Resistance diagnostics as a public health tool to combat antibiotic resistance: A model-based evaluation

Short title: **Resistance diagnostics as a tool to reverse selection on resistance**

David McAdams*[1], Kristofer Wollein Waldetoft[2], Christine Tedijanto[3], Marc Lipsitch[3] and Sam P. Brown*[2]

1. Department of Economics and Fuqua School of Business, Duke University
2. School of Biological Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology
3. Center for Communicable Disease Dynamics, Department of Epidemiology and Department of Immunology and Infectious Diseases, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health

*Corresponding authors

Keywords: Antibiotic resistance, molecular diagnostics, opportunistic pathogens, conditional strategies

Abstract

Rapid point-of-care resistance diagnostics (POC-RD) are a key tool in the fight against antibiotic resistance. By tailoring drug choice to infection genotype, doctors can improve treatment efficacy while limiting costs of inappropriate antibiotic prescription. Here we combine epidemiological theory and data to assess the potential of RD innovations in a public health context, as a means to limit or even reverse selection for antibiotic resistance. POC-RD can be used to impose a non-biological fitness cost on resistant strains, by enabling diagnostic-informed treatment and targeted interventions that reduce resistant strains' opportunities for transmission. We assess this diagnostic-imposed fitness cost in the context of a spectrum of bacterial population biologies, and find that the expected impact varies from selection against resistance for obligate pathogens to marginal public health improvements for opportunistic pathogens with high 'bystander' antibiotic exposure during asymptomatic carriage (e.g. the pneumococcus). We close by generalizing the notion of RD-informed strategies to incorporate carriage surveillance information, and illustrate that coupling transmission-control interventions to the discovery of resistant strains in carriage can potentially select against resistance in a broad range of opportunistic pathogens.

Introduction

> "Because antibiotic resistance occurs as part of a natural evolution
> process, it can be significantly slowed but not stopped. Therefore, new
> antibiotics will always be needed to keep up with resistant bacteria."
> (CDC, "Antibiotic Resistance Threats in the United States, 2013") (1)

The antimicrobial resistance crisis threatens to undermine key features of modern medicine, at great costs in terms of patient morbidity, mortality and treatment expense (2–6). Current mainstream antibiotic-treatment strategies sow the seeds of their own downfall by strongly selecting for resistant strains, leading some to argue that continual new-antibiotic discovery is the only way to stay ahead of a "post-antibiotic future" (1, 7, 8). If this bleak vision is correct, there is an urgent need to buy time by extending the lifespan of existing antibiotics while research and development for new ones takes its course. More optimistically, it may be possible to improve how we use existing antibiotics and to implement other control measures so that an endless supply of new antibiotics is not required.

Among a number of innovative approaches to improve antibiotic use (9–15), one of the most promising leverages point-of-care resistance diagnostics (POC-RD) that provide prescribers with a rapid readout of the sensitivity/resistance profile of an infecting organism. POC-RD allows prescribers to choose older, cheaper, and/or narrower-spectrum antibiotics when such drugs are most appropriate for patients, thereby saving newer, more expensive, and/or broader-spectrum antibiotics for situations where they are really needed, and perhaps reducing the intensity of selection for resistance to these drugs (16–18).

Less often considered is a second potential benefit of resistance diagnosis: to enable "Search & Destroy" (S&D) tactics to combat the most dangerous resistant pathogen strains, such as methicillin-resistant *Staphyloccus aureus* (MRSA) and carbapenem-resistant *Enterobacteriaceae* (CRE) (19–24). S&D strategies aim to identify and then isolate patients who are carrying problematic resistant strains until pathogen clearance can be confirmed. If resistant strains can be rapidly, accurately identified and their transmission curtailed by targeted infection-control measures, then S&D can create a *non-biological diagnostic-imposed fitness cost* borne only by targeted resistant strains. However, the magnitude of this fitness cost is hotly debated, especially in the context of MRSA control (25, 26), and, in any event, intensive medical interventions such as patient isolation are not a practical or economical option in many circumstances.

In this paper, we ask: when it is possible to create *net selection against resistance*, even when (i) there are no biological fitness costs associated with resistance, (ii) the best available treatment cannot be withheld from any patient, and (iii) all non-antibiotic intervention options are only moderately effective. We define "net selection against resistance" as maintaining the fitness of one or more resistant strains below that of the drug-sensitive strain, so that the frequency of these resistant strains will decline toward zero. This can be accomplished, generally speaking, when diagnostics permit medical personnel to artificially shape the pathogen fitness landscape so that resistant strains are disproportionately disadvantaged. We show that the potential to reduce or even reverse selection on resistance depends on two key factors. (i) <u>Pathogen lifestyle</u>: is symptomatic disease tightly coupled to transmission (obligate pathogen), or can the pathogen also transmit from an asymptomatic carriage phase (opportunistic pathogen)?

80 (ii) Pan resistance: are untreatable pan-resistant strains already in circulation? Table 1

81 offers a preview of our main findings in a simple setting with two equally-effective

82 antibiotic-treatment options, "drug 1" (first-line treatment to which resistance has already

83 emerged in the target-pathogen population) and "drug 2" (second-line treatment to

84 which resistance may or may not have already emerged).

Lifestyle	Pan-resistant	Key findings
Simple Obligate	No	Net selection against drug-1 resistance is **possible**.
Simple Obligate	Yes	Net selection against pan resistance is **possible only if** *either* there are substantial biological fitness costs associated with pan resistance *or* a highly-effective infection intervention ("isolation") is available.
Opportunistic	No/Yes	Net selection against drug-1 resistance **may be impossible**, even if all those with sensitive infection are left untreated and all those with drug-1-resistant infection could be targeted for isolation—**unless interventions are also conditioned on asymptomatic carriage RD**

Table 1: Preview of main findings.

Methods

We describe a mathematical model for a single pathogen species ("target pathogen")

with multiple strains having different antibiotic susceptibilities, in which health care

providers and public health officials (hereafter "providers") can shape the pathogen

fitness landscape by tailoring treatment and transmission-control measures informed by

resistance diagnosis (RD).

