

1 **Engagement with daily testing instead of self-isolating in contacts**

2 **of confirmed cases of SARS-CoV-2: A qualitative analysis**

3 Sarah Denford^{1,2,3*}, Alex F. Martin^{4*}, Nicola Love⁵, Derren Ready^{1,5}, Isabel Oliver^{1,5}, Richard
4 Amlôt^{1,4,6}, Lucy Yardley^{1,2,3,7**}, G. James Rubin^{4**}

5 *SD and AFM contributed equally to this paper and are joint first authors.

6 **LY and GJR also contributed equally and are joint senior authors.

7

8 1. Health Protection Research Unit in Behavioural Science and Evaluation at the University
9 of Bristol, Bristol, UK

10 2. Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

11 3. School of Psychological Science, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

12 4. Health Protection Research Unit in Emergency Preparedness and Response at King's
13 College London, London, UK

14 5. National Infection Service, Public Health England, Bristol, UK

15 6. Behavioural Science Team, Emergency Response Department Science and Technology,
16 Public Health England, Porton Down, Salisbury, UK

17 7. School of Psychology, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

18

19 Correspondence to:

20 Sarah Denford sarah.denford@bristol.ac.uk

21

22

23 Abstract

24 Introduction

25 In December 2020 and January 2021 Public Health England (PHE) with NHS Test and Trace
26 conducted a study to explore the feasibility and acceptability of daily testing as an alternative
27 to self-isolation following close contact with a confirmed COVID-19 case. This qualitative
28 paper aims to identify factors influencing uptake among those offered daily testing, and the
29 subsequent impact on behaviour.

30 Methods

31 We conducted in-depth interviews with 52 participants who had taken part in the feasibility
32 study. Participants were asked about their experiences of daily testing or self-isolating, their
33 reasons for choosing to test or isolate, and their behaviour during the study period. Data were
34 analysed using inductive thematic analysis.

35 Results

36 Results are presented under two main headings: 1) factors influencing acceptance of testing
37 and 2) impact of test results. Participants appeared highly motivated to engage in behaviours
38 that would protect others from the virus. Factors influencing the decision to accept testing
39 included 1) needing to avoid self-isolation 2) concerns about test sensitivity and 3) perceived
40 benefits of detecting infection. Participants who were taking tests reported: 1) positive
41 consequences following confirmation of COVID status 2) engaging in essential activities 3)
42 uncertainty and 4) self-isolating whilst testing.

43 Conclusions

44 This study has identified a range of factors that appear to influence the decision to engage in
45 daily testing or to self-isolate following close contact with a positive case, many of which
46 could be addressed by clear communications. Covid-19 infection rates and government
47 restrictions influenced experiences, and so further research is needed to explore perceptions

48 of daily testing and behaviour following close contact with a positive case among a wider
49 range of individuals, in the context of lower rates of COVID-19, few government restrictions
50 on general population behaviour and more widespread testing.

51

52 Introduction

53 In the UK, a key strategy to limit the spread of SARS-CoV-2 is the requirement that,
54 following contact with a confirmed case of COVID-19, people must self-isolate at home for
55 10 days. This can place a substantial burden on people, with negative impacts reported on
56 mental health, financial strain and reduced access to education [1, 2]. For some people,
57 particularly those who work in public-facing positions, this policy can also lead to multiple
58 self-isolation periods [3]. Isolation of contacts can also place a burden on organisations if
59 multiple members of the workforce are required to self-isolate at the same time, presenting
60 significant challenges to front-line sectors, such as emergency and health care services, and
61 education settings [1].

62 From the end of 2020, lateral flow device (LFD) antigen tests have become increasingly used
63 in a variety of settings, including schools and businesses, to provide a rapid assessment of the
64 presence of infection [4-6]. Between December 2020 and January 2021, a study was carried
65 out by Public Health England (PHE) with NHS Test and Trace to explore the feasibility and
66 acceptability of daily testing as an alternative to self-isolation following close contact with a
67 confirmed COVID-19 case [7]. Where people accepted home-testing, they were asked to
68 perform an LFD test at home once a day for up to six days. If each test was negative they
69 could continue to leave their home, within the limits of local guidelines [8]. Details of the
70 feasibility study have been reported elsewhere [7, 9]. In brief, it found that daily testing is
71 potentially acceptable to some but not all, may facilitate sharing of close contacts, and
72 promote adherence to isolation rules.

