

1 **On-site rapid molecular testing, mobile sampling teams and *eHealth* to support primary care**  
2 **physicians during the COVID-19 pandemic**

3

4 N.N. Cheung,<sup>a^</sup>, S.A. Boers<sup>a^</sup>, S. Kiani deh Kiani<sup>b</sup>, R.W. Jansen<sup>b</sup>, D.O. Mook-Kanamori<sup>b,c</sup> L. Janssens<sup>d</sup>,  
5 M.C.W. Feltkamp<sup>a</sup>, A.C.M Kroes<sup>a\*</sup>, B.C. Mourik<sup>a\*#</sup>

6

7 <sup>a</sup>Department of Medical Microbiology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

8 <sup>b</sup>HADOKS, Haaglandse Dokters, Den Haag, The Netherlands

9 <sup>c</sup>Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The

10 Netherlands

11 <sup>d</sup>The Netherlands Red Cross, Den Haag, The Netherlands

12

13 Running Head: On-site rapid testing during the COVID-19 pandemic

14

15 #Address correspondence to Bas C. Mourik, [b.c.mourik@lumc.nl](mailto:b.c.mourik@lumc.nl)

16

17 ^Joined first author.

18 \*Joined last author.

## 19 **Abstract**

### 20 *Objectives*

21 We evaluated the effects of on-site rapid molecular testing at a drive-through sampling facility,  
22 deployment of mobile sampling teams and implementation of an online *eHealth* platform as  
23 supportive measures for general practitioners (GPs) during the COVID-19 pandemic.

24

### 25 *Methods*

26 An *eHealth* platform was developed that allowed GPs to either refer patients to a drive-through  
27 sampling facility or to request a home visit by a sampling team. Nasopharyngeal swab samples from  
28 patients marked as urgent (n=333) were tested immediately on-site using a GeneXpert System. Non-  
29 urgent samples (n=1,460) were sent once a day to a university hospital laboratory for routine  
30 testing. Time stamps starting from referral to the moment of test report sent were recorded to  
31 calculate the turnaround time.

32

### 33 *Results*

34 The *eHealth* platform was rapidly adopted and used by a total of 517 GPs to test 1,793 patients in a  
35 period of 13 weeks. On-site rapid molecular testing reduced the median turnaround time to  
36 03h:41m compared to 29h:15m for routine testing. Positive SARS-CoV-2 test results were identified  
37 amongst 84/1,477 (5.7%) and 33/316 (10.4%) patients sampled at the drive-through or at home,  
38 respectively. In the age category of >80 years, 80.4% of patients were tested by a mobile sampling  
39 team.

40

### 41 *Conclusions*

42 The combination of rapid molecular testing and *eHealth* reduced the time between referral and  
43 results sent back to the GP to less than four hours. In addition, mobile sampling teams helped in  
44 reaching non-mobile, elderly patient populations with a higher prevalence of COVID-19.

## 45 Introduction

46 Major global efforts have been undertaken since the emergence of novel coronavirus disease 2019  
47 (COVID-19) to limit the spread of infection. One of the cornerstones of successful outbreak  
48 management is prompt diagnosis of patients suspected of SARS-CoV-2 infection (1). In order to  
49 achieve this, mass testing campaigns have been introduced to lower testing thresholds. Drive-  
50 through sampling facilities are often an integral part of such campaigns, because they provide an  
51 accessible, safe and efficient method for large-scale sample collection (2). An important  
52 disadvantage of such facilities however are delayed turnaround times due to transportation to  
53 nearby laboratories before the diagnostic test can be performed. In addition, drive-through facilities  
54 are often less accessible for non-mobile and/or elderly populations. In the Netherlands, these  
55 patients rely mostly on home visits by their general practitioner (GP) for sample collection. This can  
56 be time-consuming and potentially hazardous for GPs due to the already increased working hours  
57 during the pandemic combined with insufficient availability of personal protective equipment during  
58 the early phases of the pandemic (3-5). On top of these limitations, test accessibility for GPs was  
59 restricted in the Netherlands during the early phases of the first COVID-19 wave.

60  
61 To support the primary care in our region during the pandemic, we developed a system aimed at  
62 reducing diagnostic turnaround times and improved test accessibility. To this aim, we implemented  
63 an *eHealth* platform through which GPs could request a home visit by a mobile sampling team or  
64 refer patients to a drive-through sampling facility. Prior to visiting, patients could fill in their  
65 symptoms and risk profile online. During their visit at the facility, the patient's vital functions were  
66 measured and registered in the *eHealth* system. After their visit, these data were sent back to the GP  
67 together with the test results to aid them in their further evaluation and care of the patient. The  
68 sampling facility was equipped with a mobile laboratory in which we could perform rapid molecular  
69 testing to reduce the turnaround time of patient samples marked as urgent by the GP. Results were

70 sent directly to the GP through our *eHealth* platform to ascertain an efficient and effective route of  
71 communication.