Pathogen strains: Two antibiotics are available to treat infections caused by the target

pathogen: drug 1 (first-line treatment that would be prescribed to all patients in the

absence of resistance diagnosis) and drug 2 (second-line treatment). Resistance to

drug 1 and potentially also to drug 2 has already emerged in the target-pathogen

population but not yet reached fixation. In particular, there are up to four resistance

profiles in circulation: an untreatable "pan-resistant" strain (strain 12); a "drug-1-

resistant" strain that remains sensitive to drug 2 (strain 1); a "drug-2-resistant" strain that

remains sensitive to drug 1 (strain 2); and a "pan-sensitive" strain that can be effectively

treated with either drug (strain 0) (Fig 1A). The model encompasses a spectrum of

pathogen lifestyles, from "simple obligate pathogens" (causing disease immediately

after colonization, Fig 1A,B) to "opportunistic pathogens" (transmitting from an

asymptomatic carriage phase as well as during symptomatic disease, Fig 1C).

Figure 1. Schematic of the obligate/SIS (A,B) and opportunistic/SCIS (C) epidemiological models. Boxes denote proportions of hosts in mutually exclusive states: S for uninfected (susceptible) hosts, I_0 for hosts infected with a strain sensitive to both drugs, and I_1, I_2, I_{12} for hosts infected with strains resistant to drugs 1, 2, or both 1 and 2, respectively. In the SCIS model (**C**, showing only two pathogen genotypes for

clarity), C_0 and C_1 denote asymptotic carriage of sensitive and drug-1-resistant bacteria, respectively, and d is the rate at which disease develops from carriage (when $d \to \infty$, we recover an SIS model). Box colors denote distinct clinical presentations in the absence (**A**) or presence (**B,C**) of multi-drug POC-RD. Solid arrows represent flows of individuals between states, and dashed arrows represent factors influencing those flows (e.g., antibiotic treatment). Grey and black arrows denote transmission and clearance, respectively. Equations describing the system are in SI.B.

Resistance diagnosis (RD)-informed treatment and control: We use standard reproduction-number analysis to investigate the pathogen-fitness impact of _RD-informed treatment and control_, depending on pathogen lifestyle (obligate vs opportunistic), what sort of resistance diagnostic is available, and what sort of transmission-control options can be feasibly targeted against each resistant strain, once identified. Cases considered include: point-of-care RD (POC-RD) with an obligate pathogen (Case #1, Fig 1B); POC-RD with an opportunistic pathogen (Case #2, Fig 1C); and carriage resistance surveillance ("carriage RD") with an opportunistic pathogen (Case #3). See the SI for omitted mathematical details as well as several extensions, including to settings with intermediate resistance, public health interventions aimed at discovering drug-resistant infections more quickly, resistance-conferring mutation, host migration, and diagnostic escape.

Notation	Details
Pathogen strains and pathogen-lifestyle parameters	
x	Drugs $x = 1,2$ are available to treat infections caused by the target pathogen.
X	Each strain is named for the drugs (if any) X = 0, 1, 2, 12 to which it is resistant: strain 0 is susceptible to both drugs ("pan-sensitive"); strain 1 is resistant only to drug 1; strain 2 is resistant only to drug 2; and strain 12 is

	resistant to both drugs ("pan-resistant").
$\beta^C, \beta^I > 0$	Transmission rates during carriage and during infection, if uncontrolled and if no biological fitness costs
$f_X \geq 0$	Biological fitness cost associated with strain X resistance, reducing transmission during carriage and infection by a factor of $1 - f_X$
$\gamma^C > 0$	Baseline carriage clearance rate
$\phi_x^C > 0,$	Carriage clearance rate of drug-x-sensitive strain due to bystander exposure to drug x
$d > 0$	Rate at which infection develops from carriage (in the limit $d \to \infty$, we recover the SIS case)
$\gamma_0^I > 0$	Baseline infection clearance rate when untreated or ineffectively treated
Diagnosis, treatment, and transmission-control parameters	
$D \geq 0$	Diagnostic delay, i.e., time from sample collection to result
$r_X \geq 0$	Rate at which resistant strain X is discovered while in the carriage state
$\gamma_x^I > \gamma_0^I$	Infection clearance rate of drug-x-sensitive strain when treated with drug x
$Z_X^I, Z_X^C \leq 1$	Proportional reduction in transmission during infection (Z_X^I) or during asymptomatic carriage (Z_X^C) due to heightened transmission control (HTC$_X$) measures targeted against strain X
Key derived variables	
$R_{0,X}$	Basic reproduction number of strain X
f_X^*	Threshold biological fitness cost for strain X not to enjoy a reproductive advantage, i.e., $R_{0,X} > R_{0,0}$ if $f_X < f_X^*$ and $R_{0,X} < R_{0,0}$ if $f_X > f_X^*$

Table 2: Notation.

Results

Case #1: POC-RD and a simple obligate pathogen (SIS model)

In the limiting case when the target pathogen immediately causes disease ($d = \infty$),

what we call a "simple obligate pathogen," our SCIS model reduces to a standard

Susceptible-Infected (SIS) epidemiological model (27–29). Few if any real-world

bacterial pathogens fit this case, but it is useful conceptually as a limiting case (Fig

1A,B).

Figure 2. Rapid resistance diagnostics enable conditional treatment and infection control strategies that can select against resistance for obligate pathogens even with no biological costs of resistance. The minimal cost of resistance $f^*(D)$ that allows universal treatment without causing an increase in resistance is plotted (contour lines) against diagnostic delay D. The dashed vertical line indicates the longest diagnostic delay (D^*) given which there is selection against drug-1 resistance while treating all cases. Three scenarios are shown: resistance diagnostics (RD) not available (No RD, contour plot of $f_1^*(\infty) = f_{12}^*(\infty)$); RD control of I_1 only (RD (I_1), contour plot of $f_1^*(D)$); RD control of I_{12} (and trivially, I_1) (RD (I_{12}), contour plot of $f_{12}^*(D)$). R_0 expressions are defined in Box 1, with further details in SI.B. Parameters (rates per day): $\gamma_0^I = 0.1, \gamma_1^I = \gamma_2^I = 0.2, \beta^I = 0.2, Z_1^I = 0.8, Z_{12}^I = 0.8$.

Fig 2 illustrates the impact of RD-informed treatment and transmission control on

whether the drug-1-resistant and/or pan-resistant strains enjoy a reproductive

advantage relative to the pan-sensitive strain, for a generic pathogen with average

duration of infection of 5 days (with effective treatment) or 10 days (without treatment).