73 Several uncertainties still exist about implementation of this system, however, which need to
74 be addressed before it can be rolled out more widely. Some of these relate to how willing
75 people are to carry out home testing as an alternative to self-isolating, how people carry out
76 and interpret their tests, and how they behave following a positive and negative test result. In

77 this study, we carried out in depth interviews with individuals who were offered home-testing
78 as an alternative to self-isolation following close contact with a confirmed case, as part of the
79 previous PHE / NHS Test and Trace study. We over-sampled individuals from ethnic
80 minority backgrounds and those who declined testing, as these groups were under-
81 represented in the original study analysis. The aim of our study was to gain a better
82 understanding of factors influencing acceptance of home testing, and for those who accepted,
83 to explore the impact of test results.

84 **Method**

85 We interviewed participants who took part in a study carried out by PHE with NHS Test and
86 Trace exploring the feasibility and acceptability of daily testing as an alternative to 10 days
87 self-isolation following close contact with a positive COVID-19 case. Full details of the
88 methods of that study are reported elsewhere [7, 9]. In brief, between 11 and 23 December
89 2020 and 4 to 12 January 2021, asymptomatic contacts of confirmed Covid-19 cases were
90 given the option to carry out LFD antigen tests at home, as an alternative to self-isolation.
91 Those who consented were asked to complete up to six tests and report results daily using an
92 online system. If a test result was negative, the individual could continue with daily activities
93 for the next 24 hours, including leaving the home, within the limits of governmental policy
94 restrictions in place in their local area [8]. The study received ethical approval from Kings
95 College London's Psychiatry, Nursing and Midwifery Research Ethics Subcommittee:
96 Reference HR-20/21-21592 and Public Health England's Research Ethics and Governance
97 Group: Reference NR0235.

98 **Recruitment and data collection**

99 We used purposive opportunity sampling to recruit participants who were offered home
100 testing and either accepted or declined. We targeted participants from ethnic minority groups,
101 and those who declined home testing, as these were under-represented in the original study

102 analysis [7, 9] and we considered their views particularly important for informing efforts to
103 maximise acceptability, feasibility and inclusivity of daily testing. All participants who we
104 approached for interview had provided additional consent to be contacted by our team. All
105 were 18 years or older. Additional verbal consent for our study was obtained prior to the
106 interview.

107 We asked participants about their experiences of home testing or self-isolating, with a focus
108 on their motivation for their chosen option and their experiences and behaviour during home
109 testing or self-isolation. Full interview schedules are reported in Supplement 1.

110 Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Following the six stages of
111 thematic analysis [10], the two lead authors independently assigned initial codes to the
112 interview transcripts using NVivo12 software. The research team met regularly to discuss
113 the codes and agree a preliminary set of themes. As analysis progressed, this list was refined,
114 and similar themes were combined. Charts were developed for each theme, and verbatim
115 quotes for each theme were collated. Charts were then used to identify narratives within and
116 between cases.

117 **Results**

118 Fifty-two participants took part in the interviews, including 17 who declined the offer of
119 home testing and opted to self-isolate instead. Participants were aged between 18 and 73
120 years (mean 43 years). Thirty-three participants were female, and 18 were from ethnic
121 minority groups (Table 1).

122 **1. Factors influencing acceptance of testing**

123 **Protecting those around you**

124 Regardless of whether participants chose to take daily tests or self-isolate, the need to protect
125 themselves and those around them was a priority:

126 *“You don't want to put anybody else at risk, so you don't do anything that you could pass*
127 *onto anybody else” (female, mixed ethnicity, consented to testing)*

128 However, whilst participants were highly motivated to do all they could to protect themselves
129 and others around them from COVID-19, there was a conflicting need to minimise the impact
130 of self-isolation on their lives. This resulted in participants weighing up the level of risk
131 associated with various behaviours against their need to perform various activities:

132 *“You're really fed up of being inside, but at the same time you think if there's a chance that I*
133 *could be going out too early and spreading it people, of course you don't want to do it. It was*
134 *a difficult call”(female, white, self-isolated)*

135 Need to avoid self-isolation

136 There appeared to be considerable variation in the extent to which participants needed, and
137 wanted, to avoid self-isolation and leave their homes. Participants explained how they were
138 willing to take daily tests to enable them to perform essential activities, such as shopping,
139 collecting medication, and for daily exercise. Due to the festive period, the ability to run
140 errands appeared to be particularly important, especially for those who were unable to secure
141 supermarket deliveries:

142 *“[If] I were negative then I could go about, at least nip out and go to the shops just for some*
143 *vital items”(male, white, consented to testing)*

144 *“We were just coming up to Christmas. Of course... and I hadn't got any Christmas*
145 *shopping. I thought, Oh My God. Knowing where we live, you just cannot get online*
146 *shopping”(female, mixed ethnicity, consented to testing)*