72

73 A significant and often overlooked portion of the COVID-19 burden falls in primary care, outside of  
74 the hospital. We evaluated how implementation of these supportive measures could help GPs to  
75 better manage the increased workload of SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics during the early phase of the  
76 COVID-19 pandemic in the Netherlands, when national mass testing campaigns were still in early  
77 development.

## 78 **Materials and Methods**

### 79 *Online referral of patients and eHealth consultation*

80 The Heroku (San Francisco, United States) cloud application platform and database were used to  
81 develop an *eHealth* platform. Data was collected using questionnaires constructed with Typeform  
82 (Barcelona, Spain). Site and account access were regulated with Auth0 (Bellevue, United States).

83 Short Message Services (SMS) communication services were used from Twilio (San Francisco, United  
84 States) and Messagebird (Amsterdam, the Netherlands).

85

86 GP's referred patients by an online form available through an online account. Upon form  
87 completion, the GP was asked to enter the mobile telephone number of the patient, after which an  
88 SMS with a personal link to the 'symptoms and risk profile' questionnaire was sent to the patient.  
89 Next, a second SMS was sent to the patient, containing their personal referral code and directions to  
90 the drive-through sampling facility. After testing, a comprehensive PDF file consisting of the patient's  
91 'symptoms and risk profile' questionnaire result, vital function measurements and SARS-CoV-2 test  
92 results including interpretation from the clinical microbiology specialist were sent to back to the GP  
93 through the same *eHealth* platform.

94

### 95 *Location, time period and sample logistics*

96 Our drive-through sampling and testing facility was operational between April 21<sup>th</sup> and June 12<sup>th</sup>  
97 2020 at a location nearby the Hague, the Netherlands. During this period, GP's could use our *eHealth*  
98 platform to refer patients to our facility or to request a home visit by a mobile sampling team (in  
99 collaboration with the regional Red Cross). Nasopharyngeal swab samples were transported directly  
100 to our facility after collection.

101

### 102 *On-site registration*

103 A Virtual Private Network (VPN) connection with the Leiden University Medical Center (LUMC)  
104 network was available on-site. When either patients or samples arrived for registration, we entered  
105 their personal information in a specifically designed dashboard in R-software (Auckland, New  
106 Zealand). This dashboard communicated directly with GLIMS (Ghent, Belgium), the Laboratory  
107 Information System (LIS) of our Medical Microbiology department. After completion of the  
108 registration form in R, sample ID stickers from GLIMS were directly printed and placed on the test-  
109 tube prior to sampling.

110

#### 111 *On-site sample processing*

112 Collected swab samples were immediately processed in our mobile laboratory. Samples were  
113 vortexed and divided in a laminar flow cabinet: 1 mL was stored at -20 °C and 1 mL was either used  
114 immediately for rapid testing or temporarily stored at 4°C awaiting transportation to our clinical  
115 microbiology department.

116

#### 117 *SARS-CoV-2 molecular testing*

118 Urgent samples were tested on-site with the Xpress SARS-CoV-2 assay using a GeneXpert GX16-8  
119 system (Cepheid) (6, 7). Routine samples were transported to the Medical Microbiology department  
120 of the LUMC where RNA isolation was performed using the MagNA Pure 96 (Roche, Bazel,  
121 Switzerland) and E-gen RNA amplification was done on the CFX RT-PCR platform (Bio-Rad, Hercules,  
122 United States). For routine samples, cycle-threshold ( $C_T$ )-values of >35 were interpreted as negative  
123 and  $C_T$  values of 30-35 were retested for confirmation using the geneLEAD VIII platform (Precision  
124 systems science, Matsudo, Japan).

125

#### 126 *SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing*

127 The CORIS COVID-19 antigen lateral flow assay that detects nucleoprotein antigen in respiratory  
128 samples was used (8). Briefly, 100 µL of a respiratory swab sample in GLY-medium was placed in a 15

129 mL tube with 4 drops of Lysis buffer and vortexed. The antigen lateral flow strip was then placed in  
130 the mixture tube for 15 minutes before read-out of the results. All result interpretations were  
131 checked by a second person.