The blue parameter regions are where the drug-susceptible strain has a higher

reproduction number (R_0) than the drug-1-resistant strain and/or the pan-resistant strain,

as a function of diagnostic delay D and the biological fitness costs f_1, f_{12} of drug-1 and

pan resistance, thereby creating net selection against these resistant strains.

*** START BOX 1 ***

Box 1. Reproductive numbers (R_0) for strains in the SIS model. See SI.B for more

detailed derivations.

Pan-sensitive strain: Strain-0 infections are treated with drug 1 and subjected to

standard transmission control, whether or not RD is available. Since strain-0 infections

clear at rate γ_1^I under drug-1 treatment and strain 0 transmits at rate β^I under standard

control, strain 0's reproduction number is

$$R_{0,0} = \beta^I / \gamma_1^I$$

170   *Equation 1*

171   *Drug-1-resistant strain:* Since strain-1 infections clear at rate γ_0^I during the diagnostic-

172   delay period, a patient will remain infected long enough for RD results to become

173   available (triggering drug 2 and transmission control) with probability $e^{-D\gamma_0^I}$. Depending

174   on diagnostic delay D and fitness cost f_1, strain 1's reproduction number takes the form

$$R_{0,1} = \beta^I (1 - f_1) \left(\frac{1 - e^{-D\gamma_0^I}}{\gamma_0^I} + \frac{e^{-D\gamma_0^I} Z_1^I}{\gamma_2^I} \right)$$

176   *Equation 2*

177 *Drug-2-resistant strain*: Since strain-2 infections are susceptible to drug 1 and therefore

178 clear at rate γ_1^I during the diagnostic-delay period, such infections will be diagnosed

179 before clearance with probability $e^{-D\gamma_1^I}$. Strain 2's resulting reproduction number is

180
$$R_{0,2} = \frac{\beta^I(1-f_2)}{\gamma_1^I}\left(1 - e^{-D\gamma_1^I}(1 - Z_2^I)\right)$$

181 *Equation 3*

182 *Pan-resistant strain*: Strain-12 infections clear at the untreated rate γ_0^I during and after

183 the diagnostic-delay period. However, diagnostic results (if available before infection

184 clearance, probability $e^{-D\gamma_0^I}$) can trigger heightened transmission control, reducing strain

185 12's reproduction number to

186
$$R_{0,12}(f_2, D) = \frac{\beta^I(1-f_{12})}{\gamma_0^I}\left(1 - e^{-D\gamma_0^I}(1 - Z_{12}^I)\right)$$

Equation 4

*** END BOX 1 ***

The solid contours in Fig 2 illustrate the critical threshold resistance costs for the drug-1-

resistant strain ($f_1^*(D)$) and the pan-resistant strain ($f_{12}^*(D)$), the smallest fitness costs

that allow universal treatment while keeping the resistant strain at a reproductive

disadvantage relative to the sensitive strain. The introduction of RD has the greatest

impact on the drug 1 resistant strain (Fig 2, strain I_1). In the limit of no diagnostic delay

($D = 0$), we find that $f_1^*(0) = \frac{z_1^I\gamma_1^I - \gamma_2^I}{z_1^I\gamma_1^I}$. This implies that resistance to drug 1 (given

available drug 2) can be selected against even in the absence of resistance costs

$(f_1^*(0) < 0)$ so long as *either* drug 2 is more effective than drug 1 *or* drug 2 is less

effective than drug 1 but transmission control is sufficiently effective that $Z_1^I < \frac{\gamma_2^I}{\gamma_1^I}$.

Control of a circulating pan-resistant strain I_{12} is more challenging, even with POC-RD.

Absent fitness costs ($f_{12} = 0$), net selection against pan resistance can be maintained

only if $Z_{12}^I < \frac{\gamma_0^I}{\gamma_1^I}$, meaning that transmission control of the pan-resistant strain is more

effective than drug-1 treatment at speeding clearance. In the case of more modest

transmission control (Fig 2, $Z_{12}^I = 0.8$), net selection against pan resistance requires

that there be sufficient fitness costs associated with pan resistance. (In the POC-RD

limit when $D = 0$, the threshold fitness cost $f_{12}^*(0) = 1 - \frac{\gamma_0^I}{Z_{12}^I \gamma_1^I}$.)

Both thresholds $f_1^*(D)$ and $f_{12}^*(D)$ are increasing in D, as longer delays reduce the

effectiveness of diagnostic-informed treatment and control, and converge in the $D \to \infty$

limit to the "no-RD fitness-cost threshold" absent any resistance diagnosis: $\lim_{D \to \infty} f_1^*(D) =$

$\lim_{D \to \infty} f_{12}^*(D) = \frac{\gamma_1^I - \gamma_0^I}{\gamma_1^I}$. In Fig 2 with baseline clearance $\gamma_0^I = 0.1$/day and drug 1 assisted

clearance $\gamma_0^I = 0.2$/day, the no-RD fitness-cost threshold equals 0.5, greatly exceeding

typical reported costs of resistance. To give some context on empirical estimates of

costs of resistance, f, a recent meta-analysis estimated $f = 0.21$ (+/- 0.024) for

chromosomally encoded resistance and $f = 0.09$ (+/- 0.024) for plasmid-encoded

resistance (30), albeit using growth rate rather than epidemiological transmission

measures of fitness effects.

Case #2: an opportunistic pathogen with a carrier state (SCIS model)

Many disease-causing bacteria are opportunistic pathogens capable of transmission from an asymptomatic carriage state, while living harmlessly in a host microbial compartment such as the gut or the nasopharynx. Such pathogens face "bystander exposure" to antibiotics used to treat infections caused by other pathogens or to treat noninfectious conditions (31). Take for example the pneumococcus (*S. pneumoniae*), one of the top bacterial causes of death globally (32) and a leading cause of antibiotic prescription. Despite the severe burden of disease, the pneumococcus is subjected in the US to an estimated 9.1 times more courses of any antibiotic during asymptomatic carriage than during disease. Fig 3 compares the volume of bystander selection to target antibiotic exposure for several major bacterial pathogens. An alternate visualization of the proportions of bystander exposure (absent *C. difficile*) is presented in Tedijanto et al. (31).