147 Exercise was another key driver for people who had limited or shared space:

148 *“I'm in a Uni house, I've got a very small room, so for me being able to go out and go for a*
149 *walk was a big thing”(female, white, consented to testing)*

150 For participants who needed to complete essential activities, such as collecting medication,
151 the ability to leave the house caused considerable relief:

152 *“The pharmacy couldn't deliver to us, we couldn't do anything, so I was like how am I going*
153 *to get this? Am I going to wait round until ten days just to get this prescription for my*
154 *[relative]? I think in that way it was just a huge stress release to know that I can get out and*
155 *get it” (female, ethnicity not provided, consented to testing)*

156 Whilst motivation to avoid self isolation generally led people to take part in daily testing, for
157 some, the strong need to avoid isolation reduced their willingness to take tests. This was due
158 to concerns about potentially extending the isolation period:

159 *“I had a conversation with my work shortly after and said, 'Look, I've been offered this*
160 *seven-day trial where if you're negative test you can go out for 24 hours, but if in that seven*
161 *days I get a positive test result then I have to do the ten days from then.' I think they then*
162 *said, 'No, I think it'd be better if you stick to the ten days,' so I just stuck to the ten days....*
163 *worst case scenario is if you've been isolating for nine days and then you get a positive test*
164 *result and then have to do a 17-day isolation” (male, ethnicity not specified, self-isolated).*

165 In contrast, a number of participants explained how a lack of need to go out – even for
166 essential tasks – resulted in them opting to self-isolate:

167 *“To be honest with you, working in the home, we've pretty much done isolation since this all*
168 *began nearly a year ago” (female, ethnicity not specified, self-isolated).*

169 Concern about test sensitivity

170 For some participants, doubts about the accuracy of LFD tests led them to choose to isolate
171 rather than home test.

172 *“That test, I wasn't sure of, because I understand that sometimes, even if you are positive, it*
173 *can come back as negative, because I work in the NHS and I use it as well. Because I work*

174 *with vulnerable people, I didn't want to put them in risk. That is the reason why I thought it*
175 *would be better to self-isolate rather than going to work” (male, Asian, self-isolated)*

176 *“I think I would if I didn't have my job. I think I definitely would [consent to testing] if I*
177 *didn't have my job, because then I won't have anything on my conscience” (female, mixed*
178 *ethnicity, self-isolated).*

179 Some participants were concerned that they would potentially put others at risk if they had
180 not taken the test accurately.

181 *“I didn't feel confident that I would have been doing it properly, if that makes sense...*
182 *Because I think, you know when you have to swab yourself, you tend to chicken out*
183 *sometimes, if that makes sense? Not that you'd do it on purpose... But you've got to think you*
184 *could be carrying the virus, whether you've got symptoms or not now, haven't you?” (female,*
185 *mixed ethnicity, self-isolated)*

186 Concerns about the safety of daily testing appeared to be related to participants' concerns
187 about the potential for transmitting the virus. One participant described a concern that he
188 would be able to transmit the virus – even if he did not have it himself:

189 *“I did not want to be a carrier in any form. I mean, not necessarily within my body, but what*
190 *if I carried the virus on my breath or some part of me carried it, then I went out it could*
191 *spread to other people, so that's why” (male, Asian, consented to testing)*

192 Participants were also worried that they would be able to contract and transmit the virus
193 within the 24 hour window between tests:

194 *“If I tested negative and I went out and then the next I tested positive, I'd be thinking to*
195 *myself, was that test yesterday positive and I went out and infected people?” (female, white,*
196 *consented to testing)*

197 This was particularly true among people who were living with a positive index case, as one
198 participant explained that he would not be willing to take daily tests due to his belief that he
199 would, at some point, catch the virus from his partner:

200 *“I decided to carry out the quarantine rather than daily testing because for me, if it's an*
201 *airborne virus then it doesn't make sense if I'm still sleeping next to the person who's been*
202 *told they're positive for me not to have it.”(male, ethnicity not specified, self-isolated)*

203 Perceived benefits of detecting infection

204 In contrast to those voicing concerns about the transmission risks of daily testing, some
205 participants described being motivated to take part in daily testing to make sure that they had
206 not caught, and were not spreading the virus:

207 *“The reason I decided [to take tests is] because my family caught Covid... They contracted*
208 *Covid and when I was offered these tests, I wanted to make sure that I take them on a daily*
209 *basis and make sure I don't get Covid and basically preventing the spread of Covid” (male,*
210 *Asian, consented to testing)*

