(0.01–0.08)		
Mesu 2018	NECT	5	130		0.04	(0.01–0.09)		
Mesu 2018	Fexinidazole	5	264	+	0.02	(0.01-0.04)		
Common effect	model		1565	٥	0.03	(0.02–0.04)		
Random effects	s model			\diamond	0.02	(0.01–0.04)		
Heterogeneity: I ² =	= 70%, τ ² = 0.8, <i>p</i> < 0.01							
all_ages_lbl = A	All ages							
Priotto 2006	Melarsoprol and Nifurtimox	3	18		0.17	(0.04–0.41)		
Priotto 2006	Melarsoprol and Eflornithine	1	19		0.05	(0.00-0.26)		
Priotto 2006	NECT	0	17		0.00	(0.00-0.20)		
Checchi 2007	NECT	9	31		0.29	(0.14–0.48)		
Priotto 2012	Single arm	265	2190	+	0.12	(0.11–0.14)		
Schmid 2012	Single arm	182	629		0.29	(0.25–0.33)		
Common effect	model		2904	\diamond	0.16	(0.15–0.17)		
Random effects	model			\bigcirc	0.15	(0.08–0.27)		
Heterogeneity: I ² =	Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.4$, $p < 0.01$							
Test for subgroup differences (fixed effect): $\chi_1^2 = 135.06$, df = 1 ($p < 0.01$)								
Test for subgroup	differences (random effects): $\chi_1^2 = 1$	7.61, df =	1 (<i>p</i> < 0	.01) Pr. Weight <35kg	0.5			

Because the data showed significant heterogeneity according to the tau-squared test for heterogeneity, we have chosen to use the random-effects estimate: 0.02 (0.01-0.04), represented by probability distribution: Beta(8.30, 359.61).

E.6.3 Proportion of S2 cases that are severe

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: prob_late_stage2
- Source: [43, 55, 56, 58–62]
- Country of estimate: Various
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(76.93, 44.87)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.63 (0.54, 0.72)

Notes

The definition of severe stage 2 gHAT disease by the WHO is when there are more than 100 white blood cells (WBC, leukocytes) per micro-litre in the cerebrospinal fluid. We have searched the clinical trials for the proportion of stage 2 patients that have high concentrations of leukocytes upon admission to treatment.

Study	Arm	Events	Total						Est	•	95% CI
						_					
Priotto 2006	Melarsoprol and Nifurtimox	9	18		_	- 1		-	0.50) (0.26–0.74)
Priotto 2006	Melarsoprol and Eflornithine	12	19						0.63	3 (0.38–0.84)
Priotto 2006	NECT	6	17						0.35	5 (0.14–0.62)
Eperon 2006	Melarsoprol	407	1108			+-			0.37	7 (0.34–0.40)
Priotto 2007	NECT	31	52			_		-	0.60) (0.45–0.73)
Priotto 2007	Eflornithine	39	51						0.76	3 (0.63–0.87)
Checchi 2007	NECT	18	31					_	0.58	3 (0.39–0.75)
Priotto 2009	NECT	107	143					+	0.75	5 (0.67–0.82)
Priotto 2009	Eflornithine	115	143						0.80) (0.73–0.87)
Ngoyi 2010	Pentamidine and Melarsoprol	209	272						0.77	7 (0.71–0.82)
Priotto 2012	Single arm	1373	2190				+		0.63	3 (0.61–0.65)
Schmid 2012	Single arm	397	629						0.63	3 (0.59–0.67)
Common effect	model		4673				\		0.58	3 (0.57–0.60)
Random effects	s model						\diamond		0.63	3 (0.55–0.71)
Heterogeneity: I^2 :	= 96%, τ ² = 0.3, <i>p</i> < 0.01				I	I	I	I			
2 7	· •		(C	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1		
					Pr. >1	00 W	/BC in	CSF			

Because the data showed significant heterogeneity according to the tau-squared test for heterogeneity, we have chosen to use the random-effects combined estimate: 0.634 (0.546, 0.713), represented by the probability distribution Beta(76.93, 44.87).

E.6.4 Length of hospital stay: Pentamidine treatment

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: treat_duration_penta
- Source: [43]
- Country of estimate: Global recommendations
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Fixed value
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 7

Notes

For NECT treatment, patients must stay in inpatient care for a minimum of 7 days for the effornithine infusions, and whether they stay for a total of 10 days for nifurtimox administration is unclear. For the most recent clinical trial [57], NECT patients were released on days 13-18 after admission, but we have assumed that for the most recent trial, the average patient can be released from care after 10 days in the hospital.

E.6.5 Length of hospital stay: NECT treatment

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: treat_duration_nect
- Source: [43, 57]
- Country of estimate: Global recommendations
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Fixed value
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 10

Notes

For NECT treatment, patients must stay in inpatient care for a minimum of 7 days for the effornithine infusions, and whether they stay for a total of 10 days for nifurtimox administration is unclear. For the most recent clinical trial [57], NECT patients were released on days 13-18 after admission, but we have assumed that for the most recent trial, the average patient can be released from care after 10 days in the hospital.

E.6.6 Length of hospital stay: fexinidazole treatment

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: treat_duration_fexi
- Source: [43, 57]
- Country of estimate: Global recommendations
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Fixed value
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 10

Notes

For the only trial that is published [57], patients were released on days 13-18 after the initiation of treatment, although the treatment only took 10 days, so we have assumed that in routine care the average patient will be in inpatient care for 10 days.

E.6.7 Pr. of relapse: pentamidine

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: treat_prob_failure_pent_s1
- Source: [55, 62–64, 66, 67]
- · Country of estimate: Various
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(50.3, 665.48)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.07 (0.05, 0.09)

Notes

The WHO guidelines for the treatment of HAT in 2019 [43] presented existing data on treatment failure of pentamidine treatment. To produce one comprehensive estimate of treatment failure, we performed a meta-analysis on proportions within a single group.



Because the data showed significant heterogeneity according to the tau-squared test for heterogeneity, we have chosen to use the random-effects estimate, to which we assigned a distribution of Beta(50.30, 665.47).

E.6.8 Pr. of relapse (treatment failure): NECT

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: treat_prob_failure_nect_s2
- Source: [57–61, 65]
- · Country of estimate: Various
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(15.87, 378.55)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.05 (0.02, 0.08)

Notes

The WHO guidelines for the treatment of HAT in 2019 [43] presented existing data on treatment failure of NECT. Kansiime and colleagues [65] also performed a systematic review of studies estimating the outcomes of NECT treatment. To produce one comprehensive estimate of treatment failure, we performed a meta-analysis on proportions within single groups.



Because the data showed non-significant heterogeneity according to the tau-squared test for heterogeneity, we have chosen to use the fixed-effects estimate, to which we assigned a distribution of Beta(15.87, 378.55)

E.6.9 Pr. of relapse: fexinidazole

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: treat_prob_failure_fexi
- Source: [43]
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(9.49, 496.54)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.02 (<0.01, 0.03)

Notes

Mesu and colleagues [57] have published the only study on fexinidazole treatment effectiveness in late-stage 2 cases. Moreover, the accompanying meta-analysis for the WHO treatment guidelines released in 2019 shows the outcomes of an additional extension study on stage 1, both early and late-stage 2 disease as well for the data from Mesu et al stratified by the concentration of WBC in the CSF [43].

Study	Subgroup	Age	Events	Total		Est.	95% Cl
Mesu unpub	Stage 1	6+	4	258		0.02	(0.00-0.04)
Mesu unpub	<100 WBC/muL in early and late stage 2	6+	2	170	<u> </u>	0.01	(0.00-0.04)
Mesu 2018	<100 WBC/muL in late stage 2	15+	3	103		0.03	(0.01–0.08)
Common effect	model			531		0.02	(0.01–0.03)
Random effects	s model				\diamond	0.02	(0.01–0.03)
Heterogeneity: <i>I</i> ² =	$= 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 0.56$				0 0.02 0.06	口 0.1	
				F	Pr. Treatment Fail	ure	

Because the data showed non-significant heterogeneity according to the tau-squared test for heterogeneity, we have chosen to use the fixed-effects combined estimate: 0.017 (0.009, 0.032), for which we assigned a distribution of Beta(9.49, 496.54).

E.6.10 SAE: pentamidine treatment

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: treat_prob_sae_pent_s1
- Source: [55, 63, 64]
- · Country of estimate: DRC and South Sudan
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(1.43, 551.42)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.002 (<0.001, 0.008)

Notes

As part of the WHO guidelines for the treatment of HAT in 2019 ([43]), Cochrane performed a systematic review of studies that evaluated the efficacy of NECT compared to fexinidazole studies and presented the probability of serious adverse events. Severe or serious adverse events in studies for S1 treatment were defined as "significant hazard, contra-indication, side effect, or precaution" [55, 63, 64].

Study	Events	Total					E	stimate	95% CI
Eperon 2006	0	820	F					0.00	(0-0.00)
Burri 2016	1	41				-		0.02	(0–0.13)
Pohlig 2016	1	137						0.01	(0-0.04)
			t t						
Common effect model		998	\diamond					0.00	(0–0.01)
Random effects model			\sim					0.00	(0–0.03)
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 =$	= 2.5, p =	0.69		1	1	I			
			0 0	0.05	0.1	0.15	0.2		
					Pr. SAE				

Because the results do not contain evidence of significant heterogeneity, we have chosen to use the fixed (pooled) estimate of 0 (0-0.01), which would result from a beta distribution of Beta(1.43, 551.42).

E.6.11 SAE: NECT treatment

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: treat_prob_sae_nect_s2
- Source: [57-61, 65]
- · Country of estimate: DRC
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(40.88, 367.8)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.05 (0.03, 0.08)

Notes

The WHO guidelines for treatment of gHAT in 2019 [43], presented all NECT studies to date, as did Kansiime and colleagues [65]. We searched through these studies for evidence of the probability of severe adverse vents (SAEs), described as events of Grade 3 or higher according to the National Cancer Institute Common Toxicity Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE).

To produce one comprehensive estimate of the probability of SAE, we performed a meta-analysis on proportions within single groups.



Reproduced from Antillon et al [5] with permission under a CC-BY license.

Because the data showed non-significant heterogeneity according to the tau-squared test for heterogeneity, we have chosen to use the fixed-effects estimate: 0.098 (0.073, 0.130), which would result from a beta distribution of Beta(40.88, 367.80).

E.6.12 SAE: fexinidazole treatment

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: treat_prob_sae_fexi
- Source: [57]
- · Country of estimate: DRC
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(3, 261)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.01 (<0.01, 0.03)

Notes

There is only one published study on fexinidazole, so the probability of serious adverse events will be parameterized with the observations from that study: 4 adverse events attributable to fexinidazole in 3 people among 264 people, so we have assigned a distribution of Beta(3, 261).