An implication of our analysis is that, for pathogens like *S. pneumoniae*, *E. coli*, *H. influenzae*, and *C. difficile* that overwhelmingly face bystander exposure to antibiotics, even the strongest possible medical interventions informed by point-of-care resistance diagnostics can be insufficient to halt the rise of resistance to any drug in routine use. Mathematical details underpinning this analysis, including derivations of each strain's reproduction number with and without POC-RD, are provided in SI.C.

Figure 3. Incidental antibiotic exposure during asymptomatic carriage exceeds disease-related antibiotic exposure for key human pathogens. Bold font: Tier 1 urgent resistance concerns according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (1). Standard font: The most frequent etiologic agents of the top indications for antibiotic prescription in US ambulatory care. "Target antibiotic exposure" is defined as any antibiotic use associated with disease caused by that organism; "bystander antibiotic exposure" refers to the incidence of antibiotic exposure in asymptomatic carriage, roughly calculated as the product of the incidence of antibiotic prescription in ambulatory care and the proportion of the population in the relevant age group that carries the bacterium, less the number of target antibiotic exposures. The dotted line is where incidence of antibiotic exposure in carriage is equal to incidence of antibiotic exposure due to disease. See Tedijanto et al. (31) for method details, source references, and an alternate visualization of the same data on *N. gonorrhoeae*, *S. pyogenes*, *S. pneumoniae*, *E. coli*, and *H. influenzae*. Values for *C. difficile* were calculated using the same methodology and additional sources for disease incidence (33) and carriage prevalence (34); see SI.F for details.

In Fig 4, we parameterize our SCIS model for the pneumococcus, to show the threshold

strain-1 fitness cost f_1^* (contour lines) for a population with substantial bystander

exposure (the I_1 resistant strain is counter-selected in the blue regions above the

contour lines). Pneumococcal serotypes show considerable variation in carriage

duration (Fig 4, arrows on *x*-axis) (35) and, unsurprisingly, our analysis illustrates that

bystander selection becomes increasingly problematic for longer carriage serotypes –

represented by a higher threshold resistance cost f_1^* to balance selection on resistance.

Our parameterized model indicates that the threshold costs even in the absence of RD

are of a similar magnitude to *average* costs of plasmid encoded resistance discussed

earlier (30). However, more problematic is the common observation of cost-free

resistances (including single SNPs) in the pneumococcus (36, 37), indicating that these

average costs are liable to decrease in response to selection.

Even in the absence of pan-resistant strains, POC-RD has a weak impact due to the

rarity and brevity of infection events (median infection duration in the absence of

treatment is 8 days) relative to long periods of carriage and associated bystander

selection. As a result, we anticipate ongoing selection for low-cost resistant strains, with

or without POC-RD-informed strategies (Fig 4).

Fig 4. POC-RD alone cannot reverse selection on cost-free pneumococcal resistance. The minimal cost of resistance (f_1^*) that allows universal treatment without causing an increase in strain-1 resistance is plotted (contour lines) against the expected duration of carriage. Two POC-RD scenarios are shown: with ($Z_1^I = 0$) and without ($Z_1^I = 1$) transmission control. Arrows on the *x* axis are serotype specific mean carriage duration estimates from (35) (serotypes with ≥15 recorded carriage episodes only). The remaining parameters (rates per day) are d = 0.001, ϕ_1^C = 5x10^{-4}, ϕ_2^C = 0, $\gamma_1^I = \gamma_2^I$ = 1, γ_0^I = 0.125. We make the simplifying assumption that baseline carriage and infection transmission rates are identical ($\beta^C = \beta^I = \beta$) given which f_1^* does not depend on β. Details on parameterization are in SI.G.

Case #3: carriage resistance diagnostics

Our pessimistic conclusion concerning the public health merits of POC-RD for commensal opportunists such as *S. pneumoniae* (Fig 3,4) is based on the inevitability of bystander selection during prolonged carriage phases—but what if bystander selection could be opposed by public health interventions during carriage? For example, what if resistant-strain carriers could be identified and subjected to transmission control interventions even when they do not have active infection? Consider the South Swedish Pneumococcal Intervention Project (SSPIP) (38, 39), a public health intervention launched in January 1995 in Malmöhus County, Sweden that aimed to reduce penicillin-resistant pneumococcus (PRP) transmission, especially at preschool daycares. Any time a preschool-age child was identified with symptomatic PRP infection, providers would obtain nasopharyngeal cultures from all other children in the same daycare classroom. Children found to be carrying PRP were then required to remain home until subsequent testing proved them to be PRP-negative, penalizing PRP strains by reducing their opportunities for transmission from carriage.

In SI.C, we extend our analysis of the SCIS model to examine the potential of carriage

RD-based interventions to generate selection against resistance. A key result is that, in

order to select against drug-1-resistance, the drug-1-resistant strain must be discovered

while in carriage at a rate r_1 that exceeds the rate ϕ_1^C at which the sensitive strain is

cleared from carriage due to bystander exposure to drug 1. In Fig 5, we again

parameterize our SCIS model for the pneumococcus as in Fig 4, under two extreme

scenarios of carriage duration (35): 20 weeks (Fig 5A) and 2 weeks (Fig 5B). The blue

parameter space in Fig 5 highlights the combinations of carriage discovery rate (r_1, x-

axis) and HTC effectiveness against drug-1-resistant bacteria discovered in carriage (Z_1^C

y-axis) that lead to a net selection against drug-1 resistance.

Fig 5A illustrates the most problematic serotype from a POC-RD perspective, due to the

dominance of bystander selection. Given the introduction of annual carriage

surveillance (ensuring $r_1 > \phi_1^C$), our parameterized model predicts that HTC

interventions (such as removal of an infant from nursery) would need to reduce strain-1

transmission from carriage by at least 20% in order to select against the drug-1-

resistant genotype in the worst case scenario of zero resistance costs ($f_1 = 0$).

Epidemiological studies of the impact of child-care attendance on pneumococcal

carriage suggest that a 2-fold reduction in transmission due to removal from daycare is

not unreasonable (40).