211 Participants described how testing could help protect vulnerable people in their household:

212 *“I thought it was a great addition that I could have that resource available so that I knew*
213 *that the vulnerable people in my house wouldn't be put in any harm” (female, ethnicity not*
214 *specified, consented to testing)*

215 One participant described how testing could facilitate self-isolation and so prevent spread of
216 the virus:

217 *“Also, it's good to know whether you've got it or not, so that you then know that you have to*
218 *isolate so that you're not transferring it around” (female, mixed ethnicity, consented to*
219 *testing).*

220 2. Impact of test results

221 Positive consequences of confirmation of COVID status

222 Participants who went on to develop symptoms during the study, described how tests

223 provided rapid confirmation of their COVID status:

224 *“When I first felt ill, I didn't immediately think it was Covid; I was convincing myself it*
225 *wasn't. I was like, 'Well, I haven't got a temperature, and I haven't got a cough...' Although I*
226 *did get a cough, eventually. I was like, 'No, it's not going to be Covid. It's not, it's not; it's just*
227 *the flu.' No, actually, it was only from having a positive test at home that I knew” (female,*
228 *mixed ethnicity, consented to testing)*

229 Tests were often used in combination with (a lack of) symptoms as a way of providing
230 additional reassurance that they did not have the virus:

231 *“You blow your nose, you sneeze, you think, aye-aye, and then you start to get paranoid. I eat*
232 *like a horse anyway and I can smell a fart from about 300 yards, so I know there's no trouble*
233 *with me, pardon the expression” (male, white, consented to testing)*

234 Participants described how it helped their mental wellbeing to know whether or not they had
235 the virus:

236 *“It's just that peace of mind because I was genuinely having sleepless nights, worrying, but I*
237 *wouldn't tell my [relative] that. The fact that it was in the same house and the [relative] told*
238 *me, that they said it could be fatal to me, was a worry. So it was lovely to have that*
239 *reassurance that every morning” (male, white, consented to testing)*

240 Participants were not always concerned about having a positive test result, but were eager to
241 know either way:

242 *“When I did the tests and I got the results at the end of it within 30 minutes, it gave a peace*
243 *of mind that obviously, that I was not positive on the days, or I was... Either I was positive or*
244 *negative, within the 30 minutes I would know that, so it was ease of finding out where I am*

245 *with Covid and basically, getting the results at such a pace, it just gave us peace of mind*
246 *more than anything else” (male, white, consented to testing)*

247 Enabling essential activities

248 Several participants described how negative test results enabled them to undertake essential
249 activities, such as collecting medications:

250 *“When I was negative, and I thought I need to collect my [relative’s]medications and just get*
251 *on with my life. When I got it I was like, let's just do this”(female, ethnicity not provided,*
252 *consented to testing)*

253 Others appreciated being able to spend time with loved ones over the festive period:

254 *“The following days, obviously the next day would have been Christmas Day, so it was nice*
255 *to know that I could actually spend that day with my family... Me and my partner don't live*
256 *together, so it was nice to know that I could still meet up with him outside over Christmas*
257 *because we've spent quite a lot of this year apart, so I think we both would have found that*
258 *quite difficult” (female, ethnicity not specified, consented to testing)*

259 Participants appreciated being able to leave their homes for a short while, but described
260 making efforts to ensure that they did so safely:

261 *“I was still fairly restrictive. To be honest, I was only popping to the supermarket, not every*
262 *day. Probably out of that ten-day period I visited the shops three times, and that was only one*
263 *supermarket for a short period of time. Then just daily dog walks, which again, were, living*
264 *fairly rurally so we weren't seeing any people anyway, so it was just to have the freedom to*
265 *be able to do those essential things really” (female, white, consented to testing)*

266 *“I think I went into the supermarket once to get some bits, but other than that I didn't do*
267 *anything. Like I said, I think you can trust the result to a point, but I was still well aware that*
268 *there was Covid in our house, so just tried to be responsible” (female, ethnicity unspecified,*
269 *consented to testing)*

270 A number of participants described being particularly cautious in their behaviour during the
271 testing period, but felt on reflection that they could have done a bit more:

272 *“Looking back at it now I felt like I could have done a little bit more, but I was just being*
273 *precautionary. I only was still going out where I needed to go because for me, it was like*
274 *even though it's a negative I felt like I still could get it the next day. Even though the test was*
275 *negative that day, that's not to say that the next day it would be negative. I think that I just*
276 *felt that I needed to take those extra steps just for my own peace of mind and to make sure*
277 *that they would be safe”*(female, ethnicity not specified, consented to testing)

278 However, for many, the ability to leave their home was considered important for their mental
279 health:

280 *For my mental health, it really did benefit me being able to know that I could go about my*
281 *daily routine rather than... To stay isolated on your own for ten days, it's not good for*
282 *anyone's mindset. Yes, I found it really good to have that option available to us”* (female,
283 *ethnicity unspecified, consented to testing*)

284 Uncertainty

285 A small number of participants who consented to home-testing were confused by the rules,
286 and questioned whether or not they were actually allowed to leave the home.