There were additional data reported in the appendix to the WHO's interim guidelines ([43]) related to studies that are ongoing. However, since we do not know details about whether those SAEs were attributable to treatment, we have chosen to omit those data.

E.6.13 Days lost to disability: due to SAE

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: treat_duration_sae
- Source: [68]
- · Country of estimate: DRC
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Gamma(1.22, 2.38)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 2.96 (0.14, 9.99)

Notes

Our only source of information for the duration of severe adverse events (SAEs) is Alirol 2013 [68], which lists the most common adverse events and the median duration of these events. Most events last a median of 1-2 days (with interquartile ranges reaching up to 4 days).

For simplicity, we have fit a gamma distribution with interquartile range of 1-4 days. Our distribution is therefore Gamma(1.22, 2.38) with a mean and 95% confidence interval of 2.92 (0.12, 9.95), which provides a sufficiently large range of values in light of the scarce information we have.

E.7 Life-years lost (DALY) parameters

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

E.7.1 Age of death from infection

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: age_of_death
- Source: [55–66, 68, 69]
- Country of estimate: DRC and South Sudan
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Gamma(148, 0.18)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 26.63 (22.41, 31.08)

Notes

No good registry of the age of infection exists, so we have searched through the literature that we have used to parameterize the model for the average age of HAT patients. Among the studies that we have used to inform other parameters, eight studies reported age information in a sample of patients of all ages, and nine studies reported the age information in a sample of older children or adults (12-15 years and older).

However, the data exists in a state that is difficult to synthesize:

Therefore, we have fit a gamma distribution to the means and medians of the studies that included patients of all ages. We have omitted the median from Alirol et al. 2013 [68] as this median seems unusually high – even higher than the mean age of patients in studies where only adults (over the age of 15) were recruited. Our distribution is therefore Gamma(147.93, 0.18) with a mean and 95% confidence interval of 27 (23, 31), which provides a sufficiently large bound of uncertainty in lieu of the information we have.

E.7.2 Life expectancy

- Name in the code: life_expectancy
- Source: [70]
- · Country of estimate: DRC
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Interpolation
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): See below.

Notes

We took age-specific life expectancy at around the time when people die of HAT in DRC for 2019, the last year for which there are estimates.

We see here that the expected years of life left at each of the ages is:

Using these data, we made an interpolating function in R (function: approxfun) that would calculate the life years left for each age of death (see previous parameter, age_of_death).

E.7.3 Disability weights: S1 disease

- Name in the code: disability_weighting_s1
- Source: [71]
- Country of estimate: GBD
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(22.96, 147.21)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.14 (0.09, 0.19)

Notes

The Global Burden of Disease listed the impact of sleeping sickness as equivalent to the health state labelled "Motor plus cognitive impairments, severe" and their estimate for a disability weight is 0.542 (0.374-0.702), using the 2013 weight values. No distinction was made between stage 1 and 2 of the disease.

While this seems appropriate for the second stage of sleeping sickness, for stage 1 disability we chose to use the disability weights for equivalent to "infectious disease, acute episode, severe", which is described as "has a high fever and pain, and feels very weak,

Citation	Group	Age Group	Summary
Priotto 2006	Melarsoprol and Nifurtimox	All ages	Mean: 29.1 range: 5-56
Priotto 2006	Melarsoprol and Eflornithine	All ages	Mean: 28.1 range: 11-61
Priotto 2006	NECT	All ages	Mean: 29.1 range: 9-62
Balasegaram 2006	Pentamidine	All ages	148 under 15 and 504 over
			15
Eperon 2006	Pentamidine	All ages	56 patients 0-5, 226 patients
			6-15, 568 patients 15+
Eperon 2006	Melarsoprol	All ages	63 patients 0-5, 249 patients
			6-15, 796 patients 15+
Priotto 2007	NECT	Over 15 years old	Mean: 33.1 range: 15-69
Priotto 2007	Eflornithine	Over 15 years old	Mean: 36.1 range: 15-70
Checchi 2007	NECT	All ages	Mean: 23.9 range: 4-45
Priotto 2009	NECT	Over 15 years old	Mean: 32.8 SD: 12.5
Priotto 2009	Eflornithine	Over 15 years old	Mean: 34.6 SD: 13.5
Ngoyi 2010	Pentamidine	Over 12 years old	Mean: 35 SD: 13
Ngoyi 2010	Pentamidine and	Over 12 years old	Mean: 34 SD: 12
	Melarsoprol		
Priotto 2012	Single arm	All ages	Median: 24 IQR: 15-35
Schmid 2012	Single arm	All ages	35 patients 0-4 yo, 65
			patients 5-11 yo, and 529
			patients 12 yo or more.
Hasker 2012	All	All ages	Median: 27 IQR: 16-40
Alirol 2013	Single arm	All ages	Median: 36 IQR: 20-50
Burri 2016	Pentamidine	Over 15 years old and >35	Median: 31 range: 15-50
		kg	
Pohlig 2016	Pentamidine	Over 12 years old and >30	Median: 31 range: 13-75
		kg	
Pohlig 2016	Pafuramidine	Over 12 years old and >30	Median: 30 range: 12-64
		kg	
Kansiime 2018	NECT	Over 15 years old	Mean: 27.23 SD: 12.07
Kansiime 2018	Eflornithine	Over 15 years old	Mean: 27.33 SD: 8.59
Mesu 2018	NECT	Over 15 years old	Mean: 35.2 SD: 13.2
Mesu 2018	Fexinidazole	Over 15 years old	Mean: 34.5 SD: 12.6

Age	Years left
15-19	54
20-24	50
25-29	45
30-34	41
35-39	36
40-44	32
45-49	28
50-54	24

Life-years left for each age group. Source: https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators/indicator-details/GHO/gho-ghe-life-tables-by-country. Variable: *expectation of life at age x*.

which causes great difficulty with daily activities" and has a much lower disability weight equivalent to 0.133 (0.088-0.190). The distribution for this parameter is therefore Beta(22.96, 147.21).

It should be noted that other cost-effectiveness analyses have used different values for disability weights [52, 72, 73]. These values arise from the 1994 Global Burden of Disease Study but we prefer to consider updated values. Since most of the disability is due to deaths rather than illness during life, we do not believe that this difference is cause for concern.

E.7.4 Disability weights: S2 disease

- Name in the code: disability_weighting_s2
- Source: [71]
- Country of estimate: GBD
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Beta(18.37, 15.63)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.54 (0.37, 0.70)

Notes

The Global Burden of Disease listed the impact of sleeping sickness as equivalent to the health state labeled "Motor plus cognitive impairments, severe" and their estimate for a disability weight is 0.542 (0.374-0.702), using the 2013 weight values. No distinction was made between stage 1 and 2 of the disease. The distribution for the parameter is Beta(18.37, 15.63).

It should be noted that other cost-effectiveness analyses have used different values for disability weights [52, 72, 73]. These values arise from the 1994 Global Burden of Disease Study but we prefer to consider updated values. Since most of the disability is due to deaths rather than illness during life, we do not believe that this difference is cause for concern.

E.7.5 Disability weights: SAE

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: disability_weighting_sae
- Source: [71]
- · Country of estimate: GBD
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Uniform(0.04, 0.11)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.08 (0.04, 0.11)

Notes

As far as we are aware, no one has considered the disability due to severe adverse events attributable to gHAT treatment, but the most common adverse events are gastrointestinal problems and headaches.

We consulted the Global Burden of Disease for disability weights. The health state labeled "symptomatic tension-type headache" was described as "moderate headache that also affects the neck, which causes difficulty in daily activities" and was estimated to have a disability weight equal to 0.037 (0.022–0.057). The health state labeled "moderate symptomatic gastritis and duodenitis without anaemia" was described as "abdominopelvic problem, moderate has pain in the belly and feels nauseous; the person has difficulties with daily activities" and was estimated to have a disability weight equal to 0.114 (0.078–0.159).

Our distribution is therefore Uniform 0.037-0.114. Since most of the disability is due to death rather than illness during life, we do not believe that the uncertainty in this parameter is cause for concern for the purpose of the conclusions of this analysis.

E.8 Vector control parameters

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

E.8.1 Linear km of targets

- Name in the code: vc_length_default and vc_length_enhanced
- Source: [30]
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Fixed value
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): Varies by health zone

Notes

The parameter for the extent of the riverbank covered by vector targets is a fixed value. The values for each health zone are detailed in the Supplementary Methods, section A.8.1, and see Supplementary Note 2 for the length of rivers covered by VC per health zone.

E.8.2 Target per km

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: vc_density_linear
- Source: [30]
- · Country of estimate: DRC
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Fixed value, varies by health zone
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): Varies by health zone

Notes

In this analysis, we are using bank length, because, in some health zones, we do not cover with targets on both sides. In DRC, on average, while the goal is to cover rivers with 40 targets per kilometre, placing them 25m apart on alternating sides, or 50m apart on each side, records have shown that approximately 30 targets are used per kilometre. We parameterize the targets per kilometre as half that since we are considering the bank length, rather than the river length.

We used a fixed value for the parameter for the extent of the riverbank covered by vector targets.

E.8.3 Replacement rate of targets per year

← Return to the Summary of Health Outcome Parameters.

- Name in the code: vc_deployments_yr
- Source: [30, 74]
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Statistical distribution and parameters: Fixed value
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 2

Notes

We have set this parameter as a fixed number, as this is the number of times that one must replace a set of targets in order to provide continuous protection throughout the year [30, 74].

E.9 Screening cost parameters

E.9.1 AS: capital costs of a team

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: as_cost_team_capital
- Source: [40, 51, 52]
- · Country of estimate: DRC
- Distribution and parameters: Gamma(25.31, 747.18)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 18,973 (12,276, 26,961)

Notes

Capital costs are denominated in 2022 US dollars.

To our knowledge, no active surveillance costs have been estimated via a detailed costing study [75]. We took into account only the two studies that calculated costs using an ingredients approach [51, 52].

Lutumba and colleagues [51] calculated that the total cost of screening 40,000 patients in 2003 was 46,734.29 Euros (1 Euro = 0.86 USD in 2003) (see table 3 of [51]). Of that value, 21 percent of the costs were capital costs, or a cost of 26961.36 in 2022 USD. The publication did not indicate whether that value was annualized or not.

According to Bessel and colleagues [52] the cost for a mobile team that screens 250 patients per day for 220 days a year has capital investments (annualized for five years) of \$12,000 for a team that administers CATT and \$12,781 for a team that administers RDT (in 2013 USD) (see [52] Table S1). Adjusting for inflation, that would equal 14755.66 in 2022 USD.