132

### 133 *General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)*

134 This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the LUMC for observational studies.  
135 No patient-identifying data were stored in the cloud database. Instead, a 7-digit reference code was  
136 sent to the GP and patient by email and SMS respectively upon referral. The reference code and  
137 patient-identifying data were registered together in the GDPR-compliant LIS during on-site  
138 registration. After performing the diagnostic test, LIS sent only the reference number and the test  
139 results to the cloud application. Next, an email with a link to a PDF file containing the reference  
140 number and the test result were sent to the GP.

141

### 142 *ISO-15189 audit*

143 A quality officer was assigned to ascertain that our mobile laboratory was in compliance with the  
144 International Organization for Standardization (ISO) – 15189 accreditation quality framework (9). A  
145 prospective risk analysis and an on-site internal quality audit was performed that included  
146 evaluation of all reports filed in our quality management system during the operational period.

147

### 148 *Statistical analysis*

149 The Fisher's exact test was used to determine the statistical significances in positivity rates between  
150 age categories and to determine differences in complaints between positively and negatively tested  
151 patients.

152 **Results**

153 *Impact of rapid on-site molecular testing on time-to-result*

154 A total of 1,793 patients referred by 517 GPs have been tested for SARS-CoV-2 using the *eHealth*  
155 platform (Table 1). Patients marked as urgent were tested using the on-site rapid molecular test.  
156 This concerned 199/1,477 (13.4%) of patients sampled on site and 134/316 (42.2%) of patients  
157 sampled at home.

158


159 **TABLE 1 Number of patients and samples tested through the eHealth platform.**

Route	Urgent (n)	Pos (n)	%	Regular (n)	Pos (n)	%
Sampled at facility (patient)	199	15	7,5	1278	69	5,4
Sampled at home (sample)	134	11	8,2	182	22	12,1
<b>Total</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>7,8</b>	<b>1.460</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>6,0</b>

160

161 The median time from referral to result sent of patients tested either immediately on-site or by  
162 routine PCR at our clinical microbiology department is shown in Fig. 1. For urgent cases, the time  
163 period between registration and test initiation was reduced 43-fold and the time period between  
164 test initiation and report of result was reduced 6-fold compared to non-urgent cases. For patients  
165 sampled at the drive-through, this resulted in a total turnaround time of 03h:41m (95% CI: 03h:23m  
166 - 04h:06m) for urgent patients and 29h:15m (95% CI: 29h:12m - 29h:31m) for non-urgent patients.  
167 For patients sampled at home, the turnaround times were 07h:03m (95% CI: 05h:46m - 07h:36m) for  
168 urgent samples and 29h:10m (95% CI: 28h:28m – 30h:04m) for non-urgent samples.

169



170

171 **FIG 1** Impact of on-site rapid testing on the time-to-results


172 Patients that visited the sampling facility are shown as ‘patients’, while samples received from patients sampled by mobile  
173 teams are shown as ‘samples’. Blue bars show the time between referral and on-site registration, grey bars show time  
174 between on-site registration and start of diagnostics, red bars show test initiation until sending of result. Data are shown as  
175 median with 95% confidence interval. Regular patients: n=1,278, urgent patients: n=199, regular sample: n=182, urgent  
176 sample: n=134.

177

178 *Mobile sampling teams as a valuable addition to sampling facilities*

179 Collection of nasopharyngeal swabs took place at the drive-through for 1,477 patients and at home  
180 by mobile sampling teams for 316 patients. The total number of tests performed and the  
181 percentages of positive SARS-CoV-2 test results for each age-category are shown in Fig. 2. Patients  
182 sampled at home were of a median age of 82.5 years old compared to patients sampled at the  
183 facility who had a median age of 49.7 years. In the age category of >80 years, 80.4% of patients  
184 were tested by a mobile sampling team. Patients that were sampled at home had a significantly  
185 higher percentage of positive test results of 10.4% (33/316) compared to 5.7% (84/1,477) of patients  
186 sampled at the facility ( $p < 0.01$ ).

187



188

189 **FIG 2 Patient age and mode of testing**


190 Blue bars represent patients referred directly to our drive-through test facility, while red bars represent patients sampled  
191 via mobile teams. The dotted right line shows the percentage of positively tested patients per age category and is plotted  
192 against the right y-axis.

193

#### 194 *Integrated healthcare using an eHealth platform*

195 Combined data extracted from the 'symptoms and risk profile' questionnaires indicated that  
196 anosmia, fever and contact with a proven COVID-19 case within the last two weeks prior to  
197 presentation had the strongest association with a positive SARS-CoV-2 test result in our primary care  
198 population (Fig. 3).