287 *“I did end up phoning NHS Direct also, because I felt, like we said before, a little bit uneasy*
288 *that the rules... I just wanted to double check that I was okay. I did phone NHS... They said if*
289 *I had the information letter about participating in a study, and I had that with me, that I was*
290 *okay to be out, and because I'd uploaded my tests electronically, so I had the test results and*
291 *everything there to hand... but even my [relative] said to me, 'Do you think you should be*
292 *going out?’* (female, white, consented to testing)

293 The main source of confusion appeared to be whether participants were able to leave the
294 house when living with a positive case. This may have been the result of a lack of clarity in

295 the messages about this situation. For example, one participant described how she had been
296 told (correctly) at the point of recruitment that she was able to take part even though many of
297 her household had tested positive:

298 *“When the lady phoned me, she said, 'If you test negative you can go out.' I said, 'What?*
299 *Even though the rest of the family are positive?' She went, 'Well, if you're negative you can*
300 *go out.' I thought, yes!” (female, white, consented to testing)*

301 Formal study documentation stated that to continue to work and visit shops “we would
302 encourage you to separate yourself from the person (with COVID-19) in your household as
303 much as possible during the study period”, which people interpreted in different ways:

304 *When I received the paperwork it said that it didn't apply if the person lived within your*
305 *household. It was only if you'd been in contact with that person and had no further contact*
306 *with them, so I was a bit confused as to whether or not it did actually apply to me or*
307 *not”(female, ethnicity not specified, consented to testing)*

308 One participant who was living with a positive case was confused about whether they were
309 able to go to work:

310 *“The plan was to get back to work sooner, but I was a bit confused over that because the*
311 *person that I'd been in contact with lived with me... so I didn't end up going back to work, but*
312 *that was my initial reason for wanting to do it”(male, white, consented to testing)*

313 Those living with a positive case sometimes combined isolating with testing as a result of
314 being confused by the rules: :

315 *“Well, to be honest, I did quarantine anyway because I was actually living with my [relative]*
316 *at the time, so I think it was different, that I still had to quarantine even though I was doing*
317 *the test kit” (female, white, consented to testing)*

318 However, a level of uncertainty was evident – even within families:

319 *“We had this big argument with, my [relative] and myself, because he said to me, 'You can't*
320 *go out even if it says negative....' . I said, 'But it does say in here that if I was living on my*
321 *own and I was negative I could go out.' He went, 'No, you're reading it all wrong.' So we had*
322 *this discussion a couple of times, and in the end I thought, I give up. I wasn't going out*
323 *anyway” (female, mixed ethnicity, consented to testing)”*

324 Self-isolating whilst testing

325 Despite consenting to take daily tests, a considerable number of participants were still
326 reluctant to leave their homes. This group described restricting their behaviour, over and
327 above what was recommended, by still not going out despite a negative test result:

328 *“Even if the tests that were given to me, the rapid tests allowed me to step out for 24 hours, I*
329 *decided not to basically do it. Yes, again, I just followed the basic national guidelines, etc.,*
330 *etc., looking at all of that, but just decided to self-isolate” (male, Asian, consented to testing).*

331 This group used test results to allow them to spend time with others within their household:

332 *“They did obviously, indicate that as long as the tests were negative, I could go around my*
333 *daily routine, so once that test was negative, I then was able to leave my bedroom and just...*
334 *I still did kind of socially distance from my family within the house... but I was able to*
335 *obviously, spend some time with them and not feel so isolated, so that was good” (female,*
336 *ethnicity unspecified, consented to testing)*

337 However, despite initial motivations for taking part in daily testing, participants reported
338 feeling uncomfortable when it came to leaving their home:

339 *“I did initially think I'll just be able to go into uni and things like that, but I didn't end up*
340 *doing that because it didn't quite feel right” (female, white, consented to testing)*

341 Following a seven day testing period, one participant felt obliged to then isolate for the
342 remainder of the 10 day isolation period:

343 *“I actually waited then, because it was seven days after, but I kind of waited until my ten*
344 *days was up before I ended my isolation period, if you like” (female, white, consented to*
345 *testing)*

346 Discussion

347 Main findings of this study

348 To our knowledge, this is the first study to qualitatively explore perceptions of daily testing
349 as an alternative to self-isolation following close contact with a positive case. In choosing
350 whether to take daily tests or self-isolate, participants described a decision-making process
351 that ultimately aimed to maximise the safety of themselves and others around them, whilst
352 minimizing any detrimental impacts of self-isolation. This involved individual assessments of
353 the extent to which avoiding self-isolation was necessary and important, combined with level
354 of confidence in the safety and accuracy of daily testing.