According to Snijders et al [40], the capital cost of an active surveillance team was \$11,406 in 2018 for a team that administers CATT. Adjusting for inflation, that would equal 12,276.26 in 2022 USD.

Although no publication gave us a sense of the uncertainty in capital costs, we had three studies, so we assumed that the range was equivalent to the 95% confidence interval. Therefore, our probability distribution is Gamma(25.31, 747.18), which yields a distribution with mean and confidence intervals of 18,973 (12,276, 26,961).

E.9.2 AS: fixed management costs of a team

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: as_cost_team_management
- Source: [40, 51, 52]
- · Country of estimate: DRC
- Distribution and parameters: Gamma(56.18, 1412.66)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 79,281 (59,984, 101,426)

Notes

Recurrent management costs are denominated in 2022 US dollars.

To our knowledge, no active surveillance costs have been estimated via a detailed costing study [75]. We took into account only the two studies that calculated costs using an ingredients approach [27, 51, 52].

Lutumba and colleagues [51] calculated that the total cost of screening 40,000 patients in 2003 was 46,734.29 Euros (1 Euro = 0.86 USD in 2003, for an equivalent of \$40,191) (see table 3 of [51]). Of that value, 79 percent of the costs were recurrent fixed costs (\$31,751), or a cost of 101,426.06 in 2022 USD after adjusting for inflation and changes in the exchange rate.

According to Bessel and colleagues [52] the cost for a mobile team that screens 250 patients per day for 220 days a year has annual recurrent costs of \$30,307 and daily recurrent costs of \$97 in 2013 values (see [52], Table S1). Summing those costs (\$51,647) and adjusting for inflation and changes in the exchange rate, would equal 61,506 in 2022 USD.

According to Snijders and colleagues [27], the management and recurrent costs of an active surveillance team were \$42,408 in 2018, and \$7,961 for the management costs from the provincial and central level PNLTHA (including training and supervision) for a total of \$50,369. Adjusting for inflation and changes in the exchange rate, would equal 59,983.68 in 2022 USD.

Although no publication gave us a sense of the uncertainty in recurrent costs, since we had at least three studies, we assumed that the range of observations was equal to the 95% confidence interval (59,983.68, 61,506). Therefore, our probability distribution is Gamma(56.18, 1412.66), which yields a distribution with mean and confidence intervals of 79,281 (59,984, 101,426).

E.9.3 CATT algorithm: cost per test used

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: dx_cost_catt
- Source: [40, 51, 52, 75]
- · Country of estimate: DRC
- Distribution and parameters: Gamma(12.11, 0.1319)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 1.59 (0.82, 2.63)

Notes

To our knowledge, costs for CATT tests are only featured in three sources: 1) the WHO, cited by Keating et al 2015 [75], 2) by Lutumba et al [76], and 3) by Bessel et al [52].

- 1) Keating et al listed the cost of a CATT test at 0.73 in 1998 USD, equivalent to 2.62 in 2022 USD.
- 2) Lutumba et al listed the cost of a CATT test at 0.52 in 2003 USD, equivalent to 1.23 in 2022 USD.
- 3) Bessel et al listed the cost of CATT test at 0.70 for a mobile team and 0.89 for a fixed post in 2013 USD. The reason for the difference in price between screening at a mobile team vs screening at a fixed post was due to the differential wastage and was given in the supplement notes: "Costs at mobile teams and fixed units are different because once a bottle of CATT antigen is open repeat cases and controls must be performed. Materials are the cost of test materials plus the cost of the lancet."

In terms of 2022 USD, the costs are 0.83 for CATT tests in mobile teams 1.06 for CATT tests in fixed posts. We take into account wastage as a separate parameter.

4) Snijders et al listed the cost of a CATT test at 0.77 in 2018 USD, or 0.83 in terms of 2022 USD [40].

Because we had more than two studies on this parameter, we chose gamma distributions where the 2.5th and the 97.5th percentiles would match the minimum and maximum values in the literature, so our parameter distribution is Gamma(12.11, 0.1319), which has a mean and confidence interval of 1.59 (0.82, 2.63).

Considering delivery costs (described in E.10.6, the cost of CATT tests is 2.26 (1.17, 3.72) in 2022 USD. Considering both delivery costs and wastage, the cost of CATT tests is 2.50 (1.30, 4.15) in active screening teams and 2.90 (1.49, 4.82) in passive surveillance (fixed) posts.

E.9.4 Staging: lumbar puncture & lab exam

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: dx_cost_lumbar_exam
- Source: [40, 77]
- Country of estimate: DRC and Chad
- Distribution and parameters: Gamma(3.73, 2.96)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 11.03 (2.93, 24.07)

Notes

To our knowledge, costs for lumbar puncture tests were listed in detail only by Bessel and colleagues [52] and will be featured as part of an upcoming publication by Snijders and colleagues [40]. The cost listed by Bessel et al was 2.38 in terms of 2013 USD, equivalent to 2.83 in 2022 USD. Snijders and colleagues report a cost of 23.02 in 2018 USD, or 24.78 in 2022 USD. Irurzun-Lopez [77] have reported a similar value, so we will assume a value equal to that of Snijders and colleagues.

Because we had more than two studies to inform this parameter, we chose a gamma distribution where the 2.5th and the 97.5th percentiles would match the minimum and maximum values in the literature, so our parameter distribution is Gamma(3.73, 2.96), which yields a distribution with a mean and confidence interval of 11.03 (2.93, 24.07).

E.9.5 Confirmation: microscopy

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: dx_cost_microscopy
- Source: [27]
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Distribution and parameters: Gamma(8.47, 1.36)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 11.09 (5.13, 20.51)

Notes

The per-patient price to confirm a patient with a full microscopy procedure is reported in an upcoming publication by Snijders et al [27]. They report that a microscopy procedure consisting of mAECT and LNA (lymph node aspiration) costs 9.53 in 2018 USD, or 10.26 in 2022 USD. Because we had no report of the standard error around that estimate, we assigned a gamma distribution that had a confidence interval that spanned half the estimate and twice the estimate, yielding a distribution of Gamma(8.47, 1.36), and a mean and confidence interval of 11.09 (5.13, 20.51).

E.9.6 RDT algorithm: costs per test used

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: dx_cost_rdt
- Source: [27]
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Distribution and parameters: Gamma(8.47, 0.20)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 1.71 (0.76, 3.05)

Notes

To our knowledge, costs for RDT tests were listed in Sutherland et al [73], Bessel et al [52], and an upcoming publication by Snijders and colleagues [27].

Both Sutherland et. al and Bessel et. al coincided on a cost of 0.50 USD 2013 for the test in the international market (after a 25 cent subsidy paid for outside of DRC). Bessel also calculated staff costs, shipment, and wastage of 0.32 USD 2013. Because we can split the cost between tradable and non-tradable costs, we inflate and adjust the costs for the staff costs and shipment and then add the cost of the RDT. In terms of 2022 USD costs, the shipment and staff costs are 0.38, and the total cost is 1.13.

2) Snijders et. al reported a cost between 0.85 and 1.97 in 2018 USD, depending on the company from which the test is purchased. It should be noted that no single company produces enough tests for any single intervention, and so a range of prices must be considered. Snijders' estimate does not include delivery or wastage, so we take that into account separately. The values of both tests are 0.91 and 2.12.

It appears difficult to compare the three estimates, so we will take Snijders' estimate from a recent micro-costing analysis. The mean was \$1.41 in 2018 USD, or 1.52 in 2022 USD, and we assign a distribution with confidence intervals equal to half and double the costs. The distribution is Gamma(8.47, 0.20), which yields a distribution with mean and confidence intervals 1.71 (0.76, 3.05).

Considering delivery costs (described in E.10.6), the cost of RDT tests are 2.49 (1.10, 4.41) in 2022 USD. Considering both delivery costs and wastage, the cost is 2.65 (1.19, 4.72) in passive surveillance teams, and we don't consider the deployment of RDTs in active surveillance teams.

E.9.7 Variable management costs (PNLTHA mark-up)

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: program_markup
- Source: [27]
- · Country of estimate: DRC
- Distribution and parameters: Uniform(0.1, 0.2)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.15 (0.10, 0.20)

Notes

Snijder's and colleagues [27] have assumed that there is a component of management at the national programme (PNLTHA) level that is approximately 15% of the expenses at the local and coordination level (both fixed costs and variable/consumable costs for both active screening and passive screening in fixed health posts). However, the mark-up was not applied to the consult in the fixed health post, as these were consultations paid for by patients for symptoms in general, but testing and confirmation for HAT specifically is administered and paid for by PNLTHA, so we have included a mark-up for these items.

E.9.8 PS: capital costs of a facility

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: ps_cost_facility_capital
- Source: [27]
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Distribution and parameters: Gamma(8.47, 225.81)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 1,911 (850, 3,401)

Notes

Capital costs are denominated in 2022 USD and apply to each health centre or hospital that is capable of HAT diagnosis. We took into account the results of a micro-costing study in Yasa Bonga and Mosango [27], two health zones of Kwilu Province

(Bandundu Sud coordination). The study reported a cost of 1580 USD in 2018 values, for an equivalent of 1700.55 in 2022 USD. To parameterize the model, we assign a distribution with 95% confidence intervals equal to half and double the costs. The distribution is Gamma(8.47, 225.81), which yields a distribution with mean and confidence intervals of 1,911 (850, 3,401).

E.9.9 PS: management costs

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: ps_cost_management
- Source: [27]
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Distribution and parameters: Gamma(8.47, 1060.74)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 8,942 (3,994, 15,977)

Notes

Recurrent management costs are denominated in 2022 USD and apply to the health zone.

We took into account the results of a micro-costing study in Yasa Bonga and Mosango [27], two health zones of Kwilu Province (Bandundu Sud coordination). The value was 7422 in 2018 USD, for an equivalent of 7988.29 in 2022 USD.

To parameterize the model, we assign a distribution with confidence intervals equal to half and double the costs. The distribution is Gamma(8.47, 1060.74), which yields a distribution with mean and confidence intervals of 8,942 (3,994, 15,977).

E.10 Treatment cost parameters

E.10.1 Hospital stay: cost per day

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: treat_cost_ip_day
- Source: [37, 78, 79]
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Distribution and parameters: Gamma(5.81, 0.48)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 2.80 (1.01, 5.51)

Notes

We got the estimates of inpatient treatment costs from the 2010 WHO CHOICE cost estimates (recently updated by [78] and [79]). In 2010, a consult at a primary hospital in DRC would be 2.41 (0.90, 5.73) I\$. In 2010, a consult at a secondary hospital in DRC would be 2.59 (0.98, 5.81) I\$, and a consult at a tertiary hospital in DRC would be 3.25 (1.32, 7.20) I\$.

