

At-home self-testing of teachers with a SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test to reduce potential transmissions in schools

Results of the SAFE School Hesse Study

Sebastian Hoehl^{*1}, Barbara Schenk^{*1}, Olga Rudych¹, Stephan Göttig², Ivo Foppa³, Niko Kohmer¹, Onur Karaca¹, Tuna Toptan¹, Sandra Ciesek^{1,4,5}

*These authors contributed equally

¹ Institute for Medical Virology, University Hospital Frankfurt, Goethe University Frankfurt am Main, Germany

² Institute for Medical Microbiology, University Hospital Frankfurt, Goethe University Frankfurt am Main, Germany

³ Hessisches Landesprüfungs- und Untersuchungsamt im Gesundheitswesen (HLPUG), Abteilung I (Gesundheitsschutz)

⁴ German Centre for Infection Research, DZIF, external partner site Frankfurt, Germany

⁵ Fraunhofer Institute for Molecular Biology and Applied Ecology (IME), Branch Translational Medicine and Pharmacology, Frankfurt, Germany

Abstract

Background

Rapid antigen tests for SARS-CoV-2 became available recently, offering an opportunity to vastly increase testing capacities. Antigen tests offer lower sensitivity than the gold standard, RT-PCR, but rapid sample-to-answer time. High-frequency testing with an antigen test may offset the lower sensitivity, and testing can be done with at-home collection of samples, offering potential benefit in screening efforts. In this study, we set out to evaluate the practical application of self-performed high-frequency antigen test in a school setting.

Method

A total of 711 teachers from 86 schools were enrolled in a seven-week study. After instruction, participants tested themselves every 48 hours at home with a rapid antigen test for SARS-CoV-2 (target: nucleocapsid protein) in a self-collected anterior nasal swab. Positive results in the antigen test were confirmed via RT-PCR from the same sample that had been determined to be positive by the study participant. A questionnaire was given to all participants to evaluate whether the test failed to detect infection.

Findings

10 836 tests from 602 teachers were recorded and analyzed. A total of five confirmed cases of viral shedding of SARS-CoV-2 was detected by use of the antigen test. One study participant with a SARS-CoV-2 infection was presymptomatic and four were mildly symptomatic at the time of the antigen test. Sixteen false positive antigen tests (0.15% of all tests) were reported, predominantly when the local incidence in the general population was low. In four cases, the study participant reported that a PCR had detected a SARS-CoV-2 infection, but the antigen test was negative, indicating a false negative result.

Interpretation

High-frequency, self-performed rapid antigen tests can detect individuals with a SARS-CoV-2 infection, and therefore potentially reduce transmissions. Testing may be most beneficial when applied during high local incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infections and when mild or atypical symptoms are present. To avoid a high rate of false positive results, a test with optimized specificity should be used.

Funding

The study was commissioned and funded by the Hessian Ministry of Education and the Hessian Ministry of Integration and Social Affairs.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

44 Introduction

45 In the ongoing pandemic of SARS-CoV-2, test strategies continue to rely mostly on real time (RT-) PCR,
46 a highly sensitive and specific method to detect SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Rapid antigen tests (RATs) are also
47 becoming increasingly available and offer point-of-care testing, with results available within minutes.
48 These tests, that are much more affordable and offer the potential of increasing testing capacities as
49 well as reducing sample-to-answer-time, are limited by a lower sensitivity and specificity when
50 compared to PCR.¹⁻³ However, the sensitivity of RATs may be sufficient to detect most infectious cases²,
51 especially when testing is performed in high frequency.^{4,5} RATs are usually very simple to perform, and
52 can be combined with self-sampling, to offer at-home testing for non-medical professionals. When
53 using a RAT to test for SARS-CoV-2, anterior nasal swabs have been shown to be a viable alternative to
54 oropharyngeal or throat swabs, when collected by a medical professional,¹ as well as when the sample
55 was self-collected by a non-medical professional.^{3,6-8}

56 High-frequency testing for SARS-CoV-2 with an RAT is proposed to make some critical environments
57 safer during the pandemic when other non-pharmaceutical interventions are not sufficient to prevent
58 transmissions. Theoretical models have proposed that high-frequency antigen testing may be
59 efficacious to reduce transmissions in such environments.^{5,9} Keeping schools open during the
60 pandemic should be considered a high priority due to potentially detrimental effects of withholding
61 education from children of various age groups. Here, the application of rapid antigen tests could prove
62 to be beneficial.