355 Participants varied in their need and desire to avoid isolation. In line with previous research,
356 those who were unable to work remotely, unable to access support or supplies, or who lived
357 in crowded accommodation with limited outside space appeared to have a greater need to
358 avoid isolating than those who had a strong support network and were able to work remotely
359 [11]. The decision to decline testing could stem from either a lack of need to avoid self-
360 isolation, or in a small number of cases a strong need to avoid self-isolation. This latter group
361 described concerns that a positive test result could potentially extend the standard 10 day
362 isolation period – something that they were highly motivated to avoid. Pressure from
363 employers appeared to exacerbate this; highlighting the need for support for isolation from
364 employers. In our sample, some employers appeared to hold an irrational view of self-
365 isolation, preferring that a potentially infectious member of staff attend work than allowing
366 them to remain in self-isolation beyond the originally intended 10 day period. Any

367 widespread roll-out of daily testing should include communications for employers
368 highlighting the benefits of the system in reducing the likelihood of workplace outbreaks.
369 Perceptions of the safety of testing appeared to be influenced by participants' beliefs about
370 the accuracy of tests and transmissibility of the virus. Due to media coverage and ongoing
371 debates about the accuracy of the LFD [12] many participants indicated surprise and concern
372 regarding their use. A number of participants, particularly those who were living with
373 someone who had the virus, reported concerns that they could potentially transmit the virus
374 even if they had not tested positive. This included concerns that they could carry the virus on
375 their clothes, be infectious before they tested positive, or contract the virus within the 24 hour
376 window. Greater clarity about the use of LFDs among people who live with a case will be
377 required in any future roll-out. Study documentation stated that people may still leave the
378 home following a negative LFD test, provided that they separate themselves from the positive
379 case as much as possible but this was interpreted in different ways. Our findings also
380 highlight the need for support for self-isolation among those who do not feel comfortable or
381 able to continue with their normal daily routines following exposure to the virus.
382 Test results provided participants with valuable confirmation of COVID status, particularly
383 when faced with uncertain or unusual symptoms. For vulnerable individuals, or those highly
384 concerned about catching the virus, confirmation provided much needed reassurance and
385 reduced unnecessary anxiety. This finding tallies with a wider literature on the impact of
386 emerging health risks, where uncertainty about exposure status is often cited as anxiogenic
387 [13, 14].
388 In some cases, testing facilitated the identification of a positive case, leading to immediate
389 isolation. Importantly, these participants appeared to have been struggling with their
390 understanding of the symptoms of COVID-19 expecting either that loss of smell would be the
391 key symptom or convincing themselves that their symptoms would not be COVID-19. In

392 these cases, the provision of daily testing helped them to receive an earlier diagnosis. In
393 accordance with existing literature, this suggests that a confirmatory test results is likely to
394 facilitate adherence to social distancing measures [9].

395 Participants were informed that they could leave the house for 24 hours following a negative
396 test result, and our previous work found that participants did engage in more activities
397 following a negative test result than on the days that they were trying to self-isolate.

398 However, only a small percentage reported engaging in more high contact activity than they
399 had before the testing period [9]. Whilst no additional restrictions were mentioned in terms of
400 what participants were and were not able to do during the 24 hour period, it was clear that
401 participants did not accept the result of the LFD as conclusive evidence that they did not have
402 the virus, and still made every effort to distance as much as possible. Indeed, many
403 participants choosing to take daily tests to enable participation in essential activities reported
404 that they had restricted their behaviour more than they had prior to testing, and others still
405 engaged in self-isolation, despite negative test results. This was particularly important among
406 those who were living with someone who had the virus. Whilst this is in line with previous
407 research [15] that found participants engage in social distancing measures over and above
408 what is recommended, it may be argued that those living with a positive case are more likely
409 to catch the virus themselves, therefore cautious behaviour is sensible. This belief may
410 explain why our previous work found that individuals receiving a positive test result reported
411 less contact on the days that they had a negative test result than those that received negative
412 test results throughout [9].