The equivalent estimates in 2010 USD are 1.27 (0.47, 3.02) per day at a primary hospital, 1.36 (0.52, 3.06) per day at a secondary hospital, and 1.71 (0.70, 3.79) per day at a tertiary hospital. After converting to local currency, applying the inflation index, and converting to 2022 USD, the estimates are 1.85 (0.69, 4.39) per day at a primary hospital, 1.98 (0.75, 4.45) per day at a secondary hospital, and 2.49 (1.01, 5.51) per day at a tertiary hospital.

At the moment, we do not know how many of each kind of hospital the population of HAT patients attend, nor do we understand how costs at district hospitals, referral hospitals, etc resemble those of the two kinds of hospitals under analysis by the WHO CHOICE programme. Therefore, we take the estimate with a higher mean (hospital day in a tertiary hospital) in an effort not to understate the costs of treatment and interventions.

To parameterize the model, we assign a gamma distribution with 95% confidence intervals equal to those reported by WHO CHOICE [37]. The distribution is Gamma(5.81, 0.48), which yields a distribution with median and confidence intervals of 2.80 (1.01, 5.51). Although this yields a higher mean, the uncertainty is adequately characterized.

E.10.2 Outpatient consultation: cost

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: treat_cost_op_visit
- Source: [27, 80]
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Distribution and parameters: Gamma(5.23, 0.42)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 2.20 (0.73, 4.46)

Notes

We got the estimates of outpatient consultation costs from two sources:

- 1) Laokri and colleagues [80] presented an estimate with mean \$2.33 and standard deviation 0.27 in 2013 values, or 1.69 (0.20) in 2022 USD values.
- 2) Snijders and colleagues [27] reported that the cost of a consultation is \$3.33 in 2018 USD values, or \$3.58 in 2022 values.

If we assume that the uncertainty is about 12% of the value for Snijders as it is for Laokri, we can do a small meta-analysis of the two estimates.

Citation	Cost SD		Est.	95% CI
Laokri 2018	1.69 0.20		1.69	(1.30–2.07)
Snijders 2021	3.58 0.43		3.58	(2.74–4.43)
Common effect	t model	- -	2.01	(1.66–2.36)
Random effect	ts model		2.60	(0.74-4.45)
Heterogeneity: I ²	= 94%, τ^2 = 1.7	p < 0.01	1 5	
		Costs	0	

The distribution to represent the random-effects estimate is Gamma(5.23, 0.42), which yields a distribution with mean and confidence intervals of 2.20 (0.73, 4.46). Although this yields a lower mean, the uncertainty is adequately characterized.

E.10.3 Course of pentamidine: cost

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: rx_cost_pentamidine
- Source: [75]
- · Country of estimate: WHO
- Distribution and parameters: Fixed value
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 54

Notes

The cost of pentamidine, for stage 1 disease. Because it is available on the international market, where is it sold in USD, and not subject to the inflationary pressures of any particular country, we have not inflated the cost or converted them to any other currency.

In the future pentamidine treatment it may be replaced with fexinidozole treatment, which would circumvent the need for a lumbar puncture.

E.10.4 Course of NECT: cost

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: rx_cost_nect
- Source: [81]
- · Country of estimate: WHO
- Distribution and parameters: Fixed value
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 360

Notes

This represents the cost of NECT to the capital for stage 2 disease. Simarro and colleagues listed a cost of 1440 USD for the treatment of four patients.

Because it is available on the international market, where is it sold in USD, and not subject to the inflationary pressures of any particular country, we have not inflated the cost or converted them to any other currency.

In the future, it may be replaced with fexinidozole and this would be the drug for treatment failures or very severe patients.

E.10.5 Course of fexinidazole: cost

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: rx_cost_fexinidazole
- Source: [73]
- Country of estimate: WHO
- Distribution and parameters: Fixed value
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 50

Notes

The cost of fexanidozole, for stage 1 and 2 disease. In the near future this will be the drug of choice for first-line treatment for both stages of disease. It may require hospitalization, but eventually, it should be taken on an outpatient basis.

E.10.6 Drug delivery mark-up

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: rx_delivery_markup
- Source: [78, 79]
- · Country of estimate: DRC
- Distribution and parameters: Beta(45, 55)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 0.45 (0.35, 0.55)

Notes

Because we do not know the delivery price of drugs for each country, we have applied the standard value for the mark up of traded goods recommended by the WHO CHOICE programme for AFRO E: https://www.who.int/teams/ health-systems-governance-and-financing/economic-analysis/costing-and-technical-efficiency/quantities-and-unit-pr

E.11 Vector control cost parameters

E.11.1 Operational cost per kilometer of riverbank covered

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: vc_cost_management
- Source: [42]
- Country of estimate: DRC
- Distribution and parameters: Gamma(8.47, 49.08)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 414.77 (186.43, 739.58).

Notes

Vector control operational costs are denominated in 2022 US dollars on a per-kilometer basis.

To our knowledge, only one vector control micro-costing study has been performed in DRC by Snijders and colleagues [42]. In that study, centred in Yasa Bonga, Kwilu Province, targets were laid out across 210 km of river length (or 420km of river bank). The target deployment activities cost 61,796 USD, or 294.27 USD (in 2016 values) per km. The equivalent cost is 369.62 in 2022 USD per target.

As there was no sense of the uncertainty in VC operational costs, we assigned a distribution with confidence intervals equal to half and double the costs. The distribution is Gamma(8.47, 49.08), which yields a distribution with mean and confidence intervals of 414.77 (186.43, 739.58).

E.11.2 Deployment cost per target

← Return to the Summary of Cost Parameters.

- Name in the code: vc_cost_deployment
- Source: [42]
- · Country of estimate: DRC
- Distribution and parameters: Gamma(8.47, 0.42)
- Summary statistics (mean and 95% CI or fixed value): 3.60 (1.59, 6.42)

Notes

Target deployment costs are denominated in 2022 US dollars on a per-target basis.

To our knowledge, only one vector control micro-costing study has been performed in DRC by Snijders and colleagues [42]. In that study, centred in Yasa Bonga, Kwilu Province, 22,622 targets were laid out across 210 km of river length (or 420 of river bank). The target deployment activities cost 57,571 USD, or per target 2.54 USD (in 2016 values). The equivalent cost is 3.20 in 2022 USD per target.

Uncertainty: as there was no sense of the uncertainty in target deployment costs, we assigned a distribution with confidence intervals equal to half and double the costs. The distribution is Gamma(8.47, 0.42), which yields a distribution with mean and confidence intervals of 3.60 (1.59, 6.42).