Fig 5. POC-RD plus Carriage RD can reverse selection on pneumococcal resistance, even for long carriage-duration serotypes. The parameter space generating net selection against resistance is plotted in blue as a function of the rate of carriage discovery (r_1) and the effectiveness of carriage HTC (Z_1^C). (A), longest carriage-duration serotype (6B, median 20 weeks). (B), shortest duration-carriage serotypes (1,4,5; ~2 weeks). In both (A) and (B), two POC-RD scenarios are shown: with ($f = 0.01$) and without ($f = 0$) biological cost of resistance. The red dashed line represents the probability of strain 1 discovery while in the carriage state ("C_1 discovery"), an increasing function of the rate of carriage diagnosis. The remaining parameters (rates per day) are $d = 0.001$, $\phi_1^C = 5\times10^{-4}$, $\phi_2^C = 0$, $\gamma_1^I = \gamma_2^I = 1$, $\gamma_0^I = 0.125$, $\gamma^C = 0.006$ (A), $\gamma^C = 0.07$ (B). We make the simplifying assumption that baseline carriage and infection transmission rates are identical ($\beta^I = \beta^C = \beta$), given which the space of parameter generating net selection against resistance does not depend on β. Details on parameterization are in SI.G. The asterisk positions the outcome of an annual intervention with 50% efficacy in reducing C_1 transmission.

The analysis underlying Fig 5 in SI.C implicitly assumes that all uninfected hosts are tested for drug-1-resistant carriage at a constant rate. While this assumption is useful here from an expositional point of view to highlight ideas, we note that such an approach would be inefficient in practice since many hosts would be tested even when their likelihood of drug-1-resistant carriage is low. By contrast, in SSPIP, only

classmates of children who developed PRP infections were tested. Thus, even if PRP

were rare in the general population, each child tested through SSPIP would have a

substantial likelihood of PRP carriage. By introducing simple contact-tracing principles,

the effective rate of carriage discovery can be higher for a given level of investment in

patient sampling.

Discussion

The antibiotic-resistance crisis is placing increasing pressure on healthcare globally and

is widely viewed as a one-way street toward a dangerous "post-antibiotic world" (1, 4).

In this paper, we ask whether resistance diagnostics (RD), when combined with public

health interventions such as heightened transmission control (HTC) for drug-resistant

bacterial strains, can substantially change the trajectory of resistance evolution.

In the early decades of the antibiotic era, doctors had no choice but to treat and control

infection *unconditionally*, creating a selective pressure favoring strains that were

resistant to whatever antibiotic was being widely prescribed. In that context, once

resistant strains emerge with zero biological fitness costs, all antibiotics become

"exhaustible resources" whose value to society is diminished by use (2, 3). In this paper,

we show that exhaustible resource antibiotics can in principle be transformed into

"renewable resources" whose value to society can be maintained over time even as

they are put to widespread use, so long as (i) RD is available to detect the target

pathogen and determine its antibiotic-sensitivity profile, (ii) prescribers adopt RD-

informed treatment strategies, (iii) identified resistant cases are subject to more

stringent transmission control, and (iv) bystander selection on the target pathogen is

either minimal (Fig 2) or counteracted (Fig 5). For obligate pathogens that face minimal

bystander selection, POC-RD-informed treatment reduces the advantage that resistant

strains would otherwise enjoy (41) but, as we show, RD-informed treatment plus

heightened control can potentially be sufficient to create a net selection against resistant

pathogen strains, reducing their prevalence over time in the pathogen population.

However, for opportunistic pathogens that face extensive bystander selection, POC-RD

alone is insufficient—identifying resistant strains when they are not yet causing infection

(so-called "carriage RD") is essential to reverse the rise of resistance. This note of

caution is important as society seeks to allocate resources most effectively in the

struggle against antibiotic resistance.

Our analysis identifies strategies to renew or maintain sensitivity to an antibiotic in a

pathogen population, the most effective of which depend on the availability of other

antibiotics that can be used to treat resistant infections. The potential to restore

antibiotic sensitivity is therefore limited once pan-resistant strains are in circulation.

Consider now the impact of the discovery of a new antibiotic (drug 3) to which these

bacteria are still sensitive. Drug 3's discovery transforms previously pan-resistant

bacteria into treatable "multidrug-resistant bacteria." Providers can now deploy targeted

treatment and HTC to hold the multidrug-resistant strain at a reproductive disadvantage.

In this way, introducing a new antibiotic to which disease-causing strains are not yet

resistant may make it possible to reverse the rise of previously pan-resistant bacteria,

restoring the effectiveness of pre-existing antibiotics. Moreover, as multidrug resistance

to pre-existing antibiotics grows less prevalent over time, the number of patients who

need the new antibiotic will itself decline over time, allowing the new antibiotic to be held

in reserve for increasingly rare cases for which it is the only effective treatment. This

potential decline in drug 3 use highlights the importance of having drug 3 resistance

diagnostics available when drug 3 is introduced, when we envisage the greatest use.

Indeed, if drug 3's introduction is coupled with drug 1-3 resistance diagnostics, it may

not be necessary to discover even more new antibiotics *beyond* drug 3, as diagnostics

will allow 'search and destroy' tactics against rare 1-3 pan resistant strains. We note

that rolling out drug 3 at the same time as a drug 3 diagnostic raises the challenge of

diagnosing resistance before widespread clinical use and clinical resistance discovery,

necessitating increased investment in resistance discovery in the laboratory and

phenotypic resistance surveillance in the clinic.

Whether net selection against resistant strains can be maintained depends on the

effectiveness of the HTC measures that can be feasibly targeted against each resistant

strain. By design, HTC measures impose additional barriers to resistant-bacterial

transmission by (i) identifying resistant bacteria (during infection and/or asymptomatic

colonization) and (ii) deploying additional resources specifically to prevent their

transmission. Many sorts of HTC measures could be relevant in different contexts.

Some examples: for hospital-associated infections, imposing heightened contact

precautions when a hospitalized patient is found to have resistant infection (19, 21); for

pneumococcal infection, requiring young children found to be infected or colonized with

penicillin-resistant pneumococci to stay home from daycare (38); for sexually

transmitted diseases, providing expedited partner therapy (EPT) when a patient is found

to have resistant infection (42); or, for livestock-associated infections, eradicating an

entire herd when resistant infection is identified. Note that HTC effectiveness may vary

depending on the resistant strain being targeted, e.g., EPT measures may be less

effective against pan-resistant strains since partners' transmissibility cannot be

controlled through treatment, while other measures may only be economically feasible

against some strains, e.g., eradicating an entire herd may only be economical when

pan-resistant infection is found, since other strains can be controlled through RD-

informed treatment. More research is needed to quantify the effectiveness of HTC

measures in practice.