63 There is limited experience from real-life application of RATs, especially when testing is performed by
64 a non-medical professional without supervision. The primary aim of this study was to determine
65 whether at-home testing results in true-positive detection of unknown viral shedding.

66

67

68 Methods

69 The *SAFE School Hesse Study* (SAFE acronym: German: **SARS-CoV-2 FrühErkennung**, English: Early
70 detection of SARS-CoV-2) set out to evaluate the practical application of self-testing for SARS-CoV-2
71 with a RAT, performed by teachers. The primary goal of the study was to evaluate the potential of an
72 RAT to detect SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals and thus to enable necessary infection control
73 measures.

74 Teachers from primary and secondary schools in three distinct school districts were invited by the
75 Hessian Ministry of Education to participate in the study. The study period was seven weeks, of which
76 three were before and four were after a two-week autumn vacation in Hesse (September 14th to
77 October 4th and October 17th to November 15th, 2020).

78 Study participants received written instructions, as well as an instructional video on how to collect an
79 anterior nasal swab, and step-by-step instruction to perform and read out an RAT (RIDA® QUICK SARS-
80 CoV-2 Antigen test, R-Biopharm, Darmstadt, Germany) at home. In the testing process, two reagents
81 were combined with drop bottles, the nasal swabs were irrigated in medium, and a predetermined
82 amount of this sample was transferred to the testing tube with the reagents using a single-use pipet.
83 After 10 minutes of incubation, a lateral flow test strip was added to the test tube. The visual result
84 readout was performed after an additional 10 minutes. Study participants were instructed to observe
85 whether the control band was visible to determine the validity of the result, and to determine whether
86 the test band was visible to determine a positive (test band visible) or negative (test band not visible)
87 result. Study participants were instructed to record all tests on a standardized form.

88 Study participants were provided with the telephone number to the study hotline as well as a
89 designated email address in case any support was needed. In case of positive or inconclusive test
90 readouts, participants were asked to call the study hotline for further instructions. When a sample was
91 deemed or suspected to be positive by the study participant, the sample medium from which material
92 was inserted into the antigen test by the study participant was collected. In the laboratory (Institute
93 for Medical Virology, Goethe University Frankfurt), a SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR was performed, using either
94 Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 (Roche diagnostics, Basel, Switzerland), Alinity m® SARS-CoV-2 Assay
95 (Abbott Laboratories, Abbott Park, IL, USA) or Xpert® Xpress SARS-CoV-2 (Cepheid, Sunnyvale, CA,
96 USA). The study participants were asked to self-quarantine until PCR results were conveyed.

97 At the end of the study, all participants received a questionnaire to determine whether they
98 encountered any difficulty in the testing procedure, and to record whether they were diagnosed with
99 a SARS-CoV-2 infections but were tested negative with the RAT.

100 When a study participant was quarantined due to exposure to SARS-CoV-2, positive test results were
101 not evaluated. When a positive antigen test was recorded, either true or false, no further RAT tests
102 were analyzed from the respective study participant.

103 **Funding and ethical approval**

104 This study was commissioned and funded by the Hessian Ministry of Education and the Hessian
105 Ministry for Integration and Social Affairs. The study protocol was approved by the ethics board of the
106 University Hospital, Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main, Germany (No. 20-899).

107

108 Results

109 Characterization of study participants

110 711 teachers participated in the study. A total of 602 teachers (86.7%) from 85 schools provided
111 records from the RATs. The age range was 21 to 67 years. A total of 10836 tests were recorded (mean:
112 18 tests per study participant). 10768 of these tests (99.37%) were recorded to have been valid and
113 negative, 47 (0.43%) were recorded as invalid and 21 (0.19%) as positive (either true or false).

114 True positive results

115 A true positive antigen test result was confirmed by RT-PCR in five teachers during the study period
116 (table 1). A prior or ongoing infection with SARS-CoV-2 was not known in any of these participants at
117 the time of the antigen test. All five true positive cases occurred when the local 7-day incidence in the
118 school district was higher than 100 cases / 100 000 inhabitants (mean 7-day incidence at the time of
119 true positive test result: 252.66 cases / 100 000 inhabitants). At the time of testing, four of them were
120 symptomatic, and one was presymptomatic. No asymptomatic infection with SARS-CoV-2 was
121 detected in this study. The Cycle-threshold (Ct) values for the five RAT-positive samples ranged 17.6
122 and 20.2.