199



200

201 **FIG 3 Symptoms and risk profile**


202 Data extracted from 71 positively tested patients (red bars) and n=1.205 negatively tested patients (green bars) that  
 203 completed the *eHealth* symptoms and risk profile form and provided permission to use their data. Fisher's exact test was  
 204 used to calculate significance, \*\*\*\* P < 0.0001, \*\*\* p < 0,001, \*\* p < 0,01.

205

206 *Impact of rapid antigen testing*

207 In addition to our primary objectives, we also evaluated the use of antigen testing. This was  
 208 performed on-site for n=350 samples (Fig. 4). Comparison of these results with the C<sub>T</sub> value of the  
 209 routine PCR results of the exact same samples revealed that the antigen test was only able to  
 210 identify positive SARS-CoV-2 samples with C<sub>T</sub> value ≤23,4. This translated to a sensitivity of 37,1%  
 211 and a negative predictive value of 93,5%.

212



213

214 **FIG 4 Sensitivity of rapid antigen testing**

215 True positive antigen tests (n=13) are shown as green dots, while false negative tests (n=22) are shown as red dots. In  
216 addition, n=328 antigen tests were true negative and n=0 antigen tests were false positive (data not shown).

217

218 *Quality monitoring*

219 An on-site ISO-15187 quality audit showed compliance on 78 points and identified 17 non-critical  
220 points that required modification. In addition 7 reports were filed in the quality management system  
221 during the operational period. None of these reports concerned direct patient care.

## 222 Discussion

223 Rapid and efficient diagnostics are key-factors in coping with the current COVID-19 pandemic and  
224 should not be restricted to solely the technical qualities of a diagnostic test. Instead, efficiency  
225 should apply for the entire diagnostic process starting from sample collection to delivery of the test  
226 result to where it matters most, the patient and the treating physician. Our *eHealth* platform  
227 provided GPs with an integrated healthcare system allowing for rapid patient referrals as well as  
228 efficient collection and communication of patient's complaints, vitals and test results. In addition, we  
229 show that on-site rapid molecular testing at a sampling facility can reduce time from referral to  
230 result sent by at least twenty-four hours compared to samples from the same facility that were  
231 tested by routine PCR in a nearby laboratory.

232

233 Mobile sampling teams complemented our facility by reaching the non-mobile and/or elderly  
234 population. These patients resided primarily in elderly homes that are known to be associated with  
235 high SARS-CoV-2 transmission-, and mortality rates (10). The importance of rapid testing in this  
236 particular population was reflected in the 3-fold higher percentage of urgent requests and a 2-fold  
237 higher percentage of positive tests compared to patients sampled at the facility. A potential  
238 selection bias where the referring GP adheres more strictly to referral guidelines before requesting a  
239 home visit cannot be excluded. Nonetheless, current mass testing campaigns in the Netherlands  
240 mainly consist of drive-throughs that are nearly inaccessible to this particular population and can  
241 therefore benefit from the addition of mobile sampling teams.

242

243 One of the advantages of performing a diagnostic test in a readily established laboratory is  
244 assurance of high quality standards and minimal risk of exposure for laboratory workers. We  
245 demonstrate that on-site diagnostics can be successfully implemented within the same quality  
246 framework as a conventional microbiology laboratory.

247

248 Next to on-site molecular testing, antigen tests are potential candidates for widespread rapid SARS-  
249 CoV-2 diagnostics. Our evaluation of one of such tests showed a limited sensitivity, which was in line  
250 with a previous evaluation (8). However, the test was simple to perform and did produce consistent  
251 results with high specificity. Also newer generations of antigen tests are entering the market with  
252 improved sensitivity. Therefore, the antigen test might prove valuable in the early diagnosis of  
253 patients with high viral loads, in low-resource settings where no molecular diagnostics are available  
254 or in surveillance settings where frequent and fast screening is desired (11, 12).

255

256 Our aim was to support the SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic process while minimizing the risks of exposure in  
257 primary care during a period of time in the Netherlands where mass testing campaigns were not yet  
258 available. Strengths of our study include the implementation of a fully integrated *eHealth* platform  
259 equipped with a data management system that allowed complete data collection and efficient,  
260 automated communication with GPs. Such platforms could be further utilized to develop algorithms  
261 for categorizing samples, e.g. in low-risk samples eligible for pooling or high-risk samples that could  
262 benefit from (on-site) rapid testing (13). Limitations might include an overly optimistic notion of the  
263 time-to-result. For example, our patient volume during the operational period consisted of a  
264 maximum of 120 patients per day, while current sampling facilities can receive up to 1500 patients  
265 each day. It is uncertain how such volumes would impact the total turnaround time.