Supplementary Note 4: NTD PRIME Criteria F

1. Stakeholder engagement Authorship list and acknowledgements Strategy components were determined along with the country director of PNLTHA, Brick Miaka (co-author). Implementation of simulations of AS and PS costs was aided by Rian Snijders, who has helped run field operations in former Bandundu. Implementation of costs of VC was aided by Andrew Hope, Infaki Tirados, Sophie Dunkley, and Rian Snijders and collaborators at the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, who have run field operations in DRC since 2015. Authorship list and acknowledgements 2. Complete model documentation Description in Supplementary Methods. Scients A.1, through A.9 access the code via DRC_whole countryCEA ¹ . 3. Complete description of data used Information about the data used for fitting is described in Crump <i>et al</i> [1]. The data according to conventions in the cononic evaluation literature. No that from fitting sing from the choice of vector control operation inputs, discounting, and time horizon are shown by re-running the entire analysis with alternative samuptions. Main text results and discussion. Results with alternative time horizons and discounting and time horizon are shown by re-running the entire analysis with alternative assumptions. Parameter uncertainty: The epidemiological model predictions. Tables 4 and 5 Main text results and discussion. Results with alternative time horizons and discountary (CA ¹). Prediction uncertainty: Observational uncertainty in epidemiological model predictions. Tables 4 and 5 Supplemental Methods, Sections A.9, and A.10, and Supplementary Methods, sections A.9 and A.10, and Supplemental Methods, Sections A.9 and A.10, and Supplementary Methods,	Principle and what has been done to satisfy the principle?	Where in the manuscript is this described?
 2. Complete model documentation Pull model (including the fitting code) and documentation are available through OpenScienceFramework (OSF). The epidemiological model is fully described in the fitting study of Crump <i>et al</i> [1] and cost model in the Supplementary Methods. 3. Complete description of data used for fitting is described in Crump <i>et al</i> [1]. The data used for clinical outcomes and costs were estimates from the literature. No data from intervention operations was used. Assumptions and estimates were parameterized according to conventions in the economic evaluation literature [82] 4. Communicating uncertainty: The epidemiological parameters are the posterior distributions of a model fitted to im-series data, and full details are available in another publication [1]. For the parameterized according to conventions in the economic evaluation literature [82]. <i>Parameter uncertainty</i>: The epidemiological parameters are the posterior distributions of a model fitted to ime-series data, and full details are available in another publication [1]. For the parameterized according to conventions in the economic evaluation literature [82]. <i>Parameter uncertainty</i>: The epidemiological parameters are the posterior distributions of a spects for which we knew very little. <i>Prediction uncertainty</i>: model predictions. Tables 4 and 5 present both means and 95% prediction intervals. The GUT² includes box and whisker plots to show uncertainty in cases, deaths and DALYs. We include the probability of meeting EOT by 203 as well as the expected year of EOT. For cost-effective) at different willingness-to-pay thresholds rather than solely providing ICERs using the net benefits framework (see Supplementary Tables 24, 25, 26, 27). 5. Testable model outputs are rotinely reported metrics of the disease cours: give roting coverage and he unbroe of fixed health posts equipped for passive surveillance. Some components of cost pred	1. Stakeholder engagement Strategy components were determined along with the country director of PNLTHA, Erick Miaka (co-author). Implementation of simulations of AS and PS costs was aided by Rian Snijders, who has helped run field operations in former Bandundu. Implementation of costs of VC was aided by Andrew Hope, Iñaki Tirados, Sophie Dunkley, and Rian Snijders and collaborators at the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, who have run field operations in DRC since 2015.	Authorship list and acknowledgements
 3. Complete description of data used Information about the data used for fitting is described in Crump <i>et al</i> [1]. The data Information about the data used for fitting is described in Crump <i>et al</i> [1]. The data intervention operations was used. Assumptions and estimates were parameterized according to conventions in the economic evaluation literature [82] 4. Communicating uncertainty Structural uncertainty: Uncertainty: Parameter uncertainty: Parameter uncertainty: Parameter so model health outcomes and costs, assumptions of a model fitted to time-series data, and full details are available in another publication [1]. For the parameters to model health outcomes and costs, assumptions for aspects for which we knew very little. Prediction uncertainty: Observational uncertainty in epidemiological model predictions. Tables 4 and 5 present both means and 95% prediction intervals. The GUT² includes box and whisker plots to show uncertainty in cases, deaths and DALYs. We include the probability of meeting EOT by 2030 as well as the expected year of EOT. For cost-effectiveness results, we present the optimal decisions (the probability of meeting EOT by 2030 as well as the expected year of EOT. For cost-effectiveness results, we present the optimal decisions (the probability of each strategy being cost-effective) at different willingness-to-pay thresholds rather than solely providing ICERs using the net benefits framework (see Supplementary Tables 24, 25, 26, 27). Stetable model outcomes Epidemiological model outputs are routinely reported metrics of the disease course: detected active and passive case detections. Therefore, these predictions can be compared to future data as long as the data is put into context alongside measures of cast year until 2050 and by coordination and health zone can be viewed in the GUT². All the ingredients to the economic costs were shown in detail in the supplement stom Al.0.	2. Complete model documentation Full model (including the fitting code) and documentation are available through OpenScienceFramework (OSF). The epidemiological model is fully described in the fitting study of Crump <i>et al</i> [1] and cost model in the Supplementary Methods.	Description in Supplementary Methods, Sections A.1, through A.9 access the code via DRC_wholecountryCEA ¹ .
 4. Communicating uncertainty Structural uncertainty: Parameter uncertainty: Phe epidemiological parameters are the posterior distributions of a model fitted to time-series data, and full details are available in another publication [1]. For the parameters to model health outcomes and costs, assumptions and estimates were parameterized according to conventions in the economic evaluation literature [82], taking care to sample from large distributions for aspects for which we knew very little. Prediction uncertainty: Observational uncertainty in epidemiological model predictions. Tables 4 and 5 present both means and 95% prediction intervals. The GUI² includes box and whisker plots to show uncertainty in cases, deaths and DALYs. We include the probability of meeting EOT by 2030 as well as the expected year of EOT. For cost-effective) at different willingness-to-pay thresholds rather than solely providing ICERs using the net benefits framework (see Supplementary Tables 24, 25, 26, 27). 5. Testable model outcomes Epidemiological model outputs are routinely reported metrics of the disease course: date size sceneing coverage and the number of fixed health posts equipped for passive surveillance. Some components of cost predictions can be validated against expenditures, but it must be noted that these are economic costs, and so resource use for which there is no explicit invoice is taken into account as well. 	3. Complete description of data used Information about the data used for fitting is described in Crump <i>et al</i> [1]. The data used for clinical outcomes and costs were estimates from the literature. No data from intervention operations was used. Assumptions and estimates were parameterized according to conventions in the economic evaluation literature [82]	For assumptions around intervention, treatment effects and costs, see Supplemental Methods, Sections A.8, A.9, and A.10.
 Parameter uncertainty: The epidemiological parameters are the posterior distributions of a model fitted to time-series data, and full details are available in another publication [1]. For the parameters to model health outcomes and costs, assumptions and estimates were parameterized according to conventions in the economic evaluation literature [82], taking care to sample from large distributions for aspects for which we knew very little. Prediction uncertainty: Observational uncertainty in epidemiological model predictions. Tables 4 and 5 present both means and 95% prediction intervals. The GU1² includes box and whisker plots to show uncertainty in cases, deaths and DALYs. We include the probability of meeting EOT by 2030 as well as the expected year of EOT. For cost-effectiveness results, we present the optimal decisions (the probability of acch strategy being cost-effective) at different willingness-to-pay thresholds rather than solely providing ICERs using the net benefits framework (see Supplementary Tables 24, 25, 26, 27). 5. Testable model outcomes Epidemiological model outputs are routinely reported metrics of the disease course: detected active and passive case detections. Therefore, these predictions can be compared to future data as long as the data is put into context alongside measures of active screening coverage and the number of fixed health posts equipped for passive surveillance. Some components of cost predictions can be validated against expenditures, but it must be noted that these are economic costs, and so resource use for which there is no explicit invoice is taken into account as well. 	4. Communicating uncertainty <i>Structural uncertainty:</i> Uncertainty arising from the choice of vector control operation inputs, discounting, and time horizon are shown by re-running the entire analysis with alternative assumptions.	Main text results and discussion. Results with alternative time horizons and discounting are available in our GUI ² .
<i>Prediction uncertainty</i> : Observational uncertainty in epidemiological model predictions. Tables 4 and 5 present both means and 95% prediction intervals. The GUI ² includes box and whisker plots to show uncertainty in cases, deaths and DALYs. We include the probability of meeting EOT by 2030 as well as the expected year of EOT. For cost-effectiveness results, we present the optimal decisions (the probability of each strategy being cost-effective) at different willingness-to-pay thresholds rather than solely providing ICERs using the net benefits framework (see Supplementary Tables 24, 25, 26, 27). 5. Testable model outcomes Epidemiological model outputs are routinely reported metrics of the disease course: detected active and passive case detections. Therefore, these predictions can be compared to future data as long as the data is put into context alongside measures of active screening coverage and the number of fixed health posts equipped for passive surveillance. Some components of cost predictions can be validated against expenditures, but it must be noted that these are economic costs, and so resource use for which there is no explicit invoice is taken into account as well. Tables 2-4 of the manuscript and the GUI ⁴ . Tables 2-4 of the manuscript and the GUI ⁴ . Epidemiological projections for the period 2024-2040 are shown in Figure 5 for the whole country, and by coordination (aggragated and by year in Supplementary Figures 14-21. Epidemiological outcomes for each year until 2050 and by coordination and health zone can be viewed in the GUI ² . All the ingredients to the economic costs were shown in detail in the supplement section A.10.	Parameter uncertainty: The epidemiological parameters are the posterior distributions of a model fitted to time-series data, and full details are available in another publication [1]. For the parameters to model health outcomes and costs, assumptions and estimates were parameterized according to conventions in the economic evaluation literature [82], taking care to sample from large distributions for aspects for which we knew very little.	Epidemiological parameters are available on OSF DRC_wholecountryCEA ¹ . Health outcome and cost-effectiveness parameters: see Supplementary Methods, Sections A.9 and A.10, and Supplementary Note 4.
5. Testable model outcomes Epidemiological model outputs are routinely reported metrics of the disease course: detected active and passive case detections. Therefore, these predictions can be compared to future data as long as the data is put into context alongside measures of active screening coverage and the number of fixed health posts equipped for passive surveillance. Some components of cost predictions can be validated against expenditures, but it must be noted that these are economic costs, and so resource use for which there is no explicit invoice is taken into account as well. Epidemiological projections for the period 2024-2040 are shown in Figure 5 for the whole country, and by coordination (aggragated and by year in Supplementary Figures 14-21. Epidemiological outcomes for each year until 2050 and by coordination and health zone can be viewed in the GUI ² . All the ingredients to the economic costs were shown in detail in the supplement section A.10.	<i>Prediction uncertainty:</i> Observational uncertainty in epidemiological model predictions. Tables 4 and 5 present both means and 95% prediction intervals. The GUI^2 includes box and whisker plots to show uncertainty in cases, deaths and DALYs. We include the probability of meeting EOT by 2030 as well as the expected year of EOT. For cost-effectiveness results, we present the optimal decisions (the probability of each strategy being cost-effective) at different willingness-to-pay thresholds rather than solely providing ICERs using the net benefits framework (see Supplementary Tables 24, 25, 26, 27).	Tables 2-4 of the manuscript and the GUI^4 .
	5. Testable model outcomes Epidemiological model outputs are routinely reported metrics of the disease course: detected active and passive case detections. Therefore, these predictions can be compared to future data as long as the data is put into context alongside measures of active screening coverage and the number of fixed health posts equipped for passive surveillance. Some components of cost predictions can be validated against expenditures, but it must be noted that these are economic costs, and so resource use for which there is no explicit invoice is taken into account as well.	Epidemiological projections for the period 2024-2040 are shown in Figure 5 for the whole country, and by coordination (aggragated and by year in Supplementary Figures 14-21. Epidemiological outcomes for each year until 2050 and by coordination and health zone can be viewed in the GUI ² . All the ingredients to the economic costs were shown in detail in the supplement section A.10.

¹ DRC_wholecountryCEA with full address: https://osf.io/ezjxb/.
² GUI with full address: https://hatmepp.warwick.ac.uk/DRCCEA/v6/ 1

Supplementary Table 32: PRIME-NTD criteria fulfilment. We summarise how the NTD Modelling Consortium's "5 key principles of good modelling practice" have been met in the present study.

Section/item	Item No-	Recommendation	Reported on page no, line no
Title			
Title	1	Identify the study as an economic evaluation or use more specific terms such as "cost-effectiveness analysis", and describe the interventions compared.	Cover page
Abstract		deserve ale mer fondens compared.	
Abstract	2	Provide a structured summary of objectives, perspective, setting, methods (including study design and inputs), results (including base case and uncertainty analyses), and conclusions.	Abstract
Introduction	1	· · ·	1
Background and objectives	3	Provide an explicit statement of the broader context for the study. Present the study question and its relevance for health policy or practice decisions.	Introduction section, in particular the second-to-last and the last paragraph.
Methods	1		
Health economic analysis plan	4	Indicate whether a health economic analysis plan was developed and where available.	No previous protocol was published.
Study population	5	Describe characteristics of the study population (such as age range, demographics, socioeconomic, or clinical characteristics).	The population is described in the Supplementary Methods, Section A.2 and Supplementary Tables 1, and 2.
Settings and location	6	Provide relevant contextual information that may influence findings.	The location is described in the Supplementary Methods, Section A.2 and Supplementary Tables 1, and 2.
Comparators	7	Describe the interventions or strategies being compared and state why they were chosen.	Figure 1; second paragraph of the Results section; third section of the methods; and more detail in the Supplementary Methods, Section A.8, Supplementary Table 8, Supplementary Figure 7, and Supplementary Table 9.
Perspective	8	State the perspective(s) adopted by the study and the rationale.	Fourth subsection of the methods, "Cost-effectiveness analysis", in a subsection called "Costs".
Time horizon	9	State the time horizon over and why the horizon is appropriate.	Fourth subsection of the methods, "Cost-effectiveness analysis", in a subsection called "Economic evaluation and investment horizon".
Discount rate	10	Report the discount rate(s) and reason chosen.	Fourth subsection of the methods, "Cost-effectiveness analysis", in a subsection called "Economic evaluation and investment horizon". 3% is the recommended rate by WHO-CHOICE and the Gates Reference Case.