123 False positive results

124 In 16 cases, a positive RAT result was determined by the study participant but could not be confirmed
125 by RT-PCR. 13 of these tests were conducted when the 7-day local incidence was below 40 cases / 100
126 000 inhabitants, and three occurred with a 7-day local incidence between 171 and 213 cases / 100 000
127 inhabitants. 12 of the 16 false positive tests occurred while the study participant was asymptomatic,
128 and four while symptoms were reported by the study participant (table 1). In 10 of these 16 cases, the
129 false positive result occurred in the very first test the teacher performed.

130 Protein A of *Staphylococcus aureus* and other coagulase positive *Staphylococcus* species are known to
131 bind the Fc region of IgG and which can lead to false positive reactions in lateral flow test systems.¹⁰
132 Therefore, seven false positive anterior nasal swab samples were analyzed for the presence of *S.*
133 *aureus* by culture and PCR (target sequence: nuc and MREJ). Six out of seven samples were positive by
134 PCR and four out of seven samples were culture-positive.

135 False negative results

136 For four teachers, a false negative result in the antigen test was assumed, as they reported to have
137 received a positive test result by SARS-CoV-2 PCR from a swab that had been collected by a medical
138 professional during the time of high-frequency self-testing with the RAT. Three of these events
139 occurred during high incidence of SARS-CoV-2 (171, 213 and 253 cases / 100 000 inhabitants,
140 respectively). Two of these study participants were symptomatic and one was presymptomatic at the

141 time of the positive PCR test result (table 1). For one case it was not reported when the false negative
142 test occurred, and if symptoms were present. In one case, the RAT later was positive seven days after
143 the RT-PCR result.

144 Local incidence during the study period

145 The 7-day local incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infections in the general population was 9 to 348 cases per
146 100 000 inhabitants.

147 Discussion

148 We evaluated the practical application of at-home, high-frequency RATs for SARS-CoV-2 by teachers
149 to prevent SARS-CoV-2 transmission in schools.

150 The test used in this study is a lateral flow SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test. While the overall sensitivity
151 of this test was only 50.0 to 77.6% in a recent study, it was 88.2% when samples were used with Ct
152 values below 28, a range that is typically seen during the first week of a SARS-CoV-2 infection, when
153 the patient is likely infectious. Cumulative specificity for the test has been reported to be 94.85%.¹¹

154 The objective of the study was to determine whether at-home testing results in true-positive detection
155 of unknown viral shedding, causing the potentially infectious teacher to become aware of an infection
156 with SARS-CoV-2, and therefore preventing potential transmissions in school. This outcome was
157 archived in five out of 602 study participants. These individuals had a high viral load in the self-collected
158 nasal swab (Ct values 17.6 to 20.2), indicating they were likely infectious. Possible onward
159 transmissions in the school or in a private setting may have been prevented. All but one of these
160 participants were mildly symptomatic at the time of testing, but only one reported fever at the time
161 of testing. This demonstrates that RAT testing is especially useful when symptoms are present, even in
162 the absence of fever. In one case, headache and fatigue were the only reported symptoms, which
163 highlights the need to test for SARS-CoV-2 even in cases with symptoms that are very prevalent in the
164 general population that may not be immediately attributed to COVID-19.

165 A total of 16 false positive results were recorded by the study participants. Notably, 13 of the 16 false
166 positive tests occurred while the local 7-day incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infections was below 100 cases
167 / 100 000 inhabitants, demonstrating the implications of a low positive predictive value of the RAT
168 during low infection prevalence. To avoid the occurrence of false positive results, large-scale testing
169 could be applied during periods of high incidence, and a test with higher specificity should be used in
170 such screening efforts.

171 In this study, the test material was a nasal swab, which is demonstrated to offer high diagnostic
172 sensitivity, which could also be demonstrated for self-collected samples by non-medical
173 professionals.^{3,6,7} We observed 16 false positive results; however, when compared to the total number
174 of study participants, this occurred only in 2.66% of all study participants. As anticipated, the rate of
175 false positive results decreased with a rising prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 that occurred throughout the
176 study period (table 1). The decrease in the false positivity rate may also indicate that false positive
177 results occurred due to a permanent host factor that resulted in these study participants to drop out
178 of the study as it progressed. One such conceivable factor is the nasal colonization with *Staphylococcus*
179 *aureus*, which could result in false positive result due to interference with the lateral flow assay

180 through the binding of immunoglobulin by staphylococcal protein A (SpA).¹² Indeed, in six out of seven
181 false positive samples, the presence of *Staphylococcus aureus* could be confirmed.