Additional strategic options can be used to reduce the prevalence of bacterial strains

with intermediate resistance, if RD is available that provides quantitative (e.g.,

sequence-based inference of minimal inhibitory concentration (43)) information on the

degree of intermediate resistance. Details are provided in SI.B but, to see the point,

imagine that POC-RD had been available when penicillin was first introduced that could

quantitatively determine the penicillin sensitivity of gonorrhea infections. *Neisseria*

gonorrhoeae strains emerged in the 1940s and 1950s that were less sensitive to

penicillin but, at the time, these strains could still be effectively treated with a higher

dose (44). Armed with quantitative POC-RD, providers would have been able to target

intermediate-resistant gonococci with a higher penicillin dose—taking away the

treatment-survival advantage that intermediate-resistant gonococci would otherwise

enjoy—and could also have deployed additional public health resources to find and treat

others who might still be spreading intermediate-resistant gonococci. Such a policy of

RD-informed treatment and heightened discovery could have potentially held

intermediate-resistant gonorrhea strains at an overall reproductive disadvantage relative

to highly-sensitive strains, though only with HTC would it have been possible to avoid

rapid selection of the highly resistant strains (45). See SI.B for mathematical details.

The example of the gonococcus raises the key challenge of bystander exposure to

antibiotics, as gonorrhea infection is initially (and in some, entirely) asymptomatic and

therefore does not drive immediate medical attention and exposure to POC-RD. During

the asymptomatic phase of infection, drug-sensitive gonococcal genotypes are at risk of

being cleared due to antibiotics taken for other medical concerns (46). In Fig 3, we

outline how the extent of the bystander challenge is even greater for commensal

opportunistic pathogens (47, 48) which spend proportionately longer in asymptomatic

carriage states. Parameterizing our SCIS model (incorporating a carriage /

asymptomatic stage, prone to bystander selection) for the key commensal opportunist

S. pneumoniae illustrates that selecting against resistance via POC-RD-informed

strategies alone is not a plausible outcome for this particular pathogen (Fig 4), given the

lengthy duration of carriage and relatively rare and brief infection events caused by this

species.

We explore a strategic response to this concern: conditional interventions in response to

diagnostic information during asymptomatic carriage. Fig 5 illustrates that coupling

differential transmission control to carriage RD can drive net selection against

resistance, even for the most carriage-prone serotypes of the pneumococcus. The

South Swedish Pneumococcal Intervention Project (SSPIP) offers a concrete example

of using carriage RD to drive public health interventions. While SSPIP targeted

pneumococcal strains that remained treatable by other antibiotics, similar programs

could target pan-resistant strains and, if sufficiently intensive and comprehensive,

potentially select against these pan-resistant strains even as those with sensitive

infection continue to receive antibiotic treatment.

We note that, in theory, our logic of conditional interventions during carriage could be

extended to incorporate broader 'microbiome' resistance diagnostics (M-RD) and M-RD-

informed interventions. While simple in outline, implementation presents technical

challenges on several fronts, not least in establishing meaningful sampling protocols,

designing appropriate narrow-spectrum interventions (10, 49–54), and designing

appropriate strategic rules for intervention choice given potentially conflicting

microbiome and infection-site resistance profiles. We also note that, independent of any

M-RD innovations, the widespread uptake of POC-RD-informed antibiotic use will likely

reduce bystander selection due to an overall reduction in antibiotic use (e.g., in the

context of viral infections) and a potential shift toward narrower-spectrum antibiotics

being prescribed against known pathogen targets.

Our focus on homogenous, closed populations ensures that R_0 maximization is always

favored by selection, simplifying the evolutionary analysis (55). However, the basic idea

underlying our analysis of modulating strain-fitness landscapes applies more broadly to

models where R_0 is not a sufficient proxy for fitness, such as in cases of multiple

carriage (55), host population structure (56), or an open population (28).

In the supplementary material, we extend our SIS model analysis to consider the effect

of antibiotic rationing whereby some patients are left untreated (SI.B) and show that our

findings are robust to (i) environmental reservoirs of resistant bacteria (SI.D), (ii) host

migration from high-resistance regions (SI.D), (iii) resistance-conferring mutation (SI.D),

(iv) competitive release (SI.D), (v) diagnostic errors (SI.E), and (vi) diagnostic escape

(SI.E). Inflows of resistant cases (mutation, migration) together with diagnostic errors

weigh on the scale in favor of resistant strains but can all be counteracted by sufficiently

high reproductive penalties to correctly-targeted resistant strains. Diagnostic escape

(57) presents a qualitatively distinct challenge where diagnostic tests themselves

become obsolete due to evolutionary responses in the pathogen (e.g., loss or

modification of resistance marker). The risk of diagnostic escape highlights the

importance of active resistance surveillance and rapid new-diagnostic development.

Point-of-care resistance diagnostics are already a top public-health priority, with a major

emphasis on rapidity (<1 hour) (58). Rapid point-of-care diagnostics are critical for early

effective treatment of life-threatening infections when treatment cannot be delayed.

However, most antibiotic prescriptions are for less severe infections where patients can

wait longer to benefit from more complete diagnostic information (13). Our analyses

illustrate that, for the public health goal of selecting against resistance in pathogens with

minimal bystander selection, we have more time to act—delays until treatment on the

order of hours or even days following initial infection may still allow for selection against

resistance (Fig 2), However, our conclusions depend critically on the life-history of the

target pathogen, with the message that reversing resistance in opportunistic pathogens

subject to 'bystander' selection is not generally plausible with POC-RD information

alone (Fig. 4), and will require additional interventions conditioned on carriage RD (Fig

5). Our conclusions also depend on the ability of RD to distinguish multiple resistances

in a multi-drug context, highlighting the importance of diagnostic breadth as well as

rapidity. Diagnostic-informed approaches to reversing resistance face another time

constraint—our proposed strategies for resistance-targeted intervention are most

effective when pan-resistant strains are still rare (SI.B). If we fail to act decisively while

bacteria that are resistant to all antibiotics remain rare (59, 60), we may then be unable

to reverse the continued rise of untreatable bacterial disease.

References

1.   Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2013) *Antibiotic resistance threats in*
the United States, 2013 doi:CS239559-B.

2.   Laxminarayan R, et al. (2013) Antibiotic resistance — the need for global
solutions. *Lancet Infect Dis* 13(December):1057–1098.

3.   Center for Disease Dynamics Economics & Policy (2015) *The state of the world's*
antibiotics 2015 doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(13)70318-9.