G Supplementary Note 5: CHEERS Checklist

(continued)			
Section/item	Item No	Recommendation	Reported on page no, line no
Selection of outcomes	11	Describe what outcomes were used as the measure(s) of benefit(s) and harm(s).	Fourth subsection of the methods, "Cost-effectiveness analysis", in a subsection called "Health outcomes". Moreover, Supplementary Methods, Sections A.9 and A.10.4 contain detailed explanations of how DALYs are calculated and how the natural history of HAT was considered.
Measurement of outcomes	12	Describe how outcomes used to capture benefit(s) and harm(s) were measured.	Outcomes were not measured, but were simulated. See the fourth subsection of the methods, "Outcome metrics". Effectiveness of AS, PS and VC strategies: model-based, treatment was sourced from the literature. Described in detail in Supplementary Methods, Section A.10.4, Supplementary Tables 20-21, and Supplementary Note 4, Section E.6.
Measurement and valuation of resources and costs	12	If applicable, describe the population and methods used to elicit preferences for outcomes.	The construction of programme costs are detailed in Supplementary Methods, Section A.10. As can be seen, in a publication of this scope, detailing the cost inputs in the main body would be unfeasible. However, the resulting expected costs are in Figure 5 of the main body of the paper, as well as in 22 broken down by activity, and in 23 broken down by coordination. In the GUI, one may find the costs broken down by activity by health zone, coordination, and the country for under a variety of sensitivity analyses.
Currency, price date, and conversion	15	Report the dates of the estimated resource quantities and unit costs, plus the currency and year of conversion.	Fourth subsection of the methods, "Cost-effectiveness analysis", in a subsection called "Costs". Our general approach for this is in the section "Principles for parameterization" in Supplementary Note 4, Section E.1, followed by the specific choices for each parameter.
Rationale and description of model	16	If modelling is used, describe in detail and why used. Report if the model is publicly available and where it can be accessed.	The decision analytic model is illustrated in detail in Supplementary Figure 9 and in full in Supplementary Figure 10, but the components models feeding into the decision analytic model are described as follows: the dynamic transmission (SEIRS) model is described briefly in the third methods section and Supplementary Methods, Section A.1 and pictured in Supplementary Figure 2, and the treatment model is described briefly in Supplementary Methods, Section A.9 and shown in Supplementary Figure 8.

(continued)			
Section/item	Item No	Recommendation	Reported on page no, line no
Analytics & assumptions	17	Describe any methods for analysing or statistically transforming data, any extrapolation methods, and approaches for validating any model used.	The transmission and treatment models are discussed in the Supplementary Methods, Sections A.1-A.7. The treatment model is described in detail in Sections A.9. Assumptions are described in detail in Supplementary Methods, Section A.10 and the parameter glossary in Supplementary Note 4.
Characterising heterogeneity	18	Describe any methods used for estimating how the results of the study vary for subgroups.	Heterogeneity across health zones and across coordinations was characterised by aggregation and disaggregation, showing how different geographic portions of the country may need different resources and investments to reach disease control and elimination goals.
Characterising distributional effects	19	Describe how impacts are distributed across different individuals or adjustments made to reflect priority populations.	Because there were no subgroups, there were no distributional effects. The differential impacts of treatment on poorer or less poor individuals were beyond the scope of this paper.
Characterising uncertainty	20	Describe methods to characterise any sources of uncertainty in the analysis.	The epidemiological parameters are the posterior distributions of a model fitted to time-series data, and full details are available in the Supplementary Methods, SectionsA.5-A.7. For the parameters to model health outcomes and costs, assumptions and estimates were parameterized according to conventions in the economic evaluation literature [82], taking care to sample from large distributions for aspects for which we knew very little. Epidemiological parameters are available on OSF https://osf.io/ezjxb/. Health outcome and cost-effectiveness parameters: see Table 1 and Supplementary Note 4.
Approach to engagement with patients and others affected by the study	21	Describe any approaches to engage patients or service recipients, the general public, communities, or stakeholders (such as clinicians or payers) in the others affected by the study.	Strategy components were determined along with the country director of PNLTHA, Dr. Erick Miaka and other PNLTHA members, Chancy Shampa, and Junior Lebuki (co-authors). Implementation of simulations of AS and PS costs was aided by information from Rian Snijders and Paul Verlé (co-authors), who has helped with operations in Bandundu Coordination and collaborators at the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Andrew Hope, Iñaki Tirados, and Sophie Dunkley (co-authors) who have run vector control field operations in DRC since 2015.

(continued)			
Section/item	Item No	Recommendation	Reported on page no, line no
Results			
Study parameters	22	Report the values, ranges, references, and, if used, probability distributions for all parameters. Report reasons or sources for distributions used to represent uncertainty where appropriate. Providing a table to show the input values is strongly recommended.	Table 1 and described in more detail in Supplementary Note 4.
Incremental costs and outcomes	23	For each intervention, report mean values for the main categories of estimated costs and outcomes of interest, as well as mean differences between the comparator groups. If applicable, report incremental cost-effectiveness ratios.	For four sample health zones, the intermediate outcomes are in Supplementary Tables 24-27; for the whole country, the outcomes can be found in 5 and 4; for each coordination, the results are in 14-21. For the whole country, the cost-effectiveness results are in Figures 2 and 3 and the same results can be found per coordination in Supplementary Figure 13.
Effect of uncertainty	24	Model-based economic evaluation: Describe the effects on the results of uncertainty for all input parameters, and uncertainty related to the structure of the model and assumptions.	For four sample health zones, the effect of uncertainty on the cost-effectiveness are shown in Supplementary Tables 24-27. The interpretation is in the Supplementary Methods, Section A.11. For all other health zones, the results of uncertainty on the CEA is shown in the GUI: GUI. The effect of uncertainty on the Elimination of Transmission goal is shown in Figure 3. The interpretation of the uncertainty is in the Results section.
Effect of engagement with patients and others affected by the study	25	Report on any difference patient/service recipient, the general public, community, or stakeholder involvement made to the approach or findings of the study	Our engagement with the stakeholders (co-authors) was iterative throughout the process
Discussion			
Study findings, limitations, generalisabil- ity, and current knowledge	26	Summarise key study findings and describe how they support the conclusions reached. Discuss limitations and the generalisability of the findings and how the findings fit with current knowledge.	Discussion.
Other relevant	informa		
Source of funding	27	Describe now the study was funded and the role of the funder in the identification, design, conduct, and reporting of the analysis. Describe other non-monetary sources of support.	Funding statement.

(continued)			
Section/item	Item	Recommendation	Reported on page no, line no
	No		
Conflicts of	28	Describe any potential for conflict of	Conflict of interest statement.
interest		interest of study contributors in accordance	
		with journal policy. In the absence of a	
		journal policy, we recommend authors	
		comply with the International Committee	
		of Medical Journal Editors	
		recommendations.	

H Supplementary References

- Crump RE, Huang CI, Knock ES, Spencer SEF, Brown PE, Mwamba Miaka E, Shampa C, Keeling MJ, and Rock KS. Quantifying epidemiological drivers of gambiense human African Trypanosomiasis across the Democratic Republic of Congo. PLOS Computational Biology 2021 Jan; 17. Ed. by Perkins A:e1008532. doi: 10.1371/ journal.pcbi.1008532. Available from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008532
- 2. Crump RE, Huang CI, Spencer SE, Brown PE, Shampa C, Miaka EM, and Rock KS. Modelling to infer the role of animals in gambiense human African trypanosomiasis transmission and elimination in the DRC. PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2022; 16:1–23. DOI: 10.1371/JOURNAL.PNTD.0010599
- 3. Rock KS, Torr SJ, Lumbala C, and Keeling MJ. Predicting the Impact of Intervention Strategies for Sleeping Sickness in Two High-Endemicity Health Zones of the Democratic Republic of Congo. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2017; 11:1–17. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0005162
- 4. Huang CI, Crump RE, Brown PE, Spencer SE, Miaka EM, Shampa C, Keeling MJ, and Rock KS. Identifying regions for enhanced control of gambiense sleeping sickness in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Nature Communications 2022; 13:1–11. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-022-29192-w
- Antillon M, Huang CI, Crump RE, Brown PE, Snijders R, Miaka EM, Keeling MJ, Rock KS, and Tediosi F. Cost-effectiveness of sleeping sickness elimination campaigns in five settings of the Democratic Republic of Congo. Nature Communications 2022 Dec; 13:1051. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-022-28598-w. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.25.20181982%20https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-022-28598-w
- 6. Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Journees Nationales de Vaccination (JNV) activities de vaccination supplementaire, RDC. Available from: https://data.humdata.org/dataset/rdc-statistiquesdes-populations
- 7. The World Factbook. Congo, Democratic Republic of the -. Available from: https://www.cia.gov/theworld-factbook/countries/congo-democratic-republic-of-the/#people-and-society
- 8. World Population Prospects 2022, Online Edition. Tech. rep. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2022
- 9. Franco JR, Cecchi G, Paone M, Diarra A, Grout L, Ebeja AK, Simarro PP, Zhao W, and Argaw D. The elimination of human African trypanosomiasis: Achievements in relation to WHO road map targets for 2020. PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2022; 16:1–19. DOI: 10.1371/JOURNAL.PNTD.0010047. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0010047
- 10. American Red Cross. DRC Health Zone and Health Area boundaries. 2020 Feb. Available from: https://data.humdata.org/dataset/drc-health-data
- 11. Davis CN, Crump RE, Sutherland SA, Spencer SE, Corbella A, Chansy S, Lebuki J, Mwamba Miaka E, and Rock KS. Comparison of stochastic and deterministic models for gambiense sleeping sickness at different spatial scales: A health area analysis in the DRC. medRxiv 2023 :2023–8
- 12. The World Bank. Data:Democratic Republic of Congo. Accessed: 2015. 2015. Available from: https://data.worldbank.org/country/congo-dem-rep?view=chart
- 13. Rogers D. A general model for the African trypanosomiases. Parasitology 1988; 97:193–212
- 14. Checchi F, Filipe JAN, Barrett MP, and Chandramohan D. The natural progression of *Gambiense* sleeping sickness: What is the evidence? PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2008 Dec; 2:e303
- Checchi F, Funk S, Chandramohan D, Haydon DT, and Chappuis F. Updated estimate of the duration of the meningo-encephalitic stage in gambiense human African trypanosomiasis. BMC Research Notes 2015; 8:8–10. DOI: 10.1186/s13104-015-1244-3
- 16. Mpanya A, Hendrickx D, Vuna M, Kanyinda A, Lumbala C, Tshilombo V, Mitashi P, Luboya O, Kande V, Boelaert M, Lefèvre P, and Lutumba P. Should I get screened for sleeping sickness? A qualitative study in Kasai province, Democratic Republic of Congo. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2012 Jan; 6:e1467
- 17. Checchi F, Chappuis F, Karunakara U, Priotto G, and Chandramohan D. Accuracy of Five Algorithms to Diagnose *Gambiense* Human African Trypanosomiasis. PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2011 Jul; 5:e1233–15