413 Limitations

414 The main limitation associated with this work is the extent to which the views of our sample
415 can be transferred to other settings and sectors of the community. Whilst every effort was
416 made to recruit a diverse sample of individuals, it is inevitable that not all groups were

417 included. In particular, those declining daily tests were underrepresented in the sample.
418 Furthermore, many participants reported being able to work remotely, and/or were not
419 financially disadvantaged as a result of having to isolate.
420 Secondly, many of the participants in the study reported excellent adherence to the guidelines
421 at all times, whereas anonymous surveys have found breaches of adherence are common [16].
422 It is possible that participants did not feel able to admit to breaches – even if they were
423 considered to have been necessary at the time. Participants who had poor adherence may
424 have been less likely to take part in the study. However, our findings are in line with ONS
425 data reporting adherence in 90% of people required to self-isolate following close contact
426 with a confirmed case [17].
427 Finally, data collection for this study began just as the UK went into a third lockdown, and
428 considerable social distancing restrictions were in place. This will have had a considerable
429 impact on the extent to which many participants had a need to go to work or leave the home
430 for other reasons. Future research should explore a diverse range of views in a context in
431 which lockdown restrictions have been eased and the familiarity with testing has increased
432 [18].

433 Conclusion

434 This study has described the range of factors that appear to influence the decision to engage
435 in daily testing or to self-isolate following close contact with a positive case. Participants
436 were highly motivated to protect themselves and those around them, and engaged in a critical
437 assessment of their own situation to ultimately decide how they could achieve this. Research
438 must now explore perceptions of daily testing and behaviour following close contact with a
439 positive case among a wider range of individuals, outside of lockdown, and in an
440 environment in which cases of COVID-19 are lower and testing is more common.

441

442 Declarations

443 Ethics approval and consent to participate

444 Ethical approval for this study was granted by Kings College London's Psychiatry, Nursing
445 and Midwifery Research Ethics Subcommittee: Reference HR-20/21-21592 and Public
446 Health England's Research Ethics and Governance Group: Reference NR0235.

447 Consent for publication

448 All participants provided verbal consent for data to be included in publications

449 Availability of data and materials

450 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the
451 corresponding author on reasonable request.

452 Competing interests

453 None declared

454 Funding

455 This study was funded by the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection
456 Research Units (NIHR HPRU) in Emergency Preparedness and Response, a partnership
457 between Public Health England, King's College London and the University of East Anglia,
458 and Behavioural Science and Evaluations, a partnership between Public Health England and
459 the University of Bristol. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily
460 those of the NIHR, Public Health England or the Department of Health and Social Care.

461 Authors' contributions

462 Conceived the study: All authors

463 Study design: All authors

464 Analysed the data: AM

465 Interpreted the data: All authors

466 Drafted the manuscript: AM and SD

467 Reviewed the manuscript and approved content: All authors

468 Met authorship criteria: All authors

469 Acknowledgements

470 Lucy Yardley is an NIHR Senior Investigator and her research programme is partly supported

471 by NIHR Applied Research Collaboration (ARC)-West, NIHR Health Protection Research