266 Our data provide a first and clear picture of the impact of rapid molecular testing on time-to-result-  
267 sent outside of the hospital environment and provides a concept that could be useful for COVID-19  
268 sampling facilities striving to reduce their turnaround time. The concept that is outlined is also  
269 relevant for the imminent widespread application of the SARS-CoV-2 antigen for rapid diagnosis of  
270 COVID-19.

271 **References**

- 272 1. Kretzschmar ME, Rozhnova G, Bootsma MCJ, van Boven M, van de Wijgert JHHM, Bonten MJM.  
273 2020. Impact of delays on effectiveness of contact tracing strategies for COVID-19: a modelling  
274 study. *Lancet Public Health* 5:e452-e459.
- 275 2. Shah A, Challenger D, Tande AJ, Mahmood M, O’Horo JC, Berbari E, Crane SJ. 2020. Drive-through  
276 testing: a unique, efficient method of collecting large volume of specimens during the SARS-CoV-  
277 2 (COVID-19) pandemic. *Mayo Clin Proc* 95:1420-1425.
- 278 3. Ing EB, Xu QA, Salimi A, Torun N. 2020. Physician deaths from corona virus (COVID-19) disease.  
279 *Occup Med (Lond)* 70:370-374.
- 280 4. Fusaroli P, Balena S, Lisotti A. 2020. On the death of 100 + Italian doctors from COVID-19.  
281 *Infection* 48:803-804.
- 282 5. Ranney ML, Griffeth V, Jha AK. 2020. Critical supply shortages - the need for ventilators and  
283 personal protective equipment during the Covid-19 pandemic. *N Engl J Med* 382:e41.
- 284 6. Wolters F, van de Bovenkamp J, van den Bosch B, van den Brink S, Broeders M, Chung NH, Favié  
285 B, Goderski G, Kuijpers J, Overdeest I, Rahamat-Langedoen J, Wijsman L, Melchers WJG, Meijer  
286 A. 2020. Multi-center evaluation of cepheid xpert® xpress SARS-CoV-2 point-of-care test during  
287 the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. *J Clin Virol* 128:104426.
- 288 7. Goldenberger D, Leuzinger K, Sogaard KK, Gosert R, Roloff T, Naegele K, Cuénod A, Mari A, Seth-  
289 smith H, Rentsch K, Hinić V, Hirsch HH, Egli A. 2020. Brief validation of the novel GeneXpert  
290 Xpress SARS-CoV-2 PCR assay. *J Virol Methods* 284:113925.
- 291 8. Mertens P, de Vos N, Martiny D, Jassoy C, Mirazimi A, Cuypers L, van den Wijngaert S, Monteil V,  
292 Melin P, Stoffels K, Yin N, Mileto D, Delaunoy S, Magein H, Lagrou K, Bouzet J, Serrano G,  
293 Wautier M, Leclipteux T, van Ranst M, Vandenberg O, LHUB-ULB SARS-CoV-2 Working Diagnostic  
294 Group. 2020. Development and potential usefulness of the COVID-19 Ag Respi-Strip diagnostic  
295 assay in a pandemic Context. *Front Med (Lausanne)* 7:225.

- 296 9. Wallace PS, MacKay WG. 2013. Quality in the molecular microbiology laboratory. *Methods Mol*  
297 *Biol* 943:49-79.
- 298 10. Graham NSN, Junghans C, Downes R, Sendall C, Lai H, McKirdy A, Elliott P, Howard R, Wingfield  
299 D, Priestman M, Ciechonska M, Cameron L, Storch M, Crone MA, Freemont PS, Randell P,  
300 McLaren R, Lang N, Ladhani S, Sanderson F, Sharp DJ. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 infection, clinical  
301 features and outcome of COVID-19 in United Kingdom nursing homes. *J Infect* 81:411-419.
- 302 11. Larremore DB, Wilder B, Lester E, Shehata S, Burke JM, Hay JA, Tambe M, Mina MJ, Parker R.  
303 2020. Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turnaround time for COVID-19 surveillance.  
304 medRxiv <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.22.20136309>.
- 305 12. Bullard J, Dust K, Funk D, Strong JE, Alexander D, Garnett L, Boodman C, Bello A, Hedley A,  
306 Schiffman Z, Doan K, Bastien N, Li Y, van Caesele P, Poliquin G. 2020. Predicting infectious SARS-  
307 CoV-2 from diagnostic samples. *Clin Infect Dis* <http://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa638>.
- 308 13. Hogan CA, Sahoo M, Pinsky BA. 2020. Sample pooling as a strategy to detect community  
309 transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *JAMA* 323:1967-1969.