- Davis S, Aksoy S, and Galvani A. A global sensitivity analysis for African sleeping sickness. Parasitology 2011; 138:516–26
- 19. Ravel S, Grébaut P, Cuisance D, and Cuny G. Monitoring the developmental status of *Trypanosoma brucei* gambiense in the tsetse fly by means of PCR analysis of anal and saliva drops. Acta Tropica 2003; 88:161–5
- 20. WHO Expert Committee on human African trypanosomiasis. Control and surveillance of human African trypanosomiasis: report of a WHO expert committee. Tech. rep. 2013 :237. Available from: https://www.who.int/trypanosomiasis_african/surveillance/en/
- Rock KS, Torr SJ, Lumbala C, and Keeling MJ. Quantitative evaluation of the strategy to eliminate human African trypanosomiasis in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Parasites and Vectors 2015; 8:1–13. DOI: 10.1186/s13071-015-1131-8. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13071-015-1131-8
- 22. Clausen PH, Adeyemi I, Bauer B, Breloeer M, Salchow F, and Staak C. Host preferences of tsetse (Diptera: Glossinidae) based on bloodmeal identifications. Medical and Veterinary Entomology 1998 Mar; 12:169–80
- 23. Mitashi P, Hasker E, Mbo F, Van Geertruyden JP, Kaswa M, Lumbala C, Boelaert M, and Lutumba P. Integration of diagnosis and treatment of sleeping sickness in primary healthcare facilities in the democratic republic of the congo. Tropical Medicine and International Health 2015; 20:98–105. DOI: 10.1111/tmi.12404
- 24. Mulenga P, Boelaert M, Lutumba P, Kelen CV, Coppieters Y, Chenge F, Lumbala C, Luboya O, and Mpanya A. Integration of Human African trypanosomiasis control activities into primary health services in the democratic republic of the Congo: A qualitative study of stakeholder perceptions. American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene 2019; 100:899–906. DOI: 10.4269/ajtmh.18-0382
- Rock KS, Huang CI, Crump RE, Bessell PR, Brown PE, Tirados I, Solano P, Antillon M, Picado A, Mbainda S, Darnas J, Crowley EH, Torr SJ, and Peka M. Update of transmission modelling and projections of gambiense human African trypanosomiasis in the Mandoul focus, Chad. Infectious Diseases of Poverty 2022; 11:1–13. DOI: 10.1186/s40249-022-00934-8. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40249-022-00934-8
- 26. Antillon M, Huang CI, Sutherland SA, Crump RE, Bessell PR, Shaw APM, Tirados I, Picado A, Biéler S, Brown PE, Solano P, Mbainda S, Darnas J, Wang-Steverding X, Crowley EH, Peka M, Tediosi F, and Rock KS. Health economic evaluation of strategies to eliminate gambiense human African trypanosomiasis in the Mandoul disease focus of Chad. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2023 Jul; 17. Ed. by Mireji PO:e0011396. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0011396. Available from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0011396
- 27. Snijders R, Fukinsia A, Claeys Y, Hasker E, Mpanya A, Miaka E, Meheus F, and Boelaert M. Costs and outcomes of integrated human African trypanosomiasis surveillance system using rapid diagnostic tests, Democratic Republic of the Congo. Emerging Infectious Diseases 2021; 27:2144–53. DOI: 10.3201/eid2708.202399
- 28. Castaño MS, Ndeffo-Mbah ML, Rock KS, Palmer C, Knock E, Mwamba Miaka E, Ndung'u JM, Torr S, Verlé P, Spencer SEF, Galvani A, Bever C, Keeling MJ, and Chitnis N. Assessing the impact of aggregating disease stage data in model predictions of human African trypanosomiasis transmission and control activities in Bandundu province (DRC). PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2020 Jan; 14:1–16. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0007976. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0007976
- 29. Van Nieuwenhove S. Défis en matière de diagnostic de la Trypanosomiase Humaine Africaine: Evalution du projet de MSF OCG à Dingila, RDC. Tech. rep. Médecins sans Frontières, 2015
- 30. Tirados I, Hope A, Selby R, Mpembele F, Miaka EM, Boelaert M, Lehane MJ, Torr SJ, and Stanton MC. Impact of tiny targets on Glossina fuscipes quanzensis, the primary vector of human African trypanosomiasis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2020 Oct; 14. Ed. by Matovu E:e0008270. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0008270. Available from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0008270
- 31. Aliee M, Rock KS, and Keeling MJ. Estimating the distribution of time to extinction of infectious diseases in mean-field approaches. Journal of the Royal Society Interface 2020; 17:20200540
- 32. Davis CN, Crump RE, Sutherland SA, Spencer SEF, Corbella A, Chansy S, Lebuki J, Miaka EM, and Rock KS. Comparison of stochastic and deterministic models for *gambiense* sleeping sickness at different spatial scales: A health area analysis in the DRC. MedRxiv 2023

- Touloupou P, Alzahrani N, Neal P, Spencer SEF, and McKinley TJ. Efficient Model Comparison Techniques for Models Requiring Large Scale Data Augmentation. Bayesian Anal. 2018 Jun; 13:437–59. doi: 10.1214/17-BA1057. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1214/17-BA1057
- 34. Hesterberg T. Weighted Average Importance Sampling and Defensive Mixture Distributions. Technometrics 1995; 37:185–94. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/1269620
- 35. Simarro PP, Cecchi G, Franco JR, Paone M, Diarra A, Ruiz-Postigo JA, Mattioli RC, and Jannin JG. Mapping the capacities of fixed health facilities to cover people at risk of gambiense human African trypanosomiasis. International Journal of Health Geographics 2014; 13. DOI: 10.1186/1476-072X-13-4
- 36. Murray CJ. Quantifying the burden of disease: The technical basis for disability-adjusted life years. Bulletin of the World Health Organization 1994; 72:429–45. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(96)07495-8
- 37. World Health Organization. Making Choices in Health: WHO guide to cost-effectiveness analysis. Tech. rep. Geneva, Switzerland, 2003 :318
- 38. Claxton KP, Revill P, Sculpher M, Wilkinson T, Cairns J, and Briggs A. The Gates Reference Case for Economic Evaluation. Tech. rep. April. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2014 :1–68. Available from: https://pure.york.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/the-gates-reference-case-for-economicevaluation(2663ebb2-e102-48c1-af2f-3a482a2eaae0)/export.html
- 39. Rushby JA and Hanson K. Calculating and presenting disability adjusted life years (DALYs) in cost-effectiveness analysis. Health Policy and Planning 2001 Sep; 16:326–31. DOI: 10.1093/heapol/16.3.326. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/heapol/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/heapol/16.3.326
- 40. Snijders R, Fukinsia A, Claeys Y, Mpanya A, Hasker E, Meheus F, Miaka E, and Boelaert M. Cost of a new method of active screening for human African trypanosomiasis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2020 Dec; 14. Ed. by Ndung'u JM:e0008832. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0008832. Available from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0008832
- 41. Franco JR, Cecchi G, Priotto G, Paone M, Diarra A, Grout L, Simarro PP, Zhao W, and Argaw D. Monitoring the elimination of human African trypanosomiasis at continental and country level: Update to 2018. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2020 May; 14. Ed. by Matovu E:e0008261. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0008261. Available from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0008261
- 42. Snijders R, Shaw APM, Selby R, Tirados I, Bessell PR, Fukinsia A, Miaka E, Tediosi F, Hasker E, and Antillon M. The cost of sleeping sickness vector control in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. medRxiv 2024 Jan :2024.02.02.24302172. DOI: 10.1101/2024.02.02.24302172. Available from: http://medrxiv.org/ content/early/2024/02/03/2024.02.02.24302172.abstract
- 43. WHO Department of Control of Neglected Tropical Diseases. WHO interim guidelines for the treatment of gambiense human African trypanosomiasis. Tech. rep. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, 2019. Available from: https://www.who.int/trypanosomiasis_african/resources/9789241550567/en/
- 44. Jeffreys H. The Theory of Probability. Oxford Classic Texts in the Physical Sciences. OUP Oxford, 1998. Available from: https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=vh9Act9rtzQC
- 45. Bertram MY, Lauer JA, Joncheere KD, Edejer T, Hutubessy R, Kieny P, Hill SR, and Bertram MY. Cost effectiveness thresholds: pros and cons. Bull World Health Organization 2016; 94:925–30. DOI: 10.2471/BLT. 15.164418
- Marseille E, Larson B, Kazi DS, Kahn JG, and Rosen S. Thresholds for the cost–effectiveness of interventions: Alternative approaches. Bulletin of the World Health Organization 2015; 93:118–24. DOI: 10.2471/BLT.14. 138206
- 47. Woods B, Revill P, Sculpher M, and Claxton K. Country-Level Cost-Effectiveness Thresholds: Initial Estimates and the Need for Further Research. Value in Health 2016; 19:929–35. DOI: 10.1016/j.jval.2016.02.017. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2016.02.017
- 48. Briggs A, Claxton K, and Sculpher M. Decision Modelling for Health Economic Evaluation. First. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2006
- 49. Cook JD. Determining distribution parameters from quantiles. 2010 Jan. Available from: https://www.johndcook.com/quantiles_parameters.pdf