4.   World Health Organization (2014) Antimicrobial resistance. *Fact Sheet 194*
317(September):609–610.

5.   European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) (2015)
Antimicrobial resistance surveillance in Europe 2014.

6.   Review on Antimicrobial Resistance (2016) Tackling Drug-Resistant Infections
Globally: Final Report and Recommendations. Available at: https://amr-
review.org/sites/default/files/160525_Final paper_with cover.pdf.

7.   Holmes AH, et al. (2016) Understanding the mechanisms and drivers of
antimicrobial resistance. *Lancet* 387(10014):176–187.

8.   Bell G, Maclean C (2017) The Search for 'Evolution-Proof ' Antibiotics. *Trends*
Microbiol In Press. doi:10.1016/j.tim.2017.11.005.

9.   Baym M, Stone LK, Kishony R (2016) Multidrug evolutionary strategies to reverse
antibiotic resistance. *Science* 351(6268):aad3292.

10. Chan BK, et al. (2016) Phage selection restores antibiotic sensitivity in MDR
Pseudomonas aeruginosa. *Sci Rep* 6(1):26717.

11. Kouyos RD, Abel zur Wiesch P, Bonhoeffer S (2011) Informed Switching Strongly
Decreases the Prevalence of Antibiotic Resistance in Hospital Wards. *PLoS*
Comput Biol 7(3):e1001094.

12. Beardmore RE, Peña-Miller R (2010) Rotating antibiotics selects optimally against
antibiotic resistance, in theory. *Math Biosci Eng* 7(3):527–52.

13. Wollein Waldetoft K, Brown SP (2017) Alternative therapeutics for self-limiting
infections — An indirect approach to the antibiotic resistance challenge. *PloS Biol*
15(12):1–10.

14. Ross-Gillespie A, Weigert M, Brown SP, Kümmerli R (2014) Gallium-mediated
siderophore quenching as an evolutionarily robust antibacterial treatment. *Evol*
Med Public Heal 2014(1):18–29.

15. Allen RC, Popat R, Diggle SP, Brown SP (2014) Targeting virulence: can we
make evolution-proof drugs? *Nat Rev Microbiol* 12(4):300–308.

16. Tuite AR, et al. (2017) Impact of Rapid Susceptibility Testing and Antibiotic
Selection Strategy on the Emergence and Spread of Antibiotic Resistance in
Gonorrhea. *J Infect Dis* 216(9):1141–1149.

17. Turner KM, et al. (2017) Analysis of the potential for point-of-care test to enable
individualised treatment of infections caused by antimicrobial-resistant and
susceptible strains of Neisseria gonorrhoeae: a modelling study. *BMJ Open*
7(6):e015447.

18. Menzies NA, Cohen T, Lin H-H, Murray M, Salomon JA (2012) Population health
impact and cost-effectiveness of tuberculosis diagnosis with Xpert MTB/RIF: a
dynamic simulation and economic evaluation. *PLoS Med* 9(11):e1001347.

19. Bootsma MCJ, Diekmann O, Bonten MJM (2006) Controlling methicillin-resistant
Staphylococcus aureus: Quantifying the effects of interventions. *Proc Natl Acad*
Sci 103(14):5620–5625.

20. Schwaber MJ, et al. (2011) Containment of a Country-wide Outbreak of
Carbapenem-Resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in Israeli Hospitals via a Nationally
Implemented Intervention. *Clin Infect Dis* 52(7):848–855.

21. Cohen MJ, et al. (2011) Institutional Control Measures to Curtail the Epidemic
Spread of Carbapenem-Resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae*: A 4-Year Perspective.
Source Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 32(7):673.

22. Jain R, et al. (2011) Veterans Affairs Initiative to Prevent Methicillin-Resistant
Staphylococcus aureus Infections. *N Engl J Med* 364(15):1419–1430.

23. Wertheim HFL, et al. (2004) Low prevalence of methicillin-resistant
Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) at hospital admission in the Netherlands: the
value of search and destroy and restrictive antibiotic use. *J Hosp Infect* 56:321–
325.

24. Vos MC, Ott A, Verbrugh HA (2005) Successful Search-and-Destroy Policy for
Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in The Netherlands. *J Clin Microbiol*
43(4):2034–2035.

25. Gurieva T, Bootsma MCJ, Bonten MJM (2012) Successful Veterans Affairs
Initiative to Prevent Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Infections
Revisited. *Clin Infect Dis* 54(February):1618–1620.

26.   Edmond MB, Wenzel RP (2013) Screening Inpatients for MRSA — Case Closed.
571   *N Engl J Med* 368(24):2314–2315.

572   27.   Spicknall IH, Foxman B, Marrs CF, Eisenberg JNS (2013) A Modeling Framework
573   for the Evolution and Spread of Antibiotic Resistance: Literature Review and
574   Model Categorization. *Am J Epidemiol* 178(14):508–520.

575   28.   Lipsitch M, Bergstrom CT, Levin BR (2000) The epidemiology of antibiotic
576   resistance in hospitals: Paradoxes and prescriptions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
577   97(4):1938–43.

578   29.   Laxminarayan R, Brown G (2001) Economics of Antibiotic Resistance: A Theory
579   of Optimal Use. *J Environ Econ Manage* 42,:183–206.

580   30.   Vogwill T, MacLean RC (2015) The genetic basis of the fitness costs of
581   antimicrobial resistance: a meta-analysis approach. *Evol Appl* 8(3):284–95.

582   31.   Tedijanto C, Olesen S, Grad Y, Lipsitch M (2018) Estimating the proportion of
583   bystander selection for antibiotic resistance in the US. *bioRxiv*:288704.

584   32.   Carapetis JR, Steer AC, Mulholland EK, Weber M (2005) The global burden of
585   group A streptococcal diseases. *Lancet Infect Dis* 5(11):685–94.

586   33.   Lessa FC, et al. (2015) Burden of *Clostridium difficile* Infection in the United
587   States. *N Engl J Med* 372(9):825–834.

588   34.   Furuya-Kanamori L, et al. (2015) Asymptomatic *Clostridium difficile* colonization:
589   epidemiology and clinical implications. *BMC Infect Dis* 15(1):516.

590   35.   Sleeman KL, et al. (2006) Capsular Serotype–Specific Attack Rates and Duration
591   of Carriage of *Streptococcus pneumoniae* in a Population of Children. *J Infect Dis*
592   194(5):682–688.