472 Unit (HPRU) in Behavioural Science and Evaluation, and the NIHR Southampton

473 Biomedical Research Centre (BRC).

474 Sarah Denford is supported by the NIHR Health Protection Research Unit (HPRU) in

475 Behavioural Science and Evaluation at the University of Bristol in partnership with Public

476 Health England.

477 Alex F Martin is supported by the Economic and Social Research Council Grant Number

478 ES/J500057/1 and the NIHR HPRU in Emergency Preparedness and Response at King's

479 College London in partnership with Public Health England.

480 James Rubin is supported by the NIHR HPRU in Emergency Preparedness and Response at

481 King's College London in partnership with Public Health England.

- 482 1. 1. HM Government. Attendance in education and early years settings during the
483 coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak 2021. [Attendance in education and early years settings](#)
484 [during the coronavirus \(COVID-19\) outbreak – 23 March 2020 to 10 June 2021 - Official](#)
485 [statistics announcement - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#) [Accessed May 2020]
- 486 2. Brooks S, Webster RK, Smith L, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, et al. The psychological
487 impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: Rapid evidence review. *Lancet*, 2020. **395**: p.
488 912-920.
- 489 3. Rubin G, Smith L, Melendez-Torres GJ, Yardley L. Improving adherence to 'test, trace and
490 isolate. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 2020. **113**(9): p. 335-358.
- 491 4. Torjesen, I., COVID-19: How is the UK using lateral flow tests in the pandemic? *BMJ*, 2021.
492 **372**:n287.
- 493 5. Department of Health and Social Care. More employers sign up to rapid testing to protect
494 workforce. 2021. [More employers sign up to rapid testing to protect workforce - GOV.UK](#)
495 [\(www.gov.uk\)](#) [Accessed May 2020]
- 496 6. Department of Health and Social Care. Pilot for family members to get regular testing for
497 safer care home visits. 2020. [Pilot for family members to get regular testing for safer care](#)
498 [home visits - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#) [Accessed May 2020]
- 499 7. Love N, Ready D, Turner C, Yardley L, Rubin J, Hopkins S, Oliver S. The acceptability of testing
500 contacts of confirmed COVID-19 cases using serial, self-administered lateral flow devices as
501 an alternative to self-isolation. *MedRxiv* [preprint] (2021). Available at [The acceptability of](#)
502 [testing contacts of confirmed COVID-19 cases using serial, self-administered lateral flow](#)
503 [devices as an alternative to self-isolation | medRxiv](#)
- 504 8. HM Government. COVID-19 Response - Spring 2021. 2021:
505 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/963491/COVID-19_Response_-_Spring_2021.pdf)
506 [data/file/963491/COVID-19 Response - Spring 2021.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/963491/COVID-19_Response_-_Spring_2021.pdf). [Accessed May 2020]
- 507 9. Martin AF, Denford S, Love N, Ready D, Oliver I, Amlot R, Rubin J, Yardley J. Engagement with
508 daily testing instead of self-isolating in contacts of confirmed cases of SARS-CoV-2. *MedRxiv*
509 [preprint], 2021. Available [Engagement with daily testing instead of self-isolating in contacts](#)
510 [of confirmed cases of SARS-CoV-2 | medRxiv](#)
- 511 10. Braun, V. & Clark, V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in*
512 *Psychology*, 2006. **3**(2): p. 77-101.
- 513 11. Smith, L, Amlot R, Lambert H, Oliver I, Yardley L, Rubin GJ. Factors associated with adherence
514 to self-isolation and lockdown measures in the UK: a cross-sectional survey. *Public Health*,
515 2020. **187**: p. 41-52.
- 516 12. Deeks J, Raffle A, Gill M. Covid-19: government must urgently rethink lateral flow test roll
517 out. *BMJ*, 2021.
- 518 13. Rubin, GJ, Amlot R, Carter H, Large S, Wessely S, Page L. Reassuring and managing patients
519 with concerns about swine flu: Qualitative interviews with callers to NHS Direct. *BMC Public*
520 *Health*, 2010. **10**(451).
- 521 14. Rubin, GJ, Page L, Morgan O, Pinder RJ, Riley P, Hatch S, Maguire H, Catchpole M, Simpson J,
522 Wessely S. Public information needs after the poisoning of Alexander Litvinenko with
523 polonium-210 in London: cross sectional telephone survey and qualitative analysis. *BMJ*,
524 2007. **335**(7360): p. 1143.

- 525 15. Denford S, Morton K, Lambert H, Zhang J, Smith LE, Rubin GJ, Cai S, Zhang T, Robin C,
526 Lasseter G et al. Understanding patterns of adherence to COVID-19 mitigation measures: A
527 qualitative interview study. *Journal of Public Health*, 2021. **fdab005**.
- 528 16. Smith, LE, Potts HW, Amlot R, Fear NT, Michie S, Rubin GJ. Adherence to the test, trace and
529 isolate system in the UK: results from 37 nationally representative surveys (the COVID-19
530 Rapid Survey of Adherence to Interventions and Responses [CORSAIR] study). *BMJ*, 2021.
531 **372;n608**.
- 532 17. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after being in contact with a
533 positive case in England: 1 April to 10 April 2021. 2021. [Coronavirus and self-isolation after
534 being in contact with a positive case in England: 1 April to 10 April 2021 - Office for National
535 Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](#) [Accessed May 2021]
- 536 18. Gov.UK, Understanding lateral flow antigen testing for people without symptoms. 2021.
537 [https://www.gov.uk/guidance/understanding-lateral-flow-antigen-testing-for-people-
538 without-symptoms](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/understanding-lateral-flow-antigen-testing-for-people-
538 without-symptoms) [Accessed May 2021]
- 539

540 Table 1: Participant characteristics

	Selected daily testing (N=35)	Selected self-isolation (N=17)
Test result		
Positive	12	NA
Negative	23	NA
Age		
18-25	2	4
26-40	13	5
41-60	15	8
61-70	4	0
Over 70	1	0
Missing	0	0
Gender		
Male	9	10
Female	26	7
Ethnic group		
White	12	3
Mixed / multiple ethnic groups	8	2
Asian / Asian British	6	2
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	0	0
Not disclosed	7	10

541

542