- 50. Joseph L and Bélisle P. beta.parms.from.quantiles: [R] Computing Beta distribution parameters. 2017. Available from: http://www.medicine.mcgill.ca/epidemiology/joseph/pbelisle/BetaParmsFromQuantiles. html
- 51. Lutumba P, Meheus F, Robays J, Miaka C, Kande V, Büscher P, Dujardin B, and Boelaert M. Cost-effectiveness of Algorithms for Confirmation Test of Human African Trypanosomiasis. Emerging Infectious Diseases 2007 Oct; 13:1484–90. DOI: 10.3201/eid1310.060358. Available from: http://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/13/10/06-0358_article.htm
- 52. Bessell PR, Lumbala C, Lutumba P, Baloji S, Biéler S, and Ndung'u JM. Cost-effectiveness of using a rapid diagnostic test to screen for human African trypanosomiasis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. PLOS ONE 2018 Sep; 13. Ed. by Arez AP:e0204335. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0204335. Available from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0204335
- 53. Mitashi P, Hasker E, Lejon V, Kande V, Muyembe JJ, Lutumba P, and Boelaert M. Human African Trypanosomiasis Diagnosis in First-Line Health Services of Endemic Countries, a Systematic Review. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2012; 6. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0001919
- 54. Jamonneau V, Camara O, Ilboudo H, Peylhard M, Koffi M, Sakande H, N'Dri L, Sanou D, Dama E, Camara M, and Lejon V. Accuracy of Individual Rapid Tests for Serodiagnosis of Gambiense Sleeping Sickness in West Africa. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2015; 9:1–9. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0003480
- 55. Eperon G, Schmid C, Loutan L, and Chappuis F. Clinical presentation and treatment outcome of sleeping sickness in Sudanese pre-school children. Acta Tropica 2006 Jan; 101:31–9. DOI: 10.1016/j.actatropica.2006.12.002. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0001706X06002439
- 56. Schmid C, Kuemmerle A, Blum J, Ghabri S, Kande V, Mutombo W, Ilunga M, Lumpungu I, Mutanda S, Nganzobo P, Tete D, Mubwa N, Kisala M, Blesson S, and Mordt OV. In-Hospital Safety in Field Conditions of Nifurtimox Eflornithine Combination Therapy (NECT) for T. b. gambiense Sleeping Sickness. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2012; 6. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0001920
- 57. Mesu VKBK, Kalonji WM, Bardonneau C, Mordt OV, Blesson S, Simon F, Delhomme S, Bernhard S, Kuziena W, Lubaki JPF, Vuvu SL, Ngima PN, Mbembo HM, Ilunga M, Bonama AK, Heradi JA, Solomo JLL, Mandula G, Badibabi LK, Dama FR, Lukula PK, Tete DN, Lumbala C, Scherrer B, Strub-Wourgaft N, and Tarral A. Oral fexinidazole for late-stage African Trypanosoma brucei gambiense trypanosomiasis: a pivotal multicentre, randomised, non-inferiority trial. The Lancet 2018; 391:144–54. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32758-7
- 58. Priotto G, Fogg C, Balasegaram M, Erphas O, Louga A, Checchi F, Ghabri S, and Piola P. Three Drug Combinations for Late-Stage Trypanosoma brucei gambiense Sleeping Sickness: A Randomized Clinical Trial in Uganda. PLOS Clinical Trials 2006; 1:e39. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pctr.0010039
- Priotto G, Kasparian S, Ngouama D, Ghorashian S, Arnold U, Ghabri S, and Karunakara U. Nifurtimox-Eflornithine Combination Therapy for Second-Stage Trypanosoma brucei gambiense Sleeping Sickness: A Randomized Clinical Trial in Congo. Clinical Infectious Diseases 2007; 45:1435–42. DOI: 10.1086/522982
- 60. Checchi F, Piola P, Ayikoru H, Thomas F, Legros D, and Priotto G. Nifurtimox plus effornithine for latestage sleeping sickness in Uganda: A case series. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2007; 1:1–6. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0000064
- 61. Priotto G, Kasparian S, Mutombo W, Ngouama D, Ghorashian S, Arnold U, Ghabri S, Baudin E, Buard V, Kazadi-Kyanza S, Ilunga M, Mutangala W, Pohlig G, Schmid C, Karunakara U, Torreele E, and Kande V. Nifurtimoxeflornithine combination therapy for second-stage African Trypanosoma brucei gambiense trypanosomiasis: a multicentre, randomised, phase III, non-inferiority trial. The Lancet 2009; 374:56–64. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61117-X. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61117-X
- 62. Ngoyi DM, Lejon V, Pyana P, Boelaert M, Ilunga M, Menten J, Mulunda JP, Van Nieuwenhove S, Muyembe Tamfum JJ, and Büscher P. How to Shorten Patient Follow-Up after Treatment for Trypanosoma brucei gambiense Sleeping Sickness. The Journal of Infectious Diseases 2010; 201:453–63. doi: 10.1086/649917
- 63. Burri C, Yeramian PD, Allen JL, Merolle A, Serge KK, Mpanya A, Lutumba P, Mesu VKBK, Bilenge CMM, Lubaki JPF, Mpoto AM, Thompson M, Munungu BF, Manuel F, Josenando T, Bernhard SC, Olson CA, Blum J, Tidwell RR, and Pohlig G. Efficacy, Safety, and Dose of Pafuramidine, a New Oral Drug for Treatment of First Stage Sleeping Sickness, in a Phase 2a Clinical Study and Phase 2b Randomized Clinical Studies. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2016; 10:1–18. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0004362

- 64. Pohlig G, Bernhard SC, Blum J, Burri C, Mpanya A, Lubaki JPF, Mpoto AM, Munungu BF, N'tombe PM, Deo GKM, Mutantu PN, Kuikumbi FM, Mintwo AF, Munungi AK, Dala A, Macharia S, Bilenge CMM, Mesu VKBK, Franco JR, Dituvanga ND, Tidwell RR, and Olson CA. Efficacy and Safety of Pafuramidine versus Pentamidine Maleate for Treatment of First Stage Sleeping Sickness in a Randomized, Comparator-Controlled, International Phase 3 Clinical Trial. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2016; 10:1–17. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0004363
- 65. Kansiime F, Adibaku S, Wamboga C, Idi F, Kato CD, Yamuah L, Vaillant M, Kioy D, Olliaro P, and Matovu E. A multicentre, randomised, non-inferiority clinical trial comparing a nifurtimox-effornithine combination to standard effornithine monotherapy for late stage Trypanosoma brucei gambiense human African trypanosomiasis in Uganda. Parasites and Vectors 2018; 11:1–11. DOI: 10.1186/s13071-018-2634-x
- 66. Balasegaram M, Harris S, Checchi F, Hamel C, and Karunakara U. Treatment outcomes and risk factors for relapse in patients with early-stage human African trypanosomiasis (HAT) in the Republic of the Congo. Bulletin of the World Health Organization 2006; 84:777–82. DOI: 10.2471/BLT.05.028399
- 67. Bastide S, Priotto G, Ecochard R, and Etard JF. Effectiveness of short vs. long treatment schedules with pentamidine in first-stage HAT: a large field cohort study. Tropical Medicine & International Health 2011; 16:68–9. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/toc/13653156/2011/16/s1
- Alirol E, Schrumpf D, Amici Heradi J, Riedel A, De Patoul C, Quere M, and Chappuis F. Nifurtimox-effornithine combination therapy for second-stage gambiense human African trypanosomiasis: Médecins Sans Frontières experience in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Clinical Infectious Diseases 2013; 56:195–203. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cis886
- 69. Hasker E, Lutumba P, Chappuis F, Kande V, Potet J, De Weggheleire A, Kambo C, Depoortere E, Pécoul B, and Boelaert M. Human African Trypanosomiasis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo: A Looming Emergency? PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2012; 6:e1950. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0001950
- 70. World Bank. Life expectancy at birth, total (years). Washington, DC., 2020. Available from: https://data. worldbank.org/indicator/SP.DYN.LE00.IN?locations=CD
- GBD 2017 DALYs and HALE Collaborators. Global, regional, and national disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) for 359 diseases and injuries and healthy life expectancy (HALE) for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2017: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. The Lancet 2018; 392:1859–922. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32335-3
- Hackett F, Berrang Ford L, Fèvre E, and Simarro P. Incorporating Scale Dependence in Disease Burden Estimates: The Case of Human African Trypanosomiasis in Uganda. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 2014; 8. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0002704
- 73. Sutherland CS, Stone CM, Steinmann P, Tanner M, and Tediosi F. Seeing beyond 2020: an economic evaluation of contemporary and emerging strategies for elimination of Trypanosoma brucei gambiense. The Lancet Global Health 2017 Jan; 5:e69–e79. DOI: 10.1016/S2214-109X(16)30237-6. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(16)30237-6%20https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2214109X16302376
- 74. Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine. Use of Tiny Targets to control tsetse flies in Gambian HAT foci: standard operating procedures. Tech. rep. October. 2016
- 75. Keating J, Yukich JO, Sutherland CS, Woods G, and Tediosi F. Human African trypanosomiasis prevention, treatment and control costs: A systematic review. Acta Tropica 2015 Oct; 150:4–13. DOI: 10.1016/j.actatropica.2015.06.003. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.actatropica.2015.06.003%20https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0001706X15300267
- 76. Lutumba P, Robays J, Miaka C, Kande V, Simarro PP, Shaw APM, Dujardin B, and Boelaert M. Efficience de differentes strategies de detection de la Trypanosomiase Humaine Africaine aT. b. gambiense. Tropical Medicine and International Health 2005 Apr; 10:347–56. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-3156.2005.01391.x. Available from: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-3156.2005.01391.x
- 77. Irurzun-Lopez M, Erondu NA, Djibo A, Griffiths U, Stuart JM, Fernandez K, Ronveaux O, Le Gargasson JB, Gessner BD, and Colombini A. The actual and potential costs of meningitis surveillance in the African meningitis belt: Results from Chad and Niger. Vaccine 2016; 34:1133–8. DOI: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.10.045. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.10.045

- 78. Bertram MY, Stenberg K, Brindley C, Li J, Serje J, Watts R, and Edejer TTT. Disease control programme support costs: an update of WHO-CHOICE methodology, price databases and quantity assumptions. Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation 2017 Dec; 15:21. DOI: 10.1186/s12962-017-0083-6. Available from: http://resource-allocation.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12962-017-0083-6
- 79. Stenberg K, Lauer JA, Gkountouras G, Fitzpatrick C, and Stanciole A. Econometric estimation of WHO-CHOICE country-specific costs for inpatient and outpatient health service delivery. Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation 2018; 16:1–15. DOI: 10.1186/s12962-018-0095-x. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12962-018-0095-x
- 80. Laokri S, Soelaeman R, and Hotchkiss DR. Assessing out-of-pocket expenditures for primary health care: How responsive is the Democratic Republic of Congo health system to providing financial risk protection? BMC Health Services Research 2018; 18:1–19. DOI: 10.1186/s12913-018-3211-x
- Simarro PP, Diarra A, Ruiz Postigo JA, Franco JR, and Jannin JG. The human African trypanosomiasis control and surveillance programme of the World Health Organization 2000-2009: the way forward. eng. PLOS neglected tropical diseases 2011 Feb; 5:e1007. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0001007
- 82. Briggs AH, Goeree R, Blackhouse G, and O'Brien BJ. Probabilistic Analysis of Cost-Effectiveness Models: Choosing between Treatment Strategies for Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease. Medical Decision Making 2002 Aug; 22:290–308. DOI: 10.1177/0272989X0202200408. Available from: http://mdm.sagepub.com/cgi/ doi/10.1177/0272989X0202200408