593   36.   Rozen DE, McGee L, Levin BR, Klugman KP (2007) Fitness Costs of
594   Fluoroquinolone Resistance in Streptococcus pneumoniae. *Antimicrob Agents*
595   *Chemother* 51(2):412–416.

596   37.   Trzcinski K, Thompson CM, Gilbey AM, Dowson CG, Lipsitch M (2006)
597   Incremental increase in fitness cost with increased beta -lactam resistance in
598   pneumococci evaluated by competition in an infant rat nasal colonization model. *J*
599   *Infect Dis* 193(9):1296–303.

600   38.   Ekdahl K, et al. (1998) Limiting the spread of penicillin-resistant *Streptococcus*
601   *pneumoniae*: experiences from the South Swedish Pneumococcal Intervention
602   Project. *Microb Drug Resist* 4(2):99–105.

603   39.   Melander E, Hansson H-B, Mölstad S, Persson K, Ringberg H (2004) Limited
604   spread of penicillin-nonsusceptible pneumococci, Skåne County, Sweden. *Emerg*
605   *Infect Dis* 10(6):1082–7.

606   40.   Huang SS, Finkelstein JA, Lipsitch M (2005) Modeling Community- and
607   Individual-Level Effects of Child-Care Center Attendance on Pneumococcal

Carriage. *Clin Infect Dis* 40(9):1215–1222.

41. McAdams D (2017) Resistance diagnosis and the changing epidemiology of
antibiotic resistance. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 1388(1):5–17.

42. Hogben M, Collins D, Hoots B, O'Connor K (2016) Partner Services in Sexually
Transmitted Disease Prevention Programs: A Review. *Sex Transm Dis* 43(2
Suppl 1):S53-62.

43. Li Y, et al. (2016) Penicillin-Binding Protein Transpeptidase Signatures for
Tracking and Predicting Beta-Lactam Resistance Levels in *Streptococcus*
pneumoniae. *MBio* 7(3):1–9.

44. Amies CR (1967) Development of resistance of gonococci to penicillin: an eight-
year study. *Can Med Assoc J* 96(1):33–35.

45. Wang YC, Lipsitch M (2006) Upgrading antibiotic use within a class: Tradeoff
between resistance and treatment success. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 103(25):9655–
9660.

46. Olesen SW, et al. (2019) Azithromycin Susceptibility Among *Neisseria*
gonorrhoeae Isolates and Seasonal Macrolide Use. *J Infect Dis* 219(4):619–623.

47. Brown SP, Cornforth DM, Mideo N (2012) Evolution of virulence in opportunistic
pathogens: generalism, plasticity, and control. *Trends Microbiol* 20(7):336–342.

48. Levin BR, Bull JJ (1994) Short-sighted evolution and the virulence of pathogenic
microorganisms. *Trends Microbiol* 2(3):76–81.

49. Santagati M, Scillato M, Patanè F, Aiello C, Stefani S (2012) Bacteriocin-
producing oral streptococci and inhibition of respiratory pathogens. *FEMS*
Immunol Med Microbiol 65(1):23–31.

50. Nakatsuji T, et al. (2017) Antimicrobials from human skin commensal bacteria
protect against *Staphylococcus aureus* and are deficient in atopic dermatitis. *Sci*
Transl Med 9(378):eaah4680.

51. Saeidi N, et al. (2014) Engineering microbes to sense and eradicate
Pseudomonas aeruginosa, a human pathogen. *Mol Syst Biol* 7(1):521–521.

52. Hwang IY, et al. (2014) Reprogramming Microbes to Be Pathogen-Seeking
Killers. *ACS Synth Biol* 3(4):228–237.

53. Citorik RJ, Mimee M, Lu TK (2014) Sequence-specific antimicrobials using
efficiently delivered RNA-guided nucleases. *Nat Biotechnol* 32(11):1141–1145.

54. Bikard D, et al. (2014) Exploiting CRISPR-Cas nucleases to produce sequence-
specific antimicrobials. *Nat Biotechnol* 32(11):1146–1150.

55. Lipsitch M, Colijn C, Cohen T, Hanage WP, Fraser C (2009) No coexistence for
free: Neutral null models for multistrain pathogens. *Epidemics* 1(1):2–13.

56. Blanquart F, Lehtinen S, Lipsitch M, Fraser C (2018) The evolution of antibiotic

resistance in a structured host population. *J R Soc Interface* 15(143). doi:10.1098/rsif.2018.0040.

57. Hill-Cawthorne GA, et al. (2014) Recombinations in Staphylococcal Cassette Chromosome mec Elements Compromise the Molecular Detection of Methicillin Resistance in *Staphylococcus aureus*. *PLoS One* 9(6):e101419.

58. Longitude Prize (2017) What Kind of Test Could Win the Longitude Prize. Available at: https://longitudeprize.org/blog-post/what-kind-test-could-win-longitude-prize.

59. Elemam A, Rahimian J, Mandell W (2009) Infection with Panresistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae*: A Report of 2 Cases and a Brief Review of the Literature. *Clin Infect Dis* 49:271–274.

60. Lobo LJ, Tulu Z, Aris RM, Noone PG (2015) Pan-Resistant *Achromobacter xylosoxidans* and *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia* Infection in Cystic Fibrosis Does Not Reduce Survival After Lung Transplantation. *Transplantation* 99(10):2196–2202.

Supplementary Information is available in the online version of the paper.

Acknowledgements. We thank Luke McNally, Dan Cornforth, Steve Diggle, Arjun Srinivasan, Cliff McDonald and Alison Halpin for discussion and comments on earlier drafts. The project described was supported by the CDC (OADS BAA 2016-N-17812), the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (U54GM088558), the Simons Foundation (396001), HFSP (RGP0011/2014), the Wenner-Gren Foundations, and the Royal Physiographic Society of Lund. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the CDC, the National Institute of General Medical Sciences or the National Institutes of Health, or any other supporting organization.

Author Contributions DM conceived the project. DM and SB developed the mathematical models. DM analyzed the models. KWW, CT & ML reviewed and summarized epidemiological data. DM and SB wrote the manuscript. DM wrote SI.A-E, CT wrote SI.F, and KWW wrote SI.G. All authors edited the manuscript and discussed the modelling approach.