182 When reviewing the records, very few tests yielded an invalid result (47 out of 10 836 tests, 0.43%),
183 indicating that the RAT could be performed satisfactory by the study participants, who could call a
184 hotline in case any technical or medical support was needed. It is imperative that, when the test is
185 performed without supervision of a medical professional, support is easily accessible.¹³

186 Presumably, four out of 10 836 tests were false negative, which might be due to insufficient swabbing
187 technique, an error in testing, result readout, or low viral load in anterior nasal sampling.

188 This study has several limitations. All participants were educators in primary or secondary schools, and
189 therefore had a higher education. Not all teachers at the schools that participated in the study
190 performed the test every 48 hours throughout the entire study period, and not all teachers from the
191 schools participated in the study. Furthermore, no students from these schools were tested, and
192 transmissions in the participating schools were not examined. As no students were enrolled in the
193 study, we also do not know whether the approach of high-frequency, self-performed testing is
194 beneficial in children.

195 In conclusion, we could demonstrate that a high frequency, self-performed antigen tests by teachers
196 can result in the detection of individuals who are probably infectious, and therefore could contribute
197 to making the school environment safer during the pandemic.

198 Testing for SARS-CoV-2 is especially important when symptoms are present, which may also be mild or
199 atypical. As infections may also be missed by use of an antigen test, all non-pharmaceutical
200 interventions should be applied regardless of the use of rapid antigen tests.

201 The authors received positive feedback from the study participants throughout the study, a large
202 majority of whom experienced the study participation with regular testing for SARS-CoV-2 to be
203 reassuring when working in schools during the pandemic.

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211 Appendix

212 Table 1:

213 Characterization of all true positive, false positive and false negative antigen tests results determined
214 in the SAFE School Study. Ag.: Antigen, n.a.: Not applicable.

215 * result interpretation by the study participant at home. + positive: test band weaker than control
216 band. ++ positive: test band as strong as control band. +++ positive: test band stronger than control
217 band.

218 ¹⁾ Cepheid Xpert Xpress® SARS-CoV-2 ²⁾ Abbott Alinity M® SARS-CoV-2 ³⁾ Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2
219 on the Cobas® 6800 ⁴⁾ PCR done elsewhere # ORF-region

No.	Study week	Result of Ag Test at home*	Result SARS-CoV-2 PCR	Ct value	Classification of Ag Test Result	Local 7-day-incidence (school district)	Symptoms of COVID-19		Symptom Classification at time of Ag test
							Symptoms at time of Ag test	Days of symptoms prior to Ag test	
1	1	+	negative ¹⁾	n.a.	false positive	17.71	none	n.a.	asymptomatic
2	1	+	negative ²⁾	n.a.	false positive	17.71	sore throat	0	symptomatic
3	1	++	negative ³⁾	n.a.	false positive	17.71	none	n.a.	asymptomatic
4	1	++	negative ³⁾	n.a.	false positive	14.58	none	n.a.	asymptomatic
5	1	+	negative ¹⁾	n.a.	false positive	17.71	none	n.a.	asymptomatic
6	2	+	negative ³⁾	n.a.	false positive	11.75	none	n.a.	asymptomatic
7	2	+++	negative ³⁾	n.a.	false positive	24.45	none	n.a.	asymptomatic
8	2	++	negative ³⁾	n.a.	false positive	24.45	none	n.a.	asymptomatic
9	2	+++	negative ¹⁾	n.a.	false positive	31.47	none	n.a.	asymptomatic
10	3	+++	negative ³⁾	n.a.	false positive	28.10	none	n.a.	asymptomatic
11	3	+	negative ³⁾	n.a.	false positive	39.91	rhinitis	4	symptomatic
12	3	+	negative ²⁾	n.a.	false positive	28.10	none	n.a.	asymptomatic
13	3	++	negative ³⁾	n.a.	false positive	39.91	none	n.a.	asymptomatic
14	4	+++	positive ³⁾	18.9 [#]	true positive	108.76	fever, cough, head ache, body ache	3	symptomatic
15	5	+++	positive ²⁾	20	true positive	267.12	headache, fatigue	2	symptomatic
16	5	+	negative ²⁾	n.a.	false positive	211.35	sore throat	0	symptomatic
17	6	++	negative ³⁾	n.a.	false positive	213.60	abdominal pain	3	symptomatic
18	6	-	positive ⁴⁾	external test	false negative	213.60	none	0	presymptomatic
19	6	+++	positive ³⁾	17.6 [#]	true positive	275.56	fatigue, body ache	0	symptomatic
20	6	+	positive ³⁾	19.7 [#]	true positive	139.45	cough, nasal congestion, loss of schmell and taste, headache	2	symptomatic
21	7	++	positive ³⁾	20.2 [#]	true positive	252.66	none	n.a.	presymptomatic
22	7	negative	positive ⁴⁾	external test	false negative	252.66	congested nose	2	symptomatic
23	7	+	negative ³⁾	n.a.	false positive	171.51	none	n.a.	asymptomatic
24	7	negative	positive ⁴⁾	external test	false negative	171.51	nausea	2	symptomatic

