

**Table 9. Various intervention runs aimed at examining the sensitivity of results presented in Table 2**

Intervention	$R_0 = 1.6$	$R_0 = 1.9$	$R_0 = 2.1$	$R_0 = 2.4$
<b>Targeted antiviral prophylaxis</b>				
60% TAP, 7 days after pandemic alert, unlimited antiviral supply (number of courses used)	0.06 (2.8 M)	4.3 (182 M)	12.2 (418 M)	19.3 (530 M)
60% TAP (household only), 7 days after alert, unlimited antiviral supply (number of courses used)	3.7 (23 M)	23.6 (132 M)	29.2 (154 M)	35.4 (175 M)
80% TAP, 7 days after alert, unlimited antiviral supply (number of courses used)	0.03 (1.6 M)	0.4 (27 M)	4.4 (262 M)	13.3 (595 M)
80% TAP, 10 days after alert, unlimited antiviral supply (number of courses used)	0.04 (2.0 M)	0.6 (40 M)	5.1 (300 M)	13.5 (600 M)
<b>Travel restrictions and other social distancing measures</b>				
Reduction in long-range travel, to 1% of the normal frequency, during the entire 180-day simulation	27.4	44.0	48.9	54.0
School closure and local social distancing, starting 7 days after alert	0.1	8.7	29.3	41.0
Local social distancing and 50% cut in long-distance travel, 7 days after alert	23.6	39.3	44.7	50.4
School closure, local social distancing, and 90% reduction in travel, all starting 1 day after alert	0.07	3.8	22.4	40.6

Shown are the mean number of cases (cumulative incidence per 100) and antiviral courses required for various interventions and different values of  $R_0$ . M, million.