220

221

222

223

224 Acknowledgement

225

226 We would like to thank Marhild Kortenbusch, Regine Jeck, Jessica Gille and Lena Marie Pompe for
227 technical support and RT-PCR testing.

228

229

230 Literature

231

- 232 1. Abdulrahman A, Mustafa F, AlAwadhi AI, Alansari Q, AlAlawi B, AlQahtani M. Comparison of
233 SARS-CoV-2 nasal antigen test to nasopharyngeal RT-PCR in mildly symptomatic patients. *medRxiv*
234 2020: 2020.11.10.20228973.
- 235 2. Corman VM, Haage VC, Bleicker T, et al. Comparison of seven commercial SARS-CoV-2 rapid
236 Point-of-Care Antigen tests. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.11.12.20230292.
- 237 3. Lindner AK, Nikolai O, Kausch F, et al. Head-to-head comparison of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-
238 detecting rapid test with self-collected anterior nasal swab versus professional-collected
239 nasopharyngeal swab. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.10.26.20219600.
- 240 4. Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity — A Strategy for
241 Containment. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020.
- 242 5. Larremore DB, Wilder B, Lester E, et al. Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and
243 turnaround time for COVID-19 screening. *Sci Adv* 2020.
- 244 6. Tu YP, Jennings R, Hart B, et al. Swabs Collected by Patients or Health Care Workers for SARS-
245 CoV-2 Testing. *N Engl J Med* 2020; 383(5): 494-6.
- 246 7. Altamirano J, Govindarajan P, Blomkalns AL, et al. Assessment of Sensitivity and Specificity of
247 Patient-Collected Lower Nasal Specimens for Sudden Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
248 Testing. *JAMA Netw Open* 2020; 3(6): e2012005.
- 249 8. Lee RA, Herigon JC, Benedetti A, Pollock NR, Denkinger CM. Performance of Saliva,
250 Oropharyngeal Swabs, and Nasal Swabs for SARS-CoV-2 Molecular Detection: A Systematic Review and
251 Meta-analysis. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.11.12.20230748.
- 252 9. Paltiel AD, Zheng A, Walensky RP. Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Screening Strategies to Permit
253 the Safe Reopening of College Campuses in the United States. *JAMA Network Open* 2020; 3(7):
254 e2016818.
- 255 10. Cronin UP, Girardeaux L, O'Meara E, Wilkinson MG. Protein A-Mediated Binding of
256 Staphylococcus spp. to Antibodies in Flow Cytometric Assays and Reduction of This Binding by Using Fc
257 Receptor Blocking Reagent. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 2020; 86(17).
- 258 11. Corman VM, Toptan T, et al. Evaluation of a SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test: potential to help
259 reduce community spread? *Journal of Clinical Virology* 2020. accepted for publication
- 260 12. Ljungberg UK, Jansson B, Niss U, Nilsson R, Sandberg BEB, Nilsson B. The interaction between
261 different domains of staphylococcal protein a and human polyclonal IgG, IgA, IgM and F(ab')₂:
262 Separation of affinity from specificity. *Molecular Immunology* 1993; 30(14): 1279-85.
- 263 13. Rafiei Y, Mello MM. The Missing Piece — SARS-CoV-2 Testing and School Reopening. *New*
264 *England Journal of Medicine* 2020.

265